
RECORDED VOICE: This meeting is now being recorded.

BRENDA BREWER: Thank you, Alan. Good day, and welcome, everyone, to the RDS WHOIS 2 Review Team Plenary Meeting Number 8, on 28 of September 2017 at 1100 UTC. In attendance today, we have Alan Greenberg, Dmitry Belyavsky, Cathrin Bauer-Bulst, Susan Kawaguchi, Stephanie Perrin, Lili Sun. In the observer room, we have Subham Charan and Vignesh Pamu. From ICANN Organization, we have Jean-Baptiste Deroulez, Brenda Brewer, Trang Nguyen, Steve Conte, Roger Lim, Negar Farzinnia, Lisa Phifer, Maguy Serad, Alice Jansen, and we have an apology from Volker Greimann. I'd like to remind everyone that this call is being recorded, so please speak your name clearly for the transcript. And I'll turn the meeting over to you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Are there any comments on the agenda before we adopt it? I do have one AOB item I'd like to add, and that's an update from Staff on the Statement of Interest status. We were told that there would be a new one coming, and I don't believe I've seen it yet. And before we adopt the agenda, can I ask Staff how much time they expect to allocate – we should allocate to the briefings, and how much to leave for the other items at the end?

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.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. This is Negar. I imagine thirty minutes, Alan, should be sufficient for the briefing, unless there are additional questions by the Review Team members throughout the presentation.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. If that's our target, then that clearly shouldn't be a problem at all. Thank you very much, Negar.

In that case, unless I hear any comments or questions, we will adopt the agenda as currently displayed in Adobe Connect, and we will go on to the first item, which is, indeed, the briefings on recommendations 4, 12, 13, and 14. I can turn it over to whoever on Staff is taking the lead here.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Thank you. That will be Negar again, for the recording. Hello, everyone. Let's go ahead and get started with the second briefing session for the implementation of WHOIS recommendations. In today's presentation, with us today, we have Roger Lim, Director of Contractual Compliance. He was with us last time, as well. We have Trang Nguyen, VP of Strategic Programs, also with us last time. And I will be moving to the next slide. Just to let everybody know, in today's briefing, we are covering four recommendations: Recommendations 4, 12, 13, and 14. And with that said, let's start with Recommendation 4.

On Recommendation 4, the Board action was to [inaudible] or to create and publicize a reporting structure on Compliance activities and regularly report on Compliance activities related to the gTLD

registration data. Our deliverables to meet this Action Plan was to implement new Compliance complaint handling systems and procedures; provide greater visibility on WHOIS-related metrics and improvements to Compliance processes and results; conduct outreach in Asia Pacific, highlighting WHOIS obligations in native languages; publish an organizational chart on the ICANN website to provide information regarding the contractual compliance reporting structure; and last, but not least, publish information about budgeted funds and actual expenditures for contractual compliance, as well as provide a summary of the contractual compliance budget in the Annual Report. And for details of this implementation, I'll hand it over to Roger, so he can provide more information to the Review Team. Roger, please go ahead.

ROGER LIM:

Hello, everyone. This is Roger Lim, from Compliance. Today, I'm going to be talking about Recommendation 4, and this you can see on your slide right now – slide 8. It looks like a bunch of links, but actually, they are responding to all the questions – all the deliverables for Recommendation 4. So, one of the deliverables was greater visibility on WHOIS-related metrics and improvements. We've actually published this on the icann.org website. The first one, which is the Compliance outreach information and metrics page – on this page, you can actually see links to all our notices, our outreach events, all the compliance reports, as well as the [inaudible], which are the metrics that we have running on a thirteen-month rolling period. So, we've actually provided this link as a reference to all the information there, instead of providing

everything specifically onto – because that would take up a lot of slides – so we provided all the links, so that is very clear.

The second link that we have is actually the established processes and approach, so we also have the – we call that the – link for that one, where we published on the icann.org website, as well, for the ICANN process and approach. And the other deliverable was also published – the organizational chart for the Compliance Team – and we’ve also done that. It’s publicly published – all the names and Staff members – and those are all clearly stated on this link, number three.

The other deliverable was on – I’m sorry, Alan, did you have something?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yes, I just want to point out – the links in the document don’t actually work; at least, the first one doesn’t. If we could put the correct links in the chat, I would appreciate it, please.

ROGER LIM:

Oh. Sure. I just tried them. Yeah, I could do that for you. I’m sorry?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah, I’ll note, for instance, the first one – the text link is completely different from the hyperlink. That may be the cause of the problem. I’m not sure.

ROGER LIM:

Oh, okay.

MAGUY SERAD: Roger, this is Maguy. Roger, this is Maguy. I will take care of that. If you'll continue, so we don't delay the timing.

ROGER LIM: Sure. Thank you. Sorry about that. So, back to the slides. So, one of the last deliverables that we had in Recommendation 4 was regarding published information on budgeted funds and annual expenditures for the Compliance Team. And we actually have published that annual report and quarterly reports, as well, and all of those can be found in the fourth link. And also, it's – excuse me – it's done by quarter, and also audit reports, also, there. The annual reports are also found on that page, as well. So, quite comprehensive information on those ICANN pages. Maguy has started to put in all the links to the information I was talking about on the chat room right now. Thank you.

What else is there? Ah. So, just wanted to note that Compliance is always looking for ways to improve our reporting and transparency. So, currently, we are also trying to figure out how we can add more granularity to the reporting. We've heard from some community members that they would like to see more granularity in this reporting, so we are trying to figure out how to do that with the systems that we have available, as well as the information that we have available from our complaints. So, more to come, definitely, and we will keep everyone updated on this one. And we will be talking about this when we go to ICANN meetings, as well.

Okay. Negar, could you go to the next slide, please? Or am I controlling? Ah, okay. Thank you.

So, one of the recommendations was that – back then – recommendations was that ICANN hire a Compliance Officer – Chief Compliance Officer – and we’ve actually done that. Allen Grogan, and now Jamie Hedlund, on board. And we’ve also had our first Consumer Safeguard Director, Bryan Schilling, who’s been on board since May this year. I’ve put in the announcements there for reference, in case you need to find out more about these people – especially Bryan, since he’s quite new to the organization.

And the last one over here is regarding systems. So, when we had the recommendations come out, one of them – the first one – was “implement Compliance handling systems and procedures.” So, we are currently on most of the Kayako4 system for managing and processing all the complaints, and in the near future – once it’s technically possible – we will be moving to the Salesforce environment, where we will actually have all the information together on the same platform, which will make us more efficient and more accurate in the processing of our complaints. That is also something to look forward to in the very near future.

Any questions, please?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Opening the floor to any comments or questions – either because of what is in the – what is being presented – or other things related to people’s needs. We are talking about a prospective recommendation

on Compliance – not a recommendation – an area of scope, an area of study, on Compliance. And I’m wondering to what extent there are, in fact, things that we need to do with Compliance that are not covered by this recommendation and a further extension of it, if anyone has any thoughts on that.

Seeing nothing, I guess we will go on to the next recommendation. Thank you.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: I’m sorry; this is Cathrin. Can you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, we can, Cathrin. Go ahead.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Yes, I’m sorry I cannot put up my hand in the chat because I’m not dialed in. But just to say, I had a quick question about the role of Bryan Schilling. Because [inaudible] the [inaudible] on Monday about the consumer [inaudible], and I was a bit surprised by the way in which Bryan characterized this role. If I remember, you said that he was the sort of research associate, who could help any member of the community find information about safeguards. And I believe that was the recommendation of the first WHOIS Review Team, and then it was a bit more than that. So, I was just wondering to what extent this role has been defined; I asked on the call, and it seemed that the details were still a bit open. But I have to say, I was a bit puzzled by this

announcement. I'd be interested in hearing a bit more about how ICANN sees this role, either now or later in the process. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I'm not sure there's anyone on this call who really has that as their formal responsibility, but does anyone have an answer right now, or do we put it on the request for future information?

NEGAR FARZINNIA: I would like to just keep the question for responding back to the Review Team at a later time.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Let's go ahead, then.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Thank you, Alan. Let's move on to the next set of recommendations. Recommendations 12, 13, and 14 are all tied together. As such, I'll just go over the Board Action Plan that is consistent for all three recommendations for one of them, and then we can get into the details of the implementation.

For these three recommendations, the Board directed the CEO to have Staff do a number of things. One, to task a Working Group to determine the appropriate internationalized Domain Name Registration data requirements, and evaluating any relevant recommendations from the SSAC or GNSO. Number two, to produce a data model that includes

requirements for the translation or transliteration of the registration data, taking into account the results of any PDP initiative by the GNSO on translation/transliteration, and the standardized replacement protocol that was under development in the IETF's Web-based Extensible Internet Registration Data Working Group at the time. Three, to incorporate the data model in the relevant registrar and registry agreements within six months of adoption. Four, to evaluate available solutions, including solutions being implemented by ccTLDs. Five, to provide regular updates on technical developments of the IRD. And the other item that the Board directed ICANN Org to do was to investigate using automated tools to identify potentially inaccurate internationalized gTLD Domain Name Registration data.

With that in mind – and I'll move through the other two slides, because the information is the same – the deliverables for these recommendations included the following: work on the IRD requirements and the final report from the expert Working Group; issuance of the translation/transliteration being explored as a policy matter; Board approval of IRD Recommendations and translation/transliteration PDP recommendations; an implementation plan to be developed, to implement Registration Data Access Protocol; and finally, to develop resources and schedule.

With this high level in mind, allow me to turn it over to Trang, to get into the details of the implementation of the team. Trang, go ahead, please.

TRANG NGUYEN:

Thanks, Negar. Historically, there have been a few threads of work relating to internationalization of registration data, so I will try to provide an overview of these various threads of work, the linkages, and then the status of the current work. I'm going to take us back to June of 2009, when the ICANN Board passed a resolution requesting that the GNSO and SSAC form an Internationalized Registration Data Working Group to study the feasibility and suitability of introducing this many specifications to deal with the internationalization of registration data. So, a Working Group of the GNSO and SSAC was formed, and they called themselves the IRD Working Group. In May of 2012, this Working Group published its final report. To answer the feasibility question, the Working Group provided three main findings. First, it found that it is desirable for registrants to be able to submit the domain name registration data in characters other than [inaudible], but that this desirability should be balanced against other uses of the data. And the Working Group explained that while domain name registrants may intend to only use their domain name locally to interact with people in their native scripts, the nature of the Internet itself means that the domain – that any domain [inaudible] is globally available. So, that's the other uses of the data that should be balanced against the localization of the data.

Number two, the Working Group also looked at which basic data elements are suitable for internationalization, and they looked at a short list of data elements and concluded that all of the data elements should be internationalized, with the exception of the sponsoring registrar. And the reason behind that is, that information is to law enforcement and IT investigations. And so, therefore, they believe that

that information should not be – that’s a reason to not internationalize that data element.

The third finding was that the Working Group recognized that internationalized contact data can be translated or transliterated, and they tried to provide four models, but they could not reach consensus on any one model. And so, they recommended an Issues Report on translation and transliteration of contact data. We’ve made it to that they agree that the current WHOIS is not capable of handling [inaudible] and displays of internationalized registration data. And they encourage the ICANN community to identify, evaluate, and adopt an [inaudible] protocol that could do that. And then, to the question of feasibility, the Working Group agreed that it will be feasible to introduce [inaudible] and display specifications [inaudible] internationalized registration data.

So, based on that work, in October of 2012, the GNSO requested an Issue Report on translation and transliteration of contact data. As you recall, the first WHOIS Review Team did their work and published their final report at around the same time that the IRD Working Group published its final report, in May of 2012. And the WHOIS Review Team final report recognized that there is ongoing work in the area of internationalized registration data, and the Review Team provided three recommendations – the three that we are covering right now: Recommendations 12, 13, and 14. These recommendations led to the creation of another Expert Working Group called the Internationalized Registration Data Expert Working Group. This Working Group was tasked with determining submission and display requirements and data models, and the Expert Working Group spent a lot of time deliberating on “To what extent should internationalized data be localized?” Should

it be every time, upon demand only if someone wants to look at it in their particular script? Or should the data always be displayed in English, and then give the user the option to display it in their local script, if they choose?

The Expert Working Group published its final report in September of 2015, and the report identified three principles to guide internationalization of registration data. The first principle was something called the User Capability Principle, and this principle is around the fact that in defining a requirement for a particular data element or category of elements, the capability of the data-submitting user should be the factor – the determining factor.

I'm going to skip around a little bit on this slide, but I'll get to the RDAP and the translation and transliteration of contact information implementation momentarily.

The second principle was Simplicity and Reusability. Where possible, existing standards that are widely used for handling internationalized data should be applied. And then, the third principle was Extensibility. Where possible, the data models should be able to be easily extended to tailor to the evolution of data elements displayed.

So, based on these principles, the Expert Working Group proposed two high-level requirements: one, that registrants should only be required to input registration data in the language or script that they are skilled at; and two, unless explicitly stated, all data elements should be tagged with languages or scripts in use, and the information should always be available with the data element. Additionally, the Expert Working

Group also categorized all registration data elements. So, they went a little bit further than what the IRD Working Group did, and listed all data registration elements and categorized them into groups, and proposed internationalization requirements for each of these categories. The Expert Working Group recognized that there may be policy implications raised by its final report and suggested that the Board send the final report to the GNSO for appropriate follow-up because, as I mentioned, this work followed the work of the IRD Working Group and also, there were some recommendations relating to this in the WHOIS Review Team report. So, that recommendation was made for coordination purposes.

So, at the time of publication of the Expert Working Group's final report, the GNSO, PDP, and translation and transliteration of registration data was already well underway. And in fact, it concluded with the publication of this report, the same year, a few months earlier. And recall that this PDP originally stems from the 2009 IRD Working Group's recommendation. The difference is that the Expert Working Group looked at internationalization of registration data, whereas the PDP Working Group only looked at translation and transliteration of contact data.

So, the other difference is that the PDP Working Group determined that the translation and transliteration of registration data should not be mandatory – which, recall that the Expert Working Group said that it should be – and that the market forces should drive the determination. So, for example, if a U.S. registrar would like to operate in the Chinese market, it should be up to that registrar to determine whether or not they want to offer the ability to provide registration data in Chinese –

but the decision should be left up to the registrar; it shouldn't be made mandatory. It should be noted that the IPC submitted a minority statement in the final report recommending mandatory translation and transliteration of contact information, but did not provide a cost – did not answer the cost question – so, who would bear the burden of that translation and transliteration.

So, after the Board approved the GNSO PDP Working Group's recommendations on translation and transliteration of contact data, an Implementation Review Team was formed. And that IRT was tasked by the Board to incorporate the work of the IRD Working Group, to the extent that it facilitated the T&T implementation. So, that work has been going on – the Implementation Review Team work has been going on – for, I believe, close to a couple of years now, and Staff and the IRT are about to review a Strawman policy document. So, Staff and the IRT are about to review a Strawman policy document that would anchor the requirements for translating and transliterating registration data to the IRD Working Group's data model – this is the one from 2009 – for tagging registration data outputs with a specific language tag. So, this work is currently being reviewed in the IRT right now. The IRT also noted that the adoption of RDAP would be a requirement to implement the final translation and transliteration recommendations coming out of that Implementation Review Team, because [inaudible] required to communicate language tags would be required, and that would be implemented by RDAP, which is not possible with existing WHOIS protocol.

Recommendation 12 from the first WHOIS Review Team also asked that ICANN would investigate automated tools to identify potentially

inaccurate internationalized gTLD domain name registration data and forward to – and potentially inaccurate records – to registrars for action. We will be providing the Review Team with a briefing on WARS, which stands for “WHOIS Accuracy Reporting System,” at the face-to-face in Brussels. WARS – that currently includes internationalized gTLD domain names – review and output is currently being included as part of that work, and we will cover that in more detail in Brussels.

I know I covered a lot, so I will stop there before I move over to talk – to give a status on RDAP – to see if there are any questions.

ALAN GREENBERG:

It’s Alan. My question is in relation to your last comment. This is an awful lot to accept when it’s just verbal – and I know we will eventually have a transcript – but going back, when we’re tasking the individuals to actually analyze all of the output and decide whether the recommendations were implemented properly and whether we need further work – I’m wondering, to what extent can we get something in writing to help us? You know, at least bullet points on each of the recommendations and details, but exactly what was done, and where can they find the further details? I’m just looking forward and seeing, how do we get to the next step for the work we have to do, and that’s one of the reasons I had suggested written briefings when we originally started this, and I’m a little bit worried how we task the people. Reading transcripts is not a really good way to fully understand what has happened. So, if Staff can think about that. And I see Dmitry’s hand is up, but I know he sent an email just before the meeting on why he believed there was an issue with Recommendation 12, and perhaps that

is what he's put his hand up for, or perhaps not. So, we'll go over to Dmitry. Thank you.

DMITRY BELYAVSKY:

Hello? This is Mr. Belyavsky, for the record. There is a significant issue that [inaudible] 12, when there were the standards published describing the so-called international email addresses. I mean email addresses which use non-[inaudible] symbols because they're [inaudible]. Such email addresses have become rather popular, especially in the Asia Pacific region, and some national registries already have [inaudible] such email addresses as [inaudible] for example, [inaudible] or other [inaudible] information. But such email addresses can be [inaudible] if they are not [inaudible], they become undeliverable. It's a very special case. It significantly differs from the case of language [inaudible] organization language cannot [inaudible]. Currently, it's not allowed by their, for example, some [inaudible] standards. But I think [inaudible] can change; but it's only just because many Asian countries, such as China, Japan, Thailand, and some others, provide significant research in using such addresses, because it allows – because the use of such addresses allows much more [inaudible] of the Internet. So, I think that we should treat this case more or less specifically, and I have a question whether this case was taken into account by the IRT. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Dmitry. Trang? Do you have anything you'd like to address right now, or take it as an Action Item?

TRANG NGUYEN:

I don't, Alan. I know that there is a very specific data model that was provided in the Expert Working Group final report that – with specific recommendations for which standards to use – internationalized standards to use for each of the data elements. That is certainly something that we can include for you in the paper that I mentioned in the chat, so that the Review Team can take a look at it in more detail. I do not know specifically, Dmitry, whether or not the specific standard that you're talking about is one that was recommended or not.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Trang. I would have assumed that the work that you were talking about before – obviously, with RDAP you can store information – you can store an email address which has internationalized characters to the left of the @ sign. And I thought you had already said that you'd be reporting on the validation verification processes that are being looked at, or have been looked at, in terms of validating, or verifying, the internationalized data. So, I would have thought that was already covered. But perhaps I'm missing something. Any further questions?

Seeing nothing, hearing nothing, I'll go back to you, Trang.

TRANG NGUYEN:

Thank you, Alan. This last bit is just to give you an overview, if you will, a summary of where we are with RDAP. So, RDAP is a new protocol that was identified by the community to essentially [inaudible]. It stems from an SSAC report, SAC 051, published in September of 2011. The Board adopted SAC 051, and the ICANN Organization [inaudible] to implement it in June of 2012. A lot of work has been going on within

the IETF community to develop RDAP, and as you can see, they are on the [inaudible] in March of 2015, they each have published the RDAP RFCs, and ICANN Organization began working on the implementation of RDAP. We initially started with working on a profile for that implementation and have been in conversations and discussions with the contracted parties since then, and the profile has gone through many iterations, and at this point, skip forwards a little bit – in September, earlier this month, we published an announcement that we have begun an RDAP pilot with the contracted parties, and this pilot is going to last for one year. The pilot would allow, essentially, the contracted parties to experiment with various implementations of RDAP. This period would also get ICANN Organization and the contracted parties the opportunity to discuss an initial Strawman, if you would, [inaudible] the profile for the implementation of RDAP. So, we have additional information on the RDAP pilot on icann.org, and I will try to find a link and provide it in the chat.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Trang. I put my hand up. I just wanted to highlight for the group – the only term I can use is the schizophrenic – the dual personality – that we have going with RDAP. That although it is in the contract that contracted parties must implement it, we are going ahead with pilot project products; at the same time, the RDS PDP periodically comes up in the discussion, saying that we don't know if RDAP is what we're going to select or not as the protocol to be used in the future. So, we are going along this double path. I presume they will eventually merge together, but at this point, if I was to be looking at this from the outside, it looks rather curious. Any other comments, questions?

Not seeing any hands, not hearing any people calling out, I will turn it back to you, if you have any further issues or items to add. Trang or Negar?

NEGAR FARZINNIA:

Alan, this is Negar. I believe this is the last of the briefings slated for today. With that in mind, Jean-Baptiste, let me turn it over to you, so we can move the presentation over to the [inaudible] section of today's agenda, and Alan, I believe you will have the floor to continue with your normal meeting agenda items.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. Stephanie in the chat says, "Who says RDAP is not the protocol of choice?" There are regular comments – or at least, were earlier in the PDP process – about people saying it's still not clear we need a new protocol, and is RDAP the right protocol or not? I don't believe there's strong technical issues behind the comments, but those comments have been made, and the PDP has not formally made any statement to that effect. And I will read Carlton's comments, but you can read them, yourself.

Alright, if we can go on to Scope, then, and bring up the document. Now, a lot of work has been done since the last meeting on trying to pull together a Scope document. We're edging towards what we actually have to formally decide on. The document looks a lot like it did before, but number one, the last column has been added, which is draft text which will go into the Terms of Reference; and a second-to-last column was added of the issues that, essentially, we need to discuss and

potentially resolve in order to finalize the text. As this was being created, a number of questions came up that we thought had been resolved, but perhaps are not, because we just couldn't come up with the proper words for what to put in the Scope – and I'd like to proceed with that. We have, at this point, forty-five minutes left in the call. I'm presuming we need at least fifteen minutes for Items 4 through 6. Jean-Baptiste, is that a reasonable amount of time to allow for it, or should we allow a little bit more?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: I can deal with that, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. So, we'll try to do work for about a half an hour on this. Alright, the first recommendation, which is the basic one of "review the prior recommendations," I think we're pretty well complete on. There may be some minor wordsmithing, but we're close to done on that one. The second one is, "Board shall cause periodic review to assess the effectiveness of the current gTLD Registry Directory Service." And the issues that come on this is, do we know what "effectiveness" means? Now, Stephanie was going to be proposing a definition. I'm not sure – I don't think I've seen that yet. Maybe we can get an update from Stephanie on – are we likely to see that in the near future, or do we need to work around it? Stephanie is typing. We'll come back to that.

Right now, if you look at what's going on within the PDP, there are still questions about what the purpose of RDS and the individual fields' RDSes are; and I'm questioning if, indeed, the community has not

identified exactly why we are doing this, can we decide whether it's effective or not? And that really is the main question. Now, there was work in Review Team 1 on Scope that may enlighten us, but I'd like to open the floor and – how do we resolve these issues? Because the core question is, if, indeed, we have methodology that we can use to do this, then that's fine. If we're stuck with saying, "How can we define 'effectiveness,' for instance, if we can't recognize it?" then we have a real issue.

Anyone – oh, go ahead. Stephanie, you have your hand up; please go ahead.

STEPHANIE PERRIN:

Yes, thanks very much. Stephanie Perrin, for the record. I agree we've got an issue, Alan. I think when I first proposed that I would come up with some language, it was because anybody who's on the RDS Group will know that we've got issues in moving forward on WHOIS. Hopefully, we'll get results sometime fairly soon. But how can we honestly – I think of us as being like an audit team. You can't go in and audit the numbers on something if the entire project is misguided. And I'm overstating that, just as an example. I'm not suggesting that the work that we've been doing on WHOIS is all misguided; but we're moving forward on things that are important, but we're still dodging the main stated purpose of WHOIS and the whole privacy question, so I would say that there's a certain point where the workaround leaves a giant whole in the center. So, I think we do have to say that we've reached the end of the rope, where we have to actually tackle that to be effective. I guess that's what – I'm giving you a hint of what I want to

say. I'm not – if it were easy, I would have written it by now – goofing off – I've got the dissertation done. That was my priority. So, I hope you catch the drift of where I'm going with this. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Well, what I hear – and I'm not quite sure it's what you're saying – but what I'm hearing is that we really cannot measure effectiveness when there's a parallel effort going on to decide what the purpose is, and therefore, then we could measure – we could predict, perhaps, effectiveness of the next RDS system. But we've been charged with measuring the effectiveness of the current one. And that's where my concern comes. I mean, I understand we can't judge the work of the oncoming one, but we have acknowledged one way back that the uses of the DNS and WHOIS information have evolved significantly over the years, and the documentation, as it were, that goes along with it, has not. We have hands up. Cathrin, I'll put you in the queue. And we have Susan, and I know also Carlton had made some comments about the Expert Working Group looking at the same issue. So, why don't we start off with Susan?

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI:

Thanks, Alan. I'll take a crack at this, and hopefully have maybe something for us to review in Brussels, because I think it's imperative that we do define "effectiveness," and I have some personal feelings about how effective the WHOIS record is right now, but I think this is really critical and that we need to make sure that we have a guideline to review everything concerning WHOIS and something to guide us on the

effectiveness of it. It is early for me, so my words are not very good this morning. But anyway, I will take that on as an action, and hopefully have a draft of something that we could at least look at and talk about in Brussels.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much, Susan. It strikes me, as you were talking, that I suddenly realized that when I started in ICANN eleven years ago, just about the time I came in, the last major – or perhaps the first – whatever – a major effort – and I think it was actually a PDP on WHOIS – had just declared failure; that they could not come to closure on where we should go. We have had all the activity since then. I think we can declare the current WHOIS is not effective. If we can't – if we could declare it effective, why have we spent this much time – well over a decade and a half now – discussing it and trying to decide how to change it? Perhaps our answer is very simple, and we don't need to belabor the point. But in any case, Cathrin, please go ahead.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST:

Sorry, struggling with the mute button. This is Cathrin. Thank you, Alan, and thank you, Susan. I fully agree with Susan; I think we do need a definition. And I think in terms of the purposes, I agree with Stephanie that that's a hard question. At the same time, maybe it's not for us to judge which purposes are appropriate, and if we think that [inaudible] and get [inaudible] which purposes the current WHOIS is de facto being used for, then we can build on the [inaudible] that ICANN Org and the Board has done with the help of the community [inaudible]. But I

believe [inaudible] quite comprehensive overview of the current purposes, and maybe we can use that as a starting for it, and we can still have a discussion on whether or not we want to talk about which of these purposes is legitimate or not. So, that would be my input. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. Thank you. I will put on the table the issue I just raised – of, if indeed, it is effective, then why are we spending all this time on it? That may be the crux. Remember, the recommendations – the scope of this Review Team – is an ongoing thing, so the same question will apply when we finally implement the next great WHOIS system. So, I think, at some level, we have an easier level than they may have, in that there is a huge laundry list over at least fifteen years of reasons why people think it needs to change, and that input, to me, implicitly is saying it's not effective. Stephanie, go ahead, please.

STEPHANIE PERRIN:

Thanks, Alan. Stephanie Perrin again, for the record. If I may give you a hint of where I was going, and I will try to get this – unfortunately, I won't be in Brussels – but I will try to get this thing drafted. Part of the problem, as I see it, is that to have a multistakeholder community comprised of third-party data users decide what the purpose of WHOIS is, is going to be fraught with, I would say, interminable contention. And the question is, how can you frame that fundamental question, "Why are we doing WHOIS?" in a way that fits with ICANN's limited remit? The problem is that we have lots of stakeholders at ICANN who

are basically there because they want the data, and there's lots of them. So, the more they show up, the less likely this issue is to be resolved without third party action from, let's say, the data commissioners, for instance, to stop the – to crack down on the abuse. So, I don't know. To me, we need to measure our own progress in addressing that fundamental problem. And that fundamental problem was identified way, way, way back in time, when the GNSO came up with the two rival purposes of WHOIS, and there was a stalemate because the stakeholders were divided on it, evenly. At least, that's the conclusion that I reached, in going over this historical record, many of you were there for all of this, so I realize that I'm kind of pontificating by standing back, coming in new, and evaluating, but that seems to be a fundamental problem. I've never seen a data management arrangement where the stakeholders actually got to veto the law, you know? Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Any further comments?

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: This is Cathrin again.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, please go ahead, Cathrin.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Sorry, this is Cathrin again; if I can – it’s just on the effectiveness, Alan, I’m wondering whether that really is a yes or no question. I think we can be a lot more – we can differentiate a lot more according to the different uses of the WHOIS. And I agree with Stephanie that of course we can look at which of them are legitimate, and there is a discussion to be had certainly on that level, as well. But at the same time, you can have a more nuanced discussion on the effectiveness on the basis of these purposes, and then I think the rest of the discussion on the legitimacy, maybe we want to take a stab at that in Brussels, because I do think it’s a conversation worth having. I’m not sure we have the [inaudible] to do it today.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Cathrin. Susan, did you want to get in again?

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: No, thank you. I’m fine.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Erika?

Cannot hear you, Erika.

While we’re waiting for Erika, I will read out the comments that Lisa put. Said, “It may be helpful to recall that the first WHOIS Review Team recommendations were to address what they saw as the gaps in effectiveness of WHOIS, as it was at that time. The Review Team needs to assess the effectiveness of the current WHOIS, including

improvements made since RT1.” To that end, I perhaps asked the question of, “Are we addressing this issue simply by reviewing the recommendations and looking at whether further work needs to be done?” And I don’t know the answer to that. Erika, we cannot hear you, but if you do want to type it, then I’ll read it into the record.

Any further questions or comments, while Erika is talking? It’s a thorny issue, and as I see this going forward, we can either – we can do anything between a very simple answer of saying, “It’s not effective, because look at how much work we’re doing,” or “The effectiveness was what Review Team 1 looked at, and by reviewing theirs, we are implicitly doing it,” or we can end up with a very significant, major study. So, I think we need to, out of Brussels, go forward and at least understand where we’re going and how we’re going to get there, if indeed, it’s the major work.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Alan, this is Cathrin again, if I may.

ALAN GREENBERG: Please, go ahead.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Thank you. Just to say, I think we tried to get the closure on this point before. I think the conversation we keep having, or coming back to, is that looking at recommendations and other [inaudible] WHOIS at the time when the recommendations were made is one thing. I think what Lisa is highlighting, if I view it correctly, is that there is also the WHOIS

as it stands today – imperfect as we all agree it is – that might be worthy of our analysis, as it stands now, in terms of the effectiveness. So, I do think we need to go a bit farther than looking at the implementation of the recommendations [inaudible]. But I do agree with you, Alan, that those processes are very much linked. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah. Thanks very much. I wasn't really advocating one or the other; I was just pointing out we have a wide spectrum of options ahead of us, and we really do need to make a decision on where we're going. Erika –

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST:

I fully agree.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Erika says, "Concerning the privacy effectiveness issues, we need to separate between data and particular business data that can be collected legitimately, and data that falls under certain data protection limitations. Let's discuss this in Brussels." I guess we will.

Alright, let us – without having really closure on that one – let's go on to the next one, where the list of comments is even more extensive. This one is the complex one of judging whether the implementation meets legitimate needs of law enforcement, whether it promotes consumer trust, and whether it safeguards registrant data. I would like to suggest, before we look at the specifics, that when I read – when I try to read – the section that we're going to put into the Terms of Reference – it is a very long and complex to parse sentence. And I would suggest that we

break that particular sentence in the bylaw into three scope issues and separate out, in separate words, the legitimate needs of law enforcement, whether it promotes consumer trust, and whether it safeguards registrant data. I think our job's going to be a lot easier if we simply have an easy-to-read sentence or easy-to-read section on each of those. And I'd like some comments on that. Stephanie, are you on this item, or still on the previous one? I see your hand is up.

STEPHANIE PERRIN:

Thanks, Alan. I think I'm actually bridging the two items, because there's one final thing I wanted to say on the previous item, and that is that I think it's worthwhile to explicitly recognize that Lisa has very usefully pointed out terms of the first review. And I mean, if you look at it historically, not only did the U.S. Commerce Department set up ICANN with an explicit requirement to have a free and open WHOIS, but the subsequent Affirmation of Commitment and the very terms of these WHOIS Review Teams were set in direct counterpoint to European and global data protection law. So, it's baked through to the bones of what we're doing that we may be "safeguarding" registrant data, but that's after over-collecting and disproportionately collecting it. So, that is the inherent crux of this problem with effectiveness, is, we may be effectively carrying out the mandate that the Commerce Department has set; the question I would raise is whether that actual mandate is now permissible in a global ICANN that is not an American corporation.

RECORD VOICE: [Multilingual audio]. This call is interrupted. Please try again later.
[German audio].

ALAN GREENBERG: Are the rest of us still here? Is anyone still here?

UNKNOWN: Yes; that was Cathrin.

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh.

UNKNOWN: Yeah, sorry, that was Cathrin's line disconnecting.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay.

UNKNOWN: Apologies.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. When one hears beeps in one ear, I can't tell whether it's me disconnecting or someone else disconnecting. Yes, there's no question we have conflicts. And we can identify the conflicts and get the two different answers, but I'm not sure that's a useful way to go

forward. I look forward to the meeting next week. Is there any disagreement with what I was just – dividing these into three different things, so we can talk about each of them without confusing the issue?

I see no comments. Okay. Then let us do that. Alright. I had a number of questions on, what are the legitimate needs? Cathrin has added a useful sentence there, and I believe that – and from my point of view, she’s added law enforcement needs – “swiftly accessible, accurate, and complete data.” And I think that is a reasonable definition and something we can work to in judging whether that is, indeed, met by the current WHOIS. So, I’m not unhappy with that one. Does anyone have any further comments on that particular sentence?

Somebody – Cathrin, is that you?

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Yes. Sorry, I’m going on mute.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. So, I think that addresses the first question of “What are the legitimate needs of law enforcement?” And I think we can move forward on that one. And how do we assess it – I think that we can certainly do surveys, or whatever, and try to get some information on that. So, I’m comfortable at this point with the law enforcement part. And – Lisa, do you have – do you feel comfortable that you can fully flesh that out? And hopefully, we can put a “no issues” on that section next time around. You can answer later or in the chat; as you wish.

The second part is, we're asked to assess whether the current WHOIS promotes consumer trust. That one, I have more problems with, because I'm not quite sure what we are looking at. If you look at consumers and assume we're talking about either the definition of someone who uses the Internet, or more likely, individuals who use the Internet for commerce, to what extent does WHOIS provide trust? And from my perspective, the simple answer is, "Well, if you can look up who it is you're dealing with, you may have more trust in them." Is it a wider question than that, or is that as far as it goes? I open the floor. Go ahead, Stephanie.

STEPHANIE PERRIN:

I think, once again, we're back to that inherent problem, in that – and it's been pointed out by the data [inaudible] commissioners since about 2000 – you're not going to get accurate data if you have an open WHOIS. So, we may very well have an ability to look up individuals there, but you're not going to get the good data. Now, that is totally separate from what Susan has brought up in the chat. The business needs for [inaudible] are very different than personal needs. So, I think we need to keep remembering that, and as she points out, most of the data is commercial. Now, that brings you to the whole regulatory problem that we thought about in the PTSAI, as to whether or not it was ICANN's job to tell websites what to do, and to provide consumer trust data through WHOIS. I don't see that as either workable or a correct role for ICANN. But again, that was baked into the open WHOIS that set up ICANN. Whether or not it's acceptable under law – that's a whole other question. And that gets us back to whether we're chasing our

tails in assessing something that is not properly set up in the first place.
Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Stephanie. I'm not sure how relevant that is to answering this particular question – they're important issues. I read – and maybe there are other interpretations – that when we talk about consumer trust, we are talking about the needs of individuals who are using the Internet, and if I were looking at the current WHOIS – not the next WHOIS, which may have very different rules on accessibility of the data – the current WHOIS provides some level of consumer information to tell you who you're dealing with. It may or may not be accurate, and that impacts consumer trust, if the consumer understands that. But I'm not sure the legality of it is something that we consider in the current version. But I heard Cathrin [CROSSTALK] Cathrin?

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Could I answer that, Alan?

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Yes, thank you [CROSSTALK]

ALAN GREENBERG: After Cathrin.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Okay.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Sorry, I'll be quick. I just wanted to say that – Alan, I think what you set out as the basic definition is also what I understand the Review Team on Consumer Choice and Consumer Trust was looking at. And as I was pulling together the submissions from the GAC for this mapping of purposes, we did come across a whole bunch of federal [inaudible] testimony as to the important role of the WHOIS for consumer trust, and also for [inaudible] consumer complaints. So, there's definitely some evidence out there that we might build on; but as a simple first step, maybe it would be good to reach out to the other Review Teams and ask them how they looked at the WHOIS, in terms of consumer trust and what role it played there, and see whether we can build on that, also, and make use of their results, because they also had [inaudible] helpful study. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Staff, if we could take that as an Action Item, please – to consult with the Consumer Trust Review Team on their views, or what they have found in relation to WHOIS. Stephanie, go ahead.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Stephanie Perrin, for the record. I don't think we do have good global data as to whether a, consumers use the WHOIS, or b, whether the data that they get from the WHOIS is actually useful in determining who they're dealing with. I mean, it is useful for the big players, such as, say, Facebook. But is it useful for detecting fraud and phishing, and all of

that? I would say, probably not, because you'd have to be an expert to unravel the data trail. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. I don't question that. I'm not sure we are going to end up with a statistically valid, provable answer, because of the lack of that kind of data. Carlton, did you want to add anything? Carlton is on the Consumer Trust Review Team. Can't talk. I suggest we figure out how to buy Carlton a talking device in the future.

Alright, we seem to have a diversity of views, and again, I worry how we are going to get from here to be able to put solid words on it by the end of the Brussels meeting. And we really do need to do that. And the last item is, we need to assess whether the current implementation safeguards registrant data.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST:

Sorry, Alan, this is Cathrin again.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yes, go ahead, Cathrin.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST:

Sorry. I actually think [inaudible] I think there is a diversity of views, but I don't think they are incompatible. Because what Stephanie is referring to, to me, would be a question of the effectiveness assessment. And so, you know, we do have [inaudible] consider consumer trust, we may not

have global data to do the best assessment possible; but the point that Stephanie is making, for me, [inaudible] assessment of the effectiveness. And I think that dropping that point altogether – which I’m not sure it’s what Stephanie’s suggesting – I think that would not be a very good option. So, let’s take a look at it, let’s assess the effectiveness, and if we have issues with the impact on consumer trust or think it’s not a good basis, then we can talk about that in our report. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I don’t think there’s any question about dropping it; I don’t think we have that option. So, we do have to answer the question, even if the answer were – there’s no way to get the answer – but in fact, because of the kind of things Cathrin said – and I think that that’s mapped by what Stephanie said and I said – we know what some number of consumers – and we don’t have a clue on what percentages – might use WHOIS for. We also know that the data is exceedingly unreliable, and the user may be relying on it to a larger extent than we know is reasonable, given the accuracy problems and the validity problems. But that, in itself, is an answer, so I’m not particularly worried about that. But I don’t think there’s any question about dropping it.

Alright, back on safeguarding user data. Do we have any clue – what does that mean? Is that simply, we make sure that we don’t lose it? We certainly can’t make a claim that we are protecting the data in protecting it from access, because the current rule is, it’s accessible. So, I’m not sure I know what “safeguarding user data” means in the context

of a fully open WHOIS. Does anyone have any insight into that? Go ahead, Stephanie.

STEPHANIE PERRIN:

Safeguarding is a term that we privacy advocates might describe as a “weasel word” that is put in there if you are not actually going to apply data protection principles. You’re going to gulp down all the data; then, you talk about safeguarding, and it means “protect” data, really, in storage. And we all know how well that’s working these days, with the rate of data breach. So, “safeguarding,” in my view, was selected to ensure that we could continue to gather the data and just continue along the way. We’re not safeguarding the data, [inaudible] point out, if we’re publishing it. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:

That was my perception. I think it’s a really easy one to answer. ICANN does require escrow and stuff so we don’t lose the data, but in terms of safeguarding it, presumably, since we are publishing it, it’s not a matter of access. So, I would think that to the extent that ICANN can, as from privacy perspective, be expected to protect the data – which I guess means protect from improper access – we don’t do that. So, again, I think it’s a moderately easy question to answer. It may be highlighting the fact that this whole area is something we’ve ignored, which is not any revelation to anyone. But I don’t think it’s a particularly complex question to answer. But I might be – I may have some surprises, there. And Carlton agrees that “safeguarding” in terms of protection is ignored, generally. I think it’s ignored – it’s not ignored; it’s explicitly

denied – that we don’t protect the data from access, by very definition. Stephanie, I see you’re muted and you have your hand up. And I note we have gone into Jean-Baptiste’s fifteen minutes that we said we would allow him. So, I am going to bring this discussion to an end; but Stephanie, if you do have a comment, please go ahead. No?

Alright, then. I’m not very comfortable with how far we’ve gotten, but I guess we have no choice. I would suggest that, to the extent possible, we try to do a little bit of work on the mailing list in the few days we have before we get to Brussels. It would be nice if we – well – I don’t have a high degree of confidence that the few hours we have in Brussels are going to fully resolve this, but maybe face-to-face will be more effective.

I’ll turn the – we’ll now go on to Item Number Four on the face-to-face agenda, and I’ll turn the call over to, I think, Jean-Baptiste.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ:

That’s correct, Alan. Thank you. I’m just going to move back to the slides. For Agenda Item Number Four [inaudible] face-to-face meeting one agenda, so we just wanted to share again the different meeting goals that were identified: “to understand specific review processes, to identify tasks to be performed by subgroups and allocate responsibilities, to fully understand and agree upon Scope and Objective, Work Plan, and Terms of Reference, and to complete the Plan Implementation Briefing.” A few leadership [inaudible] are listed here, which are “listen to previous Plenary calls in case you have missed them, do not hesitate to put your hand up and volunteer during face-to-

face meetings, take responsibility on Scope, and leave the meeting with work assignments.” So, what I’m going to share now –

ALAN GREENBERG:

If I can interrupt for a moment – if you combine all that, one of our real tasks is to come out of Brussels knowing, to a large extent, who is actually going to do all this work that you’re talking about. So, as you’re reviewing the documentation, please think about it from a perspective of which sections – both in the review of the prior recommendations, and in the new work that we are committing to – which parts are you willing to work on and willing to commit time and effort to producing our answers? It’s fine to decide – to come up with a Scope issue which we believe should be done, but that has to be done by one of us. So, going forward, please look at it from that perspective of, “Which ones are you willing to commit to?” And with that, back to Jean-Baptiste.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ:

Thank you, Alan. I’m just going to move to the draft agenda that was prepared and presented to you. I’m going to project that on the screen. Okay. So, on this draft agenda currently on the screen, what I just wanted to mention to you – it’s a bit about the organization of different sessions that were suggested for this face-to-face meeting. So, what I wanted to remind everyone is that each day of the face-to-face meeting will start with a breakfast at the ICANN office from 8:30 to 9:00. And in terms of structure – so, sessions will be divided with three breaks – always one in the morning, from 10:15 to 10:30, a Review Team lunch of

forty-five minutes from noon to 12:45, and a break in the afternoon of fifteen minutes, from 3:45 to 3:30.

So, looking at the session on the first day, the face-to-face meeting will kick off with some opening remarks from [inaudible], the head of the [inaudible] Department within ICANN, and followed with a Statement of Interest update – and I will get back to that in a minute, Alan, as you requested under AOB. Roll call and administrative items, which will be introduced by [inaudible] leadership, look at the different Day One objectives. And it will be followed by two presentations: one on the specific review processes, presented by Alice, and also an introduction on the Work Plan and the timeline templates, also by Alice. After the morning break, there will be a first working session, intended to review the objectives on the Scope section. So, this will be presented and facilitated by Lisa and Patrick, and it will be followed in the afternoon, after a lunch break, with another session on the same topic, to leave more time on that. And after the afternoon break will be another working session on the Terms of Reference. At the end of the day, there will be a review of Day Two agenda and closing remarks from the Review Team leadership, and we also would like to remind you that there is a reservation booked for the Review Team at [inaudible], which is a restaurant really close by to your hotel and the ICANN offices, and this will start at 7:00.

On the second day of the face-to-face meeting, there will be a debrief of Day One and a review of the objectives of Day Two made by the [inaudible] leadership, followed by a presentation from me on [inaudible] a previous request on what were the different costs and the differences between face-to-face meetings, during ICANN meetings

outside of ICANN meetings, so I'll provide a presentation on that. And then, there will be the WHOIS 1 Implementation briefings on Recommendations 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 9, 15, and 16, which are listed in this document. And this will be divided into sections, and there will be a short break in the meal. And after the lunch break in the afternoon, there will be a session scheduled for the Work Plan and working on a timeline to identify and define [inaudible] and assign subteam members and [inaudible] the Work Plan and milestones into Terms of Reference. After the afternoon break, it will be an occasion to finalize and formally adopt the Terms of Reference, including the scope and objectives of the review, and this will be led by the Review Team leadership. And after that, from 4:30 to 4:40, it will be an occasion to confirm the leadership, depending on the scope, and also to confirm the Plenary schedule and identify subteam call needs, based on previous discussions. At the end of the day, there will be a wrap-up by the Review Team leadership, to review the different Action Items and decisions reached during the face-to-face meeting, determine the response to the Board request, and a meeting communique, and also a notification to CCNSO. Ending with AOB and closing remarks from the Review Team leadership, I would also like to note that we are working on populating the reading list, which will be posted on the wiki. You have the link on the previous slide that I showed. And also, I want you to mention that today, you will receive a document with [inaudible] guidelines and how to get to offices and how to travel in Brussels when arriving at the airport. This will be provided this afternoon. I welcome any comments that you may have on the draft agenda, and if no comments, if we can receive a sign-off on this. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. A couple of questions. You answered my first question, of recommended travel from the airport. We had discussed an informal dinner the first night. Could we have a show of hands, or voices, or something, of – are there likely to be people there who are interested, and if so, we should set a time of when to meet in the lobby, and I'm guessing something like 6:00, 7:00. Some people will have traveled far to get there and perhaps not be interested in dinner, or want to make it an early night. Yes, Erika, we're talking about Sunday night. Is there going to be any interest? I'm certainly going to want dinner; I don't know about anyone else. May I propose that we meet at 7:00, and if we could put that into the agenda – let's say 6:45 in the lobby of the hotel – and if we could have a recommendation or two from Staff on places that we may want to consider?

My last question is, it would be useful if everyone who was attending the meeting could send either the list – or me, personally, if you prefer not to publicize it – when your flights are planning to arrive, or your flight, or train, or whatever you're taking, is planning to arrive, so we have some idea of when people are there and start sending out search teams if we haven't seen you. So, I would appreciate that. Back to you, Jean-Baptiste.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ:

Yes, thank you Alan. I was just wondering if there were any other questions on the agenda, and if this can be considered final.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think we –

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: – [inaudible] your comments on the informal dinner.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, I think we can consider it as final; it's going to be right now. Obviously, as we progress through the two days, we may well make some adjustments.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Of course, yeah. Thank you, Alan. I'm going to move on to the next item on the agenda, then, which is the ICANN 60 informal meeting. So, I just wanted to remind everyone that you should have received reminders via email to fill in the Doodle poll, if you haven't yet. You have – we have received [inaudible] answers so far, so if you have not, please do by tomorrow [inaudible]. We just wanted to mention that, for this informal meeting, [inaudible] that meeting [inaudible] for breakfast, or using a public room for the [inaudible] ICANN meeting. Those are free of charge but do not include catering, so for public rooms, the solution would be to bring your own food, as we cannot make at this stage any further meeting room or catering requests.

ALAN GREENBERG: At the Leadership meeting earlier this week, I said if we are going to actually have this meeting – and if there's only four of us, I don't think it's worth having the meeting, to be quite honest – if we're going to

have the meeting, then I would like a catered lunch; otherwise, if people bring their own lunch, by the time they actually get there, we won't have any time left to talk. So, I would suggest that we – people have till the end of today to fill in the Doodle. If you have not filled in the Doodle, we are presuming you are not coming, and we may well cancel the whole event. There was a strong desire to have an informal meeting, but if very few people are willing to actually do that or be there, then there's not a lot of point. So, please fill in the Doodle or send another message, to whatever extent you believe you can fill in the details, Doodle, but you will be there, or whatever. Let's make sure. Are you going to have dial-in capabilities in the pop-up meetings? No. If it's in a pop-up room, there are no dial-in capabilities. If we do it in a regular meeting room, there might be dial-in capabilities, but that would depend on whether we can get Staff to staff it during the lunch hour. I don't think we can assume there will be comm activity for the lunch. And the same if it ends up being at a breakfast time.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: That's correct, Alan. And I've placed the Doodle link in the chat for this [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. So, please, if you do plan to attend, make it known and – otherwise, we will cancel it, if there's just not enough critical mass.

Stephanie, it's not clear we will have any comm activity. Certainly – presumably, there'll be Internet connectivity, and we can try to get a Skype going. At this point, I'm not convinced the meeting's going to be

held at all; so let's see what the Doodle does, and then we'll try our best to try to make sure there's some sort of external connectivity.

Alright, and the last item – the AOB on the Statement of Interest.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yes, Alan. So, concerning the Statements of Interest, those are still under legal review, so we are currently waiting for confirmation from them, and as soon as we hear something, we'll let you know.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I'm just a little bit concerned that if the questions are under that much legal review, are we going to end up with people on this Review Team who don't meet whatever the criteria is, and have to back out? We seem to be doing this in the wrong order. But I guess that's not under your control, either.

Alright, thank you very much for attending, and safe travels for all. And we'll see you or talk to you in Brussels in a few days. Bye-bye.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Bye, Alan. Bye, all. See you in Brussels.

UNKNOWN: Thanks, everyone. See you soon.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]