RECORDED VOICE:	This meeting is now being recorded.

BRENDA BREWER: Thank you, Alan. This is Brenda speaking for the record. I'd like to welcome everyone to the RDS WHOIS 2 Review Team Plenary Call No. 21, on February 23, at 13:30 UTC. In attendance today, we have Dmitry, Lili, Alan, Susan, Thomas, Stephanie, and from ICANN organization, Jean-Baptiste, Amy, Steve, Alice, Lisa, Brenda.

We do have apologies from Cathrin and Volker, and at this time, there are no observers joining us. I'd like to remind today's call is being recorded. Please state your name before speaking for the transcript, and I'll turn it over to you, Alan. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much, and welcome to the call. Today is the second meeting of the week that we are currently working on. We have scheduled a number of general subgroup reviews, plus some specific ones that we'll go into in some additional depth.

The first item we have, however, is the review of the blog post, which is commemorating the submission of our terms of reference and work plan to the board. And we are obliged to do outreach on a regular basis when we have significant landmarks -- specific, you know, items that we have completed.

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.

And I'll turn it over to Jean-Baptiste to very quickly review what is in the blog post -- not to read it, but just to go over the main sections, and we'll open the floor up to questions. This document has been reviewed a number of times by the leadership, and it's undergone a number of changes as we've evolved and, at this point, from our perspective, it looks good. Jean-Baptiste. Do we have Jean-Baptiste on the line?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yes. Hold on, Alan, just one second.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. [AUDIO BREAK]

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: It seems there is an issue with the blog post. It won't show. Just a minute. [AUDIO BREAK]

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Okay. Perfect. And so you should now be able to see it now in Adobe Connect. I put it into shared with the meeting invitation. So, just to reflect and so, what's currently in the blog post -- and also, what were the last changes to it.

So, what you see on screen is basically -- so, describing what the review team has been working on and then informing the community that the terms of reference and work plan were developed and were submitted

to the ICANN board, to ensure that it's in scope and the timeline is consistent with the ICANN bylaws.

So, here what we put in the first section of the blog post is a reflection of what is currently -- into the terms of reference and different objectives are listed here. So recently, we have updated the section under "the review team will" to provide a better parallel with what's currently in the terms of reference.

And we also listing into the blog post the next steps for the review team, just to keep the community informed of work -- and we are listing the plan that there will be a second face-to-face meeting in Brussels that is being scheduled, and what are the objectives of this meeting, which will be to review the different draft findings and recommendations from subgroups. And we are always reporting, at the end of each blog post, how people can get involved in the RDS review and participate as an observer.

And this is also an important tip for the reader to also uplink to your Wiki page, and have a look at the different updates that will come out as the review moves forwards, by reading the outreach plan for more information. Any questions?

ALAN GREENBERG: Anyone have any comments or questions? Stephanie asked whether we're accepting input from the review team. I presume that was on the blog. And, yes, we certainly are.

If no one has any comments on this call, we will put out a request by email for anyone to submit any comments. Jean-Baptiste, if we do it by the -- no later than the end of Tuesday, we can review any possible changes on Wednesday, and then, get it out, is that timing sufficient?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: That's a good question, Alan. The last update I had from a communications was the possibility to post it next Tuesday. But if you wish, we can discuss with reset that deadline to a little more time for the review to review the blog post.

ALAN GREENBERG: I would think so. If we're going to give people time, who aren't on this call, I think we have to make it a little bit later than Monday, but Tuesday should be fine.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Okay. So, we [CROSSTALK] --

ALAN GREENBERG: So, we'll accept input. If we don't already have a leadership call scheduled for next Wednesday, then let's presume we will get together either on Skype or on the phone, and do any updates if there are any suggestions.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Okay. So, we'll write an action item that the review team members can send comments up until Tuesday, close of business, correct?

ALAN GREENBERG: That's fine. Or close of business or end of the day in UTC.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Okay. Thank you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Stephanie, I understand, but we do have to keep moving here, and this is not a particularly large or onerous document, so I hope you'll find five minutes to look it over and make any comments if you have any. And Lisa notes that most of it is extracted, perhaps with slight wording changes, from the terms of reference.

All right. Let us go ahead with the next item, and that is we're into the bulk of this call, which is a review of subgroups, and we're first looking at a few areas that we do not have -- we have not had the initial work plan summary and questions answered discussed yet. And the first one up is Stephanie. Do you we have anything from you?

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Stephanie Perrin for the record, and I apologize for my voice and cough. We're having a call right after this meeting, and I hope that we will find out how available people are to actually get our heads together and do some work on this.

I do apologize, as I've been saying in the chat, it's just been insane the amount of time that has been demanded for GDPR, so, this is my next project once I get a [inaudible] piece off my plate today. So, hopefully, they'll call at 10:00; we'll find out where everybody is on this. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Stephanie. And Stephanie faded at the end, but I think the summary is there's a call right after this one. I hope it will be attended by a significant number of the subgroup, and, hopefully, we should have a plan going forward out of that.

Any further comments, questions, on the "anything new" item? If not, we'll go on to the next one. That's law enforcement needs -- Thomas.

THOMAS WALDEN: Hey. Good morning. This is Thomas. We have a call today at 11:00 so I can get a little further guidance on where I need to go with this. What I've been doing, aside from my other duties here with my agency and all, I've reached out to some of my folks here in my agency with a few little questions, and their input on questions that I need to ask.

I got some questions from Cathrin, so I'll kind of compare those and contrast those with what I have. As I said, I have an 11:00 meeting today, following this one to get a little guidance, make sure I'm going down the right road, and I'll follow that up with setting up a meeting with the rest of the subgroup.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. And I don't believe there have been any messages to the mailing list. If you could try to keep the mailing list informed, so -- there are other people who look at that, even if they're not part of the subgroup, and I think it's important that we keep the whole group able to understand where we are.

THOMAS WALDEN: Outstanding. I can do that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Any questions for Thomas? Again, we will be meeting later on this -- today, and, hopefully, out of that we'll have some way going forward. Nothing -- hearing nothing, we will go on to the next item, which is a discussion in some additional depth on two of the issues.

The first one is mine on outreach, and if we could put the slides up -- I did distribute them, well, a few hours ago -- yesterday, my time -- today, for some of you. Thank you. And if we go on to slide No. 1 -- or slide No. 2, I guess -- the first none title one. Yes, please go ahead.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Alan, you have a presentation rights if you wish to move the slides, or we can do it if you wish.

ALAN GREENBERG: I would prefer if you not make me presenter and you do it because I have a tendency to --

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: I have a tendency to play with my mouse and that means things will be moving randomly. I'm not quite disciplined enough to be a presenter.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Okay, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: At least, not with Adobe Connect. All right. The first thing I did in this one is to go back to the actual report from the last review team. And it was interesting. The section on outreach is very short, but it was very clear, just from reading the very short introduction to it, that the motivation for this was driven by the consumer confidence requirement. And consumer confidence means, do users have the ability to know who they're dealing with?

Now, obviously, GDPR and things like that are going to alter this, but at the time they were looking at it, the conclusion that was in the report is, the vast majority of consumers were unaware of the existence of WHOIS service and those who were aware of it, struggled to understand what it meant.

Now, if we then go on to the actual recommendation -- next slide, please -- the recommendation is, "ICANN should ensure that WHOIS

policy issues are accompanied by cross-community outreach, including outreach to communities outside of ICANN with specific interests in the issues and an ongoing program for consumer awareness."

Next slide -- which is -- the next slide was extracted from the briefing we received on the status of this recommendation. Next slide.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: If Lisa can move the slide; I've been kicked out of Adobe Connect. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: The next slide summarizes what the recommendation is, the board action, and the rationale. And I won't read it, but you'll note the recommendation is not the same one as was in the report. And if we can go on to the next slide -- for some reason, and I don't quite understand why; although, I have a suspicion -- the part of the recommendation that was copied into both our briefing and the implementation of it was just the first part. It did not go into detail on outreach to communities outside of ICANN.

Next slide. So, the implementation said they were putting together and have put together a pretty comprehensive WHOIS web presence with a lot of, you know, if you look -- if you go to whois.icann.org, what you'll find is a lot of pointers to a lot of other things that are relevant to WHOIS. Not quite sure how user-friendly it would be considered, but it is -- a lot of things are there. There is a registrant benefits and responsibilities what was incorporated into the RAA. Outreach was

conducted to registrars and there is a registrant educational series launched, again web-based, to try to educated registrants and there were regular updates that, in theory, were published.

And the real question in my mind is -- next slide, please? Sorry. ICANN did very little to address what I consider the main thrust of the recommendation -- to reach out to those who are not already familiar with ICANN and, both, make them aware of the presence of WHOIS and explain it.

The explanation could well be incorporated into the documents that we just looked at, and neither I, nor the other review team members have gone and done a deep dive into those documents to understand how well they're done. But my real question to this group is, ICANN did not do a lot to reach out to the, you know, the non-ICANN parts of the community -- users, not registrants, who might have an interest in looking at WHOIS.

And the real question is, how would we do that? And I'm not quite sure how we would do that, and at this point, if the review team agrees that this recommendation was not addressed, in the way that it might have been and I'm going to ask Susan after we finish -- I'll give you a warning -- to comment on did I interpret the intent properly. I seem to be following the words, but I wasn't in those meetings. And if so, is there really a way to do this, or was it an impractical thing that was recommended and ICANN organization, reasonably, ignored that part?

And then the second part of it is to look at the existing documentation and websites -- look for completeness, consistency, understandability,

and we also have an item in our to-do plan, to look at what outreach events were planned. There is one to the registrar community, but were there, in fact, any that perhaps we've missed that are not well-documented -- weren't well-documented in briefing itself?

So, first, I'd like to go to -- I see Stephanie's hand is up. But I'd like, Susan, if you could comment, is my understanding and motivation for the recommendation correct? And if so, did I misread the implementation and it was done or where do you sit on this having actually been on the review team?

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Thanks, Alan, for asking the question. I do think you interpreted the recommendation correctly, you know, what we concerned with is, you know, it's the problems you still have, but I think there is more awareness now, just because of IANA transition and things, but it seems at the time that, you know, registrants, you know, were not thoroughly informed at the registrar level and just, in general, you know -- people in the world, in general, did not know what ICANN was and how they could look to ICANN for resources and information about their own domain name, or domain names they were interacting with.

So, you know, I think the main point of this recommendation was, you know, it shouldn't be such an insider group, and that ICANN had a responsibility to go out into the world and make its presence known.

You know, [inaudible] may have done that a little differently -- with a different agenda than what we were thinking of, but we also ran a study where, you know, people were asked -- a third-party did a study for us

where they were asked, you know, "Do you know ICANN?" and, "Do you know how to look up a WHOIS record?" and you know, "How would you find out information about these websites?"

And, you know, it was pretty telling that, you know, we got the response we thought we were going to get was, you know, people don't know what the WHOIS is. And don't really use it in that manner, though, they could if, you know, if they understood it a little bit more. In reviewing the compliance report, the 2017 compliance report, it seems like compliance is responsibility for part of this implementation of this recommendation, and so they point to a lot of, you know, "How to transfer your domain." "How to find your information."

You know, there's some on the ICANN website. I didn't go through all those -- I ran out of time, mainly, but I thought I would take a look at those, too, but those really fit within the outreach recommendation.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Susan. I guess my concern is the -- in the report, anyway, the motivation seemed to be consumer confidence, and how do non-registrants get information. There's no question that we are in significantly better shape for registrants to have information, and users who find us might, in fact, be able to understand some of it more, but the actual outreach, I didn't see a lot of to users. And I'm not quite sure it is even really possible.

It's one thing to do a study and go out explicitly to a selected number of people and it's different to target something in, you know, in the media

that they will likely read. This is not something newspapers are going to pick up on their front page.

So, that really is, I think, where our discussion's going to have to focus -- of is there really a reasonable expectation that we could make this more well-known, and, of course, with things like GDPR, the information that a user could find is likely to be somewhat curtailed, at least for domains that are owned by individuals. Stephanie, please go ahead.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Thanks very much, Alan. And I apologize; my phone's ringing in the background, so let's just ignore it. Stephanie Perrin for the record. I was putting up my hand to respond to your question. I mean, basically, behind this recommendation, what's required is a pretty detailed marketing plan for this initiative.

And I would agree that the website's better and there's more information there, but it seems to me there's a yawning gap, in terms of the assertion that consumers need WHOIS, in order for confidence, with respect to the DNS. The entire reseller market is more or less ignored in the RAA and in information that is provided to consumers about actually who they're dealing with.

I mean, if you're dealing with the GoDaddy -- if that's who your registrar is, you probably know who you're dealing with. For the vast number of resellers, and subcontractors, and all the rest of it, people may get lost using WHOIS to try to find even their own data. And there is very little information that is provided, in terms of the [inaudible] services market

and who actually is harvesting their data, such as for instance the [inaudible].

Now, in the light of the GDPR, recognizing that's only Europe, a lot of that is going to have to change, because they will have to be -- I beg your pardon -- there will have to be agreements in place between controllers, co-controllers, and processors, and some of that data should be made available in the hierarchy, but at the moment, that's blank. And I think it's a bit of a problem. I don't think we can comment on that in the light of that recommendation.

And I look to Susan to answer that question, because I don't think that, that recommendation was addressing a pretty clear and huge gap. And this is getting down to what we need, now, if you see what I mean. But it might be a recommendation in the future, because these are obligations under data-protection laws to provide more data to the end-user -- not the end-user -- I mean, the registrants. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Stephanie. I don't understand your references to resellers and things like that on how is that relevant to end-users finding out who they're dealing with.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Well, and I'm indebted to a discussion that we had, actually, on the RDS about this. That caused me to do a little bit of research, and if you're -- if the person you purchase, for lack of a better word, is a seller -- you will not find them in the ICANN list of accredited registrars.

And in some cases, you could be dealing with a huge holding company as the actual accredited registrar. And the name of the company that you purchases your domain name from will not appear, and they are not obliged to provide information to you about who's the accredited registrar. So, that gives you a bit of a gap in your research as to how you connect up to the DNS. Does that explain?

ALAN GREENBERG: Not really. But maybe I'll stop talking and let other people. That's an issue of information to the registrant about who they're dealing with in the registrar community, including resellers, but I don't see how that's a WHOIS issue. But maybe I'm missing something. You know, when a registrant start connecting with someone, there is no WHOIS record at that point. So, are we deficient in addressing how we identify resellers and how that market works? I would tend to agree strongly, but I'm not sure it's a WHOIS issue.

But let's open it up. Anyone else have any comments or questions, because I'm not quite sure I agree with Stephanie on this? But I'll put my hand down, and, Susan, please go ahead. Stephanie, I assume that's an old hand.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Yes, it is.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: So -- this is Susan Kawaguchi. This is recorded, right? So, I would agree with Stephanie because when you're -- I think it's gotten better over the

years, but if resellers offer consistent, you know, [inaudible] some website and register the domains and let's just call it, one, two, three domains, but actually it is a reseller of GoDaddy, and so, the indication on the WHOIS record was, you know, GoDaddy, but they didn't -- but the registrant didn't have any idea that GoDaddy was really involved when they purchased the domain, and then sometimes those resellers do not provide an option to look up an website.

So, they wouldn't have known to go to -- "Who is in WHOIS?" "What is my registrar?" and then, this is where I'll find it. So, you know, part of this education and outreach was in conjunction with the other recommendation on a centralized portal, a common interface for the WHOIS, because people -- I mean, in those days, when I was looking for a WHOIS record, you know, there were times when you could not find where to go and I presented some of those examples to the WHOIS review team.

You know, it's like, you look this up. You tell me where you're going to find this. And it wasn't so simple. I mean, there was a few that we never did find a WHOIS record for beyond the stem WHOIS.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Dmitry.

DMITRY BELYAVSKY: Dmitry Belyavsky for the record. I just want to say that a seller, in some case, are presented in the WHOIS data as the billing contact, and so, that information can be available and accessible. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I put myself in the queue. Susan, I agree with you completely. I'm just not sure that's part of this recommendation. So, that really my confusion, and although, I understand what reaction we're likely to get from registrars, I would strongly support a recommendation saying that the registrant should be able to find out [inaudible] in the name of privacy information, whether this is in the public WHOIS or not is a different issue.

But, certainly, the registrant should be able to find out what the responsibility path is for their particular registrations. So, that I would strongly support. I'm just not sure that it's a logical conclusion of what is presented in the original report and the recommendation made in this case. Something I think we'll continue to discuss.

Any further comments? I believe that was the last slide. If there's another one, I forgot it. Let's confirm. Yeah, that was just talking about pointing to the various documents, and those are all -- that's extracted from the work plan document. I see several hands. Lisa, please go ahead.

LISA PHIFER: Thank you. This is Lisa Phifer for the transcript. Alan, I wonder if -- and this is really probably a general suggestion that will apply to other teams as we move forward, but I wonder if because, in your research of the materials so far, you didn't find the answer to what efforts were made to reach out to consumers that might not be familiar with ICANN -- that that should be a request for a follow-up written or verbal briefing, so

that if there were activities that were done and just not part of the materials you've looked at, you get an opportunity to hear about them before reaching your recommendation.

ALAN GREENBERG: And that is the work plan as one of the items -- in my case, in any case.

LISA PHIFER: Great.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. But I agree, of course. Any further comments on this one? If not, we'll go on to the next one, which is Susan and compliance.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Okay. Should I go ahead?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, please.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Okay. I was waiting to see if anybody had their hand up. So, I don't have any slides. I did -- and I did send a few things out to the compliance subgroup, but just late last night, and you know, I agree with Stephanie -- GDPR is completely messing up all our lives. But I did do an in-depth review of the compliance, 2017 compliance report, and did just a real draft summary of -- took pieces of that and put it into a

document, and then asked some questions, which we'll need to follow up on, or noted some questions.

What I thought was interesting -- there was over 50,000 complaints since 2017. So, there is a workload there, which, you know, you would have assumed that, but I had no idea what those, you know, how many complaints they're actually handling. And most of those are inaccuracy reports. In one of the -- in some of the data they provide resellers -- back to Stephanie's point -- reseller's seem to be an issue, still. We haven't solved that problem. And resellers aren't conveying messages, or conveying information data a registrant really does need, especially in the renewal area.

Another thing that I found very interesting in this is -- and I had forgotten this -- so, I need to go back and read the 2009 RAA, but 40 percent of the existing registrations -- only the 2009 RAA requirements on WHOIS pertain to those registrations.

So, here we are nine years later with the 2013 RAA looking fairly old and maybe needs to be updated, in my opinion, on some requirements -- and 40 percent of the WHOIS gTLD registrations are only required to fulfill the requirements in the 2009, which, you know, I know we're not talking about GDPR, but this is going to be problematic, because registrars are not required to collect email on the registrant, but there seems to be a lot of discussion in the community of data minimization since GDPR, and they may not have collected a registrant email address.

So, I think we, you know, I'm not sure this group has the duty, but just in general information, the community needs to ensure that if there's a

data minimization in GDPR that we do not allow just the registrant information to be maintained, which does not include an email address.

And I think some of the numbers of the -- I think compliance has improved with some of the validation and verification. So, anyway, the report was really interesting. The group, you know, I've sent out my thoughts to the group with some suggested questions on which we'll follow-up.

And also, I asked the subgroup to select different policies, you know, so we can divide the policies up, look at those, look at the compliance report and figure out what our next steps and list the questions to compliance are. I do see another -- a discussion with compliance in the near future to get some more answers, and more data, and sort of walk through processes. And that's all I have.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Susan, I'm curious about your number of 40 percent. I would have thought that when you take the largest of the registrars, and you know, GoDaddy, Wild West Domains, and you know, I'm not sure if eNom is still called eNom, or it's folded into Two Cows, but when you look at them, I presume they're all on the new gTLD because they're selling new TLDs -- I would have thought that would have accounted for more than 60 percent with them alone. And I'm sort of curious about your 40 percent number.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Yeah. If it wasn't so early, I would have a slide on that, but -- so I made that assumption, too, that if they'd signed on to the 2013, then they were required to adhere to the 2013 requirements for WHOIS.   And they are with new registrations. But existing registrations that existing prior to the 2013 RAA, do not have to comply with the 2013 RAA, only the 2009.

So, to me, there's a little bit of a blip there that -- and what I haven't look at is, well what about the registrations before 2009? Did they not have to --? I mean, I don't know what was in the RAA before 2009 on WHOIS, so I guess that's something the team should look at.

But when the 2013 was signed onto, there was no going back, I guess, and this is something we're to have to get more information from ICANN, but there was no requirement to -- at renewal, to make -- to require the, you know, those existing registrations compliant with the 2013 RAA.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. Thank you. That's interesting. My understanding, and I would have put a fair amount of money on it, that when a registrars signs an RAA, that all domains sponsored by that registrar have to meet the requirements regardless of when they first registered or when the last renewal was done.

So, I'd be interested in, where does it say that, in fact, only applies to new registrations, because I thought it applied to everything that registrar does once they're on the RAA.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: So, I could have misunderstood this, but I would have to pull it out of the report -- if I have right here in front of me -- let me see. Maybe I do. That's the statistics in there. So, let me pull that up, and I can push that out to the whole list via email. You should read the report; it's really interesting.

ALAN GREENBERG: I will do that, then. Open the floor. No other comments or questions? Stephanie, please go ahead.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: This is Stephanie Perrin for the record. I think this is very interesting, and I'm wondering -- I'm always kind of looking for low-hanging fruit, in terms of a recommendation for us.   Does this look like a recommendation? Something to fix? You know, is this in the pile, or an ongoing spreadsheet of potential recommendations, so far? If so, I've missed it. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Certainly. I'm not sure this is something that within our domain. It may well be consensus policy, but it certainly sounds like something we should investigate if that indeed is an issue.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Stephanie -- not Stephanie. Susan, just for clarification. I noticed there are quarterly reports and an annual report -- it's the annual report you're talking about I presume.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Correct.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: And let's verify I'm correct, because, you know, sitting here -- I did this last night on a plane coming home late. But I mean there is a 40 percent statistic in there, definitely, so we'll delve into a little bit more and provide information to the whole group.

ALAN GREENBERG: If I do a search on 4-0, will I [inaudible], or is it about 40 percent?

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Like 40.7, I'm thinking.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. If you can point me to where in the report it is, I'd appreciate that, either now or offline. Lisa, please go ahead.

LISA PHIFER: Thanks, Alan. Lisa Phifer for the transcript. Susan, I wanted to point you back to, also -- there was a question that came up in the first round of briefings on what the criteria was for the grandfathered domain names, and there was an answer given with respect to, you know, under what conditions an update to a WHOIS record would necessarily require application of the 2013 RAA.

And in that answer, it did not that the accuracy reporting system does test all records against the 2009 requirements. So, I think a question about, you know, whether everything had to, at least, comply with 2009 -- just pointing your attention back to the answers to those questions from the briefing.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Oh, okay. I may not read those, Lisa, yet. If I do, I'm not reading very much right now. And that is something we can search in that report. I'm just not seeing it as [inaudible] this morning, but they refer to the GF or non-NGF, non-grandfathered in the data. And so, it would be great if somebody else had the time to take a look at that, too, and see if my interpretation is wrong.

LISA PHIFER: And just a quick follow-up. So, if you look at the answers from the questions that were raised about the first round of implementation briefings -- if you look -- they're numbers like 17, 18, and 19, I think are relevant to the points you're raising.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Okay. Thank you. I'll take a note of those.

ALAN GREENBERG: Anyone further?

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: That's all I have.

ALAN GREENBERG: Lisa -- that's an old hand. All right. If Susan has finished her report and there are no more questions, then we will go on to agenda item No. 4. This looks like it may be a quick meeting.

And then next one is the plenary call schedule and timing. This was suggested on the last leadership call -- that we, perhaps, re-think our call schedule once more. We rarely have more than six review team members on these calls, and if we get six, we're doing moderately well. That means almost half the review team on any given call is not available.

With the current schedule, we know by definition, because people have already said so -- that they cannot make a call on certain days. So, we have some people who are never the Friday call, some people who are never on the Monday call. Is there any merit in trying to do this again? Obviously, we can't adjust the schedule at this point, before the ICANN

meeting. But should we look at it again and try to find a better time or times to hold these meetings?

We went from a single time to two times, or two times/days to try to maximize the number of people who could be here, but clearly, we are not all that effective. And the question is, can we do better than that, or is it a futile effort? But, certainly, if we think we can do something better, we're willing to. Stephanie, please go ahead.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Thanks, Alan. Stephanie Perrin for the record. I think that, at least, we know that, for instance, Volker has a conflict with one of the meeting times. If we could possibly find a time where we accommodate his, you know, routine going to be there, that would help. I realize how difficult it is, looking at the time zones. Have we asked people whether they actually care -- like I'm retired -- I'd just as soon have a call at 1:00 in the morning, as at 7:00, frankly, in the morning?

So, you know, there are probably people, who are a lot more flexible than others, for whom, you know, they're in the middle of driving to work, you know. Maybe we should try another go at a very expensive Doodle poll to see just how flexible people are, you know. Because I have serious doubts that we have credibility when we've got the turnout that we have and I apologize for missing a few due to my recent illness. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Stephanie. We did go through that, and I thought we got definitive times. One of the problems is that, although, a time is theoretically good for some people, it isn't good on a specific day. And we also have to not only worry about the review team members, but staff having commitments, you know, for other ongoing projects at various times and days.

But what I'm hearing from Stephanie, certainly, is let's try it again and see if we can do any better. I'm not quite sure how we formulate the question, you know, we could certainly have everyone fill in a Doodle for the five days of the week and 24 hours, and see how it works. I'm not quite sure how we analyze it, but if analysis is the only challenge, then we'll meet that one. Stephanie, new hand?

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Old hand, Alan. But easier than typing. I was about to type this. I have great confidence that Lisa is the wizard of all these tools, and can figure out a way to do this. I mean, I have certainly done spreadsheets for mine in various things, where I -- you know, I basically color-coded things as, you know, this is a hard conflict -- this is a preference -- this is a flexibility are, and you know, if we got everybody to do that -- at least we'd be able to track the hard conflicts, and I include staff in my, you know, previous remarks; although, in terms of people evaluating our product at the end of the day, they won't be looking at whether staff only made half the meetings, they'll be looking at whether the review team made half the meetings. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:	Yeah. Thank you. One of the problems we have is we're in a changing world, and I know I and a number of other people are involved in other work groups and other activities that come and go over the, you know, will come and go over the next year. We don't always have full control over those. You know, so, we're certainly in a position where we may well schedule something and then find there's a significant conflict as we evolve, but I don't think we can address that.
	I think all we can do is look at where the world is today. So, we'll talk about it and try to figure a way of going forward that doesn't put too onerous a task on individuals for reporting their availability, but, hopefully, we'll try to do better than we can right now -- than we have right now. Susan, please go ahead.
SUSAN KAWAGUCHI:	Yeah. I mean, I do think we should reschedule -- figure out a different time or date -- day of the week -- you know, because on Mondays, Volker can't make it at all, and you know, he was upfront with us and said, "This one will not work." I don't know if it's just that specific time on Monday or, you know -- and unless you want this -- oh, go ahead.
ALAN GREENBERG:	Yeah. I was going to say. It is that time on Monday because he has a staff meeting. The problem is that, if we're assuming that people do not want to be meeting, and we did ask explicitly, you know, between midnight and 5:00 am, then it's a very narrow window, given that we have people in almost every time zone around the world. So, that was what forced the window during the day.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: So, you know, I mean, in the spirit of being cooperative, I know this impacts staff, too, so don't hate me. But, you know, I can go to a 4:00 am meeting or a 5:00 am meeting, if we could -- if that would help get more people on the call.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. We will do it again, and, hopefully, we'll end up with something better this time. So, we'll take that as an action item to discuss how we ask the questions and, hopefully, with an aim towards finding some times that will work better for people.

Next item. I think that that item is complete. Susan, I assume that's an old hand. Next item is ICANN62 face-to-face, and I would really like to defer this until Chris is on the call, because if we're going to do a face-to-face, I think it's important that he participate, and I know he has had strong concerns about meeting at ICANN meetings.

62 is a slightly different situation, in that, it may well be the time that we want to present, not only to the community, but perhaps, with individual ACs and SOs, in which case, we will probably require pretty much the full review team to be present at the meeting, and do we want to make an exception and take advantage of that opportunity when everyone is there to actually hold a face-to-face meeting?

And, of course, the question is, with regard to timing, is this an opportune time to actually hold that meeting. So, that we'll have to look at, in regard to the timing. If I could ask, either Alice or Jean-

Baptiste, if we were to follow our current schedule, when would we likely be sending out the draft report for public comment?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Hi, Alan. So the draft report will be sent for public comment according to the work plan, by the end -- sorry -- beginning of August -- that would be published. On the work plan, it's currently set up at 7th of August.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. So, it wouldn't be out in time for the June meeting, clearly. And so, the question is, that probably is not an opportune time, therefore, to meet with the community -- because we won't have published, really published anything that we can discuss with them at that point. So, the meeting with the community may not be as relevant for the June meeting -- probably more appropriate for the annual general meeting, then. Lisa, please go ahead.

LISA PHIFER: Thank you, Alan. I just wanted to follow-up on that point. So, by the time of ICANN62, the review team will have been underway for roughly a year. Given that it is a meeting that's intended for, you know, cross-community sessions, it does seem like an ideal time to at least share the objectives of the review team and solicit input on whether the review team is looking at the right topics, as opposed to sharing findings and soliciting feedback on actual findings and recommendations.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Lisa. I think it's a given. And I think we've already said that we will hold a community outreach session, and probably try to ensure that it is a cross-community session. That's not fully under our control, but I think that's a given that we will do that in ICANN62.

And we said we're not prepared to do that for the March meeting, but for June meeting, there's no question, but that doesn't mean we need the full review team there to do that. It would only be if we're meeting with ACs and SOs, that we really need the full review team there, so that's why that was the question. I don't think there's any question we will try to hold a wide an focused session with the community in general.

Anything else?   Then, we'll raise that discussion.   We'll bring the discussion back in a little while. Perhaps, not the next meeting. And we have any other business next. And we have Lisa. Please go ahead.

LISA PHIFER: Yes. Lisa, again, sorry to be a nag. I wanted to raise this actually before we had left the subgroup update section, but we kind of moved on to the next topic, so, I'll raise it now. The subgroups that have not yet presented or expected to send the answers to those questions about next steps to the full working group. That was an action for about a week ago.

And we probably should be looking for updates from those groups on our next plenary call. In addition to that, I wanted to ask for those of you who did speak today, what your next steps were; in particular, do you need subgroup calls scheduled now? Do you need more time to dig

into the work you've already identified? And if you have specific materials you feel like you're missing or briefings that you're waiting for, can you flag those for us, now?

ALAN GREENBERG: I can certainly answer that for mine. What I plan to do is, based on the discussion we had, to send out a report to the subgroup, and that should, you know, I'll certainly identify the one briefing question, or one or two that we've already identified and ask for more, and I plan to assign the, essentially, the homework that each of the people are going to be doing, and I don't think we'll need a call until we get those results back. So, we don't need a call. We will be asking for some information on the outreach one. Susan.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: I don't envision -- well, hopefully, I don't envision a call, but that will also depend on how many people step forward and respond and take on some of the documents that I've listed.

So, since I just sent that out yesterday, I'll probably make a decision on Monday on what our next steps would be, but, hopefully, in the meantime, liked Carlton stepped forward and Alan -- so, you know, hopefully, we'll get those documents reviewed and then, we'll have a subgroup call to discuss our findings and what are next questions are.

ALAN GREENBERG: Lisa, please go ahead.

LISA PHIFER: Thank you. Just one follow-up request. As you begin to write down your thoughts about what you've found and the questions that you may have, if it's possible to prioritize pulling those questions that you do, either materials or briefings on, sooner rather than later. There might be some lead-time to getting that scheduled for you. And we want to make sure that things are moving in the pipeline towards you at the time that you need them.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Lisa. Noted.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Yes. And I'll go back and look at some of the questions we already have and if we can, you know, submit them soon.

ALAN GREENBERG: Anything further under AOB? Then, I'll turn it over to Jean-Baptiste for a review of decisions and action items.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Thank you, Alan. So, I don't think there were any decisions reached at this stage. But under action items -- so, the blog post will be shared again by email to the review team inviting review team members to provide comments by Tuesday, 27th of February, end of the day, UTC.

The plenary call schedule will be discussed between leaders and ICANN -- also the whole team to find out a better one that fits review team members attendance. And the ICANN62 face-to-face meeting topic will be further discussed at the next plenary.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. And, Jean-Baptiste, I realize I probably misspoke in that, although, there is a review team leadership meeting scheduled for next Wednesday, I will not be available for it. I'm testifying in a court case all day. And so, either someone else will have to take that -- either Stephanie -- not Stephanie -- Susan and/or Cathrin. Or we'll have to move that.

So, I'm happy if we want to move till early Thursday morning, my time, or something like that. Or it can be handled by Cathrin and Susan on the Wednesday. So, just something to note. We need to work it out amongst ourselves, but I had forgotten I was not available at that point.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Thank you, Alan. We will do so.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Any further comments before we close the meeting? And thank [CROSSTALK] you all -- Go ahead. Sorry.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Just back to my, you know, your question about the 2009 requirements -- so that was in the ARS report, which the compliance team report has so many links that you're going off onto all kinds of different reports they've included in it.   And I put the information about the 2009 requirements for the registrars in the chat and a link to the report.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much.   I will copy that before we make it go away. Thank you all. Bye-bye.

BRENDA BREWER: Thank you all.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]