
BRENDA BREWER:

Hello, everyone. This is Brenda speaking for the record. Welcome to the RDS WHOIS2 Plenary Call #30 on 4 June 2018 at 15:00 UTC. Attending the call today is Alan, Carlton, Cathrin, Chris, Lili, Susan, Volker. We have no observers at this time. From ICANN Organization, Alice, Jean-Baptiste, Lisa, Steve, Amy, Trang, and Brenda. Apologies from Dmitry and Erika.

Today's call is being recorded. May I please remind you to state your name before speaking for the transcript, and I'll turn the call over to you, Alan. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. First of all, are there any changes to statements of interest? Hearing nothing, seeing nothing, we will go on to the agenda, if we could put the agenda up on the screen, please. We have short-term options, face-to-face, subgroup status, ICANN 62, and any other business. Is there anyone who believes we need to change this, add anything, or have any other business? Then the agenda is accepted as displayed and we'll go on to the first item, and that is short-term options.

A financial justification or financial explanation of where we believe we are – at least where I believe we are – and I haven't gotten any negative comments other than one from Erika, which she then corrected. I also sent out a draft letter. At this point, the question is: is there anyone who believes that the letter should not be sent? And presuming that we do not have a majority of people in that position since last week we had

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.

very good attendance and we had a decision to proceed with the letter, the question is: is the letter acceptable at this point? Do we need any changes? I'll open the floor if anyone wants to make any comments. Other than Susan saying thank goodness we're back on Adobe. Carlton's microphone looks like he's talking, but I don't hear any voice.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Are you hearing me now, Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: We can hear you now.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Okay. I am saying that the letter as we presented is fine and I think we should move it forward and send it [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much, Carlton. I see Susan's hand is up.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: So, long comment, but you referenced ten members, but actually we have eleven, right, with Chris?

ALAN GREENBERG: Chris is not technically a member, and I believe Chris is taking the position that he does not participate in decisions. Chris may speak up if he wishes. He's on the call, but I think that was the position he took. As

the person who has to at times judge what we are producing, I believe Chris said he did not want to participate in decisions. I'm happy to record or not record his position on this if he chooses to give it. Lisa says Chris is listed as a member. Chris? Is Chris here?

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

I'm here. Yes, yes. I just typed into the chat. Yes, I am a member, but I am not going to participate in the decision-making process because I just don't think that's appropriate. I mean, I'll express an opinion if I want to and I already have, in the case of the letter, but it's not appropriate for me to be participating in the decision-making process.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Alright. I will update the letter to cover that. I thought as a liaison you were not technically a member if we used the same definition of liaisons to the board. I guess we don't have to use the same definitions.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

No. I'm not sure that I am a liaison. Anyway, who cares? I am what I am. That's all there is to it.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. I will make sure that you are not recorded as having participated even though you did give us an opinion and I will change whatever words to make it right. Cathrin has her hand up. Susan, I presume you were finished.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Cathrin, please go ahead.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Thank you, Alan. Hi, this is Cathrin. I hope you can hear me.

ALAN GREENBERG: We can.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: I just have a really small point for the letter. Thank you so much for preparing that. I just wanted to add one small point on the savings because what I am just realizing reading this is if really the idea is to pause the review team, then there wouldn't be any savings, per se. It would just be deferred spending, and that might be something to highlight, unless I'm misunderstanding pause and what really is meant is cancel the review. My understanding was they were thinking of a true pause.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. They were talking only about fiscal year 19. So, you are correct. There would be a cost, and in fact the cost would be greater if we paused for fiscal year 19 and restarted in fiscal year 20. There would

certainly be a significant. I can't say exactly how much, but a significant increase in cost because of work that would have to be replicated and new people gotten up to speed, new staff, whatever. If people feel I should mention that, then certainly we can add that.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: I think it's a pretty obvious argument, maybe in addition to the very good ones you've already added. I would be in favor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. I'll add something about that. So, essentially, a comment on the impact of pausing on fiscal year 20. The whole pause, since they said we should pause in April, and they'll make that decision in July, was somewhat moot to begin with. But, I have no problem adding that. Carlton, were you ... Oh, sorry, Cathrin, go ahead. I thought you were finished.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Yes. Just to say could we have a bullet point, the one that starts "The public comment is due to close" where you make that argument about how it's actually asking for a pause to start before it closes? So it makes [inaudible] already. And you already said there in the second to last sentence by that time the work will have been done and to scrap part of it or pause for a year implies much of that work will have to largely be repeated again later, and then you could just add potentially at a significantly greater expense or something like that. That might be an easy way to fit it in. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Got it.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Cathrin actually said what I was going to say, Alan, that the pause they ask for is a moot argument [inaudible] last year. I would just add to the last sentence a little piece that says potentially it could have added expenses in fiscal year 20. That could take care of it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Noted. I'll note on a personal note actually having to write fiscal year 20 since we're 20% into the 21st Century already, it's scary.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Anyone else? I'm hearing no negative comments. I have had two suggestions for changes and I'm quite happy to put both of them in. Do you want me to just send it or put this final version out for a 24-hour call for approval?

CARLTON SAMUELS: Send it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Send it? Okay, done.

CARLTON SAMUELS: That's my feeling.

ALAN GREENBERG: Susan agrees. Lili is agreeing. No one is disagreeing. We've made a decision. Next item on the agenda. Thank you very much for that. It's really nice to have a group that can make decisions.

Next item on the agenda, please. I need to figure out what the agenda is because I don't have it in front of me.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Face-to-face meeting.

ALAN GREENBERG: Face-to-face meeting.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, please, go ahead.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Sorry. Just before we move on, could you please recap the two action items that were identified on the modifications to the letter, please?

ALAN GREENBERG: Can identify the action items? Is that what you said? Yes. We'll put a reference in to increase cost post fiscal year 19, if there were to be a pause. That's number one. And number two correct the wording where it says ten working group members to reflect the fact that Chris is a member, but not to imply that he is formally voted.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright. We have gone from what was an amazing feat that we had. I think almost everyone participating in the face-to-face and now we have a situation where due to a change in work commitments Cathrin cannot be there and we are looking at whether there is an option which will be better or at least something. Can I be reminded from staff, did we in fact have everyone at the face-to-face that we were planning on the 19th and 20th? If not, who was missing?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Alan, on the 19th and 20th, I believe Erika wasn't [inaudible] this week whether she could attend. Thomas was unavailable for that meeting. And that's it, I believe. Brenda, please correct if this is wrong, but that was my assumption.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, so we had nine of the eleven people in attendance, plus staff. Alright. I haven't attempted to try to put down on a piece of paper the status of the other people. Has anyone on staff done that and can we get a summary of where we are and who do we not know about for the options of the 23rd, 24th or 24th, 25th? I know several people have said they're available for one or both and I haven't ... At this point, I haven't had a chance to try to try to compile them together. Are we in a position where anyone can state where we are and is there a chance that we could move the meeting and have better attendance? Chris said he cannot make the 23rd. He could make the 24th, 25th. I'll not that is not a weekend, so it makes travel more expensive. Not expensive, but more work days away. Yes, Jean-Baptiste, please.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yes. I just wanted to jump on that on the dates that were suggested. We quickly looked at who would be available [inaudible] and it looks like our IT is not available to conduct that meeting, [inaudible] easier on the two sets of dates. The other issue is that we don't know whether the meetings team could support it either. That's the first update.

So, if everyone wants to proceed with those dates, we will need to add them for confirmation.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright. When you say the meetings team, I'm not sure what their involvement is other than ...

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: That's for meeting support, technical support.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. You listed technical support separately. That's why I wasn't quite sure. You said technical support is not available.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yeah, exactly. If you recall, when we looked at the 19th and the 20th, we had our IT was in Brussels. We could help support that meeting.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright. Now, what are the implications of not having IT support? Does that mean we cannot hold it, we take a chance that something doesn't work? I'm not sure I understand the implications.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Remote persons would not be available, for one.

ALAN GREENBERG: Would not be available, which technically is a showstopper, although we tend not to have very much remote participation.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Alice, do you want to jump in?

ALICE JANSEN: Thank you, Jean-Baptiste. So, just to clarify, as you may recall from the first Doodle poll, the meetings team was not available on the 24th and the 25th, but was available at the time on the 25th of July through August the 1st. So, we did publish a Doodle with those dates. Then it was decided that we should probably [inaudible] the week before, which the meetings team couldn't do at the time, but we asked our tech support in Brussels if he could help us out, which he gracefully accepted.

But, now, we are in a situation where the tech support is not available on the 24th and 25th which leaves us with 25th and August the 1st as potential timeframe that could work, but we will need to check with meetings team if that's still available, if that makes sense.

And as Carlton highlighted, if you don't have tech support there, then that means you have no remote participation.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Are we allowed to have a meeting without remote participation?

ALICE JANSEN: I believe per Terms of Reference that you wish to be transparent with all your [inaudible] and decisions and so on, so my recommendation would be to have remote participation.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Let me try to summarize. It's hard working without any visuals at all. Which dates are you saying might be possible? I thought I just heard the 25th, which I thought you said 25th is not possible.

ALICE JANSEN: At the time when we looked at the dates initially, 25th through August the 1st was possible for meetings team, but now if you want to explore those dates, we need to go back to them and say, "Are you still available?"

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. But, the 24th is not available and we are looking for a two-day meeting.

ALICE JANSEN: Not available.

ALAN GREENBERG: And we are looking for a two-day meeting. That implies the 25th, 26th and I believe that changes the picture significantly if I remember correctly. Okay. So, a meeting on the 24th, 25th is possible for everyone except Thomas and Volker. Thomas is pretty well unavailable for almost any date we looked at if I remember correctly, however. And Cathrin is unavailable on the 26th I believe. Is that correct?

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: I'm available I believe also on the 26th. Let me just check.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Is there anyone else on this call ...

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: No, sorry. I'm available until the 25th included.

ALAN GREENBERG: The 25th, but not the 26th.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Yes, but if I'm the only obstacle, I can try to find other options. I'm the one causing all this rescheduling anyway, so if we do it, I'll try and find some option.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright. There's been a bunch of chat things. Does it look like the 25th, 26th is viable for other people on this call? Lili says ... Volker says the 24th, 25th will not ... Volker, will the 25th, 26th work for you?

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: He says on Adobe it's difficult.

VOLKER GREIMANN: Yes, I have a board meeting at Nominet on the 24th, which means I basically ... The only option would be to either fly from London directly to Brussels, which could work. I have to reschedule a couple of flights

for that. Or to come in the morning at Brussels which would mean that I wouldn't be able to be there before noon. Difficult doesn't mean impossible. It's just going to be difficult.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: If it's in London, you can take the Eurostar and be there very early.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think there's a 7:00 AM flight also, but I'm not sure about that.

VOLKER GREIMANN: If I have to go from Brussels to here, it's a weird flight time.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Chris is suggesting that if staff is available we do a Doodle. At this point, as far as I know, we only have two people who have [inaudible] tickets, so the change fees will not be exorbitant. I guess let's proceed on that point. Let's see if the 25th, 26th can work and to what extent we can make it work. If I could ask people to complete that Doodle really, really quickly ... Alice, how quickly do you think you'll have an answer from the meetings team?

ALICE JANSEN: Hopefully today. And the other item I forgot to mention, Jean-Baptiste is on a well-deserved vacation that week, so we will lose Jean-Baptiste. I just want to [inaudible] that. That means we potentially will need to fly in some help to have a full support team.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, understood. Alright. Once the Doodle is out, can you reach out to people one by one and try to get it completed as soon as possible?

ALICE JANSEN: Yes. We'll work with Brenda to make sure everyone responds.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. I did have one comment on the letter, if we can go back to the previous agenda. I was going to suggest that we add an extra \$10,000 to the contingency and bring the total cost up to \$300 from \$290. That was prompted by just this discussion of extra costs that we may bear because of various things. So, I'm going to suggest that. If anyone has any problem with that, let me know. That's a third item that we're changing in the letter. That is, adding another \$10,000. Alright. Next agenda item is ...

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: The subgroup status update.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. Subgroup status. Let us pull up a chart on that. We have at this point one report that has been sent to the subgroup, to the plenary, and there are several others which are very, very close. I haven't counted them at this point, but I'm guessing at least four or five of them are close enough that I don't foresee major significant changes between now and them going to the plenary. Would you like to go through it one by one and I'll ask Jean-Baptiste or Lisa to take it?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ:

I mean, it's as you wish. I'm happy to maybe I can start and can jump in. So, all rapporteurs have received an e-mail from Lisa over the weekend just to confirm the status of the subgroup report and whether it was in a position to be approved by the subgroup before being shared with the review team. So, at this stage, there are two subgroups where there was [inaudible] to Lisa and [inaudible] if Susan ... I believe that was for strategy policy, single WHOIS policy current interface, and anything new. And for user subgroups. So, [inaudible] outreach [inaudible] this one as subgroup approval and I shared it with the review team, Alan.

Compliance. Susan has just shared an updated version incorporated [inaudible] comments, and not including the comment from Volker, but Susan has opened the floor for discussion and possibly for subgroup call with Volker to discuss it.

On recommendation [9] on data accuracy, Lili listed the [inaudible] issues between Volker and her and asked for subgroup to provide input on this.

On recommendation 10, privacy-proxy services, there were questions that were sent in by Lili. One reply to Volker and also [inaudible] of privacy-proxy services, service abuse for subgroup review.

Recommendation 12-14, internationalized domain names, Lili has just submitted comments on this one and this one is close to approval.

Recommendation 15-16, Lili sent a last call for agreement and this was already shared with the review team. And under the ones, so law enforcement, we provided some feedback from the legal department to the subgroup on the law enforcement survey and there [inaudible] update to the subgroup report at this stage. And on consumer trust, Erika mentioned that she will incorporate the comment from Volker and send an updated version. And on the [inaudible], Alan you have shared a version of the subgroup and review team for comments and approval from the subgroup.

Lisa, your hand is up, so please jump in.

LISA PHIFER:

Thank you, Jean-Baptiste, and thanks for running through all of that. I just wanted to point out that on anything new we really don't have a draft report yet. We have the template that was provided by staff in advance of the face-to-face and then incorporating the action items from the face-to-face, but we really don't have the subgroup on record as completing that report, and I believe there was some text that Stephanie had intended to insert for law enforcement needs. We're in somewhat of a similar situation in that the subgroup has been focused on preparing the survey, but during that time period, we don't actually

really have a subgroup report that describes in any level of currency the approach the subgroup is taking and that's what would need to be factored into the review team's draft report.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Lisa. Although clearly have to get the work done on anything new and I would encourage Stephanie, who I think is the team leader on that one, to get that tossed out. We know there are no recommendations coming out of it. It's not an impediment to getting our other work done, or even preparing for the face-to-face. Not the face-to-face, for ICANN 62. But, it would be nice, given that we know it's an easy one to do that we get that one out of the way.

What other red flags do we have to raise, to wave? Are there any other places that we believe, even if the work isn't done, rather that the work isn't done and we don't quite see a clear path to getting it done? It's the clear path that I'm concerned about right now. We have a pretty good cushion between now and the face-to-face, regardless of which week it's held. So, I'm less worried about meeting that target with knowing when we go into Panama that we have something clean to present. Lisa, please go ahead.

LISA PHIFER:

Thank you, Alan. So, it's my understanding that materials for ICANN 62 actually are expected by the 8th of June, and perhaps Alice or Jean-Baptiste could reconfirm that. I do not have a clear picture of how we pull together the night quite final subgroup reports in this week to meet that 8th of June deadline.

ALAN GREENBERG: Let me try first before they answer. I thought that was a self-imposed deadline. Maybe a reasonable one, but was self-imposed. In terms of presentation materials, although everyone likes to get things submitted way, way ahead of time to the technical staff of the meeting, we can do submissions later on or revisions of it later on. I'm not saying it's optimal, but that's certainly not a violation of any laws of physics. Jean-Baptiste, please go ahead.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Thank you, Alan. I just wanted to confirm that indeed it was a self-imposed deadline on updating the plenary call just before, but one [inaudible] with the chairing and at that time the review team was in a position where it was possible to submit all input for that deadline. Looking now, what I've prepared for review team is a new set of deadlines, and I would present that under ICANN 62. Because looking at today's date, the engagement session is in three weeks, so we now have [inaudible] material to sending the slides to the meetings team.

ALAN GREENBERG: I guess the target should be something like everything should be in if not the formal words, then the content has to be pretty well locked in a week from now to give Lisa a week to do some preparation and not have to be doing it on the plane on route to Panama. Does that sound doable from Lisa's point of view and from other people's point of view? I see we have hands up from Susan and Lisa. Susan, please go ahead.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Let's let Lisa go first.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay.

LISA PHIFER: I know that Jean-Baptiste just said he has some dates to present under the ICANN 62 slides, so perhaps we could review those. But, in responding to your question there, Alan, I do think that it's important that we allow time for not only for me to insert what the subgroup's report said into the slides, but for rapporteurs to confirm that they are happy with the presentation of their subgroups, in particular any draft recommendations. That's where the subgroup reports are perhaps in the most drafty state is actually the wording of any recommendations, and as you're going to be presenting them to the community, I expect to want an opportunity to really look at them and perhaps even pull some that you're not quite as comfortable with at this preliminary stage.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sure. I can't argue with that. Susan?

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: So, when I made the arbitrary decision while you were having surgery, Alan, on the June 8th date, I had envisioned – and maybe correct me if

I'm wrong – that we were just focusing on the recommendation, draft recommendation, for ICANN 62 and not focusing on the full report. So, if we get our recommendations into shape by Friday, that doesn't mean that we could provide slides I guess by Friday. Is that our goal or is there more content that we should be prepping for, for the meeting?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Let me give a stab at that. I think we need to be able to ... Remember, not everyone is necessarily going to be at the meeting. So, whoever is presenting I think has to understand the rationale for the recommendation well enough that we're not put in an embarrassing position. I don't think that's really problematic for most of the recommendations that I've seen so far, but other people may not have been paying as much attention to all of the subgroups as I have, not that that's an awful lot.

So, I think recommendations are what's going to show up on the slides. The background I think we need to know and understand, but I'm not as concerned that we say the draft report is finalized as opposed to having a draft report with some significant input, some significant content in it. Does that make any sense, Susan?

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI:

Yeah. I think we need to try our best to get those draft recommendations agreed upon. Volker, I looked at your input for the compliance but didn't understand some of it, and then it didn't line up with what other discussions we've had. So, I feel it's critical that we

have another compliance subgroup meeting that you can attend and we can have that open discussion.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. So, we've identified compliance as one of the issues. What other subgroups are in a position where we don't think we are going to ... We don't have a high level of confidence we're meeting the deadlines of this Friday, the new deadline of this Friday? Maybe that was the original deadline. I've lost track now. And let's hear ... We have most people on this call, so let's try to identify what the realistic target is, if Friday is not.

Lisa, if you can identify what subgroup one by one that is potentially problematic in your mind, because you're the one who's got to do the next stage. Which part is problematic in your mind? Let's go through it one by one and potentially corner the rapporteur and see where we are.

LISA PHIFER:

Alan, we can do that.

ALAN GREENBERG:

But you don't feel comfortable.

LISA PHIFER:

It's not that I don't feel comfortable. It's honestly I don't know where some of the rapporteurs feel they are. So, from an external point of

view, I haven't seen the strategic priority draft report recently. Cathrin, do you feel that you're close to finalizing recommendations?

ALAN GREENBERG: Just to be clear, Lisa, you can put whatever words that you want around which ones you're identifying. I'm not going to say the recommendation from ... I want you to identify which ones you don't feel comfortable with right now, and strategic priority is the first one. That I believe is Lili's.

LISA PHIFER: That one actually is Cathrin.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: That is Cathrin.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, sorry, Cathrin's.

LISA PHIFER: Carlton is in pretty good shape, I think, unless Carlton has anything to say about it.

CARLTON SAMUELS: No, I think I'm in fairly good shape here. I'm just waiting for [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. Can we go back to strategic priority? Cathrin said she's not on Adobe Connect, but still on the call. Cathrin are you in a position where we're going to fix ... Get strategic priority at a level where we can proceed on it now? Maybe Cathrin is not on the call. Alright, I guess she has dropped off then or can't speak. One of the two. Alright, let's proceed and we'll keep that one on hold and find out what's going on later.

Carlton said he has a level of comfort, and Carlton's mic is still unmuted. Back to you, Lisa.

LISA PHIFER:

I believe you already expressed a level of comfort on outreach. We've already discussed compliance is one that is somewhat at risk. Data accuracy, Lili has sent that for last comment but that seems pretty close to completion, notwithstanding resolution of Volker's comments which were made as a member of the full review team, not just that subgroup.

Privacy-proxy and common interface, both we do not have a recent subgroup draft and so it's not clear that we're close on recommendations. In particular, privacy-proxy. I question what the recommendation's final version will be. In common interface, I believe the group was heading towards not making any recommendations, but we're waiting for Volker to weigh in on the work that was done in his absence.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah. I think that is correct. Common interface clearly is something that's going to change, perhaps significantly, with GDPR and it doesn't make a lot of sense for us to contemplate a recommendation today which may or may not make any sense by the time we actually issue the report. So, I can't see us making recommendations on that one, other than to review things later on.

LISA PHIFER:

If I recall correctly, the potential recommendation that was on the table was around instrumenting the common interface to actually use it as a way of determining accuracy. IDNs is close to ... Was in fact finalized, but then Dmitry has one to factor in from Lili. So that seems like it's quite likely to finish this week.

Then, plan and annual reports. Lili had sent to the review team at large previously and now issued a last call, so that one seems likely to close this week.

We've already discussed the status of anything new in law enforcement needs. Both of those ... It doesn't seem like there are any recommendations from those at this point in time. Erika is in transit. I don't know that I feel very comfortable that we have a solid phrasing of a recommendation out of consumer trust. Erika had begun work on it, the draft recommendation around reseller transparency and gotten some feedback from Volker I believe on that. So that one is question mark for me as to what the recommendation might look like eventually.

Alan, you already indicated safeguarding registrant data. You sent a last call out to your group.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah. Let me put a stake in the ground. I don't have a problem if we identify any possible recommendations or other statements that we're making in Panama as this is a subgroup position. It is not gone to the plenary yet. I mean, we're saying we're having a face-to-face in July and we'll be issuing a report sometime after that, a draft report sometime after that. We're not pretending that it's all locked in at this point and agreed to by everyone. Although I would prefer to be able to flag which ones have some level of agreement from the plenary and which ones do not, I'm not worried that if we cannot present a single unified position and status on all of them. I don't know if anyone else supports that, but I feel comfortable even if we say some of these are softer because we have not really had a substantive discussion within the overall review team.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST:

I would also feel comfortable with that, but I'm wondering whether it wouldn't even be better if we just say we're still in drafting mode and these are draft recommendations that have not yet been agreed and don't necessarily distinguish because I'm not sure what it would add in terms of benefits. But, I missed part of the discussion because I was dropped from the connection for a little bit, so apologies if this battle has already been fought and decided.

ALAN GREENBERG:

No, no. We're just doing that. I have no problem with that, either. We're giving this presentation in June, which is a month before our face-to-

face and two months perhaps or whatever before we issue a draft report. I'm not worried about being softer and we are asking for input at this point. So, to say something is pretty well locked in already and then ask for input doesn't seem to be the right tone in any case.

Cathrin, now that you're back, we did have a question on the status of strategic priority.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST:

Yeah. So, the status is that Volker in fact provided feedback on the draft recommendation in particular, and we're just actually in an e-mail exchange now to try to figure out the wording. So, we're not yet at a position where the draft report is agreed at the subgroup level, but that's my fault because I overlooked an e-mail of his. So, apologies for the delay.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. Lisa, do you have a higher level of comfort now? We will keep the target of the ... I believe you said it was the 8th, which is this Friday. We'll do another status update on Monday and see what we have to do at that point. Stephanie in the chat said she's traveling for the rest of the week. Does that mean you don't plan to do any work? Traveling is sometimes when I get most of my work done. Stephanie is typing. I know Chris has dropped off the call. He may come back. Short flights and driving. Alright.

My feeling is that the anything new report is ... We're talking about a couple of hours of work. I don't think we're talking about days of work

to get that one done. Lisa, back to you. Do you have a better feel of comfort or do you have any suggestions how we get there?

LISA PHIFER:

Alan, I have I guess a confirmation of which subgroups may need the most encouragement this week, so I'll work on that. But I also, I think your setting context that these are draft recommendations developed within subgroups but still in drafting mode and not agreed by the full review team, I think that helps understanding what belongs in the slides and how much work there might be between that and presenting them at ICANN 62.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah. I presume we're having a leadership call on Wednesday and perhaps we can identify which ones are problematic and do a bit of brainstorming of what we have to do to get past that stumbling block. Alright. Next agenda item or do we need more discussion on this one? I hear nothing. I'm assuming we can go on. Stephanie is saying her stakeholder group is going to have comments. I'm not sure what that is in relation to, if it's in relation to anything new. We have come to some conclusions on anything new, and if indeed you're suggesting – I'm talking to Stephanie – you're suggesting that you're going to put something in the report that's different than what we previously discussed, I think we need a head's up pretty quickly.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ:

Stephanie has her hand up.

ALAN GREENBERG: Please go ahead.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Hi, Alan. I mean, let's face it. Anything new is not the important part of this report. As I said in the chat, I'm just giving you a head's up that I'm traveling. I need time to comment on the final reviewed results of all the other working groups, [inaudible] the important bits. The law enforcement piece is important. Accuracy is important. I mean, that one has been around for a while. So, it's not anything new. It's all the other important material where we're going to have recommendations. I hope that's clear. I will do my best, but as I say, I'm going to be driving on the day closest to the deadline, so that's going to be tough.

ALAN GREENBERG: Stephanie, I think your priority right now is commenting on any recommendations or anything else in the draft reports of the groups in which you are a subgroup member. We are not saying at a meeting in June that everything here has the full approval of the entire plenary or even the consensus of the entire plenary since we're going to be doing that in July. So, at this point, I would focus on the groups for which you are a reporter and the groups for which you are a member of the subgroup. Anything else you can do is a bonus, but those are the mandatory ones.

Susan, please go ahead.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI:

I just wanted to comment on Stephanie. Take this with a grain of salt, Stephanie. But, it's much easier to edit and comment on other people's drafting, but we haven't seen any drafting from you to comment and edit. So let's be fair about this. So, I do think you should do anything new. It's really a short one, and it's only fair that we get to comment on your edit or on your drafting.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Stephanie, your hand is still up. Is it an old hand or do you want the floor? Alright, I hear nothing else. I see discussion going on between Stephanie and Susan, and Stephanie has agreed she will try to grind out the report.

Next item, ICANN 62. I think we have had significant discussion about that at this point. Is there anything further that we need to discuss regarding ICANN 62? We have dates here. The target was June 8th, this Friday, for approving the subgroup reports. That is at the subgroup level. 13th deadlines for comments on the subgroup reports. I think we've depreciated that item somewhat in that we are not pretending that these have been approved, although it would be nice to get any significant comments. If we're going to have major objection to a recommendation, it would be nice to know before we got into Panama and maybe delete it from the ones we're presenting or identify it as one that is still under substantial discussion. And the 20th approval and the 23rd is submit to ICANN.

Anyone want any comment on that or to review anything? I'm moderately comfortable with that, with this schedule, and that we can

make this target with the caveat of what I just said, that if anyone is going to have very strong disagreement with recommendations, they at least identify that might happen so we can flag those recommendations as still being under substantial discussion. Lisa, please go ahead.

LISA PHIFER:

Thank you, Alan. I apologize if this was discussed at one point and I overlooked it, but have you discussed who is actually presenting at ICANN 62?

ALAN GREENBERG:

We have not discussed that and I would suggest we first discuss that on the leadership call on Wednesday and then rediscuss it next Monday.

LISA PHIFER:

Okay, great. The question that I was going to raise is that whomever is actually going to present some of these slides may want to have an opportunity in this timeline to provide any feedback.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yes. Can we leave it at that? I think once we've identified who the possible people are and gotten they're agreement, we'll proceed from there. At this point, almost everyone is going to be at the meeting with one or two exceptions, but we have a fair amount of flexibility. It is a non-conflicted session. We may well want pretty much everyone on the podium if there is a podium and have a small number of people presenting, but a larger number of people being able to answer

questions. Stephanie is saying what she's trying to convey. She's expecting a significant number of negative comments. Noted.

Further comments on ICANN 61? Staff or review team. I see nothing. Let us go on to the next agenda item and that is AOB. Do we have any AOBs? I see nothing. I hear nothing. Give people one more moment. Then may we go on to the next item of review of action items and decisions?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Thank you, Alan. Under decisions reached, Alan you would send [inaudible] to edit slides on this call.

Under action items, and that's for the letter to Theresa Swineheart, so you will put in a reference to increase the cost for fiscal year 19 if there is a pause, and correct the wording where it says that there are ten working group members on the review team to reflect that Chris is a member but that he did not vote on this matter, and there was a third one adding \$10,000 I believe.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's correct.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Then, the face-to-face meeting, number three. Staff will inquire whether the 25th and 26th of July is available in meetings team schedule and we'll issue a Doodle poll if it's still available. And all review team members need to hold off on booking in the meeting time.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Can we add one item onto that? It was brought up in the chat. Can someone verify with constituency travel which tickets were issued and verified that they are all changeable or refundable? Not refundable. Either changeable or usable to reissue a ticket if we change the dates. I believe there's only been two or three tickets issued, so it shouldn't be a major issue. I know my ticket is changeable on a moderately large change fee. I presume the others are similar.

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

LISA PHIFER: Yes, I do. Thank you. Once a decision is reached on the meeting dates, I would encourage everybody to book as quickly as they can. The reason I say that is I found myself very limited routings available even now. So we know we're in a busy time of year.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. That is summer in Europe. Interestingly, on my flights, I have four flights and three of them were wide open and one of them was almost completely booked. Go figure.

Alright, anything else further before we adjourn or end the meeting?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Lili has her hand raised.

ALAN GREENBERG: Lili, go ahead please.

LILI SUN: I noticed from the chat that maybe 25th and 26th of July is still difficult for the face-to-face meeting. My suggestion is add the previous two weeks for the Doodle poll for the face-to-face meeting as well.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm sorry, I didn't quite ... Go ahead, Lili.

LILI SUN: Yeah. I'm suggesting we add like the second and the third week of July as a possible candidate for the face-to-face meeting as well, not just the 25th and 26th.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think we've already pretty well eliminated other dates because of other people's commitments at this point. I may be misunderstanding you, but I think we had eliminated other options.

LILI SUN: Okay. But, currently, it's still uncertain whether the ICANN meetings team is available. Also, I noticed there are several members not available [inaudible] and can be fixed.

ALAN GREENBERG: At this point, we're looking at the 25th, 26th. We know Cathrin isn't available, plus a number of other people, on the previous week because that's where we had it and have rescheduled it. My recollection is the week of the 9th of July was not acceptable for another reason and the following week we're then going into August which we know is not acceptable. I may be missing something, and if staff can confirm, but I think we've pretty well ruled out the other weeks at this point. So, I think we either stay with the 19th, 20th and do without Cathrin or we figure out a way to move to the week of the 23rd or postpone to September, of course.

LILI SUN: Okay, understand. So, I just have a concern that once put in [inaudible] 25th and 26th, we will still need to come back again to do a Doodle poll again.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think at this point if we cannot make it on the 25th, 26th, we have a decision that we make which is reschedule in September or hold it on the 19th and 20th. I think those are our two options as I understand. Alice or Jean-Baptiste, am I missing something?

ALICE JANSEN: Our first action here is to check with meetings team whether 25th and 26th is still open in the schedule. If it is, then we'll issue a Doodle poll out to the review team with two sets of dates. Essentially, 19th and 20th which is the initial agreed date, and then the 25th and 26th and then

based on that, I think you will reach a decision on whether to keep the 19th and 20th or to reschedule.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah. Alice, I should've said this earlier, but perhaps you want to verify again the 24th is still not available. Maybe things will have changed since the last time you talked to them. We discarded 24th and 25th because of the meeting team's original statement, but the world does change sometimes, so that might be worth checking.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST:

First of all, if I may just take the floor, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yes, please.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST:

Sorry. This is just to say that I'm really sorry for the mess which I'm creating and [inaudible] because I shared it with the leadership but not with the rest of the team yet. Basically, I'm in charge of a legislative proposal and there's basically a six months rotating president of the union and the new presidency under the Austrians starts in July and they've just issued their dates for July. I'm in negotiating sessions all day on the 19th and 20th and I'm not allowed to miss those, based on my management instruction, so that's why I can't be there for the face-to-face. I'm really sorry that this comes so late.

That being said, I think the point Lili is making is that if there's a possibility to reconsider also at least that same week, because I for example would be available on the other days that same week, Monday through Wednesday, if the 24th, 25th, 26th would not be an option. So, if we do start the Doodle, I think Lili's point was just to say let's add a few more options beyond just those two to make sure that we really cover the possibilities.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. You're saying cover the whole week of the 23rd.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Of the 17th, yeah, or 16th.

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh, the previous week also you're saying. You're saying go back to the previous week, but the beginning of it.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: If we take Alice's two-step approach, to first see whether there is a possibility on the 24th, 25th, 26th and if not, if we have to restart the Doodle, then to see whether we can add a few more options beyond just the 19th and 20th and 25th and 26th. I think that was Lili's point, if I understood her.

ALAN GREENBERG: Oaky, got it. Thank you. I misunderstood. Alice, is that now clear with you?

ALICE JANSEN: Okay. I'll go back [inaudible] they have left for the week of July 23rd.

ALAN GREENBERG: And the week of the 16th.

ALICE JANSEN: Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright, we may get through this. Cathrin, thank you for doing that. I forgot you had only sent that message to the leadership team. We of course are disappointed that you're not just going to resign your job in favor of the review team as being a higher priority.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Oh, of course, I would, Alan, but I think I would lose my seat [inaudible] of the GAC.

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh no, you have been appointed as an individual at this point. We're stuck with you or vice-versa. It's not a serious option, however, in any case.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Right, [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Just a joke. Alright, thank you, all. Before anyone has an opportunity to say anything else, I think we'll call the meeting to an end and turn back another 15 minutes or so of you to your real life and we'll be talking to you later. And please, anyone who owes us something in terms of getting their draft reports past their committee, their subgroup, please try to get it done so we can meet our targets. Thank you.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Thank you.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Goodbye. Thank you!

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]