RECORDED VOICE:                 This meeting is now being recorded.

ALICE JANSEN:                   Thank you, Alan.  Welcome to the RDS WHOIS Plenary call #20.  Today is February 19th, 2018, 14:30 UTC.  In attendance we have Alan Greenberg, Dmitry Belyavskiy, Erika Mann, Stephanie Perrin, Chris Disspain, Lili Sun. in ICANN org. we have Alice Jansen, Lisa Phifer, and we have apologies from Volker Greimann, Cathrin Bauer-Bulst, Susan Kawaguchi.  This call is recorded, and thank you for muting your lines if you're not speaking.  Over to you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:                 Thank you very much.  We first have the approval of the agenda; does anyone have any other items?  I'll note that I did ask that the protecting registrant data be added.  Oh, I see it was added as the second item in bold.  I'm not sure I warrant having a title in bold, but it is effectively one of the last bullets under number 2.  Any other comments, then we'll accept the agenda as presented, minus the bold, and proceed?

And the first item on the agenda is to -- the substative item on the agenda is to review our status of working groups and to try to both present where we are and see if there's any input we have from other members of the working group.  The first item is strategic priority, and Cathrin, and Cathrin is not on the call; is there someone else in the group who can present where we are in this group on this sub-group?

Apparently no.  Let's see who else is in that sub-group.

LISA PHIFER:          Alan, that's Carlton, Cathrin and Volker.

ALAN GREENBERG:       Thank you, I guess we'll take a pass on that one then. Next is compliance; compliance is Susan; Susan is not on the call. We have a number of other people in that one and that is Carlton, Chris, Erika, Susan and Thomas. Is there anyone who has anything to say?

I know Susan has been doing some work on it, and has distributed a number of documents, anyone have any input for the rest of us that have not been following it as closely? [AUDIO BREAK]

And we have no one. And Carlton has joined the call.

LISA PHIFER:          Alan, this is Lisa Phifer.

ALAN GREENBERG:       Please Lisa, go ahead.

LISA PHIFER:          Susan reached out to me over the weekend to tell me that her internet access was down where she was working this weekend, so I know that she was intending to send out the answers to these questions for the sub-group over the weekend; I suspect she wasn't able to because she didn't have internet access, but that is her user action.

ALAN GREENBERG:     I don't know who that one was, am I still online?  I just heard a "Please hold," on my line.

LISA PHIFER:     I think we're all still on.

ALAN GREENBERG:     Okay.  Someone is talking in the background; I can't hear quite who it is or what they're saying.  Alright, we will go on to the next item; privacy proxy services, Volker, Volker is not on the line, and we have other people on it; are Cathrin and Stephanie, Stephanie is on the line. Stephanie do you have any input or can you tell us where, as far as you understand, this sub-group is?   Stephanie; "Can't talk anyway; still coughing."

Alright, I have not been following this sub-group at all, so I cannot speak to it.  Next item, this is going to be a very quick meeting it looks like. Common interface; Volker is the lead on that, and we have myself and Susan as the other people.  I have not seen very much on that; Lisa have I missed something? Oh, we have a hand up, Lisa, please go ahead.

LISA PHIFER:     Thank you Alan, Lisa Phifer for the transcript, and I apologize for my voice; I too have a cold.  And just following up on the previous group, privacy proxy, I do know that Volker had submitted edits to the first pass work plan document.  I had not seen anything further on the sub-

group list regarding that.  That sub-groups next step is listed here on the slide, but I believe that was in Volker's to-do pile to get out the proposed next steps.

On common interface; I believe Volker also send around a first cut at the first pass work plan, I have not seen anything additional in response to his first draft of that work plan.

ALAN GREENBERG:             Okay, thank you.  Anything new is the next one, and Stephanie; Stephanie says she cannot speak today.  And the other people on that one are myself, I have not seen anything I believe, and Susan.  Lisa again, I'll turn to you as someone who is perhaps paying more attention.  Was there anything that was sent out or are we still…

LISA PHIFER:                I believe on this item there is actually no additional news to report.

ALAN GREENBERG:             Alright, I see in the chat Lili says, "I couldn't hear anything now." I'm not sure if she can still here us or not, Alice has just asked her.  I'll assume that is proceeding.  Law enforcement; Thomas, Thomas is not on, Lili, Cathrin is not on, Lili is on, Lili are you in a position to speak; can you tell us where that is?

Last I heard there had been some messages privately, but nothing on the mailing list itself.  I don't know where that stands right now.  Lili is

not actually on that group, I thought Lili was on the group.  Chris, have you seen anything on the list of that one?

CHRIS DISSPAIN:    Not that I can recall.  I will, while you're chatting away about other things Alan, I'll go and check in my e-mail boxes, but I'm pretty sure I haven't, but I'm going to check.

ALAN GREENBERG:    I'm pretty sure I haven't either.  Lisa, Lisa has a hand up, please go ahead, Lisa.

LISA PHIFER:    Thank you, Alan.  I believe that the last I heard on law enforcement needs, which is Cathrin, Chris, and Thomas, was that there had been some off-list back and forth between Cathrin and Thomas, and Cathrin had plans to send out her next steps to the sub-group.  I did not see that happen over the weekend, but that was Cathrin's action coming out of last weeks' leadership call.

ALAN GREENBERG:    I do recall that, thank you.  Alright, the next one is consumer trust; Erika, we do have Erika on the line, she has not yet indicated she can't speak, Erika, are you with us?

ERIKA MANN:    I'm with you if you can hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG:        We can hear you very well.  Are you still hiking or are you back home?

ERIKA MANN:           No, no, I'm not home; I'm still in Arizona, but I hiked yesterday and I'm back in the areas where I can have calls.  So I will review my to-dos today, I think have to set up a call.  This is what I think I left the group with, which I will do this week as long as I am in Arizona, and otherwise I have to reply to the last round of questions, all others are replied to, so I have to reply, which I will do today to the last round.  Will set up a call, hopefully I can do it this week if others do have the time and then we can move forward.

ALAN GREENBERG:        Thank you very much.  And the last item is mine; and do we have either the updated document or the e-mail that we can display?  If not, if you give me 30 seconds I will find the e-mail myself.

LISA PHIFER:          Alan, we're looking for it now.

ALAN GREENBERG:        As am I.  [AUDIO BREAK]

LISA PHIFER:          You're looking for the planning questions?

ALAN GREENBERG:    I sent an e-mail in response to the discussion we had on the last meeting, and I'm trying to find that. I don't recall if I actually updated the document or not. [AUDIO BREAK]

ALICE JANSEN:    Hi Alan, I've just uploaded into the Adobe Connect pod, if that's what you're looking for.

ALAN GREENBERG:    That is, and I just found it myself. The real question is, last time I had done a work plan and last time we had a discussion and a number of issues were raised as to whether indeed I had covered all of the issues that we committed to in at our Brussels meeting. And after thinking about it again, there was one aspect of it that I think I had not covered, we have not covered, that had never even been mentioned before and I think it is very relevant.

And the other part that I think, I believe was covered adequately, the part that was not mentioned is in terms of safeguarding registered data, we don't know a lot about what happens with the offsite escrow that data is stored with, both by registrars and registries as appropriate. And there is, since that is the site of last resort, and given the number of data breaches which one reads about on a regular basis. The question is; are the procedures adequate, are things covered?

I noted that groups like Iron Mountain when they started really were protecting magnetic tapes and storing them offsite, and now of course

everything is online and that makes things more vulnerable, so that was suggested that we look at escrow providers and talk to them and I had suggested Iron Mountain, Volker had suggested that we also do one of the smaller ones or one of the other ones, and try to understand how their business runs so we understand to what extent there are vulnerabilities, both in terms of loss of data or change of data.

And the other aspect of it, which I don't know to what extent we can actually do, is to again look at registrars and registries and get some feeling as to what extent do we have vulnerability there.  Not so much necessarily to loss, but to data being changed potentially.  And Volker did make a comment that he thinks both are reasonable and as I said, he added that perhaps we should look at a second escrow provider as well.

The other part that I rethought or looked at again was; in Brussels we had said that we were going to do a number of different things associated with this task, and one was identifying the life cycle of registered data determining if and how data is safeguarded in each phase, identifying high priority gaps and recommending specific measures if any.

And to a large extent I believe that A,C, and D are being covered in excruciating detail, or will be by the time they are finished in the next-gen RDS work, plus of course in the ongoing GDPR work because we are obliged to look at data from all aspects, from the collection to eventually retention of them.

And to a large extent I think that if we do that kind of work we are going to be replicating work from the GDPR without any benefit to doing it in this phase, and the question is; does anyone believe that we really need to be putting significant effort into those parts of the task, or is it indeed replication?

I received no comments from the work group, the sub group on that, so I'm presuming Volker, who apparently did read the message and responded did agree with that, and I'm wondering do we have any input from any other review team members?

Now these are items that we specifically added in Brussels, and I think it is reasonable to have analyzed the requirements for addressing this issue this way, but I don't really see merit putting a large amount of effort into it, so if there's anyone who is not on the sub-group or is on the sub-group that feels differently, now is a good time to speak up. And I wouldn't mind having Chris' input on this since he is our attempt at crystal balling how the board might react.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:          I simply say I agree with you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:          Thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:          As you know, I'd love to disagree with you, but on this particular instance I find myself at item with you.

ALAN GREENBERG:          We'll have plenty of things to disagree on in the future, don't worry.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:          Oh don't worry, I'm already working on those.

ALAN GREENBERG:          Anyone else have any further comments?   If not, we'll cast this in concrete into the documents and consider that one done.

LISA PHIFER:          Alan, you have a few comments in chat.

ALAN GREENBERG:          I do?  Did the comments, what do they say?  I would point out that there is significant volume of proxy protected registrations which are not public but are escrowed.

That's correct; I'm not sure how that affects what we are saying.  If we are looking at the escrow dealer, escrow companies, we certainly could interview proxy providers in addition to registrars.  I'm not sure that their business is substantially different enough that it makes a big difference, especially since the larger proxy providers are in fact run by registrars, but maybe I'm missing something.

There is an issue as I point out in my e-mail that registrars are under no obligation to speak to us or reveal exactly what measures they take, so

this is going to be purely voluntary and we may well find that we don't have a lot of registrars who are willing to go public, or even semi-public in terms of saying how they're protecting their data, but it's certainly a question we can ask.

Alright, I don't see any negative comments here, and if Stephanie has a reason we should look at proxy providers separately from registrars I'll certainly consider that and bring it back to the group.

Alright, next item, we have now finished our review, does anyone else have anything they wish to raise on items on sub-groups that they are either part of, leading or simply have questions that would like to be brought to the sub-groups? We'll leave a moment for people to respond.

And not seeing anything, we'll go on to the next agenda item and that is a sub-group membership review. This is not a—yes, go ahead. Sorry Lisa, go ahead please.

LISA PHIFER: Apologies for interrupting. Before we leave the status update, I just want to really kind of reiterate that in order to follow the timeline that's laid out to get us to our Brussels face to face meeting with substantive work to discuss. All of the sub-groups should be done planning their work and actually in the analysis phase.

Our schedule actually would have the analysis phase; that means going through all the documentation and the briefings by the 22nd of February, which clearly that would be an optimistic date given where the

subgroups stand. So it is important that everybody understands the timeline that we set out in front of us, and that that work of actually digging into the materials that have been collected and any briefings you've identified really needs to start now.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Lisa. Yes, I should have said that as well, sorry, I'm not quite awake yet obviously. I did send out an e-mail earlier this week or a few days ago pointing out that at that time we had three more meetings, three more plenary meetings before ICANN 61 and 2 and at most 3, or 3 and at most 4 meetings after ICANN 61 before we arrive in Brussels, and given the number, the amount of work that we have done, at least apparently and the state we're in, I think we have a big problem, and somehow we either have to start working very quickly and get this done, or I don't see what the other alternative is, and it's probably too late to cancel the meeting at this point but we have three days there that are going to be rather interesting if we don't have real work and substantive work to discuss and preferably work that has been distributed ahead of time so people can do their homework and be prepared to discuss these things. So on paper this group is working really well, but somehow we have to start delivering. Chris, please go ahead.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thanks Alan, this is Chris. I understand exactly what you're saying and I don't disagree with you, but I wonder if there's any merit in treating a

face to face meeting as the cage if you will to get this work done?  Or is that just an opportunity to delay things even further?

ALAN GREENBERG:            Chris, if you're asking what do we do when we get there and we have nothing on the table to actually discuss, and we tell people to go off in little groups and read the stuff they should have been reading over the last couple of months, and then try to cobble together something quickly, yes, I guess we'll do that.

But that's not what we're spending a huge amount of money to get together for, so…you know, is that a fallback?  Sure, and we may end up doing it for some of the sub-groups but I would like to think that we're going to have something substantive to discuss, and we are supposed to be coming out of that meeting with at least some idea of what our analysis is and where we're going on recommendations.

Now, the work plan has a large amount of time left between then and June to actually formulate things, and put it in writing and make it pretty.  So yes we have some slack we can move into, but at this point I'm starting to worry that in many of the projects we're really not anywhere, and that worries me.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:            It's Chris again, can I ask then, does anybody have any ideas, I mean apart from simply saying everybody needs to get on with it and get it done between now and whenever, does anyone have any other ideas

about ways that we could work or ways that we could operate that would assist?

I mean frankly, for what it's worth, I mean there's a whole at least 10 day hiatus when we are travelling to and in Puerto Rico, and I doubt very much if much is going to get done unless we force, and I use the force not literally, but figuratively people to sit down in Puerto Rico in small groups and get stuff done. So my concern is that we'll also end up coming out of Puerto Rico without much progress having been made.

ALAN GREENBERG:    That is indeed my concern, and some of us will be in Puerto Rico, but I can predict I will have zero time in my agenda, and you're probably the same. And I'm not planning on getting a lot done in Puerto Rico other than a few people who are not there may have a nice quiet time where they can do some work, but at this point we have two meetings before Puerto Rico, and as I said 3, maybe 4 if we push it after and that's starts to be worrisome.

And I haven't heard anyone say, "I guess I'm resigning from the work group, obviously I don't have the time to do this," so there's an implicit commitment that we will get the work done, but the ticking of the clock is bothering me. I'm not sure what else we can do other than say, "Please, please, please," and start riding on people, but given that we can rarely get more than half the people at any given conference call, I find it somewhat problematic. Lisa, please go ahead, Lisa is going to have the solution to our problems.

LISA PHIFER:
Oh Alan, I wish that were true.  I had actually put this in chat, but I wanted to raise it, which is that not everyone in this review team has participated in a review before and may not be aware that there are quite a number of steps that the review must go through, even after assembling your findings and sharing them in draft form in a presentation at ICANN 62.

If this review team wants to complete its work by the end of this year, it has to make some of these very near-term milestones in its work plan; you just can't accelerate things at the end and expect that you'll be done by the end of the year.

So perhaps one of your tools Alan is to make it clear for those that are on this review, if they can't commit to getting the work done now, they are committing to continuing the work beyond the end of the year.  And I suspect many people would like to finish this year, and that does mean getting the work done now.

ALAN GREENBERG:
There may be some people who want to draw this out as long as possible.  Chris, go ahead.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:
I'm not one of those.  I wonder whether we could, Lisa I'd be guided to some extent by your thoughts on this whether we could ask staff to facilitate calls with the working group, call to call, get team members working through on that and actually facilitate those small groups with the process of what it is that they need to come up with.

Again I have no idea if that's even feasible, practical etcetera, but it strikes me that what we need is some organizational rigor and it's hard to put that in when we're all busy doing other things.

ALAN GREENBERG: Chris, one of my concerns, I'll let Lisa answer for herself, but one of my concerns is that I see little indication that other than the person, perhaps the leader of the group who put together the work plan, I see little evidence that people even have done their reading ahead of time.

And you cannot do that communally, I guess we could have someone read to them, but that's just not a productive way of doing work, and maybe I'm reading this wrong and people will tell me I'm wrong, but that's my take on it.

And just so it doesn't sound like I'm preaching; I'm behind on my own projects also, so I understand the problem, but somehow we have to get past that. Lisa, please go ahead.

LISA PHIFER: Thanks, and Chris I guess I want to clarify what you're suggesting; so each of the sub-groups currently has a rapporteur, and the rapporteur's role really is to decide when calls of the group are needed, initiate that, and status of course available to help participate, take notes, and record results of any sub-group call.

Are you suggesting that staff initiate some of those calls, maybe one on one with the rapporteur to get things rolling? I guess I think we could certainly try that, I do share Alan's concern that it requires the sub-

group members actually dig in and do the work, not just participate in a call.

ALAN GREENBERG: We of course ask Lisa; just write the report for us.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Frankly, I'm massively in favor of that, but saying that aside, but then I spend two years working with Lisa, so I know how good she is.

ALAN GREENBERG: I have no problem of the quality of the work; I just think that somehow avoids the issue of this being a volunteer run report on basically what staff has done.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: No, I think really what I'm—so if I may, Lisa, what I meant was, that is kind of what I meant. What I meant was actually saying, alright so let's have a call, let's say sub-group A, there are three people on it, let's have a call, organize a call for next Tuesday at 4:00, here's the reading list, and then push that through, get the call, have the call, if only one or two people turn up, well so be it.

You know, you just move forwards. I find that getting stuff done and producing comments and stuff is often an incentive for people, especially when they don't agree. But it's just a suggestion, and I know

it's really easy for me to suggest these things, so I'm conscious, but I'm just trying to be helpful and I'll back off now.

ALAN GREENBERG: Please don't, Chris. Look, the reality as I see it anyway, my reality, is that in any project like this, one or two people, and I'm talking for each of our sub-groups, will take the lead and actually do the work and do the writing, and you're hoping that the other people in the group will have done their reading and at least critique what is written; that's probably how it's going to work.

You know, we're not likely to have each person doing the work in parallel and then merging it. Although in one of my groups I am suggesting exactly that. But, if we don't have the rapporteur or someone else on the group taking the lead and doing that work, then it's not going to materialize; there's no fairy dust that we can sprinkle on it that will make it suddenly materialize, and my concern is I am not seeing that level of activity, Lisa, please go ahead.

LISA PHIFER: Thanks. So I think based on this conversation, what we might be given in action to do is to reach out to the rapporteurs of each subgroup, perhaps starting with the rapporteurs who haven't yet produced the answers to their questions, and set up a call with that rapporteur to get that work down on paper, get it started.

If sub-group members can attend that call that's great, but the feasibility of getting all sub-group members together for all the these

calls is low, so I think the action would be to reach out to the rapporteur, schedule a call to which the sub-group members are invited, and see if we can use that as a way to get some of this work going.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: If you can do that, this is Chris, if you can do that Lisa, I think personally that'll be fantastic, but it's up to Alan to say, but my view is that would be really great.

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh, I'm happy to both say let's go for it and give it a try, and so what we would do I guess is quickly send out a doodle for several of the sub-groups that we're looking at, and try to get certainly the rapporteur and as many of the other key members together at the same time and just start talking about how we're going to get to an end point if we're not anywhere near yet, do I have that correct?

LISA PHIFER: Yeah, that's correct. And specifically we'll try to at least answer the questions that are on the screen in Adobe right now for the groups that haven't been able to do that. And then depending on the success of that effort, maybe we'll continue with other sub-groups and subsequent calls.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, so if we're going to do this with two or three sub-groups, then I guess one doodle for all of them, and then we can look at who fills in

which and try to find the best times for each of the sub-groups, does that sound reasonable?

LISA PHIFER:          Yes, with the provider that we'll go ahead with the call even if just the rapporteur is available.

ALAN GREENBERG:      That's correct, yeah, I understand.  But we'll try to find one that other people can attend.  That's fine, let us take that as an action item then please.  And maybe by Friday we'll have something better to respond, so we're really talking about doing that this week, so it's pretty short lead time to do this.

ALICE JANSEN:        Alan, this is Alice, if I could clarify a question?

ALAN GREENBERG:      Please go ahead, Alice.

ALICE JANSEN:        So is your intent to have one doodle call, and then one call for all sub-groups, or should we have one call per sub-group, I think you want to tailor the messaging to your audience, right?

# EN

ALAN GREENBERG:    One call per sub-group, but one doodle poll to collect the information of who is available when.  Otherwise the doodle polls will overlap anyway, so there's no reason not to put them all on one doodle.

ALICE JANSEN:    Okay, excellent, thank you for clarifying.

ALAN GREENBERG:    Alright, let us go to the next action item, or sorry, the next agenda item, and that is the sub-group membership review.  We do have one group data accuracy which we had looked for another member; Lili had asked for another member, I think that is the only one that we're doing that with, and I would like to, if possible, is there anyone on this call who would be willing to put their name into that group?

Currently the formal members of the group are led by Lili, Dmitry and Cathrin are the other members, I am omi to the group mailing lists and will occasionally participate but I'm not necessarily a formal member of it.  So we are looking for somebody else who thinks they actually have enough time and will actually deliver on this.

The people with the lowest work load I believe are Erika and Thomas; they are each only on three groups, I believe everyone else is on at least four.  Thomas is not on the call.  Erika, are you willing to take this one on, or is that pushing you past the limit you can do?

ERIKA MANN:    I don't know, I already said I can support it in the chat room.

ALAN GREENBERG:   Okay, thank you very much Erika.  Just to remind everyone what this is, this is a review of recommendation 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9, which are all recommendations associated with data accuracy, and this is to review the implementation, which I will remind you all according to stats evaluation they have fully completed this, but our job also of course is to look at effectiveness, not just completion.  Thank you, we have Erika and I appreciate that.

We'll go onto the next agenda item, and that is the outreach, the blog post.  You all I believe have received a copy of the blog post.  I can't seem to get that out! The upgrade, updating the community on where we are.  Alice, is that correct, I know it went out to leadership, we decided at the leadership meeting to have it go out to the full working group, did that in fact happen?

ALICE JANSEN:   Hi Alan, no it did not happen I'm afraid, I had to add a couple of references, Lisa, do you want to comment on this?

ALAN GREENBERG:   Yikes, please forgive the ringing in the background; it'll stop in a moment.

LISA PHIFER:   So this is Lisa, Alan, I saw the comments that you sent back to the full group list, we do need to post those documents that you asked for in

PDF format and then adjust the links as you suggested. In addition, in our staff review of the blog post which had come back from COMS, we noticed that there were a few items in the list of objectives that were not fully aligned with the terms of reference as they had been sort of simplified in language, so we would like to come back to you with a few small suggested edits for your consideration and then sharing with the review team.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, please let's get that done as quickly as possible then. So it's an action item out of today. I am gone after this meeting for the rest of the day until my evening, so I may not get a chance to look at it until tomorrow, but I will try today if it gets to me today.

ALICE JANSEN: Hi, this is Alice.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, please go ahead, Alice.

ALICE JANSEN: Hi, I think there was an item you wanted to discuss with the review team on holding a webinar or having the discussion of ICANN 62; should we wait for ICANN 62 or should we have a webinar? Again, that was something we wanted to bring up with the group.

ALAN GREENBERG:      Yes it is, I was just getting to that.  The end of the blog posts which most of you have not seen, or all of you have not seen, said we will be holding webinars, and in square brackets it said details to be provided.  In the blog post we would provide details.

I cannot see us at the stage today where we are prepared to commit to a specific webinar at this point, either on exactly what the topic is or when, so I suggested that we replace that line to saying we are considering webinars, webinar, or webinars and we will be holding a community update session at ICANN 62 in Panama.

So I think that's as good as we're going to get in terms of a commitment because we have to do the ICANN session if we're going to publish a report, we have to be talking to the community at some point.  I think we have only been talking about a public session, I do not believe we've been talking about individual meetings with AC's and SO's, although that is a possibility, but at this point I don't think we've talked about it enough to commit to it in a blog post, but I don't see how we can really do anything more than that if we're going to get this blog posted relatively soon.  Alice, please go ahead.

ALICE JANSEN:      That was an old hand.

ALAN GREENBERG:      Alright, so we will get the blog draft out to the whole group as soon as possible, hopefully by the end of today or tomorrow at the latest, and

we will put it back on the agenda on Friday for a final review. Face to face meeting; what do we have to update on that?

The travel invitations went out, at least I got mine; I'm assuming everyone else got theirs, and arrangements should be made I presume within the next few days. Chris, please go ahead and then I'll ask Lisa or Alice if they have any other issues to raise on the face to face. Go ahead Chris.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:        When you say invitation, you mean the calendar invitation?

ALAN GREENBERG:        No, those of us who have to do travel through constituency travel have received their request to start booking.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:        Oh, okay, I ran into some challenges last time around because boards thought that it was being dealt with by…don't worry about it; it doesn't matter now that I know what you're talking about, it's fine, I'll get it sorted, sorry.

ALAN GREENBERG:        If you don't have air tickets soon you should.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:        No, I'll be going by train anyways.

ALAN GREENBERG:          Okay, well if you don't have train tickets soon you should.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:          Anything else you'd like to do for me?

ALAN GREENBERG:          No, no, no.  If you don't plan to be in Brussels, please let us know, how about that?  The rest of it we'll leave to someone else.  Alright, at this point if I could ask Alice or Lisa if she knows, do we have any apologies for this meeting?  I think I did see one.

LISA PHIFER:             Yes Alan, Volker I believe indicated that he won't be joining us in person.

ALAN GREENBERG:          That's correct; he is moving, but he will try to participate to the extent possible.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:          Sorry Alan, it's me again and I apologize, just it would be helpful to me if someone; Alice or Lisa or whatever could just send me a note that tells me, I don't for example know the hotel details; I'll need to make those arrangements through board travel, but I don't have any of those, so if someone could send that to me I'd be very grateful.

ALAN GREENBERG:     Yeah, I don't know to what extent anyone has those yet.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:     Not a problem, just as long as it happens when it needs to that would be cool.

ALICE JANSEN:     Hi Chris, I'm happy to send you the details.  And just for everyone to know; we're staying at the same hotel as last time.

ALAN GREENBERG:     The A-Loft.

ALICE JANSEN:     Yes, correct.

ALAN GREENBERG:     Which I have to believe is the silliest hotel name I've ever heard, but I'm clearly not a marketing person though.  Chris, you don't have to apologize for interrupting; I will do almost anything to make this purely the Alan show, so anytime someone else is willing to talk I'm glad to have them do it.

Alright; next item on our agenda if there is nothing else to raise by either staff or working group members on the face to face, and I don't see any other hands.  And Alan says it's a busy time, book early.  I'm

trying to desperately. All we have to do is actually get the tickets issued, but I'm hoping now that it's Monday that will happen. Next item is, any other business; do we have any other business?

And we do not have any other business. At least no one is volunteering, and I'll then go over to Alice I presume for decisions reached; I don't know if we've made any decisions and action items.

ALICE JANSEN: I think Lisa has her hand up, Lisa?

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh, you're right, it wasn't up when I started talking. Lisa, go right ahead.

LISA PHIFER: I do, thank you. And I'm not sure that this fits in any other business, but I'll take the opportunity to just amplify a point I think you yourself raised Alan in e-mail, that when sub-groups do begin their work, it is very important for purposes of transparency that the work occur on the mailing list and not in private discussions.

That allows the whole community to see how the work is progressing, and observers to submit any comments they may have. I think we'd all welcome input from the community at any time. To make that happen, we do need to actually do our work on list in the sub-groups and in the full routine.

ALAN GREENBERG:          Thank you Lisa.  Any other business?  Then I again turn it over to I think Alice for the review.


ALICE JANSEN:            Thank you, Alan.  So in terms of decisions reached we have two; the first one is the decision to move forward with the next steps Alan outlined in the safeguarding registrant data e-mail, along with an examination of both registry and proxy provider as well.  Erika has volunteered to help Lili on the assessment of WHOIS one data accuracy implementation.

In terms of action items, the rapporteurs who have not addressed any questions i.e. Cathrin, Susan, Stephanie, Thomas need to send their input to the RDS who is to review team lists as soon as possible.  ICANN org will set up separate calls with each rapporteur, through one doodle poll and sub-group members as available to see how they can help.  ICANN org will also add Erika to data accuracy mailing lists and the wiki page.

That's all for today's call.  Oh wait, I forgot one, I'm sorry.  The ICANN org is also doing [inaudible] on the blog post as soon as possible for final approval on Friday, so that's it for today.


ALAN GREENBERG:          Thank you very much.  On the first decision reached it should be registry, registrar and proxy.

ALICE JANSEN:             Okay, thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:           Alright, I believe it is the same escrow agent that works for all three, but it is all three.

ALICE JANSEN:             Thank you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:           If there is no further comments, then we'll call this meeting to an end a half our early.  We reconvene on Friday to the extent possible.  It would be nice if we had full attendance, thank you.  Bye-bye.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**