BRENDA BREWER:	Good day, everyone. This is Brenda speaking, for the record. Welcome to RDS WHOIS2 Plenary Call #33 on 9 July 2018 at 15:00 UTC. Attending the call today is Dmitry, Lili, Erika, Susan, Alan, Chris, Stephanie. We have no observers at this time. From ICANN Org, we have Alice, Jean-Baptiste, Lisa, Steve, Amy, and Brenda. We do have apologies from Carlton and Volker. Cathrin and Thomas will be delayed today. I'd like to remind you today's call is being recorded, so please state your name for the transcript. Alan, I'll turn the call over to you.
ALAN GREENBERG:	Thank you very much. Are there any changes to statements of interest? Hearing nothing, seeing nothing, we'll go on. The agenda is posted. Does anyone have any AOB items they want to add? Again, nothing. Then, we will proceed. If we can go to the first agenda item of the ICANN 62 debrief. This is going to be a packed meeting, I suspect, so we should try to be as brief as we can.
	We're going to review the items that were raised from the floor, some of which I'm familiar with, some of which I'm not. In the case of the first two, these were raised – at least the first one was raised … One second. Yeah, this one is in relation to the filling in of the contact information for a domain that's suspended. Susan, do you want to take that one?
SUSAN KAWAGUCHI:	Sure. Sorry about that. I needed to plug in my computer. Hold on a second.

So, there was a little confusion on our recommendation, but it still stands that I think that if we explain it a little bit more, people will understand that if a domain name is suspended for inaccurate WHOIS information, and maybe we add the criteria has been involved in abusive behavior. So, in some ways, it was suspended for abuse, not inaccurate, but at least in my best practice, it's reported as abuse and has inaccurate data, we make two different reports. That inaccurate data should not stay within the registration. I think if we just sort of clarify out thinking there for the final report.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Stephanie says she cannot hear anything and someone else is also complaining. Brenda, is that under control? Dmitry also says he can't hear anything.

BRENDA BREWER: I am working on a dial-out for Dmitry right now. Stephanie, I can call you as well. The audio seems to be working for everyone else, so I'll call you, Stephanie.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. Everyone else may be on the phone. It may be the Adobe Connect audio that isn't working. In any case, we will proceed and have them catch up, if necessary.

Susan, wasn't this one where we were recommending that there be a new flag and say why it was on hold?

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Yes. And maybe new data.

ALAN GREENBERG: Maybe that needs to be [inaudible] clarified. The second one is the one where there was the – well, I thought was the delightful rant from Michele. I know Lili weighed in on this online, so we'll go to her in a minute.

My understanding of the issue is no one is arguing that the overall recommendation is not reasonable. I think the only contention was the pronoun A. That is, one single WHOIS ticket, should be sufficient to trigger an audit. That was I think the overall part that was being contested. But, I'll turn it over to Lili, if she can speak. Go ahead, Lili.

LILI SUN: I replied to the mailing list of the review team this morning regarding Michele's comment. So, this recommendation is actually [inaudible] the registrar fulfilled to show the proof it has fulfilled or implemented all the due validation or verification which was exposed or discovered by the ARS project.

The rationale behind this recommendation is that [inaudible] will not be a standalone case. So, it's not purely a single complaint. I reviewed the ARS project report carefully and for the format errors. It's not even considered as a valid complaint according to ARS project.

So, only those who failed to validate or verify the WHOIS data can be deemed as a valid complaint, according to the WHOIS ARS project.

So, I believe there is still enough rationale to proceed with this recommendation. My only concern is will it still be manageable by the compliance team? That's my only concern.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. Okay, thank you. Lili, are you saying that if there is an ARS WHOIS ticket raised, then that implies a pattern of failure, not necessarily a single failure?

LILI SUN: The failure is not necessary to be implicated by a pattern, and if the registrar couldn't provide proof they have fulfilled the validation and the verification, then the audit will be triggered.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright. Then, I think we just need to be very clear in the explanation and in the preamble to the recommendation and the recommendation that this is not a single failure to have valid data, but based on a consistent pattern. So, if that's the case, then I think we need to be more clear in the description than it is right now.

LILI SUN: Yeah. I agree. Maybe the text needs to be revised and to be as precise as possible.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. How are we doing, Brenda, on sound? Do we have people on now?

BRENDA BREWER: We seem to be still having technical difficulties, Alan. We're trying.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you. Alright, let's go on to the next slide, please. I'm sorry, I didn't ask if anyone else wants to speak on that. I think we were finished. We need to make sure the wording does not imply that it's a single incident, but some level of pattern. I don't see any other hands.

The next one was the comments that DAR blacklist does not have any accountability, so we may not want to make reference to it. We did review this quickly on the leaders call the other day, and I think the consensus was the DAR report which relies on multiple blacklists is something that ICANN is treating as serious and I think we can, therefore, use it. I understand why some registrars may feel there's no accountability, but my understanding is ICANN believes this is an effort worth [inaudible], that OCTO has put a lot of effort into. My understanding is that compliance may or may not be currently using it, but I don't think I have any problem because the black list independently may not have suitable accountability in the eyes of the registrar. Anyone else like to weigh in on this one? Steve, please go ahead.

STEVE: I'm not [inaudible]. I can't give you the deep and gory details on this, but I do know that compliance uses it as a tool and not as the rule. It's just another tool in their toolkit to determine compliance or not.

We do have specs that allow other people to recreate the DAR tool itself, depending on what the resources are because we do pay for some of those [feeds], but we're trying to be as open and transparent with this tool, with this [power] tool, as possible. We understand that lists are managed by other people. We have no control over those lists and that's why we pull in as many as we can to help create a broader picture of what the Internet is seeing and then how we can parse that bit out.

So, I guess, in general, I agree with you.

RECORDING: The host has left the meeting to speak with meeting support and will rejoin soon.

STEVE: I agree with [inaudible], but I just wanted to be a little bit more clear on what it is [inaudible] use it as the authoritative method. It's just another tool in a box on how to [inaudible] in breech or not.

ALAN GREENBERG: Right. Thank you. We may need to be slightly clear how compliance uses it as opposed to treating it as a ticket of a complaint on a specific domain or registrar. I have no concern. I don't support the concern

raised by the person in the audience. Any further comments on the DAR one?

Next one is consumer trust. The comment says the US Federal Trade Commission has some useful information re the role of accessible WHOIS and protecting consumers, and therefore promoting consumer trust. Erika, do you want to take that? You responded that it's something you're aware of. I'm not quite sure what we should be doing because of this comment. Is Erika with us? Erika is typing. Erika cannot hear us. Alright. Can someone ask Erika in the chat does she want to say anything about this one or is she happy to discuss it when we do our face-to-face? It's amazing this technology is still as flaky as it is. Lili, please go ahead.

LILI SUN: I noticed there was a comment about contact ability a goal of WHOIS1 and that the goal has been accomplished. So, I replied to the mailing list today regarding this comment. I believe there is an assumption behind this comment. The assumption is that the WHOIS data has association with the registrant. Is this assumption valid? I doubt. Is this the provision? Is the assumption valid? If the assumption is not valid, then contact ability has no meaning for the WHOIS [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: My understanding is if by contact ability we mean we know we can contact the actual registrar, registrant, then I don't belt hat is something that has been accomplished or are we trying to accomplish? I think at this point all we are trying to do is ensure that the information looks

usable. There is no attempt at this point in the normal practice to actually verify that we can contact the specific registrant. Susan, do you have any further comment on that? I think that's something that you've been working on a little bit. If so, we may need to make sure that we're using words like contact ability correctly. Lisa, please go ahead.

LISA PHIFER: Thanks, Alan. In trying to follow the various comments that have been raised on this, I see there maybe is a disconnect. Some want to limit the discussion here to what the first WHOIS1 Review Team intended in their recommendation. So, Kaveh's comment both at ICANN 62 and I believe Volker's comment, have been around what the original WHOIS Review Team meant in their recommendation and whether that was actually satisfied.

But, I think there is also the larger question whether WHOIS as it exists today meets needs and this team needs to discuss and agree whether going beyond just validation to actually being able to contact the party you intended to reach is something that needs further addressing.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, that makes some sense. I guess if that is what we want to say, that would apply to data that is normally hidden from most observers under some future GDPR implementation. Perhaps even more so because of that. I think that's something that we're going to have to discuss. It would be nice if we could have some of that discussion prior to the face-to-face. We do only have two days and I'm not sure if we're going to be able to cover everything if we don't do some work prior to

that. Let's try to keep that on our to-do list to look at. I don't know if we want an action item or simply keep it in focus. Susan says she agrees with Lisa, so let's go on to the next item then. Brenda, are we doing any better on sound? I see we have phone calls now for some people.

BRENDA BREWER: Yes. Stephanie can hear and I believe Erika is not able to hear. I did do a dial-out. I did not get an answer from Erika. If you have another number, please provide it privately, Erika. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I presume you sent her that in a message because she can't hear you say it.

BRENDA BREWER: Thanks, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright. Next item is status of the various subgroups. I'm going to turn it over I think to Lisa, but before I do that, I will express a significant amount of concern over the number of red exes we still have, specifically even at the subgroup level. We have, after this, I believe, if we have a meeting on the Monday preceding our face-to-face, which I believe we will, we have two more meetings, two plenary meetings, before the face-to-face and I'm starting to get a little bit worried that we have so many subgroups that are still not anywhere near complete. But, I will turn it over I think to Lisa. Is that correct?

LISA PHIFER: Sure, Alan. I can take it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you.

LISA PHIFER: So, just running quickly through the list of subgroups and what we understand to be the next step on strategic priority. There has been a draft out for a while to the subgroup for review and approval, but that still needs to be finalized and submitted to the full review team. It's not clear whether there are any changes necessary at this point or simply calling it a day and sending it on to the review team. There were no comments raised so far on that draft.

For recommendation two, single WHOIS policy, just prior to the ICANN 62 meeting, there was some discussion about the recommendation in that draft, and ultimately we ended up removing the recommendation from the presentation for ICANN 62 in part because now that there is a temporary specification that's been adopted and it appears there will be an expedited PDP on RDS, that subgroup's draft and recommendation really need to be updated to reflect the current status. Just pausing briefly to see if there are any comments.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, I think that's accurate and Carlton is not on the … I think that's Carlton's, right?

LISA PHIFER: Yes, that is Carlton.

ALAN GREENBERG: And he's not on the call. I believe that's the correct.

LISA PHIFER: I would suggest for that subgroup that we actually think about scheduling a call to get that drafting work done in advance of the face-to-face meeting.

ALAN GREENBERG: I encourage you to try to have that happen. Stephanie, you're asking a question why that one and not the others. Are you talking about why updating it with regard to GDPR?

LISA PHIFER: I think she's asking why all subgroup drafts don't need to be updated. I would say, just in response to that specific question, that is the recommendation that produced the RDS PDP and needs to track at least the changes to the RDS PDP trajectory, not to say that other subgroups may not have updates they wish to make.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. I think other subgroups either are already factoring it in if it's applicable, or at least mentioning it, whereas that specific one says

there is no single WHOIS policy, and with the expedited PDP, by the time we deliver our report, there may well be very close to a single WHOIS policy actually formulated. So, I think that one is more applicable than others because that is exactly what that recommendation was saying, at least that's my take.

LISA PHIFER: And this is a good example of why we need to have a call on this one, to start fleshing out the impact. Clearly, the full impact won't be known before the expiration of this review team.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. Stephanie and Susan imply we don't know whether the EPDP is going to be successful. That indeed is true, but all I was saying is we need to say that's now the current state that it's at, just that we're cognizant of the work that is going on, not that we're predicting success or not.

LISA PHIFER: Alright, I'm going to move on to recommendation three, outreach.

ALAN GREENBERG: Please.

LISA PHIFER: That, of course, is done to the full review team and if there are any further concerns about that one, they'll be expressed during our face-

to-face. It doesn't seem there's anything more than needs to be done on that currently.

Recommendation four, compliance. Of course, we just touched on three recommendations that were affected by comments received at ICANN 62. There was also a request for additional answers from ICANN Organization that have been received. So, I believe the action is on Susan's plate to produce a new draft to address those.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Yeah, it is. All I can say is EPDP. Until we get this charter done, I can't focus. So, hopefully, in the week and hopefully get it out this weekend to the subgroup and see if we can – or maybe just the whole group, but try to get the subgroup to focus on it.

LISA PHIFER: Susan, as always, if there's any help we can do in drafting, just let us know.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Okay, thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm happy to have a subgroup meeting if we can squeeze one in and try to make sure that we're a little bit closer to where we want to be on this one.

LISA PHIFER:	Alright, recommendation 5-9, data accuracy. The recommendations themselves ended up in the compliance report, but of course the findings and analysis are in the data accuracy report. So, Lili's subgroup draft will be impacted by those comments at ICANN 62 as well. I believe that action then is to Lili to work in tandem with the compliance team to make sure those two drafts are in alignment.
ALAN GREENBERG:	Okay. And as I understood from the details, we're not necessarily changing any overall intent, but we may need wording clarifications.
LISA PHIFER:	Correct. That brings us to recommendation 10, privacy and proxy services. The draft that Volker put out just prior to ICANN 62 still does need closure from the subgroup itself. There was one comment raised during ICANN 62 on privacy-proxy having to do with the conclusion that the recommendation had been implemented. I think it's just a question of what it means to have completed implementation of the recommendation without completing implementation of the new policy and maybe some clarifying text will help that.
ALAN GREENBERG:	Yeah. I had a little bit of – there was a little bit of fancy dancing to try to answer that. Although I went into it feeling that our analysis was correct, I'm not 100% sure that we want to classify it as fully implemented if it is indeed not fully implemented. ICANN has done whatever it could under the board direction, but given the time it's

taking, something may be … We may want to be a little bit less positive and sunny than we were.

That reminds me, as I was doing the review of the slides on outreach, I had some trouble justifying how we said – or how I said – that outreach had been fully implemented when there had been no real outreach to non-ICANN groups. So, I think we may want to revise that one as well, but I'll take that under my responsibility. Back to you, Lisa.

LISA PHIFER: Alright. So, that leaves us at recommendation 11, common interface. Again, there is a draft out to the subgroup. The subgroup does need to reach some closure on it. I'm not aware of any outstanding comments on it, but more just simply confirming there's agreement within the subgroup and sending it forward to the review team. When Volker presented that recommendation at ICANN 62, he indicated the subgroup wasn't quite final on the wording of the recommendation. I don't know if he had any reservations about that recommendation.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Lisa. Back on 10 for a moment. Do you feel we need a subgroup meeting at this point or are we close enough that we can finalize the report and pass it on to the plenary? I got the feeling there was still some question about some of the recommendations.

LISA PHIFER: Volker put out an update just prior to ICANN 62 and no one commented, so I don't have any foundation to answer that. I think the

subgroup members need to respond to the list as to whether they're comfortable with the current draft or not.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you. Back to you.

LISA PHIFER: And I think the same holds true for common interface. There's a draft out there to the subgroup and the subgroup really needs to indicate whether they're pretty comfortable with the draft as it is or there needs to be further work.

For IDNs, that one has reached closure and gone to the full review team with a minor update recently, but no further work that I'm aware of on that draft.

For plan and annual report, there were some concerns raised about the recommendation. I know that ICANN Organization was asked to provide some additional briefing materials. To my understanding, that might be happening towards the end of this week. Can anyone else from ICANN Organization on this call confirm that?

ALAN GREENBERG: Alice or Jean-Baptiste? Or Lili, you have your hand up. Please, go ahead.

LILI SUN:	I saw Chris on the call and I remembered Chris flagged some of his concerns regarding the findings [of the] recommendations. So, since Chris is on the call, can you clarify a bit more?
ALAN GREENBERG:	And I know Cathrin is now on the call. Chris, can you speak? I notice he's not on Adobe Connect. I don't know if he was before or not.
LILI SUN:	Okay. Then, I'll check with Chris offline.
ALAN GREENBERG:	Thank you. Someone from staff to clarify, did we have a formal query we put into ICANN or is this just sitting in Chris's lap?
ALICE JANSEN:	So, we have received [inaudible].
ALAN GREENBERG:	Alice, you're very garbled. I can't make out what you're saying.
ALICE JANSEN:	Is it better now?
ALAN GREENBERG:	Now it's better. Yes.

ALICE JANSEN: Okay, great. Sorry about that. I was saying we received a request for clarification. I know the team is working on it. We don't have an estimated delivery date at this stage, but we'll make sure to share that as soon as possible.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I don't think we could wait a month on it. Back to you, Lisa.

LISA PHIFER: Thanks, Alan. So, depending on the response that's received, it might be appropriate to think about having a final subgroup call for recommendations 15 and 16 once that response is received, so the group can reach closure, at least on draft text, prior to our face-to-face.

For anything new, there was a draft that went to the subgroup just prior to ICANN 62. There had been I think one action item imbedded within it for Stephanie to provide some updated text which ended up in the ICANN 62 slides. It just needs to be factored back into the subgroup draft. Stephanie, if there are any further edits needed to that draft, that would need to happen and then go to the full review team. I see Stephanie is typing. I'll give her a second.

ALAN GREENBERG: While we're waiting, if we could have an action item to send out to the whole review team to please review any of the documents that were sent just prior to the ICANN meeting. I know, in my case, I have not

looked at any of those that came out just prior to the meetings. So, perhaps a reminder to everyone to look at them would be warranted. Stephanie said she'll try to put her edits in all sections this week.

LISA PHIFER: Good. Thanks. So, that brings us to law enforcement needs. I don't know if Thomas has joined us yet. Looks like he has.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thomas isn't, but Cathrin is.

LISA PHIFER: So, perhaps I could ask Cathrin if there's been any further movement on finalizing the survey for that one.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: No, there hasn't yet. I'm sorry. We still need to finalize that and send it out. That is still pending some agreement between the group, so we need to get together once more and then we can hopefully send this out in the very near future. As of now, no news to report.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. We were hoping to have answers back by the time we met and that's a little over two weeks away from now. So, I guess I'm starting to get a little bit antsy on that one.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: No, I agree. I think I'm really struggling, and as of now, [inaudible] are the others. That's been a bit of a challenge for us, but indeed, it needs to get out as soon as possible. And the question is just really whether we try to in any way still assess the staff [inaudible] the changes or whether we really focus on the impact now, which in a sense would be my preference. Then add a couple questions on the actual changes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Right. Okay. Back to you, Lisa.

LISA PHIFER: Just to reach closure on law enforcement, that sounds like we're going to have a subgroup call as soon as feasible to try to close on the survey and get it launched.

ALAN GREENBERG: We should certainly try to do that, yes.

LISA PHIFER: And of course the subgroup draft there is lagging, but getting the survey launched takes priority over updating the subgroup report to say that something is planned and not yet done.

For consumer trust, we had the one comment from ICANN 62 that Erika might take a look at some of the US FTC material on the definition of … Actually, on the role of WHOIS and protecting consumers. Erika had indicated in chat she would reply in e-mail, I believe. But, that draft,

there was a draft just prior to ICANN 62 and it is awaiting some response from that subgroup to try to bring that to closure.

In particular, there was a new recommendation in that draft that the subgroup should really take a hard look at and see if they have some agreement.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you.

LISA PHIFER: And then, of course, safeguarding registration, registrant data has already been submitted to the full review team. I think we marked this as agreed in the subgroup, but not within the review team simply because we hadn't had that level of discussion within the review team yet. I don't know if there are any known issues.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. If on the reminder, we can perhaps include that one as well, because I don't think there were any comments from the review team. Perhaps, Volker will make one, but I'm not sure.

LISA PHIFER: Alright, and back to you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright. Then, next slide. And the face-to-face meeting. Just give me a moment, please. Well, before we talk about the face-to-face meeting, let's talk for a minute about the e-mail I sent out because it's sort of linked to this item and the past item and the ones going forward. And that is there was a suggestion during the last leadership call from Cathrin, I believe, that – our plan at this point is to have the draft report out sometime in early August following the July meeting in Brussels, and to keep it open for about two months. That's what was in our work plan. Closing it in early October, we would have the summary of the comments done just about by the time we got to the ICANN 63 meeting in Barcelona.

Originally, we were not planning to have an engagement session, but we certainly could have an engagement session in Barcelona and we also could meet individually with ACs and SOs if they wish.

The suggestion was made that we should keep the public comment … That we should have an engagement session and keep the public comment open for that period and perhaps a week or so afterwards to allow people who might not have read the draft report, but came to the presentation to submit comments formally into the public comment.

The implication of that is the public comment would be open almost a month longer, and that would delay the final report probably to the end of January instead of the end of December.

The other implication of it is since a three-month public comment is perhaps a bit excessive, we might have a little bit of time in early

August, despite vacations, to clean up the report and put it in perhaps better shape than it might be just immediately coming out of Brussels.

So, I have a little bit of discussion about do we want to consider this, that specifically an engagement session in Barcelona and keeping the public comment open for it, which implies a delay of the entire project by perhaps a month, still well within reason and well within our budget year. I'd like to open the floor. Anyone have any thoughts? Cathrin, it was your original suggestion. You may want to weigh in. And I know Susan has, in the past, indicated she really did not want to delay this project anymore.

The other implication of this is with the EPDP starting, and some of us might be involved in that, a little bit of breathing room in parallel may be a good thing. I'm not sure. Cathrin, go ahead.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Yes, thank you, Alan. The idea stemmed from the fact that, as seen on other review teams, or really the only one I closely followed was the one on consumer trust, consumer choice, and competition, that there was an engagement session after the draft report had been published and before the final report was issued. And if we don't do an engagement session in Barcelona, we would be missing that opportunity. But, of course, I do see there are practical issues around it, so that was the only reason why I proposed it and I think that's the only argument that can be made for delaying the closing of the public comments, because of course, it [wouldn't] make so much sense to have an engagement session either just after the comment period has

closed because then we would not yet be in a position to really say anything to the comments because we haven't had time to review, or once the comments have really been integrated and we're just presenting our final report. So, that can also be our approach. Then we just choose that any comments in our report will be in written form, and since there will not be any substantive discussion on the substance of the report in any ICANN public meeting, which I think is also fine. But, it's just the choice that should make and that's why I raised the question of whether we should consider having an engagement session and leaving the comments open so that we have possible further oral feedback.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Cathrin. As you were speaking, it dawns on me that even if we just have engagement sessions with individual ACs and SOs, we'll still be in the same situation, that any feedback will not have come during the public comment period.

Now, we won't have processed it, so we can still take note of them and discuss them, but it's not quite as formal as actually being submitted. Susan, you have any thoughts on this one? Specifically, on the implications of delaying the whole thing and is that something we can live with, to make a better report with an engagement session or keep to the current schedule?

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Yeah. I'm fine if we need to delay things to have a thorough report. I'm fine with that. I do think engagement sessions are helpful. I was actually

surprised that the session we did in Panama being the last session of the whole week and we had quite a good turnout. So, I'm just being pessimistic about that, so I was happily surprised. If we need to move things around, I'm fine with that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Yeah. I was rather surprised also. The last engagement session I did for a specific review we had very few people other than the review team in the room. That was positive. Scheduling nothing against it probably does help.

Okay. It sounds like we may well be willing to delay the – to have the public comment opened later, have an engagement session and that implies we also have a little bit more flexibility in terms of completing the report by later than just early August. That's something we can discuss perhaps at the face-to-face and seeing where we are at that point and we do have that option open to us. Maybe we can have a note for staff to add that to the face-to-face meeting, which is where we are right now in the agenda. We've just skipped to the next one I think. Any other comments on the face-to-face? We are scheduled to meet in about two-and-a-half weeks. I don't think we have started working on a – at least not publicly working on agenda for the meeting, but I'm assuming Alice and Jean-Baptiste are starting to pull one together and we'll have one soon.

Note that the first composite draft of the report has been sent out. I haven't looked at it yet. Anybody have anything to add with regard to the face-to-face? Do we know that everyone who is attending the

meeting has tickets and such ready and that we don't have any problems lurking there? Lisa, please go ahead.

LISA PHIFER: Thanks, Alan. I'm actually responding to your observation that a first draft of the composite draft has been sent out. I should note that the sections that have been filled in are those that were finalized and sent to the full review team. We have not populated the subgroup sections that are still in churn. It makes more sense for you all to be able to edit your own document individually instead of editing the very large document, but once you reach that stage of finalizing and sending to the full review team, we will fold that into the very large draft report.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Calling it a very large report worries me a little bit, but I'll keep that to myself.

LISA PHIFER: It worries me as well, but acknowledging the reality.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. We will have to think about what we do for executive summaries and such, with the understanding that many people [inaudible] read that. Any further comments on the face-to-face? At this point, who are we going to be missing from the face-to-face? That's a question for staff. We know Cathrin cannot be there the last half of the last day and

BRENDA BREWER: Excuse me. I'll just respond that I do not see flight arrangements for Erika yet. However, Susan, Alan, Carlton, Lili, Volker, Lisa, and Chris all have their arrangements. Dmitry is not able to attend. I believe … Stephanie, are you able to attend?

ALAN GREENBERG: Stephanie had said she was going to attend. Erika, I don't remember if she was still a maybe or when we moved the meeting it was okay for her. I think it was okay for her. She's no longer on the call, apparently, though.

BRENDA BREWER: Correct.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright. If I could have an action item for staff to confirm with everyone and find out the status, just so we know who is going to be there and who isn't. And if we can go on to the next slide, the next few slides.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Can you hear me?

BRENDA BREWER: Yes, Stephanie.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Okay, good. I'm coming to Brussels. All booked.

ALAN GREENBERG: Excellent. And we are now on slide 12 Barcelona. And I think based on the previous discussion we just had, I think we will request a face-to-face high-interest session on engagement presentation of the draft review. And I believe we probably want to send out a message to AC and SO chairs saying we will be having a face-to-face engagement session, but if they would like to do something privately within their own AC and SO, then we are willing to meet with them as well. Any further comments?

I do not believe at this point we are considering a formal face-to-face meeting at ICANN 63 for the same reasons that we weren't considering it earlier, and I don't believe in fact we will need one at that point. We probably should be talking about scheduling a face-to-face in the November timeframe to try to finalize or review the results of the public comment, but we're going to have to look at a new timeline, assuming we keep the public comment open later. I don't think that needs to be done today.

Any further comments? I thought this meeting was going to run over. At this point, we're going to be ending early. And we may choose to use it to talk about some substance. Any further comments on Barcelona? Seeing nothing, hearing nothing, we will go on to any other business.

Given that we have pretty good turnout here, Lisa, is there anything that you think we might be able to productively use this time for on any of the substantive topics? I'm putting you on the spot with no warning; I know.

LISA PHIFER: Thanks, Alan. I'm looking at who we do have on the call. We're missing Carlton, so we can't have the discussion on recommendation two. We are missing Thomas. Cathrin I know may need to leave early, so we can't do law enforcement. Those would have been the two most pressing.

ALAN GREENBERG: And, of course, Volker's, too.

LISA PHIFER: Right. I have to reluctantly say no. Probably we don't have the right cast of people to address the topics …

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright. Thank you, Lisa. Is there anything else anyone wants to raise? Then, surprisingly, I will call this meeting formally to an end and ask somebody to review the rather extensive list of action items that we have.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Happy to do so. Yes. So, on decisions reached, all of the subgroups that have not yet submitted their report of the review team are asked to

review the latest draft to indicate [inaudible] comments to be addressed.

On ICANN 63, there will be no face-to-face meeting before or during the meeting, and there might be an engagement session with [inaudible] sent to SOs and ACs to see if they wish to schedule time separately from the engagement meeting.

Then, in terms of action items, there were several ones related to the engagement session at ICANN 62, one on recommendation 4.3 [inaudible] recommendation to indicate how data would be updated. On recommendation 4.7, Susan and Lili to clarify the [inaudible] to indicate the audit would apply only in cases where there is a pattern of failure to validate [inaudible]. On recommendation 4.8, Susan to clarify that the DAR blacklist is but one source of input, not considered authoritative.

Lili to work in collaboration with subgroup recommendation for compliance to make sure that those subgroup reports are in alignment for any comments received at ICANN 62.

ICANN Org to send out a reminder to the review team to review the subgroup reports that were sent prior to ICANN 62 and just a reminder that the latest versions are available on the Wiki.

On recommendation two, the subgroup call to be scheduled to update draft and recommendation to reflect recent events. Schedule a WHOIS1 recommendation for subgroup call after Susan produces the new draft addressing ICANN 62 comments.

On recommendation 15 and 16, schedule a subgroup call after ICANN Org provides further responses on law enforcement needs. Schedule a subgroup call ASAP to finalize and launch the survey.

And finally, ICANN Org to contact and consume status of participation to face-to-face meeting in Brussels.

ALAN GREENBERG: And if you could add an action item for me to revise or to review the conclusions on outreach.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Sure.

ALAN GREENBERG: And decisions reached, please.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: I beg your pardon?

ALAN GREENBERG: Decisions reached. I don't think we …

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: I started with that.

ALAN GREENBERG: You did? Alright. I'm not paying attention. I was watching someone type. I wasn't listening to what you were saying. Alright. Thank you. Any further comments before we adjourn the meeting? Then I turn a half an hour of your life back to you. Thank you, all. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]