

CR - WHOIS Policy Review Team (WHOIS RT) Meeting
Sunday, March 11, 2012 – 15:45 to 17:00
ICANN - San Jose, Costa Rica

Emily Taylor:

...just drift endlessly, so apologies for that. And welcome to members of the review team, a hearty welcome to our observers here, and we've got a very interesting and busy few days ahead of us. Could I just say, before we get started, a huge thank you to Kathy and to Alice who've worked very, very hard in the last couple of weeks to prepare for this meeting, to make sure that we have thought about the schedule, the materials and our responses to questions? So I would like to say for my own part, thank you very much.

Okay. So the highlights of this week, I'm sure you're all familiar, but let's just step through what we're doing. This evening we are going to, at 3:45, so in 2 ½ hours, we will be meeting with the GNSO Council. That is the first time that we will have had face to face interaction with the council at any point during our work over the last year and a half. So this is a valuable opportunity both to talk and listen.

We did have a brief call with them in preparation for this a couple of months ago, where we were literally, and in fact, Olof ended up having to do it, we just took them through the findings and recommendations. So I think that they have that as a basis and have also very kindly sent us a list of questions, which I think I would like to spend a bit of time today working on our responses to. Again, Kathy has given us a straw man of some responses to think about to those questions for which thanks again.

And then, very importantly, we have a dinner tonight, which will be, I think; I'm viewing that as our belated celebration for getting our draft report out nearly in the time that we originally set ourselves kind of. Monday morning, which is tomorrow, we set out early, so just note that. We have a 7:30 meeting here in this room. And that will be to prepare for our interaction with the community,

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.

which happens later on that day. So that's our big set piece really. We're hoping rather than doting around the various GNSO constituencies, we're hoping that people will come together from across the different constituencies and give us their views on our findings and recommendations.

And that's really an important component of our outreach and our public comment period. So that will be from 4:30 until 6:00 tomorrow. And we will have a debriefing, drinks will be served. I think at that stage we'll need it. And Alice will let us know where the venue is.

On Tuesday we have a relatively light day. We're back with the GAC again. We did have, we've given them a number of briefings. There was a call and James and I also travelled over to Brussels to address the high level group. So again, I'm hoping that they will be coming from a reasonably informed level and that we will be able to be quite interactive there.

Moving on to Wednesday – this is our working meeting. So we'll be considering then, what we've heard this week from the various inputs. And also, we have a meeting with the Board of Directors. Now, like the GNSO Council, the Board of Directors of ICANN have not been able to give us any time face to face throughout our work, so this again is a very valuable opportunity. We had a briefing call with them a few weeks ago where we ran through the show and tell of our findings and recommendations.

I'm very hopeful that in this hour we will be able to hear from them and to provide our responses. But mainly I think my overall guidance, if you like, for us this week is we've been in listening mode throughout the ICANN meetings during our time. This is an opportunity for us also to communicate now, back to the community, what we heard from them. But perhaps most importantly, something that I keep forgetting because I now take it for granted, that all of our recommendations are consensus recommendations.

To me, from where I sit as your Chair, this is our greatest achievement. And this is something that we should be very proud of as individuals; that we have managed to find a way of whatever our backgrounds and whatever our

commercial interests, of respecting others points of view and trying to find a moderate middle way. I'm sure that the recommendations don't go nearly as far as some people would like, and that they go a lot further than others would like, but there you have it. These are things that we can all sign up to. And I'm sure and I trust that we will all be able to be supportive of the recommendations while listening to the feedback during this week.

So I think that's quite enough from me. Can we move onto the second – first of all, can I just ask for any input on the agenda; today's agenda? Does anybody want to add some things or ask any questions? Does anyone have any agenda items to propose or should we just run through? No? Okay, well perhaps we could just hear from anyone who's, I know Seth because you kindly copied me in, that you've been doing some extensive outreach with ALAC, and just to hear whether individual members, what interaction they've had with their own communities, what feedback we're getting so far? I'm looking at you Seth; perhaps you could just give us a sense of people's reactions.

Seth Reiss:

Actually I was asked to do a couple of briefings, one for APRALO and another for At-Large, and the At-Large was in conjunction with the general WHOIS briefing. So I didn't really get any points of view. I think they appreciated our work. They appreciated the presentation; it went very fast. I think it was a lot of information, particularly At-Large. So I didn't get any comments. I had a few questions.

But I will note that from the WHOIS perspective, and I am a WHOIS rep – I'm sorry, the At-Large perspective and I am an At-Large rep, there is a website dedicated to WHOIS At-Large and they did provide comments that is available on that webpage, but it's not comments that were posted directly to our comment page. And they were basically complimentary. They were drafted by Carlton Samuels and I think one point of divergence might be that they kind of endorsed what we would call version two of our proxy. In other words, more of

the concept that proxies should not exist; should be defined in a way so they don't exist, as opposed to having the relay regulatory regime.

But on the other hand, I noticed comments to that comment that suggested that there is differing opinions within At-Large. So even though that's the official statement, there are other views. I think that's all I have.

Emily Taylor:

Thank you very much for that. does anybody else have any experiences to share? Bill?

Bill Smith:

Sure. As a member of the BC, I sat in on some calls where the recommendations were discussed. I'd say generally that the BC is supportive. What I found in those calls was a tendency to deep dive and get lost in the weeds, especially around proxy and privacy. And there were some issues with language we chose – retail proxy provider or whatever, they claim not to understand that. Yet when I asked for an alternative definition no one could or would come up with one.

So I think there may be some; my experience there lead me to sort of believe that our recommendations are at a pretty high level, and I think at an appropriate level. The tendency I'm seeing in a number of people in discussing them is they want to get down to an actual solution. So they're picking at words and saying "Well that's not precise enough. That's not legal language." And I said "Well yeah, we understand; this is a complex issue. It took us a very long time to get to this point. It's a consensus based position and yes there's more work that needs to be done on it, but this is an issue that the community or somebody needs to address" basically.

So I'm concerned in some of our dialogue people will want to get down into that level and it's not going to be productive, in my opinion. The conversation that I was on with the BC was productive in that people there Mikey O'Conner and

some others basically said “Oh, okay we now see some of what you had to grapple with.” It’s like yeah, and it’s not done, but basically…

Emily Taylor:

That's very helpful and I think that's probably an observation that many of us will share from the brief interactions we've had so far, is that as people start to get their heads around what we're recommending, and perhaps it's a product of the industry that we're in, is that there's a natural tendency to operationalize and to go for precision in the language. And perhaps it would be good for us to sit here a moment and think about our response to that. I mean Bill's saying one response would be like “deal with it”; do we want to go further than that? Kathy, did you want the mic?

Kathy Kleiman:

Yeah. Kathy Kleiman for anybody who doesn't know me in the room. Bill, question for you. With that tendency to drill down into the details, it sounds like they're ready to jump into it which is great. Were there any suggestions about process? Whether we should send it to the Board, to the GNSO, PDP – because that's one of the things we're out there looking for input on. And one of the things, I've been – just quickly = I didn't do a briefing for the registries but I did sent email back and forth to people in the registries who are drafting the comments and worked with them on some issues. We've also heard certain questions being raised, and I know that the question has been raised – oh, and I talked to NCUC also; same thing, talking to the people who were drafting the comments, answering their questions about things.

But one of the things is this process issue; I know there are people who are very concerned. And my answer has been “Hey, that's the question we're asking you; give us the answer.”

Bill Smith:

Bill Smith. Yeah I would say generally the BC is, more toned in tenor than specific, is “do something faster, sooner, rather than later. And if a PDP is going

to take a long time then find another way.” Okay? The sense I’m getting from many people is there are genuine issues people want something done. and I’m also hearing frustration from the GAC and others about process here; that it takes years to get things done and they’re unhappy with it.

Emily Taylor:

Michael?

Michael Yakushev:

Michael Yakushev. So, very briefly, slightly unexpectedly our activity is noticed in my region, so the people pay attention to what we are doing and mostly they support asking for more clarity and everything which has led to WHOIS protocol and all procedures on identification. Just two again, unexpected remarks. For the Russian translation of our draft report does not reflect the terminology that is widely used among the engineers and the lawyers that work in the internet industry. And I’m afraid this can happen also to Arabic or even Chinese version. So I’m ready to assist to check and maybe to fix the most evident problems.

And second, of course it may be a misunderstanding, the people started asking what for you are writing anything about WHOIS as is now. We were waiting a totally new protocol that would replace WHOIS fairly soon. So I think for this purpose we need very clear understanding of what will be told us on Thursday. Thank you.

Emily Taylor:

Thank you very much and thank you also for offering assistance on the translation. I think this is a matter of great concern if the translations are not accurately using terminology which people in the relevant language or regions will understand. This is something that ought to be rectified as a matter of urgency. Did somebody...okay, yep.

Bill Smith:

This is not an uncommon problem though. I was just at the ITU where we were discussing different translations of the English – I've now forgotten, but complete, complimentary, supplement, compliment and it was very interesting to hear how the discussion amongst the diplomats went. So this is a common problem. I agree it is one that should be addressed and we should use the correct terminology, but a simple word choice, one word different can cause a dramatic difference in the meaning. So I think it's good that Michael points it out, we should do what we can to assist, but I don't want it to, I don't think it should really fall as a negative on ICANN. I've seen this a lot.

Emily Taylor:

Thank you for that. Kathy did you want the mic, did either of you two want...?

Kathy Kleiman:

I had a question. You said something about the meeting on Thursday, is that the replacement of the WHOIS session and could you tell everybody a little bit about it because we haven't talked about it yet and I'm not sure everybody's seen it. And I should just add to the people who are listening, that one of the things that we've warned ICANN about all year is that studying a system in motion is a very difficult thing. So while we're studying WHOIS, really as it existed a year ago, ICANN has moved forward on many different fronts. There are studies going on here. There's technical work going on there. And we had to deal with what we were dealing with when we started, so just to note about that.

Michael Yakushev:

So, just a brief introduction, it will be a one hour meeting in Bougainvillea room between 1:00 and 2:00 pm. A replacement of WHOIS, it will be on Thursday. The presentation of the draft roadmap for the replacement of the WHOIS Port 43 Protocol as directed by the Board and recommended by SSAC 051. So there will be opening remarks by Kurt Pritz, the presentation of the draft roadmap by

Francisco Arias and Steve Chang, open microphone and discussion, so, one hour.

Emily Taylor: Thank you. Kathy?

Kathy Kleiman: And later on during this session, we're going to talk about other things that are coming up with WHOIS with consumer trust, and maybe kind of delegate it out among ourselves who's going to be there so that we can report back to the team on all of these different things that are going on, because people will assume that we know.

Emily Taylor: Well that's nicely put Kathy and leads up right into our next agenda item, which is to try to define our objectives for this week and a common strategy and approach. As Kathy mentions, as Michael mentions, there are a number of relevant projects that are ongoing at the moment; there are some meetings this week, to what extent do we want to nod to those in our report? So perhaps we can start with a slight brainstorming if you like, to try to identify what our personal objectives are? Where would we like to be if we're now sitting here at the end of our meeting on Wednesday? We have set ourselves the target of finalizing and publishing our report by the end of April, so what do we need to accomplish this week in order to set ourselves up for success there? Bill?

Bill Smith: Bill Smith. I think there are a few places in the recommendation where we laid out options, and I think it's incumbent upon us to listen to feedback, that's why we put the option in, was to hear community input on those and make decisions on those. That's probably something we do on Wednesday. There's also, in my mind, I think we, on the recommendation for strategic, that ICANN has to have strategic emphasis, I believe perhaps today I would like to go over that. I think

we may have, may have, I stress may, put an extra word in there that was not intended.

And then the other thing is, I think is, to go through the as many of the comments that have come in and first acknowledge them, we should really go through all of them. And then make a determination about, if anything, we're going to do with them. My belief is I believe pretty strongly in the report and the recommendations. I don't want to dismiss opinions or anything, but we spent a very long time hashing through this stuff and I think we'd need to see some compelling evidence that our recommendations are in fact somehow in error, to go back and change them.

Emily Taylor: Okay. Wilfried did you? Kathy?

Kathy Kleiman: I have to say I have a slightly different approach than Bill does on this one. We did, we listened a lot. We listened very carefully. But some of the things we did in the final report we really hadn't put out there for public comment yet, so this is the first time. So we listened and then we discussed and researched and debated and put our materials together, and I really think we're in a true "notice and comment" period, where it's time for us to go back into listening mode and see what people think of what we presented. It's the first time we're consolidating it and gelling it and giving the rationales for it.

So if someone doesn't agree with a recommendation, I'd like to present the reasons why we came up with that recommendation so that they can tell us if the underlying facts are not right; did we get something wrong there? Is it not the way we think it is? Are the facts, are the underlying facts about the registry contract or the registrar contract, are these not right? Because then maybe the recommendation does need to be re-evaluated.

So I take our mode – whenever the government issues something, the Federal Communications Commission or the Federal Trade Commission, it's just

something that I know they've initially done their work, and then they've done their research and they've done their thinking and then they put it out there for public comment. And sometimes they get it dead wrong and we tell them so. I don't think we've gotten anything dead wrong. I think the questions we're hearing about seem to be on the borders, but they're good questions.

So I'm very much back in listening mode, I want to hear what people have to say so that we can go into the final mode. And whether it's a little redrafting or a lot of redrafting, I think we're listening. Thanks.

Emily Taylor: Okay. Seth?

Seth Reiss: Thanks. I don't disagree with anything that's been said of course, but I think we can triage. I think some of the comments are all positive and clear, like a single policy. I saw a lot of comments saying "makes perfect sense." I didn't see anybody saying "Why would you want to have a single policy"; if somebody tried to say that I'm not sure where they'd say that, but I think that's a success and I don't think we have to look for further comments on it. It's great.

Then we have areas like proxy and privacy and interface where there's going to be a continuing discussion this week; we have to be open-minded. There's a few areas I'd like to bring up a little later that people said we forgot to address, and those are very...I just want to know if people have thoughts on those. I'm not sure we have time to deal with it, but I'm curious. And I'll just name them now.

The IP WHOIS and from a law enforcement point of view that's really interesting. I don't think we ever mentioned it or thought about it. I don't know if it's part of our scope of work, but if we did miss something maybe we have to acknowledge that we missed it.

Emily Taylor: I think, if I may, unless anybody else wants to come in on that, there are two areas where I think people are – that is one and the other one is ccTLD WHOIS policy where people said is this covering. Kathy, Susan and I were just discussing this briefly over lunch, but it's probably a conversation that may have happened before you joined us Seth.

Seth Reiss: Sorry.

Emily Taylor: No. And I'm pleased to have the opportunity to say something about it. So, our mandate is to look at the ICANN WHOIS policy and the extent to which – blah, blah, blah – we can fill in the rest of that; that's our scope. And so the ICANN WHOIS policy is contained at the moment in the contracts with the contracted parties. And so, that the contracted parties, which are the registries and registrars, are bound into the ICANN policy for WHOIS. But the IP, the RIRs, the guys who look after the IP addresses and the ccTLDs are both policy independent. They are not contracted parties in the same way for this purpose, and so they are quite clearly out of scope.

Now this doesn't mean that they might not read what we say with interest. They might perhaps think "Oh some of that would do for our environment," but it's very clear that we have no mandate and no compulsion in that area.

Seth Reiss: I think that's feedback, but we can always do this offline if it's something that I just missed.

Emily Taylor: But it's a question we're getting so we need to be prepared for this because several people...

Seth Reiss: I'm a useful tool, huh?

Kathy Kleiman: You're a useful member.

Bill Smith: This is Bill Smith. I think we may want to consider though, since we have gotten this from a few corners, at least a mention in the report, if not a recommendation that says "this is an issue and somebody should look at it. We didn't feel it was in our remit, but that it is an issue."

Emily Taylor: And we need to be a bit clearer about where we are coming from on that because if people are asking us about it it's because we haven't been clear enough. Anything else in terms of – Susan?

Susan Kawaguchi: I'm concerned about Steve Crocker's comments. I mean it was great that he has read the report and has gone through it, but his first comment on Chapter 1, Section 8 concerns me, because I think we addressed this briefly in the report, but what the WHOIS protocol was created to be is not what it is, what some people think it should be now. And so maybe we should come to more of a...

Emily Taylor: Yeah. If I can just pause you there, everybody, Alice has helpfully produced a digest of the comments and this is, we don't have page numbers but there's a sort of second table about four or five pages in. So, Susan is talking about this one here.

Susan Kawaguchi: Sorry, I should have – I've got it on my computers. So I mean he definitely asks a lot of questions, but talks about, you know it sort of is the continuing debate of

what is WHOIS and what should we expect out of it, and I'm not sure we went into that. And I'd have to go back to the report, and I must admit I didn't do that, but I don't think we really went into the difference between what was intended for and what we expect out of it now. And my basic feeling is I don't really care what it was intended for; I know what I need it to do now.

So, and whether that means we change the WHOIS, somebody else makes those decisions, but I think we need to address Steve's comments.

Emily Taylor:

I think that was a useful comment because it was something we had discussed at some point and all agreed that we should do some sort of exposition on the purpose of WHOIS. And we sort of got part of the way there because we did manage to identify, well consumers are probably not the big users of this; we're talking about law enforcement, those enforcing private law rights and technical community. But we didn't quite go into "and what they need is this," and so I agree with you.

That was a takeaway that I had from those comments is that we could probably expand and perhaps just deal with the purpose of WHOIS as we understand it, rightly or wrongly. Because it would just orient people into where we're coming from when we're making these recommendations. Sarmad?

Sarmad Hussain:

Right, but that should be sort of the starting point of a policy, so it should be defined not by us, but by ICANN. And there is no single document which says this is why WHOIS is actually going to be used. So obviously this comment is useful, but we really do need to have some statement from ICANN about it. So, originally it started like this, but what we see in the AOC is actually a clear mention of how it's useful for law enforcement. So there is definitely this changing expectation from WHOIS, but it's really not clearly written out anywhere, so that's part of the policy.

Emily Taylor: Okay, thank you. That's yeah, I like it. Not just because it cuts down our work, although it has that attraction to, but I think that's a nice way of thinking about it. Bill did you?

Bill Smith: Sure, Bill Smith. Since I think I'm the person who wrote the section that Steve is commenting on, I'd be happy to sit down with Steve. I believe his comment is...

Emily Taylor: Is that the "factious" bit?

Bill Smith: No, I don't think so. Anyway, I'd be happy to sit down with him. I believe his comment is correct, but it's not what he RFCs and the written documentation state.

Emily Taylor: Okay. So what – Kathy you want to come in?

Kathy Kleiman: Just a quick note that I can see us spending a lot of time on this probably on Wednesday, because this is really going to be an interesting thing and there are differences about the historical context and what's in the RFCs and what's not and what was surrounding them and what RFCs include. Anyway, this is really, this is one of the key questions, so just a quick note that there's lots of time. If we have time at the end of this session we'll be talking about specific comments. And then lots and lots of time on Wednesday.

But I'm really glad we're flagging what the key things that we're all thinking about because it's important for us to know because it gives us something to listen to, listen for when we're going into our sessions.

Emily Taylor:

Well, perhaps we could move on from that; that's a healthy reminder of our actual agenda but perhaps if we can say that there is an issue here about purpose and our choices are whether we dive in and go for it, or whether we say "no this isn't actually what we're here for." But in either event, we probably need to explain ourselves a bit more clearly. If we are going into the purpose let's do it. If we're deliberately not, that is a decision we've made, and we just explain that we've made that decision and we've considered it and why we don't go there at the moment, to take Sarmad's point.

But, let's just try and focus on, so we're going to get on top of all these comments this week, we're going to listen to what people said either from the perspective of "Well they're going to have to convince us" – and I think actually what you say Bill is well said. It's not particularly ICANN, but we spent quite a while hammering out some very hard won consensus on these recommendations, and as we learned in Dakar, we revisit them again. We should just know what we're taking on there.

So, we need to have gone through, sorted out what we think about the comments, what our work ahead is, and allocate some tasks so that we're then set up for the next six weeks. Because it's going to be – I don't know how much work it's going to be, to be honest. People aren't screeching at us that we've got absolutely everything wrong. Maybe it's just that we haven't heard that yet. If everyone's happy, we've probably done something terrible in this, or nothing at all.

Okay, anything else on our objectives this week?

Kathy Kleiman:

Just a quick note. I think Steve picked on my section too. So if that's – I think he's equal.

Bill Smith: Yeah, plus one on that. I'm concerned about Steve's comments generally.

Susan Kawaguchi: And that's something I think we really should look at his comments in a whole, because if that's his view and he's the Chair of the Board right now, we need to make sure that we're understanding where he's coming from, and that he truly understand where we're coming from. And that may take sitting down and discussing it with him one on one.

Seth Reiss: Yeah. I think we may be attributing too much to the inability to have a face to face. It may just be what it appears from a series of emails. So I think trying to have that dialogue face to face might be useful.

Emily Taylor: I agree.

Kathy Kleiman: And also, maybe, he comes from the old school, he's been through this. He goes back longer than any of us. So there may be something to learn, not necessarily from the written comments, but from oral comments about the history and some kind of context we may not have because we didn't do a deep dive in the history really. We started, kind of what Susan said, we started with what we see today. And he is, in some ways that's his job; let's not forget he founded the RFC process. So there may be something, perhaps not rightly worded that he's trying to insert that we're not thinking about, but that we shouldn't take personally yet, because we've all been insulted equally.

Denise Michel: May I just; just to follow up on what Kathy has said, it's true. And also, just to give you a little more context, Steve was the original founding Chair of the SSAC, the Security and Stability Advisory Committee, was Chair for several

years. And as Chair, he marshaled and authored several papers relating to WHOIS over the years. So he has a very good personal knowledge of this space and I think he also has a personal interest in helping the team to strengthen the report, clarify it, and make it as actionable as possible. So I just want the team to know that that's the space he's coming from here.

Emily Taylor:

Thank you Denise. That's very helpful. I think that one area where I would part company, and I probably wouldn't mention it except that a different Board member collared me this morning and made exactly the same point to me. Which is that Steve and this other Board member seems to view the Board has having a quality control editorial role in our report and therefore the report of other review teams. I have to say from my perspective this is something that I feel very strongly about, and that is that the Board has no role whatsoever in quality control, other than in feeding into the selection of appropriate people.

And that is something where I'm afraid, and I'm going to have to ask you to help me even if that's just to slap me down and put me in a corner on that. That's going to be something that I'm going to push back very strongly about. Bill?

Bill Smith:

This is Bill Smith. I agree completely. If they want to make comments, they can make comments, but we are independent. If not, there's no point in doing the work and I and the rest of us have wasted over a year.

Wilfried Woeber:

Wilfried here, and I think the term quality control can mean largely different things to different people. I fully agree with the sentiment here that regarding the content, we are completely independent and we are supposed to listen and to make up our minds. But I would not from the very beginning sort of object to suggestions on the process level, or the structure level, how to improve the quality of the product. And in particular, sort of one of the phrases he uses in

two or three of his comments, I think they are very reasonable to think about, is to not just state that something is broken, but also to sort of indicate a path or a direction for a potential solution.

This should not get us into micromanaging or engineering or suggesting particular implementation, but just to think about okay we believe this is broken, and we should not sort of put the full stop, but we might add the sentence like what we think a potential solution could be thinking about A or investigating B. This is on different levels. Content wise no problem, we are independent. But sort of process quality wise, I think we should listen to suggestions.

Emily Taylor:

Thank you very much. Where's my queue? Kathy then Seth – did you have your hand up Bill or no?

Kathy Kleiman:

I think this is actually when we should talk to Brian Croteau, the Chairman of the ATRT and just see what they did with it. And he's indicated his ongoing willingness to help, even though he's shifted positions now. Just a quick note about where this hangs. We're the first review team Steve is working with. Peter Dengate-Thrush worked with the ATRT, I know Steve was on the Board, he was vice-Chair, but Peter was actually on the ATRT, so there was actually a Board member whereas we have Michael, Rod Beckstrom's delegate is here. So you're kind of our official ICANN person on the Board.

But just so you know, my experience with engineers and technical people, as the daughter and the wife of engineers, is that they're often very process oriented. So my thought is maybe that he was being a little causal and maybe should think about in context that we're the first review team he's reviewing and so he's thinking kind of big picture – what does he do with committees and working groups and review teams. And I think a proper response is "Hey Steve, we're your first and you should know we're independent. This is not an ICANN product, this is an independent product."

Emily Taylor: And I would say in all fairness to Steve, I would imagine that he would be completely comfortable with that sort of response. Seth and then...

Seth Reiss: Yeah, I view us as independent. I think it's clear from the AOC. But I think it would be helpful for all of us and for Emily if we each, if you polled us for that so you know how we each feel, so that's just my comment. In a sense I think you would like to know how we feel.

Emily Taylor: Yeah. It's something that as I said is something that I feel very strongly about. And I don't want to be going out on a limb and actually that's not what you think as well. So I don't actually imagine that we're going to have an awful lot of this, but I wouldn't have mentioned it at all except that I had it this morning from a different Board member. So I want to know where you would direct me, as your spokesman on that, I guess. Bill did you?

Bill Smith: Sure, Bill Smith. It was suggested to me, when we first saw Steve's comments by a technical person who reviewed them that perhaps Steve's review was done in the manner of a peer review of a technical paper. And that we should perhaps take them in that light. And if we do that, then they have a different, in my opinion, they carry a different message as opposed to coming from the Chair of the organization that we are reviewing. Do I believe – well, if it's a peer review you're going to go in and you're going to read the paper and you're going to say "This isn't substantiated. Fix this, fix that, do this, do that, and then you can publish." That's fairly common practice and that's very helpful in a peer review. It's not necessarily as helpful coming from a Chair of an organization you are reviewing, my opinion.

Emily Taylor: Agreed.

Denise Michel: Yeah and I think Steve clarified that they were his personal observations and opinions. And I just wanted to come back to the independence issue. In all of my discussions with the Board and briefings with the Board on your work, Board members have indicated that they clearly understand this is an independent community review. Anytime we speak of the WHOIS Review Team we always start out by saying "an independent community review team." So I personally don't have the impression that the Board has any question that you're an independent committee, just in case anyone has gotten that impression, I'm not aware of any Board member that is confused about this issue.

Emily Taylor: From what you say I would expect the same, but just the repeated questions about the Boards role in quality control over these sorts of reviews, I think the Board members need to be aware of the message that that sends, which is that they've viewed themselves as the ultimate editors effectively.

Kathy Kleiman: That's the message it sends to me.

Denise Michel: Does it? Well I think also you should remember that this is the first set of reviews under the affirmation of commitments, and so I think another aspect of the Boards job ultimately will be in marshalling these periodic review processes, is also to, and we're doing a quality assessment of the ATRT and getting input on how to improve the process for the next review team. We'll be doing the same thing for the WHOIS Review, so the Boards job is to take the results of each review and make its own determination of what to accept or not. But the

Boards job also is to help improve and marshal a process long term, so there's that as well.

Emily Taylor: Thank you. Sarmad?

Sarmad Hussain: So I guess one possibility is to just ignore the comments which are not coming through a formal channel. They have to be, and the comments which are actually coming through a formal channel, which means that we actually asked for comments and we got comments, and we didn't really say that somebody could comment and somebody could not. Obviously anybody could comment. So we should look at each of those comments for their merit and it's up to us to decide what to do with each of those comments.

And if somebody commented on a particular aspect of the report, that's again, for us to decide what to do with it. But then if there are comments coming from informal channels, so informal channel I mean they're not responded to online, but actually just verbally communicate. One possibility would be to just request those people to actually comment online so that we can process that appropriately. But we should take each comment on its merit and address it based on what the comments actually trying to say.

Emily Taylor: I don't see anybody around the room wanting to disagree with that. Kathy?

Kathy Kleiman: This was really for later, but I think we're going to get lots of comments through informal channels. That's the very nature of ICANN. In fact, we'll talk about it later, but we actually set up, Alice and I set up a template for helping track because we're actually holding sessions where people are going to come to the microphones – the public forum, the GNSO Council meeting, the GAC meeting

– we're going to get lots of comments. And I think it's the tradition, at least on the GNSO side that comments delivered during a meeting are considered comments, they're part of the official record. I've delivered many, many comments that were part of the discussion.

Emily Taylor: Yeah. I didn't hear – Sarmad is disagreeing with that because those are on the record aren't they?

Sarmad Hussain: Yeah. So those sort of things are actually formal as far as I'm concerned.

Emily Taylor: What you're talking about is the corridor chat and barroom type of chat.

Sarmad Hussain: Exactly, those sort of things.

Emily Taylor: Fair enough.

Kathy Kleiman: Agreed, very good point.

Emily Taylor: So I'd like to move us on to the next item which is just thinking to our immediate future, which is meeting with the GNSO Council in an hour and a bit.

Kathy Kleiman: We've got some documents.

Emily Taylor: Great, that's super. And I'm going to ask you to lead that session Kathy, just to warn you.

Kathy Kleiman: Oh! Yikes!

Emily Taylor: But what I'm hearing from the room, and please raise your hand and let me know if you disagree. I think that there's a general openness to accepting feedback in good faith. We're not saying we got everything right, and it's very difficult to let go of something that you've been working on quite intensely for a year and to hear people criticizing it and saying some of it's all wrong or that you've got something that's bad. We have to kind of rise above that and treat, as Sarmad and Wilfried have urged us to, to look carefully at each comment regardless of how its expressed or the personal irritation we might feel at being criticized and be big about it and say "right, is this a fair comment? Do we respond to it?"

And I would expect us all, and I'm seeing a sense that we would all be very open to that sort of approach. So, we're okay, do we need a...Bill?

Bill Smith: This is Bill Smith. Just very quickly. For me, and I think I put this on an email, the important thing is the recommendations. I'm happy if somebody, well I may not be happy, but if people – I will accept an awful lot of criticism on the report itself, provided that we get, if people have issues with the recommendations, I would like to hear them and I'd like to see real reasons why we should consider to change them. If people have problems with the words or they don't think we've provided enough justification, fine, I'm going to do the best I can to let that fall off my back.

Emily Taylor: Well and also, just before we move on, one practical suggestion that I have as we move into the next phase, might be to revert to the authors of those sections as the report was prepared. But I'm conscious that this is actually loading individuals with quite a lot of work, but that each individual would go back to the chapter that they drafted and look at the specific comments on that chapter and see whether or not they're – just sort of refresh the draft bearing in mind, not always following if they don't agree, but either a follow or explain why not. And that might be a way of us practically achieving the work that we have ahead. Anybody wildly object to that? Good, agreed, right?

Kathy Kleiman: Agreed.

Emily Taylor: Kathy would you be okay if I asked you to just lead the next section and introduce where these questions came from, because not everybody was able to be involved in the briefing call or know where the GNSO questions arose from. And also explain the draft responses and the origins of those.

Kathy Kleiman: Sure. Just a quick note to Bill that I agree with what he said, plus one.

Bill Smith: This is Bill Smith. One quick question I had in reviewing these questions, are they being asked by the GNSO, an individual, the Chair; who is asking these questions? What hat is being worn?

Kathy Kleiman: Let me give actually two introductions. The first introduction is an agenda introduction. We're now entering the preparations for the upcoming session, it's time. Because between now and when we meet again on Wednesday, although we have a quick breakfast tomorrow, between now and really when we have our

next big session we are meeting with the public and we're meeting, we're having follow up meetings with the GNSO Council, the GAC and the Board.

So this afternoon we've got the first meeting, it's with the GNSO Council. There was a preparatory session, I believe it was the 19th of January, where we prepared slides and poor Emily got stuck in a tunnel as they were being delivered. Olof did deliver the slides – a train tunnel and went offline.

Emily Taylor: That was one of my best presentations ever.

[laughter]

Kathy Kleiman: And to our credit, we'd gotten very little notice about the meetings, so we did have slides and we did go through the overall, and Olof walked through the introduction and the overview. At which point the Chair of the GNSO Council, and Alice, correct me if I'm wrong because we got this off a transcript, so questions were raised by the Chair of the GNSO Council, Stephane Van Gelder, presumably in his role as Chair but I don't know; there was nobody else identified.

It's my understanding that the Chair raised these questions and they were taken from the transcript and given to us. And so I've prepared some responses. Denies seems to have a different interpretation.

Denise Michel: No no, just that the policy staff indicated when they transferred these that they reflected individual Council members' questions and that the Council did not get together as a whole and agree as a Council that these were the questions. So they should be treated as individual questions.

Emily Taylor: Okay, that's really helpful actually.

Kathy Kleiman: So should we edit out – in the material we received Stephane, again, Chair of the GNSO Council – for identification purposes he comes from the registrar stakeholder group, although by all indications I understand he's a very good Chair and a very fair Chair; he hails from registrars. With Jeff Newman by the way as vice-Chair, who hails from the registries. So the material we got identifies Stephane as the asker of the questions, but maybe I should point out in this session that we're not sure he asked all these questions.

Denise Michel: It might be a good thing to clarify it with the Council.

Emily Taylor: And it might be a thing to clarify as well whether they would expect us to run through them in the formal way that we have or whether they were just throwing them out there as part of their initial brainstorming.

Kathy Kleiman: Well we've got an hour with them and they're good questions, so I don't see why we shouldn't talk about them. So what I did, I think it's worth walking through, because of all the places this is the GNSO Council, if there is a PDP, a Policy Development Process it's coming out of the GNSO Council; they're going to have to lay out the specs, they're going to have to put it together, they're going to have to initiate it out of the GNSO Council. So of all the groups we should be meeting with one some of these details, this is perfect.

So I spent time looking at the questions; it's what I did on my flight here. I ran them through with Michael this morning, thank you for your time on that. So let me run them through with you and then my recommendation is after with the

GNSO Council, after we go through their questions, then we go back to kind of the consolidate recommendations. We have a sheet of recommendations, the same one we reviewed with the Board by the way, and just go back and focus in. We're focused on the recommendations, is there anymore discussion. And that will more than fill up our hour I'm sure. That's the recommendation on the table.

Emily Taylor: Okay. Please – well first of all, thanks for doing that. And please take us through it.

Kathy Kleiman: Okay. Alice, can you hold the pen on the edits? Okay. So, with the GNSO Council what I'll do is just present our meeting on the 19th, the questions posed, and that we're going to try to talk and give some background on the answers. So the first question is, in light of recommendations 1 and 18, we were asked whether or not ccTLDs were to be included in the review teams work.

So what Alice did, which I thought was really nice, was she gave us recommendation 1 and recommendation 18. What I did was I added what category they came from, like Internationalized Domain Names, because you'll see in some of the answers I think they took some of the recommendations out of context. They apply to privacy services but they seem to, out of context it looks like something else, so I want to anchor it in what section it comes from.

So unless anybody disagrees, what I responded was, what did I respond, I'm looking at the wrong version.

Emily Taylor: Yes, you're saying very much as we were just discussing now with Seth's question, we worked within the gTLD model, our recommendations are directed to that system. Quoting from the affirmation of commitments, "That the policy

is embedded in the contracts and those apply to the registries and registrars," so it's not applying to ccTLDs.

[someone enters room]

Emily Taylor: Hello!

Peter Nettlefold: I've actually just come to give apologies. I probably won't be able to make any of the sessions today. We had a tricky thing in the GAC this morning that's been carrying over. Apologies.

Female: Off with his head.

Kathy Kleiman: No definitely not, we need his head.

Peter Nettlefold: I could leave it here and just take my body back with me.

Kathy Kleiman: Very quick, that was Peter Nettlefold who is a member of the WHOIS Review Team; he's also Australian GAC. And he told us ahead of time that he'd be in two or three places all at the same time. Sorry Bill.

Bill Smith: That's okay. So I too looked at these on the plane ride and I think came up with pretty much the same answer, except mine was three words – "We believe not."

And generally, do we want to invite a lengthy discussion about these things or just answer the question very succinctly and say was it to be included – no.

Wilfried Woeber:

Well in light of the previous discussion we had regarding the mandate, I think we could resolve the major part of that question by making sure that in the introductory section of the whole report, or in the management summary, or in any other appropriate place, clearly stating that we have a mandate to look at the WHOIS stuff, which is based in the AOC in the contracts in all its boundary conditions.

But during the discussions and thinking about the implications of our recommendations, we may in one place or the other indicate that a similar or the same solution to a problem might be helpful for other pockets. And in that sense, sort of the answer here formally, as you said, is no, but we might want to explain that some of the recommendations might be interesting for other parties, and in that particular case for ccTLDs. But formally the answer is no, sorry.

Emily Taylor:

Could I just say that this is sort of a working meeting, we're not really.

Male:

I understand. I know, I'm sorry. I just had an observation. I'm an observer, I'm from a ccTLD. I just noticed that in your response you said you were never able to find WHOIS policy relating to ccTLD. Does that mean there is none existing? I'm just curious, sorry.

Emily Taylor:

I think probably on a very specific point there may be references to WHOIS in some of the, what are they called – the contracts between ccTLDs and ICANN – accountability frameworks. Some of those do mention WHOIS. But in the main and even notwithstanding that, ccTLDs are independent in their policies.

So you will find different WHOIS implementations and policies right across the ccTLD landscape.

Male: Okay, thank you.

Kathy Kleiman: I understand notes are going in, but not for the Council; for our purposes right? Okay, good. Any additions or changes to question one? Okay, excellent. Question two, in light of recommendation two, which is the WHOIS Data Reminder Policy, Stephane Van Gelder asked if the review team has considered whether from a registrants point of view the Data Reminder Policy was very useful. Can you read the response, you do that so well.

Emily Taylor: Okay. We're saying we don't know whether it's useful. And something that we were discussing just before this meeting is that we do have anecdotal evidence from James of GoDaddy, who's on the review team, that actually registrants don't find these useful and don't know what they're about and often complain about them. But we don't have anything more than anecdotal evidence to support that. It would be something that I'd be interested to hear from the GNSO Council whether it's research area they would like to pursue. I would view it as part and parcel of the analysis that needs to be done on whether or not the WDRP is a functional and useful policy.

Bill Smith: Bill Smith. We could potentially, if we want to do more than say, which my notes again had three words in it – "we did not."

[laughter]

Kathy Kleiman: You're so terse. I love it.

Bill Smith: Well it was basically the way the question was phrased I'm just like okay, yes we heard what you said and we answered your question, we acknowledge it. If we want to go beyond – and what we said here is very good – if we want to go beyond we may also want to point out that in our recommendation on WDRP in Cincinnati...

[background conversation]

Kathy Kleiman: Old television show in the United States.

Bill Smith: A very old television show yeah.

[background conversation]

Bill Smith: No I doubt it.

Kathy Kleiman: A bad television show.

Bill Smith: I hope not. We could point out that basically we gave two options in the recommendation, which either is fine do it, establish metrics and figure out if it

does anything. Or do something else. And I think so far I believe all of our recommendations are grounded in some fact, and for us to say it isn't actually doing anything is, I think we came out pretty close to saying that' as close as we can with what we have. But do registrants think this is a good thing or not; we really don't know. But I think we could say generally there is an opinion, I believe, amongst us that this things isn't doing much.

Emily Taylor: Kathy?

Kathy Kleiman: Alice, can we add the line to this – and I don't want to wordsmith, but I think it's really important – after the second sentence, after the word "ICANN" period, can we just add the line "We have anecdotal evidence that it's not" period, so it's not useful. After the word "ICANN" or "Registrars," yeah we have anecdotal evidence that it's not. Perfect.

[background conversation]

Kathy Kleiman: Evidence. Perfect. And you guys aren't going to leave me alone in front of the GNSO Council right? We're going to do this all together?

Bill Smith: We're all going to run out.

Emily Taylor: I'm just asking you to brief us at the moment. I'm very happy to lead it if you don't want to.

Kathy Kleiman: No no no, I'm happy to lead it. I've been fed to the lions on the GNSO Council before. I've been on the GNSO Council before.

Emily Taylor: Fine. Obviously we'll support Kathy. And one of the things that I think that has naturally come about but why not just state it, is that each individual on this group has worked in more depth on a couple of issues than another and I would be looking forward to, for example on IDNs, for Sarmad and Michael to take the floor. For the proxy/privacy for James, if he's there; for Susan as well on data accuracy and policy, I would expect Peter if he's there, Bill and compliance I don't mind talking about it as I did some work on it. So I think we almost naturally line up in these areas, and obviously people should feel free to pitch in and support whoever is speaking at the appropriate time. I think that this above all, our message to the community, whichever we're visiting, is that we are actually making these recommendations as a group and that we all sign up to them.

Kathy Kleiman: Great. No no, I think it's right because really what we're doing here is also planning our strategy for not just this meeting, but for the next three or four that will come.

Emily Taylor: Yes exactly. I mean we have them split out in the agenda piece by piece, but let's focus on the GNSO because that's our immediate task and we'll see where we get to.

Kathy Kleiman: And again, I think these are very good questions. It's when nobody asks any questions that I get nervous. These are good questions. Okay, so question three, in light of recommendation five, which is a data accuracy recommendation, Stephane Van Gelder asked what kind of measures the group was

recommending to reduce unreachable WHOIS registrations. And so what I've posed, if you could move down a little – and this is our 50% reduction in unreachable registrations and we know the recommendation well.

So what I said was “good question. Here we’re attempting to capture the unreachable or the uncontactable domain names, the low hanging fruit here are the domain names that have completely bogus WHOIS information clearly visible on its face.” This is something that we’ve now talked about for several groups. “For example all blanks are a mere A entered into every space. We understand there are fairly easy ways at the point of registration to screen our clearly bad information and that a number of ccTLDs already use such screens. Since we don’t want to define policy, we leave implementation details to ICANN and the GNSO.”

Emily Taylor:

Bill?

Bill Smith:

Yeah, I agree with that. I had scribbled down “in essence we believe all parties responsible for collecting and maintaining WHOIS data must establish reasonable and effective measures”; basically saying this doesn’t need to be regulatory. It doesn’t have to be prescriptive. You must do the following...

Kathy Kleiman:

Right, good point.

Bill Smith:

But that actually I believe – I had a lengthy conversation with persons setting up the WHOIS Accuracy Workshop that I think is happening tomorrow, and the impression I got is that’s what they’re looking for. They want to know how other industries do this, specifics. And I kept pushing back and saying “There are ways to do this. You guys need to find them.”

Emily Taylor:

I have just a comment if I may Kathy, on the response, which is that you're dealing very well there with data on the way in, but then there's what you do when you discover bad data in the existing registry, in existing database. And I think that where we're going on that, correct me if I'm wrong, is cancellation of those. And this is part of our general theme of the unbroken chain of responsibility right down through to the registrant, is that we would expect those existing contractual provisions to be enforced down through – it's not for ICANN – everyone's like "it's not for us, it's not for us."

Well in the main, correct, but actually having come from a ccTLD background myself, there's an expectation that bad date will lead to a domain name being cancelled, and that's expectation I don't see here in the gTLD space at all. Sarmad?

Sarmad Hussain:

Just commenting on the wording here. It says "We understand that there are fairly easy ways at the point of registration" and actually the statement is very sort of overarching and there actually could be some very complicated cases. So it's maybe if we could word it slightly differently. It may not actually be very easy to, especially when you're dealing with a lot of data. And many of these registrations are blind in a way that they're not sort of manually monitored.

Bill Smith:

This is Bill Smith. Actually I think there are some very simple things that registrars could do if they chose to. First would be to, if you were a "retail registrar," a GoDaddy or whoever, you force the registrant to tick a box that says "don't use my billing address as the address for WHOIS" and they have to supply a different one. And if they supply a different one, perhaps this goes into a little side – in railroad terminology, a siding and sits there for a couple of days until somebody can investigate it.

That's one option. There are well known databases and international ones as well, for doing a large number, basically doing stuff in real time as the registration is happening. It won't catch everything. It does cost money. But I actually believe there are some very simple things that could be done. And the registrars keep pushing back. I don't believe we can do everything and I recognize and understand the international issue; internationalized data is a real problem, but there are things that could be done and I would like us to state as strongly as we can that there are things we believe people could do.

And I actually would, in addition here, we are recommending that ICANN establish sort of graduated in penalties; there's nothing to prevent registrars from doing that today. They have that ability.

Emily Taylor: Okay, Wilfried and Susan.

Wilfried Woeber: This may be sort of – I may be feeling my engineering tendons and nerves here, but I get the impression that actually this question would tie in pretty nicely to the previous one, the WDRP thing. Because if as soon as you establish some sort of recurring data quality review mechanism, whatever it looks like, it would actually have a very sound impact if you do these sanity checks on that particular percentage of registrations which are covered by the WDRP during that 12 months phase of whatever the schedule is.

So, just asking the question whether it would be into micromanagement and engineering if we would add a sentence here like say, "well you could actually consider using the WDR to do the right thing with regard to that recommendation." I don't know whether this is too specific already.

Emily Taylor: Well I think that the key points I see arising from this, these are questions about data accuracy as a whole, and we've made numerous recommendations across

data accuracy, which should be taken holistically rather than individually. And that there is an awful lot of talk elsewhere, say in the RAA, renegotiations as I understand on data validation, but there is also an enormous legacy problem. Even if every single data item that went into the databases from now on was perfect, which I just don't believe is achievable, but there you go, you still have 20 million plus which are just rubbish. What do you do with them; and I think we're saying cancel them aren't we?

Seth Reiss: But I think Wilfried had a point. What is the acronym again, the...

Emily Taylor: WDRP.

Seth Reiss: The WDRP. In other words right now it's just a reminder to check; there's no affirmative response. If you took it a step farther and required an affirmative response you would have a tool in which you could use, just like a new applicant for at that point implementing a verification process and sanction. So it's just something that I'm not sure that we've heard before.

Emily Taylor: I'm calling order here and I'm going back into my queue, which is Susan. Now I think I can sense that Kathy, just about to go into the GNSO Council is uncomfortable with some of the more prescriptive stuff that we're coming out with here, but let's here from Susan and then...

Susan Kawaguchi: So I'll just make her more uncomfortable. Sorry Kathy. I mean I agree with Bill in the fact that there's many things that the registrars could use and are currently using, and I brought this example up last summer in our discussions. But CASS is a Coding Accuracy Support System that is listing in NSIs terms of service.

And it's a software that goes out and check postal addresses. And so they're using it right now, and they state it, I mean I can send this out again, but they stated that they're using it for the address, to validate the address on the registration.

I don't think they actually update that, that's my opinion, but they do specifically say that they will use it for the sending of invoices and other important account information. So therefore, there's a precedent here that registrars are doing some things, along with validating a credit card. So maybe we don't make this as a recommendation, but maybe we make a list and say "hey we're not experts in this field, but we can do this." And idology.com is a company, at least in the US that does ID verification on the fly. So, someone at ICANN should be looking at all this, and maybe we give them 20 points, but don't make it a recommendation because I think that would be a big hurdle to get over.

Emily Taylor:

I think, was it Bill's words, about we're not being regulatory or prescriptive here is part and parcel of what you're saying there isn't it Susan? That we're very happy to highlight instances of good practice, "we're aware that many registrars are doing this already." We have to be also aware of internationalization and the fact that one tool which may work beautifully in the US, might be a dreadful mistake to make in countries which don't have such a rigorous or embedded system of encoding of addresses.

So we need to make sure that we're not being too prescriptive here. Sarmad, you wanted to make a comment?

Sarmad Hussain:

So again, I do agree with Bill that there are certain things which are very easy to take. But I think what I was saying was, we do not know how much what percentage of bad data can those easy examples cover. And the wording right now may seem to suggest that we can actually cover most of those examples

with easy implementation, which actually may not be true. So that's why I was saying it sounds overarching. We may want to tweak the language where we say that would be a good starting point, but it may eventually lead to reasonably complicated solutions for getting some significant person data. And we actually do not have data to really say either way.

So not even going to internationalized names, even in the ASCII based WHOIS, we've got information, for example, I've registered a couple of .net and domains where we are actually putting in information which will be "nonsense strings" in English for addresses or names or any of those. So it's not very easy to – and this is all ASCII data; this is not internationalized data. And the address schemes are very different; we don't have zip codes for example and so on. Or the zip codes are alpha and not digits and so on. So what if zip codes, you're expecting digital data and you get alpha data and you say this is wrong, but actually it's not wrong.

So what I'm again, what I'm emphasizing is that we don't say that it can actually solve all the problems or solve even most of the problems. So just tweak the language a bit.

Emily Taylor:

TO be clear Sarmad, I think, and everybody, I view this recommendation, the one about deleting by 50% and then by 50% again is our most vulnerable recommendation. I think that this is the one that people are, I've not just heard from the GNSO Council, but it came through in our call with the Board, I think it came through in our call with staff as well. It was sort of like "Hang on, where did you get the 50% number." Truthful answer is we dreamed it up around the table, let's be completely clear here, there's no science behind that.

You might think it's low, but as Sarmad's pointed out, there are inaccurate records that look beautiful – Susan will be able to tell us at length about the many that use beautifully accurate Facebook addresses and details, but that are actually not Facebook. So they would look accurate, but they aren't. There's also some that might look inaccurate, but aren't.

And so I think that let's accept that we might get push back on this and what do we do about it? Do we just say "No we're sticking to our guns?" What did we want to do when we trying to formulate this? What were we actually trying to solve? And I think that from my understanding, what we were saying is, this isn't about 100% accuracy in 100% of records. It's about dealing with the worst cases as you identify them; those are the ones to prioritize.

So I've got Wilfried and I've got Sarmad.

Wilfried Woeber:

Yeah, looking at the process, this is, what we are producing is just a list of recommendations. This is not a list of requirements for anyone. So even if there is push back, I would suggest that we stick to the 50%. Maybe in a footnote explain that we just dreamed it up, I agree. We dreamed it up with a particular goal in mind, and I think that goal is still valid and we should stick to that recommendation and to that goal.

If the effected parties or the ICANN Board reviews that recommendation and comes up with a resolution that this is not achievable or not appropriate, fine with me. But just receiving push back from one or the other corners of the world does not make me reconsider the goal. And if sort of the figure is dreamed up and might not hold in the end, I think we should still stick to it.

Emily Taylor:

Thank you very much. Sarmad?

Sarmad Hussain:

So, I am not suggesting that we sort of come back on that number, so 50% definitely we should stick with it. What I'm actually saying is that we shouldn't say that it's an easy task to achieve, even for low hanging fruit. So I think that's I'm just disagreeing with some of the words we've written in the response.

Emily Taylor: Fine. So we...

Kathy Kleiman: I have some idea about wording too.

Emily Taylor: So we deliberately – and I remember some of the discussions that we had in Dakar that we were deliberately looking for stretch targets here. Now I think a very reasonable response from anybody who had the job of implementing that recommendation is “what are we starting with,” you know. “50% of what?” And so I think that I would be certainly very open to greater analysis of what there is, but we do have the NORC Study there, which seems to be, I don’t think people are massively disagreeing with, but it is now three years out of date, two years out of date.

Bill Smith: Okay so, after my conversation with the individual setting up this WHOIS Accuracy Workshop, I went online, for the first time, and inserted a search string; “international address verification software.” And surprise, surprise Google handed me back a number of responses. And many of them are more targeted at the US, but there are several that deal with international addresses. So they would deal with many of the issues Sarmad raised.

I don’t believe they will be perfect, and that’s another reason I am concerned with us making, in writing, suggestions for what registrars, whoever should be using. I think they need to use the best tools available and that they need to change. Because the bad guys are going to figure out which tools are being used and they will abuse them.

So this is; I think some of them are trying to get written into a contract what they have to do for data validation or verification. And then, regardless of how bad the data might be, we comply. And that shouldn’t; I don’t believe that is our

recommendation. Our recommendation is to clean up the mess and do something about it on a going forward basis.

Emily Taylor: Kathy's reminded me she's been waiting for ages and I just completely disregarded her.

Kathy Kleiman: Let's go back up to the wording; let me suggest something. Also, I don't think Stephane or whoever asked this question, I know there are people who would like specific answers; this is a pretty good questions guys and we're getting it from lots of corners, so I think it means that explanation helps. So I'm not going to touch the first paragraph if that's okay, just because that bad example that Susan circulated is so clearly in my mind – it was like all A's or something and I've asked her to find it.

But there is just such clearly bad data. I had always thought that this recommendation was about going after the low hanging fruit and that's why we think 50% is easily achievable. 50% of those names under the NORC Study that were uncontactable; those are what we're aiming for that were completely unreachable, right? And we think that the low hanging fruit is so easily reached that we can reduce it by 50%, and tell us if it's not and give us evidence as Bill said.

So here, let me try this in light of these very valuable expansions. Alice, second paragraph – "We understand that there are fairly easy ways at the point of registration" – and let's add the words "and after registration, to screen out clearly bad information, and that both registrars and ccTLDs are already using such screens." And I'll refer to Susan and Emily and other people. Okay, or "that some registrars and ccTLDs are already using such screens."

And that it's not really our job to tell you what to use, but that there's technology out there. One of the things I'm not sure, I talked with a group, I saw a whole presentation at a center meeting from Belgium, .be, exactly about the

screens they were using at registration point – no validation, no verification just screens. And the technology was there at least for their country.

And that made a big impression on me and I thought a lot about that with Susan showing us just such bogus information. On some of the other things I'm not sure we have consensus about take downs or all that. I don't know where Jim was on that; I don't know.

Emily Taylor: He's here, ask him

Kathy Kleiman: And here he is, but I think we have to give him a chance to set up his computer.

Emily Taylor: No no, just tell us now.

Kathy Kleiman: Just say yes or no.

Emily Taylor: Susan, you have the mic.

James Bladel: Maybe.

Susan Kawaguchi: So Bill, I was recommending maybe a list maybe because I think that's a combat as a rebuttal to their "what do we do." "Well, have you even looked at these 20 things, we're not experts and we're not recommending this, but look. There are solutions out there." The other questions I really had for Denise was when are the new studies coming, when will those be coming out, the results?

Denise Michel: Those will be sort of rolling deliveries as they're rolling reports. I'll see, I think they have target dates for the first two and I'll email that to the list.

Susan Kawaguchi: Okay, that will be interesting.

Emily Taylor: Can I just bring James up to speed on what we're doing?

Kathy Kleiman: No, definitely not.

Emily Taylor: No? Okay, we're going into GNSO Council in an hour.

James Bladel: If I could just by way of apology, I'm probably going to miss most of the RT4 sessions for Costa Rica; just saying that in advance and extending my apologies from now through Thursday. Thanks.

Emily Taylor: Well thanks a lot for joining this. We know that you are effectively the GoDaddy team in Costa Rica, so, very grateful that you're coming along to this session and hope you will at least make it for the dinner, which is the most important event of our season.

Bill Smith: And the drinks.

Emily Taylor:

So what we're doing at the moment is trying to work through a list of questions that were really, this was a useful clarification, these were kind of thrown out during a call by the GNSO Council members basically as they responded to our findings and recommendations. And so we're trying to work through what we're saying to them. This is a fairly detailed piece of work, but it's quite useful because we anticipate that the similar sort of questions will be asked by others in different constituencies and come through the public comment.

This one I think is probably an area that you'll be particularly interested in, which is – would you mind scrolling up to the question because I've now forgotten it. But it's talking about the famous reduce the number of unreachables by 50% and 50%. As you would expect, the question is what measures are we recommending to reduce and we say good question. What would you say?

James Bladel:

Irrelevant. I think what we're trying to say is that the policy exists to do better without inventing any tools or creating any new procedures or policies. I think that's the answer is, you have the procedures, you have the policies; the answer is what you already have. You just need to do it, you need to do it aggressively and you need to do it consistently and I think that's – that was my takeaway and maybe I'm out on a limb on this.

Emily Taylor:

Well I think if you wouldn't mind, I'd be quite interested to hear from your perspective as a registrar, with a great many millions of these registrations. Would you feel that that recommendation is realistic, is it implementable, is it something that you guys could work with? Seemingly you do, otherwise...

James Bladel:

Well it's more of a top level, it's not really a recommendation right; it's more of a top level directive or a strategic objective. And we're in ICANN, so we can already tell in advance without even looking at it that they're not going to make

it and it's going to be late. So, I hate to be cynical, but I'm saying this with a smile. So I think putting the stake out there, and then that's kind of what we're saying is stake your claim out here and say that we think this is possible.

Demonstrate to us that it isn't before going off and rushing off and creating a whole new reinvention of all the policy tools. That's my feeling. I'm sorry I'm coming in to this cold, so I'm just kind of shooting from the hip a little bit.

Emily Taylor:

Well that's great, that's great because we were all dancing around that particular handbag quite, but you've just sort of come in and told it as it is. And I think sort of from the perspective of where you're coming from as a large registrar, that's very, very helpful for us. Bill?

Bill Smith:

Bill Smith. I'm with James really on this. It is a stake in the ground. We have no idea whether 50% is aggressive or ridiculously low. I tend to think it's aggressive, but I don't know. And I like the "you already have the tools," and I believe if it falls on registrars, but I believe it falls on others as well, the tools are there. A registrar can pull a registration. If the data is blatantly false you can cut the name off. You don't have to do that immediately, you could chose to do other things.

There's nothing preventing, to my knowledge, nothing preventing a registrar from doing that. And we know that there's software that could be used. We know that there's lots of other things. If the community, or a community, subset of the community wanted to get creative, could find ways to improve the situation. And I am concerned; I'm okay if we provide a sort of, not an official list, it's sort of "here's some ideas." I'm happy to throw ideas out. And I'm definitely happy to do that. But if we have to come up and get consensus on the specifics, I think it will be impossible for us; for good reason.

Emily Taylor: Okay, so we'll do Kathy, James, Wilfried and Susan.

Kathy Kleiman: Hey James. This is just quick background, it's for the GNSO Council, it's the follow up meeting to the kind of introductory slides that Olof wound up delivering because Emily went into a tunnel on the train. So there were questions raised, but there was nobody to answer them, so this is kind of coming back in to answer. But we're hearing some of the same questions in different places, so I gave a shot on answering the questions in writing so that we could kind of put it in front of people.

And kind of by talking about these questions we're winding up talking about a lot of the core issues that we think people are going to ask us about. So let me run by you the kind of text that we were looking at. Can we go back up Alice? Again the question was what kind of measures is the group recommending to reduce unreachable WHOIS registrations. And I thought we'd just talk about what we mean by unreachable WHOIS registrations because I'm finding a lot of questions about this.

That this means kind of the uncontactable registrations – a little farther. Here we attempting the unreachable, the uncontactable, that we're looking at the low hanging fruit, for example, things that are really bogus on their face, all blanks or A's. That we understand that there are some fairly ways that we understand – so we're setting out the factual basis for the recommendation – that we understand there are fairly easy ways at the point of registration and maybe after registration to screen out clearly bad information, and that some registrars and ccTLDs are already using these screens.

We're not going to tell you what to do, but we're going to tell you what the goal is. Is that...?

Emily Taylor: Could I just...what we're not saying in that answer is "These are subject to cancellation and should be cancelled"; are we saying – because that is what the contract says isn't it? No? Yes?

Seth Reiss: The end user contract; the contract with the registrant.

Emily Taylor: Not the registrars contract, but the registrants contract; those individual registrations should go if they don't get updated and they don't get amended. So with that question hovering in the air, can I resume the list of James and Wilfried?

James Bladel: I think you're both right. I think that it is in the registrar contract that we must require registrants to agree to the understanding that failure to update or provide accurate information can cause – CAN, not will – cause them to lose their domain name registration. Kathy I think that's a good start and I think that you're on the right track. In fact, I don't know how long you guys have been in this room, but I just came from the GNSO/Board meeting where there was a discussion about our recommendations.

And I think that there is concern that in some areas we have stepped over the line from policy recommendation to policy creation. And that that then starts to look like a top-down process since we're a PDP, etc. So I'll just say that I think staying away from those direct "you will do these four things and do them every three months" or whatever prescriptive measures that we would like to say here are probably more likely to see this recommendation survive that vetting process.

So that would just be in my thinking on that is by staying as neutral as possible, and like Bill said, making this a strategic objective because it does, it lends well with our other objectives. Make this a strategic priority. Beef up compliance.

All the other things start to flow from this idea that you can, based on what you have, get that going.

The only concern I would have here is where it says “point of registration.” This is coming up a lot in a number of other circles right now, and I think what we need to be very, very cognizant of is that everybody’s got a stake in this; whether it’s businesses or individual registrants. I think we’re just starting to scratch the surface of what all the consequences of screening would be and creating who is eligible to be in the internet and who is not.

And I think that this is not something frankly that you want registrars to go off into a room and solve for you because then whole sections of the globe starts to go dark. So I would just put that out there, that that’s a bigger thing. And I think from where we’re coming from here, and it probably dovetails nicely with our recommendations, is that has to go through a policy development process so we can get more voices brought to the table on that.

Kathy Kleiman: It has to go through policy development?

James Bladel: Any recommendation or requirement that there be some sort of a pre-check of WHOIS data before – and I think that is compatible with what we’ve said thus far.

Emily Taylor: Yeah I think that our draft answer at the moment suggests that we are advocating data validation. And my clear impression was that we’re not in consensus on that. That what we’re talking about is the existing legacy of 20 million plus registrations where you can’t actually get in touch with the registrant. And I think that as James has put it, the policy exists “do better,” we think this is possible and this is a stretch objective that we have set. You already

have the tools. This is actually our response on that. Wilfried, sorry to have joined the queue.

Wilfried Woeber:

Well James has already said most of the stuff I wanted to put into proper sentences. I just want to reinforce his suggestion that we should not go into details. James' point of view with regards to "We should not make policy"; I fully agree to that. My point or sort of my line of thinking is coming from the other end of the stick. We should not provide those who want to push back with an easy way to chickening out in arguing that "well you have said A, B, and C needs to be done; nothing else." You know, "We do that and it doesn't work; bad luck." Okay, just try to be generic and to leave all the details either to the policy process or to the local implementation.

And sort of out of context but just for anecdotal background, there is a very similar problem with legacy registrations in the numbers world, not just in the names world. And there is quite a bit of pressure from various parties to get that swamp cleaned out. And like at least in our region there is a major program going on already where the regional registry actually goes after all the existing old registrations. And it's very clear, it's very open, it's in blinking red letters "Unless you provide proof of your existence and you get that into the registry system, you are going to lose your numbers." So it can be done and it is being done in different parts of the world and on the internet.

Kathy Kleiman:

With my user hat on, so, with my user hat on. I'm concerned that nowhere in our report have we spelled out that we are going to cancel domain names if the information – at least I don't remember seeing that blinking red light.

Emily Taylor:

Well sorry, it's in the contract.

Kathy Kleiman: If that's exactly what we're recommending, we have to spell it out and we haven't; we haven't put that on notice. I don't think the users know. And we know that the WDRP doesn't work, so the way of notifying registrants, I'm not sure, and we know that a lot of it goes in the Spam filter, so I don't think we've reached consensus on this absolute cancellation, but if we do let's flag it. But I'm not there.

Emily Taylor: We've got James and then Bill.

James Bladel: I'll look up the section, but I think just in the interim, I don't know that we are saying that; I don't know if we've reached the finding that the WDRP doesn't work. Is that correct? We have said that there are challenges and that we need to take a look at its effectiveness or whether or not it needs to be modified to be more effective, but I don't know that we've said it doesn't work.

Emily Taylor: We have no knowledge because nobody does.

James Bladel: Right, I think we've said there's a complete void of any kind of meaningful data on whether or not it does work and that ICANN should go get some.

Bill Smith: Yeah ICANN should get some or come up with a different policy that actually gets the data to be more accurate. That was basically the recommendation. In terms of "are we saying that names should be" – I don't know the correct terminology here – cancelled, suspended, whatever. My belief, and I don't know that we have consensus on this, but my belief is that the contracts in place already allow for that; it's not our call. What I think we could suggest without making policy, in answer to some of these questions is, that is an option and

there are other options that are not specified in contract that could be employed as well.

And some of us would individually be happy to make some suggestions, but we're not going to come to consensus on them. So I think we need to stay at, basically a very high level to say "Yeah we think that 50% is a stretch goal," but the reason, for me the reason is there is an attempt to change the culture to say we don't accept patently false registrations; we do something about that. And then we're going to raise the bar and try and do better and we're going to find better ways to make sure that the information is accurate.

Emily Taylor: I've got Seth, Wilfried, James, and then I think in the interest of time we'll move on. Okay?

James Bladel: Sorry, just a quick response. Section 3 7 7 2 of the RAA that says you can lose the domain name. It says "cancel" but we have I think demonstrated in practical terms "suspension" is probably better.

Emily Taylor: I'm sorry; I'm struggling here with what the big controversial issue is. It's clearly not your first thing. You don't immediately just throw someone out, but you would try and work with the registrant and then if they don't respond or they're not playing ball you progress.

James Bladel: Right. Suspension we can back off from, cancellation is irrevocable. So I think that's – and we've discussed this with ICANN staff as well.

Kathy Kleiman: I jumped to cancellation. I was like – argh, we cancelled 20 million domain names.

Emily Taylor: Sorry. So we've got Seth, Wilfried and then do you want the mic again?

Seth Reiss: I think in one of the At-Large session briefings it was raised that the RAA empowers, and James can correct me if I'm wrong, empowers the registrar that they can lead to cancellation. And the big reaction on the part of the At-Large attending the briefing was that that was the problem; that they can, not that they must. And I think the implication was that at least some registrars, when you give them the choices, just won't do it, and so where does that get us.

And so that kind of responds to Kathy's point is that there was at least a feeling on some of the members of that group that you have to do more because you can't give the registrar the discretion to cancel when cancellation or suspension would be appropriate because they may not do it.

Emily Taylor: This is where our general direction of changing the culture is probably applicable.

Wilfried Woeber: Yeah well again, procedural mandate thinking. I've got a feeling that we should just review the current situation and make recommendations how to improve the situation. It's not within our mandate sort of to describe the penalties or the eventual reaction to that. Because my feeling is that this will be policy development. So I would be hesitant to include anywhere in this paper, or in this report, a suggestion whether it's voluntary or compulsory in the end, to cancel or to suspend or to do anything, because from my point of view this is outside the mandate of this review team.

Yeah it's in the contract, it's in the contract, but it's not our job to sort of to enforce the contract or to provide suggestions to modify the contract in the future or even during the existence of the contract. My feeling, it's not more than that, it's a feeling, this would be sort of stepping into the area of policy development.

Bill Smith:

This is Bill Smith. James you mentioned when you came in that the Board and the Council are having a meeting and they're discussing our report and suggesting that we may have stepped over the line into policy; if so, in what areas?

James Bladel:

So you know, not to cross-pollinate a couple of different meetings here, we're certainly a transcript will prove me wrong. But it was one bullet point on the lengthy discussions between the GNSO Council and the ICANN Board. And I think it was one item raised by one GNSO Council member that anything that was determined, anything that the Board received in the way of recommendation from RT4, that was a new policy or modified existing policy had to go back through the GNSO Council for a PDP, because that was the policy management body.

And so I think that, without getting, they did not give any specifics, but it was clear that this particular council member thought that there was at least one area that that was the case.

Emily Taylor:

And I think that we would agree, which is why we have asked the community to give us feedback on who should be tasked and what is the appropriate process. And certainly from what I understood we were agreeing, is that we envisioned that one or more PDPs may well be formed as a result of this, but we are engaged by the Board and that is to whom we're directing the recommendations,

even if they are not exactly directly doing the implementations; they are ensuring that they would be done.

Bill Smith:

Bill Smith. Yeah, I'm not sure that – let me rephrase. If PDPs are necessary then that would be the appropriate mechanism for changing policy. If they are not necessary then other mechanisms could be employed. I don't think we are saying, I don't believe anywhere we have said "this is the way it must be done," we're just saying "ICANN should do X or should do Y."

Emily Taylor:

I think to just try and keep the sense of momentum, and bearing in mind I would quite like to break at 3:30 before we go into the GNSO Council, let's move on. How many more questions have we got to do?

Kathy Kleiman:

Take a deep breath. We're gone though the really hard ones.

Emily Taylor:

Okay.

Kathy Kleiman:

Okay? Big breath, we're on the – but really useful; thank you everybody. Really useful because I think we're going to hear this in the public forum as well, so may as well get used to it. We're on question four. In light of recommendation 10, which is a privacy services recommendation, Stephane Van Gelder – and a note to James that it may not have been Stephane, it may have come from others as well – Stephane Van Gelder asked how the balance between the wishes of law enforcement and the protection of the individuals privacy and access to personal question would be measured; so another metrics question.

To which I responded – we'll show them recommendation 10 to which I responded just a straw man, ‘it's a good question, but we're not ready for metrics yet. The recommendation is one we envision goes to the GNSO Council for a Privacy Services PDP, in which the GNSO balances the existing protections of due process, law enforcement requirements, data protection privacy and other areas of national law” because remember the recommendation talks about “consistent with national law.”

Now this may be too much detail guys – “and then applies them to privacy services” – rewrite this one. Do whatever you want with it.

Emily Taylor: Okay, just to shake things up a bit, I'm going to go Seth, James and then Bill.

All: That's wild!

Seth Reiss: I just didn't, I guess I take exception that we had a consensus that it would necessarily go to a PDP; I don't think we got that far, so I'm not sure we want to say that at this point.

Emily Taylor: Thank you. James?

James Bladel: Wait a minute.

Emily Taylor: Do you want to see the question again?

James Bladel:

Well I think we're saying too much, just shooting from the hip. I think this question from whoever Stephane is relaying it on their behalf, is that this is a question that needs to be addressed as part of the, if there is a subsequent PDP to implement these things, then that could be, for example, part of its charter. It's certainly not something that throws back onto the lap, I think, of RT4. And I don't think that is a dodge. I think generally we need to, Bill was saying, we generally need to stay above these types of implementation details.

Kathy Kleiman:

Can you give a few lines to Alice to type?

Bill Smith:

So my suggestion would be – I believe this is actually what happened. The review team did not suggest that his balance be measured; only that ICANN establish requirements for providers. In reading some of the, for me, when I read some of these questions, I think we need, I would like us perhaps to have much shorter answers to these things to say basically read the recommendation. These questions are coming in saying “how are we going to measure this stuff” and it’s like we didn’t make any recommendation, or have I don’t think any discussion about that.

Emily Taylor:

I think it is an RTFM sort of response isn't it? There are some recommendations which are susceptible to measurement. This is something that we expound on at great length through the body of the report, which is the different legitimate needs of the different stakeholders who use and rely on WHOIS. And that where you have privacy and proxy services at the moment, that balance in our view is not being struck at the appropriate level, because the people needing the information are at the mercy of whatever comes there way, even if it's nothing. There's no acceptable sort of practices at the moment; that's what we're looking for.

And so I think that we could delete the first paragraph with thanks to you for drafting it, and just sort of...

Kathy Kleiman:

Bye-bye first paragraph. Absolutely, good. Okay. Question five, which we're going to start on a new page. Thanks Alice. In recommendation 11, Stephane Van Gelder or whoever, asked whether the de-accreditation review team is referring to is about just registrars or registries, as well, if registries that have an obligation to provide a WHOIS service breach.

Now, recommendation 11 is specifically about privacy services. The one we're looking at is ICANN should develop a graduated and enforceable series of penalties for privacy service providers who violate the requirements with a clear path to de-accreditation for repeat, serial, or otherwise serious breaches. So here, it's my understanding that the privacy service providers that we're talking about are the registrars or affiliated with the registrars.

Now, again correct me if I'm wrong, and I actually believe that explaining our understanding is worthwhile, particularly if the question is raised. It's like whatever question is raise – anyway, I think it's worth bridging it with what our findings were. So "We envision this recommendation applying to registrars. It's our understanding that registrars hold the contractual relationship with registrants and that the privacy services in question, ones in which the registrars are affiliated would not be subject to nay control by the registries. We are also trying to find options short of de-accreditation, which to us seems extreme as the only remedy."

Emily Taylor:

And also I guess many of the privacy providers might not be registrars at all.

Bill Smith:

So, Bill Smith. So, I had scribbled down, I think the response is quite good actually. The only thing I had noted was perhaps we might want to say "the

review team believes that graduated and enforceable penalties should be employed throughout ICANN.” I don’t know that we have discussed that, but the concept of every agreement I read from ICANN is there is one recourse. Exactly, off with their heads. And it never or rarely gets applied because that’s just not how business operates.

Emily Taylor: Thank you. James?

James Bladel: I just want to point out that while that may have been the case when we originally drafted this, I think that this has changed, and I’m kind of looking to Denise, probably unfairly because we probably need to talk to compliance. But I think that there was actually a registrar that is now in that limbo status, something short of de-accreditation, but it unable to create new domain names and it was part of the compliance update newsletter that just went out prior to everyone leaving.

So, I want to think that the situation on the ground may have changed since we originally wrote this. “Lament that there’s only one punishment in ICANN”; I think that since writing that, that ICANN Compliance has changed that.

Denise Michel: I’ll forward the compliance newsletter you just referred to, to the list, so you’ll have that.

Emily Taylor: Thank you.

Kathy Kleiman: So what wording changes James, would you recommend. I'll have to take a closer look, but I think it's probably that whole last sentence is no longer operative.

Emily Taylor: I think that the last sentence, if we just sort of add that caveat that you've just mentioned; that we think that this might just have been overtaken by events, but it does explain where we're going in the draft recommendations as currently drafted. Yeah? Okay, next question.

Kathy Kleiman: And this is the last one, and it goes to our choice recommendation, the choices of recommendation 17. In light of recommendation 17, Stephane Van Gelder asked why the review team thinks it should be ICANNs responsibility to do a Thick WHOIS, instead of the registries. Lots and lots of different answers here. Let me put out a straw man to talk about one take on it.

First of all we're not asking, we're not asking ICANN, we're not dealing with Thick WHOIS. Thick WHOIS, I just want to share with the group, Thick WHOIS is a hot button topic in the GNSO right now. Thick WHOIS has to do with ownership of the data; that's not what we're talking about. So let me try it here.

Several responses as the review team remains split on the issue. For the first option, the broader one, and now we're referring to recommendation 17, the response is "if not ICANN then who? ICANN seems the logical place to run such a centralized system." For the narrower option, "ICANN running an interface to full .com and .net WHOIS data to Thin registries, we were told" – I don't think the wording is quite right here – "We were told by registrars that the split of the data was one that occurred when the competitive registrar system was founded. Thus ICANN seems the logical place to create a system to help law enforcement and internet" – singular – "internet users quickly find the full WHOIS data they seek." Go for it.

Emily Taylor: Okay, comments? Did I see – James, Seth, Bill.

James Bladel: So just very quickly that my feeling is, and whether we want to reference this or not, is that because creating anything else would change the ownership structure of the data. Whereas ICANN already owns the data, so therefore they should be the operative entity. Now, what you'll see, from registrars especially and I think a lot of folks in the GNSO, is that you can't and you should not drag ICANN into operational roles, and I think I agree with that. And I think that in reality what happens is they put out RFPs and other entities operate it.

But I think that the answer is that any other recommendation for any other party shifts the ownership paradigm, whereas recommending that ICANN do it maintains, or upholds, the existing ownership relationship. Now if I'm wrong on that I'll step back, but that was my understanding.

Emily Taylor: Seth?

Seth Reiss: I may have misunderstood the question, but I noticed a lot of comments are along this line in that I thought our recommendation was for an interface and not for the creation and maintenance of a Thick WHOIS by ICANN or a third entity. And I think a better way to respond to this, if I'm not mistaken in my impression, is just simply say that. Because we're getting the same comment from a lot of other people and it engenders a lot of discussion that we don't need to have. I think it would be better just to clarify what we intended.

Emily Taylor: Yeah, that was certainly my impression as well.

James Bladel: Setting aside my previous answer, that is also my preference.

Emily Taylor: Yeah, so and also I would just say if we say “we remain split on this” in the first line, that suggests that we have more disagreement than we have. Bill?

Kathy Kleiman: How about we change the first...

Bill Smith: I have a suggestion. This is Bill Smith. I scribbled down “our recommendation is that there be a single point of access for WHOIS information. Our consumer study demonstrated the current WHOIS practice is confusing, disjointed and fails to deliver on the ICANN covenant, providing timely public access to accurate information. ICANN has both the means and ability to offer such a service quickly and with minimal disruption to existing practice.” And I think that gets to James’s point about ICANN is the only entity that could do this, whether it’s done directly or through contract.

Emily Taylor: I still think that we might be getting a bit complex whereas Seth’s formulation to me had a simplicity that I understood.

Seth Reiss: Well you know I still agree with my formulation, but I think Bill’s language is so good that we should save it for a later draft. Hold on to it. But maybe not for this.

Emily Taylor: We're asking for an interface. It shouldn't affect, there are numerous interfaces of this kind that exist already, but they're not with ICANN. But we're not suggesting that the data is moved, that the ownership changes, that the structure of the WHOIS databases changes; it's just a pure usability one. That's all I thought it was. Kathy...

Kathy Kleiman: Alright so let's say that. How about we start with Seth's line "neither option is a Thick WHOIS and we're not changing" – let's try it. Just try it as a draft to see if it sounds right. "Neither option is a Thick WHOIS. We're not changing the ownership or the location of the data," or location, we're not proposing to change.

Bill Smith: "Our recommendation does not propose"

Kathy Kleiman: Keep going Bill – "does not propose to change the ownership or the location of the data, only its accessibility." Anything else?

Emily Taylor: And usability.

Kathy Kleiman: And usability.

Emily Taylor: And then delete the rest.

Kathy Kleiman: Good. Done. Okay. The only thing I do is take the second word Alice – “neither option,” singular. Great. And then if maybe we still have more to say about this, but could you page down Alice. And then the idea is if we have more time, just to go put up our recommendations; remember what Bill said, our focus is recommendations, put them up again and they see what people want to talk about.

Emily Taylor: That's great. And I would like to say on behalf of us all a great to thanks to Kathy and also to Bill, who worked through those questions so carefully and gave us something to react against, which has saved us a lot of time. These might be painful to work through these all together at this stage when we've all got jet lag, but we're going to have these questions from the community and it's good to try and anticipate them and get something sensible to say in response. Bill?

Bill Smith: Again, if we could just sort of try and get people to come back around to the recommendation when we answer these things, and not try to expand it, or dig down deep into it as I saw in the BC. Just as our Chair said, RTFM – read what is there and don't – we chose our words pretty carefully for a reason and we can add color commentary to them. But if they actually read the words I really do believe the intent will come out.

Emily Taylor: Yep, Seth.

Seth Reiss: Yeah I just wondered how exactly are we going to present these responses and I just have a feeling that Mr. Van Gelder took a lot of time, and there may be other members who are now more up to speed, I want to make sure they have an opportunity beyond what we're doing here.

Emily Taylor:

Okay, what I would suggest is, I think that we can probably do a lot of calming by setting out at the beginning what we were hoping to do what our recommendations at a holistic level and that we are not seeking to make policy or to undermine the many processes that exist in the ICANN world; that we have deliberately set stretch targets and that we're expecting full engagement. We've asked specific questions on who should be tasked, what's the appropriate timeframes, what should be the priorities, and that that might be a good sort of ice breaker task to try and raise up the level of some of the comments. James?

James Bladel:

Yes I support that and I think that's a good, since I probably will miss many of those sessions, I would wholeheartedly encourage that approach at the outset of all of the interactions and outreach sessions. You know, our report, and this is just the nature of WHOIS, is going out there like some sort of a weird ICANN Rorschach test, where everybody sees their hopes and fears and desires reflected in their recommendations and they're interpreting it through those prisms.

So by stating it as clearly as possible as "look at this narrowly. Look at what the words are saying, not what you want them to say, not what you're afraid they're saying," but read the recommendations as narrowly as possible. Look at the specific questions that we're asking. And don't – there's probably a very diplomatic way of saying this is not the time to hit the panic button and this is also not a call, because we're talking about specific comments, this is not a call for the open community to now come back and re-deliberate all of these things that we've been talking about for a year plus.

So I think by setting the ground that way, and Emily you are so much more tactful and diplomatic and frankly pleasant to listen to then what I'm saying, but if you can set that bar at the outset I think that these interactions will go much more efficiently and smoothly. Thanks.

Emily Taylor: Is everybody sort of happy to proceed on that sort of basis? Well I would certainly be looking for you guys to chime in and support on this. I think that, and this is probably a general note for us all, we've got some fairly limited times to deal with quite big subjects of people. I hope that we can give them as much air time as possible. And so, I know that we have a lot to say, we care deeply about the issues, but just to try to give people their say and to try and keep our interventions clear and crisp and to the point; easier said than done. Kathy?

Kathy Kleiman: I actually think Emily should lead this briefing.

Emily Taylor: Okay, I'm happy to, but also, so we've got some slides...

Kathy Kleiman: No no, we're not using the slides, we're just using that.

Emily Taylor: We're going to put up this? Yep. I'm good with that.

Kathy Kleiman: But I do have a question for James.

Bill Smith: Emily or anyone with an English accent on our team.

[background conversation]

Kathy Kleiman: But I do have a question for James. Before we started down the path of the deep dive into the GNSO Council questions, we kind of went around the room and talked about what briefings we've done and what feedback we're hearing and I'd love to know, I know you've given us some hints already, but if everybody wouldn't mind I'd love to know what you're hearing.

James Bladel: My session is tomorrow at three, so. Everything that I have is just very anecdotal, ad hoc. To be completely blunt, and almost painfully so, I'm trying to do everything I can to get registrars to care. I don't know if you've heard but there's talk of a new contract that's kind of sucking all the air out of the room right now and it's really hard to distract from that shiny object and say that there's other things going on that we need to talk about. But tomorrow at three is when I get my slot on the agenda.

Emily Taylor: Terrific, thank you. Okay, what I'd like to do is have a break now. We've got a full on session at quarter to; I'd like to just have a couple of minutes to myself to think about my remarks and I think we could all use a bit of tea or coffee or some refreshment. Does anybody else want to say anything before we break? Oh no idea, no idea; where are we going.

Kathy Kleiman: La Pas B; where is that? Is that far? La Pas B?

[break]

Emily Taylor: This could be quite hard now because we've had quite an intense session. I just want to cover off items eight and nine of our agenda.

Kathy Kleiman: Can I take a pause for a round of applause to Emily because I thought she was brilliant. Well done, make them laugh.

James Bladel: And honestly, don't feel like you have to bear that burden alone. I think you said you were looking for some folks to rescue you, just call on us.

Emily Taylor: Yeah well thank you guys; thank you very much for coming in because I think also we were able to show a great deal of unity.

Kathy Kleiman: But I wanted to know if you guys have heard about any privacy or human rights issues in the course of this discussion?

Emily Taylor: No, not at all. I haven't heard anything. Okay, let's just – I don't think we're going to go through the rest of the agenda in detail, but just to highlight that there are some interesting sessions going on. On Monday particularly, we've got Compliance Program Overview from 12 to 12:30. At 13:00 to 15:00 we have an RAA Progress Report and a WHOIS Data Validation Workshop. Clearly these, and then I think there's another one on Wednesday at 11:00, Consumer Trust. I think that probably that's less directly inline, but I guess it's...

Kathy Kleiman: My recommendation is that we send representatives, like divvy all this up amongst ourselves, and give it all to James who doesn't have enough to do at this meeting.

Emily Taylor: Or Peter Nettlefold who is also not here. I know that I'm not going to be able to make the Compliance Program Overview at all personally, and I probably won't make the first hour at least of the RAA Progress report.

Susan Kawaguchi: I can go to both of those.

Emily Taylor: Could you? Would you be able to...

Kathy Kleiman: I apologize. I was thinking th old time for our session. I'm sorry.

Emily Taylor: So we're doing our interaction with the community at 4:30 tomorrow and we'll also have a breakfast meeting. So we're just going to do logistics and support. Susan if you could cover off those sessions and can we give you a slot to report back on Wednesday; that would be great. And also, if you wouldn't mind jumping up on behalf of the review team at any appropriate moments and taking the floor that would really be appreciated. And obviously if any of you could go along to support Susan in that that would also be appreciated.

Kathy Kleiman: Susan, you're going to both session; the compliance...

Susan Kawaguchi: Yeah I can go to both of them. I haven't got anything else.

Kathy Kleiman: I'm going to the RAA one too, not the compliance, but the RAA.

Emily Taylor: So the two of you can do tag team; thank you. Well that was great. Consumer Trust on Wednesday; that is actually during our meeting, our working session, it's an hour and a half. I think we might just have to catch up on that with the transcript afterwards, if you don't mind. So is that the review team on Consumer Trust or is it the working group? It's the CCTCDT.

Male: Well I won't volunteer than.

Emily Taylor: If you can't say the acronym...That would be great. I would not view that one as a priority to go to, I think we'll probably have our work cut out on Wednesday.

Kathy Kleiman: But maybe Seth could be the one to follow it, get the notes and brief us on it afterwards.

[background conversation]

Emily Taylor: I think that probably after this meeting we'll probably revive our calls, our regular calls because we're going to have a program to review this.

Kathy Kleiman: Is anybody planning to go to the replacement of the WHOIS session? I believe this is the briefing on "weirds"; the RETF Committee. Oh this SSAC. Thursday at 1:00.

[background conversation]

Kathy Kleiman: Okay, so SSAC – Michael you’re going to this? So what is SSAC 51; I’m sorry I thought this was “weirds,” but you’re right it says SSAC 51.

Emily Taylor: Is it that report that was just published a few months ago.

James Bladel: If I can jump in. If it’s the one I’m thinking about there’s two parts. The first is just completed standardization of WHOIS terminology and that they want to get rid of the concept of WHOIS, which I think we’ve touched on, describes the data, the service, the protocol; all that stuff. And they want to get into, I think they’re calling it domain name directory data, okay.

Emily Taylor: Yeah. So we adopted their definitions but just called it WHOIS data, WHOIS service, WHOIS protocol in the draft report.

James Bladel: We mapped new definitions onto what they – without the really cool SSAC acronyms, but I think we did the equivalent thing. But you know while we’re on the subject of terminology, I wanted to point out that I think we should take a closer look at recommendations 18, 19 regarding IDN and make sure that we’re not using IDN when what we mean is internationalized registration data, IRD. Because you could have non ASCII characters in a .com or a .net that’s not associated with an IDN registration. And I think we may need to take another close look at that as just a matter of editing I think.

[background conversation]

James Bladel: I think the second part was just talking about what a successor protocol would look like and it's much larger.

Sarmad Hussain: So the “weirds” is actually out of IEDF and it’s mainly driven by the numbers community. And so there is some discussion on somehow combining the names community with that, but it’s still driven by the numbers community. So as far as the SSAC 51 is concerned, yes I think it has the terminology part. And then a couple of other things, the internationalized domain names and access control kind of dimension. So they’re looking at what to do beyond it.

Kathy Kleiman: Is there something from, and maybe this is a question for – are you with us on Wednesday for the full day meeting?

Sarmad Hussain: Yeah.

Kathy Kleiman: So, from SSAC 51, is that something that we should be bringing into this meeting, our meeting on Wednesday, or have we already kind of incorporated, at least in spirit, the big picture of that. Because I spent a lot of work with the Chair of SSAC in the beginning trying to understand where that report was going.

Sarmad Hussain: So as far as our work is concerned, it’s looking at what’s the state of affairs and what’s happened in the past. What this work is about, how to organize it in the future. So I guess we need to collectively decide whether we need to comment

on those aspects as well, or do we just restrain ourselves on the state of WHOIS at this time.

Seth Reiss: I think in the briefing that I did, and a fellow from the SSAC presented on SSAC 51, the question arose whether we've become irrelevant in view of the SSAC 51 future development. And I think the message I was trying to promote in that briefing is "no, we're complimentary. That many of our recommendations could be implemented in the new protocol." And it may be useful to bring forth that message quickly as we don't want to be regarded as irrelevant.

Emily Taylor: Okay, Wilfried.

Wilfried Woeber: Just as an observation, I haven't followed closely on this particular development, but just looking back in history a little bit, even if all the relevant parties agree on a WHOIS NG, whatever it's going to look like in the future, I think the existing infrastructure is not going to become irrelevant within the next 10 years. Because there has already been a pretty major attempt to replace or to develop WHOIS into something more fancy – "Crisp" was the catch phrase. IRIS, yeah.

And this failed miserably. Over the years I've gotten a little bit pessimistic and while I would like to support each and every attempt to get something off the ground as quickly as possible, I still have to see the real impact in the real world. So, just as an observation.

Emily Taylor: A little reminder. Bill?

Bill Smith:

Yeah I would echo Wilfried's remarks. I was asked to do a summary of the SSAC 51 roadmap for the BC and that's one of the things I highlighted was an implementation of any of these proposals will take years. I mean the IETF has yet to spinoff a group. It's not clear what its charter will be, there's bickering about that. I believe in any of the proposals, whatever the charter might look like; names will be done after numbers. And we could argue whether that's a good thing or a bad thing, but that's what the IETF area director wants, that's what the person doing the drafting wants. And I've given up at attempting to get a charter that I think would allow both to go in parallel.

The other thing is I like the stuff that's in the SSAC recommendation. One of the issues I had though was with the nomenclature. Just that while it is accurate it's pretty difficult to pronounce. I had suggested using basically shortening stuff to domain name registration and then have DNR data, DNR protocol, service, model...there's a problem with DNR, within the US at least, for Do Not Resuscitate, but at least it's easier, it rolls a bit off the tongue as opposed to, and I'd forgotten what the proposals were from SSAC.

I agree 100% with the definitions, absolutely. We need those definitions. We need what's behind them. We just need to make them in a way that can be pronounced by humans.

Emily Taylor:

And just to follow on from that, I think in our draft report we have actually taken wholesale their definitions, and replaced the labels with WHOIS data, WHOIS protocol, WHOIS service for want of a better thing. We spoke with both Jim and Patrick about this and kind of said "no hard feelings, hope you're okay with that" and they were very, very relaxed about it.

Kathy Kleiman:

I'm really glad Michael's going to the session and I'm really looking forward to hearing. And if there's anything to circulate that would be great, because that's a great session.

Bill Smith:

One other thing, and that would be that my commentary back to the BC was to recommend that ccTLD, the ccTLDs and the gTLD operators, registry operators and even registrars, begin to participate at the IETF. One of the arguments that is being pushed back consistently is the IETF did all this work on IRIS and CRISP and it was never adopted, tell us why. And we don't know, don't have a great answer other than nobody liked it, it was hard to implement. I don't know. I basically have said there "Look, a spec was published and nobody chose to implement it; that's the way it goes."

Emily Taylor:

Okay, let's just continue this over dinner because we can all talk about this. No no...

Bill Smith:

No I'm just saying if we don't show up the IETF will say you're not important and we don't care.

Emily Taylor:

I want to just finish off, there's one agenda item which is just introducing this framework and how we're going to process comments as we go forward. We just discussed it very briefly. I threw out that it might be possible to go back to the chapter authors and to ask them to specifically look at the comments on their chapters. Kathy do you want to introduce this?

Kathy Kleiman:

Yeah. Actually hold on, can we just go back really, really quickly to the meetings with the GAC and the Board, going back to our agenda numbers five, six, and seven, just in case we don't get another chance to do it. And I'm sorry we don't have Alice here to change the slides guys, I'm still on the first page of Sunday. Number five, we finished our preparation for our second meeting with

the GNSO Council. Number five is now preparation for a follow up meeting with the GAC, and let's combine it with number six, preparation for meeting with the Board.

Since we've already had initial meetings with all these guys, and they've got our slides, they've got our overview, what we were thinking of doing is just exactly what we did when we met with ICANN senior staff; is just put up a copy of the recommendations. And Denise gave us a consolidated version, kind of a shorthand version of the recommendations, which look good. You've got it on your landscape sheet. SO unless anybody objects, that's what we're going to put up.

We have no specific questions to answer from the GAC or the Board and Steve Crocker didn't repeat his questions, so I think he's just leaving that as a written comment. So we'll just put up the recommendations and do some introductory remarks, which Emily does so well, and then go straight into what their questions are and discussion; unless anybody objects.

And number seven, the preparation for the public forum; I think we did our preparation for the public forum today in our preparation for the Council. And a lot of the stuff we were hashing out today, I think we're going to hear similar questions in the forum. We've been asked by individual constituencies to speak to them, and what we said was what I told the registries and I believe it was told to others was, please come to the public forum so everybody can hear everybody and really let's bring it all out there. Let's have everybody talking to everyone.

And so that's going to happen. We've got the slides that were distributed with apologies, those were actually due early; we didn't realize that. So everything is kind of a cut and paste from our discussions and also from the report. And that's about it for that. I'll talk about the template in a second. I know Bill has some comments.

Bill Smith: Yeah. I think if the GNSO meeting is any indication we're going to be very pressed for time. And certainly my impression in some of the questions was that we were getting, not we, but the questions were way off topic and the commentary – well ccTLDs came in and told us to do stuff that is anti-competitive with the gTLDs. Right? Seriously, I mean this stuff is going back...

Kathy Kleiman: I didn't. I know the guy who's asking.

Emily Taylor: Well I think that we've got to; it's very, it can be frustrating sort of consulting on things that you've been working on a year or more. People just have to, they will ask what they ask and we just have to be able to handle it.

[background conversation]

Emily Taylor: Yeah, point well taken Bill. We're going to get a whole bunch of questions and we just have to try and keep it moving; that's going to be a challenge. I think that probably the way that I would play the public forum is to just launch in and step through the recommendations. We can see from this document, which I think is great, thank you Alice for doing this, that there are some that will provoke comment and they'll provoke a lot of comment, and there are some that will just literally go through.

So we'll probably just rather than doing a great big boom this is it and now ask our questions, we'll probably just step through it like that and let people intervene. Kathy?

Kathy Kleiman:

Like let me – I went to the public forum for the ATRT, the Accountability and Transparency Review Team presentation. And prior to that there were some of the recommendations of the ATRT that had been talked about a lot in the hallways, and argued about a lot in the meetings, but it wasn't till I went to the ATRT meeting that I saw the presentation of the recommendations in context, in their full with the explanation. And I think that this is a very special opportunity.

Know that 80% to 85% of the people in that room will not have read our report. Because what they're doing is reading other things. And what we're hearing is not people trying to derail us. There were three people in that room, four people in that room from NCUC and that's their job is human rights and privacy issues and they want to know that we took that into account in the balance.

Jeff Newman lives and breathes his competition with ccTLDs and he wanted to know if we considered that; he's not trying to derail us, this is what's in their heads. And I think it's important for us, we've heard a lot about law enforcement, we've heard a lot about consumer trust, we're now hearing with some of the other communities that have to deal with the system and what their concerns are. So just take it for what it's worth. This is what's on the top of their heads and this is what they're living and feeling. I think it's interesting to get the feedback even if from our perspective it's like yes, yes of course we've considered that.

So in drafting these slides I tried to think about what can we quickly give the community that's never read a word of our report, and hasn't read a single recommendation? And first I think what we can do is give them the full text or our recommendations. And Alice is going to be handing it out. Do we have to read every word; of course not. But I think we owe them, we have 20 recommendations and one of the things we're getting back is that's a huge amount. At least I'm hearing that a lot, is "Wow this is huge."

And actually the answer is it's nine categories guys. We broke it out for clarity, but it's really own nine types of recommendations; I think of it as nine. Can you

go to slide six, Alice? So let me show you, this is no clear WHOIS policy; it's a finding. So here I just put in, we've described it a million times, so just put it up quickly as a visual. These are six of the places we found the WHOIS policy scattered, so boom, recommendation one – put it one place. I think that will take about two seconds, but at least it's there.

As we know there are a number of people who don't speak English as a first language; they're going to be using our slides as a guide. There are a number who aren't present; they'll be using our slides as a guide, as we will be using the slides from other groups that are presenting on WHOIS issues. So take a look at slide number eight if you would.

Again here, we've now mapped it out; we've been asked about it in different meetings. But some of the questions that we have about the WHOIS Data Reminder Policy; just put it out there kind of quickly. We're not trying to take up huge amounts of time, but for the people who are worried about a million other issues here, who have bothered to come to our public forum, let's tell them what we're thinking. That was the idea, and how helpful I found ATRT to suddenly hear all the recommendations in context, I'm like "Oh that makes sense. Now I understand where they're coming from." That's the thought.

Emily Taylor:

Well thank you for your work on those slides, Kathy. I think we'll just have to bust it at the public forum to be honest and we've got a very good framework of slides there and we will just have to keep an eye on the time and make sure that we're getting through. Bill?

Bill Smith:

I guess I'm just again, based on today, I'm concerned that we will get people coming up and raising issues that are completely orthogonal to what we were tasked to do. I heard in the room basically a hew and cry for us to have expanded our scope to include ccTLDs, the RIRs etc. And at other times, we have been chastised for not being narrow enough. Well, but I think we can say,

we read the AOC this was our scope, that's what we did. I think nice, we can listen, but if we continue to engage on those, seriously I think answers like "yes we considered that" are appropriate. Is it a decided issued, no it is not, but yes we did consider it.

When things get too far, from my perspective, when things get too far afield, if they aren't asking a clarifying question – so for me some of the questions that we saw from the GNSO would be clarifying or whatever, but they were an attempt to be an open-ended question – did you think about this. And if we give the opening – "yeah we thought about it and here are the 10 things we thought about" – we'll get derailed for 20 minutes.

Emily Taylor:

Thanks for that. That's a very good reminder that we've just got to keep it moving really. But at the same time I do want to take the opportunity where appropriate to explain and to clarify.

Kathy Kleiman:

Alice has been incredible. Actually the first thing I want, but we'll leave the template up, is the comments on recommendations. Alice has been absolutely incredible this past week; she's been doing a lot. So I'm going to talk about the comments and then I'm going to talk about the template, okay? So the comments break this down recommendation by recommendation to what we've received as of yesterday I think, which meant that Alice was working in her sleep on some of this stuff.

Alice Jansen:

The document that the members have received dates back to March the 6th, but I've updated that version as well, so I've got a new version.

Kathy Kleiman:

This is a newer version that you're holding in your hand?

Alice Jensen: No, it's the last one. I'm happy to circulate handouts for the new version if it helps.

Kathy Kleiman: Well this is more modern than the one we have. This has got IPC on it. Yeah, this is the more modern version. You didn't change the date; we'll try to keep dating it for when...But this is an ICANN meeting and again a lot of people are coming, they're leaving their issues for a little bit and coming to our issues. So the template, my guess is we haven't gotten a lot of the comments that we're about to get. And so here's the thought that a bunch of stuff is going to come in on deadline, but that we're going to hear about it in the public forum, in our meeting with the GAC and our meeting with the Board, and we heard about some of the issues today before Council.

So, Alice and I were brainstorming, and I don't know if you'll find this useful, but this a template to try to capture some of the comments that we're hearing recommendation by recommendation. And my thought was if we all carry this around with us and right down things that strike us as legitimate types of clarifying questions, legitimate types of questions about underlying findings, revisions of the recommendations that make sense to us; please, please write it down. Because our last face to face meeting is Wednesday, before the deadline for the comments.

So please, please, please take what you hear that's useful, put it under the recommendation and that was on Wednesday we can go recommendation by recommendation and maybe have captured 80% of the spirit of what we're going to get. We'll still have more meetings to go, but if you could just carry it around to the different meetings it would be awesome. Mine is already filling up so.

Emily Taylor: Thanks a lot for that. And I think that's a good initiative. I think that that's really all we're going to usefully cover today. I'd like to thank you all for your input. It's going to be quite a tough week; we're going to be seeing a lot of each other. We've got breakfast at 7:30 tomorrow, that's not the tough bit. I'm looking forward to our dinner tonight, so we're going to be meeting at 7:00; I think it's here isn't it? Is it in the Japanese – is it half past seven? Okay, and that's here on site.

[background conversation]

Kathy Kleiman: So tell me, does anybody like my template or do you think it's really silly?
Where is the restaurant, do we know? Is it walking distance from here?

Male: You can go down towards where it says "ICANN Press" and there's a little sign there that says "Tiffany Room this way" and you kind of walk past the Tiffany Room and keep going and there's a little path right there.

Kathy Kleiman: Okay, so it's like right next door?

Male: Yeah it's actually I think faster than walking to the lobby. Just look at the sign and where you see it says like "Tiffany Room" or something; just head in the direction.

Kathy Kleiman: Has anybody tried the sugar cane drinks? Can you tell us about the local beverages we should be considering?

Female: No, I'm not taking any advice from her.

[End of Transcript]