

---

BRENDA BREWER: Hello, everyone. This is Brenda speaking. Welcome to the RDS WHOIS2 Plenary Call #31 on 11 June 2018 at 15:00 UTC.

Attending the call today is Dmitry, Lili, Alan, Susan, Erika, Volker, Stephanie, and Chris.

We have no observers at this moment.

From ICANN Org we have Jean-Baptiste, Alice, Trang, Lisa, Amy, and Brenda.

We have apologies from Cathrin and Steve.

Today's meeting 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. Is there anyone with any statement of interest change? If not, then we'll proceed to the first agenda item and that is the face-to-face meeting, which since our last meeting has moved. We are now set to hold the meeting on 26<sup>th</sup>, 27<sup>th</sup>. We will have not quite a full team. Thomas, as you know, could not be at any of the meetings. Dmitry, unfortunately, will be on vacation during this meeting and he says he's going to be very far from the Internet. That's unfortunate. Cathrin will be with us for a day and a half, even though the chart that we're showing shows she's not there Friday. She will be there Friday morning and we may try to start a bit early and presumably end earlier

---

*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.*

---

in the afternoon and try to get as much benefit from her being there as possible. We'll decide that when we get closer to the meeting. So, that is now set and, please, let's issue tickets as quickly as possible to keep the costs under control. Any comments on the face-to-face at this point?

Jean-Baptiste, if I understand correctly, you will not be there? Do I have my weekends correct?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: That's correct.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. And you will be replaced by someone else or Alice will just be working even faster?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: She might be. [inaudible] question, I would be replaced.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay.

LISA PHIFER: I'll be there, too, as well.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, I know. Thank you. But, you always work as fast as you can. That's not fair to Alice. Both of you do. I'm just trying to make light of it and I'm not doing very well. But, unless anyone has any other comments, we'll go onto the next agenda item and give people a moment, though. Alright, next item, then.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Just before we move, I just wanted to mention that Cathrin has sent apologies via e-mail.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm sorry. Say that again. I missed that.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Cathrin has just sent us apologies via e-mail.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you. Status upgrade. I'm not doing well today – update. Where do we stand on that? Lisa, do you want to take us through this quickly? I'm not sure we want to spend a lot of time on each of them, but perhaps identify the ones where we think there are potential problems and see what kind of confirmation we can get from the rapporteur or someone else that we are going to be close to the deadline since we've already passed the deadline on many of these.

---

LISA PHIFER:

Sure, Alan. On rec 1 strategic priority, of course Cathrin isn't with us this morning. She is awaiting some feedback on the draft that she sent to the subgroup and that one should be finalized.

Single WHOIS policy recommendation 2, I reached out to Carlton. I heard from him over the weekend. That draft was ready to be approved. However, I'm not sure that he realized there was an outstanding comment from Cathrin on the draft, so we'll work with him today on that. I know Carlton has just sent his apologies for today's call, so he can't comment on that.

Recommendation 3 outreach. That one is closed and out to the review team for ongoing comments.

Recommendation 4 compliance. Susan provided a rough draft over the weekend that she has asked for some assistance in cleaning up the [inaudible]. I know Susan is on the call. If she wishes to say anything further about that, I'll give her a chance to now.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI:

Thank you, Lisa, to make this look like a better workable draft. Also, I did try to incorporate some additional comments. Volker, there was a few things I didn't quite understand. I got too busy last week to schedule a meeting, so if you could go in and make comments to the draft, that would really be helpful.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I have a question for Susan. At the last face-to-face we decided that the data accuracy recommendations would be moved under outreach.

---

We've had some discussions at the leadership call for cases where we are ultimately moving the recommendation. Do we want to move it now and essentially put it within the subgroup report or do we want to keep it where it fits, where it originated and move it later?

I know for ones that have gone from compliance to outreach, we decided that probably they should stay in the compliance report and be moved later. Do you have any feelings with regard to the ones on data accuracy? Lili, I'll go to you next after Cathrin speaks. It's a question of which group is in a better position to phrase it properly?

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI:

So, I did more work on fleshing out the recommendations in this draft and I do think that ... And I think we could do this probably in our face-to-face the most effectively. But I do think there are recommendations that should be grouped and Lili did provide some recommendations to the compliance subgroup report.

What I haven't had time to do is go back and look at the recommendations in the compliance subgroup report and the data accuracy ones to see where they overlap and see if we can ... I sort of feel like we have bits of recommendations and they need to be ... We need to put several bits together to have a fully formed recommendation. We may not ... I think there's eight recommendations for compliance right now, but some of those as you noted were outreach and some of those could be put together into a larger recommendation if the team decides that's a better way of doing it. So, I would assume that with the data accuracy recommendations and the

---

overlap with compliance we should probably look at doing that, sort of join some together.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. Yeah. It strikes me the two situations are different. In the ones moving to outreach, they really originated in compliance, but for implementation, they fit better under the outreach one, whereas the overlap with data accuracy in compliance, the actual recommendation is coming from both of you independently and just needs to be merged as you're implying now. I think what you're suggesting makes sense. Lili, does that sound okay to you? I'm not sure if you have voice or not.

LILI SUN:

Yes. Actually, I indicated in the draft report. I believe the top-level [inaudible] of the WHOIS accuracy requirement is enough. It's just how to enforce all the contractual obligations, both to registrant and registrars. So, I would propose a recommendation to the compliance subgroup. I notice Susan [inaudible] recommendation, so we can have more discussion during the face-to-face meeting.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. Excellent. So, I think we have a plan going forward. Back to you, Lisa.

LISA PHFIER:

Thank you, Alan. I believe I was on recommendation 5-9, data accuracy. As Lili noted, the recommendations coming from that group have been

---

forwarded to other subgroups for inclusion in their report. Lili, did you want to say anything about the status of your subgroup's report?

LILI SUN:

Yes. I want to remind the members of this subgroup [inaudible] could you please confirm the [inaudible] draft report or do you have any objections? And especially regarding Volker's comments. Please do share with me about your opinion of this draft report after this plenary call.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Lili. Just to be clear, I'm occupied in meetings for the rest of the day going into the evening, but I will be reviewing pretty much everything I think tomorrow.

To echo something I sent in an e-mail earlier or late last week, to the extent that a subgroup cannot come to closure on something, then that should be simply put into the draft report because the subgroup is just a small number of people that will put together to be able to work on things, but clearly it's the overall plenary group that if we cannot come to closure has to make the decisions. So, don't worry too much about reaching full agreement in the subgroup. If there is a disagreement, then present it and we'll discuss it either prior to the plenary or during the plenary.

Clearly, if there is a disagreement in the subgroup there may be a wider disagreement there. It may be just one person who remains one person on the entire plenary or it may in fact be something that's felt by a

---

number of people in the larger group and we should present those. We shouldn't let that unreasonably delay the submission of the draft report. Lisa, back to you.

LISA PHIFER: Thank you, Alan. That takes us to recommendation 10 privacy-proxy services. Volker is with us today, correct? Why don't I let Volker update us on the status of that report?

VOLKER GREIMANN: Sure. We have the basic framework of the report ready. We still have to gain unity or gain a common ground on how to treat the [inaudible]. I think we probably will have to discuss this on a separate call with the subgroup and then probably do as you said, Alan, present the different option that we have for moving forward. I think there will be a difference of opinion there.

LISA PHIFER: Volker, does that mean that we should be Doodling for a time for the subgroup to meet?

VOLKER GREIMANN: I think at this stage it would be the best way instead of shooting back and forth e-mails. I think we'll just have to come to an agreement how to best frame the different positions and have [inaudible] present that to the larger group.

---

ALAN GREENBERG:                    Sounds reasonable to me.

LISA PHIFER:                        Alright. So, staff will take an action to launch that Doodle and hopefully have the privacy-proxy subgroup meet earlier this week rather than later since we are trying to wrap up the subgroup reports to feed into the ICANN 62 preparations.

On recommendation 11 common interface, I believe ...

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ:        Lisa?

LISA PHIFER:                        Yes?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ:        Just on the action item, can I invite Volker maybe to share his availability for this week, so that we can send the Doodle? Thank YOU.

VOLKER GREIMANN:                I will have to look at the calendar. There's a lot going on at the moment. I don't have all the ... I don't want to have a conflict [inaudible] to invalidate that. I would propose a Doodle would be better. If we want to shoot for an earlier appointment, then probably Wednesday in the late

---

European afternoon would be best. That's something I know I still have available.

LISA PHIFER:

I note that Stephanie has asked about joining the subgroup. As we are wrapping up the subgroups at this stage, it might not make sense to join the subgroup, but all Review Team members are welcome to join subgroup calls, I believe.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Just have to make sure the invitation goes to her or at least the Doodle.

LISA PHIFER:

Noted. Alright. Recommendation 11 common interface. I believe the status of that was ICANN Org had put out a draft that just included the discussion from the face-to-face which Volker was to review. I believe Volker sent some comments back to the subgroup on e-mail and Susan suggested that Volker take a crack at incorporating those in the draft. Volker, can you give us an update on where you stand with that?

VOLKER GREIMANN:

Basically, my question was rather trying to wrap my head around the recommendation that has been proposed because I don't quite understand where that came from and what the actual rationale behind that was because none was provided in the draft by the proposer, so I would just like to see more information on what the recommendation is all about and why it's felt that this is necessary. I think we can do that

---

on e-mail because that's mainly just drafting and getting clarity on the topic rather than making a decision on an actual point of discussion that we are having.

LISA PHIFER:

Volker, one thing that may help you is actually to listen to that section of the face-to-face where that was discussed. I can send you a pointer to where in the transcript or recording that discussion was had. That may help you gain some of that context.

Alright. For IDNs, recommendation 12-14, I believe that Lili and Dmitry worked together on a clarification and Dmitry has now shared that updated version back with the full team. Dmitry is with us today. Dmitry, did you have anything further you wanted to say about that report?

DMITRY BELYAVSKIY:

I just wanted to thank Lili for the right wording, right phrasing, of the recommendation and conclusion. But there is no significant changes in the document.

LISA PHIFER:

Alright. That takes us to recommendation 15 and 16, plan and annual report. I know Lili sent the last call out to the subgroup and there's been no further response from the subgroup. Lili, did you have anything that you wanted to add to that other than inviting members of your subgroup to provide their opinions or comment back to you as quickly as possible?

LILI SUN: Yeah. So far, no. Please, there should be some agreement on this draft report since I didn't receive any concerns from last face-to-face meeting.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Just to be clear, we are looking to the extent possible for actual agreement as opposed to silence from the subgroup. Since I've been one of the negligent ones of not answering in the groups I've been in due to other conflicts, I will say please try to get that out as soon as possible.

LISA PHIFER: Thank you, Alan, and thank you, Lili. That brings us to anything new. Stephanie, I believe you took an action away from our last plenary call to provide an update of the subgroup report. Where do you stand on that?

ALAN GREENBERG: Stephanie looks like she's talking but we can't hear her.

LISA PHIFER: Stephanie is typing now. She's taken off mute, but is unable to speak.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Her microphone is showing ... Now she's muted. And now she shows she's talking. We just can't hear anything. Oh, dear.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Hello?

ALAN GREENBERG: Now we can hear you.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Can you hear me now?

ALAN GREENBERG: Now we can.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Oh, wonderful. I was just playing with all the buttons. I'm guilty. I didn't do it last week. I had a heck of a week. I'm hitting it today, so I will get it out to you very shortly. My apologies.

LISA PHIFER: Alright. Let's move onto law enforcement needs. In that subgroup, we don't actually have an updated subgroup report. That subgroup has been focusing on getting a survey together to launch. And as Cathrin as Thomas are both not with us today, I don't know that we have any further update on that. I do know that Cathrin had planned to speak to the subgroup about the timing of the survey and whether at this

---

junction it makes sense to try to do a pre-survey that is pre-GDPR implementation or to just incorporate surveying response about the impact of GDPR as part of the original survey. So those of you that are in that subgroup can expect to see some communication from Cathrin on that.

On consumer trust, Erika is with us. Erika, would you like to say a few words about where you stand with an update to that subgroup report?

ERIKA MANN:

Yeah. I can do this. What I have done, I have followed the various discussions, particular from Lili, and to [inaudible]. I've imbedded them in the Google doc which I have for this particular subgroup. I haven't sent it to the subgroup members yet. I'm looking for an approach that is workable for the group because I'd like us to be hopefully on this topic to be united. I don't know there's a need to have division which is maybe not super helpful in this case.

I will have a call – we just agreed on this – with Lisa tonight, and then afterwards, once I had a chance to talk to her, I will hopefully be able to finalize the document and then forward it to the subgroup members hopefully tonight. If not tonight, tomorrow, and then we can take it from there.

LISA PHIFER:

Thank you, Erika. Our call this evening, just to be clear, is to assist in just assembling Erika's thoughts for consideration [inaudible] the subgroup. It's not actually a subgroup call.

ERIKA MANN: No, no, no. It's not. Thank you so much. It's not a subgroup call. It's just to get a few points before I send the document to the subgroup members.

LISA PHIFER: Finally, safeguarding registrant data. Alan, I know you had requested some additional information which shows [inaudible] received an e-mail earlier today from ICANN Org. how are you feeling about wrapping up that subgroup report?

ALAN GREENBERG: I hadn't realized all those contracts were online, and now that I know they are, I'll look at them. That will either make things pretty easy or we'll decide we need some further work on it, but I only got that e-mail just before this meeting so I haven't looked at them yet, but I will in the next day or so.

LISA PHIFER: Very good. That is the end of the list of subgroups. As it probably is clear to everyone from listening to the status, perhaps half the subgroups are pretty close or completed – have completed – their subgroup report and then a fair number of subgroups are still actively working. That may affect what we choose to actually include in the slides for ICANN 62 which I know is later in our call today.

---

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much, then. I think that's the next item, if we could go on to the next slide. Well, this is a summary. Again, this is as good a time as any. We set as a final deadline on Wednesday for subgroup reports. It sounds like you may have one or two or three more by then. You're clearly not going to have all of them by then.

The question is what do we do with regard to the slides? I would request that each of the rapporteurs who for whatever reason are not in a position to say this report is final to somehow flag in their draft versions of the reports what it is we want to discuss or raise in Panama.

At some level, a recommendation which is not finalized but we're still either trying to decide whether we should make it or exactly what it should say is actually fine material for putting in the engagement session since one of the things we're looking for, to the extent we might get it is actual feedback.

So, I don't think ... The fact that something is not finalized may in fact be almost a positive for getting some interaction at that meeting. But, I would ask each rapporteur, if we're not in a position, to define what we are going to be recommending and what we have found, then identify what it is you would like to see on those slides. I don't think that's a reason we shouldn't include it all together. Anyone have any thoughts or comments? Does that sound reasonable? Erika says she agrees. Chris said we can pass that task across the – oh, sorry. He was answering me on a different issue. Yes, Lisa, please go ahead.

---

LISA PHIFER: Thank you, Alan. As the person attempting to draft the slide for you all, I think what we'll be looking to do in the draft slides is to provide some common framework I guess, templating, to the readout from each of the subgroups. I think, Alan, what you're suggesting is not that the rapporteurs provide us with the actual slides but with some [inaudible] of which recommendations they wish to see reflected in the slides or which points of discussion they wish to see reflected.

ALAN GREENBERG: That is what I thought I said. If I didn't say that, yes, of course, that's what I meant.

LISA PHIFER: Thank you. Just wanted to make that clear.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Lisa. What comes out is not always what I thought was going to come out, so I grant that. Any further comments on the deadline? What we're saying is subgroup report by Wednesday, and by next Monday we plan to have slides for everyone to comment on. We're looking for approval from the leadership, if not the rapporteurs by Wednesday of next week. No further comments? Next slide, please. And next.

We have said ... I have asked anyone who is interested in presenting. And I think we also had a comment from Lili saying she would not be there, so she is not going to be able to present. If anyone else has an interest in presenting, then let us know. Otherwise, we will take it on

---

the leadership to do that. Any other comments with regard to the meeting? This is a meeting that does not have much scheduled against it, so despite the fact that review team meetings like this do not necessarily have huge attendance in general, in this case it may well. So, we do want to try to present, prepare as much as we can.

Alright, I'm going to leave it open. If anyone else has an interest in presenting, please let us know. Otherwise, we will allocate it among the group leadership. Further comments on the ICANN 62, other than Chris has asked a question that we'll go to in a moment. I see no hands.

Chris asked: is it possible or should we have whoever is there from the review team meet with the Board RDS Working Group? This is the group on the board that oversees all things RDS. And although this review team has not been the largest focus over the last couple of weeks, I think it will be fine if we meet with them, assuming we can actually find a time. So, unless there's anyone who objects to it or thinks it is not a good idea, then we will do our best. [inaudible] looking for 30 minutes or so or do you think longer?

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

I think these things [inaudible] 30 minutes. I think 45 or an hour is [inaudible] what we want.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Target an hour.

---

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Yeah. Look, it would be a case of you guys coming to talk to us and say, “I don’t know what the Board Working Group will have ...” They’re obviously being focused, as you quite rightly say, on other matters. But, if you wanted to come and say, “Look, this is the timeline. This is what the review team is doing,” it would be very useful and helpful. But, you don’t have to. It’s not critical. It was just a thought that crossed my mind the other day and I thought I’d ask. That’s all.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, look, certainly given that we have put our stake in the ground with regard to the public comment on short-term changes and we’ve made a moderately firm commitment that we do plan to have a draft report out, I think we’ve already said that part. But, I’m happy to meet with the group and make sure that everyone is satisfied where we’re going. If you think there’s any reason at all [inaudible] scheduling.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: How about we do this? How about we say if we can find a convenient time that doesn’t inconvenience people and there are enough of both groups available to attend, it would be worth doing just to sit face-to-face and talk about what happens next.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sure.

---

CHRIS DISSPAIN: But we shouldn't bust a gut to try and organize it. I think that's probably the best answer.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. The days are pretty well full. I don't think there's any high-interest topics afternoon sessions that we can write off as no one being interested in them. The rest of the days are, certainly from my point of view, pretty full and I think the same for the GNSO ones. So, it's probably going to come down to breakfast or lunch if we can find a slot that's available.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Alright. I'll get onto it. Thanks very much.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you. Anything else on the face-to-face? Next slide, please. AOB. That was done. It was accepted. I was on both of the calls, the webinars, on the issue. There was not a single question asked about why did we do it or anyone seem to care that we did it. I have nothing to report other than it's off our plate in terms of action items to have to work on other than to deliver on what we said we would. Any comments? Then we will go ahead. Any other any other business? Then it looks like we're aiming at a recordly short meeting. Next slide, please. And over to you, Jean-Baptiste.

---

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Thank you, Alan. So, in terms of decisions reached, we have an agreement that the engagement session slides will be reviewed on the plenary call next week.

On action items we have for recommendations for compliance, Volker to review the latest draft from Susan to share comments. On recommendation 10, privacy-proxy services, ICANN Org will prepare and send out a Doodle for a subgroup meeting including Stephanie this week based on Volker's availability.

On recommendation 11, common interface, ICANN Org will provide Volker with a [inaudible] timestamp of the face-to-face discussion on [inaudible] and Volker will review that discussion.

On ICANN 62, rapporteurs [inaudible] to define what they are recommending will flag what they want to present in Panama from their [inaudible] draft report. And that's it.

ALAN GREENBERG: And an undocumented action item for everyone to within the next 24-36 hours, please go over your e-mails. If you haven't responded to something that is awaiting a response, please do so, so we can make the formal action item deadlines that we have. I know I will certainly do my best to try. Any other business before we close the meeting and turn 45 minutes back to you to do the actual work?

I have a reasonable comfort level at this point that we are on target. We're behind schedule, but I think our tasks are doable at this point. Any further comments before we close? Then I thank you all for

---

attending the meeting and look forward to seeing you online and we will have our next and I think final meeting before we leave for ... Yeah. Final meeting is next week and some of us get on planes not too long after that. So, we'll see you next Monday and then for those of you who will be in Panama, see you there. Thank you, all. Bye-bye.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Bye.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**