
BRENDA BREWER:

Hello everyone, this is Brenda speaking and I would like to welcome you to the RDS WHOIS 2 plenary call number 28. On May 21, 2018 at 14:00 UTC. Attending the call today is Alan, Susan, Dmitry, Erika, and Lili. From ICANN Organization we have Alice, Amy, Lisa, and myself Brenda. We do have apologies from Vulcar, Catherine, Carlton, Thomas, and Chris may be delayed. I would like to remind you today's call is being recorded, please state your name for the transcript, and I will turn the meeting over to you Alan. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. If we can go to the next slide with the agenda, and first of all, is there anyone with any statement of interest updates? Hearing nothing, I am presuming there are not, and we'll go directly into the agenda and the first item on the agenda is the public comment that was issued on, among other things, this review giving a number of options for the community to weigh in on, on what we do with it. Next slide please. Again, and the document provided with the public comment provided three options for people to give their opinions on, the first one was essentially proceed as currently planned. The second one was revert back to what was an original proposal that is the review should just address the previous review and nothing else. The third one is to essentially pause the review, our review work. Now, it says after the April meeting in this. I don't recall that document actually saying that. I thought that this was a public comment that was going to close in July, would be summarized somewhere around the 25th July, and presumably at that point a decision will be made to pause it if that was

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.

the communities wish, can someone on staff comment on this? Did I misread this? I don't know where the April comes from.

ALICE JANSEN:

Alan this is Alice. I wanted to run a quick search, see if it's in there. I am pretty sure it is in the [inaudible]. Hi Alan, it's actually in the table of the main document. If you go to page 16 of the main document short options, April is referenced there.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Alright, hold on. This is taking me completely by surprise. Let me look this up and if others want to do the same thing. So you say it is in the main document of short term options...

ALICE JANSEN:

I posted the link in the chat box.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I am pulling up the document, what page is that on?

ALICE JANSEN:

16.

ALAN GREENBERG:

16.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Yeah, that is the wording Alan, I am looking at it right now. This is Susan for the record.

ALAN GREENBERG: Can anyone explain to me, how a public comment that close in July is supposed to agree that the review should have stopped working in April? Subject to not having time machines, and I don't believe ICANN owns one, how is that supposed to work? I didn't even notice that the first time around. Does anyone have any comments?

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: This is Susan. I assume some people [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry go ahead Susan.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: I'm sorry, I stepped on you. When we talked to Larissa last week in the leadership meeting, she did... because I was questioning why they would put this out at the same week as the temporary specification, and she did say at that point that this was supposed to go out several weeks earlier, I think they had April in mind, but you're right. I mean, they're just... in some ways that one sentence is just preproposing that the RDS review team would be paused, I love the use of pause, because this is a suspension and no matter how they try to soften that, what they're attempting to do here is exactly what they did to the SSR2. It's just another step...

ALAN GREENBERG: With the community support, of course, this time. I'm not questioning whether it is a good thing or a bad thing, I'm just looking at the operational logistics of it, even if this public comment had been issued a month earlier, the end date would have been June. That is still after April.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Yeah. No, I agree with you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright, something else to raise then, let's ignore that for the moment. Unless they're planning to chastise us in July for not having foreseen the outcome and paused in April, or something. Sorry, this is getting a little bit more surreal and it's not the only thing going on at ICANN right now that's surreal. Alright, let us have the substantive discussion within this group, all the comments I heard, and I won't try to name the people who said it, but there were a fair number of the key members said at this point they recommend full steam ahead, and if it gets paused after the fact, then it gets paused, we will likely not fight the pause. At least that was the general perception of the comments I saw, but, at this point we are not planning to take the decision on ourselves and pause at this point. I see hands from Stephanie and from Erika. I don't know what order they came in so we'll take them in that order.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Thanks very much, hope you can hear me, it's Stephanie for the record.

ALAN GREENBERG: We can.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: I want to make a rather administrative point. This document was a classic example of what I've been complaining about in ICANN documents that looking at it, even now, but let's imagine 2 years from now, you're scratching your head going, where the heck did this come from, who authored it, under whose authority was it drafted, etc. So, I'd just like to say that when we comment on this, we should bring all those issues up, thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Erika.

ERIKA MANN: Erika on the call. I must say when I read the document and tried to understand the procedure behind it, it's really like Stephanie said, quite puzzling. It's the process which is puzzling, it's the timing, even when you look at it from an investment point of view, to come in after a year, where you clearly need a review and then to put this forward to the community, with these questions, it's a very bizarre process, and I'm not sure what really triggered it, if there's a feeling that because of the GDPR, the whole work is useless, which is of course not true, as you still need your review. It's a bit puzzling and I would really say we should send a quite... in our reply, a very prudent and very legalistically applied to you, just highlighting all the points which we... where we see, you

know, where this is questionable, but in a very legalistic and prudent and objective way. Concerning the question of the pause, I don't know what a pause is actually, and a procedure, because when we continued our work, and there is the option on the table that the community may argue in favor of a pause. So is it really recommended the pause to continue working, it's a little bit strange. In a typical normal environment outside of ICANN, if such a question would be brought forward, of course, people would stop working and would then wait until one would have the time to analyze the replies. I'm in favor of continuing, don't get me wrong, we should just continue because ICANN pauses are never clear and never straightforward so we should continue, but it's not totally logic that we continue actually, our work.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Erika. I can give you part of the answer to the question you're asking, where did this come from? Where this came from was Goran has been making the comment for a significant amount of time that in the coming year we will have, and I believe that the number is 11 reviews going. This is the position that I think is completely wrong, in any case but conflating specific reviews with organizational reviews and just because they share the name review and are both overseen by MSSSI, there somehow is an equation of the two. In any case, there are 11 reviews going on, and in a world where they're trying to find a place to save money and money seems to be the operational issue, not our work, when you look at it the organizational reviews all have funds already committed and contracts signed so there's no point in stopping those. That may save a huge amount of community work, but it doesn't save any money. Of the OAC class reviews, the specific reviews, the

ATRT is an obvious one to look at, as it hasn't started yet. The review team has not been named. CCT is just about over and it's not due to start again for a long time. SSR2, I suspect they didn't have the nerve to say, after it's supposed to be restarting let's look again at pausing it. The outrage in the community would be completely unreasonable. So we're left with RDS review, which they have put a huge number in the budget for, for next year and it's not clear that it's justified, and it ignores the fact that we are significantly under budget this year, but nevertheless it's a number that they thought they could present to the community and look good by saving money. I suspect that's why we ended up with what we have. Like I said, I didn't see that April date, it's completely surreal and sort of implies that we will pause now and wait to see what the community says, which to be honest would ease my workload significantly. I have enough things to keep me busy right now, but, it makes no sense at all. So, Erika is that a new hand or an old one?

ERIKA MANN: It's a new one.

ALAN GREENBERG: Please go ahead.

ERIKA MANN: I agree. It's Erika on the call. I agree with you Alan. A similar analysis that I made, but it's still, if you want to give something like this to the community, you would assume that the first thing the board would do, would say we do an evaluation and we make a recommendation for,

you know how to deal with all of the reviews and this is the process, do we agree with the process. Because if you just pick and choose, maybe the most expensive one doesn't give you, probably the right. Because you have to do the review, so how can you then justify it to then actually put it to [inaudible]. I mean, just from a process point of view and from the, you know... it's absolutely not obvious to select a process like this one. This is what is puzzling me and I believe I think you're absolutely right with your judgement. This is what...

ALAN GREENBERG:

By the way, I've already gotten agreement from ICANN. I'm not sure who has seen it, I think it was a message that went to the leadership yesterday. We had asked them, and I had asked them a number of questions including where did the budget numbers come from and things related to that. There was a statement saying they would correct... the document has an incorrect statement, it says we may consider pausing, and then in another place, in an earlier sentence says we did already pause, or defer some of our work because of GDPR. They said that they would correct that one. It's not clear that they're going to change anything else. Clearly this April issue will have to be raised with them. If you accept the fact that most of the people who have commented, or all of the people who have commented, I believe, have said let's continue working. On the presumption we do that, the argument that we're certainly going to put in our response is our current work plan calls for us to have a draft report, at or soon after the same timing as we're expecting the report on this public comment. So pausing at that point when we already have a draft report does not seem to make a lot of sense. The only question that comes up, that I

think we need to consider is, what are the chances we will not make that date. By the time that July comes around, we will be far from a draft report. If there's a possibility that that's going to happen, then I think we have to consider that now when we're phrasing our response. I would like to open the floor, I see Susan has her hand up, but I'd like to open the floor on that particular question, do you believe that we will in fact meet our rough timeline, I know we may or may not have the meeting in July at this point, it's still something we're looking at. But do you have a level of comfort we will make that commitment and if we put it in writing in our response, it'll not something that will come back to embarrass us later. Susan.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI:

So, to answer that specific question. I do think we will have a draft report after our face-to-face, whether or not it comes out at the same time as the report, you know, that staff will do based on the public comment. But, I think that, and I was very clear with this on the leadership call, but this was a pretty irresponsible act by MSSI. I think we should be on, I think we should continue to work on a report as diligently as we can, aim for that timeline, but also I think we should ask for a deferral of these public comments, the community in whole are... and maybe we do this through our own communities, but the community as a whole is overwhelmed and now that MSSI has just added to it. I also think we should add, to invite or request Theresa Swinehart to discuss this with us at our next meeting. Not expect too much time from her but 10-15 minutes of why the hell did this happen, and what is your intention. I am going to continue to perpetuate my conspiracy theory. I think they just would like to get rid of reviews

altogether, and this is the way. They can't do it the way they did it last time with SSR2, so they're asking the community to do the dirty work, and I think if we allow them, as a review team, to pause or suspend us, which is truly what's happening, you know, the attempt is to suspend the work, then the important part of affirmation of commitment that it's served us well as a community will be gone. So, I really think this is a ploy and there is another beyond budget and beyond caring for the community and how hard everybody's working. There's a different agenda here and maybe we ask for in that question, I think we send a very strong message that we're going to continue our work until we absolutely... I mean, in my opinion they can't stop the community work. We could do this review without ICANN support. Wouldn't be the best work product, but for me this... there's much more going on behind the scenes here than this report indicates, and if there isn't more going on behind the scenes then it's really... this just becomes more curious. Because it, you know, I mean... this is putting a burden on the community, so you know. There's no rhyme or reason to this at all. I feel like I am in Alice in Wonderland.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Susan. Couple of comments. Number one, I honestly do not think it's conspiracy, I believe this is a classic example of you shouldn't have seen conspiracy when incompetence explain something. I think this is incompetence explain something, and I think this is incompetence in spades, I'm afraid. I mean, this April date just adds to that belief, and I did ask on the leadership call when Larissa was on the call with us, what happens if the community overwhelmingly says pause? And we say no, because we do have it within our right and the document does make it

clear that we would have to agree. I said, what happens then? Does that mean that ICANN withdraws funding, and we can continue but we have no funding and no staff support, or does it mean they would say yes, the funding is there because the review is ongoing, and Larissa's answer was, they haven't thought about that. So, I really think this is in spades, group think that somehow came out of it... or whether it's group think or not wanting to disagree with Goran, I don't know. OK, at this point I have heard nothing that says we intend to pause at this point, certainly not after the April meeting, and we are going to go full ahead, we will draft a response to this and I believe that all of us should [inaudible] talk to our AC's and SO's. Do we need any further discussion at this point? I will say that I've said in writing in a number of places that I believe option B, or perhaps the equivalent of option C, that is, don't hold the review would have been the right answer before we started it. There is no secret that I did not believe that we should let the bylaw words which accidentally said we have to do the review, immediately make that happen in that timeframe. It has happened, we've put 8 months of work into it, or 9 months of work into it. Staff has put a huge amount of work into it, and if we were to pause this review, I think when it restarted there would be a significantly different review team, assuming it did start, but assuming it does start there would be a significantly different review team, the staff support will be completely different and essentially it will have to done all over again, and that is an unbelievable waste of community time and resources. Stephanie, please go ahead, and then I'd like to move onto another item.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Thanks very much. I think as you know, I was uncertain about starting this review right in the middle of GDPR for all the same reasons that Alan just described. However, and we have our policy meeting at NCSG tomorrow. I'm pretty well adamant that we must not allow [inaudible] that is in progress to be, in my view [inaudible] in this way, because I went back and forth on you know, what are these reviews? Are they audits, are they program reviews? They are not well defined, and you cannot permit management to intervene in the middle of a review on principle. I am not suggesting that we are discovering things that are inconvenient. There isn't a bureaucrat alive that lives under an audit [inaudible] wouldn't like to make the thing go away once they discover something uncomfortable. So I think just on process alone, we cannot, we have to respectfully disagree with the community, if they try to stop us. Not that our work is that brilliant, this is not coming from vanity, it's coming procedurally. So I would suggest that we need a pretty fulsome chapter in our response on procedure. That would, of course, include value for money that has already been spent. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Although they have finessed the issue that this is not management that would stop us, this would be the community.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Exactly.

ALAN GREENBERG: I am not really looking for a response there.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Yeah. Well that's what's making it more problematic in my view. There's a lot of things that are getting a community whitewash these days. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Susan.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Just real quick. I know that we've heard from several people about providing a response from the review team to this proposed situation. But I think we need everybody to weigh in that we are going to do a response, this is my personal view.

ALAN GREENBERG: Certainly, is there anybody on this call who does not believe that we should respond? And specifically respond saying we do not believe a pause or a reduction in scope is appropriate at this time? Alright, I haven't heard anyone on this call say we shouldn't be doing that. We will, could I ask staff to remind me to send a message out to the group, ensuring that from among the whole group there is no one who believes we should not respond, and not respond in a way to indicate that our preference at this point is option A. With that, unless there is someone else who would like, I'd like to go onto the next item. That is the plenary call, time and I'm not sure there's any merit in having this discussion right now, given that the main person who could not make... who cannot make our original time at some cases on the call, I suggested

that we look at the possibility of moving the call one hour late, that gives me a conflict sometimes, but I'm willing to live with that. I already have a conflict with the end of this call, it just means that I have a conflict with the beginning of the call, and I'm willing to accept that. For the people on this call, is there anyone who would object to moving it later on Monday? So, keep it on Monday but make it at 15:00 UTC. Now, the second line of this slide says, 15:00 to 16:00, I presume we mean 16:50, I believe this was a 90 minute call and I don't believe we're planning to change that. The question is, is there anyone who cannot or would prefer not to move it to that time, and Lili is clearly the person who gets disadvantaged the most because she's at the end of her day while the rest of us are either at the beginning or somewhat earlier in the day. Give people a moment to either type something into the response. Dmitry says that he prefers not to move. Dmitry, are you saying that you would not attend the meetings if we did not move, or you would simply prefer not to?

DMITRY BELYAVSKY: I will simply prefer but sometimes maybe I will be partly unable to attend.

ALAN GREENBERG: Understood. Lili says it is fine with her, I will ask staff to put out a message to the entire review group saying at this point we have a semi consensus to move it one hour later to accommodate [inaudible], and is there anyone who believes that they would not be able to attend

regularly if we move it from 14:00 to 15:00. I hear nothing from staff but I assume that's noted.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Hi Alan, action taken, thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, next slide please. Alright we're now looking at ICANN 62. There is a 90 minute session that is on the agenda. It is a non-conflicted time that is, there is nothing else explicitly scheduled against it, although AC and SO's may choose to schedule something against it at their own desire. At this point I think we have to start doing some detail work. The meeting is about a month away from now and the documents are due in, I believe, something like 2 and a half weeks. This says the deadline for finalizing session materials is the 8th June. I thought there was a deadline for submitting any documents of the 8th June, that session materials, other than the agenda itself, in the past in general, we have been able to work on that up until the day before, as long as it gets submitted to staff for display. Is something changed at this point that I don't understand? That is a question for staff.

ALICE JANSEN: Hi Alan, this is Alice. This actually is inline with the conversation we had on the last plenary call with Susan. The review team established June 8th as the deadline to finalize material that will be presented at the session. This was agreed on the last call.

ALAN GREENBERG: This was our decision to do that?

ALICE JANSEN: Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think it's an unrealistic decision, but I am curious as to the rationale for it.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Just trying to get the work done and check things off the list.

ALAN GREENBERG: Presentations are for writing on the plane to the meeting, didn't you know that.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: This is my theory. We provide all of that, but we may have a few changes.

ALAN GREENBERG: OK. My experience with this kind of thing is normally staff will do a first cut at this, and then the review team work group, whatever, will adjust it. Do we understand enough about what we want to do that staff is in a position to actually do that? There is a next slide, which talks about that. I think the next slide actually talks about it in minutes.

LISA PHIFER: Alan, this is Lisa.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes please Lisa, go ahead.

LISA PHIFER: I believe, and Alice, she confirmed that we're in a position to begin to build you a template deck. My concern would be that the review team really needs to give some attention to the recommendations that you wish to actually include in the slide, as we have maybe draft recommendations coming out of the face-to-face, but perhaps not final wording of any of those.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, that goes into the... perhaps the next item of the agenda, or not the next but one of the later items on the agenda of where we are in terms of deadlines. I am happy to say on one of my two projects I now have a almost final draft that I've sent out to the work group, and I hope to have the second one done with in the next day or so. How realistic are we that we're going to have things on the other review teams? Mine were moderately easy ones compared to some. Lisa, I'm asking you as someone who is paying attention to the documents as they come out from the review teams, perhaps more than anyone else. Do you feel comfortable we are going to have something in time to insert them into this report prior to the meeting? Whether it's June 8th or not?

LISA PHIFER: I think some subgroups more so than others, is the honest answer. We know coming out of the face-to-face we had some groups that were nearly done their work and certainly those portions of the presentation would be fairly sound. The groups that had much more work left to do, obviously we won't have recommendations to present, even if the questions that the subgroup was pursuing could be presented.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sure, and I think that's quite reasonable, we're not saying that we have a draft report in the middle of June, we're saying we plan to have a draft report some time in July or whenever we actually get our next face-to-face. I don't think that's unreasonable. I guess we will ask staff to start putting this template together and identify where there are big holes in it and decide how to approach it going forward. I suggest that we keep this on the agenda for the next couple of meetings and review it each time to say where are we and what holes or problems do we think we have. Any comments on that? I see no hands.

ALICE JANSEN: Alan, this is Alice.

ALAN GREENBERG: Please Alice, go ahead.

ALICE JANSEN: Sorry, just to clarify, do we have an agreement with the proposed engagement session description that is on the previous slide? Brenda if you could move back to the previous slide, that would be great. Thank you. We need this by Wednesday May 30th, so it can make it to the public schedule.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright, so we're looking at the big paragraph in the middle of that slide, is that correct?

ALICE JANSEN: Correct, yeah.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think that misses the fact that the largest part of our work is to assess the implementation of the previous review teams recommendations. If we only phrase it like this, I think we are opening ourselves up to huge amounts of criticism, in light of the public comment, because if we are mainly doing is assessing the effectiveness of the current WHOIS, then that's a really dumb thing to be doing at this point in our life. So, even though that's what the bylaws say, I think we have to phrase this somewhat differently to acknowledge just what we are doing. I'm happy to try to draft something with staff. Anyone disagree? Somebody is typing. Several people agree. Alright, if we can put a joint action item for myself and staff to put something together and pass it by both leadership and the rest of the review team so we can get this locked in as quickly as possible.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thanks Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Anything else talking about ICANN 62? Next, face-to-face meeting in Brussels. These were the dates that we put in the Doodle, clearly none of them was particularly acceptable. The 30th to 31st was the best choice but that omitted, OK, who is the remote person by the way? On the 30th, 31st?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I believe Catherine is the remote person.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, she is listed as unavailable.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Can you go back to the Doodle post.

ALAN GREENBERG: OK.

ERIKA MANN: Alan, its Erika.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yes Erika, go ahead.

ERIKA MANN:

I do have a hard time, I might not be in Europe, so I don't believe that I put in remote, but I made a comment in the comment section that it was going to be difficult for me and I'm not certain now.

ALAN GREENBERG:

OK. Certainly, my belief and Susan's as well was based on this, none of these dates were acceptable. We did ask staff to look at the availability of, I believe, the week of July 20th, 16th?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

That's actually on the next slide.

ALAN GREENBERG:

That would imply that we could not hold it in the ICANN office, but we have plenty of funds available at this point. Well, we may have plenty of funds available, given that it's next fiscal year and we don't know what funds we have available, but we're assuming we'll have plenty of funds available, therefore holding it offsite would not be unreasonable. I believe the response we got from ICANN was, the support staff could handle a meeting off site, so at this point I think we need to schedule it, exactly when within that week we'll hold the meeting, I think we're still talking about it, 2 day meeting, so we have several options within the week. I presume we'll do it at the beginning or end of the week to allow some people to travel on the weekend, taking time away from family

but not taking time away from work. Dmitry supported that position I see. [inaudible] said... oh sorry we already did that. I didn't even see we had a Doodle out for that at this point. We have again no possibility of everyone being at a meeting, isn't that delightful. Yes go ahead Alice.

ALICE JANSEN: Sorry, just to clarify, does the meeting on the week of July 16th, happen at the ICANN office in Brussels? [inaudible] person in Europe, would be the [inaudible] meeting for you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh, I thought we weren't given that option as we couldn't hold the meeting at the ICANN office.

ALICE JANSEN: No. The office was actually, the SSR2 Doodle [inaudible], so it is showing it wouldn't work out for the ICANN office, but SSR2 is not going to happen in July, so that's why we opened these dates. The meetings team is also busy elsewhere in the July month, there's a number of events happening around the world, but our IT in Brussels can cover this if you decide to meet there on these dates.

ALAN GREENBERG: OK. I thought you hadn't opened our Doodle until the SSR one was already resolved. OK, my misunderstanding. Comments, at this point with 5 people reporting in and you can consider my report there as being available all week. We have no two days that everyone could

attend. This is getting more and more frustrating. Now I thought Susan, can you clarify, I thought we opened that date because Catherine said she was available that week?

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Yeah she is available those 4 days. I guess, that was the better week for here. I also think that, we only have 5 participants, to really figure this out we need everyone to fill out the Doodle poll.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, if we can have a reminder from staff and I must admit, I must have missed it as I don't see my name there. If we could have an action item from staff to resent that and see where it goes.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: It is in the chat right now, Alice put it in there.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Alright. Anything more on this item? I don't think we can make a decision at this point. I have now done the Doodle. Alright, is there anyone on this call that would like to present anything on their items? I would speak up that recommendation 3, outreach, I have sent out what I believe was a almost complete draft. Erika says she has some comments on it. I think that should be ready to go to the whole review team in a day or so and actually meet the 24th deadline. I hope to do the same thing on my safeguarding registrant data, that's a bit more complex, but I will be working on that in the next day or so,

time permitting. I'm afraid some other major fires have come up which are requiring me to focus a bit on them, but I will try to put some time into this one. Anyone else like to volunteer to speak? Erika, please go ahead.

ERIKA MANN: Alan, this was an old hand, apology.

ALAN GREENBERG: Would you like to speak anyway?

ERIKA MANN: You're funny. Concerning the updated report you sent, these are tiny comments I have tried to send. The difficulty is that I can't copy the text which I want to make some recommendation to, so it's a little bit... I will find a way of sending it to you, [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Erika, I'm going to send out another version. I planned to do it before this meeting but I didn't get chance. I'll send out another version with line numbers on it, which may make it easier for you to comment on specific parts of it, if you wish to.

ERIKA MANN: Thank you so much.

ALAN GREENBERG: What about consumer trust?

ERIKA MANN: I am nearly done, I need a few more hours, but I am nearly done in embedding all the comments which were taken in Brussels. I hope to be able to send it to you all by tomorrow in the evening. I have another paper to finish, but I hope tomorrow evening I can do it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much Erika, would anyone else like to speak on their projects? And Susan, my call failed. I am trying to dial back in. Let's wait for Susan to come back. I see a comment from Alice that Erika's response to the Doodle poll through the comment box. Alice, perhaps you can fill the poll in with whatever the appropriate answers are on her behalf, so we can take a look at the Doodle. I see we now have 8 participants on the Doodle, and so we're only missing 3. At this point we have [inaudible] not available the first three days, and Chris and Catherine not available the last day. I see no other hands, no one else is volunteering... oh I see Lili has her hand up. Please go ahead Lili.

LILI SUN: Yes this is Lili for the record. For the [inaudible] annual reports. I will try to meet the deadline [inaudible], and I read through from Thomas message for the [inaudible] he's now collating the survey result, but I didn't see the finalized questionnaire, so I want to check with staff, did I miss something from the sub group mailing list for the law enforcement [inaudible]?

ALICE JANSEN: Hi Lili, this is Alice. No, there was no confirmation from Catherine. I know Catherine wants to revise some of the questions, so I'm not sure of what prompted Thomas to send that note out I'm afraid.

ALAN GREENBERG: Apparently he must have distributed it, because he is getting answers.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [inaudible]. I do, I just wanted to note that the plan for that subgroup is actually to conduct the survey online, so that all results could be collected and tabulated in the same way, so Thomas may have misunderstood and forwarded an earlier drafted collate.

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh dear. Can I ask staff to follow up on that with Thomas directly.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Will do.

ALAN GREENBERG: Any other comments? I'm not going to object to ending this meeting early, but if we can get anymore work done, then so be it.

LISA PHIFER: This is Lisa, I don't know as I'm not on Zoom whether Susan's been able to rejoin us.

ALAN GREENBERG: I thought I heard Susan at one point.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Yeah, I finally got back in. Sorry about that [inaudible] all of a sudden the phone ends, computer went, so... were you just asking for a report on the sub groups I'm working on?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, does anyone have anything they feel will help us if they want to report their current status, and particularly to what extent are you likely to make or partially make the target date of the 24th?

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: So, on the compliance sub group, we had a call last week and discussed more of the information provided by the compliance team, and additional report that have gone out in the last few months, and/or at the end of the first quarter, and came up with some definite discussions around points that were interesting. Some things we'll need to go back and ask a couple of questions but others we can draw conclusions. So, and I've drafted quite a bit more of the reports that it's not ready to go to the sub group yet. I am hoping by tomorrow morning, and it does... I think we'll have quite a full report for the compliance sub group, unfortunately that doesn't leave the other team members that much

time for comment but I'm hoping that we can kind of turn it around and then keep working on it after the 24th too, obviously. The other thing is that has Lisa agreed to flesh out the, anything new, and she sent that over. I haven't had chance to look at that but once I send the compliance report over then I will take a look at that. Stephanie if you have a chance to add your comments and language to that, that would be extremely helpful. On privacy proxy, I did take a stab at incorporating [inaudible] comment, we've asked in several questions after the face-to-face and so, you know, that won't be out in time for the whole sub group to, unless [inaudible] is working on something that I don't know about, to actually maybe comment before the 24th, but I think it'll be substantial [inaudible] that it should go to the full review team. Common interface, I'm not sure I am going to get to.

ALAN GREENBERG:

It's the least of our problems at this point to be honest, given we know things are going to change there. Alright, any further comments? It sounds like we are not in bad shape. Susan, the meeting we had last... I think it was last week, I found rather productive but we were very tightly time constrained. You're talking as if you don't really think we need another meeting at this point, I was going to suggest that we schedule one and at least leave an hour for it, even if we... maybe an hour and a half to try to make sure we get through everything, even if we don't use all that time. Do you think we need something or not? Or are you comfortable?

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: I thought it was a really productive discussion and it would have been great to have more time that day, unfortunately my schedule is...

ALAN GREENBERG: I understand.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: It's always good to have a meeting. I just don't know if I can squeeze one in this week. I could definitely do it next week, as we continue working on these.

ALAN GREENBERG: Why don't we try to put a Doodle out for one. If we do it a week or a week and a half in advance, there's more chance we may actually get people to be able to participate.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Yeah sure, I'll put something out for next week and that way we can keep working on the draft report, but I think we should have a fairly, not well drafted but a lot of good points, let's put it that way. I definitely need everyone else to weigh in on the report.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Dmitry, can we assume yours will be in roughly on time also? Because you were, at a pretty good state last time.

DMITRY BELYAVSKI: Sure, I've sent more or less finalized version. [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: This chart is not quite updated.

DMITRY BELYAVSKI: It should be just clear from the reminders of [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: OK. Anything or further comments on... let me start that over again. Any further comments on sub group status?

LISA PHIFER: Alan, this is Lisa.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sure Lisa, go ahead.

LISA PHIFER: I just wanted to make the offer to any [inaudible] that would find it helpful, staff can always copy into your draft sub group report, the points that were raised and documents from the face-to-face meeting, and know that that's what we did for anything new, but if anyone finds that they're in a similar situation and that would give you, a little bit of help, certainly let us know.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I'm tempted to take you up on that offer on safeguarding data, but I think I really need to listen to the conversation again and really understand the depth of it. I did do that on outreach and it was a useful use of my time, so I think I will do that on safeguarding registrant data, so if I can find an hour or so to do it. I suspect you copying [inaudible] will not help me an awful lot, but thank you for the offer. Anyone else have any comments? Not hearing anything we will go onto the next slide. Approval needed from the face-to-face meeting agreements and action items. I thought we had already put that first item, those two items to bed. Did we not give an absolute deadline and say it was deemed to be complete at this point?

ALICE JANSEN: Hi Alan, this is Alice. There was a comment from [inaudible] on the list saying that he wants to submit input but will not make the final deadline that you established, so I wanted to clarify how we should proceed here.

ALAN GREENBERG: That deadline was a very long time ago, was it not?

ALICE JANSEN: Correct.

ALAN GREENBERG: Let's send out another notice giving everyone to the end of this calendar week, or set it to Thursday, if you prefer, so that you can have something finalized by next Monday.

ALICE JANSEN: Alright, thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Next item on our agenda is open action items. We have a relatively long list, several slides worth. Is anyone feel compelled to review these one by one right now? Or simply call people's attention to it. I note we're at the one hour mark of the hour and a half meeting. Does anyone feel that it would be useful use of our time to review these one by one? I see no hands, I hear no voices. Then I would suggest staff send out a message to all of the people who are mentioned here, and point out that they have some open action items and would they please either take care of them or report back on them. With that we ar, any other business. Asking us to respond to this Survey Monkey on Zoom, which I am tired of doing, I must admit. I was on an Adobe Connect session the other day, which I consider positive. Has staff heard anything on when we will likely see Adobe Connect in production. This was apparently testing a hardened version that was used during the board meetings and the associated other meetings that were held last week. What I was on, was on the accreditation model. No one has heard anything. Alright, last call for any other business. Then everyone has lots of work to do, we will give you back half an hour of your time and we'll

meet again next Monday, thank you... oh sorry, if staff would like to report on action items and any decisions.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you Alan, there's an action item for leadership to raise the after April meeting referenced in the short term options on the [inaudible] with MSSI. An action item to request a tentative [inaudible] briefing with Theresa Swinehart. There's a decision reached to...

ALAN GREENBERG: May I interrupt. Theresa was for next Monday. If she cannot make it, let us know as soon as possible.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Will do, thank you. Noted. There's a decision reached. Agreement to continue work as planned and to raise short term option at the [inaudible] on an individual basis. Action items, Alan to confirm review teams intent to comment at [inaudible] appropriate at this time. Action item, ICANN Org to reconfirm review team that [inaudible] plenary call to 15 UTC. No objection was made on the call number 28. Action item, ICANN Org to start putting engagement session slides together. Action item, Alan and ICANN Org to finalize the ICANN 62 session description and agenda. Action item, ICANN Org to resurvey the Brussels [inaudible]. Action item, ICANN Org to reach out to Thomas to clarify the law enforcement logistics and request status update. Action item, ICANN Org to schedule a follow up call for the compliance sub group. Action item, announce that Thursday 23:59 UTC is the final deadline to

raise any concerns that the review members may have with the Brussels meeting note. The final action item is for ICANN Org to follow up with sub groups to clarify status of open action items. Thanks Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's both the... for the Brussels meeting, that's both the action items and the meeting report, right?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Correct, and I see Stephanie has posted a comment in the chat box.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright. Stephanie, I understand what you're saying but we really cannot defer a report on a meeting for a month and a half. I'm happy to post it as an interim report and adjust it if necessary. But I think that's all we can do, we've been talking about this now for several weeks, and I understand the pressure on him but at some point we have to cut it off, and if we have to revise it, we'll revise it. And lastly again, seeing no hand, and hearing nothing then I will call this meeting to an end, thank you all for your participation, and see you in a week. Could I ask staff to, assuming Susan and Catherine can make it, to plan on a 60 minute leadership call on Wednesday. I think we're going to have to talk a little bit about what we're going to say to Theresa and give her some notes ahead of time. We should try to allow the time for that if our schedules can make it.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Noted, thank you Alan. We'll make sure [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you all, bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]