JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ:	Alright. This is the [inaudible] 12th of December, 2018, and it's currently 12:42 UTC. I turn the call over to you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:	Thank you very much. The intent of this section is to start reviewing the revised recommendations and with the ultimate intent of finishing them to the extent we can today and doing consensus calls [inaudible] 5.1 because it's one that has substantially changed, and at least one objection has been raised, or potential objection. This was rewritten, I think, by Cathrin and Lili. And if we could get the recommendation up there and if you could briefly give your rationale for why [we have what we have,] and then we'll open the floor. Thank you.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST:	What we tried to do was basically reflect the discussion we had yesterday around the fact that the ARS is [inaudible] at the moment may not survive as is, and also, the misunderstandings that seem to exist around the requirement for data accuracy and whether that's compatible with [inaudible]. So what we actually put now is direct reference to [inaudible] article 5, [inaudible] of the GDPR which basically says that data quality is [inaudible] to the purposes for which the data is processed. [inaudible] we recommend that the board instruct the organization to take every reasonable step to ensure data quality, and then we added the previous reference to the ARS anomalous reports as a "such as," as an example, to make sure that It's [inaudible] in terms of possible changes to the ARS policy as such. And

---

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 we basically also, just to make it really watertight, added a sentence to say that the logic of the recommendation should also apply to any replacement policy in case the ARS were to be abandoned as it now exists and were to be replaced by a different data quality assurance program. And then we also added one reference to make it explicit that our recommendation refers to both normal registrations and registrations made using privacy proxy services. That was the edits that we made, which I think are quite significant, which we aim to [– of course, our] aim to be in line with what we discussed yesterday, and the wording is still far from perfect. So, any suggestions here are welcome.

ALAN GREENBERG: Volker, you clearly have some objections. I would suggest to the extent you can, identify the parts that you think may be objectionable as opposed to simply different.

VOLKER GRERIMANN: Yes. Well, my first suggestion would be to remove this entirely. This is completely outside of the realm of what has been discussed previous. I had expected from the discussions that we had yesterday – at least that I was [part to] with regard to the understanding that had been gained with regard to the error rates that the WHOIS [ARS] and the closed tickets that resulted from that have been understood, and therefore, this recommendation was no longer needed. Now this goes into a very deep obligation for the contracted parties to go out and correct data that they have no reason to suspect to be incorrect. The entire GDPR reference [inaudible] interpretation of the GDPR that we fundamentally

dispute, because I think we believe this to be a misinterpretation of the GDPR. I have absolutely no idea where this is coming from. At least this was not discussed anytime when I was present. This is unacceptable. This completely rewrites the entire idea of the original recommendation [inaudible] last-minute addition that [inaudible] This is – I don't know what to say. I'm speechless.

ALAN GREENBERG: Let me say something then. What we decided, I believe, was we were going to delete the entire recommendation, because we believed that we could not stand behind essentially questioning the numbers that were coming out of Compliance in response to the Tickets. But I believe we did decide to replace it with a [recommendation] reaffirming the need for continual monitoring.

VOLKER GRERIMANN: Yes, but this is not that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Let me finish, please. I'm trying to get agreement on what – I think we did agree that we need a program such as the ARS, and we must continue to monitor with the intent of lowering inaccuracy rate. Now, I'm not saying that that wording is saying that, but I believe that is what we discussed. Does that sound at all closer to what you heard?

VOLKER GRERIMANN:	I agree with you, and when you say that we were to replace this with something that would ensure continued monitoring, but this goes so beyond that –
ALAN GREENBERG:	No, we're not talking about this. I'm trying to get agreement across the table. Erika, I see your hand up. I'm trying to get agreement on what I believe we did agree, that is continued monitoring, and the intent of monitoring is ultimately to be able to lower inaccuracy rates. Otherwise, it's an idle activity with no purpose. Is there anyone who strongly disagrees that that is what we did discuss? Okay. Now I'll open the table to people who want to speak. We have Erika first, Carlton, and Stephanie. Sorry, Erika, Carlton, Cathrin, Stephanie.
ERIKA MANN:	I understand the reasoning for this on your recommendation, but I do have some concern, because it turns around the liability issue. Because typically, what happens – and if I'm not completely mistaken, what GDPR recommends – is that a data record must be accurate, but typically, it's the user who notifies the respective organization if an information is not accurate. It's not the obligation or not automatically the obligation of the organization who is collecting the data to keep the record up to date, which is, by the way, very difficult if you follow the GDPR law. So here, we turned it around, which makes it a liability obligation, which I find a bit strange. I think it needs to be reworded, definitely. It can't stay like it is right now.

The second which I find a little bit puzzling, we again make the same mistake that we take a local [law] and suddenly make it a global recommendation, which is a bit strange. We shouldn't do this in WHOIS recommendations, because it's applicable only to European personal data, but it's not applicable to data which is not affecting a citizen outside of the European sphere. So [I'm not really] comfortable with the way it is framed.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think we had Carlton next.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Just suffice to say that though you recalled what was discussed and agreed yesterday, though I recall that we were going to keep ARS as the monitoring tool, and we were going to report from the monitoring of the ARS inaccuracy.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: I think on the ARS – and Carlton, maybe you were still in transit at the time, but we did say that – or some people are of the opinion that ARS may not be continued as it now stands under GDPR, and we wanted to make sure that whatever we recommend doesn't just fall if ARS is abandoned, but rather, applies more generally. When it comes to the – we can easily drop the explicit reference to the GDPR and just keep the wording [without] referring to the law, which still makes sense.

And in terms of the interpretation, I'm not giving any interpretation to it. We're asking the organization to find ways of identifying inaccurate

data, which was the intent of the original recommendation to look at the ARS anomalies to try and identify with hat lessons can be drawn for the identification of inaccurate data. And that, I think, is the spirit that we would like to preserve in this recommendation. Of course, we can drop this specific example of the ARS. That's something that I was discussing with Jackie at the time, that I wasn't clear on what the review team wanted here, whether they wanted to concrete example to be dropped entirely or to be kept as an example, which of course may no longer be appropriate [inaudible] doesn't entirely reflect the discussion as it stood before.

But in no way do we impose any obligation on the contracted parties here. We're asking the organization – I disagree with the assessment that this would be a liability risk. We're asking the organization to create mechanisms to try to find inaccuracies in the data. And I dispute any interpretation that solely relies on the registrant's responsibility to rectify data, because that, I believe, is not compatible with the principle of data quality, and that's also at odds with the Union position that was taken on the new model.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: We have Stephanie, myself and Volker in that order.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Thanks. And I apologize, but my memory of what we agreed is hazy. [inaudible] seem to focus on the GDPR in a way that, as Volker said, may be open to question in terms of the interoperation. I certainly would interpret it as being very user-centric, so it's a question of proportionality and necessity.

For instance, as I keep saying, this business of cancelling a registration if somebody hasn't changed their address within three weeks is [inaudible] So in general, focusing on the GDPR – maybe we say this in the beginning of the report, but the GDPR is more or less the industry standard now. Okay?

Nevertheless, citing it precisely as we do in this example may not work. So I think we have to genericize – if that's a verb – the reference to article 5 and make it – acknowledge, even if we have to repeat it every time, that GDPR is the acknowledged standard in data protection, and its accuracy provisions provide the following, basically.

VOLKER GRERIMANN: [inaudible]

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Yeah. And that this should be considered with the interests of the registrant in mind. That being said, bla bla. And why don't we recommend that ICANN identify this as a data quality exercise as opposed to this kind of semi-punitive compliance – it's really a data quality exercise. You do sampling.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Yeah, but it doesn't feel like it. It feels like heavy hobnail boots coming in and taking your domain away and forcing the registrars to do compliance, which is –

ALAN GREENBERG: Can we keep it short? Or Volker's going to leave before we finish the discussion.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Fine. I'm done.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I would suggest based on what I've heard so far that, number one, we remove the references to GDPR. The WHOIS1 review team made a recommendation that we are responding to here way prior to ICANN's consciousness about GDPR, and in fact before GDPR as such existed. The ARS was designed, again, prior to that, because the ARS was designed in 2013.

I would [inaudible] that yes, we don't want to restrict it to ARS, because there may be something that we use instead of ARS, some other methodology, so that's correct, we don't want to restrict it. I think the other part that I'm not sure was in the previous one at all, and that's the

implication that ICANN organization and therefore its contracted parties must take every reasonable measure to ensure.

Now, that is an ultimate aim, and I would not find it offensive to list much higher accuracy as an ultimate aim, but I would not directly connect it, other than responding to particular errors that are noted. Volker.

VOLKER GRERIMANN: The original recommendation was made with a very clear stated target, which was that there were [inaudible] of the ARS with regards to following compliance action that were not understood or understandable with the data that we had at the time. Certainly, it wasn't envisioned to make it into an additional obligation for a compliance action against contracted parties.

How to salvage this at this time, first half, until "Including for example" should be removed, with a new introductory language based on what we have in the other recommendations. I have no objection against the review of ARS results for anomalies and the underlying causes, and taking appropriate action to reduce those anomalies, and the language towards discontinuation. However, the last four words would have to be struck as well, "for data quality assurance," because we did not determine that as a goal in the original implementation. Our goal in the original recommendation was understand the numbers and help the next review team understand the numbers better, not make any move towards data quality in itself. By doing that, we turn the original

recommendation on its head, and I cannot support that. That being said, I have to go. Sorry.

ALAN GREENBERG: Before you leave, Volker, the changes I suggested, do those come closer to what you're talking about using different language, perhaps?

VOLKER GRERIMANN: Like I said, we have to remove the GDPR references and any references to data quality assurance, and we're fine. We need to get back to the intent of the original recommendations, which is understand the data better, and if we find anything that seems weird, we should be able to or ICANN staff should be able to explain that and reduce instances of such [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Can you live with a ref to an ultimate goal?

VOLKER GRERIMANN: The ultimate goal is understand the numbers, yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, no, an ultimate goal of reducing inaccuracies by understanding the numbers.

VOLKER GRERIMANN: We have to her recommendations that already do that. This was not the goal of the original recommendation. The original recommendation was understand the numbers. I cannot support anything that changes that, otherwise, we would have to go to another public comment. If we change radically all the recommendations – or even one of the recommendations, then I see no other way forward than to put it back to the community.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, I disagree with that. We decided [inaudible] discussion at the beginning of this meeting that other teams have added things at the end and we could also, although we were trying to reduce the number of times we had to do that. Lili.

LILI SUN: The original recommendation was generated based on the belief that the ARS will be moving forward anyway, and it will be moving forward even through the phase three, and that means [inaudible] accuracy check. So since [inaudible] has changed and we received public comments that the ARS may not survive in the future, I don't agree that we just focus on the original recommendation.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just to be clear, we have said the ARS may not survive. It may survive. We cannot presume that. We may want to put an escape hatch if it doesn't, but I don't think we can presume that as much as presume

[inaudible] part of the EPDP right now. We have Stephanie, Carlton, Erica.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Just to point out that if we regard this as a data quality issue instead of a program of ARS, then it is risk-based. And you don't do the kind of massive sampling if there is no risk. So the [inaudible] accurate, but if the contactability remains, then you don't really have a high risk. Just pointing that out.

ALAN GREENBERG: Carlton, I believe, was next.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Yes. The question of whether ARS exists or not going forward was discussed, and my recollection is that we agree that the tool, the purpose for the tool would remain regardless of what you call it. So we were going to have a tool that monitors the accuracy and be able to report it. So that's where we should go.

ALAN GREENBERG: Erika?

ERIKA MANN: Looking at the recommendation, I wonder why we need all the new language which is [inaudible] because in reality, the only thing we want to say is that personal data needs to be accurate, and everything

[reasonable, feasible] – which is already said in the text – measure to ensure that personal data that – yeah, you turned it around, you jut say it has to be accurate, and you take any reasonable steps. And the rest, you delete. Yeah. Because all the rest, Alan, which is mentioned here is exactly interpretation of GDPR. It's not even correct in the WHOIS environment.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think we heard, per se, that saying the target is accuracy might be problematic. Now, I'll point out, the original recommendation we were responding to was a recommendation saying, "Make things more accurate and do it at a very fast rate." ICANN's response was, "Let's just measure it." Chris, I think you want to speak.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I'm not going to get involved in the argument, but I do want to say that I think you said a little while ago, we can make changes and we don't have to go back out for public comment. And whilst I accept the principle of that, I do to think that it's instructive to look at that slide and see how much red text there is. I would argue that irrespective of whether you agree with this or you don't, this is a significant change. And I don't think you can just sit on that and go, "Oh, well, that's okay, we're allowed to do that." I do think this is a significant change that would require input.

EN

ALAN GREENBERG: Let's be clear. I think we've already pretty well come to conclusion – I'll let you speak in a moment – that the reference [to GDPR] should not be there. So that takes out a lot of the red. The change of intent, however, is an issue. Cathrin.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Just if we're starting to compare percentage of red and black, I just want to point out that half of the red text is actually the black text deleted underneath. So it's just incorrectly shown on the slide. What we added are three lines, so we should be clear on that. And my task was to add the reference to the accuracy rules that I had explained two days ago, but we did. In fact, we added a precise reference to the accuracy rules I was trying to explain. We did not add any interpretation to it, and I don't see that this is a significant change, because the aim in identifying the ARS anomalies was to ensure a greater accuracy, which is what the first WHOIS review team tried to ensure ,and which we said was only very partially implemented. So I disagree with the conclusion that we're completely renovating everything here. I don't [think that's] the case. That being said, of course, we don't have to make this about GDPR. I agree with Stephanie's proposal that maybe we can have a more generic language about data quality. And I just want to highlight that we not calling on anyone to take down sites here or turning this into a compliance rampage as some of the comments just now seem to suggest. That is really – if you read the text, what we're saying here, what I tried to say – in a somewhat verbose, German way, I admit that – is that steps should be taken to comply with the law, and we can not reference that if you want, and that in order [inaudible] for data quality, you need to identify where the data quality is not up to par. And then

we suggest some examples of what steps could be taken to do that. Now, if there's people who say we have absolutely no stake in ensuring any data accuracy, then that's a position that I posit will be extremely hard to defend under the GDPR. But that's your own legal risk regardless of whether we put it here or not.

VOLKER GRERIMANN: Indeed, and that's why we shouldn't delve [inaudible] The original intent of this recommendation was understand the data, not assure data quality directly. Therefore, the only way I can support this change is by removing the entire first part and removing the last four words of the –

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: Let Volker finish, and then you can use your microphone.

VOLKER GRERIMANN: There has been quite a significant change. So the recommendation would now read that – well, paraphrasing – ICANN should or could look for potentially anomalous ARS results to determine the underlying cause and take appropriate action to reduce anomalies. And instead of reduce anomalies, we could add to that that – explain anomalies, because like I said, our original intent of the original recommendation was to understand why numbers were so weird, so to say. "If the ARS

program were to be discontinued," that's okay, "Measures to the same effect should be implemented for subsequent program." Period. That would be acceptable. Nothing else.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: If I can say one more thing on this –

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, please.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: First of all, I disagree with the process of first having a big discussion on this, agreeing as a team, sending me off to do the work on this, and then coming back on the results and not being happy and saying let's just go back to what was there before, when we as a team decided that this did not make sense.

And the recommendation is not designed to identify issues in a process to determine anomalies. I mean the recommendation was designed with a goal in mind of identifying the root cause underneath these anomalies and [inaudible] from that process for other processes for determining inaccuracy. So I disagree with your presumption that whatever we say is just about improving this anomalies process. That is not what this recommendation was about.

VOLKER GRERIMANN: It was intended to provide tools for the next review team or any other effort to have better data available to them to make a recommendation, because we didn't feel we were able to do that based on the data that we had, because we couldn't understand it. That was why we had this recommendation in there. [inaudible] it feels like a last-minute effort to sneak something in. And I cannot support that.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: I disagree with that completely.

VOLKER GRERIMANN: I didn't say it is, it just feels like that.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: No, but you're [inaudible] very upset about it.

VOLKER GRERIMANN: Volker, we spent a lot of time talking about cooperation, and let's try to see if we can get to somewhere. And I know you have to leave. Stephanie. Stephanie, you wanted to speak? Quickly.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Very quickly, I think the concept of data quality may dig us out of this hole, because I don't like going back to where we were at the beginning, because I think it's too open-ended, and I'm not happy with the whole ARS thing, and I'd be very happy to lose it in favor of something that

actually gave us more fact-based analysis of the data inaccuracies. Because I don't think the ARS was a well-received effort.

So, could we work on something that genericize the GDPR references accepting that [inaudible] we are meeting a high standard for data protection that we weren't attempting to meet in the past? Right? That's point number one. And point number two, that we would be looking for data quality analysis, or words to that effect. Because that would give you some idea of why the data was inaccurate. Right now, we don't know.

ALAN GREENBERG: I would strongly stay away from something like that, because the only people who can do that are the contracted parties and we would be trying to impose through [inaudible] a significant analysis effort.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Why can only the contracted parties do that?

ALAN GREENBERG: They're the ones who have the data.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Well, sure, but aren't we sampling the data through the ARS program? What are we doing?

ALAN GREENBERG: Right now, we are not sampling any data through ARS program, and you've just said you want to get rid of it. So we could ask DomainTools to do the analysis. I don't think that's going to be [inaudible].

STEPHANIE PERRIN: No, not anymore.

ALAN GREENBERG: We could ask them to do the analysis last year. Carlton.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Yes, I think there's a solution. Cathrin started out by just outlining what the original objective was, and then she went on to lay out how we could meet the objective. I think if we start with that notion [inaudible] the original objective. Nobody disagreed with it. So –

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

CARLTON SAMUELS: No, Volker doesn't disagree with that. He was disagreeing with the elements involved in the analysis part of it. That is my reading of it. Right, [Gunther?]

VOLKER GRERIMANN: I don't quite know where you're going, Charles. Good one.

CARLTON SAMUELS: You didn't disagree with when Cathrin restated what the objective was, what she thought [inaudible]. You agreed with that.

VOLKER GRERIMANN: My interpretation of the original objection – and I might have been way off on that, but I don't think so, because I think I can read – is that we wanted to have more data available for the future and avoid situations where we would find anomalous – or so-called anomalous – results that we weren't able to understand with the data that we had available, so that future review teams or future groups that use that data have better understanding of what they would be doing, what they should be recommending [inaudible] the intent.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Okay.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Then I'm wondering whether we should just rephrase. Because if all were doing is getting numbers, then we could say something like take every reasonable measure to analyze why personal data are inaccurate [inaudible] purpose for which they are processed. And then we can talk about measures to rectify.

EN

VOLKER GRERIMANN: The question is not why data is inaccurate. The question of the recommendation in its original form was if data is [inaudible] why were there so few compliance actions. That was the anomaly that we found and used as an example for potentially other anomalies that exist. So we were saying –

ALAN GREENBERG: [inaudible]

VOLKER GRERIMANN: if this is the result of the ARS, and this is the result of what the Compliance team has done, where's the disconnect? Why do these numbers not match up? And that is what we were trying to resolve with that recommendation. That was the original intent. And [any] reinterpreting that cannot be supported.

ALAN GREENBERG: Volker, we –

VOLKER GRERIMANN: And I have to go, sorry.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just listen to me. You don't have to comment. We agreed the original recommendation was ill-suited. We did decide to put a replacement recommendation in which would address accuracy issues, with a different intent, and I believe what our intent was was to reiterate that

EN

we needed such a program and – sorry. But the ultimate aim of such a program is not just to occupy six people in ICANN. The purpose is ultimately to reduce inaccuracies. Remember, that's the original RDS WHOIS1 review team. So why is that offensive? Maybe we have to schedule a call on Monday.

VOLKER GRERIMANN: [I think we do.]

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. We do have a call scheduled on Monday, correct? Okay. [inaudible] come up with some compromises by then and discuss where you go forward. Volker, thank you. Gunther, thank you for being with us.

VOLKER GRERIMANN: [Thank you, Ryan.]

ALAN GREENBERG: I would suggest we go through the rest of the recommendations and then come back to this one. Obviously, we don't have Volker's yes or no on any of them. We'll give him an opportunity to comment in the near future. Back to you, Jean-Baptiste, I think.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: So, Alan, there were several updates submitted. I'll just take this in order, and this is an update on recommendation 3.2.

ALAN GREENBERG: I would like to go through the woggle set, if you don't mind.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: The whole set, even those that were not modified yet? Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, if it's convenient to do these first and do the others afterwards, it's fine.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: No, I'm more than happy, we can do that. Alright.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright. If I may have your attention. Ladies? Can someone tap the ladies on their shoulders? Alright, we're going to go through [all of the] recommendations. The ones that have not changed, hopefully, we have no change in our agreement of consensus. Recommendation 1.1, ensure the RDS is treated as a strategic priority. The wording has not changed. Is there any change in agreement? Then subject to Volker – and do I understand correctly that Thomas has officially resigned from this team, or – please, Cathrin.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Sorry, I started this rumor yesterday or on Monday. No, I never said he had resigned, but my information based on a message that I also shared

with Jean-Baptiste is hat he had already retired. But actually, he's retiring on the 5th of January. So I have no explanation for why he's not here today, but yes, I think we should give him the opportunity to explain that separately without me explaining for him.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, I don't need [inaudible] why. If he's still officially on the team, we need to verify with him that he is supporting this recommendation so we can claim whether it's unanimous or not. Jean-Baptiste.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: And just for the record, we tried to follow up with Thomas as well on his participation and whether there were any updated on his side, and haven't heard anything yet.

ALAN GREENBERG: If he doesn't respond, he's missing in action and we will say unanimity of all those active in the group, or something to that extent. Alright, recommendation 1.2, and this was a follow-on, is the mechanism the board should instruct ICANN organization to assign responsibility. We had no disagreement last time. Can I presume we have no disagreement in this room this time? Yes.

DMITRY BELYAVSKY: We suggested better wording to ensure that the process will be interactive from both ICANN and national stakeholders at least.

ALAN GREENBERG: Did we suggest the wording of the recommendation, or [inaudible] text say that? I don't recall saying the recommendation should change.

DMITRY BELYAVSKY: Well, surrounding text should be enough. Okay. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: We'll so note. And presume you'll check up on us. Next page. Recommendation 1.3, the ICANN [inaudible] update the charter of the working group on RDS to ensure the necessary transparency of the group's work such as providing for records of meetings and meeting minutes to enable future activities. I thought we said we are going to generalize this recommendation in light of the belief that this group doesn't actually exist – the group so named doesn't exist. So on the presumption that we update it to say board – what's the right expression? Working groups? Is there a lowercase term we can use? Pardon me?

DMITRY BELYAVSKY: Small working group.

ALAN GREENBERG: Committee or working group.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: If you want to capture any possibility of what the board might set up, then it would either be a committee or a working group. So you should probably mention those.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Committee or working group, lower case in all cases. So with the appropriate changes, do we have any objections? Next, please. 3.1 –

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Totally unrelated question.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: The NCSG recommended that we figure out a cleaner numbering system. Is there any action on that recommendation?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes. the action is we have a clean numbering system which corresponds virtually identically to what the NCSG asked for, we just never bothered to explain it. We will.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: They asked us to relate the recommendations to the previous ones, not invent a new numbering system. R3 says it is in relation to R3 of the original one.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: If you really have a better one, you can tell us, but let's not discuss it while we're trying to get consensus on the content [inaudible]. But we did discuss it, and that is the conclusion to came to.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: It just leaps to mind because one does wonder what R3.1 is.

ALAN GREENBERG: And we will define it this time. You don't seem satisfied with defining how we're using the numbering system.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: No, because given the way people read reports, I'm not sure you're going to carry that definition all the way through.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes.

STEPHANIE PERRIN:　　　　　They're going to get lost.

ALAN GREENBERG:　　　　　We are carrying it all the way thorug.

STEPHANIE PERRIN:　　　　　Okay. I look forward to seeing it.

ALAN GREENBERG:　　　　　We have consistently numbered our recommendations with the –

STEPHANIE PERRIN:　　　　　I understand.

ALAN GREENBERG:　　　　　R ones referring to the previous ones, which is what they asked us to do. Sorry, I'm trying to remember what this recommendation is and my eyes are getting blurred.

NEGAR FARZINNIA:　　　　　Alan, would you like me to read them out?

ALAN GREENBERG:　　　　　Read it out or summarize it. Okay. With these glasses, I can actually see the letters, but yes, please.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Okay. I'll be happy to. Recommendation 3.1 reads, "The ICANN board should direct ICANN organization to update all of the information related to RDS, and by implication, other information related to the registration second-level gTLD domains."

ALAN GREENBERG: This [inaudible] get your documentation up to date, make it consistent, and make sure that there are not unrelated, unconnected parts to it. Any objections? Agreed. Next. Sorry, I should have put the right glasses on to begin with. Alice, yes.

ALICE JANSEN: Early on when we discussed the operational [inaudible] and then I think you came to the conclusion that you should specify what is actually needed in terms of – it should be clearly mapped how the information is interrelated. Is that something you'll be adding to the actual text, the supporting text of the recommendation, or –

ALAN GREENBERG: That is correct.

ALICE JANSEN: Ok. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Recommendation 3.2, with community input, we should essentially do outreach. The change is due to the fact that because of GDPR, we know

that there's going to have to be not only outreach to groups not familiar with ICANN, but we have an obligation under GDPR and simply treating customers properly to make sure that the various communities inside and outside of ICANN, including registrants, are aware of how we are now using their data, how it is available, what they need to do. so we have added a clause. "In light of GDPR-driven changes, ICANN should consider the need for education within and outside of ICANN communities." Because the original intent was just to focus on outside of ICANN communities. Susan.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: So maybe considering the conversation or discussion we just had, we should remove the reference to GDPR, but we could put in a refence to privacy laws or something.

ALAN GREENBERG: I would suggest that given that we know use of people's data will be different due to GDPR, who can access it will be different due to GDPR, it's not inappropriate to mention that in this particular case. I can live with a vaguer reference, but I think this one makes it clearer. Stephanie, you wanted to speak.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Well, I'm not very comfortable with the wording right now, and I've raised this at the time when we were discussing, that this seems like a huge mandate [inaudible] particularly when we say, "Identify which groups outside of those that routinely engage with ICANN should be

EN

targeted effectively – effectively is a big word, because communications cost a pile of money and you don't get effective with a routine communication. You get a communication. If you want to target things effectively, then that [ramps up a few] notches. Through RDS WHOIS –

ALAN GREENBERG: To be clear, where is the word – okay, now I see it. Got it.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Second line. Outreach. And then in the light of GDPR-driven changes, ICANN should consider the needs for education within and outside ICANN communities. Well, again, that's pretty broad, and it's not the GDPR that really mandates that kind of communication program. There are specific [inaudible] under GDPR that if you're colleting my data, you have to tell me what you're doing with it, period. We have that obligation. But this original recommendation was for outreach about the domain name system, not about privacy requirements. So it changes the whole focus.

ALAN GREENBERG: It was outreach about WHOIS. Remember, this was the WHOIS review team originally that made this recommendation.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: But not about GDPR, nor certainly about privacy. There was hardly ever anything about privacy in previous WHOIS communications.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright. [inaudible] the rationale for the wording, we can change it. It's not just about notifying registrants how their data wil be used, which is mandated by the law.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Right.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay? It is not just about that, it's also all of the communities who have been using the open WHOIS who will no longer have it. And they need education as well. It's not a privacy issue.

ERIKA MANN: [inaudible] outcome then which comes out of the [EDPR] exercise. Why would you want to merge this as a recommendation now with our recommendation on the WHOIS? I understand the abstract purpose of what you want to reach, and I believe in the goal we agree, but is it really the right place to put this in here as a recommendation?

ALAN GREENBERG: Do you see any possible future where we will have a completely open WHOIS as we had it before?

ERIKA MANN: We don't know yet.

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh, yes we do. There's no possible future where it'll be completely open as it was before.

ERIKA MANN: [Not in the] current law, but you don't know if the law – part of it might change. But [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: If the law changes in three years, we will adapt to it, but that's a different world.

ERIKA MANN: [That's what I'm saying. It's a theoretical] discussion, Alan. So the question is not relevant.

ALAN GREENBERG: Stephanie?

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Let me explain to you how this will be read at the moment. It looks like you're using the excuse of the privacy requirements in the GDPR mandated by – what is it, section 5 – to go on a massive communications program [inaudible] complaining about how there's a lack of openness in the WHOIS. That is how I expect it will be read by my community and possibly by Volker's as well.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright. This was put in in response to the question from your community about why do we believe outreach is important in the near future. I am happy to remove the sentence.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: I don't question why we did it, I'm just telling you that I think [inaudible] and I think it raises more questions than it answers.

ALAN GREENBERG: Let's do one at a time. You said the word "effectively" is too broad. It was in the original one which everyone agreed to. I'm happy to propose that it be deleted. We either omit the red sentence, keep it, or modify it. Those are the only possible alternatives. Can I hear proposals? I can omit, I am happy to omit it, I am happy to leave it, and I will consider any changes.

CARLTON SAMUELS: To be frank, I don't see the need for that red sentence. I think it can be safely omitted, and we get the sense of what we intended [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: It will make it a little bit harder to answer the specific complaint or comment we received, but we have one vote to delete. Stephanie wants to delete it?

STEPHANIE PERRIN: I think deleting is the safest bet.

ALAN GREENBERG: Is there anyone who objects to deleting it?

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Can you remind us what the one comment that objected was?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes. the NCSG asked what is the urgency of any outreach.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Yeah. As I told you, I think I can tell how they're going to read this, so –

ALAN GREENBERG: Can you propose a way to write it so it meets the intent without that interpretation? Cathrin?

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Yes. I think what we discussed at the time when we thought about rephrasing this was in part also due to one example that I provided of the child sexual hotlines who no longer have access to then WHOIS information and who are now realizing that this resource has gone away, so that there are effects outside of the ICANN community proper that [have not yet been] tallied when we designed the new policy. So I think that was part of what was happening, and while the sentence can be misunderstood to be related to a more general educational effort,

what was actually meant was that, again, this effort to have evidence-based policymaking that outreach should be conducted beyond the usual group of people who know all the acronyms and are happy to contribute to make sure that other users of the Internet and other people who deal with consequences generated by some technical choices we've made are heard when it comes to reviewing polices [inaudible] that we don't inadvertently adopt stuff that totally messes up other processes unnecessarily. I think that was the original intent. Now, viewing the timeframe of this, of course, we also discussed whether that makes any sense in view of the [phase] which the EPDP is scheduled to deliver, but I think a lot of people at the time – when was this? Yesterday or the day before thought that there was as chance that this could still be useful [inaudible] would be useful for future policy [inaudible] and possible future changes. And I'm wondering whether there's some way or rephrasing this one sentence to make it very clear that what we're proposing is not a general GDPR educational program but really to just make sure that the appropriate outreach is conducted to make sure that those who should have a say in the policy development actually do have a say, and that's going beyond IGF and ICANN.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I propose that we drop the first phrase, leave the rest of the sentence. That sentence does say that discussion within the ICANN community – not within ICANN, but within the ICANN community – is important, and that covers the issue of parts within our community who might be affected, without reference to GDPR, and in the dialog, we can use GDPR as an example of one of the things which may be driving

change, needing education. Acceptable? So we remove the "In light of GDPR changes," ICANN stays capitalized, luckily, and we move the reference to GDPR into the dialog. Susan?

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: The only thing that – and I'm not wedded to this, so that's just a suggestion, is we could add something about in light of substantial policy changes, ICANN should consider the need for education. Because this isn't the only substantial policy change, there'll be another one within a year or so.

ALAN GREENBERG: Privacy proxy may do that again if [inaudible]. If we can have agreement by deleting that phrase and moving it into the reference -and Jackie, if we can, a note that the reference may well include other policy changes to address what Susan's saying. Done? Agreement, unanimity in this room? Done. Next one. Jean-Baptiste.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: I just wanted to ask, at some point, you mentioned [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry, I think we agreed to remove "effectively." Alright, thank you for the reminder. I spent most of my life saying Jean-Jacques, which is why I stumble every time I say your name.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: 4.1, ICANN board should direct ICANN Contractual Compliance to proactively monitor and enforce RDS [inaudible] to look for, address systematic issues. This was one that Volker, I thought, rewrote. Did you not get a copy from Volker, or is this the rewrite? I don't know if this has changed or not. I know it's one he worked on.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: I received CM2 from him.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, this is more recently, just this afternoon. Use your microphone.

LILI SUN: So Volker just rewrote CM2, not this one.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, I saw him rewriting it. And I know he was charged with cleaning up, because these were ones where the registrars and registries had comments that they believed we were going to go on witch hunts as oppose to using the information we already had from reports.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: The only one I have on list from Volker is CM2.

ALAN GREENBERG: Can we please use microphones?

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: I think I changed this. I'm trying to find it. What I added to this – I can't remember what I did. [I've got a document.] I added the sources of information. But I don't remember if I did it to the –hold on. Oh, yeah, you're right, Alan. "Volker to provide language to update recommendation 4.1." And Susan to delete the portion of the recommendation [inaudible] That was already done. I think you guys worked on this and submitted this yesterday.

ALAN GREENBERG: I saw him working on it today.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: [Now, it's in there. Could somebody pull up that Google doc? It's in there. I just am having a hard time finding –]

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll find the original one and see if it's different or not. Okay, I'm going to read what the original one is. Someone watch this, look at the screen, tell me if it's different. "ICANN board should direct ICANN Contractual Compliance to proactively monitor and enforce RDS WHOIS data accuracy requirements to look for and address systematic issues. A risk-

based approach to be executed to assess and understand the issues and then take appropriate actions to mitigate them."

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Same one.

ALAN GREENBERG: Same one. Alright. We're going to have to put this one on hold. Well, hold until we look at 4.2.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: [So he just changed 4.2, and 4.1 in the Google doc.] "To ensure ICANN Contractual Compliance is directed to proactively monitor and enforce registrar obligations with regard to RDS WHOIS data accuracy using data from incoming inaccuracy complaints in RDS accuracy studies or reviews to look for [inaudible] and address systemic issues." And then I put in, in the findings, "Could be more proactive in their approach when they see suspected systemic issues in accuracy complaints reported, RDS accuracy studies or reports or DAAR reports to research, analyze and enforce against in accuracy in the registration data." I added one sentence.

ALAN GREENBERG: And I'm not worried about the document. We will have plenty of opportunity to debate that.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: But this – according to the Google doc, he edited it today.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes. Okay, that's what I saw him working, he just didn't send it to us.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: And I'll point out editing one copy of the recommendation and not the other does not lead to necessarily good results.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Right. We're working quickly.

ALAN GREENBERG: But it is what it is. Alright. I am willing to put before the group – now, maybe scroll up to 4.1, because I believe he made similar changes there. Thank you for –

ERIKA MANN: Can somebody put it up here so that we can see it on our screen or no? [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: In the Google doc, which I believe everyone now has a pointer to.

ERIKA MANN: And the changed version as well? Okay, let me check it. Thank you.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: [inaudible] Google doc automatically –

ERIKA MANN: Normally, it does, yeah. If you save it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright, recommendation –

ERIKA MANN: [inaudible] Let me see if I find it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Recommendation 4.1, the ICANN board should initiate action to ensure – as opposed to direct ICANN Org – to ensure ICANN Compliance is directed to proactively monitor and enforce registrar obligations with regard to RDS. That is we're not adding new obligations. With regards to RDS accuracy using data from incoming inaccuracy complaints and RDS accuracy studies or reviews, reinforcing the fact that we're not doing new investigations and witch hunts, to look for and address systematic issues. And the last sentence, the risk-based approach [inaudible] I take silence as consent, and we have a new version of 4.1. Can we scroll to 4.2, please? The ICANN board should initiate action to ensure that

ICANN Contractual Compliance is directed to cross-reference existing data from incoming complaints and studies such as the ARS to detect patterns of failure to verify RDS WHOIS data as required by the RAA. When such a pattern is detected, compliance action or audit – so we're not limiting it to audit – should be initiated to review compliance of the registrar with the RDS WHOIS contractual compliance and consensus policies, and as agreed, we have removed the reference to sanctions, which were taken to mean new sanctions. Is everyone agreeable to this? Is there any [inaudible]? Dmitry has a [inaudible]

DMITRY BELYAVSKY: Do we really need the mentioning of the ARS here?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes and no. Currently, Contractual Compliance, when they were processing ARS data, was treating it as a ticket, an incoming ticket to address, but not a complaint. So this simply says that all of the input that comes into Contractual Compliance should be addressed. We have agreement on 4.2. Next.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: I'm sorry, Alan, I just wanted to mention to everyone if you made any changes to the Google doc, let me know and I'll switch to that. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think that's the only one where the recommendation [inaudible] 5.1 we will not be discussion at the moment. Next one is 10.1. This one has not changed. The board should monitor implementation of the [PPSAI]

and other things, as we said, regarding the privacy proxy. We have not discussed that at all at this meeting, and I'm presuming that the unanimous consent still applies.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Volker did a lot of changes. Volker made – unless that was [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: Are you saying there are changes in the Google doc?

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: He did all kinds [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: Microphone, please.

ERIKA MANN: [inaudible] Google doc [inaudible]

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: The Google doc, 10.1, he made multiple changes to the recommendations, which seems a little bit [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: Can we see it? It's all a plot and conspiracy. Microphone.

EN

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Volker said he wanted to make sure that language was acceptable. Volker never informed the rest of the WHOIS team that he was making changes to the language in the recommendation. It's one thing when you do it to the body of the report to clarify, but changing language to a recommendation without discussing with the rest of the review team is not being part of the team.

ALAN GREENBERG: Can we spend three minutes and look at it anyway and [inaudible]?

NEGAR FARZINNIA: I just wanted to add a comment, please, that part of the change, at least the part that mentions the board should take action – to make a proposal to an amendment in the previous version of the recommendation was updated as a result of the input ICANN Org provided today and asked for clarification. The rest of the changes, I don't know the reason for.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. I'm going to make a judgment call. Even if the intent is identical, there is enough language that I think we have to be able to look at the two versions side by side and make a judgment call, so we'll defer this one to the meeting on Monday. Can someone send out a very clean e-mail [showing before] and after? And preferably, the redline version and the clean version. Susan. Sorry.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Considering the comments in the earlier discussion, there's quite a few changes in this. There's a lot more red in my copy here than [inaudible] language compared to the old language.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm not sure when we see a clean version it's even going to read well, because I see a sentence that says things like, "Registrars shall be verified, and verified and validated in the application of verification and validation requirements." I don't think this reads very clearly. So let us distribute the versions, the old, redline, new version, in a simple Word document or a PDF of a Word document, and let's give him an opportunity to perhaps clean it up and discuss it on Monday. Susan?

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: I think instead of – I think we need to go to Google Docs for each and every one of these recommendations now, because we're seeing things changed in the Google docs that you weren't informed, staff was not informed. So if we can just review in Google Docs, that'll be more user friendly.

ALAN GREENBERG: The only problem, Susan, is that several of us submitted things via e-mail, which may not have made their way into the Google doc yet. Okay. I'm relying on our confident staff to identify which is which. And if you see a version in Google Docs that you know you modified, please tell us.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: [inaudible] the update that I received via e-mail, I'll just [report] that in the Google doc if it's not done already.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: [inaudible]

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: I will.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: That'll be good.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yeah.

ALAN GREENBERG: We all knew this meeting was going too smoothly. Let's not despair, let's keep on going, please. 10.2, please. This one says the review team three should do the analysis of implementation. I don't believe it has changed. We had unanimous consent last time. Is there anyone who wishes to withdraw their consent? Under penalty of – We have consent on this one. Next one, please. This is SLAs and metrics on the WHOIS interface. I don't believe there are any changes proposed on this one.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: May I just pause to salute ICANN staff who anticipate our every need? [There are truffles out there, guys.]

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Oh my god. That's a good interruption. So on this one, I added [inaudible] to the problem issue and drafted two questions that I sent in an e-mail to the whole review team, and it would be good to get those questions answered. But I am not seeing any change to the recommendation. But I don't agree with Volker's contention. He added language in the body that I don't agree with. If you go down to [feasibility of implementation,] and then also sort of – I can't say that. Says it again. Whatever. Repeats himself in rationale.

CARLTON SAMUELS: [inaudible]

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Yeah, and I don't agree with that.

ALAN GREENBERG: What did he say?

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: He said this is not to identify compliance issues. Registrar is blocking any WHOIS lookups and not complying with the RAA to provide ICANN access to whatever data's available. That is a compliance issue, so you wouldn't ignore it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Can we find the language so we can see it?

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Implementation – Negar's on it.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: What Volker had added is, "This is not primarily directed at initiating compliance action, but rather at providing data for further review." Part of the conversation, Susan, if you recall earlier today [inaudible] operational input from ICANN Org, a question came up – I think a question had come up from Compliance, and the result of that was that we were going to provide clarification in the language supporting the recommendation to say this was not just aimed at Compliance.

ALAN GREENBERG: Excuse me, can you scroll it a bit higher on the screen so it's not hidden by heads? It's gone now. A little bit higher. I'd like it to be above Lili's head so I can read it. That's okay. Alright, so that's the blue crossed out by red, so Volker put it in and Susan took it out.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Correct.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. The original sentence is, "This recommendation should be implemented by existing teams." Not quite sure what that meant by existing [inaudible] "and is not primarily directed at initiating

compliance action, but rather, providing data for further review." Susan, I can actually live with that, because we started saying we want this to be monitored and tracked.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Alan, can you check the chat?

ALAN GREENBERG: Can I check the what?

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: The chat.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: I can read Volker's comment.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. I'm sorry, I'm not on. I got dropped out.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: That's okay. I can read it out loud. First of all, he made it [inaudible] secondly, he says he's dialed in. Volker says, "I agree with Susan that if obvious compliance issues are detected, those should of course be addressed. But these would be like bycatch."

ALAN GREENBERG: I think the recommendation is saying that we did not do it primarily to take compliance action, but if we note that there are compliance issues, we should act on them.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Because if you read his language there, it would be – oh, ignore the compliance. Yeah, we didn't really meant that.

ALAN GREENBERG: I took primarily to mean that wasn't the original intent, but I'd be happy to leave his sentence in, which, remember, was addressing complaints or comments, and add, "However, should compliance-related issues be noted, they will be acted upon." They should be acted upon.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: They should be acted upon. I'm probably okay with that if you want to enter that. But I do reserve [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: We're not accepting the whole report right now, we're hopefully focusing on [inaudible].

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Yeah, but what I'm saying [inaudible] as a member of the community I come from, I have the responsibility to read the full report to accept all these changes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Of course.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: I'm not going to disagree with things that seem reasonable today, but I'm just reserving the right to next week say nope.

ALAN GREENBERG: As are we all.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Right.

ALAN GREENBERG: Some of us actually take our responsibilities seriously. Next, please. It's 11.2. It was on the same page, we just had to scroll up a smidgeon. This one says we should maintain the common interface and make it useful. I don't believe the wording has changed.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: 11.2. It has not changed, we had unanimous agreement to begin with. Is there anyone who would like to withdraw their agreement? Hearing nothing, we still have agreement on this one. Next recommendation,

12.1. This is the recommendation on internationalized domain registration data. Recommendation was that the next review team should review the actual implementation because it's pending RDAP. [inaudible] we had full consent last time. Sorry, is there disagreement on that end of the table?

NEGAR FARZINNIA: No, because we have switched documents, Jean-Baptiste is trying to put the Google doc in the Adobe room so everybody can look at it on their laptops, and he's trying to put it up.

ALAN GREENBERG: Understood. We'll pause for a moment. If they're the documents that were sent last night – oh, I'm sorry, yeah, yesterday evening, they came form [inaudible] via Google Doc. Cathrin, did you say you don't have a Google Doc ID? You don't need a Google ID. Well, you need [inaudible] Gmail address. Any e-mail address will do. Well, then we can give you one in a minute. Oh. My only concern is if we're sending out the Google Doc addresses on a publicly viewable, then I have a problem with that. If we send out the Google addresses only via private e-mail, which I believe we have in this case, then yes, we could make commenting available to anyone without logging on. I don't have a problem with that. Our editor isn't here. our editor is going to have to be a little bit more careful in accepting comments, but if we haven't publicized the addresses outside of this group, I don't feel a major problem. You should have received something last night at about 6:15 p.m.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: I'll share the link right away, Erika.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. I believe. I haven't actually looked. Can we get an ETA for when we're going to get back online so we can keep on going? It's after 3:00 already. Our chances of actually leaving early are evaporating by the moment.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Alright, which one are we on now?

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Recommendation 12.1

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: That's the international one.

ALAN GREENBERG: Internationalized domain registration information. I think I already took a consensus call on this one that said we deferred. So we'll go on to the next one, please, which is 15.1.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: That's plan and annual report?

ALAN GREENBERG: That is correct.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Calling it out for my [inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: So for recommendation 15.1, the text of the recommendation itself has not changed. However, based on the feedback we had received, we did have a modification done in the implementation which his not captured in the Google doc, and I can read it out to the team as to the change under implementation section. Oh, you pulled it up? O, there you go.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: So the change under Implementation is the following. So we'll read the full sentence. "The ICANN board should take the lead in developing the structure and metrics for the plan and implementation report. An overview of the recommendations generated by this review team will be foundation for that design." The [inaudible] and the text that was added after that is, "The organization should consider an impact evaluation to measure to what extent implementation is meeting the recommendation's intent and was effective."

ALAN GREENBERG: Again, no change in the recommendation itself. We'll all get a second kick at the can for the content, but if you have any objection now, you might as well mention it. I hear no objection to this, and I hear no objection to the recommendation itself. We have consensus. Next recommendation, LE1. Oh, comment [inaudible].

STEPHANIE PERRIN: How did we resolve the question of Alice's comment this morning that the six month didn't include the six months it'll take the board to decide on this.

ALAN GREENBERG: That doesn't say six months from when. We probably do need some clarity. I honestly don't remember what the intent was.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Well, [inaudible] intent was to make sure that we're clear that it's six months from the board acceptance. So it's a simple search and destroy [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: No, my question is, I don't remember what the intent of the original sentence was saying six months.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Well, regardless, we can't tell the board that it doesn't have six months to do it.

ALAN GREENBERG: No.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Yeah. So I'm just saying –

ALAN GREENBERG: The question I'm asking is, is the edit going to cause a change in intent, or was that what we always [inaudible] anyway? Does anyone know who wrote that sentence?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: The red one?

ALAN GREENBERG: No, the black one above the red one. Lili, was that you?

LILI SUN: I believe the six months generated from the intention to have at least an implementation plan in six months.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, but that's the implementation timeline, not the implementation [inaudible]. So within six months of having the plan. Okay. Within six months of the plan being published is the intent. Alice?

ALICE JANSEN: So while we're on this, actually, there is a number of recommendations where you've got the six months language just to [inaudible] so you know for your process that it was 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 15.1, and then LE1, LE2.

ALAN GREENBERG: Jackie will do a search and make sure there's clarity.

ALICE JANSEN: Yes. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I love delegating.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: I love when you have [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: LE1, please. Sorry, no eyes on one side of my head, apparently. Stephanie.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Do you need one of those backup cameras like I have on my little car?

ALAN GREENBERG: Stephanie, I have enough trouble with the two eyes I have.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Right. And I do apologize for not having caught this earlier, but this is a weird sentence. "Measuring, recommendation, implementation, should not be easy?" That sounds almost Calvinist.

ALAN GREENBERG: Where are you reading this?

STEPHANIE PERRIN: 15.1, feasibility of recommendation.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Thank you. "Measuring recommendation implementation should not be easy, The challenging part will be [to design metrics] for each recommendation to be tracked."

ERIKA MANN: Leave it, it's a good one.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, if you change "which" to "will" and put a period, it is technically accurate. And we're warning them.

ERIKA MANN: You knew it was coming.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think it is only fitting. ICANN and the board are continually telling us we have to have metrics and measure things. They don't tell us how or give us the tools to do it. I think it's only fitting we do it back [inaudible]. Sorry.

ERIKA MANN: You have a naughty mind.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: it's not a – well, yeah, it's a weird thing to say.

ALAN GREENBERG: It's commenting on the feasibility. What we're saying is we're making a recommendation and we know full well it's probably not feasible. But we were told to comment on feasibility. Negar.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Thank you. Volker has put two comments in the chat that I want to read for the record. The first one says, "If we do not know the intent of any language we included in the report, we should consider removing such language." And the second one says that sentence does not compute, and I'm guessing he's referring to the feasibility of recommendation we just discussed.

ALAN GREENBERG: At the very least, we'll edit it so it's sentences that actually parse. Whether we choose to continue to input it, you'll have plenty of opportunity to comment as we go through the report. And we now go to LE1? I do not believe we have made any changes to LE1.

ALICE JANSEN: Just a quick note here. Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes please, Alice.

ALICE JANSEN: On the discussion we had this morning regarding regular – and I know Cathrin suggested that amendments be made to specify what regular meant – I have that somewhere, hold on. The ex-ante – what's the term you used? So include a rationale on, one, ex-ante impact assessment, and two, evaluate new policies once they are in place.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think that that's under the implementation, isn't it? I believe there's a section on implementation.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: No, the reference is to define the word "regular."

ALAN GREENBERG: No, I understand, but I believe there is an implementation section, and I would think that is the place to define it.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Fair. Just noting that there will be some changes to this section that are not present at the moment.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Sorry. I thought every section [inaudible] implementation heading below the rationale. Maybe not.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: No.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, I wrote some. Stephanie, please. Microphone.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Just lost my page there. There were are. Good. I apologize for not [noticing it] earlier, but there's a use of passive voice that kind of bites you in this recommendation, LE1. So maybe it would be useful right now to agree to reword it so that it says the ICANN board should resolve that ICANN will conduct regular data gathering through surveys and studies. Sound okay? To inform a future bla bla.

ALAN GREENBERG: I would support that type of wording without ratifying the exact wording right now. And I believe it is within the discretion of our editor to propose such wording when [they notice in other] cases. Cathrin, you have a –

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Yes, just to say that indeed we had agreed that we define regular. And I'm sorry, I should have provided the wording now on the break, but I completely forgot about that part of my to-dos and was very happy when Jackie had checked off her list forgetting that there was more. But indeed, it was exactly the wording that you just suggested, so maybe we can just [inaudible] after this and put it in there. And I think indeed, we could not weigh down the recommendation by either putting it in a footnote, regular, or putting it in an implementation section if there is such a thing.

ALAN GREENBERG: There is an implementation section. It currently says the implementation has to be provided by the ICANN board and ICANN organization, and I have no clue what that means. A successful implementation would consist of a board resolution within six months that is put into practice [inaudible] ICANN organization, e.g. through annual surveys of relevant user groups or as defined by policy development processes. I think that implementation note needs to be rewritten extensively, but there is an implementation note.

The implementation note, by the way, is an implementation note that as it stands, because it's unqualified, applies to both LE1 and LE2.

[inaudible] why we cannot have particular sections for each one. Cathrin.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Yes. Sorry. Indeed, there is an implementation section that I completed for the both of them in drafting the original draft chapter, and we could easily add it there and just explain the rationale behind that language. That implementation has to be done by the board itself and by the organization. That's what I was trying to suggest with that first sentence that [inaudible]. The implementation –

ALAN GREENBERG: As opposed to who else?

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: As opposed to other actors. So we have measures where [some of the] implementation may need to be provided by to her parties, like we discussed for data accuracy, whether we'll actually be the organization that can do it, or I don't know which other actor might be relevant, but here in this specific instance, it would have to be for the board to resolve and then for the organization to implement.

ALAN GREENBERG: The only organization the board can direct is the board itself, or the ICANN organization. Any other entity such as a constituent part of GNSO, they can simply request or suggest. In any case, all of that will have to be tidied up. Sorry, do we have consensus on LE1? We had full

EN

consensus before, it has not changed in wording. LE2, please. That one says "Board should consider extending and conducting such surveys and/or studies as described in LE1." There's a pronoun or something missing there, to or with other RDS users working with law enforcement on a regular basis. And that one, I believe, we were going to revise. What happened? Negar.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Yes. The note was to add clarification as to what "extend" means in this recommendation. And also add a clause for factoring cost/benefit analysis for this recommendation.

ALAN GREENBERG: [inaudible] assigned to?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I don't have a penholder listed. Up for grabs.

ALICE JANSEN: Cathrin and I worked on it together, but I didn't know if the financial aspect was to be added into the recommendation itself or in the text surrounding it.

ALAN GREENBERG: I thought that was a note surrounding it. I didn't think that was a text. But do we have a revised version of the [inaudible] Google doc?

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: No. Actually, I think the language we had agreed in the meeting earlier was, "Should consider conducting such surveys and/or studies –" and then there's a part missing in the side, because then it says other RDS – "Conducting such surveys and/or studies –" what is the correct word? I guess with other RDS users, or –

ALAN GREENBERG: I thought we had "comparable" somewhere in it to say they would not necessarily be the same surveys.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: I thought the idea was that by conducting, we made it clear we're not just extending. So, you could say "Conducting comparable survey of other RDS users working with law enforcement –" Would that make sense?

ALAN GREENBERG: The original one says the ICANN board should consider extending and conducting such surveys and/or studies as described in LE1. What we're seeing there is identical to the original one, that's not changed. Negar.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Volker in comments is stating that we should remove the word "extend" from the recommendation based on earlier discussions.

ALAN GREENBERG: And I would suggest changing "such" to "comparable." So if we remove "extending and" and replace "such" with "comparable," we have "the ICANN board should consider [inaudible] comparable surveys and/or studies (as described in LE.1 to) to other RDS WHOIS users working with law enforcement on a regular basis.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: I have made the revisions in the Google doc for this recommendation.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: So we capture it as redline changes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Do we have consensus on that? Sorry?

ERIKA MANN: I was just saying Volker's happy to.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Can we roll back – we don't have to roll back. I'll just point out that putting a footnote on a recommendation makes it a little bit problematic when you put it into tables and things like that. It can be done with editing, making it look like a footnote but not a footnote. But if we can find am ore elegant way of doing it, that might be appropriate.

But it's only going to show up in one table in the executive summary, and we can fake that one, I think, if necessary. We have a new sentence added to that recommendation. I don't know what version it is we have here.

Oh. Alright, we have another change that I'm not quite sure where it came from. We had at the end of it, "The ICANN board must either negotiate –" Oh, okay. That's the standard language. "The ICANN board should [inaudible] action intended to ensure that [inaudible] consider effecting such changes." That doesn't parse. Oh, okay, effecting is putting in place such changes. It's not affecting, it's effecting. Negar.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Thanks, Alan. As a result of this morning's discussion, I have an action item captured for you to review this section with an eye towards section 3.2 of the 2013 RAA, and I just wanted to see if the changes made here take that into consideration or if further changes are needed.

ALAN GREENBERG: I believe that was making sure there's a table somewhere in the document that lists what requirements we have on the various classes of contracted parties, and I think [inaudible] pointing out that I got it wrong in that particular area. I can check in a minute. Why do we have consumer trust right after law enforcement in the report, but we have a different order here? The answer is just to confuse me. In any case, it's a reference to the report, the body of the report.

EN

NEGAR FARZINNIA: So we'll note, then, as an action item to go back.

ALAN GREENBERG: That is correct. And the ICANN board – adding a sentence saying the ICANN board should consider whether and to what extent notification of breaches that it receives should be publicly disclosed. That was a question related to, should it provide raw statistics of, "We have N breaches with X registrants exposed?" Or should it provide specifics that particular registrar has noted a specific breach on a certain date? And we're simply putting that under the board's view to take a look and decide.

Subject to making sure the last sentence in the first paragraph actually says something clear. Do we have agreement on this recommendation? Essentially unchanged other than the addition of public notification of breaches. Done.

CM1. This is the recommendation that says we should make sure we flag registrations suspended because of inaccuracies, and don't unsuspend them unless the data is corrected. The only change is the reference to "The board should negotiate." And I believe there were some comments, but I believe we addressed those suitably and we didn't make any changes. Any disagreement on this one? Hearing none, CM2, please.

This was the recommendation on addressing grandfathered domains, not having their accuracy checked. There were significant pushback and misunderstanding of this one and we have rewritten it completely to not rely on a particular study to be done. Moreover, it factors in the

potential reality that the admin contact data may disappear because of the EPDP. Currently, under the 2009 RAA, the registrant contact data was optional. The admin contact data was not. So, if one were to, for instance, completely remove the admin contact, how one could do that protecting registrant rights, I'm not quite sure. But there is a proposal on the table that we do that. If we were to remove admin contact, we could be left with registrations with no contact information whatsoever.

Pardon me? Carlton, please use the microphone.

CARLTON SAMUELS: I was saying that is known, so why would they suggest it?

ALAN GREENBERG: Carlton lives in a world where no one ever suggests anything which is illogical or doesn't make sense to everyone. Can I live there, too? Dmitry?

DMITRY BELYAVSKY: Shouldn't we clarify what does the [word] comparable mean here?

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm not sure how to do that. The 2013 RAA says that registration data for new or transferred, or there might be a third, [inaudible] edge case condition, that your contact information must go through a set of validations essentially looking at format, and that at least one of the contact fields … But all fields are mandatory and they must be verified

and one of them must be … They must be validated and one of them must be verified.

You may ask what does comparable mean here. I know you just did. Does it mean that all of the fields must be present? Does it mean they must be validated and verified? In many cases, there will be information there already. So, if, for instance, you do eliminate the admin field but the other fields are fully filled in, is that sufficient? Could you construe this to mean that the registrars must actually validate all the information in the 300 or 400 domains we're talking about? Or verify them. I call the person and see if they answer the phone.

I would suggest it is to our advantage to keep this unclear because having data present was our original target. If this is interpreted to mean it must also be validated, marvelous. But I believe comparable in its loosest interpretation will say it must be present, you cannot have a field omitted. I believe that is sufficient. Yes?

DMITRY BELYAVSKY: Maybe we should specify not only present, but [inaudible] correct.

ALAN GREENBERG: I would suggest you don't want to do that if you want this to be accepted. Remember, if they accept any new data from a registrant, it must be validated and verified. With that discussion having happened, do we have agreement on this? Susan nodded yes. Volker wrote it. I think we have agreement. [inaudible] which I believe has been deleted. Sorry. CM3 has been deleted in favor of a reference perhaps in the

recommendation, more likely in the text of the outreach [inaudible] not had time to do. Hopefully, I'll do it before I leave the room, but we'll bring that one back up. If the outreach one changes, it should be brought back up on Monday. But the CM3 itself is deleted.

CM4, the bulk WHOIS. That one is being deleted in favor of request documentation be clarified with the proviso that if we do not get a satisfactory response, we might choose to put it back in.

CM5. The ICANN board and the GNSO adopt a risk-based approach to incorporating requirements for measurement, auditing, tracking, reporting, and enforcement of all RDS policies. We had consensus. We have not changed the wording. I see no disagreement. I'm presuming we will alter the numbering of this to make it CM3. [inaudible] the recommendation formerly known as CM5.

[BY1]. We're on the last one, I believe. This, we have a new version, which I presume Carlton sent somewhere. I will read it, then. We'll be in touch. You sent it to me. I didn't realize you were transferring responsibility to me to handle it. Hold on. I will try to find it, perhaps unsuccessfully. Ah, here we are. It's a document you opened, right?

Okay. The recommendation previously read the ICANN board should take action to eliminate the reference to safeguard registrant data in ICANN bylaws XX and replace the section on OECD. To replace it with a more generic requirement for RDS WHOIS review teams to assess how well RDS WHOIS policy and practice addresses applicable data protection across border transfer regulations, laws, and best practices.

The change is to replace the word "eliminate" in the first sentence with "extend". That's it. I found that exceedingly elegant. Please, go ahead.

NEGAR FARZINNI: I am ready to put the change in the document [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: We are saying if the ICANN board should take action to extend the reference to safeguarding registrant data, the appropriate bylaw, and replace – should we delete this section? No, no. This is fine because we're not predicating the wording of it. We're replacing the reference to the OECD with a more generic requirement for the WHOIS review teams to assess how well RDS policy and practice addresses applicable data protection cross border data transfers, regulations, laws, and best practice.

So, we're essentially saying what we were saying is eliminate the section saying safeguard and eliminate the section saying OECD guidelines and replace them with a new section which we thought were covering both. The wording did not imply that. The wording implied we were deleting the reference to safeguarding registrant data, so we are simply saying extend the reference to safeguarding data and … We are replacing the word "eliminate" with "extend". It is not on the screen. We're all crazy here. You're not crazy for not seeing the word.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Stephanie, the change has been made in the Google Doc to reflect current discussions.

ALAN GREENBERG: The change is solely a one-word replacement which says extend the reference to safeguarding registrant data, and the rest stays the same. No. We are saying and replace section E3, which is the OECD guidelines. Microphone.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: It would be much easier for outsiders to follow us if, as we say replace section 4.6 blah-blah (which refers to the OECD guidelines) with a more generic reference or requirement blah-blah-blah.

ALAN GREENBERG: After the word "ICANN bylaws" in the second line, add a parenthetical which refers to the OECD guidelines. I consider that a friendly amendment.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Yes. Then people won't freak out.

ALAN GREENBERG: Since Negar is updating it, now we have two changes. Is it possible to show that version on the screen? Jean-Baptiste is going to hate me before the end of the day, if not already.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: It's definitely a thing of beauty [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: You should have seen the look in his eye just now. Blame it on her. I only had one word changed.   Third line, after ICANN bylaws, open parentheses. I've warned Jackie I love parentheses. I think Guidelines is capitalized. Stephanie, do we need to reference which OECD guidelines or is it … There is only one OECD guidelines referenced in that bylaw. We don't need to [cite] the name of it, though. Okay, thank you. Do we have … Unfortunately, he did it as a change, not a replace – not a recommendation – so you can't see it. But pretend that bracket is red. We have agreement? Thank you, Stephanie. I think that's a good addition. Thank you. [inaudible], right? He's not listening to me. Chuck to his friends, though.

We have agreement. We have several recommendations we will bring back on Monday. Hopefully, there will be some rework done on them in the interim. I'm not sure who is doing the rework on the most controversial one, on the ARS [inaudible]. Is Cathrin taking responsibility for that?

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Am I now?

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll be glad to do it. You may not like it.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Just for the record, I was not the author of this recommendation. I was asked to add a clarification and I really did that in good faith without wanting to cause the kind of total chaos that ensued. I note for the record that the changes that Volker is suggesting on another recommendation [inaudible] the ones that we've added. I'm happy to take productive comments, constructive comments, from anyone on how this can be rewarded, would in fact be grateful. I do think we should preserve the original aim of the recommendation which, as you rightly pointed out, was not to [inaudible] compliance on how they can fix one specific process relevant to one specific issue.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, in reference to the ensuing discussion, I think that falls under the guidelines of no good deed goes unpunished. May I subject myself to the next level of abuse and suggest that I'll draft something and send it to Cathrin, the one who drafted this version and Susan who drafted the previous one. The ARS one. Sorry. I don't do numbers, but yes. Can someone put that on my action list?

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Sorry. I just want to clarify. Alan, you will be looking at the language [inaudible] suggest changes?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes.

NEGAR FARZINNI: Okay. I'll capture that.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm hoping by the time I leave the room today someone will have a definitive list of what I must do before Monday. I happen to be going home to a few other tasks, which are going to be occupying at least 12 hours a day. I'm replumbing part of my basement.

Alright. We have a consensus call on most of the recommendations. We need to verify with Volker if he did not contribute a yea or nay to any of them and we need to attempt to get an answer from Thomas once we have them all put together in a form which we can look at. I would not presume he's going to access the Google Doc.

What else do we need to do today?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: I believe, Alan, reconfirm the work plan and also agree as well just on the schedule of calls. [inaudible] for the action items [inaudible], so let's quickly look at the work plan.

So, this is what we had discussed on day one. I just wanted to verify with you whether there are any adjustments needed on that. So, just as a reminder, by 21st [inaudible] recommendations would be updated based on comments received and [inaudible] of January [inaudible] recommendation for submission to ICANN board would be approved. And by the end of January, by the 25th, the final report will be sent to ICANN board and Language Services and [inaudible] members would be identified to remain available during the implementation phase.

ALAN GREENBERG: What's your availability between Christmas day and January 11th? Are you unavailable those periods? Okay. So, basically, you're available subject to the couple of days when you're not. Alright. We may give you one day off a week, maybe.

I think that is doable. I'm dubious on the date of the 11th. I'm certainly not willing at this point to slip to the 25th, though. We're talking about going to the board and Language Services on the 25th. So, we're really allowing the 11th to the 25th for clean-up, and if that date moves without moving the 25th, then so be it.

The EPDP meeting is when, the 15th, I think? Okay. So, that's another reason to get it done by then because I'm going to be unavailable for a good four days, three-and-a-half days anyway. I was counting travel. But for me it's only three-and-a-half days.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible] four days.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, no. I was factoring in—

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It was the use of the word "good" [inaudible]. I suggested that four days would have been a better way of putting it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Hell, you're going to spend part of that time on a plane which is going to be better than the EPDP sessions. I only have an hour on the plane, so I can't even take credit for that luxury. I think at this point we can agree that plan is still the plan.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: So, as far as I understand, we'll have a plenary call scheduled for next Monday.

ALAN GREENBERG: You bet. Well, we can defer the one on Monday and we can have one scheduled for the 24th and 31st. Those are work days in some places.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: That's what we are agreeing on.

ALAN GREENBERG: If it's not in his calendar Monday his time. Microphone, my dear. Do you prefer to hold it on the 24th? How else are we going to get closure on the recommendations we don't have closure on? We've deferred that until January and some people don't come back for a good week after January 1st. We are slipping the report. I am not willing to do that. Jackie?

[JACKIE]:   Is next Friday too late to have a meeting to review all of our changes?

ALAN GREENBERG: Getting it on our Friday calendars is somewhat potentially problematic, not to mention it puts it onto Saturday's calendar. Negar?

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Many of us have got Tuesday and Thursday meetings next week. PDP meeting Tuesday and Thursday of next week. So, if you want to try and do it … I'm assuming that I think we can do it online, right? Or we need to try and do it on Monday because if we fail on Monday, then we need a rollover time, don't we? So, I think you have to go for Monday.

ALAN GREENBERG: I have no allusions we're going to get everyone to agree on everything, but we have to try. No, we have several others that they may [inaudible]. Stephanie, yes, once we read the report, we may find things that we don't like. But if you already don't like a recommendation, then we need to know earlier rather … There is always the possibility we will find something that clashes, that makes it objectionable, that causes a minority report. We discussed that at the beginning of the first meeting before you arrived. No, no – may I? We're talking about submission on the 25th. We hope to get agreement on the 11th. I've already said we may slip at that point.

We need consensus which means we've defined as about 80% which means two people can disagree and we will go ahead with it. We will try to of course get wording changes to make everything compatible, everything agreeable as we did in the draft report. Whether that will happen or not, we'll see. Negar?

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Thank you. Just reading out a comment Volker put in the chatroom with respect to the meeting on Monday. He'd rather work on this over next week than over the weekend.

ALAN GREENBERG: But that means if we are needing a voice to voice meeting, it's going to have to be on the 24th. I'm fine with doing it on the 24th, but other people may find it a lot more difficult to make. And for Lili, it's the 25th. Microphone, please.

CARLTON SAMUELS: I am just giving a head's up. I'm going to find it really difficult. I'm going to be in the mountains and I don't have Internet access from that point.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just give me your proxy.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Alright, [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: But I really think we have to try to do it. I don't relish going home and immediately having to do this, but I just don't see how else we can meet the target without likely slipping. We can do that if we have to. Let's try to do it on Monday. If we can't make it, we don't.

I do want to make sure, however – and I'll ask Jean-Baptiste to verify, maybe we can do it at this moment – that Volker can make the meeting. If we find out that Volker can't make the meeting because he has a conflict, then we have a real problem.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Volker is listening in [inaudible] typing a response.

ALAN GREENBERG: Remember, we kept the UTC time which changed the local time and that may shift it, may have made it easier for him or harder for him. I don't know which. What's next on our agenda while we're waiting for a response?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Closing remark.

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't think there's any other business since I haven't heard of any. I don't have any. This meeting went unbelievably well until the last couple of hours which is not unexpected. But I really would like to say I

appreciate the level of commitment of everyone to try to find compromisable answers. The number of times I heard either the expression or the intent here – and Stephanie may have said it, but maybe somebody else of, "Well, I don't quite support it, but everyone else seems to think it's important, so I'll accept it." That intent has been expressed a number of times.

Given that WHOIS is as contentious as it is and given the parallel discussions that are going on which are even more contentious than normal WHOIS stuff – forgive me for calling it WHOIS. I'm old. I probably will never change. I'm just really [inaudible] over this group and what we have accomplished. So, thank you, all, for the effort you put into it, the time, and the end product. Negar?

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Thank you, Alan. I wanted to make two comments. One is Volker's response to your request regarding meeting on Monday. Is that Monday after 16:00 local time is possible for him to meet. However, it is not [inaudible] as it leaves no time to review material prior to the meeting.

The second comment is on my own perspective. I just wanted to note – and I know this work is not done yet. But you guys as a team have collectively done a wonderful job from my perspective conducting this meeting and working together, coming to agreement, reaching consensus. Really nicely done. It's wonderful to watch it happen.

ALAN GREENBERG: Not to mention saving ICANN $400,000.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: The meeting is not over yet.

ALAN GREENBERG: You mean we can still … Hey, that's one [inaudible]. We can give it to the EPDP for their legal counsel. Of all the benevolent things I would want to do with my money, I'm not sure that's what I would do with my money. It isn't. What ICANN does with it, we have no control over. I'm glad we have [inaudible]. We've at least demonstrated it can be done. Any further comments from anyone? Then I'll say thank you for all the work. It's not quite done yet.

Sorry, in response to Volker saying 16:00 is doable but not great, is there any later time? Would that make it easier for other people or does that put other people into an impossible situation? I'm just looking.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: If I may grab the mic here. What about staff? Jackie has lost her edits. I would get a Google Docs expert because we had this happen a while ago to us and we found them all, but it was some Google Doc magic guy that found them.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think Jackie has them on a different Google Doc. It's just a matter of reentering them, I guess, and that's not fun.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: No. Well, just a thought.

[JACKIE]:   Yes. They're all in the complete [inaudible], but the sections, all the comments and track changes have been lost. Just so you know that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sadly, if we made no changes here, you might have been able to find a way to import them. Now that we've mangled the document beyond recognition, there's probably no way to merge them other than manually. Do you have two screens so at least you can look at them from left to right?

[JACKIE]:   What I'm thinking at this point is to wait until everyone does their changes and then go back and edit the whole thing over again. The problem is when it was ported into sections that's when everything gets lost. We have a complete document. All of my comments are there. Everything. But once it was set off into sections, they were lost for some reason. It was really strange. It happens.

ALAN GREENBERG: Having had to do a similar thing not very long ago, the only word of something I can give you is it's not as difficult as it looks like it's going to be to reproduce 150 comments that you've made. I cannot remember

[inaudible] about that many comments from a Google Doc into Word manually or vice-versa. I can't remember the details. It didn't take as long as I thought it was going to and I only missed a couple. Life is not perfect, I'm afraid. Jean-Baptiste?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Sorry. Can we have a decision? Is that 3:00 PM UTC [inaudible]?

ALAN GREENBERG: If that was the time. I thought I heard 16:00 UTC.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Local time, not UTC.

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh, okay. Local. The other way around. He was talking 16:00 local time. That's 15:00 UTC, 3:00 PM UTC. I think we all agree.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: And that's [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Unless we want to try and move it. I don't see the possibility of getting agreement at this point. It's not optimal. Let's hope we present language that's clear enough that people can read it during the meeting and not have heart attacks. I'll do my best, but I don't know we'll make that target.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: So, one further question. That means, then, once Jackie is through with her final edit, we'll have another go to make sure that nothing got fractured in the lost of the passive voice, etc.? Right? So, that would b sometime next week but not Monday, maybe? January?

ALAN GREENBERG: Our target is to have a semi-complete document the end of next week, in terms of content. That does not mean all of the passive voice editing or cleaning up language, or for that matter removing redundant sections. We're trying to settle on the content. The intent of the editing is not to alter meaning. Hopefully, Jackie's experience in doing this and our counseling watching her, we'll try to make sure that … None of us react saying she did it deliberately because she's trying to sabotage the report, although we know that's probably in her nature.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Don't put words in my mouth. I'm very familiar with the editing process. I'm just trying to carve out time to go over it again because when you leave things out, sometimes it affects the meaning.

ALAN GREENBERG: There's no question we all understand that. Just trying to bring a bit of humor into this. That wasn't casting aspersions. We're looking well into January to have a final final report. So, yes, we are expecting significant changes to be made going forward, but not in the intent.

So, I am assuming that by the roughly end of December, which may well mean just before Christmas, we'll have something that we feel comfortable people should take some time to read. So, [inaudible] will be available between Christmas and New Year's. I am expecting that people will not come back with their comments immediately. I think we have to reasonably give people time to read the document. In January, we'll start in earnest trying to clean up things that have been identified and do as many other iterations as necessary. Done?

Thank you, all. Safe travels for those who are traveling. We'll see you online in a few days.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]