

---

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: The recording has started. I'd like to welcome you all to the RDS WHOIS2 Plenary call #29 on 28 May 2018 at 15:00 UTC. Attending the call today is Lili, Susan, Alan, Stephanie, and Carlton. From ICANN Organization, we have Alice, Jean-Baptiste, Lisa, and Brenda. We have apologies from Dmitry and Erika will be running a bit late today.

The call is being recorded. May I please remind you to state your name before speaking? Alan, I'll turn the call over to you. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. We also have apologies from Chris. Alright. We only have five people on the call, so we're going to do a bit of a rearranging of the agenda. But, first of all, is there anyone with any statement of interest updates? Hearing no one and seeing no hands, let us change the agenda to do, first of all, the subgroup status update and then we'll go through these items in, essentially, reverse order from what they are on the published agenda. So, let us skip to subgroup update first.

I will turn the call over to I guess Jean-Baptiste or Lisa to review where we are on each of those and see if we can get any additional inputs from anyone. I have some comments on both of my items when we get to them.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Alan, may I suggest maybe to have each rapporteur [inaudible] on each of their subgroups?

---

*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.*

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Sure, and just run through them.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Okay. So, the first one, that's recommendation 1, strategy priority. [inaudible] distributed an updated report and to [inaudible] to the subgroups to [inaudible] this report and finalize. Just a reminder that each subgroup should approve the report before sharing it with [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: I haven't seen Cathrin yet. Have we heard anything from her?

CARLTON SAMUELS: No, but the report is circulated. I've seen the report. I read the report on Saturday afternoon. I'm going to have another read before I make any ... But, there are a couple of comments that can be made to that report. We'll do that sometime this week for sure.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Lisa, as we go through these, if you have any input as to whether these reports are sort of what you had foreseen in terms of completeness, or rather if you believe any of them are not at that stage, can you let us know? Certainly, I know when I was filling out mine, I had some questions about whether what I'm putting is really sufficient or

---

over-covering or not sufficient. So, if you have any thoughts, feel free to chime in.

LISA PHIFER: Sure, Alan. I will. On the strategic priority, I think there's considerable new text in there, so all the subgroup members really do need to read that one.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright. Thank you. Let's go on to the next one, single WHOIS policy. That I believe is Volker's.

CARLTON SAMUELS: No, that's me.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's Carlton? Okay. Then, where are you on it?

CARLTON SAMUELS: Yeah. This week has been really rough with me, some personal time in my business and traveling and [inaudible]. So, I have done the first draft, but I need to go back to it. I've added a couple of things to it. It's not a lot of changes, but I still want to go and look at it again to ensure that I cover all the bases. So, I think I will release it to the team by Wednesday morning latest and then we will wait for the team to have some responses before we make a final final of it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Carlton. The next one ... Sorry, Lisa, you have a hand up. Go ahead. Okay, you took your hand down. I presume that was an error then.

LISA PHIFER: I'm sorry. I was on mute.

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh, okay. In that case, we'll let you speak with really speaking.

LISA PHIFER: Thank you. I just wanted to ask Carlton to make sure that he leaves sufficient time for the subgroups to take a look at the drafts and make sure that he does a call for final comment before it then goes to the full review team. In this round, we do want to make sure that the subgroup has weighed in and has made any comments they wish to make before it goes back to the review team.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Yes, Lisa. That's the plan, and Wednesday I will release it to the subgroup for comments and final comments. As I said, there's not a lot of substantial changes that will be made. There are a few things I have added to this report, from the interim report. I don't suspect that will be a long process. But, yes, the subteam will have time to look at the

---

report and make their comments on it. If it is necessary for us to have a call, I will leave it up to them who will make the call.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Carlton. I note that we now have Volker and Thomas on the line as well, and Erika. So, we're ending up with pretty good turnout. We're now about to go on to recommendation #3. We have done single WHOIS and strategic priority. If any of the new people on the call have anything to say about either of those two, I'll give you a moment to raise your hand or speak. And hearing nothing, seeing nothing, we'll go on to outreach.

Outreach, I did a revision of the report, of the draft report, about a week ago. I had some significant good comments from Volker. Not from Volker, from Carlton. And Erika said she would be giving some comments but I haven't seen them yet. I sent a revised version out sometime this weekend and said I'd like any last comments by Friday so we could turn it over to the plenary group before the next meeting next Monday. If anyone has any comments at this point, then I'll open the floor. I think it's getting to be pretty close to finished at this point, though.

The question I have for this group is one of the recommendations is not that I can do additional outreach, but convene a group to try to identify what kind of additional outreach will be needed. This is outreach to non-ICANN people.

I feel more comfortable with that than actually saying do outreach, because at this point, we can't come up with a lot of viable targets for

---

such outreach and I'm happy to keep the recommendation there, but it would be useful if we had a few more examples that would demonstrate that there is a need for outreach as opposed to convening a group just to come out and say, "Well, we can't really think of much."

The only groups that we have there now that I've listed as examples are consumer protection, both civil society and governmental ones. I did include outreach to cyber professionals and security people, but as Carlton pointed out in some comments to me, we don't really need to outreach to those people. They know what we're talking about.

So, if anyone has any real ideas as to who this kind of outreach could go to – and Susan, you participated in the last group's decision – to make such a recommendation, that would be useful. Or we can consider removing it altogether if we really don't feel this is a viable thing that we need ICANN to do. I'll wait a minute to see if anyone has any comments now or certainly on e-mail if you have any thoughts.

THOMAS WALDEN:

I have a quick question. When you're discussing outreach, are you including folks who don't have some sort of participation within the ongoing discussion [inaudible]? What I mean by that is we have the Public Safety Working Group, but then there's also law enforcement as a whole. So, would you include law enforcement under those of us that belong to the Public Safety Working Group or would you want additional outreach to other law enforcement that may not have a place or active participation at ICANN through the Public Safety Working Group?

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, certainly – and that’s a good idea. It’s curious we didn’t put that there, but that’s probably one of the more viable ones. There’s lots of law enforcement in the world that don’t have anything to do with ICANN. Even if their country is represented on the Public Safety Working Group, which is a small number, there’s lots of law enforcement that is completely disconnected from that. Law enforcement is probably an interesting one that we should include.

THOMAS WALDEN: Alright. [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Any other comments?

BRENDA BREWER: We have one person that dialed in without a name attached. May I ask who just dialed in perhaps three or four minutes ago.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Hi, this is Cathrin. Hi, Brenda. It’s me. I have a non-disclosed number. Apologies for the delay.

BRENDA BREWER: Thank you very much.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Welcome, Cathrin. Alright. With that, I'll leave outreach and we'll go on to compliance. Susan?

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Thanks, Alan. I did send out an updated report to the full review team, though with apologies to the subgroup because I didn't get it to them in time for comment. It definitely needs more edits, more work. I did put some draft recommendations in, but didn't fill out the full form for each recommendation because the subgroup needs to weigh in on those recommendations before we take them further in it. It could be that we could group some of those into a larger recommendation.

I know we have a Doodle poll out for a call this week, but I did not check that. So, hopefully, we'll have time for a call this week and get some more input, and then I can finalize the report.

ALAN GREENBERG: The call is scheduled I believe for tomorrow. No, Wednesday.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Wednesday.

ALAN GREENBERG: At noon hour my time, so that's 16:00 UTC. 9:00 your time, Susan.



---

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Okay. I had just not checked my e-mail thoroughly enough to see that, so thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: You're welcome. Any comments for Susan? I have not reviewed the documents or the e-mails you sent, so I will be doing that over the next day or two, certainly before the call.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Appreciate that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Anyone else comment on compliance? Yes, Lisa, please Go AHEAD.

LISA PHIFER: Thank you. This is responding to what Susan just mentioned, but really it applies to all of the subgroup reports. In the section where recommendations are being drafted, there are a number of I guess you would call it subsections in the template for each recommendation, one of which is the rationale for the recommendation and another is the finding that led to the recommendation. Those may be a good place to start to help everyone understand how the recommendation ties to what the subgroup has been doing so far. There are other fields in the template that are things like impact and what parts of the community would be impacted or the priority. Those could potentially be deferred until later, but it is really important to have that rationale as you're drafting your recommendations. Thanks.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Lisa. Any further comments on compliance? Then we'll go onto data accuracy and Lili.

LILI SUN: So, the updated report was circulated to the whole review team last Friday and I'm sorry I couldn't meet the deadline for the subgroup members. Until now, I saw the comments from Volker and I'm looking for [inaudible] from the subgroup members. For Volker's comments, I replied I believe this morning and I believe we have some [inaudible] as how to [inaudible] the recommendation 6, especially recommendation 6. So, I will reply to Volker later and [inaudible] what's my understanding and hopefully we can pick some common ground on the [inaudible] of the recommendations, and also the [inaudible] of the accuracy.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Lili. Comments, anyone? Again, I'll make the same disclaimer that any of the e-mails that came in pretty much most of last week I have not had a chance to work on yet, but will be. No hands, no voices, then we will go on to data accuracy – sorry, privacy-proxy. Volker is on the line and I'll turn it over to him.

VOLKER GREIMANN: Yes, but [inaudible] taking the lead at this point would be a bit presumptuous because actually Susan has done most of the work, picked up the slack that I have left due to my absence and heavy

---

involvement in our own GDPR work, so I apologize for that, for not being able to contribute as meaningfully as I had intended for that for the subgroup's work.

So far, what I've seen from Susan, what we've worked on is while we still could use a bit more substance on some of the other team members and maybe from the entire group, I think we're in a good place already.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Comments, anyone else?

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: This is Susan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Please, go ahead.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: I did add a little bit of content to this. There's not a whole lot to say, I think. I think we're in good shape, but would love other subgroup members, too, to weigh in. Though I do think I left out a few possible recommendations that we agreed to at the face-to-face. I need to go back to that report. I meant to do it on Thursday and just ran out of time. Hopefully ... I'll take another look at that and try to get that out probably tomorrow.

---

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Susan. Just for the record, on both of my sections, I went back to the actual recording, Zoom recording, and it's pretty easy because we generally did follow the planned agenda, and by looking at what's on the screen on Zoom you can home in on the right part pretty quickly. I found that was a good use of my time in any case for the hour-and-a-half or so I spent relistening to those. I thought I got ... I walked away with a better understanding of what we had said or better memory than I did from just the printed documents. So, something people may want to consider. Any further comments on privacy-proxy?

Then we will go on to common interface and that one I think is Volker also, but I'm not sure. Does anyone remember who owns it?

VOLKER GREIMANN:

I think it might be me and the same applies here that applies to the other work as well. I think we have some document already that's [inaudible] a bit of [inaudible], which of course is due to my not being available to organize and schedule the meetings. I apologize for that. But, we have something and I think if we can just add a bit more meat to the bones, then we're in a good place. I think we do need some more work on that.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay, thank you. We still have a couple of weeks before Panama and then I think there's about four weeks afterwards before the July meeting. It may be less than four weeks now that we've moved it up a bit. So, we do have a little bit of slack, but not an awful lot. Lisa, please go ahead.

LISA PHIFER:

Thank you, Alan. As a result of our last plenary call, I actually circulated to the subgroup a draft on the common interface, and in that draft, I did reflect what we discussed during the face-to-face in Brussels and I think your suggestion of going back to listen to that recorded section of the face-to-face meeting is a really good one because there was some good discussion on common interface during the meeting and actually really I think brought most of the activity that's needed on this one to closure.

So, Volker, as you're trying to sort of catch up on where this subgroup is, if you listen to that portion of the session, you might find that you're pretty close to done.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Lisa. Just as a hint, I had trouble finding the agenda to see where each section was and it was staring me right in the face as a little PDF image in the middle of the page on the face-to-face meeting that houses the agenda if you click on it. So, in case anyone else couldn't find it, that's where it is. Or maybe I'm just generally blind.

Next issue is IDNs and Dmitry is not on this call. Does anyone else recall where we are? I am on the subteam, and to be honest, I don't recall where we are. Well, that's not true. I vaguely recall that we're pretty well done on that and that report is wrapped up and has been sent to the plenary, but I'm not 100% sure. It may not have gone to the plenary yet. Lisa, please go ahead. You may be on mute.

---

LISA PHIFER: Yes, it seems that my interface is delayed when I unmute myself. Yes, Alan, you're correct that Dmitry did send his report to all and there was no further feedback from the subgroup following the face-to-face meeting. That one is pretty much done.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Next one is annual plan and report. I believe that is Lili.

LILI SUN: Yes. I incorporated some feedbacks and discussions in the second face-to-face meeting in Brussels. Also, there is an open action item to incorporate the findings of the strategic – or [inaudible] – into this subgroup report. So, I'm now waiting for the draft report of the strategic priority subgroup and to check with I can incorporate more findings into this subgroup report. That's [inaudible] update status.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Any other comments? Seeing no hands, next item is anything new. My recollection is that's pretty well finalized. Perhaps still waiting for a little bit of work, but close to final. Is that correct? Stephanie I believe is the lead.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Hi, can you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: We certainly can.

---

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Wonderful. Yes. I am remiss. Last week was a little too GDPRy and now [inaudible] go to lawsuits. Unfortunately, I haven't had time to comment and add my little piece, but that shouldn't take more than a day or so if things would just quiet down for a while. Unfortunately, the lawsuit has got everybody going.

ALAN GREENBERG: Nothing is going to quiet down, I'm afraid. That is my prediction.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: You're not an optimist, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: I am. I'm pragmatic.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Yeah. well ....

CARLTON SAMUELS: You're probably right about this.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Yeah. Well, I promise I'll get to it this week and pump it out to everybody. I don't think we need to send it to the small team first. Let's just get it out.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Thank you. Any further comments? Next item, law enforcement needs. Thomas?

THOMAS WALDEN: I think the last place we stood was we were still working on the survey and finalizing that. I've been kind of talking to some of my [inaudible] feedback. I haven't spoken ... I was out of the office all week, so I haven't spoken to anybody else. I've just been kind of speaking amongst my agency finding out how those questions [inaudible] what they do.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright. My understanding is you had circulated the questions, the preliminary questions, to see what kind of responses you got. But, if I remember correctly from Cathrin, we are close to or perhaps already have finalized the final set of questions.

THOMAS WALDEN: Right.

ALAN GREENBERG: When do you foresee getting enough answers back to start to reach conclusions? This one does have me a little bit worried in terms of overall timeframe.



---

THOMAS WALDEN:

Right. I started getting some ... A little bit of responses back from the ones that I put out before, so what I can do is follow-up with any changes we had from those preliminary questions and get that feedback. They got them back to me in a pretty timely fashion. I started getting things back all last week. I'm in the process and actually I was going to use this evening here today to finish compiling the data and making up a little flowchart of where we fall and how different [inaudible] responded.

So, once we get the finalized, I can get responses back or answers back from them within a week. So, it's a pretty quick turnaround. So, whenever we get the final questions of this is what we want to know, I can almost pretty much guarantee within five to seven days of having a final answer from my agency.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. Thank you, Thomas. Lisa?

LISA PHIFER:

Thanks, Alan. Thomas, I think it's important for this subgroup to coordinate on the tool that should be used to collect responses more broadly from the community. In order for the survey to have some statistical significance and to be viewed as valid, we really need responses to come through the online survey tool and then to be actually aggregated through the analysis bits of that tool. So, perhaps this subgroup could have a meeting and talk about the status of the survey questions and whether you're ready to go live and how you'll actually begin seeding results through the tool.

---

THOMAS WALDEN: I can do that. No problem.

ALAN GREENBERG: Lisa, I'm a little bit worried that if Thomas has already circulated things and can forward the modified answers that we may want to not force these people to do it all over again using a different tool, but perhaps enter those answers manually or something on their behalf. It's hard enough getting people to respond to surveys like this. Asking them to have to redo it probably is something that we want to avoid.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: If I may?

ALAN GREENBERG: Please, go ahead.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Alan and Thomas, I was actually ... My understanding had been that, Thomas, you were testing the functioning of the survey questions more than you were actually working on getting a complete set of answers yet. I understood that you had a testing community that basically was designed to still feed into how we designed the questions rather than starting to respond to the survey with the [inaudible] of getting all the responses on the substance.

---

THOMAS WALDNE: Correct.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Of course, we are already late on that. Correct, excellent. Well, then, I think we're still lined up with the need to use that tool. Lisa, whenever we can ... I think my understanding was that the questions were finalized and that we could go live, and then I got some more feedback from ICANN legal about a need to collect individual consent from everybody before we share the survey, which I have to say I'm a bit surprised about because we don't collect any personal data with the survey. So, now I have to ask consent for sending an e-mail to someone. That would be quite surprising and I don't think can be interpreted as a consequence of the GDPR.

ALAN GREENBERG: Everything is a consequence of GDPR.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Yes, company. But, as somebody who has spent some time on the GDPR, I now have to contact you every time I try and want to send you an e-mail before I send you an e-mail to ask whether I may send you an e-mail with a link to a survey which will not process any personal data of yours. I would find that shocking, to be frank.

I'm not sure where we stand on this, but I certainly do not think we need to send an individual e-mail to everyone to ask them whether we may send an e-mail on the survey. Maybe I'm misunderstanding things. But, Jean-Baptiste, I don't know if any of you can clarify what exactly it

---

is that legal expects us to do. I think all we should now do is actually circulate the link, because Thomas, unless you have further urgent feedback on how we should shape the questions, then I think we agreed on the last leadership call we were [inaudible] in view of the fact that we're already late and make sure we get the survey out now for actual responses.

THOMAS WALDEN:

I mean, we can send the link out and I can ask them to re-review them and send them back through the link and ask for the same ... The one good thing is they pretty much looked at it. They know what's kind of been asked. So, the turnaround shouldn't be that hard, but it's just asking them to do it again. We can send it out and try and see what we get back. I have no problem with that.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST:

Yeah. And if you have feedback now on the questions, then we can still integrate that. So, if they said this question makes no sense, if we already have that now, we can work that in. It's just we really should be doing that as soon as possible.

THOMAS WALDEN:

Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Alice or Jean-Baptiste, any idea about this issue of getting approval from legal?

---

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Thanks, Alan. I noted different concerns. I'm not sure we're in a position to answer on that, so [inaudible] legal department and get back to [inaudible] on that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Please.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Okay, thank you. And is there understanding that we should not go live with this until this is sorted or what is ... Because I [inaudible] as soon as we have this sorted out with the feedback on the questions themselves from Thomas's colleagues, I think we should circulate this to the stakeholders.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: What I'll do in the request is I'll ask them to reply urgently on this, so it doesn't impact your timeline.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Okay, so we will just ... Okay, thank you.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Thank you.

---

LISA PHIFER: This is Lisa, if I might.

ALAN GREENBERG: Please, go ahead.

LISA PHIFER: Because of the concern that was raised which I think is very valid that you really can't go back to the same subjects multiple times and ask them to redo surveys, it will save you time in the long run if this subgroup has an agreement in writing, even if it's not very long, just that you have written down what you see your process could be as you send a link to your colleagues. For example, what will you put in your invitation when you do your outreach to your colleagues asking them to respond, click on a link and respond to the survey? For example, what you'll tell them the purpose of the survey is and what will be done with their answers. Just a little bit of thinking around that to make sure that you all do your outreach the same way will probably save you time later on.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Lisa. Any further comments? Please go ahead.

THOMAS WALDEN: I was just saying thanks.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Any further comments on law enforcement needs? I don't see any hands. Then, the next one is consumer trust and I'll turn it over to Erika.

ERIKA MANN: Hi, Alan, everyone. So, let me ... I had some difficulty in getting the document to you. Apologies for this. There are some recent changes at Google which I haven't figured out why they make it so difficult in the moment. Anyhow, I have a professional Google service and I maybe have to check their changes, their recent changes. Maybe it relates to GDPR. Who knows?

Anyhow, you have to document now and I have to think in particular Lisa because she helped immensely. My time is at the moment under so much constraint. I really have to apologize.

Anyhow, most of it is done. I still have to add certain parts in relation to the discussion we had about resellers and whether resellers do have a policy vis-à-vis consumers which give the relevant information.

I checked in the meantime about 12 resellers, all the big ones, some of the smaller ones from different nationalities as well as long as I could read it in English and I must say there is no coherence at all. I started making some recommendations concerning this topic. I haven't totally figured out what is the best approach, so I'm looking into similar environments where one could learn from.

One approach would be that ICANN would make recommendations for resellers, what kind of information shall ideally be included, and there are different approaches as well which are possible. I don't think ICANN

---

has the power to put any conditions for resellers, but certainly can make recommendations, but that's an issue which I still have to work on a little bit more. Apologies to my subgroup as well because I never consulted you after the Brussels meeting. There's too much going on right now.

Anyhow, that's where we are, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Erika. Just a comment that ICANN can require that resellers do things by putting it in either through negotiation or PDP, by putting it in as a requirement in the RAA that registrars enforce certain things. We can pass that through, assuming we can put the appropriate text in.

ERIKA MANN:

But, I wonder if we can do this for ... Because it's practically a recommendation or requirement what kind of information concerning consumers must be included on their website, which is a little bit tricky and it affects so many different jurisdictions and some jurisdictions would be maybe not even allowed to put in such kind of requirement. I'm looking into it and searching for the best report, request – I mean, recommendation – certainly we can do. But, I'm not sure if we can go any further. But, your advice and the advice from everybody would be more than welcome.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah. It's something I have some knowledge of and I suspect Volker does as well. Perhaps we can work offline on that.



---

ERIKA MANN: That would be nice.

ALAN GREENBERG: Volker, please go ahead.

VOLKER GREIMANN: I'm just saying that I would be glad to help there as well. Our largest customer base is resellers and it's a tricky bunch, but somehow we always manage. So, if there is anything that I can help with, I'll be glad to do that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. There are certainly current rules in the RAA that resellers must do certain things that otherwise would've been the registrar's responsibility. So, some things may already fall under that blanket provision and other things may have to be put in specifically.

The wording I'm using in the recommendation I did on safeguarding data is that ICANN should do something, either through a negotiation or by initiating a PDP on the subject. That doesn't guarantee the outcome, but it says ICANN should take whatever actions it can to try to put this in place, even though we don't know which mechanism is the appropriate one.

---

ERIKA MANN: Thanks so much, Alan and Volker. I will look into this and it would be nice to have a discussion about this in an e-mail exchange. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: I believe I am on all of the ... I don't remember if I'm officially on that team, but I'm on all of the lists. Alright. The next item ... Any further comments on consumer trust? Then, the next and last item is safeguarding registrant data. I sent out a revised version to my subgroup yesterday and asked that they return, make any comments by the end of this week so I can get another version out to the subgroup for final approval. Hopefully, that will be done. That does include a draft resolution, which I think will be close to final. I may have missed something, but I think it's close. Any comments? I see no hands. Then, I think we are finished with this subject and we will go on to the next item, which is face-to-face meeting in Brussels. I'll turn it over to Alice or Jean-Baptiste I think. Cannot hear whoever is speaking, if they're speaking.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Thank you, Alan. We are happy to confirm that, based on the last Doodle poll, the [inaudible] members in Brussels are on the 19<sup>th</sup> of July and the 20<sup>th</sup> of July and that's a Thursday and Friday. So, we have sent this information to the travel services, so you should be receiving [inaudible] anytime soon for this meeting.

---

ALAN GREENBERG:                   Excellent. Any questions? By the way, Chris had originally said he could not make the Friday and he said he would rearrange his schedule to be there for both days. Presuming he manages to do that. Erika?

ERIKA MANN:                        I might have to be in the US at the time. I'm trying to find a way of making it possible to be in Brussels, but at this time, I can't promise it. I hope to have clarity in about a week.

ALAN GREENBERG:                   That's fine. We understand. There were no dates that everyone could guaranteed make it at this point.

ERIKA MANN:                        I know.

ALAN GREENBERG:                   Anyone else have any comments? I checked reservations yesterday and there's one more seat left at the lowest price, so hopefully that invitation will get to me soon. Any further comments?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ:        Volker's hand is up.

ALAN GREENBERG:                   Sorry, I didn't see that. Volker?

---

VOLKER GREIMANN: No. I would just throw a comment it's final. Looking forward to seeing that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Remind me, I thought Cathrin said she could not make it for the Friday. Did that get changed? I believe that was changed, though. Is that correct?

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Yes, that's correct. I can be there.

ALAN GREENBERG: Good. Excellent. Alright. Next agenda item, then, if there's nothing else on the face-to-face is ICANN 62, another relatively short item. We have a deadline for the description of two days from now and I believe we have a draft ... I did some suggested modification to the description and it's on the screen now. Essentially, what I did is took out the things like the bylaw number, which I didn't think anyone is really going to care about and tried to streamline the work so it's a little bit more understandable. I did add in one of the critical things that is assess the implementation of WHOIS1, which hadn't been included in that, and yet that's the bulk of our work.

So, if people can take a quick look at that, we have two days to finalize it. I'm sure there's some tweaking that can be done to it, but I'm feeling

---

comfortable and I hope if one or two other people say, “Yes, that looks good,” we’ll just publish it.

I would’ve preferred to put in this description to lead off with assessing the recommendations of the first WHOIS review instead of what the other items ... Essentially, take them in the order that we’re looking at them. But, I couldn’t figure out a way to easily word that to say that because it turns out the bylaws are not very explicit on that. If someone can figure out a way, staff or Lisa, to invert those, I think that would be useful because a lot of our work is going to focus on the review part, not the new items. Other than that, I feel moderately comfortable and I think with a little bit more tweaking we’ll get it done. Anyone have any comments?

CARLTON SAMUELS: If you add a sentence to say that particularly our [inaudible], particularly the implementation of [inaudible] that the first WHOIS recommended.

ALAN GREENBERG: it is there, but it’s at the end of the sentence.

CARLTON SAMUELS: I noticed that. That’s why I’m saying I would change it and take that sentence, put a ...

ALAN GREENBERG: How about this, Carlton? We put a period after bylaws.

CARLTON SAMUELS: That's right.

ALAN GREENBERG: And say this includes the part about the assessment of WHOIS1 and then follow it with the other ones.

CARLTON SAMUELS: That's exactly like I'm suggesting. Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: That would work well. If someone could do a pass on that and send it by us for a last review, I think we may be close. So, if Jean-Baptiste or someone could do that, I'd appreciate it.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Will do.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. We also have a description ... The first cut at the text to be provided and I believe we had a ... I won't say volunteer, but I believe staff which I presume is a combination of Jean-Baptiste and Lisa will put a first cut of slides together for our comments. Anything else on this agenda item? Then we get to the interesting one, and that is the short-term options to address the timeline for specific reviews.

---

Where we are is I had made a request that the description be changed. This is the short-term options for the RDS review. That is, the options are A) leave everything alone B) restrict the review to only the assessment of WHOIS1 and option C) pause everything until some unforeseen time in the future.

There were a number of errors and implications there. First of all, the document said we have decided to defer GDPR issues and that is not the case. I got confirmation that that could be changed.

The budget numbers I believe do not fairly represent the situation. The estimate for fiscal year 19 is way, way above anything we're likely to spend at this point.

I don't see any potential and if anyone thinks I'm wrong, please speak up. I don't see us contracting with an outside organization for any studies at this point. Initially, we had been told that effectively a drop-dead date was January and we certainly didn't take any action, and I haven't heard any discussion in these reviews that we may want to contract some workout. If that's wrong, I guess someone should speak up quickly. But, there's a \$200,000 item in the budget for that.

The travel expenses that are being predicted for next year would be sufficient at our current spend rate for about five face-to-face meetings next fiscal year, which I cannot see happening.

So, I think the budget for next year is way over and I believe we really need a statement on how we did on our budget this year and I have not gotten from ICANN ... I have not found out what the fiscal year budget was for fiscal year 18 for this review team, and I will ask through Jean-

---

Baptiste and Alice, please, we need that number. Finance must've had some number to put in the budget and I'd like to know what the number is so we can compare our expenses with what was predicted for last year.

Curiously, although ICANN never does multi-year budgeting and has regularly said they cannot do multi-year budgeting, review teams are provided with a multi-year budget. That is, the numbers you see in our fact sheet is a multi-year number. But, they have to have broken it down per year and I would really like to know what it is.

If we are going to continue with these comments, if the public comment will stay open, then I believe we must get these numbers corrected and the rest of the details corrected so people have an opportunity to comment on reality and not some theoretical image of where we were going. That's number one.

Theresa Swineheart has, however, offered, should we choose, at our request to simply close down the RDS part of this public comment. Essentially, say the review team has requested that we not continue with it. Whatever statement we make would be published and they would be told to simply refer to the review team if anyone has any questions or concerns.

Chris sent an e-mail just before this meeting which people may have seen expressing some concern that, if we do that, we may be subject to criticism that is the review team is refusing to allow the community to comment on what they're doing. I think he's correct that we may well be subject to that.



---

The downside of continuing the comment, even if we correct the data, is it is quite possible that some people will comment based on the old data, and what happens if for instance we are told the community has generally weighed in and said we should stop the review?

At that point, we will have a draft report ready. Are we really going to honor the community input and stop, even though we're just about ready to go out with a draft report? That seems like a rather waste of our time.

So, I guess I'd like to get some input from the rest of the community. We have to make a decision quickly to either ask ICANN to make the changes or to ask them to pull us out of the public comment. I see Stephanie has her hand up. Please, Stephanie, go ahead.

STEPHANNIE PERRIN:

Thanks very much, Alan. The whole budgetary thing is something that I had not turned my head to and I'm kind of shocked that there would be such bad data out there. I mean, there's no way we're going to be having five face-to-face meetings. Who's in control of the budget? Who came up with the budget?

To be judged on a budget for which we don't actually exercise control strikes me as beyond ridiculous and reinforces the point that I tried to make in Brussels, that these review teams are at a very rudimentary level in terms of their efficacy as review instruments. It's not clear what they are. They're neither fish nor fowl, and if we don't even control the budget, how on Earth can we act responsibly?

---

Having said that, the very idea that the reviewed entity can reach out and stop a review in midstream after we've already spent a large chunk of what I would've thought was the budget is ridiculous on two grounds. One, procedurally in terms of wasting money, and secondly of course, at a fundamental level, the reviewed entity cannot stop a review.

I don't know what the board, the CEO, whoever cooked this up was thinking, but I think we need to respond very strongly to it and point this out.

Now, unfortunately, with no reply comments, we're going to have to live with the fact that people are going to be responding to the original numbers. That should ... We should get the commenting quickly so that, fortunately, if a few people read those comments they will factor it into their own comments. We can also take it back to our own communities who presumably are going to comment on this. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah. Thank you, Stephanie. I see I have some hands up, but a couple of clarifications I think are important. The issue of budget control I think is a critical one. It's only recently that ICANN has asked volunteers to take control of any budgets. The first time it ever happened was the CCWG Accountability.

I'm fine with that, but I also agree that we should be involved in setting the budget, and unfortunately that is purely a staff function. I've made that clear and I think we will reiterate that. But, that's not today's battle.

---

If the comment is going to stay open, then in my mind, ICANN has to change the documentation that's out there. It's not just our comment that will make it clear. But, that doesn't of course people read the new version. So, we will have to live that some people may not. And you're right, us going back to our communities may well be a mandatory part of that.

But, the real question today is do we exercise Theresa's offer and simply shut it down or do we not? If we keep the public comment open and the community says pause it or scrap half of it, whichever, they cannot do that. This group is the only group that can shut us down. We can shut ourselves down. We are volunteers and we can say we're finished and we're not publishing a report. If we get a community request to shut us down or to change our scope, it is still our call whether we follow it or not.

So, if we feel that it would be stupid because we only have three more minutes work to do, we can just ignore it. That is within our mandate. So, just to be clear on those points. Susan, please go ahead.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: I think Erika had her hand up first. She's in the chat.

ALAN GREENBERG: Erika. Fine. Go ahead.

---

ERIKA MANN: Thank you, Susan. I'm fine whoever goes first. I believe we should shut it down. There is no reason to keep it running. It makes everything complicated. It costs more time and more effort, even more money, and there is no reason for it, so why shouldn't we ...

ALAN GREENBERG: Erika, please, shut down the review team or shut down the public comment?

ERIKA MANN: Shut down the public comment. This was your question. Sorry. This was your question. Shut down the public comment. It makes no sense. I mean, I looked at it from all angles, but looking at even Chris's comments. I sent him a quite note and he replied to it. And Theresa's comment. It makes no sense. It's much better we justify and when we sent a comment, why we believe the public comment period shall be shut down. We explain. We give a justification. It's much better even for the public to understand our reasoning. I believe it's better for the whole of the organization to prevent similar things happening again in the future. Happy to go more into details, but I believe it's .... Yeah.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Erika. I will note that if we say we do not believe the public comment should be continued we will be under extreme pressure to make our deadlines. Saying we're going to almost be finished by July so we should shut the public comment down and then not making that target is something we would not want to ... It's a situation we would

---

not want to be in. I'm comfortable that we're not going to be. Susan, please go ahead.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Alan, can you just add me to the queue?

ALAN GREENBERG: Sure.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: I agree with Erika that we should just ask the RDS Review Team to be removed from the public comment, and then take the action that everybody has the responsibility to go back to their own communities and really explain this. I think we should add an explanation or address it in the Panama meeting when we have our, not face-to-face but our community session, so that people have a time to address it with us and we also can show everybody the reasoning for it.

I think we should also correct the record with our comment, but there is ... For an entity to shut down an independent review, or attempt to, is a bigger issue than us pushing back and saying, "No, you can't do that." So, we need to be prepared with all the right responses, but we should not go along with this and see what the community says because then that puts us in a worse situation.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Carlton next.

---

CARLTON SAMUELS:

I want to echo Erika and Susan. Susan said everything that I had listed. Just to reiterate, we should just remove from the public comment. The larger issue is that we should resist this idea that an independent review can be shut down by the entity. That is something that we should not [inaudible]. We should take an opportunity to have the record corrected in terms of the budget and all those things.

We should also develop a text to explain why we take the position at the 62 meeting in Panama, and since all of the SOs ACs most of them are represented on this review team, it is in our interest to message back to our [inaudible] organizations and let them know what we are thinking, even before we go public. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Carlton. Just to be clear, this public comment could not shut us down. This is asking for input from the community. We would then have to make the decision to agree and honor that comment or decide not to. So, it is not a case of them shutting us down. It's a case of our shutting us down based on the solicitation of public input. Just to be clear. Cathrin, please?

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST:

Yes. Thank you, Alan. I agree with Susan and Erika who have already said that it would not be useful to stop the review now and I would agree with requesting to have this removed from the public comment period that is now ongoing.

---

I just note, also in response to Chris's concerns which I think are valid, that we are not withdrawing from public comment and public viewing of what we're doing, but rather we're asking for comments on what we've been asked to do, rather than without any indication from the community that such a consultation is needed, subjecting ourselves to a consultation that we as a review team should shut down or pause or redo our scope. I really do not see a purpose in that, and I don't think that there's any clash between us continuing our work and making sure that everything we do is subject to public scrutiny as it should be. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. That's something good to note, that everything we do is going to be subject to public scrutiny. I think the next person we have is Stephanie.

STEPHANIE PERRIN:

Thanks. Apologies. I didn't disentangle the two ideas sufficiently when I spoke. I do think that if we ask to be removed from this public comment on the validity of having these reviews, we are missing an opportunity to push back very strongly against what I consider ... As you know, I've been pretty lackadaisical about how much worth we're getting out of this review. Yes, we should review what happened in the first WHOIS review, but given the chaos, I understand that there might be a view that we're not doing work that is particularly relevant. Not a view that I totally share, be assured.

---

However, to just say, “Please exempt us. We’re nearly done,” misses the opportunity because we are the review that is in progress. I think it’s outrageous for the community to be consulted about the validity of closing down an ongoing review. I think that is a separate issue, and you have to examine what would be the effect of just quietly allowing management to retreat from its request to get community input on shutting us down in mid-review. I know that’s a long, backwards sentence, but I hope you understood what I mean.

Absolutely we continue working, but to ask to be removed from this, I think it will be viewed as self-serving, and it also misses an opportunity to push back very strongly about what I think is the major issue here. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Stephanie, I’m afraid I’m not clear. Can you be specific? Are you suggesting that we exercise Theresa’s offer and ask to have us removed from this public comment or are you suggesting that we continue in the public comment and receive the input from the community?

STEPHANIE PERRIN:

I’m suggesting that we absolutely keep in the public comment and that we put a very forceful comment that it is outrageous to try to stop a review in mid tracks, and the very thought that they’re making this move, if we ask for us to be removed and say, “Hey, we’re nearly done,” that ignores the big issue here. Thank you.



---

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Stephanie, to be clear, none of the options are to stop the review. It is to either reduce the scope or pause the review. Let's be clear on the terminology. And the decision to do either of those would be this review team's. So, it is not an action of the community or staff, or the board for that matter, to actually do it. It would have to be we concur. But, nevertheless, you are saying stay in the review. So, you are stating opposite to what everyone else has said so far. I have Erika next.

ERIKA MANN: Just a tiny point. If I understood Stephanie correctly, she is worried that we are not able to raise our concerns with the process, and if we continue with our review and don't allow the public comment period to [inaudible] forward. I would argue, Stephanie, actually, we can in requesting us to be taken out and continue in our work, I would argue we actually can make the point and can give good reasoning why we argue for not having the public comment period.

So, the point, if I understood you right, you are concerned about – and I share these points – we could actually explain [inaudible] short argument or short document we would have to send anyhow to ICANN.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. We have Volker next.

VOLKER GREIMANN: Yes. Thank you, Alan. I agree with Stephanie's sentiment that there should be some pushback against the process here and that we should make a very forcible statement.

---

That said, I also agree with what you said, Alan, that it is us that have to shut this down or pause it, as you say. The longer it's paused, the more the shut down will be a status quo, I think.

However, we are all here sent as representatives of our individual communities and if the people that sent us here, basically, say that we have no job doing the job that we're doing that we've been originally sent to do by them, then it's going to be a bit harder for us to make that decision, even though we're free to do so.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah. I think if it came to that, we would have to make a decision at that time and I certainly ... If our work is largely done, except for accepting comments from the public comments and incorporating them, I would be very reluctant to shut it down at that point and toss that work away, certainly, regardless of what the public comment said.

But, just to be clear, in my mind, making a forceful statement against this process – that is, this came out and hit us blindsided without any knowledge it was coming, without any consultation, without any consultation on could we reduce the budget size to a more manageable number, because the budget is what is driven this whole thing. I think we are going to make that protest regardless of which way we go. So, I don't think the protest is the question. The question is do we exercise Theresa's offer and say take us out or do we not?

I am hearing, I believe, from Susan, Carlton, Cathrin, Erika, and I think Volker but I'm not sure that we should proceed with the review, but make sure that we make a protest – sorry, we should not be subject to

---

this review, but we need to protest the process that led to it. I'm not sure if Stephanie agrees with that as well. Cathrin, please go ahead.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Sorry. I don't want to take anybody's place, but can you put me in the queue unless I am the only one?

ALAN GREENBERG: You're the first one in the queue right now.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Okay, thank you. Just to say that I agree that it would be useful to refer to this inauspicious process. I'm not sure we need to really be extremely belligerent about it, but I certainly think it would be useful to put in a reference as well, and as I understand Theresa's mail, our response would be published, so it has the same effect as a public comment because it will be visible to everyone and there will be a change to the public comment scope because of our comments.

So, I think in terms of the prominence of our intervention, if anything will be more visible, it will already be already out there as the first public comment on this.

And in terms of going back to our communities, I fully agree with Volker. And we did go back to the GAC. I spoke to the GAC leadership last week and briefed them on this whole series of events and they are fully in line with what we've proposed to do. So, at least from the GAC I can say that they haven't changed their mind about our participation in this review

---

and continue to consider this a useful exercise within the scope that we've defined together.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Stephanie, you had your hand up but it's now down. Do you still want to speak?

VOLKER GREIMANN: I have my hand up.

ALAN GREENBERG: Volker, you're after Stephanie at this point.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: I think you've summarized what I think. As I've written in the chat, it's very important that the decision-making here and the attempt to shut us down does not disappear from the record. That's one of the things I'm worried about in terms of just quietly removing us from this process. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: We can certainly submit our letter or something comparable to the public comment where it's a permanent record, in addition to writing to Theresa. Volker?

---

VOLKER GREIMANN:

Thanks, Alan. Just one minor comment. You're right that I'm personally very much in favor of having this resolved rather quickly and without any fuss. The offer from Theresa is tempting, but I'm not quite sure what the public perception piece would look like if we first are part of that review and then taken off again. How would that be perceived by parties within ICANN that would be eager to comment or that have some reasons for wanting that to be part of the comment period and how do we react to that?

So, if we took it back, asked to be taken off, would it be seen as some backhanded attempt to circumvent something, some part of the process? I'm not sure how that would look in the public perception piece.

If I had some more visibility of how the politics of it would look, how the removal would play out, then I would be very much in favor of that. If not, I would be more cautious, just to make sure that we avoid the perception of any malpractice or backroom deals.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah. Thank you. Let me be rather blunt, having been the point person on the At-Large review that is currently subject to a significant amount of criticism. There are people who are going to say that by asking us to be taken out we are simply trying to avoid having criticism lobbed at us that we know is going to be coming and we are taking an unreasonable act in doing that. There will be such comments. Hopefully, if each of us go back to our communities, our communities themselves will not say

---

that. But, there's no question individuals are going to say it. That's the decision we're making.

As Chris pointed out, that is an issue. We do have to be sensitive to it. What I'm hearing from at least five of the people I think on this call so far is that that be damned. It is a better process to be taken out and subject to that criticism than to leave it open. But, clearly, each of us have to weigh in. Erika, please go ahead.

ERIKA MANN:

Thank you, Alan. Yeah. I would support your argument because I believe if we would not ask to be taken out, it would be even more problematic to justify this because it's not just that we are close in finalizing the report. We invested time. We invested money. And there is no logical argument in being taken out right now.

Now, there are arguments Stephanie referred to which have a different [inaudible] because of different policies which need to be taken in the future in consideration, but they do not relate to the current WHOIS system, and the current evaluation of the current WHOIS system is part of the process. So, it's not like somebody could come and say just skip it because something new happened. You can't do this in legal environment or you couldn't do this in policy environment, neither.

So, our argument is much more process-oriented. It's time-oriented and it's money-oriented. So, I can see, yes, there will be some people criticizing us, but I have more the feeling they would be criticizing us even more if we would not ask for this. That's my feeling.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Alright. We haven't heard from Thomas and Lili. I know both Thomas and Lili are less integrated into the politics of ICANN, but I really would like to know: do you have an opinion or are you willing to go with the majority of the rest on whether we ask to be withdrawn from this public comment or simply ... With a protest over how it came about and the process follows or simply ask for the information to be corrected that misrepresents us? If either of you have a thought, I would appreciate hearing it. Lili, go ahead, and then Thomas.

LILI SUN;

Yes. I still reserve my stance that [inaudible] in the message I sent out before. As an independent review team, I would insist that we can go ahead with the review unless we were informed by ICANN that this review should be narrowed down the scope or hold on for a little bit. Unless we are informed, we shouldn't stop. [inaudible] stand. And for the public comment, it's another policy issue which initiated by ICANN and unless ICANN can justify the public comments collected to the review team [inaudible], I don't think that we are necessary to be involved in the process. That's what I'm thinking.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah. Remember, we're not being told to shut down [inaudible]. The community is being asked whether they think we should or not. The question is do we want to continue with that process to ask the community whether they want to weigh in on this now or not? I think

---

I'm hearing you say that we do not want the community to be asked this. Is that correct?

LILI SUN:

No. I don't think so. Actually, the public comment was an initiative by ICANN and it must be some policy rules within ICANN for the public comment. I believe ICANN Org as a whole is in the position to take or not take the public comment. So, we are entitled by ICANN bylaw as an independent review team. I don't think there is any confliction between our duties or responsibilities with public comment. So, if ICANN wants to take a step further, like to narrow down the scope or hold down the whole review, there should be justification provided by ICANN.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Now, to be clear, we are the only ones who could do that. We may choose to take the input from the public comment into account if we make that decision, but there is no question that we are the only ones who could actually shut it down or change the scope. Thomas, do you want to weigh in?

THOMAS WALDEN:

Being new to this and listening to all the viewpoints, I feel that we should continue with what we're doing because I was glad to hear you say we are the ones to ultimately make that call, and include of course the public's view on where this needs to go, too, if that makes sense.



---

ALAN GREENBERG:                    Okay. So, you're saying we should maintain. The comment which is currently open we should keep open to see if the community has any input for us.

THOMAS WALDEN:                    Correct.

ALAN GREENBERG:                    Okay. I see a hand up from Erika. Not a new hand?

ERIKA MANN:                         No, it's an old one. Apologies.

ALAN GREENBERG:                    Okay. Alright. At this point, we have what I believe is a majority of this group and there is one person not in attendance on this call, who is saying that we should request that the public comment be withdrawn. That is, we have at this point Stephanie, Susan, Carlton, Cathrin, Erika, and I also believe that. That implies we may be subject to some criticism, that we have shut down a public comment, but I believe that in light of our progress at this point, it would be inappropriate.

Now, there are several reasons that I'll add to this. Number one, option number C was the review team should stop work after the April face-to-face meeting. Now, clearly, we will only get the public comment at the end of July. The concept of having an option saying we should have shut down in April but only telling us that in July in my mind makes

---

absolutely no sense. We don't have a time machine and we can't predict what the outcome will be. So, that option was worded exceedingly improperly.

The second part is a large premise of the request to ask should we take any of these actions is GDPR. We said in our terms of reference that we may choose to defer some things for a little while because of GDPR, but my analysis right now is that although by the time we report, and certainly by the time we have a draft report, we may know what the details of the GDPR implementation are. We may or we may not. But, we will certainly not have had time to understand the implications of this and that's probably going to take a good six months, a year, two years, to understand what the real implications are.

So, I do not believe it's within the scope of this review team to analyze the implications of GDPR and see whether there are any further requests, further recommendations, we make. Is there anyone who disagrees with that analysis? Does anyone believe we will understand not only the details of GDPR but the implications of it in time to incorporate that into our report?

If you're all generally in agreement, then GDPR really is a red herring and yes we may have to have some words on GDPR, but we are certainly not going to be able to analyze the impact of GDPR. Any comments on that or is there general agreement? Because if there is general agreement on that, then it makes the whole argument a lot easier. Go ahead, Cathrin.

---

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Sorry to rain on the party, but I do think that for the law enforcement that the survey does aim to do some moderate assessment of whatever is the immediate impact of the changes made with a view to compliance with GDPR. So, there, we do have some data. Of course, it won't be comprehensive and I agree with you that we won't have understood the overall ins and outs and [there will be changes] to the policy, so it's just sort of taking stock of where we stand now after GDPR has come into force.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, and that's fine because it's not delaying the work.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: That's right. No delay to the work. It's just something that you take into consideration based on the results of the survey. So, that's okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. We know that law enforcement is going to have a harder time and that safeguarding and registrant's data will be more protected. Yes, we know that. We don't understand the full implications of it, perhaps, but we certainly know that. There's no way those two things are not going to be true, but that doesn't delay our process. We can make that assessment today without waiting for GDPR to have been around for six months or a year.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Yes, indeed. Sorry, I misunderstood that part.

ALAN GREENBERG: I wasn't saying don't mention the words. I'm just saying the concept that we will have to defer work for many months, therefore we should pause the review, I don't think holds water.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: No.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright. I think we have a recommendation here. I will try to craft something in conjunction with Susan and Cathrin and get it out to the review team as soon as humanly possible or maybe a little bit slower than that.

Where else are we on the agenda? That is the end of our agenda and we are two minutes over the time, so I will go to Jean-Baptiste to confirm any actions and decisions reached.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Thank you, Alan. So, on action items, I have [inaudible]. ICANN Org to relay questions and concerns on collecting consent for entering the law enforcement survey which were raised by Cathrin.

---

ICANN Org to update [inaudible] description based on input received from Carlton and Alan and [inaudible] version for approval to the review team.

ICANN Org to confirm how much is budgeted for FY18 and then, Alan, you will draft a response based on the input received on the [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG:

Sounds good to me. Any comments? Hearing nothing, seeing nothing, thank you all for a great meeting. Thank you, all, for great participation and attendance and see each other on the lists. We'll meet again next Monday. Thank you, all.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST:

Thank you, all. Bye.

CARLTON SAMUELS:

Thank you, all. Bye, all.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**