
BRENDA BREWER: Hello, everyone. This is Brenda speaking. Welcome to RDS WHOIS2 Plenary Call #40 on 27 August 2018 at 15:00 UTC.

Attending the call today is Dmitry, Alan, Stephanie, Susan, Chris, Volker, Lili, Erika, and Carlton. From ICANN Org, Jean-Baptiste, Brenda, Steve, Alice, and Lisa. There are no observers at this time and I have no apologies. Today's call is being recorded. May I please remind you to state your name before speaking. Alan, I'll turn the call over to you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I note we have the whole team, minus Cathrin and Thomas at this point. Hopefully, Cathrin will join us as we proceed. Are there any changes to statements of interest that we need to record? Seeing none, we'll go on to the first agenda item, which is to review the draft sections.

Essentially, we are looking for substantive comments or comments, corrections, objections on the recommendations and hopefully the rest of the report, but we are going to focus to start with on the recommendations and I will ask Lisa to take us through those.

LISA PHIFER: Thanks, Alan. Starting with the executive summary. Jean-Baptiste is loading it and has just scrolled to the executive summary section. You see in red line some text edits that were submitted. This is the executive summary as Alan redrafted after our last call, including edits that Alan

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.

then addressed that Erika submitted and also some comments as you see from Stephanie Perrin on the right.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Alright. I'm going to presume that any of the edits that are in line are not substantive. I have not done a final review of the version that you're seeing right now, but Lisa I believe has essentially integrated changes that are either obviously grammar or similar or clarifications and has put in comments things that may or may not be generally agreeable. The intent right now is to go through those and try and see what it is.

The addition of registration data services, essentially I think that first change, that comment SP1 is just adding the definition for RDS. Lisa, is that correct?

LISA PHIFER:

Yes. Stephanie had proposed added "or registrant data service" which actually isn't an expansion of RDS I had heard before, so that's why I included it in as a comment.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I believe it is registration directory – whatever the term is in our terms of reference is the one we're using, so I would leave it at that and I believe I took the one of the terms of reference. We can certainly add a footnote. If there's evidence that the other term is used other places, we can add it as a footnote. Stephanie, if you can point us to a reference offline but right after this meeting, we can certainly add that as a note.

The next one is a suggestion saying that when ICANN created the WHOIS everything was public. Stephanie had added the clause “but privacy demands soon gave rise to mechanisms to comply with privacy wishes and legal requirements”. That implies to me that ICANN implemented such mechanisms and I don’t believe that is either accurate or what we’re trying to say. I would suggest that we can certainly say that, although privacy considerations began arising, ICANN did not take any action on that. Stephanie, is that acceptable?

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Hi. We started accepting privacy-proxy services very, very early. Certainly, before 2003.

ALAN GREENBERG: So, this is a reference to privacy-proxy?

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Yeah.

ALAN GREENBERG: That wasn’t clear at all to me.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Well ...

ALAN GREENBERG: I understand. That wasn’t clear from your wording is all I’m saying.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: If you want to put in brackets e.g. privacy-proxy.

ALAN GREENBERG: Noted. Okay. Lisa will make an appropriate change to make sure that's a reference to privacy-proxy. We can refine the wording as we go ahead. Thank you, Stephanie. That's a good point.

The next one was clarifying that it's not the policy – it's not necessarily policy. It's contractual obligations. That's fine.

The next one that Lisa has listed as alternate, each group are assigned a thorough analysis [inaudible]. I'm willing to take out the word thorough. I don't think that is controversial, so I'm willing to accept that. Stephanie, you have your hand up.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Sorry. Old hand.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Next substantive change or the one that Lisa has identified as potentially controversial I don't see anymore. That's it. So, we caught them all, Lisa. Is that correct?

LISA PHIFER: That's correct. I think you caught them all in the executive summary itself, not in the recommendations of course.

ALAN GREENBERG: Now onto the recommendations. Alright. Sorry, it's disappeared now. Okay, someone else is taking control of the screen. Alright, Lisa, can you take us through the recommendations one by one and identify what has changed? We can then ask one by one if there are any objections to it.

LISA PHIFER: We can do that, Alan. We've actually prepared slides with the recommendations so that we could review each of the sections and then do that call on each recommendation.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's fine then. Should we try to come to closure on priority as we're going through them? We can certainly leave any out if we can't, but if we can come to closure quickly, I think that's best.

LISA PHIFER: We can do that. We did also include a separate agenda item for prioritization. Not to conflate the issue, but we can do that as we go through.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. I notice it is in that column, though. I didn't think we had it. If we can come to closure quickly on it – I don't want to have debates, but if we all agree, then it's something we can tick off. Okay, back to you.

LISA PHIFER: And in that vein, may I ask, with the changes that we just discussed on the executive summary, is the executive summary adopted? Are there any objections?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I see no hands. I hear no voices. We'll consider the executive summary adopted. To be clear, we are missing two of our members but neither of them voiced any objections going forward. Back to you, Lisa.

LISA PHIFER: Alright. Thank you, Alan. That brings us to recommendation 1.1. We have attempted to flag in red text on the slide that you should be seeing on the screen, any text that changed since our last plenary call. During our last plenary call, we agreed to add the phrase to ensure that RDS WHOIS is treated as a strategic priority to the front end of this recommendation, and of course to expand every occurrence of RDS to say RDS WHOIS is appropriate. So, there's been no substantive change to this recommendation since our last plenary call.

I guess we should display the section on strategic priority. Jean-Baptiste is bringing that up.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. It's going to take an awful long time if we're going to be flipping back and forth each time.

LISA PHIFER: We can certainly use the report itself as the reference.

ALAN GREENBERG: That may be easier then.

LISA PHIFER: Alright. Then that puts us on what page of the report, Jean-Baptiste?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Sorry, [inaudible]. It's on page 17.

LISA PHIFER: Alright. So, on page 17 of the report, there is some rephrasing in the bottom of the introduction section to this subgroup's output. It just mirrors a similar rephrasing that was made to the executive summary. I think it was a combination of Erika, Alan, and Stephanie that suggested this clarification.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's fine with me.

LISA PHIFER: Alright. Then that takes us to – I'm going to scroll forward until I find the actual substantive items for discussion.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. We each have our own scrolling abilities, so tell us where you end up.

LISA PHIFER: So, on page 21 there is a comment from Stephanie. I think I haven't missed anything.

ALAN GREENBERG: We make no comment on this initiative. Working group output is expected within 90 days and will include strawman model. Okay. This is in regard to the ... Okay. This is the original recommendation. Sorry, the board implementation. Stephanie, I think that's true, but I'm not quite sure it really alters anything at this point. We can consider that as we're doing the final report, but I don't think it warrants a change at this point given that we have to get this out within a week. I'm assuming Stephanie will have an objection if she says so. Volker, please go ahead.

VOLKER GREIMANN: Yes. I just had a comment to the previous section [inaudible]. I just wanted to say that I think it's not quite right to say that GDPR is an area of grave concern or [inaudible] that language there, significant concern, but rather significant importance. I don't think concern is the right word to use here. We are concerned about how the impact of GDPR is going to look like.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm happy to replace concern with importance.

VOLKER GREIMANN: Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Anyone object to that? I see no hands. Erika says she can't hear a thing. I don't know what that means. Brenda, can you check with Erika, try to find out what's going on?

BRENDA BREWER: Certainly. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright. So, we will change concern to importance and SP7 we will not take any action at this point if everyone is agreeable and proceed. Lisa?

LISA PHIFER: Thank you. Of course, Lisa Phifer again for the transcript. I'm not going to continue to repeat that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Please don't.

LISA PHIFER: Stephanie had a comment on page 22 on your screens which is with regard to the last paragraph in the section on [3.2, 3.1]. While I agree that the current policy for WHOIS appears in the 2013 RAA, this is not

acknowledged as policy. These are requirements developed in absence of policy. So, I would suggest rewording.

ALAN GREENBERG: How about putting policy in quotes and a footnote? Is that acceptable?

STEPHANIE PERRIN: I think that this deserves more than a footnote, this whole discussion of policy whether you agree with me or not as to what the 2013 RAA is. I mean, in my view, it's the only WHOIS yesterday that exists because it sets the parameters for data collection, use, disclosure, and retention. If that isn't policy, I don't know what is. But, it was not developed as consensus policy, and furthermore, some of the elements are picket fence and some aren't and it's not at all clear. I don't know what Becky says. It's not at all clear what elements are picket fenced and what aren't.

So, I think we need more than a footnote. We need some kind of paragraph explaining what policy means. We should not assume that everybody who reads this report, has read all the other material that we've read, or is a veteran at ICANN that wink-wink, nudge-nudge knows what policy is.

ALAN GREENBERG: Stephanie, I'm agreeing with you 100%. I'm not disagreeing at all. I'm just saying for expediency, I think the easiest way to integrate that in right now is to do it with a footnote, by putting it in quotes and with a

footnote. Again, we can revise and clean this up as we go through the final version.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: [inaudible]. And maybe I'll come up with a paragraph or two on policy that might help, okay?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. We're on a timeline right now that if this report doesn't get finished by Friday, we don't have Lisa working with us anymore and we're on our own and I really want to get this out.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: [inaudible]. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Thank you, Stephanie. Next?

LISA PHIFER: Thank you. So, we'll put policy in quotes, footnote the explanation, and that will be the change for that point.

ALAN GREENBERG: Minus the reference to Becky Burr, yes.

LISA PHIFER: So, that takes us to page 26 in the description of problem/issue where Stephanie has questioned the conclusion of the subgroup, that these actions went a long way towards achieving the intended aim but could not replace the strategic outlook and advanced planning. Stephanie suggests that “went a long way” is a bit too strong.

ALAN GREENBERG: How about while these actions were a critical move or a critical something towards achieving. A critical step. Stephanie, is that okay? I’m assuming if you don’t speak out it is. Necessary first step, that’s fine. Lisa, note that. Necessary first step.

LISA PHIFER: Noted.

ALAN GREENBERG: Let’s go. Continue, please.

LISA PHIFER: Okay. That takes us to the actual recommendations, which begin on page 27 [inaudible]. I hope we’re all still here.

ALAN GREENBERG: We are all still here.

LISA PHIFER: I had already read the recommendation 1.1 and indicated that the text changes were from my last plenary call. There's a comment from Stephanie here on the findings, not on the recommendation text but on the findings that support it regarding – well, actually, Stephanie, why don't I let you actually indicate what your comment is here, since it's a rather long one. Stephanie, are you able to speak to this comment?

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Yes. Sorry. Which comment? Are you referring to page 27?

LISA PHIFER: Page 27, the comment on the findings where you commented on the text implementation not yet being sufficient.

ALAN GREENBERG: For some reason, we can't see the whole comment.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Sorry, I'm shuffling between. I have to be on the phone now, so I'm shuffling between the computer.

LISA PHIFER: If you slide to the right or discreet, shrink the font size, you can see the whole comment.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, it's still being cut out, but I'll look at it [inaudible].

LISA PHIFER: Alan, your voice is feint, just so you know.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: I beg your pardon?

LISA PHIFER: Alan's voice has been feint.

ALAN GREENBERG: Is it any better? I haven't changed anything. Okay, Stephanie.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: I think my comment was – I brought this up before and was rejected, but here is a ... How do I shrink this or enlarge it so that I can read it?

ALAN GREENBERG: There is no way. I'm looking at the PDF. The PDF is broken.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Okay. I'm going to put it full screen. I still can't read it, even on full.

ALAN GREENBERG: It's the PDF that's missing some text. Let me try to pull up the Word document.

LISA PHIFER: I'll copy it into the chat text. Oh, I see it. Jean-Baptiste has already done so.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Oh, good. I brought this up before and was rejected. As you read through the entire narrative, we fail to note that – I mean, you'd almost not understand that there has been a huge fight about this, that the data protection authorities have written over a dozen times that we've had numerous workshops at which people came and thought that there was pressure to accommodate and that the [inaudible] from the EWG report, which was noticed by the data protection commissioners.

I just think we are making this sound very positive. Everything was going along, the board went along and made it a strategic priority. No, they didn't. If they had, we wouldn't be in the mess we're in. I realize that we reached that conclusion, but we don't [inaudible] background documents.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. I'm looking for a quick edit that can address this. I understand the history. How about if we add in here – I'm not going to try to wordsmith it here, but if we make it clear that ICANN did not take any substantive action to address these data protection requirements?

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Yeah. The problem basically boils down to recommendations one and two reinforce this narrative that, oh, we didn't know this was going on. Every darn important company that goes to ICANN had already done their homework. We [very] well knew it was going on. We need to at least ... Unless we want people to look at these two recommendations and say, "Are you kidding? Were you not paying attention for the last 15 years?"

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Stephanie, let's keep the rhetoric out of this and try to focus. I made a suggestion that we put in saying ICANN did not take any action to address the arising data protection regulations and laws.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Where would you put that?

ALAN GREENBERG: Somewhere in this paragraph where it currently says "is not yet sufficient". Do we make it clear that they did not take any action? Which I believe is accurate.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Well, I don't want to hold us up while we try and draft this.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, we can't do that. We will not get through what we have to do if we do that.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: I believe it goes in findings.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's right. That's where you have the "not sufficient" highlighter. I'm saying in that paragraph we'll replace "not sufficient" with some phrase that implies or says clearly that ICANN did not take any action at all to address.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Outstanding [inaudible] over data protection law. Okay. I'll add something if I can.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, or Lisa will add something and we can then [inaudible]. Let's go on to the next one, please.

LISA PHIFER: I tried to include some text in the chat, which Volker is also helpfully added some text. Hopefully, we can press that into an addition to the findings that would satisfy that concern. I would also note that there's an entire section on analysis and findings which I think does discuss it to some extent.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Yes. That's the point I wanted to make out, that there's a section down there that actually went into that. So, you can go recursive on it. But there is a section that it's [going to].

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. I don't think adding what we're talking about hurts it. If it repeats it, fine.

LISA PHIFER: Yes. And I think possibly just including a "see also" section and the other section number might tie the two together.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's fine. On the change you now have on page 28 could be affected to say "was made". I have no problem with that unless anyone else does.

LISA PHIFER: Hearing no objections.

ALAN GREENBERG: Let's proceed.

LISA PHIFER: I believe I have one final comment here and that is on the [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. We never did – we skipped over our 1.2, though.

LISA PHIFER: I apologize. Jumping through the document is quite difficult. Our 1.2 has not changed for a while and was agreed on previous plenary calls, but it is to support this mechanism. The ICANN board should instruct ICANN Organization to assign responsibility for monitoring legislative and policy development around the world and to provide regular updates to the board.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. And to note on recommendation 1.1 which we had no objections on, it was rated as high. I'll presume there are no objections with all of the 1.something recommendations rated as high.

Okay, 1.2, no objection. Not hearing or seeing anything, that one is accepted and rated high.

We'll go on to 1.3, please.

LISA PHIFER: 1.3, the ICANN board should update the charter of its board working group on RDS to ensure the necessary transparency of the group's work, such as providing records of meetings and meeting minutes to enable future review of its activities.

There was an editorial change to rationale but it doesn't seem to change the substance of the recommendation. We did previously agree to this. Stephanie has a comment here on the priority but of course we haven't discussed priority yet for this. The priority suggested by the rapporteurs that this was of less important than the previous two recommendations.

ALAN GREENBERG: Lisa, did you assign a priority to 1.3? It's not on the slide deck. It's missing.

LISA PHIFER: We did not, since it wasn't stated by the rapporteur. It's not clear if the rapporteur would've meant low or medium.

CARLTON SAMUELS: 1.2 was high.

ALAN GREENBERG: 1.2 was high, 1.3 we're talking about now.

CARLTON SAMUELS: We had a discussion around it. [inaudible].

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: I've been on for a while but I can't join in Adobe because the network is not strong enough, but just to say that I didn't rate it in terms of high,

medium, or low. I just simply stated that I thought it was as important than the previous two because, to me, the transparency aspect is more of a horizontal question, so transparency is always important. But, in comparison to 1.1 and 1.2, I would still consider that this is of lower importance, because in a way, it's just keeping a record of what should be happening public but rather – yeah, in my view, 1.1 and 1.2 would still be more important. I would be happy with a somewhat lower [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG:

Then let us say medium. And in terms of the sentence there, it says this recommendation is of less importance than the above. However, it serves ... And omit the first phrase and say medium and then it serves to create as the rationale, so we're not comparing it to the others anymore. And just explaining why we believe it's medium. We have agreement?

CARLTON SAMUELS:

Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Alright. Then the recommendation has no objections and it's raised as medium with the appropriate change in the text. Back to you, Lisa. Lisa, we can't hear you.

LISA PHIFER: Oh, and I said it so eloquently. I was on mute. We've had no objections to the text as modified in this draft and during this call and the three recommendations are adopted with the priorities given for the first two and medium for the third.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay.

LISA PHIFER: Alright. Let's move on to recommendation number two, single WHOIS policy. Here, this section actually has no recommendations and has not changed for a while. We did previously have no objections to this in our last plenary meeting. However, we do have some objections now. The first one appears on page 33. Actually, this is somewhat between editorial and substantive, so I marked it here, which is that Stephanie questioned on each of the indented paragraphs starting on page 33 whether this was material quoted from somewhere else, and in fact it was the finding of the subgroup that the review team then agreed to [inaudible] face to face.

Hopefully, we have made that somewhat clearer by saying the RDS WHOIS2 should say review team instead of "we" but I take it that Stephanie may not have understood that. Did you have objections to that, Stephanie?

ALAN GREENBERG: Question. If it's simply part of our findings, why are we indenting it?

LISA PHIFER: It was for readability. This is what Carlton did in his final draft. We can preface it with findings and a colon if that makes it easier, too. I believe that was done in another section.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. I don't really want to agonize over the formatting right now, although I'm not quite sure quoting ourselves makes ... It is appropriate, but that's more stylistic than anything else. If we can make it clear what it is we are doing here, then I agree, it's a little bit confusing to look at without that context. Stylistically, it may need some changes, but that can come of the next round. I'm assuming, if I don't hear any objection, that's acceptable.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: That's fine with me.

LISA PHIFER: We'll preface that with finding and remove the indentation and maybe make this one, two, three, four or whatever. It breaks the section apart in a way that can be read.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. If it doesn't read well by removing the indenting, then just leave it. [inaudible].

LISA PHIFER: The next comment, then, is on page 34. It's comment SP14. Stephanie, are you able to read your comments or do we need to put it in chat?

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Sadly, I got kicked off Adobe, so I can't see which section you're pointing to.

ALAN GREENBERG: We're pointing to comment SP14 which is the paragraph is [finally, in support of the] EWG's report recommendations are actioned, whether the collaboration three-phrase framework developed and so forth. Your comment is, "I object to this section. First, it is very unclear. What does insofar as the EWG's final report recommendations or actions mean? The report never achieved consensus." I believe the report was adopted with consensus with your objections and the board I believe accepted that report as written.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Sure. But it's not a consensus policy.

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't think anyone says it's not [inaudible] policy.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: The way this reads it implies that once that report was received by the board that we were going to go ahead and implement it, even though there is explanation. I'm still not back on Adobe. I'm having a hard time

here. Even though we have explained that the board had to do the following processes in order to initiate a PDP following this and board struck this. But, the recommendations made by the EWG to the board, because this was an extraordinary process, as was pointed out many times by Chuck Gomes in the RDS Working Group, it's an expert group. These are not recommendations that we were to implement.

CARLTON SAMUELS: No, no, no, Stephanie. The EWG report did state ... The board accepted the EWG report and in the report it's recommended that the board initiated with the GNSO the PDP process. In the subsequent meeting with the GNSO, the board and the GNSO group agreed to three-phase approach.

The first phase was they [add their] PDP that came up and is now on [inaudible]. But that was the recommendation. A group got together and decided that this was something that was ... This was [inaudible] going to be action and we actually started the action.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: I'm not arguing that, Carlton. I'm saying this passage is extremely unclear and if you are not deep immersed in this, you are not understanding what the paragraph says. That's my point.

ALAN GREENBERG: It also implies that the PDP is currently – RDS PDP is currently proceeding and we expect it to complete. At this point, that is far from clear.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: It's far from clear, but we can't leave to conclusions at this point now. We haven't [inaudible] conclusions over events that haven't happened yet in other areas. We should not take it as a given that the RDS PDP will be killed off. Many people want it killed off. Others don't. It's a bit like [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Stephanie, noted. This par does need some clarification. Lisa and I will draft it and we'll send you a copy for clarity.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Perfect.

ALAN GREENBERG: But I think I understand what you're saying. Staff, you can add that as an action item explicitly for me and Lisa. Back to you, Lisa.

LISA PHIFER: Thank you, Alan. I believe that Stephanie's additional comment that's marked here as SP15 is sort of part of the same thing, but not really. It's questioning whether the EPDP will itself produce the single WHOIS policy.

ALAN GREENBERG: I hesitate to say that it will. I think I agree with Stephanie at this point. It certainly will create a policy, assuming it completes which tells the registrars and registries what to collect and what to make available under what circumstances or we believe it might come close to that. There are other aspects of WHOIS policy which are probably not going to be addressed by it. And although I'm not sure I can delineate them today, I would hesitate to say that that is the whole WHOIS policy.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Yeah. I think that's my point, Alan, in a nutshell. We scoped it narrowly, so a lot of things are left out to begin with. Then there's how much are we going to get done. So, there's two aspects of this.

ALAN GREENBERG: How about if we modify the words? Again, not trying to wordsmith, but we'll likely report at least some aspects of a single fit-for-purpose gTLD registration data service.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: So, we'll add—

CARLTON SAMUELS: That's speculation, too. I said likely. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: And some of us are saying much less likely. I think he thinks some aspects does not preclude all aspects but covers are our rear end.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Let the record show that [inaudible] speculated with [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Noted. But you're not objecting, I hope.

CARLTON SAMUELS: I'm not objecting.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you. Let's go on to the next one, please. I note we're 45 minutes into the two-hour call and we're just barely started.

LISA PHIFER: Alright. The next comment, SP16, is on page 35, that the temp spec may be affirmed, changed, or thrown out whereupon we have nothing, so the assumption is in denial of the facts [inaudible] object strongly. The statement is that we would expect the affirmed temporary specification will exist as a digital artifact and will be the base for a single documented force of all things pertaining to gTLD registration data.

In other words, the temporary spec will be the new base for a single documented source.

ALAN GREENBERG: How about if we just drop that whole sentence? I think it still fits.

LISA PHIFER: Any objections?

STEPHANIE PERRIN: I am still off Adobe, so I'm trying and trying to get back on. I'm not sure whether that solves my problem or not. [inaudible] my point. I mean, if we lose on the EPDP, we have nothing, zero. We're back to square one. It needs to be pointed out, I suspect.

ALAN GREENBERG: The previous sentence says in the event that the EPDP is finalized. Stephanie, you may want to go into the document Lisa sent just a little bit before this meeting. Or maybe last night. I'm not quite sure which. But the Word document is completely readable and you may want to work from that. That's what I'm working from. I believe if we remove that sentence, Stephanie can get back to us – the sentence at the bottom of page 34. Then we're okay.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: is there any reason why I can't get back on Adobe that I'm unaware of? I didn't have any problem getting on this morning.

ALAN GREENBERG: There is no reason that you should not be able to get on it.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Jolly good.

ALAN GREENBERG: There is no lockout button, Stephanie, on the staff control I don't think.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: I know. I know you want one, but still.

LISA PHIFER: Alright. The final sentence of section 3.3.4 will be deleted to address that comment.

ALAN GREENBERG: I believe that addresses the issue.

LISA PHIFER: Alright. That takes us to section 3.3.5, which is the conclusions reached on this recommendation. There were no actual new recommendations, so we don't have to call for any objections on new recommendations. There is an objection here on the conclusions reached. Stephanie's objection, I'll just read it for expedience. Stephanie's objection to item two says the adoption of the EWG's final report and development of the framework for the board-initiated PDP is intended to deliver a holistic next generation policy framework that would address current sets of

five-minute and decentralized RDS policies. Stephanie's comment is that the EWG report, with the statement, the EWG report was accepted by the board. I have no idea what the official status of my dissent was. It described my – gosh, I can't even read it.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: I think I said something like, at one point, [inaudible] described as a blog not a dissent.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. All of that is true, Stephanie, but the board accepted the report s written. They did not take action because of your dissent.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: I know. My only point is we make it sound like there was no dissent. We're just ignoring all the dissent, even though the dissent actually turns out to be somewhat relevant under the current circumstances. So, to imply that we had done all this wonderful work I think is inaccurate. I mean, you don't have to include it, but I just think we looked silly. Of course, it means I have to write about it.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: So, [inaudible] saying, Stephanie, [inaudible] and maybe just put it over the whole report. Anything there EWG Stephanie dissented.

ALAN GREENBERG: How about a footnote after when it says in item number two EWG report? Add a footnote saying there was one dissenting opinion, but that was not noted in the board's acceptance of the report, which I think is accurate.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: That would be fine.

ALAN GREENBERG: Lisa, do you have that?

LISA PHIFER: Yes, Alan, and I have actually raised my hand to say that in fact the board didn't adopt the report. They did accept the report and direct staff to carry forward with the board-initiated PDP using the report as an input.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Then change adopted to accepted, please. And add the footnote on the report noting that there was one objection which I believe the board did not note in its acceptance.

LISA PHIFER: That is correct.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Next item.

LISA PHIFER: Final comment on this section expresses a concern over the fourth point in the conclusions that the EPDP will address the adoption or adaptation of the temporary specification and will likely affirm a single WHOIS policy at the end of its work. Stephanie's comment is, of course, that this is speculating, overstates the scope of the EPDP. Could we put hopefully instead of likely?

CARLTON SAMUELS: I like that. I like that.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm happy with that. I was just adding "with the grace of the gods" but that may not be taken well in some circles. Hopefully instead of likely.

LISA PHIFER: Alright. So, those are the changed. Jean-Baptiste has recorded them in the notes pod. Are there any further objections to this section?

STEPHANIE PERRIN: I can't really tell because I'm still trying to connect. Sorry.

LISA PHIFER: Alright, so I'll read them out. Comment 13, will improve the readability of the question that the subgroup addressed. Comment 14, Alan and I will draft a paragraph to address your comment. The sentence we

would expect the affirmed temporary specification will exist as a digital artifact and will be the new base for a single documented source of all things pertaining to WHOIS will be removed. That will address your comment 16. Then, to address your comment 17, we will add the footnote [inaudible] to your dissent on the EWG report and that the board did not note this in its motion, [accepting] the EWG report.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, and change adoption to acceptance.

LISA PHIFER: Then, finally, for your objection 18, replace likely with the more aspirational hopefully. With those changes, are there objections to this section?

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Well, I'm not sure that hopefully works. I'm quite confident that there are stakeholders in this assemblage who actually just hope it will go away.

ALAN GREENBERG: Stephanie, let me interject. I am putting a huge amount of time into this. I am hoping. If I thought it was a waste of time, I wouldn't be there.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Yes and ditto, but hopefully implies a position. I just don't think it's particularly professional. But if you want to use it, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: By the time our report is finally issued, this sentence will have to be redrafted.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Go for it.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think we have approval. Lisa?

LISA PHIFER: Thank you. That brings us to recommendation three. Don't worry, it will get faster.

ALAN GREENBERG: I hope so.

LISA PHIFER: Recommendation three, Stephanie raises a comment on the introduction to the list of relevant research. That would be on page 36. She says, "I realize that we say this for every section. Are we dead certain that every member reviewed every document? If not, let's delete the word all from the phrase [inaudible] research, all members of the subgroup reviewed [inaudible] background materials."

ALAN GREENBERG: I accept that friendly amendment to remove, strike “all” in the introductory sentence in all of the sections.

LISA PHIFER: Alright. So, that will be applied globally to a similar clause in every single subgroup’s output. Carlton, you say you’re trying to say something? Has Carlton dropped from Adobe?

ALAN GREENBERG: He said he could only type, but I don’t know what that comment is in relation to.

CARLTON SAMUELS: I was muted.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. What were you trying to say?

CARLTON SAMUELS: I was trying to say that, first of all, if you use the word accepted for a board decision, that’s an adoption. Every board I’ve ever served on, if the board votes to accept a report, you adopt the report. I don’t know what the practice [inaudible], but in my part of the world, an acception is an adoption of a report.

ALAN GREENBERG: According to Lisa, the board adoption the motion but accepted the report. If that's the word they used in their motion, then I think we can readily use that word here. I do note that at times I have seen the board accept something, meaning they acknowledge it was delivered. They do not put any credence in the content. I happen to have lived through the many aspects of the At-Large review over the last several years and that is the terms the board used and it was a very pointed acceptance, not anything else.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Right. Only in this case they actually had a joint committee of board GNSO to take on the next steps. That does say something.

ALAN GREENBERG: And we acknowledge that. I take your point, Carlton. I'm not sure it's worth agonizing over at this point. We can certainly have the debate again when we go through the final version.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Yeah, go ahead. Go ahead, [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Lisa?

LISA PHIFER: Thank you, Alan. And thank you, Carlton, for bringing that up. I think we're still closed on a previous section and we're now on

recommendation three. There is a comment on page 38 marked as P20. I think this remark would be seen as condescending to [BPAs]. The perception that [BPAs] do not understand ICANN's important work is, in my view, inaccurate and suggests removing or rewording. That is in reference to the section and one has to wonder whether the entire GDPR issue would have unfolded differently if ICANN had reached out to the EU data protection commissioners to educate them about RDS and its uses and benefits long before the issue became important to ICANN in mid-2017.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. I hold a different position than Stephanie does regarding how cognizant the data commissioners are of WHOIS, but I accept the point that the wording right now is inappropriate and I would strike the phrase to educate them about RDS WHOIS and its uses and benefits. So, it now reads: "If ICANN had reached out to EU data protection commissioners long before the issue became important to ICANN in mid-2017." Stephanie, is that acceptable?

STEPHANIE PERRIN:

Yes, I think that's fine.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Fine.

LISA PHIFER: Good. That takes us to recommendation 3.1 which begins at the bottom of page 38 and continues on the top of page 39. Stephanie noted that I think what happened is in accepting numerous edits to this recommendation, a period disappeared between the first and second sentences, so the edits that were made were to split what appeared to be a very long run-on sentence into two sentences and delete the word “to” and add the word “it”. And Alan, you wrote this recommendation. You may wish to confirm that actually is what you intended.

ALAN GREENBERG: The board should direct ICANN Organization to update all of the information related to RDS WHOIS, and by implication, other information related to registration at the second level gTLD domains. I note technically that also includes some third level, but I don’t think we need to be that accurate. Domains should be ... No, that’s not correct.

LISA PHIFER: So, it should be gTLD domains, period.

ALAN GREENBERG: The content should be revised with the intent of making information readily accessible and understanding and it should provide details of when and how to interact. That’s fine. So, if we put the period after domains and add “the content should”. Good catch. And Carlton says he’s now deaf, he cannot hear anything. This is getting exceedingly frustrating. I’m sure even more so to Carlton.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Yeah, I have no Internet signal [inaudible] trying to jack the satellite into my other desktop computer. I don't know. This Internet, it's not what it's cracked up to be, you know?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, I know. Okay. Are there any objections to recommendation 3.1?

LISA PHIFER: With the modification of the first sentence and gTLD domains, and then the second sentence begins, "The content should be revised."

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah.

LISA PHIFER: Hearing no objections.

ALAN GREENBERG: And I recommended this be a medium priority. Does anyone have any objection to that? Hearing nothing, seeing nothing, accepted. And we have closure on that recommendation but we do have a comment on the implementation. Specifically, you'll remember we put a deadline that we should ... Originally, the recommendation said do this after GDPR's dust has settled. We added a statement, I believe it's face-to-face, should the implementation of this recommendation be deferred past fiscal year 2020, the existing RDS WHOIS related parts of the ICANN website must be amended to crosslink with the various sections on the

RDS [inaudible]. ICANN contractual compliance and registrars and ICANNLearn. Stephanie said that may not satisfy ICANN's legal obligation. We should check with ICANN Legal. I don't think that's our job to make sure that ICANN satisfies its legal requirements. We're simply saying that they can't avoid addressing this recommendation forever and they should start it even if the GDPR dust is not settled.

RECORDING:

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

ALAN GREENBERG:

I could live without those announcements as much as I miss Brenda. Carlton says audio is back. Good. Someone did something. Thank you. Does anyone have any objection? As I said, I understand this might not – these ICANN legal objections, that's not our department. They're legal obligations.

STEPHANIE PERRIN:

I think my comment was we've got timing issues in there. I would avoid that because I don't think we should be seen as recommending that we do something two years after or whatever it is – I can't read it. Two years after GDPR implementation, if that puts us at risk. So, if you remove the timing element, then we are not saying go ahead and wait until X to do this. Right now, they're [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: My problem with that, Stephanie, is ICANN has an obligation to document certain stuff, not to present it in an orderly and integrated way. And the whole gist of our recommendation is this all should make sense and fit together as a whole, not just piecemeal. They can satisfy GDPR regulations by doing it in a way that's wholly unacceptable to this recommendation.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: You're missing my point, but I'm not going to quibble about it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. I don't think I'm missing your point. I'm saying they can meet the obligations and still our recommendation stands as unimplemented.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: My point, Alan, is I don't want us to be making a recommendation that actually is not in compliance with law.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Our recommendation is to make sure it's all integrated in a whole.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: They have an obligation to document. They also have an obligation to disclose. At this point, ICANN is not even [inaudible] on what its role as a data controller is and there's no doubt that it's a data controller.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm not going to argue that. I just think the gist of this recommendation is different from presenting the information. They presented all of the information they had at the time when this recommendation, original one, was implemented and we deemed to be not acceptable because there were bits and pieces on other parts of the website that conflicted with it or didn't mesh with it well and that's the gist of what we're talking about.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: Next, Lisa? We have no objections and medium for 3.1.

LISA PHIFER: Recommendation 3.2, again no changes since our last call, but one comment on the rationale, pointing to the apparent lack of insight on the parts, on all parts, to understand how GDPR might impact Internet communities, demonstrates why such outreach is crucial, must include both traditional and non-traditional parties. Stephanie's comment is given the length of time that the NCSG and [BPAs] have been talking about the impact of data protection law, I find this [inaudible] of the need for outreach because ICANN was unaware of GDPR [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't think that negates the sentence.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: All I'm saying is your tone here is, gosh, we needed to do outreach to find out about this, whereas one of your stakeholder groups has been killing itself trying to bring this to your attention for [inaudible] 18 years. So, again, it's the tone of the document. Are you just ignoring us? Okay, bye. But, that's like waving a red flag in front of a variety of goals at this point in time. I think it's the tone I'm talking about here. [inaudible]. Include the reality that instead of we needed to do outreach to find out about this, we should've been listening to our own stakeholders. That's all.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright. May I suggest a friendly amendment after the first sentence of rationale, the need for non-traditional outreach was clearly understood by the first WHOIS Review Team. This need was supported by parts of the ICANN community.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Perfect.

ALAN GREENBERG: Any objection? Done. Lisa?

LISA PHIFER: The proposed priority for this one is high, and I said previously, we had no objections to this. Are there any objections at this time or can we consider this recommendation agreed as well?

ALAN GREENBERG: It's high, but it does presume that we have some level of dust settling first. Just noting that.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: If I could interrupt here, Alan, I agree with you on that, but I think that applies almost across the board.

ALAN GREENBERG: To the ones that are implicated by GDPR, yes. Okay. I'm presuming the board and staff, assuming we ever make these recommendations as recommendations, I'm assuming board and staff will, to paraphrase, read all of the words, not just some of them. We can only hope. Lisa, back to you on section four.

LISA PHIFER: Alright. Moving on to section four.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, sorry, section five, recommendation four.

LISA PHIFER: Correct. Just to note in section five on recommendation four, Stephanie actually had proposed a few copy edits to the original WHOIS1 recommendation's language and I didn't include that in the document since we do not have ... We needed a change [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: We can't rewrite history.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Well, you could put sic in there if they're doing something that is inaccurate and a footnote.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll leave that to Lisa's editorial skills to do it or not as she sees fit. We're an hour and a quarter into the call already. Lisa, back to you.

LISA PHIFER: Alright. Scrolling forward to find the next comment. Bear with me just a moment.

ALAN GREENBERG: It was on page 41, I believe.

LISA PHIFER: It is?

ALAN GREENBERG: I believe so.

LISA PHIFER: That is my point, that I didn't not include the comments.

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh, okay, sorry. My apologies.

LISA PHIFER: So, the next comment I believe is on page 46 which is on recommendation 4.1. Just to refresh everybody's memory, the compliance section was split into those dealing with recommendation four and those dealing with the further review objective on compliance. So, recommendation 4.1 is that the board should direct ICANN compliance to proactively monitor and enforce RDS data accuracy requirements to look for and address systemic issues. A risk-based approach should be executed to assess and understand inaccuracy issues and then take appropriate actions to mitigate them.

There is a comment that on page 46 on the feasibility of the recommendation, a recommendation would not be difficult for the compliance team to implement unless it requires a new policy in which case a PDP may be required. Stephanie's comment is should we not determine whether or not a new policy/PDP is required, rather than just saying it might.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think that's worded appropriately right now. We don't know what methodology or type of proactive monitoring the compliance may do. It might require that registrars, for instance, report certain data which they don't have access to and that would require a PDP or negotiations. I would replace, in which case, a contract renegotiation or a PDP may be required.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Sounds good to me.

ALAN GREENBERG: I just don't think we know what they're going to do, so I don't think we can say that for definitively. Alright, recommendation one, we had no objections. Do we have a priority level assigned to it?

LISA PHIFER: We do. Although the document that we're displaying on screen does not display that, Susan provided her recommended priorities which included in the slide deck and I believe this one was high.

ALAN GREENBERG: I would tend to agree with that. No objection, then we have this recommendation 4.1 accepted with no objections and priority set as high.

LISA PHIFER: Seeing no hands, that takes us to recommendation 4.2, which is the recommendation that the ICANN board should direct contractual compliance to look for patterns of failure to validate and verify RDS WHOIS data as required by the RAA. When such pattern is detected, an audit should be initiated to check if the registrar follows RDS contractual obligations and consensus policy. Action should be applied if significant deficiencies in RDS data validation or verification are identified.

A comment comes again from Stephanie. It's on rationale. It's really just a sort of general copy edit that in the case where a sentence would be spoken as if an RDS, that the "a" is "an".

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. Just point out that RDS is pronounced as if it started with a vowel, therefore it needs "an" instead of "a". Point taken and we have a superb editor, so I have no problem that will be addressed.

Recommendation 4.2 accepted with no objection and accepted as high. Call for any objections? Done. Back to you, Lisa.

LISA PHIFER: Thank you, Alan. I think there's nothing else in that section. That would take us to section six on data accuracy which begins at the bottom of page 47. I would just like to point out that in the list of reference documents, as part of copy editing, we have added a couple of links to the most recent [inaudible] reports that are referenced in the text that were not previously included in this list. For a substantive comment, if there is any ...

ALAN GREENBERG: This is an unbelievably long section.

LISA PHIFER: It is a very long section and very detailed.

ALAN GREENBERG: It is. Not surprising based on who did it. That was a compliment, Lili.

LISA PHIFER: Alright. I think we may have no comments other than the recommendation itself.

ALAN GREENBERG: Correct.

LISA PHIFER: The recommendation itself is on page 60, recommendation 5.1. The edits that you see on the screen here are the edits that we agreed to during our last call, plus the addition of – Alan, I believe this was your suggestion – the text between the time the [RS] report was generated and the time the registration was reviewed by ICANN contractual compliance.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, thank you. We had originally said they should look at anomalous results where the tickets were closed because the WHOIS data changed and it was not clear why it was changing. I mean, it's not clear to us why it's changing but the timeframe wasn't changing and what we meant is change between the time the ARS report was generated and the time compliance reviewed the registration data and I simply added that parenthetical. Are there any objections to it? There were none last time. This is a placeholder recommendation. There is a footnote saying we are investigating why and we will update it as appropriate. It was not rated, I believe, according to the—

LISA PHIFER: That's correct. There was no priority given.

ALAN GREENBERG: I would put to be determined because it is just a placeholder. Once we understand the world, we may decide it's something really urgent or something not as urgent. I'm not sure we have an official way to do that, but that is what I would tend to say.

LISA PHIFER: So, currently, the bottom of page 61 does say priority to be determined and we will leave that there.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm [inaudible].

LISA PHIFER: You are. We will leave that there, of course, without highlighting. I note that Lili and Erika both agree in the chat and Carlton.

ALAN GREENBERG: I would change it to not all uppercase.

LISA PHIFER: Got it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright. So, we have 5.1 accepted and to be determined as a priority and we're going on now to ... I believe the next recommendation is 10.1, but there's a lot of sections in between. Lisa, back to you. I'll note the time is one hour and 22 minutes which I believe is what we had put aside for the complete review. So, we are now officially running late. Back to you, Lisa.

LISA PHIFER: Alright. So, we're on section 3.7 which begins on page 62. This is the section on recommendation 10, privacy-proxy service. Previously, we did have agreements or I should say no objections on the two recommendations. There's some minor copy editing that was made in a section, but if you go to page 68, 68 is recommendation 10.1. The board should monitor implementation of PPSAI. In the event that PPSAI policy doesn't become operational by the time the board accepts these

recommendations, that is [inaudible] July 2019 or the 31st of December 2019, then implementation timeframe notwithstanding, the ICANN board should propose an amendment. That insertion was Alan's to resolve the TBD.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. We had TBD yesterday. I am suggesting that we use one of the two dates. That is the date where the board accepts the recommendations or the 31st of December 2019. That's Volker's area. Do you have a preference as to which we use or do you want to propose a third TBD?

VOLKER GREIMANN: Well, I would still like to keep this open. Our working group implementation review team has just today received an update that the legal review will be ready very shortly and they will start reviewing. I sort of expected it to be released this week. After that, I think we, just by leaving it open, we're not hurting anything or [inaudible] any issues.

ALAN GREENBERG: When the implementation is adopted, registrars and privacy-proxy services will be given some amount of time in which to put it into place. That's typically in the order of three to six months. I'm assuming a longer one in this case.

VOLKER GREIMANN: [inaudible] my assumption.

ALAN GREENBERG: Setting it at December gives them a full year plus from now. I'm happy to do that. July might be a bit tight because unless they adopt it very quickly and they give six months, July will probably not be enough. So, let's set the date to the 31st of December.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Happy with that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Back to you, Lisa.

LISA PHIFER: So, we'll adjust this text to say by December 31, 2019.

ALAN GREENBERG: Correct.

LISA PHIFER: Implementation time notwithstanding.

ALAN GREENBERG: We just factored in implementation timeframes.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't think we need that last phrase. We're saying operational is operational. The board will always have wiggle room. If they know it's going to happen by January 2020, they can simply ignore it. We're simply putting a stake in the ground.

LISA PHIFER: Alright. We'll delete that phrase. So, the recommendation would read that the board should monitor implementation of PPSAI. In the event that the PPSAI policy does not become operational by 31 December 2019, the ICANN board should propose an amendment to the RAA that affiliated privacy-proxy providers shall verify and validate underlying customer information provided to them in the same way as registrars are required to verify and validate other registration data. Any objections to that recommendation? It was suggested as a low priority.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think that's reasonable, low or medium, but if it was suggested as low, I'm willing to accept it.

LISA PHIFER: Seeing no hands, I think we'll accept that as agreed and low priority.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. I will note that what we're asking them to adopt as a new amendment is something that we believe for the majority of privacy-

proxy providers, affiliate ones, they're already doing. Alright, adopted and low. Next item, please.

LISA PHIFER: Recommendation 10.2 appears on page 69. Has not changed in any substantive way. The priority suggested for it is low. We've previously had no objections. Are there any objections?

ALAN GREENBERG: Hearing none, seeing none, no one is typing, this is accepted and is low. Back to you, Lisa.

LISA PHIFER: That takes us to the bottom of page 69, section 3.8, recommendation 11 on common interface. Looking at the sections for any comments, I see none before the bottom of page 72 which is where recommendation 11.1 is given and previously there was no edits to this. I'm not seeing any comments on this and it was given as a low priority. Any objections to this recommendation?

ALAN GREENBERG: This is the recommendation on the WHOIS portal to track what's going on.

LISA PHIFER: Correct, add metrics.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: I'm just noting that I'm having one very difficult time following here. I have no Internet at all at this point. Don't ask me what happened. It's quite problematic.

ALAN GREENBERG: But you don't recall any objections on this either. I will judge recommendation 11.1 on two [metricified] the WHOIS portal as no objections and low priority. Next Lisa.

LISA PHIFER: That takes us to recommendation 11.2, which starts at the bottom of page 73, that the ICANN board should direct ICANN Organization to continue to maintain the common interface, to keep up to date with my policy developments or contractual [changes] for contracted parties, to ensure that the common interface will display all publicly available RDS WHOIS output for each gTLD domain name registration available from contracted parties. That is, when they differ, both the registry and registrar RDS output could be shown in parallel. I see a typo here, but the gist of this is that, Alan, you struck port 43 and suggested that this is supposed to be displayed when they differ.

ALAN GREENBERG: To reiterate the rationale, I believe we should be focusing on results and not methodologies for achieving it, and particularly not explicitly refer to a methodology which we know may not work at all. I'd just remove the reference to port 43.

And because some people may not understand why we are recommending that both registrar and registry be presented, I made it clear that we are doing it because they may differ. I know Volker had been vocal on this one. Volker, do you accept these two as friendly?

VOLKER GREIMANN: I think I do. Which page are we on right now?

ALAN GREENBERG: If you're in the report, we are on page 73. If you are in the slides that were sent out, they are on slide 14.

VOLKER GREIMANN: [inaudible] reports. It looks okay, I think. Part of the words are missing between the first and the second section, the topic review I think.

ALAN GREENBERG: Say that again.

VOLKER GREIMANN: We are on page 74.

ALAN GREENBERG: 73 in the middle.

VOLKER GREIMANN: Oh, 73 in the middle. Sorry for that. No objections.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Last call for objections on this one in general. It was rated as high. Hearing nothing, seeing nothing, accepted without objection and rated as high. Lisa, back to you.

LISA PHIFER: Thank you. We are now at the bottom of page 74, section 3.9, which is on internationalized registration data. Recommendations 12-14. I don't believe there are any comments on this section, were there?

ALAN GREENBERG: No. We put that one to bed so long ago and Dmitry found an error more recently but corrected it.

LISA PHIFER: Alright. So, that brings us to the recommendations which appear on page 80. Recommendation 12.1, reviewing effectiveness of the implementation of recommendations 12-14 should be deferred. The board shall recommend that review be carried out by the next RDS review team after RDAP is implemented and the translation and transliteration of registrant data launches. That was Dmitry had identified that it would not be in the top five for now.

ALAN GREENBERG: I would tend to say that one is low. I mean, it's high but it doesn't [inaudible] five years. I would say to keep our tally down of how many we are saying high, we make that one low because it doesn't really make any difference.

LISA PHIFER: I note Dmitry agrees in chat.

ALAN GREENBERG: Otherwise, we're going to be looking like we're saying everything is high and we'll be criticized for that. I see no objections to both accepting it and to setting the priority as low. We'll go on to the next section, please.

LISA PHIFER: Next section begins on page 81. Recommendations 15 and 16, plan and annual reports. I have a feeling there was one change to this section. Yes, there was a change to the wording of recommendation 15.1 on page 84. Recommendation 15.1 says the ICANN board should ensure the implementation of RDS WHOIS2 Review Team recommendations is based on best practice project management methodology, ensuring plans and implementation reports clearly address progress and applicable metrics. Stephanie suggested a word was missing here. The words applicable metrics and tracking tools are used for effectiveness and impact evaluation.

ALAN GREENBERG: Good catch.

LISA PHIFER: The priority of this one I believe was identified as medium. Are there any objections to this recommendation or this section?

ALAN GREENBERG: Hearing nothing, seeing nothing, no one is typing, adopted at medium.

LISA PHIFER: Very good, moving forward. Section 4, objective 2, anything new, which begins on page 85. There are no recommendations made in this section and no comments on this section. I believe we previously had agreement on this. Any objections at this time?

ALAN GREENBERG: Before we get there ... Sorry, what page are you on?

LISA PHIFER: It ends on page 88, the section does, and I believe it begins on page 85.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright. Other than [inaudible] to be provided for section 4.6.

LISA PHIFER: Yeah, [inaudible] couple of sections. We had agreed in our face-to-face that the GDPR impacts would be provided if possible, but if not, in the next round.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright. Anytime we have a “to be provided” if we’re not addressing, just remove the square brackets, put it in proper case and remove the highlighting and we’ll fill it in sometime later.

LISA PHIFER: Will do.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. We have two recommendations for law enforcement. I believe they were rated high with one objection from Stephanie. And if you want to go over the specific objections, I would appreciate it, Lisa.

LISA PHIFER: Will do. Getting there now. Also, a long, detailed but very interesting section.

So, recommendations begin at the bottom of page 102. You may recall our last plenary call a week ago we again reworded the second recommendation, LE2, to have it refer back to LE1. That’s to define which surveys and studies were being referenced. Then, to delete the words “such as cybersecurity professionals.” The revised recommendation LE2 says, “The ICANN board should consider extended

and conducting such surveys and/or studies as described in LE1 to other RDS users working with law enforcement.”

Stephanie had previously voiced a recommendation – excuse me, objection – on both of these, but in particular, had an objection to the inclusion of cybersecurity professionals which of course is no longer there.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright. So, we need clarity. Stephanie, are you still objecting to LE1? LE2 you were objecting to because you don’t believe ICANN should be doing studies on behalf of cybersecurity workers, or at least I’m paraphrasing what your comment was.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Yes. Just a typo on LE1, regular data gathering through [service] and studies is to be conducted by ICANN. [inaudible] data gathering which is singular.

ALAN GREENBERG: That’s in the second line.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Yeah. You’re telling me that the cybersecurity professionals are gone now, such as law enforcement. How does it read now?

LISA PHIFER: It says the ICANN board should consider extending and conducting such surveys and/or studies as described in LE1 to other RDS WHOIS users working a law enforcement.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Yes. Consider is way better, so I'm happy. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. We also had you noted as an objection on LE1, but I don't know what the objection was.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: I'm not sure, either. I think you're okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: Then we'll catch you at a soft moment and say you accept it.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Yeah.

ALAN GREENBERG: So, in both cases, we have no objection now? And in both cases we have high. Sorry, go ahead please.

VOLKER GREIMANN: I think it's worse now. By eliminating the phrase "such as cybersecurity professionals [inaudible] users working with law enforcement" that now can mean any Joe Schmo that feels like reporting WHOIS inaccuracy issues to law enforcement or other issues to law enforcement. I just think that there is some merit to having it limited to certain circles. By removing the reference here entirely and not replacing it with something else, we're moving into a territory where everyone would be asked to contribute to such studies. I don't know that's [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright. I don't read "working with" meaning I submit an unsolicited report.

VOLKER GREIMANN: Maybe we should clarify what we mean by working with them.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: I do agree with Volker. When I hear "working with" I assume under contract [too] in which case there's delegated authority.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. I do not do that. Remember, we did use other words last time and Cathrin pointed out that was a technical term that had very specific meaning, effectively contracted with or by formal agreement. So, whatever that expression was, we decided not to use at that point. I can't remember what that expression was.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: I'm happy to come back in and restate again my point if that would be helpful.

ALAN GREENBERG: But I think we eliminated that expression and we said we wouldn't use it, whatever it was. So, I think working with was the fallback that we put in. Can you come up with an expression that is suitably weak but does not imply anyone who happens to call in with a spurious complaint? "Working with" I would think neither implies contract nor does it imply a random event.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Yes, I would agree with that.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Can I say something?

ALAN GREENBERG: Please go ahead.

CARLTON SAMUELS: I don't think "working with" implies with contract. Look, the baseline is that if you have information, you should be in a position to share that information, normal safeguards applied to other parties while working

towards the same goal. That's what we're trying to achieve here. I think it's perfectly reasonable to say working with.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Volker, I see your hand up. But let me propose a phrase going forward and you can comment on it. Add at the end of it "on a regular basis". Volker, does that address it?

VOLKER GREIMANN:

Not quite happy because someone who is [sending] police reports also might be doing that on a regular basis. I'm not 100% happy with it, but I also don't have the perfect solution that we could use right now and thinking about it would hold us up, so we could just keep this open. I like the suggestion Stephanie made that some form of empowerment would be required because that would be these quasi law enforcement agencies that ICANN has been talking about in some other instances already in synch with that.

ALAN GREENBERG:

My reason that I had no problem with it is I view "working with" as a bilateral arrangement, that it's not just someone feeding information into but interacting with at some level, such as ...

CARLTON SAMUELS:

Exactly. They would be in agreement and the agreement would outline all the details used and so on and so on and so on.

ALAN GREENBERG: I doubt you'll find an agreement between the Antiphishing Working Group and law enforcement. But that doesn't mean they don't work with each other.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Absolutely. One of the problems we have is that we've been using the APWG output in several ways [inaudible]. I see no reason ICANN would do a survey and we have some information [inaudible] that could be helpful to what they work with. I don't see why we would not choose to share it with them [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Can I try to get closure? We have two choices. Either the expression as it stands now or adding on a regular basis which means it's not a one of. Volker, I'll give you your option which to accept since you said your objection is not strong enough to voice it as an objection I think you said. Which do you prefer, with or without the phrase?

VOLKER GREIMANN: With.

ALAN GREENBERG: With, okay. Anyone objecting to taking the recommendation as written right now with the modifications, adding "on a regular basis" at the end?

CARLTON SAMUELS: That's good enough.

ALAN GREENBERG: I hear no objections, so we'll take it as accepted with high. Back to you, Lisa. We are at one hour and 45 minutes. We are going to run over the two hours at this point, but hopefully not by a lot. Lisa?

LISA PHIFER: Just noting that on the bottom of page 103 where we have one objection noted, we will replace that with no objections.

ALAN GREENBERG: Correct.

LISA PHIFER: We are now on page 104, section six, objective 4, consumer trust. There are no comments on this section and no recommendations made. Are there any objections to this section as written?

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry, what page are you on, Lisa?

LISA PHIFER: Page 104.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I'll be honest. I wasn't fully happy with it, but I wasn't at the stage where I made any comments. I'm going to try to do that today. If I have anything substantive, I will send it out and make sure we get agreement on the list or at least no objections. But I have nothing at this point.

LISA PHIFER: Alan, are your reservations strong enough to prevent us from adopting this section at this time?

ALAN GREENBERG: No. I suggest we adopt it as is and if I suggest any changes, those have to be adopted on the list. I may never get around to it, to be honest, but I'm going to try.

LISA PHIFER: Alright. So, section six is adopted as is with no recommendations. That takes us to section 7, objective 5, safeguarding registrant data which begins on page 112. In this section, I do not believe we had any substantive comments. We do have a recommendation, of course, which is recommendation SG1. It begins on page 114 and there was one ... I guess I classified this as a copy edit but I should raise it. It was one insertion, that in consultation with data security and privacy experts.

ALAN GREENBERG: I consider that a friendly amendment.

LISA PHIFER: And this recommendation, Alan, you identified this one as medium-high, so which is it, medium or high?

ALAN GREENBERG: This is an interesting one because, although it is accurate in what is written, if you look at the temporary specification, they go into some excruciating detail about specifying the methodology for both safeguarding data and requirements to report. So, if the EPDP is successful, and certainly today under the temporary specification, this one is rather moot. I'm happy to put it as medium.

LISA PHIFER: Are there any objections to this section as written and this recommendation ranked as medium priority? Carlton is typing. Hearing none, seeing none, to the next section.

ALAN GREENBERG: Let's move on.

LISA PHIFER: Which is objective six, ICANN contractual compliance, [inaudible] structure and processes, section eight. This is where most of the recommendations that were previously under recommendation four moved. We have a comment in this section and it is on

recommendation CM2, so let's take a look at recommendation CM1 first. That would be I think on page 125.

So, starting on page 124, recommendation CM1 is the recommendation that the board should negotiate contractual terms or initiate a PDP to require the gTLD domain names suspended due to RDS contact data which the registrar knows to be incorrect and that remains incorrect until the registration is due for deletion should be treated as follows. You can read the points on your slide. There have been no changes here. Are there any objections to this recommendation with a priority of – Susan, remind me, how did you classify this one?

ALAN GREENBERG: It was rated high. I'm not Susan but I'm reading the slide.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Sorry, what page is this recommendation on?

LISA PHIFER: It begins on page 124.

ALAN GREENBERG: The title is on 123 which I presume will be fixed when we do orphans at the final read through.

LISA PHIFER: Again, this was previously agreed to. Just looking for any objections to be raised at this time.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: My numbering appears to be different than yours. We're talking about CM2?

ALAN GREENBERG: CM1, just after the 8.5 recommendations title.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: I wonder what I did. This is coming on my page 120.

LISA PHIFER: Pagination can be different, depending on your printer, too.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Yeah.

CARLTON SAMUELS: It's [inaudible] quality issue. That's it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. This is the one there were some objections in at the Panama meeting and I believe we have made sure the wording is a lot clearer now. Call for any objections and objections of a high priority rating?

Hearing none, seeing none, I will accept it as accepted and go on to CM2. Sorry, Lisa, you said there was a comment in between.

LISA PHIFER:

The comment is on CM2. I believe noted that CM1 is accepted as is with the priority high. CM2 begins in Adobe page 125. The ICANN board should direct ICANN Organization to assess grandfathered domain names to determine if information is missing from the RDS registrant field. If 10-15% of domain names are found to lack data in the registrant field, then the ICANN board should initiate action intended to ensure that all gTLD domain names adhere to the same registration data collection requirements within 12 months. You may recall that we agreed on comprised language and a footnote in our last plenary call. We made this 10-15% and we footnoted that input was requested on the appropriate numbers.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I have a comment. It's not exactly what my comment says, but essentially I'm saying I don't believe the first half of this recommendation and second half are aligned because we say you should initiate action intended to ensure that all gTLD names adhere to the same registration data collection requirements. That implies to me a level of validation, but at the first sentence, we say if the information is missing which I read to being empty.

CARLTON SAMUELS:

Oh yes, but that's a valid issue.

ALAN GREENBERG: Empty does not meet validation, but if I put spurious information which would not need validation, it's not missing. So, the question is do we mean the test in the first half of this recommendation is the same as not having validation or are we talking about explicitly missing? Volker, please go ahead.

VOLKER GREIMANN: We're talking about explicitly missing because we're talking about the differences between the grandfathered domains and non-grandfathered domains and that spurious information is not what [inaudible] actually concerned with. We are concerned with domain names that are missing certain information because it hasn't been provided at the time of registration because it wasn't required then.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. If information provided is spurious, it will not pass validation, but it will pass the missing. Are we happy with that? I'm not trying to argue for a change. I just want to make sure what we're saying is consistent.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Yes. We are talking about missing data, missing fields. That's what this is about.

ALAN GREENBERG: If the action has to be taken, because for instance, the 10-15% number is exceeded, then the action taken may apply to more than just the missing. I'm happy with that. If everyone else is, I'm happy with leaving the wording as it is. Not hearing anything, I think we can delete the comment and accept it as it is written.

LISA PHIFER: The suggested priority for this recommendation was?

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Is it not in here?

ALAN GREENBERG: It says medium.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Just let me clarify. As currently written, basically what we do – this relates only to the missing. If we discover that it's spurious data, well that's a discovery that happens in another section and category of data. In other words, bad data, right?

CARLTON SAMUELS: Yeah, that's about accuracy.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: That's about accuracy. This is about [inaudible].

CARLTON SAMUELS: That's correct.

ALAN GREENBERG: This would only be triggered by missing data.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Correct. Okay, good. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Something which could be determined if anyone had run the data through to look for it. But, at this point, nobody has done that so we are requesting that it be done effectively. Accepted with no objection and medium. Last call. Done.

LISA PHIFER: That takes us to recommendation CM3, which in the draft on your screen is on page 126. Recommendation CM3 is that the board should direct the organization to review RDS records of gTLD domain names sampled by ARS for each region to determine whether lack of knowledge of RDS and accuracy reporting tools or other critical factors are responsible for low RDS inaccuracy report submission rates in some region. Previously, we had no objections to this and the suggested priority of this recommendation was?

ALAN GREENBERG: Medium on the chart.

LISA PHIFER: Any objections to the recommendation as medium?

ALAN GREENBERG: I'd put a question to Susan. Would you have an objection lowering it to low? I can't see this one as a real hot one. I think it should be done, but I can't see it as a real hot one, nor is it particularly hard.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Yeah. I would be fine with that. Low would be fine.

ALAN GREENBERG: Then the consensus call is accepting with no objections and setting the priority as low.

LISA PHIFER: I see Carlton agreeing to that in chat as well.

ALAN GREENBERG: And I see no objections. On to CM4, pleas.

LISA PHIFER: CM4 is that the ICANN board should direct ICANN Organization to publicize and encourage the use of the bulk WHOIS inaccuracy reporting

tool or any successor tool. That appears on page 127 of the document. No previous objections to this and the suggested priority of this one was low. Any objections?

ALAN GREENBERG:

I see no objections and to set it as low. I did have a comment that I'm willing to drop at this point but I think it merits at least some level of consideration. The question is do we want to consider a footnote saying that we are considering expanding the recommendation to include a recommendation that contractual compliance consider different, more efficient methodology in analyzing bulk data submissions where such data identifies patterns of problems.

I'll remind the group that contractual compliance, if you submit bulk data, you could submit 100 requests, 100 items or 1000 that say all of them are bad in the same way and they will act on them and investigate them one by one, and not necessarily take action on the fact that there's a pattern nor reduce their workload based on that pattern.

It's clearly too late to add a recommendation now, but I think it's a note – I believe it's a note that is worth adding. It doesn't commit us to anything. Can I have any comments on that?

VOLKER GREIMANN:

I'm not quite sure what you're trying to achieve with that.

ALAN GREENBERG:

What I'm trying to achieve is not having ICANN Org try to squash this because it is going to potentially create a huge amount of work. I'm giving them a methodology which they haven't been willing to accept in general to do shortcuts for that class of bulk data submission. I'm just opening the door to say we are considering it and look for comments. Those comments could well come from contractual compliance since we have a commitment from ICANN Org to comment on what we're saying.

VOLKER GREIMANN:

I would like to give some background on this because this is something that is likely to complicate the handling processes of these complaints when they arrive here. We, as registrars and contracted parties prefer having one domain name complaint, simply because of the reason that if you send us a bulk of domain names in one complaint, then we will likely have to address them with different – resellers have to copy and paste part of the complaint [inaudible] others that doesn't concern this reseller or that customer. Even though they may look similar on the [inaudible] of ICANN, they may not be the same, have been [inaudible] through the same channels as the other domains in that package.

So, for us, receiving them one by one makes it actually easier to deal with them as we work through those.

CARLTON SAMUELS:

Let me jump in here.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Carlton, if I may respond to Volker first and then you. I'm happy to modify the footnote further to say "and that would include potentially different methods of interacting with registrars." All I'm trying to do is lay the seeds for the fact that ... To make it more possible to address these kinds of endemic issues without radically increasing the amount of work. If there's strong objection to including it, then we'll just omit it altogether right now. But I think it's worth laying the seeds for. Carlton, please go ahead, and then we'll go back to Volker.

CARLTON SAMUELS:

Yes. I think that it's laying the seeds for. Let me tell you what's happening here. In a lot of cases, because of the way they approach this single complaint, complaint by complaint, [inaudible]. And if you look at some of the injuries that are caused, they are caused by multiple domains from the same person registering with the same registrar and reseller and the injury is the same.

Usually, they look at each one individually. I think it's important for [inaudible] same argument in the CCRT, that there has to be some way for ICANN compliance to start looking at injuries in terms of waves of injuries and put them together.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. Thank you, Carlton. We are five minutes after the hour. Now, Volker, let's come to closure on this one way or another quickly.

VOLKER GREIMANN: I think I have no issue with the way that ... Compliance has different ways of looking at a complaint. I'm just saying that when they send them on to us, then they should be in the current format because that makes our work easier at the time.

We can, on our end, still combine them and tell ICANN that we had combined them. That way ... I just have issues with ICANN suddenly changing their [inaudible] process of working with these complaints after we've had this back and forth over many years that we got them just the way that we need them.

Just a side note. I don't see that the [inaudible] WHOIS inaccuracy reporting tool will have much use after GDPR, but that's of course subjective.

ALAN GREENBERG: That may well be the case, certainly for European registrations. Volker, to be clear, are you objecting to this footnote even if it makes reference to interactions with registrars or are you accepting the concept and we'll try to reword it to your satisfaction? Your choice, quickly.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Lisa, [inaudible] chat that you might want to reflect on. I think it works.

VOLKER GREIMANN: Let me just read that. Yes. I think the analysis ... If we reference only the analysis part then we're good with that. Because then it doesn't impact the way that these are actually treated and handled. That's good.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. I'm not quite sure what the difference is between what I wrote and ...

LISA PHIFER: Nothing, Alan. It is the text that you suggested. I'm just noting that CC meant ICANN Contractual Compliance.

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh, okay. So, I think we have agreement to add a footnote and we've already had no objections, low priority, add a footnote. Lisa, back to you, CM5.

LISA PHIFER: CM5, the ICANN board should recommend the GNSO adopt a risk-based approach to incorporating requirements for measuring, auditing, tracking reporting, and enforcement in all new RDS policies. I don't believe we had any comments on this one.

ALAN GREENBERG: We had no comments, we had no objections, and it was rated as high. Anyone want to raise an objection right now? I hear nothing. I see nothing. It is accepted. Next one, Lisa.

LISA PHIFER: I believe that is it for that section and it takes us to section 9, ICANN bylaws which begins at the bottom of page 129 of the circulated document and continues on to page 131, the recommendation and the introduction to it. That's here at the bottom of page 130 of the circulated document.

The text that you see changed here are the changes that we agreed to on our last plenary call.

ALAN GREENBERG: And to be specific, we are saying eliminate the safeguard registrant data section because it will be redundant. Eliminate the reference to the OECD or eliminate the OECD and replace it with a section with a more generic requirement for RDS WHOIS review teams to assess how well RDS WHOIS policy and practice addresses applicable data protection and cross border data transfer regulations and best practices. Are there any comments?

CARLTON SAMUELS: No change.

ALAN GREENBERG: Volker is saying he's happy with it. Last call.

LISA PHIFER: And the priority of this one, Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Again, the trigger is the next review policy. I would put it as medium. If they can't around to it in five years, it's not our problem. Well, maybe one or two of our problems if [inaudible].

LISA PHIFER: So, are we approving this with low priority?

CARLTON SAMUELS: Medium.

ALAN GREENBERG: Is Chris still on the call?

LISA PHIFER: I don't see him.

ALAN GREENBERG: Let's say medium. If Chris advises that low is sufficient to actually get it done, I will take the executive prerogative and change it to low after consulting with Chris but let's set it as medium at the moment.

LISA PHIFER: You've got three people saying medium is good in chat.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah.

LISA PHIFER: Alright. So, we'll consider this one adopted as amended shown on our screen with medium priority.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright, folks. We have now accepted all of our recommendations with no objections. All unanimous. I thank you for this. I didn't think we were going to get to this point. Lisa, back to you. Is there anything else we need to review at this point in the report before we deem the report subject to editorial review as complete?

LISA PHIFER: There's nothing else in the report itself, just to note that copy edits which are defined as basic clean-up of grammar or format can still be applied as we try to prep this report for submission for publication. There is also an appendix where all the reference documents will be listed. That will be filled out.

Then, if there were any statements of objection, they would have been added to the end of the report. However, I think we ended up with no objections on everything.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, there's no objections on any recommendations. There could conceivably be objections on other content of the report. If there were any objections, they have to be filed in writing by 23:59 UTC this coming

Wednesday. I'm hoping there will not be, but if there are, we welcome them and we'll append them to the report.

If there are any changes in substance – and there may well be. As we're editing we find some inconsistencies or something that needs to be changed – I would suggest we essentially, as soon as we find any of those, one by one, we put them out as an e-mail to the review team. What should we prefix the subject with to make sure you really notice it? Do we use urgent or report change? How about just REPORT in capital letters as the prefix for anything that may influence the report that we need an online consensus call. Erika says urgent. We will do some combination of report urgent. Fine. Report Urgent. Doesn't take up too much space and it certainly will be noticeable. Noted. Back to you, Lisa. Or back to me. It's my turn again. I've lost track.

LISA PHIFER:

Just to point out that on screen you should see the recommendations and priorities list with all the priorities that we've agreed on today, and the fact that no objections have been raised on any of the recommendations that are listed here.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Excellent. I like the fact that we have a nice combination of high, medium, and low. It looks like we're doing our job.

LISA PHIFER:

And Jean-Baptiste I believe has some closing slides to show you.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Thank you, Lisa. [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. Carlton has something to say before you go ahead, Jean-Baptiste. Carlton?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Go ahead.

CARLTON SAMUELS: No, no, no. I just [inaudible] look at the e-mail. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Easier said than done. Back to you, Jean-Baptiste.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Thank you very much, Alan. Just wanted to go back if you would to that user road map [inaudible] next steps.

By the 29th, this is the deadline to [inaudible] any objections in the draft.

By 1st of September is the target to release draft report.

Mid-September, we'll organize a webinar to present your draft recommendation.

We have recorded the date of ICANN 63 where [inaudible] input on draft recommendations and subsequently organize meetings with other SO and ACs.

On the [1st of] November, the [inaudible] summary would be presented for adoption.

Any questions?

ALAN GREENBERG: The only other question I have is do we meet next week? I think we deserve a week off. Anyone believe there's something we have to do next week?

CARLTON SAMUELS: Can I say that [inaudible] we get something substantive, maybe we have to meet. But I think [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: We'll keep the meeting scheduled.

CARLTON SAMUELS: I feel very good that [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Carlton, you're suggesting that something might come up which would preclude us actually releasing the report and we may need to discuss that. Is that what you're saying?

CARLTON SAMUELS: I am suggesting that we don't say not meet next week. [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. But the rationale is we would meet if something comes up which stops us from releasing the report. Correct?

CARLTON SAMUELS: Correct.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. The meeting is not cancelled, but hopefully, we will not have anything which cannot be resolved on the e-mail list. Susan says she can meet on Tuesday.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Monday is a US holiday. We actually don't have a meeting scheduled for Monday.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Let us say we will schedule a meeting ... Hold on. Tuesday I believe is an EPDP meeting. Is it not?

CARLTON SAMUELS: You can't do that. [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: I believe there's an EPDP at the same time. No, EPDP is over by this time. Alright. We will tentatively hold a meeting on Tuesday, understanding some people may not be able to come, if we have any disastrous situation which preclude us issuing the report. We'll deal with that eventuality if we get there.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Okay.

LISA PHIFER: So, Alan, we should not schedule that meeting unless something exceptional happens.

ALAN GREENBERG: Why don't you send out a calendar invite for it noting that it will only be held in dire circumstances? Carlton, I did not find any e-mail from you, so talk about it on chat if we need to once this call is over.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright. Lastly, I'll note that the invitations were sent out to travel to Brussels for our face-to-face in December. Please make your reservation and other arrangements as necessary. With that, I'd like to thank

everyone. I didn't think we were going to be able to come to this point of actually having something ready to release and get unanimous consent on all of the recommendations. We are here. I think we all deserve a pat on the back, figuratively. I thank you all and wish you a good day. Thank you.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Thank you, all.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]