RDS-WHOIS2-RT Brussels Face-to-Face Meeting

16-17-18 April 2018

ICANN

RDS-WHOIS2-RT Brussels Face-to-Face Meeting

DAY 1 – 16 April 2018

ICANN

Welcome, Roll-Call, SoI Updates, Administrative Items

Agenda Item #1

Time: 09:00-09:10

Presenters: Review Team Leadership & ICANN org

SoI Updates, Roll-Call, Administrative Items

Raise your hand if you wish to be added to the queue

Session is recorded:
- Always use your microphone
- State your name before speaking
- Limit use of your laptop

Breaks:
- Reception desk/area for coffee breaks
- Kitchen area for lunch

Badges

Opening Remarks

Agenda Item #2

Time: 09:10-09:20

Presenters: Review Team Leadership

Meeting Objectives

Overall goals for this meeting

- Present every subgroup's questions to be answered, research methodology and materials, and draft findings
  - To help the full RT understand the subgroup's analysis
  - To flag any open questions, potential overlaps, or gaps
- As applicable, introduce subgroup-identified issues/problems and proposed recommendations (if any) to address them
- Review the RT's work plan to confirm next steps and dates

Outputs to be produced from this meeting

- Questions and action items for each subgroup to address in report
- Due dates for final subgroup reports
  - Subgroup 1 – WHOIS1 Recommendation Implementation Review
  - Subgroups 2-5 – Additional Review Objectives
- Plan to consolidate subgroup reports into draft RDS-WHOIS2 report and begin full RT work on proposed recommendations (if any)

Overview of Rapporteurs' Updates

#	Subgroup	Rapporteur	Day of FtoF Meeting	Time Allocated
1	WHOIS1 Rec #1 - Strategic Priority	Cathrin	1	30 min
	WHOIS1 Rec #2: Single WHOIS Policy	Carlton	1	30 min
	WHOIS1 Rec #3: Outreach	Alan	1	30 min
	WHOIS1 Rec #4: Compliance	Susan	1	120 min
	WHOIS Rec #5-9: Data Accuracy	Lili	1	60 min
	WHOIS Rec #10: Privacy/Proxy Services	Volker (Susan)	2	120 min
	WHOIS Rec #11: Common Interface	Volker (Susan)	2	30 min
	WHOIS Rec #12-14: Internationalized Domain Names	Dmitry	2	30 min
	WHOIS Rec #15-16: Plan & Annual Reports	Lili	1	30 min
2	Anything New	Stephanie	3	60 min
3	Law Enforcement Needs	Thomas (Cathrin)	3	60 min
4	Consumer Trust	Erika	2	60 min
5	Safeguarding Registrant Data	Alan	3	30 min

Day 1 Objectives

Agenda Item #3

Time: 09:20-09:30

Presenters: Review Team Leadership

Day 1 – Morning Program

08:30-09:00 - Breakfast

09:00-09:10 – Welcome, SoI updates, roll-call & administrative items

09:10-09:20 – Opening remarks

09:20-09:30 – Day 1 objectives

09:30-09:35 – Work plan

09:35-09:45 – Criteria for SMART recommendations

09:45-10:15 – WHOIS1 Recs #15-16: Plan & Annual Reports

10:15-10:30 – Break

10:30-11:00 – WHOIS1 Rec #1: Strategic Priority

11:00-11:30 – WHOIS1 Rec #2: Single WHOIS Policy

11:30-12:30 – WHOIS1 Recs #5-9: Data Accuracy

12:30-13:30 – Lunch

Day 1 – Afternoon Program

13:30-15:30 – WHOIS1 Rec #4: Compliance

15:30-15:45 – Break

15:45-16:15 – WHOIS1 Rec #3: Outreach

16:15-17:15 – Parking lot for items to be further discussed TBD

17:15:17:30 – Review day 2 agenda and closing remarks

19:30-21:30 – Dinner (offsite)

Day 1 Objectives

- ⊙ Present and discuss subgroup outputs for Objective #1:
  - ○ Consistent with ICANN's mission and Bylaws, Section 4.6(e)(iv), the Review Team will
    - a) evaluate the extent to which ICANN Org has implemented each prior Directory Service Review recommendation (noting differences if any between recommended and implemented steps),
    - b) assess to the degree practical the extent to which implementation of each recommendation was effective in addressing the issue identified by the prior RT or generated additional information useful to management and evolution of WHOIS (RDS), and
    - c) determine if any specific measurable steps should be recommended to enhance results achieved through the prior RT's recommendations.

    This includes developing a framework to measure and assess the effectiveness of recommendations, and applying that approach to all areas of WHOIS originally assessed by the prior RT (as applicable).

- ⊙ Points to consider throughout Day 1
  - ○ Do you have any questions or feedback on each subgroup's output?
  - ○ Are there any overlaps between subgroups that need to be resolved?
  - ○ Did the subgroup fully-address at least a) and b) above?

Work Plan & Deliverables

Agenda Item #4

Time: 09:30-09:35

Presenters: ICANN org

Work Plan & Deliverables

DATE	DELIVERABLE
By 24 May	Subgroups to incorporate edits identified in Brussels
By 28 June ICANN62	• Seek community input on draft findings/recommendations • Approve draft findings and recommendations
By 31July	Approve draft report for public comment
7 August – 5 October	Public comment on Draft Report
By 30 November	Update draft report based on public comment and assemble final recommendations
By 21 December	Approve final report for submission to ICANN Board

Per work plan submitted to ICANN Board on 9 February 2018

Criteria for S.M.A.R.T. Recommendations

Agenda Item #5

Time: 09:35-09:45

Presenters: ICANN org

Criteria for S.M.A.R.T. Recommendations

SPECIFIC

MEASURABLE

ACHIEVABLE

RELEVANT

TIME-BOUND

Evaluate results:
what is expected, how to get it
done and what the target is?

Criteria for S.M.A.R.T. Recommendations

- 11 questions to encourage discussion and consideration to result in clear, useful and implementable recommendations:

    1. What observed **fact-based issue** is the recommendation intending to solve? What is the "problem statement"?

    2. What are the **findings that support the recommendation**?

    3. How significant would the impact be if not addressed:
        1. Very significant
        2. Moderately significant
        3. Impacted areas (for example, security, transparency, legitimacy, efficiency, diversity, etc.)

    4. What is the **intent of the recommendation**?

    5. What **outcome** is the Review Team seeking? How will the effectiveness of implemented improvements be measured? What is the **target for a successful implementation**?

Criteria for S.M.A.R.T. Recommendations

6. Does the Review Team envision[2] the implementation to be:
   a) Short-term: implemented within 6 months
   b) Mid-term: implemented within 12 months
   c) Longer-term: implemented in more than 12 months

7. Is the recommendation aligned with ICANN's strategic plan and ICANN mission? If yes, how?

8. Does this recommendation require new policies to be adopted? If yes, what stakeholders need to be engaged in the policy development process to support successful implementation of this recommendation?

9. Is related work already underway? If so, what is it and who is carrying it out?

S.M.A.R.T. Recommendations

10. Who are the (responsible) parties that need to be involved in the implementation work for this recommendation?
    1. Community
    2. ICANN org
    3. Board
    4. Combination of the above

11. If only 5 recommendations can be implemented due to community bandwidth and other resource constraints, would this recommendation be one of the top 5? Why or why not?

Suggested Recommendations Format

Recommendation:

Findings:

Rationale:

Impact of Recommendation:

Feasibility of Recommendation:

Implementation:

Priority:

Level of Consensus:

Included in your subgroup report template

WHOIS1 Recs #15-16: Plan & Annual Reports

Agenda Item #6

Time: 09:45-10:15

Presenter: Lili Sun

Subgroup Members: Lili, Alan, Chris

Subgroup Wiki: https://community.icann.org/x/9pIEB

WHOIS1 Recs #15-16: Plan & Annual Reports

WHOIS1 Recommendations

- *Rec 15 – ICANN should provide a detailed and comprehensive plan within 3 months after the submission of the Final WHOIS Review Team report that outlines how ICANN will move forward in implementing these recommendations.*

- *Rec 16 – ICANN should provide at least annual written status reports on its progress towards implementing the recommendations of this WHOIS Review Team. The first of these reports should be published one year, at the latest, after ICANN publishes the implementation plan mentioned in recommendation 15, above. Each of these reports should contain all relevant information, including all underlying facts, figures and analyses.*

Questions the subgroup attempted to answer when assessing this objective:
1. Check whether Action Plan properly addressed the other 16 recommendations
2. Assess the effectiveness of the already-published WHOIS Annual Reports

Research and background materials used to answer questions:
- WHOIS1 Final Report, Action Plan, & Implementation Reports
- Implementation Briefing Presentation, Answers to Questions, & Written Briefing
- ICANN 5-Year Strategic Plan and ICANN FY2017 Operating Plan and Budget
- 2013-2016 WHOIS Annual Reports

WHOIS1 Recs #15-16: Plan & Annual Reports

Describe your methodology to answer questions and analyze the materials

- Plan to base analysis in part upon key findings for all other WHOIS1 Recs
- *[Expand upon review/analysis Methodology here]*

Based on the analysis, what are the main findings?

- *[Include summary of Findings here]*

Based on findings, the subgroup identified the following problems/issues

- *[Include Problem/Issue here or state None Identified]*

To address the above problems/issues, the subgroup proposes the following recommendations (if any)

- *[Include draft Recommendation(s) here if applicable/available or state N/A]*

Break

Time: 10:15-10:30

What's Next?

10:30-11:00 – WHOIS1 Rec #1: Strategic Priority
11:00-11:30 – WHOIS1 Rec #2: Single WHOIS Policy
11:30-12:30 – WHOIS1 Recs #5-9: Data Accuracy

WHOIS1 Rec#1 – Strategic Priority

Agenda item #7

Time: 10:30-11:00

Presenter: Cathrin Bauer-Bulst

Subgroup Members: Cathrin, Carlton, Volker

Subgroup Wiki: https://community.icann.org/x/3pIEB

WHOIS1 Rec #1 – Strategic Priority

WHOIS1 Recommendation

- *Rec 1.a – It is recommended that WHOIS, in all its aspects, should be a strategic priority for ICANN the organization.*

- *Rec 1.b – It is recommended that WHOIS form the basis of staff incentivization (including the CEO's) and organizational objectives*

- *Rec 1.c – The Board should create a committee that includes the CEO to be responsible for priority and key actions*

- *Rec 1.d – ICANN should issue public updates on progress against targets for all aspects of WHOIS*

Questions the subgroup attempted to answer when assessing this objective:

1. Has ICANN.Org made WHOIS a strategic priority from a formal perspective, by putting into place the appropriate resources and procedures?
2. Has ICANN.Org made WHOIS a strategic priority from a substantive perspective?
3. Has ICANN Org issued public updates on progress against targets for all aspects of WHOIS?
4. Based on findings of other subgroups, how have the updated complaints and other compliance procedures impacted the accuracy and functionality of the WHOIS?

WHOIS1 Rec #1 – Strategic Priority

Research and background materials used to answer questions:
- WHOIS1 Final Report, Action Plan, & Implementation Reports
- Implementation Briefing Presentation, Answers to Questions & Written Briefing*
- ICANN 5-Year Strategic Plan and ICANN FY2017 Operating Plan and Budget
- 2013 RAA, including WHOIS Requirements for Registrants
- EWG Final Report
- WHOIS Information Portal and Consolidated WHOIS Lookup Tool
- Roadmap of WHOIS/RDS Activities (as of June 2017)

Describe your methodology to answer questions and analyze the materials
- Requested additional materials, including incentivitation measures, records of Board/CEO Committee on WHOIS
- Posed of series of questions for ICANN SMEs to address is written briefing
- Plan to review the output from the other subgroups in assessing the degree to which WHOIS has been made a strategic priority within the organization
- *[Expand on Methodology here, if desired]*

* Assumes written briefing will be provided & reviewed by subgroup this week

WHOIS1 Rec #1 – Strategic Priority

Based on the analysis, what are the main findings?

* *[Include summary of Findings here]*

Based on findings, the subgroup identified the following problems/issues

* *[Include Problem/Issue here or state None Identified]*

To address the above problems/issues, the subgroup proposes the following recommendations (if any)

* *[Include draft Recommendation(s) here if applicable/available or state N/A]*

WHOIS1 Rec #2: Single WHOIS Policy

Agenda item #8

Time: 11:00-11:30

Presenter: Carlton Samuels

Subgroup Members: Carlton, Cathrin, Thomas

Subgroup Wiki: https://community.icann.org/x/4ZIEB

WHOIS1 Rec #2 – Single WHOIS Policy

WHOIS1 Recommendation

- *Rec 2 – The ICANN Board should oversee the creation of a single WHOIS policy document, and reference it in subsequent versions of agreements with Contracted Parties. In doing so, ICANN should clearly document the current gTLD WHOIS policy as set out in the gTLD Registry and Registrar contracts and GNSO Consensus Policies and Procedure.*

Questions the subgroup attempted to answer when assessing this objective:
1. LIST HERE

Research and background materials used to answer questions:
- WHOIS1 Final Report & Implementation Reports
- Responses to WHOIS1 Final Report by ICANN Constituencies, including ALAC, GNSO SG/Cs, and SSAC (SAC055)
- Board Action Plan that emerged from consideration of Single WHOIS policy rec
- Implementation Briefing Presentation, Answers to Questions, & Written Briefing
- ICANN web page on WHOIS Policies
- Next Generation RDS to replace WHOIS PDP

WHOIS1 Rec #2 – Single WHOIS Policy

Describe your methodology to answer questions and analyze the materials
- Followed timeline from WHOIS1 report releast to current time
  - Responses to the Final Report by ICANN Constituencies
  - Record of the Board's response
  - Action Plan developed by ICANN org Staff on the Board's direction
  - Subsequent published status reports and evidence of implementation
- Examined the list of WHOIS-related consensus policies and procedures

Based on the analysis, what are the main findings?
- *[Text below copied from Page 5, Recommendations – expand if desired]*
- The <u>web page</u> is a good and sufficient substitute for the single authoritative WHOIS policy document but with navigational improvements and further organisation of content could be better.
- The Board-initiated GNSO PDP chartered to address the next generation Registration Data Directory Services is in progress. This Review Team cannot now pronounce on the success of a single fit-for-purpose next generation WHOIS policy framework.

WHOIS1 Rec #2 – Single WHOIS Policy

Based on findings, the subgroup identified the following problems/issues

- *[Include summary of Problem/Issue here from Section 4, page 5 of draft report]*

To address the above problems/issues, the subgroup proposes the following recommendations

1. *[Text below copied from Page 5, Recommendations – expand if desired]*
2. Accept that WHOIS1 RT Recommendation 2 is fully implemented.
3. Accept that the adoption of the EWG's Final Report and development of the framework for the Board-initiated GNSO RDS PDP[s] is intended to deliver a holistic next generation WHOIS policy framework that would address current set of fragmented and decentralized WHOIS policies.

WHOIS1 Recs #5-9: Data Accuracy

Agenda item #9

Time: 11:30-12:30

Presenter: Lili Sun

Subgroup Members: Lili, Cathrin, Dmitry, Erika

Subgroup Wiki: https://community.icann.org/x/6plEB

WHOIS1 Recs # 5-9: Data Accuracy

WHOIS1 Recommendations

- *Rec 5 – ICANN should ensure that the requirements for accurate WHOIS data are widely and proactively communicated, including to current and prospective Registrants, and should use all means available to progress WHOIS accuracy, including any internationalized WHOIS data, as an organizational objective.*

- *Rec 6 – ICANN should take appropriate measures to reduce the number of WHOIS registrations that fall into the accuracy groups Substantial Failure and Full Failure (as defined by the NORC Data Accuracy Study, 2009/10) by 50% within 12 months and by 50% again over the following 12 months.*

- *Rec 7 – ICANN shall produce and publish an accuracy report focused on measured reduction in WHOIS registrations that fall into the accuracy groups Substantial Failure and Full Failure, on an annual basis.*

- *Rec 8 – ICANN should ensure that there is a clear, unambiguous and enforceable chain of contractual agreements with registries, registrars, and registrants to require the provision and maintenance of accurate WHOIS data. As part of these agreements, ICANN should ensure that clear, enforceable and graduated sanctions apply to registries, registrars and registrants that do not comply with its WHOIS policies. These sanctions should include de-registration and/or de-accreditation as appropriate in cases of serious or serial non-compliance.*

- *Rec 9 – Board should ensure that the Compliance Team develop metrics to track the impact of the annual WHOIS Data Reminder Policy (WDRP) notices to registrants; metrics should be used to As per (1) above, the Board will initiate a policy on the purpose of the gTLD WHOIS service, and this will help drive the principles behind privacy/proxy develop and publish performance targets, to improve data accuracy over time; if this is unfeasible, Board should ensure that an alternative, effective policy is developed and implemented that achieves the objective of improving data quality, in a measurable way.*

WHOIS1 Recs #5-9 – Data Accuracy

Questions the subgroup attempted to answer when assessing this objective:

1. *[Text below copied from First Pass Planning Doc – revise if desired]*
2. Implementation progress of 2013 "WHOIS ACCURACY PROGRAM SPEC"?
3. Progress of WHOIS Accuracy Reporting System (ARS) project – to what extent inaccuracy has been reduced?
4. Accuracy rate of WHOIS data which uses Privacy/Proxy service?
5. Are the measures which have been taken effective in achieving the objectives?
6. Can we measure data accuracy when data becomes mostly hidden?

Research and background materials used to answer questions:

- WHOIS1 Final Report, Action Plan, & Implementation Reports
- Implementation Briefing Presentation, Answers to Questions, & Written Briefing
- Other background materials listed on subgroup's wiki page
- SME responses from Global Domains Division and Contractual Compliance
- Views exchanged during the Review Team's plenary calls and subgroup calls
- Open source research about community impact of data accuracy enforcement

Describe your methodology to answer questions and analyze the materials

- *[Include Methodology here]*

WHOIS1 Recs #5-9 – Data Accuracy

Based on the analysis, what are the main findings?
- Measures now in effect or taken by ICANN to progress WHOIS accuracy:
    - (1) WHOIS Informational Website
    - (2) 2013 RAA introduced contractual obligations to validate and verify data
    - (3) ICANN is in the midst of developing a WHOIS Accuracy Reporting System
    - (4) The WHOIS Data Reminder Policy (WDRP)
- *[Include summary of Analysis here, based on Section 3 of subgroup draft]*

Based on findings, the subgroup identified the following problems/issues
- *[Text below copied from Section 4.x headings – revise if desired]*
- Objective of reliable WHOIS data has not been achieved
- WHOIS inaccuracy is believed to be largely under-reported
- Incentives for registrants to provide accurate WHOIS data and for registrars to validate and verify WHOIS data are missing
- WHOIS accuracy of domain names using Privacy and Proxy Services is misty

To address the above problems/issues, the subgroup proposes the following recommendations (if any)
- *None proposed yet*

Lunch

Time: 12:30-13:30

What's Next?

13:30-15:30 – WHOIS1 Rec #4: Compliance

WHOIS1 Rec #4: Compliance

Agenda item #10

Time: 13:30-15:30

Presenter: Susan Kawaguchi

Subgroup Members: Susan, Erika, Carlton, Chris, Thomas

Subgroup Wiki: https://community.icann.org/x/55IEB

WHOIS1 Rec #4 – Compliance

WHOIS1 Recommendation

- *Rec 4 – ICANN should ensure that its compliance function is managed in accordance with best practice principles, including full transparency on resourcing and structure; provide annual reports; appoint a senior executive whose sole responsibility would be to oversee and manage ICANN's compliance function (reporting to Board Committee); provide all necessary resources to manage and scale compliance team's activities.*

And the Objective initially assigned to Subgroup 6, now to be addressed by this subgroup:

- *Consistent with ICANN's mission and Bylaws, Section 4.6(e)(iv), the Review Team will (a) evaluate the extent to which ICANN Org has implemented each prior Directory Service Review recommendation (noting differences if any between recommended and implemented steps), (b) assess to the degree practical the extent to which implementation of each recommendation was effective in addressing the issue identified by the prior RT or generated additional information useful to management and evolution of WHOIS (RDS), and (c) determine if any specific measurable steps should be recommended to enhance results achieved through the prior RT's recommendations. This includes developing a framework to measure and assess the effectiveness of recommendations, and applying that approach to all areas of WHOIS originally assessed by the prior RT (as applicable).*

WHOIS1 Rec #4 – Compliance

Questions the subgroup attempted to answer when assessing this objective:
a) Do the current reports provide the details described above? Are they transparent and complete?
b) Is the current appointment of a senior executive appropriate? Who does this person report to?
c) Does the compliance team have all necessary resources?

Research and background materials used to answer questions:
- WHOIS1 Final Report, Action Plan, & Implementation Reports
- Implementation Briefing Presentation, Answers to Questions, & Written Briefing
- All documents cited in briefing on Recommendation 4 Compliance
- Additional documents relevant to Topic 7 Compliance
- *[Expand cited doc list here if desired – abbreviated here for length]*
- Meeting with Compliance Management (1 February 2018) & Written Answers
- Meeting with ICANN Compliance (28 March 2018) & Written Answers

Describe your methodology to answer questions and analyze the materials
- The subgroup met twice with the Compliance Team (Jamie Hedlund, Maguy Serad, Roger Lim, Andrea), each time providing a list of questions drafted by the subgroup prior to the meeting. Written answers were also provided (see above).

WHOIS1 Rec #4 – Compliance

Based on the analysis, what are the main findings?

RT1-Recommended Principle	Question	Findings and Analysis
a. There should be full transparency regarding the resourcing and structure of its compliance function. To help achieve this ICANN should, at a minimum, publish annual reports that detail the following relevant to ICANN's compliance activities: staffing levels; budgeted funds; actual expenditure; performance against published targets; and organizational structure (including the full lines of reporting and accountability).	Do the current reports provide the details described above? Are they transparent and complete?	The Compliance team has made significant progress in reporting metrics and data in their annual report. They also allocate time during ICANN meetings to meet with the community and provide additional details on their work. The reports are very helpful and quite an improvement over reporting in 2012. In reading the reports it is hard to make an assessment of the issues that are still problematic. 66% of reports to the compliance team are WHOIS inaccuracy reports which comprises the largest areas of the team workload. What is not evident in the data reported is what are the problem areas, what could be improved to assist the team with its work. ICANN Contractual Compliance has an ongoing continuous improvement cycle based on survey feedback, working group and review teams, lessons learned and internal reviews which also drive change. We appreciate that the Compliance team is working hard to receive input from the community ?????? add questions from the second report from Compliance.
b. This senior executive should report directly and solely to a sub-committee of the ICANN Board. This sub-committee should include Board members with a range of relevant skills, and should include the CEO.	Is the current appointment of a senior executive appropriate? Who does this person report to?	The Compliance team provided an organizational chart for the reporting structure of the team. Although, the SVP Contractual Compliance & Consumer Safeguards reports directly to the CEO the recommendation explicitly states "report directly and solely to a Board sub-committee." There is no indication that the recommended reporting structure was implemented. The Board action on this recommendation indicates they thought the implemented reporting structure to be adequate. The subgroup will need to ask additional questions concerning the reporting structure. At this point in time we do not believe the recommendation was fully implemented. The intention of the first review team was to ensure this role had the independence needed to perform the compliance function without restriction from the rest of the organization.
c. ICANN should provide all necessary resources to ensure that the compliance team has the processes and technological tools it needs to efficiently and pro-actively manage and scale its compliance activities. The Review Team notes that this will be particularly important in light of the new gTLD program, and all relevant compliance processes and tools should be reviewed and improved, and new tools developed where necessary, in advance of any new gTLDs becoming operational.	Does the compliance team have all necessary resources?	It appears that the Compliance team has all the necessary resources to manage compliance activities. They have improved technology over the years and implemented new systems. ICANN organization has provided the budget for the compliance team to grow. They currently have 25? Employees compared to 6 during the first review. They have implemented a bulk WHOIS inaccuracy reporting tool and improved the single input WHOIS inaccuracy tool since the first review team report.

WHOIS1 Rec #4 – Compliance

Based on findings, the subgroup identified the following problems/issues

RT1-Recommended Principle	Question	Problem/Issue
a. There should be full transparency…	Do the current reports provide the details described above? Are they transparent and complete?	We appreciate that the Compliance team is working hard to receive input from the community but WHOIS inaccuracy report data provided by the compliance team is not clear on several points. We have heard that there is inconsistency in experience and results received from users submitting inaccuracy reports. From the data we have reviewed it is not easy to assess if there is truly a problem or a perception of a problem. More in depth review should be performed of the responses they provided in the second set of questions. **[Issue Detail Omitted for summary - Expand here if desired]**
b. This senior executive should report directly and solely to a sub-committee of the ICANN Board….	Is the current appointment of a senior executive appropriate? Who does this person report to?	Additional review is needed to determine whether or not it is feasible to adhere to the intentions of the RT1 recommendation. • Why did the Board make the decision to not implement the recommendation fully? • What challenges would ICANN org face in requiring an employee of the org to report to the Board. • Are there examples of this reporting structure we could review in other businesses?
c. ICANN should provide all necessary resources…	Does the compliance team have all necessary resources?	We may want to take a closer look at how long it takes the compliance team to implement new technology.

WHOIS1 Rec #4 – Compliance

To address the above problems/issues, the subgroup proposes the following recommendations (if any)
[Text below copied from Section 5, Recommendations – expand if desired]

Recommendation #1:
All new policies implemented should be required to be measured, audited and tracked by the compliance team. Consistent Labelling and Display policy requires a registrar abuse contact email address and contact phone. This would be displayed in the WHOIS record. Possible to include this in the audit of a registrar?

Recommendation#2: (May belong in the Data Accuracy subgroup)
Require all domain name registrations adhere to the WHOIS requirements in the 2013 Registrar Accreditation Agreement.

Break

Time: 15:30-15:45

What's Next?

15:45-16:15 – WHOIS1 Rec #3: Outreach
16:15-17:15 – Parking lot for items to be further discussed
17:15:17:30 – Review day 2 agenda and provide closing remarks

WHOIS1 Rec #3: Outreach

Agenda item #11

Time: 15:45-16:15

Presenter: Alan Greenberg

Subgroup Members: Alan, Carlton, Erika

Subgroup Wiki: https://community.icann.org/x/5JIEB

WHOIS1 Rec #3 – Outreach

WHOIS1 Recommendation

- *Rec 3 – ICANN should ensure that WHOIS policy issues are accompanied by cross-community outreach, including outreach to the communities outside of ICANN with a specific interest in the issues, and an ongoing program for consumer awareness.*

Questions the subgroup attempted to answer when assessing this objective:

1. Review the multiple "outreach" resources with a specific focus on identifying:
   a) Areas where there we inconsistencies, errors and out of date info
   b) Gaps in the documentation
2. Review the various outreach events and activities

Research and background materials used to answer questions:

- WHOIS1 Final Report, Action Plan, & Implementation Reports
- Implementation Briefing Presentation, Answers to Questions, & Written Briefing
- Documents cited in briefing on Recommendation 3, including
  - WHOIS Information Portal and Consolidated WHOIS Lookup Tool
  - Registrant's Benefits and Responsibilities
  - 2013 RAA - see Section 9
  - Information for Registrars and Registrants
  - Registrant Educational Series
- SME Answer to subgroup's question on outreach activities

WHOIS1 Rec #3 – Outreach

Describe your methodology to answer questions and analyze the materials

- To conduct its research, all members of this subgroup reviewed background materials and formulated a follow-up question
- *[Expand on Methodology here, if desired]*

Based on the analysis, what are the main findings?

- *[Text below copied from Section 3 – expand to summarize findings]*
- In summary, the Recommendation was carried out, but it was not well integrated with other WHOIS-related information.
- Significant outreach to communities within ICANN has been carried out.
- *[Add analysis of outreach to communities outside of ICANN here.]*

WHOIS1 Rec #3 – Outreach

Based on findings, the subgroup identified the following problems/issues

- There is a wide variety of information related to WHOIS, some is well integrated and some very disjoint. Of necessity this information is somewhat interwoven with other information related to 2nd level gTLD domain names.

- The information and documents cover several "generations" and do not integrate well.

- Moreover a typical user or registrant will not readily be able to identify where they need to look for information, and identifying one of the multiple locations will not lead them to the others.

- The problem is exacerbated by the introduction of the terms RDS (and at times RDDS) to replace WHOIS

To address the above problems/issues, the subgroup proposes the following recommendations (if any)

- *None proposed yet*

Parking Lot (TBD)

Agenda item #12

Time: 16:15-17:15

Presenters: All

Review Day 2 Agenda & Closing Remarks

Agenda item #13

Time: 17:15-17:30

Presenters: Review Team Leadership

Day 2 Agenda

08:30-09:00 - Breakfast

09:00-09:15 – Day 1 debrief & day 2 objectives

09:15-09:45 – WHOIS1 Recs #12-14: Internationalized Domain Names

09:45-10:15 – WHOIS1 Rec #11: Common Interface

10:15-10:30 – Break

10:30-12:30 – WHOIS1 Rec #10: Privacy/Proxy Services

12:30-13:30 – Lunch

13:30-14:00 – Update on ongoing community initiatives

14:00-15:15 – WHOIS1 implementation assessment

15:15-15:30 – Break

15:30-16:15 – WHOIS1 implementation assessment

16:15-17:15 – Subgroup 4 – Consumer Trust

17:15-17:30 – A.O.B and closing remarks

RDS-WHOIS2-RT Brussels Face-to-Face Meeting

DAY 2 – 17 April 2018

ICANN

Day 1 Debrief & Day 2 Objectives

Agenda Item #1

Time: 09:00-09:15

Presenters: Review Team Leadership

Day 2 Morning Program

08:30-09:00 – Breakfast

09:00-09:15 – Day 1 debrief & day 2 objectives
09:15-09:45 – WHOIS1 Rec #12-14: Internationalized Domain Names
09:45-10:15 – WHOIS1 Rec #11: Common Interface

10:15-10:30 – Break

10:30-12:30 – WHOIS1 Rec #10: Privacy/Proxy Services

12:30-13:30 – Lunch

Day 2 Afternoon Program

13:30-14:00 – Update on ongoing community initiatives
14:00-15:15 – WHOIS1 implementation assessment

15:15-15:30 – Break

15:30-16:15 – WHOIS1 implementation assessment
16:15-17:15 – Subgroup 4 – Consumer Trust
17:15-17:30 – Review day 3 agenda and closing remarks

Day 2 Objectives

- Present and discuss remaining Subgroup outputs for Objective #1

- Refer to Day 1 – Specific Objectives, including points to consider:
  - Do you have any questions or feedback on each subgroup's output?
  - Are there any overlaps between subgroups that need to be resolved?
  - Did the subgroup fully-address at least Objective #1 items a) and b)?

- Assess the overall implementation of WHOIS1 Recommendations to:
  a) Evaluate overall the extent to which ICANN Org has implemented WHOIS1 recommendations
  b) Assess to the degree practical the extent to which implementation was effective in
    - Addressing the totality of the issues identified by WHOIS1, and
    - Generating information useful to management and evolution of WHOIS
  c) Determine if any further specific measurable steps should be recommended to enhance results achieved through WHOIS1 recommendations

- Begin presenting and discussing Subgroup outputs for Objectives #2-5
  - Starting with Subgroup 4, Consumer Trust

WHOIS1 Recs #12-14: Internationalized Domain Names

Agenda Item #2

Time: 09:15-09:45

Presenter: Dmitry Belyavsky

Subgroup Members: Dmitry, Alan, Lili

Subgroup Wiki: https://community.icann.org/x/85IEB

WHOIS1 Recs #12-14 – IDNs

WHOIS1 Recommendations

- *Rec 12 - The final data model, including (any) requirements for the translation or transliteration of the registration data, should be incorporated in the relevant Registrar and Registry agreements within 6 months of adoption of the working group's recommendations by the ICANN Board. If these recommendations are not finalized in time for the next revision of such agreements, explicit placeholders for this purpose should be put in place in the agreements for the new gTLD program at this time, and in the existing agreements when they come up for renewal.*

- *Rec 13 - The final data model, including (any) requirements for the translation or transliteration of the registration data, should be incorporated in the relevant Registrar and Registry agreements within 6 months of adoption of the working group's recommendations by the ICANN Board. If these recommendations are not finalized in time for the next revision of such agreements, explicit placeholders for this purpose should be put in place in the agreements for the new gTLD program at this time, and in the existing agreements when they come up for renewal.*

- *Rec 14 - Metrics should be developed to maintain and measure the accuracy of the internationalized registration data and corresponding data in ASCII, with clearly defined compliance methods and targets.*

WHOIS1 Recs #12-14 – IDNs

Questions the subgroup attempted to answer when assessing this objective:
1. *[Text below copied from First Pass Planning Doc – revise if desired]*
2. Verify that reports address all the aspects raised by the WHOIS1 RT and check their status of implementation.
3. As the translation/transliteration questions are not fully-addressed, they need special attention. We cannot implement the metrics necessary for addressing #14 until the implementation is completed.

Research and background materials used to answer questions:
- WHOIS1 Final Report, Action Plan, & Implementation Reports
- Implementation Briefing Presentation, Answers to Questions, & Written Briefing
- Translation and Transliteration PDP's Final Issue Report, March 2013
- Translation and Transliteration PDP web page
- Translation and Transliteration PDP Working Group Final Report, Jun 2015
- IRD Expert Working Group Final Report, September 2015
- Translation and Transliteration IRT wiki
- Translation and Transliteration Implementation Project Status
- ICANN's RDAP Webpage

WHOIS1 Recs #12-14 – IDNs

Describe your methodology to answer questions and analyze the materials
- The subgroup studied the provided materials and the decisions reached by ICANN after the WHOIS1 Report was published.
- The subgroup checked whether the measures taken by ICANN covers the recommendations made by the RT and whether it is necessary to provide any additional measures to fully cover the recommendations.

Based on the analysis, what are the main findings?
- *[Include summary of Findings here – conclusions below are from Section 4]*
- The subgroup treats Recommendations #12, 13, & 14 as fulfilled.
- The implementation of Recommendation 13 depends on RDAP progress.
- The metrics and measures developed by ARS are suitable when the internationalized registration data become available for studying.

Based on findings, the subgroup identified the following problems/issues
- *None Identified yet*

To address the above problems/issues, the subgroup proposes the following recommendations (if any)
- *None proposed yet*

WHOIS1 Rec #11: Common Interface

Agenda Item #3

Time: 09:45-10:15

Presenter: Susan Kawaguchi

Subgroup Members: Susan, Volker, Alan

Subgroup Wiki: https://community.icann.org/x/8JIEB

WHOIS1 Rec #11 – Common Interface

WHOIS1 Recommendation

* *Rec 11 – It is recommended that the Internic Service is overhauled to provide enhanced usability for consumers, including the display of full registrant data for all gTLD domain names (whether those gTLDs operate thin or thick WHOIS services); operational improvements should include enhanced promotion of the service to increase user awareness.*

Questions the subgroup attempted to answer when assessing this objective:

1. Has the creation and deployment of the WHOIS microsite at the direction of the board met this recommendation, considering the old Internic service still exists unchanged?
2. Does the WHOIS query service provided through the microsite (the common interface) provide clear and reliable access to full registrant data for all gTLD domain names?
3. What promotional efforts has ICANN undertaken to increase user awareness of the common interface?
4. Does the common interface provide clear instructions on how to notify ICANN, the sponsoring registrar and/or the registrant regarding data accuracy issues?

WHOIS1 Rec #11 – Common Interface

Research and background materials used to answer questions:
- WHOIS1 Final Report, Action Plan, & Implementation Reports
- Implementation Briefing Presentation, Answers to Questions, & Written Briefing
- Documents cited in briefing on Recommendation 11, including
    - WHOIS Informational Microsite
    - WHOIS Consolidated WHOIS Lookup Tool
    - https://www.internic.net/
- Written Briefing on query failures
- Written Answers to subgroup's questions (see below)

Describe your methodology to answer questions and analyze the materials
- *[Expand on Methodology here, if desired]*
- The subgroup reviewed backgroud materials and requested additional materials:
    - Available statistics on: use of the common interface, uptime, requests for help using the tool and what usage data is tracked by ICANN;
    - The Team/Department that implemented and maintains the common interface;
    - Any challenges with implementation and maintenance of the interface.

WHOIS1 Rec #11 – Common Interface

Based on the analysis, what are the main findings?

- *[Include summary of Findings here – none identified yet in subgroup draft]*

Based on findings, the subgroup identified the following problems/issues

- *[Include Problem/Issue here – none identified yet in subgroup draft]*

To address the above problems/issues, the subgroup proposes the following recommendations (if any)

- *[Include draft Recommendation(s) here if applicable/available or state N/A]*

Break

Time: 10:15-10:30

What's Next?

10:30-12:30 – WHOIS1 Rec #10: Privacy/Proxy Services

WHOIS1 Rec #10: Privacy/Proxy Services

Agenda item #4

Time: 10:30-12:30

Presenter: Susan Kawaguchi

Subgroup Members: Susan, Volker, Cathrin, Stephanie

Subgroup Wiki: https://community.icann.org/x/7ZIEB

WHOIS1 Rec #10 – Privacy/Proxy Services

WHOIS1 Recommendation

- *Rec 10 – The Review Team recommends that ICANN should initiate processes to regulate and oversee privacy and proxy service providers.*

- *ICANN should develop these processes in consultation with all interested stakeholders.*

- *This work should take note of the studies of existing practices used by proxy/privacy service providers now taking place within the GNSO.*

- *The Review Team considers that one possible approach to achieving this would be to establish, through the appropriate means, an accreditation system for all proxy/privacy service providers. As part of this process, ICANN should consider the merits (if any) of establishing or maintaining a distinction between privacy and proxy services.*

- *The goal of this process should be to provide clear, consistent and enforceable requirements for the operation of these services consistent with national laws, and to strike an appropriate balance between stakeholders with competing but legitimate interests. At a minimum, this would include privacy, data protection, law enforcement, the industry around law enforcement and the human rights community.*

- *ICANN could, for example, use a mix of incentives and graduated sanctions to encourage proxy/privacy service providers to become accredited, and to ensure that registrars do not knowingly accept registrations from unaccredited providers.*

- *ICANN could develop a graduated and enforceable series of penalties for proxy/privacy service providers who violate the requirements, with a clear path to de-accreditation for repeat, serial or otherwise serious breaches.*

WHOIS1 Rec #10 – Privacy/Proxy Services

Questions the subgroup attempted to answer when assessing this objective:

1. Noting that:

   a) The 2013 RAA introduced a specification on privacy and proxy registrations requiring registrars to comply with certain requirements regarding such registrations through affiliated Privacy/Proxy Service Providers as a first step towards implementing this recommendation; and

   b) The Privacy/Proxy Services Accreditation Issues (PPSAI) Implementation Review Team (IRT) is currently working on an implementation of this recommendation that will also include unaffiliated providers of such services.

2. The subgroup agreed that this review should

   a) Encompass the work completed both through the RAA specification and the PPSAI PDP, and

   b) Whether the agreed upon details adhere to WHOIS1 Recommendation #10.

WHOIS1 Rec #10 – Privacy/Proxy Services

Research and background materials used to answer questions:
- WHOIS1 Final Report, Action Plan, & Implementation Reports
- Implementation Briefing Presentation, Answers to Questions, & Written Briefing
- Documents cited in briefing on Recommendation 10, including
    - 2013 RAA, including RAA WHOIS requirements for Registrants
    - Privacy & Proxy Services Accreditation Issues (PPSAI) PDP & Final Report
    - GNSO approval of PDP Final Report, GAC Advice-Helsinki Communique, & Board approval of Final Report Recommendations
    - Implementation Plan developed & Current PPAA draft (20 March)
- Additional materials and briefings from the ICANN Org, including
    - Written answers from Registrar Services staff leading PP IRT (20 March)
    - Metrics for P/P Spec in the 2013 RAA
    - Responses from ICANN Compliance and Global Domains Division to Data Accuracy Subgroup Questions (as they relate to P/P Services)

Describe your methodology to answer questions and analyze the materials
- WHOIS1 Recommendation 10 advises that consideration be given to several specific objectives. The subgroup developed initial findings for each objective.

WHOIS1 Rec #10 – Privacy/Proxy Services

Based on the analysis, what are the main findings?

Recommendation 10 Objective	Subgroup's Initial Findings	
1. Clearly labeling WHOIS entries to indicate that registrations have been made by a privacy or proxy service	⊙	Included in PPSAI working group report
1. Providing full WHOIS contact details for the privacy/proxy service provider, which are contactable and responsive	⊙	Included in the PPSAI working group report. While details of the standard report process are still being debated, but there is consensus that providers must provide full data and be contactable and responsive.
1. Adopting agreed standardized relay and reveal processes and timeframes; (these should be clearly published, and proactively advised to potential users of these services so they can make informed choices based on their individual circumstances)	⊙	Law enforcement relay and reveal processes are still being debated and how this would be implemented in a way that would not be burdensome for each side.
	⊙	Final details of such rocesses are currently being debated, however the recommendation objective has already been met with the basis consensus model.
	⊙	Partially defined under 2.4.5 of the RAA spec.
1. Registrars should disclose their relationship with any proxy/privacy service provider;	⊙	Included in PPSAI working group report
	⊙	Partially defined under 2.3 of the RAA spec
1. Maintaining dedicated abuse points of contact for each provider	⊙	Partially defined under 2.4.1 and 2.4.2 of the RAA spec
	⊙	Already agreed by Implementation Review Team.
1. Conducting periodic due diligence checks on customer contact information	⊙	Review has shown no such checks are currently envisioned. Implementing such reviews may violatethe reliance of the underlying registrants on the privacy of their data.
1. Maintaining the privacy and integrity of registrations in the event that major problems arise with a privacy/proxy provider	⊙	Included in PPSAI working group report by mandating data escrow.
	⊙	Partially defined under 2.5 of the RAA spec.
1. Providing clear and unambiguous guidance on the rights and responsibilities of registered name holders, and how those should be managed in the privacy/proxy environment.	⊙	Partially defined under 2.4.4, 2.4.5 and 2.4.6 of the RAA spec.
	⊙	How effective are these rights and responsibility regarding the effectiveness of proxy registrations and the protection of rights of others.

WHOIS1 Rec #10 – Privacy/Proxy Services

Based on findings, the subgroup identified the following problems/issues

- *[Text below copied from Section 4 – revise if desired]*

- Issue #1: Current funding proposals for accreditation program create concerns of ICANN failing the goal of onboarding all providers of such services due to inflation of costs. ICANN Org staff seems to be unable to justify proposed accreditation fees, which may endanger the entire program.

- Issue #2: Impact of GDPR data redaction requirements on privacy services are yet unknown, but significant impact is expected as personal data becomes hidden by default without use of privacy services.

To address the above problems/issues, the subgroup proposes the following recommendations (if any)

- *None proposed yet*

Lunch

Time: 12:30-13:30

What's Next?

13:30-14:00 – Update on ongoing community initiatives
14:00-15:15 – WHOIS1 implementation assessment

Update on Ongoing Community Initiatives

Agenda Item #5

Time: 13:30-14:00

Presenters: Review Team Members & ICANN Org

Update on Ongoing Community Initiatives

Other Activities Identified in the ToR	Covered in Subgroup Briefing	For On-Going Status Updates , see…
GNSO PDP on Next-Generation Registration Directory Services	Subgroup 1 Rec 1 (Strategic Priority) & Subgroup 2 (Anything New) Inventory	http://tinyurl.com/ng-rds, in particular https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/gnso-rds-pdp-wg/2018-April/005799.html
Registration Data Access Protocol (RDAP) Implementation	Subgroup 1 Rec 12-14 (IDN)	https://www.icann.org/rdap, in particular https://community.icann.org/display/RP/RDAP+Pilot
Cross-Field Address Validation	Subgroup 1 Rec 5-9 (Accuracy)	https://www.icann.org/news/announcement-3-2017-10-26-en
Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information Implementation	Subgroup 1 Rec 12-14 (IDN)	https://community.icann.org/display/afav
Privacy/Proxy Services Accreditation Implementation	Subgroup 1 Rec 10 (PP)	https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/ppsai-2016-08-18-en
ICANN Procedures for Handling WHOIS Conflicts with Privacy Laws	Subgroup 2 (Anything New) Inventory	https://community.icann.org/display/gnsocouncilmeetings/Motions+30+January+2018, see motion for Adoption of Charter for WHOIS Procedure IAG
Implementation of THICK WHOIS	Subgroup 2 (Anything New) Inventory	https://community.icann.org/display/TWCPI/Thick+Whois+Policy+Implementation
ICANN organization's work with the community on GDPR Compliance with existing agreements with registries and registrars		https://www.icann.org/dataprotectionprivacy, in particular https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/data-protection-announcements-2017-12-08-en

WHOIS1 Implementation Assessment

Agenda item #6

Time: 14:00-15:15

Presenters: All

WHOIS1 Implementation Assessment

Assess the overall implementation of WHOIS1 Recommendations to:

a) Evaluate overall the extent to which ICANN Org has implemented WHOIS1 recommendations

b) Assess to the degree practical the extent to which implementation was effective in

    Addressing the totality of the issues identified by WHOIS1, and

    Generating information useful to management and evolution of WHOIS

c) Determine if any further specific measurable steps should be recommended to enhance results achieved through WHOIS1 recommendations

Break

Time: 15:15-15:30

What's Next?

15:30-16:15 – WHOIS1 implementation assessment
16:15-17:15 – Subgroup 4 – Consumer Trust
17:15-17:30 – Review day 3 agenda and closing remarks

WHOIS1 Implementation Assessment

Agenda item #7

Time: 15:30-16:15

Presenters: All

WHOIS1 Implementation Assessment

Assess the overall implementation of WHOIS1 Recommendations to:

a) Evaluate overall the extent to which ICANN Org has implemented WHOIS1 recommendations

b) Assess to the degree practical the extent to which implementation was effective in

    Addressing the totality of the issues identified by WHOIS1, and

    Generating information useful to management and evolution of WHOIS

c) Determine if any further specific measurable steps should be recommended to enhance results achieved through WHOIS1 recommendations

Subgroup 4 – Consumer Trust

Agenda item #8

Time: 16:15-17:15

Presenter: Erika Mann

Subgroup Members: Erika, Carlton, Dmitry, Stephanie, Susan

Subgroup Wiki: https://community.icann.org/x/AZpEB

Subgroup 4 – Consumer Trust

Objective

Consistent with ICANN's mission and Bylaws, Section 4.6(e)(ii), the review team will assess the extent to which the implementation of today's WHOIS (the current gTLD RDS) promotes consumer trust in gTLD domain names by (a) agreeing upon a working definition of "consumer" and "consumer trust" used in this review, (b) identifying the approach used to determine the extent to which consumer trust needs are met, (c) identifying high-priority gaps (if any) in meeting those needs, and (d) recommending specific measureable steps (if any) the team believes are important to fill gaps.

Questions the subgroup attempted to answer when assessing this objective:

1. Is the term 'trustworthiness' the best and only option in determining consumer trust in the gTLD environment as mentioned in the relevant WHOIS report(s)?

2. Is the increase in alternative identities (for example FB) an indication that the current use of gTLDs is not sufficiently advocating consumer trust?

3. A key high priority gap in understanding the consumer trust environment is apparently the lack of sufficient data, as mentioned in the various WHOIS report(s). Are there new developments that need to be considered?

4. Is the decline in awareness for some of the legacy gTLDs (.info, .org) an indication for changing pattern in consumer trust?

5. Security and transparency play a major role in defining a trustful Internet environment. Did the current gTLD and WHOIS system achieve this?

6. Are regulations like the European GDRP increasing consumer trust if major information is missing in the publicly available WHOIS?

Subgroup 4 – Consumer Trust

Research and background materials used to answer questions:
- WHOIS Review Team (WHOIS1) Final Report (2012), Appendix F: Consumer Study
- Competition, Consumer Trust & Consumer Choice Review Team Draft Report
- Phase Two Global Registrant Survey, and announcement
- ICANN Bylaws

- The subgroup also plans to ask ICANN's Global Domain Division to provide insight into how "consumer trust" is reflected in their approach to WHOIS policy implementation and enforcement

Describe your methodology to answer questions and analyze the materials
- Agreed to a working definition of "consumer" to include any Internet user, of which registrants are a small subset.
- Agreed to examine "trustworthiness" by determining the extent to which consumer trust needs are met.
- Plan to do a gap analysis by examining the findings and analysis of other subgroups assessing implementation of the WHOIS1 recommendations

Subgroup 4 – Consumer Trust

Based on the analysis, what are the main findings?
- *[Text below copied from Section 4 – revise if desired]*
- After reviewing available documents, the subgroup finds that the only document which specifically explores the relationship between WHOIS and "Consumer Trust" is the WHOIS1 Final Report
- The topic of Consumer Trust is mentioned in various key context environments. Excerpts have been provided for subgroup analysis.
- Other documents identified as significant in judging the relevance of consumer trust in the broader context of ICANN's consumer and public interest value system: Phase 2 Global Consumer Research Survey & ICANN Bylaws

Based on findings, the subgroup identified the following problems/issues
- Gap analysis to identify areas of WHOIS which may need to be further enhanced to promote consumer trust
- Gap analysis to be repeated after WHOIS evolves to comply with GDPR

To address the above problems/issues, the subgroup proposes the following recommendations (if any)
- *None proposed yet*

Review Day 3 Agenda & Closing Remarks

Agenda item #9

Time: 17:15-17:30

Presenters: All

Day 3 Agenda

08:30-09:00 - Breakfast

09:00-09:15 – Day 2 debrief & day 3 objectives

09:15-10:15 – Subgroup 3 – Law Enforcement Needs

10:15-10:30 – Break

10:30-11:30 – Subgroup 2 – Anything New

11:30-12:00 – Subgroup 5 – Safeguarding Registrant Data

12:00-12:30 – Parking lot for further items to be discussed

12:30-13:30 – Lunch

13:30-15:15 – Subgroups 2-5

15:15-15:30 – Break

15:30-16:10 – Parking lot for further items to be discussed

16:10-16:20 – Work plan review

16:20-17:20 – Wrap-up

17:20-17:30 – A.O.B. & closing remarks

RDS-WHOIS2-RT
Brussels Face-to-Face Meeting

DAY 3 – 18 April 2018

ICANN

Day 2 Debrief & Day 3 Objectives

Agenda item #1

Time: 09:00-09:15

Presenters: Review Team Leadership

Day 3 Morning Program

08:30-09:00 - Breakfast

09:00-09:15 – Day 2 debrief & day 3 objectives
09:15-10:15 – Subgroup 3 – Law Enforcement Needs

10:15-10:30 – Break

10:30-11:30 – Subgroup 2 – Anything New
11:30-12:00 – Subgroup 5 – Safeguarding Registrant Data
12:00-12:30 – Parking lot for further items to be discussed

12:30-13:30 – Lunch

Day 3 Afternoon Program

13:15-15:15 – Subgroups 2-5

15:15-15:30 – Break

15:30-16:10 – Parking lot for further items to be discussed
16:10-16:20 – Work plan review
16:20-17:20 – Wrap-up
17:20-17:30 – A.O.B. & closing remarks

Day 3 Objectives

- Present and discuss Subgroup outputs for remaining Review Objectives

- Refer to Day 1 – Specific Objectives, including points to consider:
  - Do you have any questions or feedback on each subgroup's output?
  - Are there any overlaps between subgroups that need to be resolved?
  - Did the subgroup fully-address each Review Objective?

- Assess findings for Review Objectives #2-5 overall
  - Determine if any further specific measurable steps should be recommended

- Consider the review team's work plan in light of progress made and identify next steps to complete and consolidate subgroup reports

Subgroup 3 – Law Enforcement Needs

Agenda item #2

Time: 09:15-10:15

Presenter: Cathrin Bauer-Bulst

Subgroup Members: Cathrin, Thomas, Chris

Subgroup Wiki: https://community.icann.org/x/-pIEB

Subgroup 3 – Law Enforcement Needs

Objective

Consistent with ICANN's mission and Bylaws, Section 4.6(e)(ii), the review team will assess the extent to which the implementation of today's WHOIS (the current gTLD RDS) meets legitimate needs of law enforcement for swiftly accessible, accurate and complete data by (a) establishing a working definition of "law enforcement" used in this review, (b) identifying an approach used to determine the extent to which these law enforcement needs are met by today's WHOIS policies and procedures, (c) identifying high-priority gaps (if any) in meeting those needs, and (d) recommending specific measureable steps (if any) the team believes are important to fill gaps. Note that determining which law enforcement requests are in fact valid will not be addressed by this review.

Questions the subgroup attempted to answer when assessing this objective:
1. Take into account current and emerging technology, to include the following
2. Cybercrime investigations and enforcement;
3. Data protection laws and enforcement;
4. What's required of the Registrar to retain data under the RAA;
5. A clear direction from Law Enforcement of what is needed; and
6. A better understanding of procedures and requirements by both Law Enforcement and the Registrars.

Subgroup 3 – Law Enforcement Needs

Research and background materials used to answer questions:

- WHOIS Review Team (WHOIS1) Final Report (2012), Chapter 6 and Appendix E: The WHOIS Review team's Law Enforcement Survey
- WHOIS Misuse Study Final Report, especially Section 4. Law Enforcement & Researchers survey
- ICANN61 GAC PSWG - OCTO Update

Describe your methodology to answer questions and analyze the materials

- Informal outreach to law enforcement contacts to solicit input on needs, including for example GAC PSWG, APWG, and SSAC members
- Review prior RT Law Enforcement Survey
- Review the update given by the ICANN Office of CTO to the GAC PSWG
- See also Findings and Analysis for "next steps"

Subgroup 3 – Law Enforcement Needs

Based on the analysis, what are the main findings?
- The subgroup has not gathered findings, but intends to take this approach:
  - Establish working definition of "law enforcement" to be used in this review
  - Each subgroup member will conduct informal outreach to law enforcement contacts
  - Based on initial findings, subgroup may conduct broader formal outreach
  - Formalized outreach (if any) would be structured in a transparent and accessible way (e.g., survey)
- After conducting this research, all subgroup members will review outreach results to determine the extent to which Law Enforcement needs are met by today's WHOIS policies and procedures and high-priority gaps (if any).
- **Note:** The timing and approach used for outreach may be impacted by near-term changes to WHOIS resulting from GDPR compliance efforts.

Based on findings, the subgroup identified the following problems/issues
- *None identified yet*

To address the above problems/issues, the subgroup proposes the following recommendations (if any)
- *None proposed yet*

Break

Time: 10:15-10:30

What's Next?

10:30-11:30 – Subgroup 2 – Anything New
11:30-12:00 – Subgroup 5 – Safeguarding Registrant Data
12:00-12:30 – Parking lot for further items to be discussed

Subgroup 2 – Anything New

Agenda item #3

Time: 10:30-11:30

Presenter: Stephanie Perrin

Subgroup Members: Stephanie, Alan, Susan

Subgroup Wiki: https://community.icann.org/x/_5IEB

Subgroup 2 – Anything New

Objective

Consistent with ICANN's mission and Bylaws, Section 4.6(e)(ii), the review team will assess the effectiveness of today's WHOIS (the now current gTLD RDS, including cumulative changes made to the then-current RDS which was assessed by the prior RT) by (a) inventorying changes made to WHOIS policies and procedures since the prior RT completed its work, (b) using that inventory to identify significant new areas of today's WHOIS (if any) which the team believes should be reviewed, and (c) determining if any specific measurable steps should be recommended to enhance effectiveness in those new areas.

Questions the subgroup attempted to answer when assessing this objective:
1. For significant new areas of WHOIS (RDS) only, answer these questions:
   a) Have these been implemented properly? What challenges have staff faced in the implementation?
   b) Are Registrars/Registries implementing these in a timely manner?
   c) Are any measurable steps that should be taken to make these new policies and procedures more effective?

Research and background materials used to answer questions:
- ICANN web page on WHOIS Policies (see Findings for list)
- Inventory of New and Changes Made to WHOIS Policies and Procedures Since the First WHOIS Review Team Completed Its Work in 2012

Subgroup 2 – Anything New

Describe your methodology to answer questions and analyze the materials
- To conducts its research, all members of this subgroup reviewed & prioritized the inventoried WHOIS policy and procedure materials
- *[Expand on Methodology here]*

Based on the analysis, what are the main findings?
- *[Include summary of Findings here, listing policies and procedures that were considered and (for each) the subgroup's analysis of need for review]*

Based on findings, the subgroup identified the following problems/issues
- *[Include Problem/Issue here or state None Identified]*

To address the above problems/issues, the subgroup proposes the following recommendations (if any)
- *None proposed yet*

Subgroup 5 – Safeguarding Registrant Data

Agenda item #4

Time: 11:30-12:00

Presenter: Alan Greenberg

Subgroup Members: Alan, Dmitry, Stephanie, Volker

Subgroup Wiki: https://community.icann.org/x/BJpEB

Subgroup 5 – Safeguarding Registrant Data

Objective

Consistent with ICANN's mission and Bylaws, Section 4.6(e)(ii), the review team will assess the extent to which the implementation of today's WHOIS (the current gTLD RDS) safeguards registrant data by (a) identifying the lifecycle of registrant data, (b) determining if/how data is safeguarded in each phase of that lifecycle, (c) identifying high-priority gaps (if any) in safeguarding registrant data, and (d) recommending specific measureable steps (if any) the team believes are important to fill gaps.

Questions the subgroup attempted to answer when assessing this objective:

1. Items a), c) and d) are being covered in both Next Generation RDS PDP and ICANN Org GDPR compliance efforts
2. For Item b), currently all WHOIS data is made available publicly. Although this will surely change as a result of ongoing GDPR compliance efforts, currently there is no protection for that data.
3. Protection against WHOIS (and other) data loss due to Registrar/Registry failure or de-accreditation is required today in the form of Escrow.
4. Aubgroup agreed to consider escrow procedures and associated data safeguards used by those who relay and store escrowed data (i.e., Escrow Providers, Registrars and Registries).

Subgroup 5 – Safeguarding Registrant Data

Research and background materials used to answer questions:
- SAC051, Report on Domain Name WHOIS Terminology (2011)
- SAC054, Report on Domain Name Registration Data Model (June 2012)
- RDS/WHOIS Contractual Requirements - Sections on Data Safeguards:
    - 2013 RAA, Section 3.6 - Data Retention Specification
    - 2014 New gTLD Registry Agreement, Spec 2 - Data Escrow Requirements
- Questions for ICANN GDD SME on Escrow rules and procedures
- Questions for Registrars & Registries about data change/loss prevention

Describe your methodology to answer questions and analyze the materials
- *[Include Methodology here]*

Subgroup 5 – Safeguarding Registrant Data

Based on the analysis, what are the main findings?

- *[Include summary of Findings here]*

Based on findings, the subgroup identified the following problems/issues

- *[Include Problem/Issue here or state None Identified]*

To address the above problems/issues, the subgroup proposes the following recommendations (if any)

- *[Include draft Recommendation(s) here if applicable/available or state N/A]*

Parking Lot (TBD)

Agenda item #5

Time: 12:00-12:30

Presenters: All

Lunch

Time: 12:30-13:30

What's Next?

13:30-15:15 – Subgroups 2-5

Subgroup 2-5

Agenda item #5

Time: 13:30-15:15

Presenters: All

Subgroups 2-5

Refer to Day 1 – Specific Objectives, including points to consider:

- Do you have any questions or feedback on each subgroup's output?
- Are there any overlaps between subgroups that need to be resolved?
- Did the subgroup fully-address each Review Objective?

Assess findings for Review Objectives #2-5 overall:

- Determine if any further specific measurable steps should be recommended

Break

Time: 15:15-15:30

What's Next?

15:30-16:10 – Parking lot for items to be further discussed
16:10-16:20 – Work plan review
16:20-17:20 – Wrap-up
17:20-17:30 – A.O.B. & closing remarks

Parking Lot (TBD)

Agenda item #7

Time: 15:30-16:10

Presenters: All

Work Plan Review

Agenda Item #8

Time: 16:10-16:20

Presenters: ICANN org

Work Plan Review

DATE	DELIVERABLE
By 24 May	Subgroups to incorporate edits identified in Brussels
By 28 June ICANN62	• Seek community input on draft findings/recommendations • Approve draft findings and recommendations
By 31July	Approve draft report for public comment
7 August – 5 October	Public comment on Draft Report
By 30 November	Update draft report based on public comment and assemble final recommendations
By 21 December	Approve final report for submission to ICANN Board

Per work plan submitted to ICANN Board on 9 February 2018

Any adjustments needed?

Wrap-Up

Agenda Item #9

Time: 16:20-17:20

Presenters: Review Team Leadership & ICANN org

Wrap-Up

ALICE/JEAN-BAPTISTE TO COMPLETE

A.O.B. & Closing Remarks

Agenda item #10

Time: 17:20-17:30

Presenters: Review Team Leadership