ALAN GREENBERG: If we could do attendance, please?

BRENDA BREWER: Thank you, Alan. Hello everyone, this is Brenda speaking for the record. Welcome to the RDS WHOIS2 Plenary call #25 on the 6th of April 2018 at 12:30 UTC. In attendance today is Alan, Cathrin, Chris, Carlton, Erika, Lili, we do have an observer who has joined us, however it's a phone number and I do not recognize the phone number, so I will try to get that information.

From ICANN org. we have Jean-Baptiste, Lisa, and myself, Brenda. We do have apologies from Volker, Dmitry, Alice and Trang. And 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 you Alan, thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Your voice was breaking up a little bit, is mine okay?

BRENDA BREWER: Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, then we have an agenda, which will be basically the review of subgroups from the face-to-face, and if there are any questions on the agenda or an AOB, please let me know now.

And, if there are any sensitive changes in the statements of interest that you need to inform the meeting about?

And I see no hands here, no voices, does everyone know how to raise their hands today?

ERIKA MANN: No. It's Erika, no.

ALAN GREENBERG: If you're showing the participants, just below participants list is a little pink hand. Mine should be flashing at you if you're looking at participants. If you don't have the participants showing, I don't have a clue how to raise your hand. Oh, there's a raise hand icon right in the middle, which doesn't work.

ERIKA MANN: It doesn't work yeah. The top doesn't work, but the participants, yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. And Chris has is hand up. And, he has his hand down. All right, then I will assume the agenda is accepted, we have no statement of interests, updates, and we will hope that we know how to raise our hands, or at least call out if you have that level of frustration.

The first item on the agenda is review of subgroup status, which I assume will take a significant part of this meeting, and I will turn it over to Jean Baptiste. I'm guessing, but I think that's who's going to take this, maybe Lisa.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Thank you, Alan. So, we have summarized on the slide that you currently see on the screen, so the subgroup progress, as you know, yesterday was the deadline to share your subgroups draft report with the review team, so we have reported on these slides with the color codes whether it was done already or not.

So, in green you can see the subgroups who have shared a draft report already with the review team, and that is the outreach, compliance, data accuracy, internationalized domain names, plan and annual reports, and you can see in the last column when those were shared.

And then, so some subgroups were provided with a draft report from their repertoire and that is for a single WHOIS policy, and for consumer trust, and there are still a few subgroups where a draft was provided to a subgroup rapporteur, but those were not shared yet with the subgroup at this stage. And, if you look at our law enforcement, so there we had occurred to provide the drafts to the subgroup of participants that there was no threat at this stage.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right, we're going to be going through them one by one, so there's no point in asking for status updates at this point on this chart, so

maybe we should just proceed to the next chart. If I missed something that we want to cover at this point.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Okay, so on the first one, on strategy, Cathrin feel free to correct it, there is a standard of things we'd like to mention, so there are recent materials and answers to the set of questions that need to be incorporated into the written implementation briefing. You are currently waiting for estimate answers, and there is a follow up call to be scheduled for any clarifying questions, and a draft subgroup report was provided to Cathrin. Would you like to add anything at this stage, Cathrin?

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Thank you, Jean-Baptiste, that was pretty [inaudible]; just to say that we're awaiting SME's answers because we ourselves were late in submitting the questions, so it's not a question of their turnaround time. But those should come in soon hopefully, and we've already received the written materials which need to be incorporated, so I hope to get a draft out to the subgroup by the end of the weekend.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Thank you, Cathrin. So, moving on to the recommendation to single WHOIS policy; so there was an action from the last call on the 6th of march, consult   Carlton to write a planning subgroup review, and then planning to interview random team members to understand any benefits of recommendation 2, and consider providing those as inputs

CARLTON SAMUELS: Hi Jean-Baptiste, I'm just in, but I don't know if you can hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: We can hear you.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Okay great.   I just got in, I didn't hear the question, I just heard, "Anything you want to add?"

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yeah, is there anything else you would like to raise regarding the single risk policy?

CARLTON SAMUELS: Oh no, I certainly did the draft and you have it on the screen here, that's what happened. I haven't heard from any of the team members yet.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: On recommendation 3, outreach, so there was a subgroup called on the 3rd of April, and subgroup members who are reviewing the materials, and Alan had circulated a draft the review team. Alan, do you want to add anything?

ALAN GREENBERG:

I'm not sure I want to add anything, this is the first time I've filled out, tried to fill out this draft report, and I do have a number of questions because of it. I found, as I was going through it, there was a fair amount of repetition.

Now, part of it was caught in at least my draft version where it listed the topic, there was a whole bunch of references, and then we had the references, and Lisa had suggested that I omit the references that had been in the outline, in the original document outline, and just have them in the relevant research, and that I did.

But when I went down to look at the problem issue, there's a fair amount of overlap with that and the analysis, and then again under the various subtitles of recommendations, there's a title for instance of "findings," and I'm not quite sure how that differs from the findings above; is that expected to be a summary of what was written a few lines above? And, so I was a little bit confused as to exactly what was supposed to be in each of these sections, and maybe Lisa can help us there.

LISA PHIFER:

Yes, thanks Alan, this is Lisa for the record. So, Alan, in your case, the way that your subgroup had framed the questions you wanted to answer actually referenced documents that you wanted to review, and that is why that duplication occurred for you; it didn't actually occur—

ALAN GREENBERG:	No, that part I understood.

LISA PHIFER:	Your question about the findings and the template; as this moves forward, the recommendations will stay intact, and the verbiage on findings will become more and more summarized. So, the idea was simply to provide sort of a backward reference to where one could find the materials in the document that were the findings that led you to that recommendation; so, it's not to repeat the whole statement of findings, but rather to refer back to the finding that led to that recommendation.

ALAN GREENBERG:	Okay, yeah, in the case of this one, sort of the findings all together add up to the requirement for the other recommendation, so it's not really a subset of it. Well, we may end up having a second part of it too, when we find out what happened with the outreach to other groups, but still, it's going to be a majority thing. So, the answer is yes; it is essentially duplicated, and we'll put a very brief summary there and refer back to the detailed findings.

LISA PHIFER:	Correct, and in the case that you just mentioned, it's actually useful to know that it's a recommendation based on the factuality of the findings.

ALAN GREENBERG: Other than that, it was an interesting experience trying to write it up. As I was doing the writing, I realized that we had glanced over a few things that hadn't, we hadn't discussed. That became obvious as I was trying to phrase the findings, so I found it a very useful exercise just in that it forced a certain amount of organization, which hadn't been there originally, so I thought it was a useful exercise, and I commend everyone to try it once.

And that's all I have to do; the document, because I sort of got caught up on the findings, I didn't finish the section on recommendations, I will over the—well, I'll flush it out a little bit more, clearly it won't be finished until we have a subsequent discussion with the whole review team, but I think it's not in bad shape, it still needs a fair amount of work. But it's always easier to correct and adjust a document than to start from scratch. And with that, I'm done.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Thank you. Moving onto recommendation 4; compliance. So there was some input received from compliance team on the 20th of March, and Susan has shared before the call their subgroup draft report to review team. Anything else you'd like to add Susan?

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Sure, Jean-Baptiste. I found the drafting the report really helpful too in sort of thinking through things again. And so, added some of the information we've received from the compliance team on the 28th that will be interesting to discuss with the subgroup and the full review team in Brussels, so it was beyond providing a report to the full subgroup, to

the full review team; it was a helpful exercise in just thinking through things also.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Perfect, thank you Susan. Moving onto the next subgroup, which is data accuracy; so, ten questions were quoted to ICANN org. to address in writing, and Lili has circulated the draft to the review team. Lili, would you like to add anything on data accuracy?

LILI SUN: Yes, sure. Lili for the record, can you hear me?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yes, we can, you sound a little bit low.

LILI SUN: Okay. So, I just went through Alan's report on the outreach. Actually I found there was an overlap for at least for the outreach, and the data accuracy recommendation 5, so we were both it says about the WHOIS team but from a team website, so for Alan's outreach recommendation, it is the main means for outreach, therefore the data accuracy for the community application, ICANN also makes WHOIS definitive website as a dedication means, so the main approach to the same implementation from different perspectives, so we may discuss further too in a face to face meeting, that's it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Jean-Baptiste?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Thank you, Lili. On recommendation 10, privacy proxy services, so there was a briefing with the IRT staff support out on the 20th of March, written input was also received. The metrics for privacy and proxy as fixing the 2013 RAA were received and addressed subgroup report was provided to Volker, Volker is not on the plenary call today, Susan, do you want to add something to that?

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Sorry, it took me a bit to get off. I'll take a look at—Volker did provide some comments for the report, so I'll take a look at it tonight, and see if I can't flush things out too, and encourage Volker to get it in by Monday.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, it's Alan, I think since he won't be at the meeting, I think we need something that's pretty complete so that the rest of us can at least discuss it.

CARLTON SAMUELS: This is Carlton, the IRT reports are quite detailed, and they sent them out every week, I am on the IRT, so if there is any gaps, we can always go back to the IRT because it has a comprehensive list of issues that they have with the outcomes, and that might be a good place to find information.

EN

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Carlton.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Lisa, you have your hand raised?

LISA PHIFER: Yes, and I just noted in chat that on recommendation 10, an initial draft was provided directly to Volker, and Volker provided direct edits for these findings, which I incorporated and sent back to the subgroup yesterday, so the subgroup does have that draft, it just has not gone to the full review team.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Thank you, Lisa. Moving on to the recommendation 11; common interface. Written briefing was received from ICANN org. regarding query failures on WHOIS [inaudible] and forced to alleviate, and an action from the last call on 20th of February was for Volker to write up findings for subgroup review, and a draft was provided to Volker. So, Alan would that be you as well to provide an update on that?

LISA PHIFER: Sorry, not on this one.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: I'll just look at it.

ALAN GREENBERG: This one is, although it's called the common interface, it is really just a subset of that, which relates to the WHOIS function itself. Most of the microsite is falling under outreach, and as Lili pointed out, there's some overlap in other directions as well, but I believe the intent is that this analysis is looking just at the WHOIS function within the microsite.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Thank you, Alan. Moving onto recommendation 12 and 14; internationalized domain names. So, there was no subgroup scheduled, but a draft was circulated to the review team, and to make sure it's not on the call.

On recommendation 15, 16, Alan, annual report. No subgroup call was scheduled, and a draft has been circulated to the review team, Lili, is there anything you'd like to add?

LILI SUN: Yes, Lili for the record. Currently I just put some findings on this subgroup, and I've been waiting for other subgroups draft reports to go through and then maybe put some problems or issues, that's it.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Thank you, Lili. Moving onto the new assessment subgroups, so with anything new, so there were no answers to circulating questions; the review, so the subgroup was reviewing policies and putting together the findings. There was the subgroup was going to make observation about dissatisfaction with procedure and likely PDP impact, but will not make recommendation at this time, and the draft was provided to Stephanie, Stephanie, is there anything you'd like to add on anything new?

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Yes, can you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: We can.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Jolly good. Yes, I apologize; I intended to have this out to you over the weekend, and Easter got in the way. Plus, Lisa sent me an excellent field format, and of course I had trouble with it, I couldn't quite get it to behave as I put all the different subsections in, so I came up with a rich text version, following the same basic headings.

And, as I did it, my experiences were somewhat similar to what Alan noted in his earlier remarks; I found I was prompted to go back to the original documents and fill out some of our comments a bit more. We were of course racing through a rather lanky list of documents. I added a couple, and I hope to have the draft to you this afternoon, it's nearly done.

Again, in terms of—there are quite a few where we make the remark that, "This is be influenced by the GDPR," that seems a bit lame, so I felt we had to go back in and explain why, or where, or just add a little bit more color to it in the comments. Otherwise, quite frankly, it looks like there was more work in the framing document than there was in the input to it, if you know what I mean? Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Stephanie. That's not a bad outcome; we have our plates full at this point. I have a question on your problem with the document; the document that was sent out is a Word document that is essentially password protected and locked, so you can't' change formatting; are you trying to use it with Word or are you using it with a plug-compatible program?

STEPHANIE PERRIN: I'm using it actually with Word, and I was just trying to get the bullets to line up and a few little mundane things like that. I also felt it would be more useful to change the bullets in our rather lanky list of documents to numbers because it was kind of staggering all over the page, but that was the problem; it's locked for a whole lot of things.

ALAN GREENBERG: You can select numbers though.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Yes, but they were not behaving properly.

ALAN GREENBERG: You can't select numbers in a straight row, you can select numbers indented.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Right. Well, I was working at it and got frustrated as I want to do with these things, so doubtless, someone who is a wizard like Lisa, who thank you so much Lisa for the format, will be able to just go "plunk" and solve all the problems I have, but it will look similar, how's that?

ALAN GREENBERG: We won't' ask you to defend the format right now. If we can go on to the next item?

LISA PHIFER: I had my hand up if you don't mind?

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh, Lisa wants to defend the formatting. Go ahead?

LISA PHIFER: I didn't choose the formatting, but just a tip on how to use it, which is; if you're used to choosing from the format bar things like bolding and italics, you can still do that, you just need to highlight the bold or italicized, and then choose the style for those, so that's how it's done within the context of that template.

The other question I actually wanted to ask Stephanie, is if you have a target for getting your drafts then out to the subgroup and the full review team?

ALAN GREENBERG: I think she said by the end of today.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Yes, I was hoping the subgroup would not mind if I sent it out to everybody at the same time, then I can get it out to everybody this afternoon.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's what I did.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Yeah, I think, I mean, we're at an early stage, so the more the merrier I thought. Carlton, if you can tell me how to unlock it, that would be great. That's what I was struggling with. But I'll try that style tip Lisa and see if I can get it back into the form, but I think it's more important at this point to get it out to everybody than to have it on the correct form.

LISA PHIFER: Yeah, agreed Stephanie, and to the extent that you can use the styles, it wll help when we pull it together in a full review team report. I'm not

personally a fan of the approach of the template, but it will help us; it will pay dividends later.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Right.

ALAN GREENBERG: If you'd pick less ugly bullets I would tend to support it.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Well, I found that the questions and the headings weren't very useful, but the formatting was kind of—

ALAN GREENBERG: All right, let's not dwell on that right now.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Okay, moving onto to law enforcement needs; so, the subgroup plan was to discuss the approach in timing, going from outreach law enforcements, they are waiting, we are waiting request for subgroup call to be scheduled, and Thomas has received an offer from support team to welcome Justin as group reports, but we have not heard any requests. And I believe Thomas is not on the call today.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, and Thomas also will not be in Brussels apparently, so we—it's another of these areas that we're going to have to look at and figure out

how do we make sure that we're covering them properly. I don't quite know what the answer to that is.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Lisa, you have your hand raised?

LISA PHIFER: Yes, thank you. Alan, and I guess this is a question for the leadership team, but also for everyone; as we're now entering the final week of slide prep and everything for our face to face, if Thomas is not going to be with us at the face to face, we do need to identify someone to at least speak on behalf of the subgroup for the face to face meeting. Is there anyone else from that subgroup that would be willing to do that?

ALAN GREENBERG: It's Alan, did we actually get a message from him saying he would not be at the meeting?   The only message I saw was saying he didn't have to select food for the dinner, because he wouldn't be there, but I didn't actually see him declining the meeting himself?

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: This is Cathrin, I think he was referring to the whole meeting, and I can try and do the law enforcement subgroup one.

ALAN GREENBERG:	Alright thank you. I know he was referring to it, but I was just wondering was there actually a formal message saying he wouldn't attend, other than the declining the dinner?
CATHRIN BAUER-BULST:	I didn't see one, I'm not sure if anyone else did.
ALAN GREENBERG:	I guess it's fortunate we asked about the dinner then. Alright, so Cathrin, we'll mark you down for it. Is that volunteering to do the report also if it hasn't been done?
CATHRIN BAEUR-BULST:	Yes, I guess so. I mean, there was a holdup on moving this forward in terms of what questions I wanted to ask those people, and I think we'll just have to see how we can move this along. Maybe I'll reach out to Thomas and see whether I can catch up with him before the meeting.
ALAN GREENBERG:	Alright, let's go onto consumer trust then.
JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ:	Thank you. So on consumer trust, Erika was working on [inaudible] questions, and providing answers to group members, and the subgroups report was shared with subgroup members. Erika, anything you'd like to add?

ERIKA MANN: Jean-Baptiste, Jean-Baptiste, thank you. I just sent it to all of you, so you should have it in your inbox by now. So, the difficulty we have with this particular group is that consumer trust, and then you look back into the findings found in the previous review and different documents is that consumer trust comes up frequently as a word and something as a goal, but it's not really well-defined, neither is it related to a particular to-do's or a particular task inside of the organization.

And so far I have done something when you will review analysis and findings, so point 4, you will see all the topics that relate to work done in different subgroups, and I have identified each time the key finding from the 2012 review team, because that's the only key and relevant document, and so what we, why I recommend to the subgroup, we haven't discussed it yet, but what I will recommend that we will wait until we see your findings, and then based on your findings we will make our recommendations, so you'll see when you review point 4, you will see all the various topics identified related to the different topics debated in the different subgroups.

And, we will then fill in based on your recommendations, we will review it, and will then make some recommendation. There's a general point maybe which goes beyond these concrete topics which we have identified, and this is that there is very little in identifying a general understanding or a general principles related to consumer trust, so we may want to make some general recommendations maybe how to identify the topic in more clear terms, in the future, but I don't think that we are there yet, but I recommend you read in particular point the

chapter 4 and I'm sure you will understand where we are with this particular report, back to you.

ALAN GREENBERG: And Lisa had her hand up, and I've put mine up. Lisa?

LISA PHIFER: Actually, it has been resolved in chat; I just wanted to find out if Cathrin would like a subgroup report drafted for law enforcement, and she said yes, so, done.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I've got a general overreaching topic that I want to bring up when we finish the individual review, and that's what I'm calling scope creep. However, in consumer trust, it has a slightly different version. The vast majority of occurrences of the use consumer trust in ICANN are not related to WHOIS. The terms obviously have been used heavily with related to the new GTLD's, but that is not really, that was not really from a WHOIS perspective.

The WHOIS, despite the fact that it was included explicitly by the NTIA in the AOC, and followed its way into our current bylaws, there's not an awful large overlap of consumer trust and WHOIS. The largest single part is things like reputation services that use WHOIS to generate information which then gets fed into spam filters and web browser references to see whether sites are dangerous or not, and all of that of course is completely up in the air with GDPR, that to whatever extent it helps consumer trust right now, we don't have a clue where it's going to

come out when we finish with GDPR, and this is one that I suspect, and the face to face discussion in Brussels may take us in a different direction, but I suspect this is one where we're going to conclude that the most subsidized part of the work in this particular section is really going to depend on whether, which way the GDPR goes, and which way the implementation goes, and so I suspect that this is one of those that's going to be largely put on hold until we can finish, and [CROSSTALK] Erika.

ERIKA MANN: I totally agree with you. That's the same analysis, which actually -- the same conclusion [inaudible]. Now, we want to be a little bit careful. I agree with you. It's very difficult to determine consumer trust, in relation to WHOIS, based on the information we have now, and based on the reports and reviews, which we currently have available.

And you're right, the future outcome, based on the GDPR will be -- the recommendation based on GDPR for WHOIS will be implemented -- will define, to some degree, consumer-trust environment, and there's a big but I would say -- because consumer trust is such a vague term -- and in our environment, maybe in particular, because it can relate to an individual user, but it can relate to professional users, as well.

And we might need -- what I think we need to do we need to have a debate at the very end when we -- just before we do the drafting of the final report, and, hopefully, we then have a clear understanding about the implementation of GDPR, and then we can make, maybe -- hopefully, a better judgment. But I totally agree with you; there's not

much we can do right now. That's why I put a reference -- topics in the findings, in the chapter about findings. But I didn't make any recommendations because it makes no real sense to do this, right now.

ALAN GREENBERG: Nor is it clear that our recommendations -- that we have the ability -- the only recommendations we should be making are ones that the Board can act on, and it's not clear that whatever our final decision is, what we want to see happen is -- that it's something that, in fact, the Board will be able to act on.

ERIKA MANN: Now, there's one -- I agree -- this is Erika, again. If I could just follow up -- now, there's one, which you will find for point C, which is related to the bylaw. Because, interestingly, in the bylaws, there's not even a reference to consumer trust. There is, of course, reference to public interest, which, to some degree, indirectly, captures the philosophy of consumer trust, to some degree, as well.

So, maybe, we might want to make a recommendation at the end that consumer trust needs to be understood better, and maybe even needs to be captured in the bylaws. But, again, I believe that's a conclusion we have to draw at a much later point and not now.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Erika. We have hands from Stephanie.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Thanks very much. Stephanie Perrin. I just wanted to note that I agree with everything that has been said, so far, on this topic. Those two words are my -- they're the favorite bugbears in the WHOIS privacy discussions -- public interest and consumer trust -- and they are being bandied about a great deal at the moment. And I think it does beg the questions -- Alan is going to say I'm enlarging the scope here -- but I think we could usefully say, without reaching out and defining the terms that, nevertheless, there is some quantitative and qualitative research, measuring exactly the impacts of the current WHOIS system on consumer trust.

Both from a, you know, the reputation, people's needs, the actual use by consumers that would be very useful in the discussion, because I have noted that over the years, we have been equally vague about what we mean, and it's not helping in the current [inaudible]. So, I made this point a number of times in the RDS discussions. I really think we need to sketch out the parameters of what ICANN needs to study, in order to provide some precision about consumer trust. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Stephanie. You made reference to -- there is existing research -- is it something we have access to?

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Well, there is existing research on the accuracy studies that were done from WHOIS. There is a study on how many consumers actually look at WHOIS, to determine whether, in fact, the claims that it is useful to the average consumer as opposed to the knowledgeable consumer -- the

knowledgeable person, you know, like a cybercrime researcher is not your average consumer. He knows what to get out of WHOIS; the rest of us find it a struggle and aren't even aware of it.

And so, that's the kind of research that I think is needed to be done, and, in fact, I made that point at a GNSO meeting and someone who has long worried about whether or not we should align on the browser for consumer trust, more than on WHOIS, came up and proposed that we set up a subgroup to look at the browser and solving the problem consumer trust. So, that is exactly the kind of research that I'm talking about.

You know, rather than bandy about vague terms to justify existing policy, could we, please, study what needs to be done? And, in some respects -- I've just got approval of our research proposal for the work on standards that I've been talking about, and that's one of the things I want to do [inaudible] review on and delve into a bit in that third-party access accreditation standards work.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Thank you, Stephanie. To the extent that we may end up making a recommendation that there should be more studies, that's one thing -- but to -- if you believe there are existing studies, which give information about how WHOIS is used by consumers or, at least, groups of consumers -- then, please, make sure they're listed in the list of documents. If you can get them to Lisa, she'll make sure they're incorporated properly.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Will do.

ALAN GREENBERG: Erika.

ERIKA MANN: There is some -- not in relation -- this is Erika -- not in relation to WHOIS, but in relation to the new gTLDs. There is some connection and some information about Stephanie was talking about, in relation to consumer trust. So, indirectly, one could draw conclusion that this relates, to some degree, to the WHOIS environment, of course, as well. And I -- so, I have this -- if you need this, I have this stored somewhere and we can look into it, but it's not an explicit connection to WHOIS. Nonetheless, it's [inaudible] information for consumer trust.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Erika. Anything more on consumer trust right now?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Carlton. Oh, sorry -- yes, Carlton has his hand up.

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: In the chat, though.

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't see it.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: In the chat.

ALAN GREENBERG: [CROSSTALK] in the chat, okay.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: In the list of participants.

ALAN GREENBERG: Go ahead, Carlton. We cannot hear you, Carlton. Carlton, I now see your hand up, but I still can't hear you. And he has put his hand down.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: I don't see him anymore in the participant list.

ALAN GREENBERG: He's dropped off Zoom. All right. Let us go on.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Should I move on?

ALAN GREENBERG: Please.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yes, and that is safeguard registrant data, and ICANN.org has provided links to materials. And Alan to formulate specific questions and the draft was provided. And the draft was provided to you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. And I have not had a chance to work on that one. I will try to get it out by the end of the weekend, though.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Okay. And I see that Carlton is back.

ALAN GREENBERG: Carlton, do you wish to talk on the last item? We cannot hear you. Your microphone is not muted on Zoom. You may be muted locally. We'll come back to Carlton, if necessary. I have two overall -- two discussions -- we've already touched into some of them. And the first is, as I've mentioned, is scope creep. I think there is a danger, since WHOIS -- WHOIS is very related to registrant things, and I think there's a real danger as we start looking at some of these items, that we may creep into the non-WHOIS aspects of registrations, and how they're managed, and how compliance works, and things like that.

And I think we need to be a little bit careful, but there are places where I think we can't avoid it, and one of them became obvious as I was doing

the outreach description -- that the WHOIS portal, for instance, talks about a lot of things other than WHOIS. The other documents we looked at, registrant rights and benefits, the education videos -- all of those -- all involve WHOIS, but since they're trying to provide an overall consistent picture to registrants, or to users, for that matter, it's not at all clear that we can separate out the non-WHOIS aspects of it, you know.

And as an example, the outreach recommendation, I'm pretty sure will end up saying, "We need a rewrite of some documentation." But that documentation is far wider than just WHOIS, because you can't just rewrite the WHOIS parts of it, and have it make any sense.

So, I think, as we move forward on all the recommendations, we're going to have to be careful about scope creep, but recognize that, in some cases, WHOIS is so closely embedded with other things that we don't really have a choice, but to wander into other areas. But I think we do have to be careful. If we can segregate it, that we should. Stephanie, please go ahead.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Thanks, Alan. Stephanie Perrin. You're probably going to label me the queen of scope creep, here, but that was one of the things that I added into our review of the anything new. I do think it's incumbent on us to have a look at that WHOIS page -- or repository -- and comment on whether it is [inaudible] accurate or, at least, assess whether -- what kind of review needs to be done.

Because I found in my study that there was a lot of things -- and I don't mean to be [inaudible] starting from -- kind of from scratch, and it's not easy to understand the deep, dark history of what's happened, but it ain't there yet. I'm constantly recommending that ICANN staff a librarian and an archivist -- and I would just like to commend that to you as a recommendation for us, because we need more help with the documentation. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. I'm not sure -- how does that relate to anything new?

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Well, it's on the list of documents. The WHOIS page. It wasn't on Susan's summary, but you'll see in the list, that Lisa compiled, that it's there. And, of course, to the extent that it reflects anything new that's going on [inaudible] and does, in fact, the -- what the GAC asked for many meetings ago -- "Could somebody give us a complete roadmap to everything that's going on with WHOIS?" That is a required roadmap, you know. So, that relates to WHOIS --

ALAN GREENBERG: Stephanie, the reason it wasn't in our shortlist of anything new is because it exists, purely as a result of one of the last recommendations. And, therefore, it's been covered in the review of the last recommendations. That's why it didn't show up in the shortlist that we looked at.

EN

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Okay. Well, you can thin it out. I still think it belongs.

ALAN GREENBERG: Anything further?

CARLTON SAMUELS: This is Carlton. I'm back.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yep. Go ahead, Carlton.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Yeah, I was telling you -- this connection between WHOIS and consumer trust -- we spent a lot of time arguing the case as to whether or not it was consequential. And the reputation services people and the [inaudible] came back strongly and said, "Yes, it is." And here's what their argument is: they said that reputation services use the information from WHOIS to determine the safety of what domains -- and using -- they publish it, and users, the ordinary users, is being asked to trust what reputation services tell them about the website, its safety, and so on.

And to the extent that the ordinary user is trusting what is said, and to the extent that reputation services make extensive use of WHOIS information to determine its safety, it is a stability issue, and it is a trust issue and, therefore, the WHOIS is absolutely critical to consumer trust.

That is the argument -- they make those connections, and if you look at the -- Cathrin referred to one of the reports that comes from the FTC, the Federal Trade Commission -- U.S. Federal Trade Commission -- and there are several others in the reputation -- from the reputation-services side that we can refer to in the CCT report.

And if you look at the comments from the constituency, you will see where [inaudible] the strongest argument that reputation services and consumer trust are linked and the WHOIS is the basis of that. So, just to give you an update of what has happened in the CCT Review work.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Carlton. We did make reference to that already, but you may have been off at the time.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Oh.

ALAN GREENBERG: But it's quite clear that the direct use of WHOIS by consumers is, you know, on a relative scale, minimal, but the implied use, through things like reputation services and spam filters, is far from minimal.

CARLTON SAMUELS: That's right. That's the connection.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yep. All right. The other item that I wanted to touch on is overlap. And I think that's one of the things, hopefully, will come out of the face-to-face meetings -- that there are issues that cross these boundaries, because the, you know, implementation, for instance, of the WHOIS portal was nominally in respect to one thing, but addressed a number of other issues going forward. And Lili mentioned accuracy, obviously, is one of those.

So, I think just going forward, we're going to have make sure that we're subdividing the work, so we're not repeating the same things in multiple places. But I think that will naturally fall out of our discussions. And with that, I think we are -- we have completed the review of subgroups -- unless there's anything else anyone wants to raise. No hands. Then, I'll turn it back over to Jean-Baptiste and go on to the item on the face-to-face meeting.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Thank you, Alan. So, moving on to the next item -- so, at the request of the leadership, we have reported on the slides, based on the face-to-face meeting current agenda, when each subgroup will be presenting its findings to the review team. And, also, how much time is allocated. So, this is really for you to have a discussion on whether the time allocated is sufficient, or too long. And whether anything should be re-adjusted.

So, really quickly, you'll notice that, currently, the subgroups who have only 30 minutes of time allocated are strategic priority, single WHOIS policy, common interface, internationalized domain names, and plan

and annual reports, and all the other subgroups have 60 minutes of time allocated for presentation of findings. Alan, do you want to --?

ALAN GREENBERG: Sure. Well, I'll open up the floor, but I'll make one or two comments first. I do not believe, since we still need some briefings and opportunity to talk to people that safeguarding registrant data will be a 60-minute item. And I would tend to presume that compliance will be significantly more than 60 minutes. So, as a first glance, I would offer those two comments, but I open the floor to anyone else. Anyone?

CARLTON SAMUELS: Sorry, this is Carlton.

ALAN GREENBERG: Please go ahead.

CARLTON SAMUELS: I tend to agree with you about compliance, Alan -- that is going to be a significant discussion. And I personally would think that if you look [inaudible] body of work that has already gone in and the questions that there are, the assessment of just the answers alone is going to be 60 minutes.

So, the discussion -- that's a two-hour discussion, in my view. The privacy/proxy services, that is both also going to be another big one -- reason why, I would say that is -- if you look at the IRT, what is coming

out of the IRT, where the people who are [inaudible] with those issues are in discussions now. And if you see how that is dragging on, around a couple of very key issues in the disclosure, and so on -- that is going to take another -- a bit longer. So, those two, I would safely say is going to require more time.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Carlton. Erika.

ERIKA MANN: It's Erika. I have a similar -- I wanted to make similar comment as Carlton did. I have the same feeling -- and I wonder, maybe we could just -- if you would keep 1 1/2 hours, maybe, for these two discussion, and then, maybe we can cut some of the other topics down to 45 minutes -- maybe this would be -- would give us some space.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you.

ERIKA MANN: Alan, that's it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Erika. Sorry, my voice disappeared for a moment. The real issue we have is, you know -- I'd like to say, well, this whole thing will float around, and we'll re-allocate the time, as necessary. We do have a situation, however; we have to consider remote participation, and we

have to give some level of predictability. So, Erika, you suggested cutting some of the 60 minutes down to 45. I would offer outreach as one that should be possible for -- do you have any other suggestions on other ones?

And if we want to keep them in the same day, then we're going to have to -- you know, if we're going up to an hour and a half or two hours on both outreach and privacy/proxy -- both of which are scheduled for the first day, I don't think that's going to be possible. We may have to move one into another day.

ERIKA MANN: Yeah. I agree with you. This is Erika. Outreach, certainly -- I mean, I can try to cut consumer trust, but following the discussion we just had, maybe, it's not a good idea to cut it down to 45 minutes. But I can certainly try.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. Well, right now, that's on a different day. Cathrin, please go ahead.

ERIKA MANN: That's true; it's a different day. Yeah.

CARLTON SAMUELS: I was about to tell her that's a different day. So, that's good. But I would recommend, Alan, that you think of moving, say outreach, to the day two.

ALAN GREENBERG: I would tend to keep outreach on day one, to allow for overflow. And continuing the discussion, if we run out of time. Privacy/proxy, I would say, is perhaps a better candidate.

CARLTON SAMUELS: For moving to day two? Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: Perhaps, yeah.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Maybe, yes. Because if Lisa -- I mean, Susan would be very busy with compliance, so maybe it's a good thing, too.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. I mean, we're just looking at the first cut at each of these. There's also some other sessions scheduled to try to pull it all together and, perhaps, to revisit some of them. So, this is the first cut, and we're trying to do that pass. Cathrin, you had your hand up.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Yes. Thank you, Alan. This is Cathrin. I mean, just to say, as Lisa has already noted in the chat, now, there's a couple hours that are allocated for the overall discussion of implementation, and on the new topics, and also on what else is happening in the community, right now. So, that gives us a little bit of a buffer, in terms of time we could use if really we do not manage to finish in the time allocated.

And then, I was just wondering whether we're really going to be able to nail this down to 15-minute segments, or whether we should -- you know, sort of keep an open mind and view these times as targets, and then not panic if we don't quite manage to stick to them in either direction.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. Thank you.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: For one, I mean, the single WHOIS policy or the annual reports -- I mean, I doubt we'll discuss for even a half hour on those, but, you know -- then, if somebody picks up something interesting, and then it just goes over time -- [CROSSTALK]

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. No, I --

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: I think what I'm saying is let's just be flexible.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. I agree. The only issue is -- well, we know Volker will not be participating remotely. Thomas, we haven't heard from yet. And, of course, we have observers who may, or may not, be on the call on parts of these meetings. So, to the extent that we can, we should certainly try to set reasonable times to start with, but I tend to agree, we're going to have to be flexible as we go forward.

And I think what we're going to have to do is, for any observers or review team members who are working remotely, you know, build some sort of way we can notify them when the schedule is changing or when they'll be on. Cathrin, I assume that's an old hand. So, we've had several comments that we'd like to increase compliance, two hours; privacy/proxy to two hours.

We have some volunteers for -- to reduce time, and outreach and strategic -- or safeguarding registrant data, I believe are those that we could reduce -- either because they're not -- won't be significant topics to discuss, or we will not have enough information at that point. Jean-Baptiste and Lisa, does that give you enough to work with, in terms of the next revision of the schedule?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yeah. Thank you, Alan, for summarizing.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Lisa, do you have any questions or comments?

LISA PHIFER: Just to recap, you're suggesting, extending compliance and privacy/proxy to two hours? And to do that, to shorten, which subgroups?

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, we're [CROSSTALK] --

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Outreach.

ALAN GREENBERG: We're adding two hours and not taking off two hours. So --

LISA PHIFER: Ah, okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: So, that's why there's juggling involved.

LISA PHIFER: Agreed. Okay. We do actually have some time in the latest agenda to allocate day two. And we can steal some from day three, if we need to -

- where we have a big roll-up session on topics two through five that may not need to be quite as big. So, yes, I think we have some things to work with.

ALAN GREENBERG: And I've suggested strategic -- or safeguarding registrant data and outreach could be reduced, on a first cut, to 30 minutes.

CARLTON SAMUELS: This is Carlton. For personal reasons, as much as you can steal from day three, I will most appreciate.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry. I didn't catch that, Carlton.

CARLTON SAMUELS: I'm saying, I have a personal request -- for as much as Lisa can steal from day three, I'd be very happy with that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. You will not be there day three, is that correct?

CARLTON SAMUELS: That is correct. Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: So, we should certainly make sure that -- I mean day three is going to be summarizing, in many cases, not doing the initial cut. So, we're going to have to figure out on the fly how we compensate for you not being there. Any further comments on this part of the agenda? Then, Jean-Baptiste, if we can go to the next slide, please.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yes, Alan. So, this regarding presenting your subgroup findings during the face-to-face meeting. And to do that -- so there are some plenary slides that have been prepared by staff, which will be sent to rapporteurs by the 9th of April, close of business.   And then, rapporteurs are invited to send the final updates to the slides by the 12th of April, close of the day. And we, support team, will circulate the final slide-deck for the Brussels face-to-face meeting on the 13th of April.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Thank you very much. I'll note the days that go along with those dates; the 9th of April is next Monday; the 12th is Thursday; and the 13th is Friday. Now, I'm -- I get on a plane on Saturday, and I presume many other are, as well -- so, we really do not have any wiggle room there. The 12th is about as late as we can afford to give staff at least a few hours to update the documents, so we can download them before we get on planes.

So, I'll point out these are moderately tight timelines for the ones -- compared to ones we normally have for this group, but we really don't have any flexibility. So, I think, certainly for the people on this call, I'll

make it clear that I think we have to adhere to these timelines. And I guess we need to get that message out to the people who aren't on this call, as well. And I see Erika has her hand up.

ERIKA MANN: Alan, how many slides do you want to use for each presentation? Or do we just want to align it just to time we have available [inaudible]? I'm -- just to tell you why -- I always prefer to have few slides, which are more comprehensive in nature, and then to allow more debate, instead of spending all the time just reviewing slides.

ALAN GREENBERG: As long as we can -- there's not so much data on the slide that we can't read it. Staff will be sending out their first cut on slides, so I'm willing to let them take the decision on how many makes sense based on the complexity of the issue.

ERIKA MANN: Okay. Okay. That's fine.

ALAN GREENBERG: Some of them, it's going to be really simple, and some, there's going a pile of slides, I think.

ERIKA MANN: Okay. That's fine with me.

ALAN GREENBERG: Lisa, please go ahead.

LISA PHIFER: Thank you. Yes, this is Lisa for the record. As Alan noted, we've been working on a slide-deck, which, quite honestly, is rather large, even without content. But you'll see that -- each of you, as rapporteurs, you'll see that there's a couple of slides for your topic with the points to be covered. And we'll populate those slides with the basics, just as we did with your draft subgroup reports, for those of you who chose to receive one.

We'll do some of the basic background, pulling from your subgroup report, so that you don't have to do that. And you can focus on the findings and what messages or questions you want to really discuss with the review team as you flesh out your slides. So, that would be what you receive on 9 April -- that, then, you have until the end of your business day on the 12th of April to complete.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Lisa. Carlton, were you trying to say something?

CARLTON SAMUELS: I was trying to say exactly what Lisa said -- that what the staff does is that they send the slides -- it works very well in the times they've done it -- in my experience. They send out the slides, and they kind of help you find your own voice on the findings, which is where it goes. But I

EN

was about to tell you that it works, even if Lisa puts her own voice on the slide -- it really does work.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I can't help but make a comment at this point -- Lisa described the slide-deck as rather large and not having any content in it yet -- that could well be an exemplar for ICANN, in general, sometimes. So, thank you for sharing that with us, Lisa. It's made this day more bearable for me. Anything else we have on the slides, or do we go on the next slide?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I had assumed that Lisa was referring to the Board when she said it was large, but empty.

ALAN GREENBERG: As I said, exemplar for ICANN -- you can look at it as many different parts.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Oh, that slide, Chris; that slide.

ALAN GREENBERG: But thank you for contributing that, Chris.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Well, I felt I had to say something on the call. Or otherwise, you might have forgotten I was here. And it does prove I was listening, also, which I think is important.

ALAN GREENBERG: We appreciate that. Back to you, Jean-Baptiste.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Thank you, Alan. So, we move on to the next slide, which is A.O.B., I believe.

ALAN GREENBERG: And for A.O.B., we have a request to do a survey. Do we have to do a survey on this Zoom, if we've already done a survey on the last Zoom? If our opinions have not changed?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: If your opinions have not changed, I'm not sure, but I've seen a lot of comments, and sometimes, complaints in the chat, so we invite you to fill-in this survey that will help us improve our upcoming calls. Thank you.

CARLTON SAMUELS: I don't think it's Zoom. I think it's my silly machine here that's causing the problems.

EN

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, based on my experiences with ICANN's use of Zoom, and ICANN's use of WebEx, at this point, I will take Zoom any day.

CARLTON SAMUELS: I will take Zoom, too. It works for other calls. So, you know.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. Do we have anything else on any other business before we go to a recap? We are, again, doing these meetings in well under the hour and a half allocated. Something that I must admit, I support.

CARLTON SAMUELS: No pain, no gain.

ALAN GREENBERG: No input on anything else -- then, I'll turn it back over to Jean-Baptiste for a review of decisions reached and action items.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Thank you very much, Alan. So, on action items -- so, first of all, the subgroup draft report on recommendation two. If no updates are received from recommendation two, Carlton will share at the end of today at the subgroup draft report with the review team.

On anything new, the subgroup draft report will be sent by the end of today. On law enforcement, Cathrin has offered to provide assistance on the subgroup draft report, and Lisa will provide a draft to Cathrin.

And also, Cathrin will provide a link to the U.S. FTC feedback on the relevance of WHOIS to the topic for subgroup.

On safeguard registrant data, Alan will share a draft report with the review team and subgroup, in parallel, by the end of this week. On the agenda for the face-to-face meeting -- so, the time for compliance and privacy/proxy services will be updated to 120 minutes, two hours; and outreach and safeguard registrant data will be -- the time for these two items will be decreased to 30 minutes each. And ICANN.org will send a reminder about the slide-deck deadline to all and all the rapporteurs will submit the final slides, no later than the 12th of April to enable the final deck to be distributed on Friday to the review team.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. To be clear, the safeguarding registrant data, I said, I'll try to have it out by the end of the weekend, not the week.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: I will correct that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Any further comments? Then, I will call this meeting to an end. Thank you all for attending.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]