
RECORDED VOICE: This meeting is now being recorded.

BRENDA BREWER: Good day everyone. This is Brenda speaking for the record and I'd like to welcome you all to the RDS WHOIS 2 Review Team Plenary Call #23; it is on March 23rd at 12:30 UTC. In attendance today we have Alan Greenberg, Chris Disspain, Dmitry, Lili and Susan. From ICANN Org we have Alice, Amy, Jean-Baptiste, Lisa, Steve and Brenda. And apologies from Cathrin, Thomas and Erika. Today's call is being recorded. May I please remind you to state your name before speaking for the transcript and I'll turn the meeting over to Alan. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Welcome to the prehistoric meeting without any Adobe Connect. What we'll try is if people want to speak just call your name out, perhaps in a quiet moment, if someone else is speaking and hopefully I'll hear you and I'll put you in the queue. There is a problem on some connections that if someone else is talking, you cannot talk. Hopefully, that won't be a problem, remains to be seen if that's a problem on this particular conference system or not.

With that, I will start the meeting and ask are there any statement of interest updates? Hearing nothing, the first agenda item is an update on a number of sub groups. Unfortunately, all the people who are due to present are not here but we may have substitutes in some cases. The first one is privacy proxy and I believe Susan has generally volunteered

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.

to present that one, Volker isn't here. Susan are you prepared to do anything?

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI:

Not prepared to say, but we did meet with Amy Bivins and Jen Gore and Owen from Compliance and we had provided questions ahead of time, which they answered in real time and provided written answers after. During the discussion with them a few more questions were generated and after the phone call then as I said they provided written responses.

It was an interesting conversation though, the top of my head I can't think of what those interesting points were, so I'd have to go back to my notes. I think we're a little bit farther down the road with understanding the compliance issues and just a sticking point for the PPSAI and I'm not sure we've made any plans to ask any additional questions yet, I'd need to go back to my notes. Sorry about that.

ALAN GREENBERG:

That's okay. Thank you, Susan. Do you have a level of comfort that by the time we get to Brussels we'll have something worthy of discussing with the Plenary Group?

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI:

Yes, I do.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Good, thank you. The next item is also Volker. I'm not sure who else is on the common interface one, is there anyone who can speak to it? My recollection is it's one of the ones that we've done moderately little on but I don't know that for a fact. If we can have anyone on the group or staff comment on where we are or who can speak.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI:

I haven't really done -- I'm on that group too and I haven't really done much except for some other work I was doing was actually using the interface to look up WHOIS records and definitely came into -- hit roadblocks on some of the new gTLD. What I thought I'd do is just go through and do more of a representative sample look up. It definitely worked for .comnet or those but I think it was .education .life and maybe .science that it didn't return anything, so I didn't know if it was just the domains I was looking up or if it was those registries are not providing the actual access to the WHOIS records.

I thought I'd go through and figure out some more domain names and a wider target of new gTLD's and see if I'm getting the same results and also try the same ones I tried yesterday in a couple days to see if there's a change there and we'd have some questions to actually ask ICANN about that.

ALAN GREENBERG:

You haven't tried domain tools or something like that to see whether you could access them or not?

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: I could get them on domain tools, I couldn't get them...

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh, so you know they do exist?

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Yes, they're definitely registered domains I just could not get them in that hour on the common interface.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think we need to send a note of thanks to the GNSO for appointing Susan to this group.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: I mean so much of this is just my day to day work. I look up WHOIS all the time.

ALAN GREENBERG: And we're grateful for this. Anyone else have any comments on it? I don't know who else is on that team. We have no other comments, so we'll go on to the next one. Which is interesting because it's law enforcement needs. Chris, I think you're the only one on the team. I guess we're going to skip over this one. It's somewhat perturbing.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Sorry Alan, it takes a while to get off mute, my apologies. There is a meeting I think next week of the law enforcement team, let me just

double check. There was one yesterday which I missed. Lisa, do you know what happened?

LISA PHIFER:

I do indeed. Yesterday we attempted to have a sub group meeting of law enforcement. The only sub group member that joined was Cathrin. Cathrin I believe was sending a follow up email to recast the non-discussion that we had yesterday and make some suggestions on list to try to move that forward while the meeting is also rescheduled.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Cathrin to her credit was willing to have a debate with herself and disagree vehemently with what she had previously written but we decided that probably wasn't worth a lot.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

That is the European Commission way, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I'm not touching that.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

She's representing 28 different states currently and so therefore is quite capable of having a vicious argument with herself.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. We have a dial in from 182006.

CARLTON SAMUELS: It's Carlton.

ALAN GREENBERG: Carlton, welcome Carlton. We have so far had a privacy proxy presentation from Susan replacing Volker and a common interface from Susan replacing Volker and we have just passed by law enforcement as not having anyone here from the team. We are now onto consumer trust with Erika.

LISA PHIFER: Just one further note on the law enforcement sub group in case the members not attending this call do listen to the recording, where the law enforcement sub group stands is actually that they had agreed to do some informal outreach to their own law enforcement contacts. The questions that Catherin to send around by email are to help formalize what that outreach will entail, so that anyone asking questions will in fact be asking the same questions.

In addition to that, the law enforcement sub group have previously discussed having a briefing from the office of the CTO during the informal meeting that 61, it was suggested because the GAC received the public safety working group had received a briefing from the office of the CTO covering probably the same area that it would be useful for the sub group to listen to the recording of the briefing and then if there's any further need for an actual briefing directly from the office of the CTO, that's OCTO, that would be scheduled at that time.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Lisa. Any further comments from anyone on the law enforcement before we proceed?

Alright, next is consumer trust. Who we do have from that? We have Carlton, Dmitry, Erika who leads it, Susan and Stephanie, so we have a fair amount presentation, can we get an update on what has been done so far, from anyone?

CARLTON SAMUELS: Is Erika on the call?

ALAN GREENBERG: No, she is not, that's why I'm asking for an update from anyone.

CARLTON SAMUELS: We completed the first documented. There were some updates to the document. There are additional documents that need to look at and that's where I think everything is.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. The last thing I saw is Dmitry pointed to the CCT Report but I wasn't quite sure what sections of the CCT Report really addressed consumer confidence and WHOIS? It addresses consumer confidence from a new gTLD perspective but I don't think there was much overlap with WHOIS.

CARLTON SAMUELS: No, there was not. There was one small part where we looked at compliance and we were looking at the records [inaudible] compliance based on complaints and there were a couple WHOIS related complaints there but we didn't think it was significant to skew the report into that direction.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Carlton. Stephanie, I saw you were trying to talk perhaps, your phone is unmuted, did you have anything to add?

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Sorry, the mute fell off, I thought there was something weird going on. I'll mute it again.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Alan, this is Susan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes please, go ahead.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: I did take a look at the CCT Report hoping that there might be a definition there we could use, consumer trust or consumer in general and didn't find anything definitive there that we could just pull. They definitely referenced consumer but it wasn't -- I was hoping for a stronger, clearer definition and didn't find it.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Can I say something again? We did define consumer trust but it was a really pedestrian definition of it. There was a lot of argument about what trust meant in terms of consumer, what they were looking for the identifiers or whether it was trust based on content and there was a lot argument back and forth about that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. One thing that came out in another discussion I was having on consumer trust related GDPR was the heavy use of WHOIS reputation services and I don't think we covered that in the questions that were originally presented and the or iteration and I took part in that but I don't remember any mention of reputation services and although very, very few real users go to WHOIS to check who they're dealing with or something like that, virtually everyone heavily depends on reputation services because the browsers automatically use them to verify whether this is a trustworthy place to go to or not.

There is a very direct contact with WHOIS and consumer trust through the reputation services and I don't think that came out in the original questions and it should be noted.

CARLTON SAMUELS: That is a good fact, Alan. In the meeting we had of the CCT group, that just came up and I think we're focusing some of the reports towards that. There's not a lot about that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Anyone else have any comments on the consumer trust issue? I will make a note to send something to the list on reputation services, just so we capture it formally.

LISA PHIFER: Just noting that staff had a little bit of back and forth with Erika while she's been travelling to determine whether a call should be scheduled or the status of her action item on this which was to work on briefing questions and provide those back. Erika expects to be back in the office next week and attend to that.

In the meantime, staff did offer to at least take a first crack at the sub group template to give her a framework to begin to fill in and she accepted that offer. You can expect to see that to the sub group mailing list shortly.

ALAN GREENBERG: Excellent, thank you very much. The next item is actually there in error, I had asked that outreach be added to the agenda and safeguard registrant data my other group was added but I'll in fact give a very brief update on both, neither of them will take very long.

The safeguard registrant data we had asked for a briefing from staff and they came back with saying, can we be more specific about what we wanted to ask both them and specifically the escrow vendors, but they also provided a link to a number of documents and I have not had a chance to read the documents yet. I don't know if anyone else on the group has or not.

The other people on the group are Dmitry, Stephanie and Volker and I don't know if Dmitry or Stephanie have had a chance to look at those documents and can comment on them. If not, then we're going to have to do that pretty soon and next week decide whether we're meeting on that and if necessary still request the briefing again from ICANN staff. Certain that's on my agenda for this weekend.

On outreach, I've hopefully activated the sub group and sent out centrally homework assignments to read all of the documents and will schedule a meeting either for late next week or the beginning the week after that. I'll presume I'll see a doodle on that from staff, I just sent out late last night. That one is progressing and both of these are moderately easy items, so I'm hoping we'll have something that will be useful to discuss in Brussels, although I'm not expecting either of them to be a really major item. Any comments on either of those two projects? Seeing nothing, hearing nothing we will go on.

The next item is the Brussels face to face meeting. I will turn it over to I think Jean-Baptiste but I'm not sure about that. There are slides on what briefings are pending, some of those have been implied with the discussion we just had but I'm not sure it's worth going over, specifically you do have the slides. Jean-Baptiste, please go ahead.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Thank you, Alan. Just really briefly, what you have on the slide is just a confirmation that the face to face meeting is on the 16 to 18 of April. The day will be starting at 9am till 5:30pm with several breaks at 10:15 and 15:30 for 15 minutes each. Then an one-hour lunch break at 12:30. We have attached in my last email that was sent two hours ago the face to face draft agenda for your consideration and I will ask Alice if she can take over to present [CROSSTALK].

ALICE JANSEN: Essentially the plans for Brussels as you all know is to discuss the finding and any recommendations if you have any obviously. You can all have a group discussion and decide whether you want to validate the findings or not. All the sub groups have a designated time slot, I think it's one hour per sub group and in addition to that we also have some time to talk about what our recommendation is.

We will also talk about the workplan and what the roadmap is to the draft report. We will also spend some time going through the -- we will talk about next steps as well at ICANN62 outreach and also determine how we're structuring the work with the other dependencies on other groups. This is what we lined up for now, this is a draft for discussion obviously. Alan, do you want to touch on the objectives for the meeting?

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm sorry, on the...?

ALICE JANSEN: Objectives of the meeting?

ALAN GREENBERG: We certainly can but before that, I think we need to make sure that -- we'll first of all, do we have any remote participants in the review team? People that we know are not going to be present but will be participating remotely?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Not at this stage, Alan, no.

ALAN GREENBERG: Volker will not be there and Carlton will not be there for the last day but I presume that Carlton, if you're leaving you will probably in transit the last day, is that correct?

CARLTON SAMUELS: Yes, I am going to be transit, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. So, we will have no remote participation that we're aware at this point from the review team proper. We may well have remote participation from observers however. I think we need to make clearly this schedule may have to adjusted for two reasons. Number one,

based on the level of completion that we have when we get closer to the meeting.

Second of all, the one-hour allocation per sub group may well not be needed or it may not be sufficient in some cases. I think the detailed agenda is going to be a little volatile and we have to simply make sure that any remote participants are aware of that and Alice, I'm sure if it's possible, we normally don't get very many remote participant but would it be possible to say that if we have a remote participant who wants to be in a specific topic that we can call out to them or at least notify them one way or another when we will be starting?

I think we have to give ourselves the flexibility to readjust the schedule and I don't want to make it less transparent that people will only dial in at a specific time and find we've already talked about it for instance.

ALICE JANSEN:

Alan yes, this is Alice. Of course, we'll look into this from a logistical point of view.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Maybe as we send the agendas closer to the meeting we point this out to people, just to make sure that we're not obfuscating things because of last minutes changes. Clearly one hour is not going to be the exact amount of time that we're going to use for each item, we have to allow us to build some flexibility into the detail schedule.

Objectives, I don't remember, did we have those in writing somewhere? I don't have them on my screen and I can adlib it but if there is

something that is written currently, I know there was a document we looked at that may well be in the agenda document that I don't have on my screen right now. If there is one, can someone read them out and then I'll comment on them?

LISA PHIFER:

You're recalling that we had a discussion of goals and objectives during the leadership call earlier this week. The output objectives that we had discussed during the leadership call were, to develop due dates for final sub group reports to develop questions and action items for each sub group to address in their final report and to begin planning for the entire review teams draft report, the report that would ultimately go for public comment.

For that later item, there is in the agenda I believe a review of the workplan, so that everyone understands the series of steps the group will go through in order to reach as a group the review teams report that will go for public comment. I believe the overall objective encompassed by all of those was establishing a level of comfort that you're on target for pulling things together in that fashion.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much for the mind job. The overall one I think is the critical one. Going into the meeting we need to make sure that each of the review teams are ready to start discussing in the plenary, just what is going on? What they still have to do? The direction they see the report going? Specifically, in terms of, are there likely to be recommendations coming out it? Is this just a postmortem that says

everything was done well or do we have issues that have raised some concerns? Coming out of the meeting, I think the real critical thing is, do we have a plan going forward so we're actually going to complete this work?

One of the concerns I have, not concerns but one of the things that came up in the discussion was on the anything new items, to the extent that we will end up deciding that we need to do some in depth dive on those items, we have to put together teams and start to work. We're essentially several months behind on those and so coming out of the meetings, we may have something coming into the meeting but it's only a few weeks away and I'm not sure to what extent we will have something, certainly the sub group will be working on it between now and then, and I think if someone can confirm, I think we requested a call be setup, is that correct? From Jean-Baptiste or Alice or Lisa if she remembers? I think we did discuss a call between me, Susan and Stephanie, we are the sub group members.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yes, correct.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Hopefully we'll have something -- we will be able to have that subset call before and going in we'll have at least the subset of items that we know we want to work on. Those items if they exist will be somewhat behind the other ones but we'll do our best to do at least a brief update in Brussels. I think that's where we sit. Any comments on this or what else do other people in this group want to achieve out of

that meeting? Hearing nothing, seeing nothing we will go on to the next agenda item then.

LISA PHIFER:

If I might, I just want to call everyone's attention to the slide nine in your deck, which is the basis for which we've been discussing. On there it notes that the 5th of April is our target as each sub group to have a report ready to send out to the full review team, a draft report to send out to the review team as the foundation for the face to face meeting. There is a link on that slide to the template that was previously circulated that is the framework that all sub group reports should try to flesh out as your draft report. They hope that in providing the template if that each of the sub groups at least start their documentation in a similar fashion, covering the same points and that will help us organize the face to face meeting and then have a good launch point for the full review teams draft report.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much, Lisa. Yes, I should have done that, it's in bright red and I should have said something about it. I'll not that the 5th of April is a Thursday, we have two meetings that week. We do meet on the 2nd of April and again on the 6th of April. The 6th of April will be the red flag day, in line with the red writing to wave that flag if indeed there are groups that have not done anything and or we believe there will be a problem in getting a document out well in advance of the meeting.

To remind you of the schedule, the meetings on the week of the 2nd and 6th are followed by one full week before we get on a plane or otherwise

get to Brussels. There is a little bit of slack put in there but not an awful lot if staff are to do any work with the documents. We will be trying to make sure we have slides on each of the sub groups, that's going to be based on the report. Expect to have staff reach out to you if that report is not in on time, so we have something to work at going into Brussels. I'm told there are a lot of nice tourist attractions in Brussels but that's not really what we're asking ICANN to fly us there for. For the record, that was sort of a joke, I hope it was joke. Any further comments on the face to face? Then we will this time go on to the next agenda item.

A discussion on whether we have a face to face meeting prior to, during or following the ICANN62 meeting that is scheduled or Panama in June I believe. Now, our practice so far has been that we have avoided face to face meetings, at least partially because Christmas schedule and my schedule really do not allow for them. Both of us have significant commitments prior to the ICANN meeting. I have a commitment for the half day after the ICANN meeting and we could schedule something further on after that, starting a noon hour or something after the meeting but I'd like to open the discussion up of what we try to do that or not?

We will be having a session at the ICANN meeting to report to the community. I believe we talked about but did not have any real conclusion on whether we want face to face meetings with different groups within the community, which would require more attendance otherwise, if we don't have a face to face. I think we determined it probably not be at a stage to present to the individual groups that would likely happen in the AGM.

Scheduling wise, that's probably also advisable anyway. This is a very tight meeting. I'll remind you all that we have now decided that the June meeting will be five days instead of four but that will not happen in Panama due to commitments we've already made. Comments on whether we should contemplate or not?

CARLTON SAMUELS:

Given the usual commitment that you and Chris have for the ICANN meeting, I think any consideration for a face to face should have to be after the ICANN meeting and it seems to me that one of the things that you could do then is to ensure we have a set of proposals, especially for the situation where we know there's going to be some community concerns about the scope problem, the scope issue. Maybe we should take that opportunity to define some proposals that we pass to the community before we [inaudible] them again in the follow [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG:

Carlton, can you elaborate on what you mean problems with the scope? I would have thought our determination of scope is well locked in at that point.

CARLTON SAMUELS:

Yes, our determination s locked in but as you know a part of the community thought that maybe the scope was a little too narrow and there's still some justification as far as I see it, to demonstrate why we would do that way given the RDS PDP, especially what we might offer to the RDS PDP from this review team would [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Anyone else on that? I personally would object strongly if we're going to try to widen the scope of this review team's work in the July timeframe. Which we're talking about anything after June.

CARLTON SAMUELS: I don't think we should widen the scope.

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't either. I'm not sure why you're raising it. I can see us deciding to take something off the scope and narrow it, but I can't see it widening it.

CARLTON SAMUELS: That's [inaudible], Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think if we decide to narrow it's going to be because we're simply not doing something and decide to not do it. I like to think we will not end up in that particular situation. Chris, any thoughts on this?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I would agree with you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: The only time I think we could schedule one if we expect Chris and I to participate is after the ICANN meeting starting approximately noon hour whatever the day is after the ICANN meeting. It's a short meeting...

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I would struggle with that for a couple of reasons. First of all, I have -- they're on me the ISOC Board and the ICANN Board is meeting on the Friday in the morning. And secondly, I need to be back. For me personally I can tell you that the flights [inaudible] 5:15 or thereabouts in the evening and I would really struggle to stay much longer than Friday.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright, other people may well have that same problem, I haven't looked at flights yet.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Not that I'm a requirement. I'm just saying.

ALAN GREENBERG: I personally think you are a requirement, that maybe just me. I hope it's not just me. At this point then we'll tentatively say that -- my understanding from Jean-Baptiste is there's a deadline of requesting the meeting which is coming up very, very soon and so at this point I think we have made a tentative decision, we will not meet in Panama given that we will have had a face to face in April, we are probably ready for another face to face therefore I'm guessing in the August timeframe.

That's makes it a little bit difficult for European's but hopefully we can figure out how to do that or perhaps early September. I think that will put us in good stand and perhaps the last meeting we need face to face prior to issuing the final report. The only catch maybe delays in GDPR related things which delay decisions but I'm hoping by the June timeframe we will have some idea of what we're doing in GDPR.

LILI SUN:

This is Lili for the record. I remember that during ICANN58 the CCT Review Team implemented [inaudible] during ICANN58 and presented about the progress for this review team and also collected the comments from the community and I'm wondering whether the WHOIS review team will also need to present to the community about the progress.

ALAN GREENBERG:

We have decided we will present at 62. Sorry, go ahead, Lili.

LILI SUN:

If this is a requirement and if we would prefer to not have a face to face meeting at ICANN62 then we have the chance to do it in the last ICANN session in this year, which means ICANN63. I think the review team [inaudible] is really long. The review team has [inaudible] for eight months until now, right? In consideration [inaudible] the draft reports in April at Brazil so I think maybe it's better for us to present to the community during ICANN62.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Lili. I believe we have already committed to having a presentation to the community at 62. To be honest, exactly when that is going to happen is a bit of a problem. I'm assuming we will request that one of the what are called cross community sessions, although that name may be renamed before we get to Panama, will be used to report where we are because there are no other public sessions as such in Panama.

There are individual meetings within stakeholder groups, within the AC's and stakeholder groups in the morning and then there are cross community group meetings in the afternoon. I'll assume we'll request one of those. Carlton, I'll go to you in a moment. Our plan is if we are given the time, we will present to the community in Panama and I believe our intent was also that in Barcelona we both present to the community and have an opportunity for individual meetings with stakeholder groups, that's certainly our plan. Carlton, go ahead.

CARLTON SAMUELS:

Yes, Alan, thank you. That's one of the things I was suggesting that when we have the -- I know we are scheduled to brief the community at 62 but I was anticipating that both of those briefings may be to the better time for us to have concrete proposals to a specific community about scope.

I was limiting my concerns to increasing scope but also in decreasing scope because I think that if you look at the timeline to 63, it was going to be very, very tight. As you're anticipating a face to face in September

or what timeframe, I really think that may be out of the briefing we might have an opportunity to review scope.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I would have thought that's -- all of us have a responsibility to brief our individual communities, we're put here by communities and we have an obligation to report back regularly and to brief them. I would have thought those of concerns can be raised through the review team members and I think in fact should be.

Now, most of us have not done a lot on the reporting because other than reporting that we've determined the scope and the terms of references, but we have not, certainly I have not, gone back and asked questions at this point but we're getting very close to that point and I presume all of the members will be doing that to our respective communities.

I guess I have a problem -- it's going to be almost impossible to schedule meetings with individual parts of the community, AC's, SO's and sub groups just because of the very, very tight schedule and I can't really see bringing the majority of the review to an ICANN meeting for some meetings that may be difficult to schedule and will be very short.

If I'm the only one, then let's hear it from other people but I can't see doing community briefings in June, I don't think we'll be quite ready for that and I'm not sure we'll be able to find the time anyway in a four-day meeting. Further comments from anyone?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Just to agree that the middle meeting, the policy meeting is pretty packed. You just won't find space and time to do it and as you say, I suspect we probably won't be ready anyway.

ALAN GREENBERG: I mean I hope we'll be ready for a briefing to the community and then I certainly will as chair will put in a request for a slot, whether we get that turns out as a vote of the community but we maybe told no they don't want one, it's not important enough. If that, so be it. I don't think we're going to get a lot more than that. Anyone else further on this. Stephanie? Jean-Baptiste then.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Alice has something to say before I jump in.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think she's just unmuted, but not talking.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Just for clarification for everyone on the call. If I understood correctly at this stage, since the deadline is approaching, I'm understanding that there won't be any face to face meeting in Panama before ICANN62 but we keep the engagement session request in Panama with only review team members which are attending ICANN62.

Also, we know that there will be a request for a face to face meeting later on prior to the draft report so that will be around August if I heard

correctly. We'll into what is feasible and send as soon as possible a doodle so you can look at feasible dates for that.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. Yes, I think that is correct. August typically is problematic for Europeans and certainly many North Americans but it may slip into early September I would guess. Jean-Baptiste, could you or Alice verify with the meetings team with Tanzania I guess and find whether you are allowed to put a request in for the engagement session, which would have to be scheduled within one of the communities meetings, the cross community meetings or if I need to do it wearing my hat, my co hat of chair of this group and chair of the ALAC? It makes more sense coming you but we may well have a rule saying you can't, I'm not sure of the status of those rules this week.

The next item is report on possible changes to this meeting. I'll turn it over I think to Jean-Baptiste or Alice and we have at this point one obvious meeting time where everyone with the exception of Stephanie, who had not completed the form, has confirmed availability and a number of sessions where some of us but not all of us can attend. From my perspective I have some blackouts for the new gTLD meeting and there are six different groups that meet and the times rotate around.

I've blocked out and perhaps others in this group have blocked out some significant numbers of meetings for their undesired that could be altered, that is if there is a meeting on Tuesday at 1500 UTC, I could say, well I just don't attend that meeting when it rotates into that slot and conflicts but clearly, I would prefer not to do that. Looks like we do

have one particular time that will fit for virtually everyone and hopefully for Stephanie also. I turn it over to either Alice or Jean-Baptiste.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Thank you, Alan. What you have on the slide in the [inaudible] team are the four identified timing spaces on availability that you have confirmed and thank you again for your feedback on that. The only timing where all have expressed and confirmed their availability is on Monday as 2pm UTC, and the following timing on the same day, one hour after in case other call would last one hour and thirty minutes is still feasible but just some of you mentioned that you could attend if need be.

Those four timings on the slide are really the only when -- so at 10 out 11, since there was one review team member where I did not know the availability would be able to participate on the plenary call. The ideal timing seems to be Monday at 2pm UTC.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you and that's one of the ones that at 3 UTC I have another meeting. At 15 UTC I have another meeting but I would be willing to either skip that meeting on the week that it does happen because some weeks it doesn't happen. At this point we are looking tentatively at changing the meeting schedule to every Monday at 1400 UTC. Stephanie, can you verify are you available at that point? That would make it unanimous if you are?

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Yes, I can make it up. Sorry to not have filled out the thing, I'm having computer problems.

ALAN GREENBERG: Everyone seems to have computer or time problems. Alright, Jean-Baptiste, can you send out a note, a very short, clear note that is only one screen long so no one can ignore it, maybe put "Urgent" or something like that in the subject title, to try to catch everyone's attention, saying unless we hear any objection, the meetings post the Brussels' meeting will be switched to Monday at 14:00 UTC.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Sure, will do.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Alright, and now we have the next item, ICANN62 face to face meeting, which I think we already talked about. I'm sorry, a face to face. And then any other business. Do we have any other business? We are at our one-hour point, which is the shortest meeting we had in a long time.

BRENDA BREWER: Alan, excuse me, this is Brenda. I do have a bit of any other business. That is, I have a little conflict with Outlook and I sent out an invite yesterday to the Compliance subgroup and I'm going to have to adjust the timing. I sent it out for 16:00 UTC and it looks like it really should be

14:00 UTC, so I just wanted to bring it your attention and you'll see a calendar invite update.

However, the doodle actually went out with wrong times as well, due to my misreading outlook. If anyone is -- I can either resend the doodle pole and get a new doodle or update the calendar invited to two hours earlier for the compliance.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I had missed which group, you said compliance and you scheduled it for what time on what day?

BRENDA BREWER:

It's on Thursday next week at 16:00 UTC, it should have been set 14:00, that's the availability of the compliance, ICANN compliance team.

ALAN GREENBERG:

That is problematic. I believe because it conflicts with the auction sub group. I don't know if I'm the only one on that auction sub group or not.

BRENDA BREWER:

The ICANN compliance team had three availability times and I'll just send out a new doodle, that's what I'll do. I'll cancel the current meeting on Thursday and send a new doodle.

ALAN GREENBERG: Who else on this team is on the auction sub group? I thought Stephanie was, I know Erika is because she's chairing it and we're looking at the compliance group which is Carlton, Chris, Erika and Susan and Thomas, it's certainly going to be problematic for several of us.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I won't be able to make the Thursday meeting whatever time it is because I am going to be in the middle of rural France with no internet.

ALAN GREENBERG: We should give you a satellite phone, there's no excuse for not joining our meetings.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: I'm not any sub groups. You're talking about a sub group, I didn't join it. If you're talking about the main meeting, yes, I'm on.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, I'm sorry. I hadn't looked at the list, you're not on the compliance sub group, so it's not relevant to you Stephanie. We've already determined Chris will make any meeting on a satellite phone. Sorry, I'm being somewhat irreverent here. Brenda, yes why don't you send out another doodle quickly and let's make sure what we can do it. If I have to skip the auction meeting I'm sure I can, it won't be the first one but Erika I'm sure it's going to be problematic for that.

BRENDA BREWER: Thank you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: You're welcome. Any other business? Any other, other business I guess? Hearing no one, presuming people have time to unmute and then we'll turn it over to Jean-Baptiste for decisions and actions.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Thank you, Alan. On action items, Alan, you had mentioned that you will work on adding reputation services to the consumer trust workplan [inaudible] that contributes to consumer trust based on RDS data. In terms of the Brussels face to face meeting agenda, the decision reached was that one of our locations possibly may have changed based on progress.

The 6th of April [inaudible] is still the deadline for sub groups to send their sub group reports. ICANN Org will reach out to sub groups who did not deliver by this deadline.

On the ICANN 62 face to face meeting the decision reached was that the review team will not be meeting at ICANN62 for a face to face but the engagement session will be requested and on that ICANN Org will liaise with the meetings team on how this should be processed.

Also, on the plenary call scheduled, ICANN Org will be sending a short note to the review team informing them that post the Brussels meeting plenary calls will be held at 2pm UTC for 90 minutes. And as Brenda just mentioned also she will be sending a new doodle to the compliance group.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Anything else? Then I think the call is over and I thank you all for your participation. Give you back 25 minutes of your life to do something interesting with. We'll see you on the various lists and again in little over one week from now. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]