

---

RECORDED VOICE: This meeting is now being recorded.

BRENDA BREWER: Welcome everyone to the Strategic Priority Subgroup Meeting No. 1, on March 6, 2018, at 12:30 UTC. Attending the call today is Carlton, Cathrin, and from ICANN.org, we have Jean-Baptiste, Alice, Lisa, Steve, and Brenda. And the call is being recorded. Please state your name for the transcript. I'll turn the call over to Cathrin. Thank you.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Thank you very much. Hi, Carlton, I guess it's you and me, and I think Alan is also -- oh, no, he's not on the call list. He thinks he might join us a little bit later. Now, I basically have two goals for this call, and the first is to give you and, ideally, also Volker [inaudible] attempt to review my proposal for the answers to the planning questions. And then, in the second step, to further flesh out the briefing questions, which we first agreed on in the first half of the planning document.

And thanks again for your input to those questions at that time. And now, we've gotten some helpful feedback from Lisa, who has suggested that we sort of flesh out these questions a little bit and try and differentiate which ones we would like to see responses from the subject-matter experts, and which others are more for us to assess and maybe not the right ones to forward to the [CROSSTALK] --

---

*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.*

---

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: The host has left the meeting to speak with meeting support and will rejoin soon.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Subject-matter experts. Can you all still hear me? Sorry.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yes, we can. Sorry about that, Cathrin.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: No problem. It's just to make sure that it doesn't mean the connection is cut. Okay.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: No, no. [Inaudible] Carlton.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Okay. Oh, so Carlton -- is Carlton able to speak?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: He will be in a few minutes.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Okay. Excellent. All right. So, then I guess we'll just give him a second.

---

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: He can hear you at this time; it's just that he will be able to speak in a few minutes.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: All right. I mean I guess I could get started running through my thinking -- so, my basic -- my first thought at this point is to get the briefing requests done because I think that is the -- that will be the main additional info that we need to clarify beyond our -- the initial briefing that we received in October on this -- to clarify the questions that we need to answer.

And we had some general and some legal information in the initial briefing, and that gave rise to the additional questions that we've put here where, in some cases, it's just a question of getting a little bit more in detail. So, we were informed, for example, that there is incentivisation for the CEOs that the Board has put in -- put them in the contracts, but there's no clear clarity as to how exactly this works and what the goalposts are, if any, and what the assessment is of that.

So, those are really the questions that I proposed on the basis of initial review of the materials provided, which included the five-year strategic plan, the implementation briefing updates on those recommendations, and the other materials provided -- those were the specific questions I had remaining, to which Carlton also added a number.

So, those were the ones that I would put forward for the briefing requests, and while I agree that some of those will also benefit from our assessment -- so, the ones that -- in particular those that are not bulleted, so the two guiding questions for these two categories that I

---

created, namely, Is there a formal recognition of the strategic importance of the WHOIS? And is there a substantive implementation of that? So, has this formal requirement really come to light?

I mean those are the two questions that we will need to assess. But for the other questions, the ones that are bulleted, I would really like to see responses from ICANN subject-matter experts to see how exactly this has been implemented. And then, for some of them, it is a judgment call. Oh, hi, Carlton. Welcome to the bridge.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Hi. Thank you, Cathrin. I'm here.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Excellent. Thanks so much for taking the time. So, yeah, that was my thinking, in terms of the briefing questions, but maybe as a first step, do you have any comment on the planning questions' answers? I mean one thing, in particular, that we can discuss is, "How we will review and analyze relevant documentation? Which will be the first additional step to take." And if you have any feedback on any of these, I'd be grateful.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Yes.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: I see Lisa has her hand raised. [CROSSTALK]

---

CARLTON SAMUELS: Yes, Cathrin, this is Carlton speaking. Oh, I'm sorry. [CROSSTALK]

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: So, Carlton, please go ahead. Please go ahead, Carlton, and then we'll take Lisa.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Thank you. Thank you, Cathrin. Carlton for the record. I was thinking that the planning, action plan document that was developed after the review strategic review team made the report is a good starting place for us to see what the thinking was from the Board, with respect to responding to the recommendations from the review team.

Some of the questions that you ask, they're quite penetrating questions, and you wouldn't see the answers from the planning, action plan document, and not even the implementation, because I've read it a couple of times. For both, what happened in-between, and for me, maybe it would be even difficult for staff to tell you. If those things are not recorded from the Board minutes, it would be difficult for us to find them.

However, I do think the questions should be asked, and maybe some -- there is some institutional memory that could give us some information. So, that's my feeling about it right now. I don't think we're going to get a lot of them answered in the way we would-- from documents, but mainly from people who were in the room at the time. Thanks.

---

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Thank you, Carlton. This is Cathrin. Lisa, please go ahead.

LISA PHIFER: Thank you, Cathrin. Lisa for the record. To follow up on what Carlton was actually saying and thus deals with the comment that I wanted to make, which is that my recollection of the briefing that was given during our Brussels meeting, some of these questions were covered to some extent in that original briefing. So, asking a question that was already answered is likely to get the same answer back, whereas if you feel that you've looked through the briefing or replayed it and it did not have answers to a specific question, that can probe further.

And to Carlton's point, I actually wonder is what you may want to do for some of these questions, with regard to the -- putting this into place from a formal perspective -- is ask for an interview with someone that was part of that Board activity, or is currently part of, you know, the Board WHOIS activity, to be able to have an open-ended conversation about these questions: What happened? And ask follow-on questions if you don't feel that you've gotten enough depth in the answers.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Thank you, Lisa. This is Cathrin. Indeed, an interview might make sense, and the briefing questions are intended as follow-up for the briefing that was provided on the 3rd of October, because that was very much focused on the Board action taken, and my -- the set of questions that we put in the first task planning, we're supposed to flesh out the information a bit more, because we were told things about that he CEOS compensations in some way tied to the WHOIS, but it's not quite

---

clear how exactly that works, and how it is measured, and what part of the compensation, if any, is, in fact, tied to which yardstick. And that would be interesting to find out more about. And the same is true for a number of the other questions.

So, I tried -- I mean, it's been a couple of weeks, now, but I've tried to go through the briefing materials that were provided in drafting these questions, and they're supposed to elicit further details. So, if there are any that you think, from the phrasing of the question, seem like they've already been answered in the October briefing, I'd be grateful for a hint, so we can improve them.

So, maybe a first action item for us could be to -- if there's no immediate comments on these questions, to go back and review them in light of the materials already provided to make sure that we're not duplicating anything that's already out there.

LISA PHIFER:

And as a follow-up to that, Cathrin, I think sometimes when asking an open-ended question, if you give an example of the type of answer, the level of detail you expect in the answer, that would give guidance, so that you don't get the same broad answer that left you feeling that you needed this additional detail.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST:

Right. Thank you, Lisa. That's makes a lot of sense.

---

CARLTON SAMUELS: Yes, I agree with Lisa. That's the way to do it. I really do think, from most of the details, that the questions are going after -- it really involves talking to people in the room at the time, and getting a sense of their own sense of what happened, and what was intended. I really do believe that that's the way to go at it.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Okay. Thank you, Carlton. Lisa, could I ask whether anyone from ICANN staff could help us identify possible persons to talk to in this context?

LISA PHIFER: Yes, certainly. If the request would be for an interview to cover this ground, we'll identify a party that would be appropriate, or perhaps, more than one that might be appropriate for you to consider interviewing.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: That would be excellent. Thank you, Lisa. And then in the meantime, maybe we can work on fleshing out the questions by adding examples. Carlton, would it be okay for you, if we divide up the questions amongst ourselves and Volker, so I would just try and divide them by numbers, so that we take four each and try and provide a bit more detail? Is that okay for you?

CARLTON SAMUELS: Yes, of course. Yes, of course.

---

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Excellent. And I guess, Volker doesn't have a vote in this one at the moment, so we'll have to assume that's he's going to be okay with it. So, do you have any preference as to which ones you want to take a look at? Are there any that you have particularly strong feelings about or that you feel that your expertise would be best placed in editing?

CARLTON SAMUELS: Oh, well, since Volker's not here, just let's throw the coin and divide them up in three sections. We wouldn't want [inaudible] can leave poor Volker with the ones that are --

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Right. Very good point. Okay. So, why don't do it in order of the alphabet? So, you take the first four, I take the second four, and Volker takes the last four.

CARLTON SAMUELS: That's fine. Works for me.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Okay. Thank you, Carlton. And thank you, Volker, in your absence. Now, Carlton, in terms of C, the approach to the rest of the work, I suppose in No. 2 that we will all review the documents to be analyzed, and we'll draft comments and findings, so here I have not yet proposed to divide the work on analyzing.

---

Now, the question would be for our approach, whether that's the best approach, or whether it would preferable to divide up the work further. I mean, my rationale at the time was that there -- this isn't the biggest point, so it's not that much work to review the material out there, but at the same time, it's an important assessment to make.

So, I thought it made sense that all of us take a look at the materials, and then together come an agreement on whether we think strategic priority has been accorded to the WHOIS? That being said, I recognize that we all have a ton of work, and I'm certainly not, you know, my participation in this team has already suffered from it, so if you think it's a better approach to divide and conquer, then now would be a good moment to make that point.

CARLTON SAMUELS:

No, can I [CROSSTALK] the best way to do it. We do the analysis, the reading, and the extraction separately, but then we come together for the analysis -- because we really need the group-level kind of approach to ensure that the output kind of makes sense and everybody's agreed on it. So, I think for analysis, we get together, and it could be just another call. In any event, we all have to read most of the base material that these questions are really asking.

So, for example, we all have to read the report, the review team report. We all have to read it the action plan. We all have to read the implementation. We all have to read the briefing notes that we got in the first briefing. The only thing that remains is for us to look at the interviews, and even though own hearing -- this is where we have to

---

apply the judgment now. I think, mainly, in hearing what the interview responses are -- that would be probably based on our set of views coming in.

We might get nuances -- we might pick up nuances that are absolutely important to determining a position. But I think that's the critical one for everyone to have a different view and listen carefully and keenly, and do the analysis. So, I endorse the way you are suggesting. We all do the reading. We all listen to the responses on the interview. We all come to some kind of [inaudible], and then we get together for the output.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST:

Okay. Excellent. Thank you, Carlton. This is Cathrin, again, for the record. Then I guess, I would update the document to reflect that in more clarity, so that each member will view the documents to be analyzed, and then, maybe, instead of saying that we will draft comments and findings, I would explicitly, say that we will not just meet and talk to integrate findings, but also we'd meet to analyze together, and then divide up the work in drafting different parts of the findings at that point.

And then I would, also, of course reflect our new response to question No. 4 on whether we will conduct relevant interviews -- to reflect what we have just now decided -- that, in fact, one or more interviews would be helpful, and that we may not even want to go for a paper-briefing request. Am I correct understanding, also, of what both you and Lisa

---

were recommending, Carlton -- that, in fact, we might not even want written answers?

CARLTON SAMUELS:

No. That's exactly right. One thing I'll tell you, the analysis phase, one of the critical staff elements is going to be Lisa because Lisa has an uncanny to hear things we're all saying, that sometimes we don't hear, and interpret it for us.

So that analytical meeting, to me, the critical person to have with us is Lisa because of -- that's the way I've seen her work and it helps us tease out new information or an idea from a jumble of thoughts. So, I would urge you to set -- whatever we set, we have to set it with Lisa availability on that specific exercise.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST:

Excellent. Thank you for that, Carlton. And Lisa, I look forward to that, and indeed, I've seen how you distill action items from the wording on the call, which is quite impressive -- let's, indeed, see how you can help us read between the lines of the different interviews that we may conduct. Okay. So, I will update question 4, accordingly. And, Lisa, I see you have your hand up. Sorry.

LISA PHIFER:

Yes, Cathrin -- it's Lisa. Thank you, Carlton, for that endorsement. I hope I live up to your expectations. Cathrin, I noticed in the original work plan document that you developed, you had identified a couple of

---

requests for materials, and I wonder if you could include that in your update to your answers to the planning questions document?

I think that you had asked for -- if there was anything in writing on the incentivisation measures for staff, including the CEO -- if there were written minutes, work plans, or objectives for that Board CEO committee, and, of course, you had an open-ended any other materials.

But if you have those specific requests for materials, if you would, please, include that in the document that you have displayed on the screen, here, that you update, that will give us that sort of formal request to go try to see if we have any written materials to supplement the interviews that might be scheduled?

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST:

Yes. Thank you, Lisa -- very good point. I mean that's exactly the kind of detail that I think we need add to the question because that was sort of what I was trying to get at with -- how has this been reflected in the compensation, you know, in staff incentivisation and stuff? So, it's very helpful to see that that should be included.

Because that's, I mean, that just helps me to see, also -- that's what I was getting at with the first question and the second question, and that is -- yeah, and that is obviously not clear, so let's put that there. I will include that, and you can add to my action items, also, to update question 1 -- and 2, also, because we've just agreed on a different approach. Actually, let's just say, "Cathrin to update answers to questions," and then, I'll just send around a second pass, now, following this call.

---

LISA PHIFER: Cathrin, I wonder if we could think about a timeline for when you would expect the rest of the subgroup to have responded your updated version? And then, we'd be ready to forward that as a formal request.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Yeah. I mean, Carlton, what's your availability like? I'm going to be traveling as of -- well, I'm leaving London Friday, and then, I'm traveling as of Saturday, early morning. So, I can either set a deadline for myself for Friday or, then, again after the ICANN meeting. And I don't whether you're going, or what your availability is like, but once I'm there, it's pretty crazy for me.

CARLTON SAMUELS: I am going to be traveling to Puerto Rico, from Tuesday afternoon. So, whatever happens before Monday, I'm good to deliver before Monday - - at least by end of day, Monday would be good for me. I can do some things over the weekend. I have some time to do that. If I have time anyways, so it's always good to throw everything in.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Excellent. So, let's set that as the deadline, and then I'll just try and deliver mine just a a bit early, so what I would propose to do is that I send around my update to questions 2-5, pretty much right after this call, for your endorsement, because that shouldn't take long, and then that we aim to have our more detailed versions of the questions under 1 by Monday, end of day. And then we'll share that in with Volker, as

---

well, and he is responsible for the last four questions. So, if we can just reflect that in the action items, also, please, that would be excellent? Thank you, Alice.

Okay. So, that for the first half planning, and planning questions. We want to have an interview. We want to possibly still have -- but indeed - - sorry, Lisa, to come back to your earlier point about the written materials we requested, if we're now switching to interview-mode for these questions, then, indeed, maybe we should have -- and I think that's what you were originally getting at -- we should have a separate request for those written materials to be maintained. Right? That was my -- or in thinking, now, because we're switching. Yeah.

LISA PHIFER: Yes, correct.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Okay. So, that we will keep as a separate request for the written materials, and I will add that to this document.

LISA PHIFER: And I apologize, I was multitasking a bit -- just to clarify your target for completing subgroup review of this?

---

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Well, my target for questions 2-5 is today. And then, for the further detailing of the questions under 1, is for Monday -- next Monday, end of day. So, that's the 12th, I think.

LISA PHIFER: Thank you.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: So, I think we're actually doing quite well on time. Carlton, do you think the questions are clear enough to you that you feel happy in fleshing them out, in terms of providing further detail, or would it be useful to you if we took two minutes to discuss them now? I'm really happy either way. We can either [CROSSTALK] --

CARLTON SAMUELS: Let's take the two minutes and discuss them now, just in case anything, you know -- two heads are always better than one.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Excellent. So, I mean, I can just put a -- try to explain what my overall approach was really to divide into these two categories to say, you know, Is there any record on paper of how the WHOIS has been formally made a strategic objective? you know, Is there language in the contracts? Is there language in plans and strategic documents to show that this is really a priority for the organization? So, that's what the first set of questions was guided by.

---

And with the question, how has it been implemented in staff incentivisation, including for the CEO? What I was trying to get at was to say, you know, what are the clauses in the contract? You know, what does it say? How is this really integrated here? Does it just say somewhere in a footnote -- "and you should also pay attention to WHOIS as part of a list of 25 items," or is there a prominent paragraph that says, and if, you know, you don't take sufficient steps to make sure the objectives and the bylaws met, you're compensation will be docked by experts and per year?

That's really the kind of detail I was trying to elicit with that question. And what do you think -- what else should be --? Do you have any thoughts on that?

CARLTON SAMUELS: No, no, no. It's good. I'm reading you, totally.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: For the second, "How has it been integrated into the organizational objectives?" I mean, I saw the mention in the five-year plan, and I just remember thinking that it was sort of very general and broad. And, in particular, also, in the funding, it didn't seem like that was matched by any commensurate resources, to ensure that strategic priority was actually [inaudible].

So, the next two questions are really, you know, designed to see in what other ways the WHOIS has been formally integrated into the strategic planning of the organization beyond compensation aspects?

---

CARLTON SAMUELS: Yes.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Then, the next couple questions are really quite -- just taking the box, you know, the Board has said they wanted to create a committee, including the CEO that is responsible for the WHOIS and for key actions - - and I just wanted to see whether there's any records, minute -- minutes of the meetings of the committee; of the work it has done of any decisions it has taken; of any reviews it has made of the, you know, importance of the WHOIS; or whatever the organization thought was the accurate response to this recommendation.

So, that's really -- and that's also, I think, one of the requests I made for written materials, is any records of this committee's work, including its creation. And the next question on the public updates, that was also something that the Board recommended -- they would keep up that there should be public updates to just basically, to determine, Has that taken place and in what form? And is it an update in name only, or does it really help us determine whether it's a strategic priority?

And then -- yeah, the following questions -- sorry, do you have comments on these, or do think -- does it --?

CARLTON SAMUELS: No. It's fine. I'm -- we're aligned here.

---

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Okay. How has the CEO complied with the instruction from the Board to oversee improvements to the contractual conditions? I mean, that's going to be a tough -- I mean, that's sort of a historical question because that was not his -- that was not the current CEO's task, but there, you know, we need to look in the records as to how this has happened, and have some information about how it happened in the 2013 RAA, which is something that law enforcement, at the time, fought hard for.

And of course, we have the -- yeah -- we have the specifications there that we can further look at. And I just see that Lisa has put in the chat that we have the annual WHOIS reports and roadmaps on our Wiki background materials, indeed; so those are the public updates on progress against target.

CARLTON SAMUELS: And you also have the -- the group also has the catalog of WHOIS policies that have come into place since 2013.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Yeah -- most of these are privacy proxy, I guess.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Yeah. The specifications that were applied and then the other things, privacy proxy, the thick WHOIS, etc., etc.

---

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Yeah. So, I guess the need for the public report, we don't really need to include that in the questions for the interview, right? The public update?

CARLTON SAMUELS: No, I don't think so. Yeah. Because those are those are available -- we just have to look at the timelines. This is just a matter of managing timelines and looking at what emerged. [CROSSTALK]

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Okay. So, let's add to our actions -- sorry, Carlton. I didn't mean to interrupt.

CARLTON SAMUELS: No, it's okay. Carry on.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: So, suggest to add to our action items, also, which of these questions we think should be forwarded for the interviews, as a basis -- and which don't really need further answers, right?

CARLTON SAMUELS: Exactly.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Okay. And then, I was also interested in understanding more about how the CEO has implemented this instruction from the Board to create

---

appropriate reporting of these improvements, and to implement staff incentivisation? So, how is this internally, you know, how is he living the priority or the strategic importance given to the WHOIS within the organization, and that, of course, will be a bit in a historic perspective, you know -- how had the CEO taken care of this?

But if there are any records, any traces of internal guidelines of staff contracts, of some sort of a standard clause that is included, for example, for compliance or for other parts of the organization in the staff contracts to make sure that this staff incentivisation is happening -- that would be sort of what would help us determine whether this has taken place.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Yes.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: And on the substantive -- sorry, do you have any comments on the formal one, before we move to the substantive ones?

CARLTON SAMUELS: No, no, no. Those are fine. The only other one that would be -- there's a [inaudible] of compliance objectives that came out of this that some of them are actually written down in the plans. But some might be incentivized -- those are the ones that you'd have to have conversations about, as part of the conversation.

---

You wouldn't find written documents that say which ones what, but I'm sure there would be -- I would say there could be some distinction between what are incentivized via compliance and so on.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Okay. So, that would be the incentive for within the organization or for others to comply -- like the contracted party?

CARLTON SAMUELS: Contracted parties, as well as organizational side -- sides that -- that's the two sides [CROSSTALK].

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Okay. And is that something we're already reflecting in the questions, or should there be another question getting [CROSSTALK] --

CARLTON SAMUELS: No, it's already reflected. We just added to the details -- the sub-sayings for the -- there are places where we can add those in the details here.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Okay. Perfect. I'll just note it for myself. Also, so we don't forget. Yes. Thank you. And Lisa was making the point in the chat, again, that giving our examples of the detail we seek will really help -- so, Lisa, may I just ask you, is that -- I mean, the level that we're now discussing, is that what's needed, or do we need more?

---

LISA PHIFER: I think the levels that you're discussing, as opposed to the level that's on the screen is going to be really helpful to get the kind of answers that you're seeking.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Okay. Perfect. Thank you for that feedback. On the substantive side -- I'm just trying in the first question to get at whether there's any other actions, you know, I'm thinking the lawyer approach or policies for that. Basically, you know, I take off what I know, and then I tried to have a question that basically tries to get at what else is there. And that's that question. You know, what else did you do as an organization to reflect the strategic priority beyond what was specifically recommended? And what form did it take?

Then, the priority and the reflections of priority in the transition from the ALT to the bylaws, I mean, I recognize that's a bit of an unclear question to the organization because it's quite -- it wasn't as up to them to -- or it wasn't at all up to them to decide what the bylaws were going to look like, and the fact that the WHOIS, in my view, was somewhat demoted in the transition, it's probably not ICANN's fault. But I included the question, anyway, in case ICANN has any comments on how that process shaped up. Yes.

And then the defect in the WHOIS contractual obligations -- I mean that's, again, referring back to the recommendation that was made that was quite specific -- what analysis was -- right. Lisa is just saying that

---

she thinks that other actions are all those taken to address the rest of the recommendations -- might be the answer we're getting for this one.

But those then would have to be specifically recommended by the WHOIS review team, so I was really trying to get at -- I mean, I think, one thing they might now refer to is the current process to ensure conformance with date-protection rules. You know, I mean, that shows our commitment to maintaining the WHOIS.

CARLTON SAMUELS:

Can I just say that -- if you look at the draft of the substantive perspective, the two big themes that came out of that is the expert working group was initiated, and the other one was the strategic -- there was a panel for strategic advice that was chaired by Vint Cerf, where some of those issues came up. Those are two big somatic ones that come out of that. So, I would agree with Lisa that there really were answers to the first set of questions.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST:

Okay. So, that would mean -- are those two big themes something that we should further seek to flesh out in the interview? I mean, I feel -- I've done some --

CARLTON SAMUELS:

Well, we may wish in the interview to -- with an independent who is -- who Lisa and Alice gets to do the interviews with us. But in my view, most of them would have been aware that deciding that getting the EWG up and going was what came out of some of those same

---

conversations that happened -- that you were touching on in the first part. That much I know because I served on the EWG, and the rationale for it came out of those discussions, I know.

So, maybe we don't need a whole set of questions around it. We can simply look at what the output was, and how it was intended to drive further work -- along EWG, which was responding mainly to issues of -- the issues that were then in environment -- the data-protection issues, the access by groups to personal information beyond those that would be protected -- that is the law enforcement writer, and so on.

So, I think, you know, if you look at the way is Lisa is suggesting, maybe we just want to note those things, and probably answer the question by looking at some of the high and overarching ideas that came out of those pieces of work.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Okay. Carlton, I'm thinking -- this is Cathrin, again, for the record -- thank you, Lisa, for the time check. I think we're almost through. I'm wondering whether we should do the first round of the interview with you, because there's so much institutional knowledge that you have that I, for one, don't have, and I don't know about Volker, but it would be very interesting to hear you talk through some of those questions, so maybe we can -- if that's okay for you -- schedule a call and first get some -- get your understanding of a bunch of this, because I think you're expertise on this far exceeds mine. [Inaudible - 00:42:46].

---

CARLTON SAMUELS:

Well, I really would want to -- I would like to be in on the interviews, but I think from the Board's perspective, we've gone through a lot of this, and kind of pull it apart and put it together again. But I think for the group, it would be very important to speak to the people, the Board, who were there at the time, and get our own sense of -- while I would agree that I do have a lot of recollection, it is also, again, through the prism that I put these that I think of these things through. And maybe we should add a little bit of it, but I certainly would think that we should need to speak to the Board people first, yes?

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST:

Perfect. Okay. Just to finish those -- the remaining questions -- I mean, those are -- I mean they're really also just checking the requirements that were in the recommendations and then I have a more statistical question about, how it has impacted the accuracy and the functionality of the WHOIS? And that, I guess, is there evidence beyond that to show that the definitions of strategic priority has had a positive impact?

And the first one, the accuracy and functionality bit, I guess I was sort of hoping for a statistic from the compliance team to see whether there is any positive impact, in terms of raise of complaints, or -- I mean, knowing that there's not really much data available from the ARS exercise, in terms of substantial accuracy, that's not really a good source to draw from, but may, at least, for syntax, we can look at whether there's been any impact. So, that was what I was trying to get at with that.

---

And the positive impact, in terms of what the definition of a strategic priority has had, in terms of positive impact. And that is, I guess, finally, a judgment question for us, but it was also, from my side, intended as sort of an opportunity for ICANN to tell us, you know, how taken together, these measures have improved the situation.

CARLTON SAMUELS:

Yeah. Cathrin, the accuracy reporting system, it is, I think, sometimes it's mischaracterized. Because what it is intended to do was more like an early-warning device. You know, once you keep on doing things, reporting things, over and over again, you see patterns emerge, and then you respond -- you try to figure out why the pattern and then you find a way to respond to it. So, the accuracy reporting system, maybe as basic as people think it is -- it was intended, in my view, as an early-warning device, to encourage further actions.

So, I personally think it has done its job in a way that would enable further development, for example, one of the problems that we've always had is what I call [inaudible - 00:46:28] and in the banking business, you know your customer. You just only want to know that the person presenting their IDT is the person that they are, but you want to know that same person live at the time, and we have not got to that set of objectives, yet, in the WHOIS, in terms of getting the WHOIS data accurate.

But, in my view, ARS does provide first-line kind of information about where else we can go. So, I would endorse that as a first step in the

---

accuracy program, and I don't think it was ever intended to be best and final.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Okay. This is Cathrin. Thank you, Carlton. Excellent. And I'm just reading Lisa in parallel -- yes, the question is also that there is the work going on in the accuracy subgroup, which might in this case, which we may be duplicating, so we need to see how exactly we can deal with that part of this -- my office phone, which is so old that I can't turn it off -- please just ignore the ringing.

But I guess that brings us to the -- I guess we should, then, focus more on the functionality of the WHOIS -- just wondering whether there's anything left in these questions other than checking with the accuracy reporting subgroup. What do you think, Carlton and Lisa? Is there anything else that we want to have answered as part of this question that is not covered by the accuracy subgroup and compliance, in fact, for the other parts?

CARLTON SAMUELS: I think those answers from them would be good indicators of where we want to go. So, I think that -- for now, I think they're sufficient.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Okay.

---

LISA PHIFER: This is Lisa. I think, probably, because what you're trying to do is make an overall assessment of how treating WHOIS as a strategic priority actually had an impact, looking at the specific results from each of the other subgroups, and then taking that into account as you make your overall finding or recommendation might be the way to go.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Yeah.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Excellent. Okay. So, maybe we just share this question with the others, and say that we're hoping to draw on their conclusions to help us assess ours, or to help us come to ours.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Good idea.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: But then we don't -- yeah, so we don't necessarily take this one up for the interview, either.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Yeah.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Okay. So, I note that we've already decided that question -- bullet 5, "Has ICANN.org issued public updates?" we don't want to ask in the

---

interview. And the last bullet, “How has the updated complaints procedures,” fa-la-la? We also don’t want to ask in the interview, right? So that we can already make a note of -- on that question 5, and start working on those and question 10.

Okay. Right. So, we went through the questions. Carlton, do you have any thoughts on these questions, or it is your -- has this discussion triggered any further questions that you think we should add?

CARLTON SAMUELS:

No. Not at the minute. I will look through again. This was very helpful, because it, at least, gives me access to the context in which you were asking the questions, and so -- and the frame -- so I can augment as I see, as I go along. But, right now, I’m good.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST:

Excellent. Thank you, Carlton. And I think maybe we can add to the action items that in each of the clarification -- our clarification exercise by Monday, we also reflect on whether these questions are complete or whether there’s others that we would like to ask in preparation for a possible interview.

CARLTON SAMUELS:

Right.

---

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: All right. And I just -- in the action items, it's not yet reflected that we're dividing up the questions for further detailing, so maybe we can just include that in the action items, so Volker's also aware of what he has to do, and I will, also, send out the updated answers to questions 2 and 5, of course.

But just to remind everyone -- so, Carlton is doing questions -- the first four bullets; I'm doing the second four bullets; and Volker is, hopefully, looking at the last four bullets. And noting that in those four bullets, we've already decided we don't to ask the last one, and also, in Volker's batch of questions, we don't want to ask the public updates one, so the first one that he has to detail.

Oh, and Lisa just says that maybe we want to talk to someone involved in the 2013 RAA and new gTLD. Yes, if -- Lisa, if you could also try and -- oh, sorry, Lisa -- I see you have your hand up -- it's so small on my Adobe that I keep missing it. My apology. Please?

LISA PHIFER: Thanks, Cathrin. And Lisa for the record. So, just to clarify -- the action item to clarify the details requested in question 1 -- that action item is actually split between you, Carlton, and Volker --

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Yes.

---

LISA PHIFER: With you taking the first four bullets; Carlton taking the next four; and then, hopefully, Volker accepting the assignment to take the final four?

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Right.

LISA PHIFER: Thank you.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Excellent. And with that clarification, I think we have to liberate the room. So, any final comments? If we're all good, then thank you so much to you, Carlton, and also, to Lisa, and the whole team, Brenda, Alice, and Jean-Baptiste for taking the time for this call, and enjoy the next one. And, Carlton, I'll speak to you soon. And, hopefully, see most of you in -- I was going to say Abu Dhabi, but it's Puerto Rico this time.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Puerto Rico, yes.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Bye, everyone.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Bye.

---

LISA PHIFER:                      Bye.

BRENDA BREWER:                Bye. Thank you.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**