Emily Taylor:	…all reaching the end of our shelf life today after quite a busy couple of days. Thank you very much, all of you, for everything you've put in this week. There's been a huge amount of commitment from all of you to sort of come and follow the Stakeholder Meetings and participate and support, and the public comments and so on. I think that's really fantastic.
Lynn Goodendorf:	Well, Emily, we all need to acknowledge the hard work you've contributed and you've done just an absolutely super job.
Emily Taylor:	Well, thank you very much.
James Bladel:	So by Monday we'll have a draft, right?
Emily Taylor:	Oh, okay. Rough?
James Bladel:	And for everything that Kathy did which is probably in her pajamas at 2:00 in the morning.
Emily Taylor:	What would you like to do? I don't think we need to take the full two hours here and certainly, speaking personally, I don't think I

can do that. Maybe we could just go around the table and just do some really brief reflections of what we've taken away from the public sessions that we've had or the stakeholder sessions.

And the also one thing you'd like to have the Review Team achieve in the next month. Okay? Susan, do you want to kick us off? Or shall I start with James? James.

James Bladel: So I made a comment today in the registry registrar and I know some were there, but not everyone. So if you'll indulge me, I'll repeat it which is that I think this Review Team has a really interesting opportunity. This is really loud. Bring this level down to Led Zeppelin.

So I think we have a really good opportunity in this group to be a microcosm of the community. I think we all kind of came to this – we're six months now – six months ago with our preconceived ideas, our axes to grind, our traditional sort of stereotypical, constituency-driven WHOIS positions.

And I think that if nothing else, I have – hopefully everyone else has – hit a point where we recognize that we're… the things that all brought us here are not going to get us out of here. Does that make sense? I don't know how to say this any other way.

Maybe if we can start to identify and start to use this as a formation for our report is how we can take that first step to dig ourselves out of these sort of intractable questions. Then that can be, I think,

extrapolated out to a path forward for the larger community and maybe we can un-stick some of these gears that have been stuck for 10 years in the WHOIS discussions and maybe we can start to make some real tangible progress on some of these things that have been off in the weeds for so long.

So some of the things I was thinking today were – and we had some good feedback. I think this community session was really interesting in terms of what we could look at, what we should be looking at, what we may have omitted. I'm encouraged. Yay? Is everybody else encouraged and yay? Okay, alright. Thanks. That's my take away.

Also don't start a mail order business in Ireland. Michele is embarrassed to speak at the microphone, but not so much that he would stop coming up to the microphone. And Dave Piscitello does not have a My FedEx Account. Those are my other three takeaways that I wrote down.

Emily Taylor: What about what you'd like to see us do in the next month?

James Bladel: I'd like to see us do something new. I don't know what that is yet. I'm going to have to noodle on that a little bit. But I think that what we've got here – we've got this far and I think that we need to take fresh eyes, I think look at some of these questions. I think

we've compiled the questions, I think that we're putting together the RFP for the consumer trust thing.

I think maybe one of the recommendations that I took away is, you know, whether or not it becomes immediately or ever becomes an obligation for registries and registrars. Maybe ICANN just needs to take the AOC and turn it into a ... and state its policy – little p, policy –on WHOIS and say, "Our policy is…" And then later it gives everybody else - whether we're talking about a study or a PDP or a review team, it gives us something to push off on and we're not just kind of flailing around here in the weeds.

Emily Taylor: Thanks a lot, James. Sarmad?

Sarmad Hussain: So I'll second James' first comment that at least the experience has made me appreciate a lot of different points of view, much more than I probably did earlier. And going through different sets of people, there've been some very similar questions which have been popping up and I think those are probably the ones which need more attention from our side as well.

And I think probably the most significant or fundamental one has been something which we've been raising as well is that we raise ICANN policy on what data has to be available and who's going to be using the data. What we got from AOC, for example, is actually not worth both things promoting consumer trust and

meeting legitimate means of law enforcement agencies was both these conditions were not the conditions for which WHOIS was originally designed; WHOIS was originally designed as an administrative base.

So when did we make that switch; who made that switch; where's that articulated within ICANN's structures? It's really not clear. So there was a very conciliation in one of the meetings that we need to go back and ask it in writing from the Board. And I think that really needs to be asked from the Board and we really need to understand - what is the expectation of ICANN from this data and the services.

And unless we are actually very clear on that, it's very hard to actually review anything. So my first question would be that this Affirmation of Commitment which is between ICANN and the Department of Commerce - what's the policy ground on which it stands and I'm still not convinced there's anything out there.

And so if there's nothing out there, then that's really the first thing which needs to come in before anything else comes in. There were comments on having a clear data model, having defined services, all those things are good, but it's really not clear… It's not possible to define the data model or the services unless we really know what this whole thing is for.

And there are now increasing usages coming so this law enforcement use and even the notion of consumer trust use, I think is a relatively newer development, considering the history.

Emily Taylor: And the next month, what would you like to achieve?

Sarmad Hussain: So I think we made excellent progress in our first meeting, earlier meeting this week where we went through the draft of the report and I think we really need to go back and start consolidating that effort, putting down what we actually know now and at least put that down in there and then we can definitely stand back from it, definitely take a fresh look at what's going on. But I think we should make some effort and put down things which we already know so that we can move on from there.

Emily Taylor: Kim?

Kim von Arx: First of all actually I would like to also thank Olof and Alice for exceptional support. We couldn't have done it without you. And on top of that I'd like to echo Lynn's comments. Emily, I think you've turned out to be an exceptional Chair. I think you are doing a fabulous job in raising controversial issues and you are peaceful and friendly so I'm very happy that things turned out the way they did, so my congratulations for that.

The other thing is I just wanted to, actually at our last session, I just wanted to quickly raise something before I forget to raise it –

is when they mentioned the cost metrics, you know, how much is it actually to implement WHOIS policy, what we need to keep in mind is that there are two distinct sets.

There is obviously legacy data and then anything else that comes in new. And from my experience when I was at CIRA, legacy data is so much more expensive to actually change. So we have to make a clear distinction between legacy data versus new data that comes in. So that's very important for our purposes anyway.

And with respect to what I would like to see… Actually what I got out of all the meetings, I was exceptionally surprised, I have to say, and I suppose I just didn't listen very carefully to you, James, but I was very, very surprised by the inputs and comments we actually got from the registrar community yesterday – or was it this morning? This morning. So I thought that was actually very helpful and very insightful for me anyway to take away.

The other ones were sort of normal points that I think we sort of understood and some things which I wasn't necessarily aware of, but at least this morning I left the room and thought, "Okay, I didn't expect that." So I was actually quite happy that we had the particular interaction with them.

And what I would like to actually see in the next month to happen is obviously that we have the RFP actually we issued and hopefully a contract signed, and put more flesh around our report. And that's at least what I would like to see our focus for the next month.

And finally, I just wanted to put in a request for our next meeting in Senegal that I think it would be nice for us to at least – because it's going to be our last face-to-face meeting to have actually a night, you know, a social event, a dinner, something like that, karaoke, whatever. Because I hear Emily actually has quite a nice voice. So that's it. Thanks.

Emily Taylor: Thanks a lot, Kim. Sharon?

Sharon Lemon: Yeah, my first ever ICANN meeting – I found it extremely enlightening in a good way. I now understand what all the groups are, I sat in on all the groups and so it suddenly hit me that not everybody knows everything about this.

And I was surprised by the lack of understanding in most of the groups about how criminals are abusing the WHOIS system. And a couple of comments that I heard from people who have been around for they said a long time were really quite naïve and there's a message from me there about how if we got that across and we on a personal level need to do some talk in educational awareness, what we're seeing everyone else sees.

I got the impression that the communities I sat in – I didn't sit on the registrars, unfortunately – are looking for our help just to sort this out. So I think the expectations about our review are quite significant and for me, I always try to explain this to the

Compliance Team of ICANN, is - at the moment less than 1% of law enforcement resources, and that's in the big countries like America and the U.K. and Australia are devoted to cyber crime, less than 1%.

That's why you've only got about 12 people rolling up at these events. All the money the governments are now putting into cyber – in the U.S. it's billions; in the U.K. it's millions – 650 million – will create, all the cops are creating cyber capabilities. So they're going to be looking around for what everybody's already got and they're going to get more and more involved in internet governance, so we've got to get some processes and structures right so we can signpost.

So at the moment, if we've got trouble with WHOIS there's only a dozen of us chipping away at this. So there's a responsibility for law enforcement to get its act together with ICANN and the Security Team to say, "Well, this is a signpost and this is the body that you will come through some so there's some sort of structure." And that's a bit broader than WHOIS, but it's just anything to do with it is going to be inundated because this is going to get obviously bigger rather than smaller. So I think it's emphasized to me how important our role is, and I'm really enthused by the whole event.

I think for me in the next month, I think that as a Chair, I would be happy with you being much more prescriptive about who does what. I'd be honest with you – conference calls – not all of us can

make them, even us in the same time zone. You know, usually we all can't get time to be on the phone.

So while there will be team-based activities, but I think now we've got the structure of the plan, of the written report, you can actually halve bits off and say, "Sharon, you will write that bit. I'm not expecting your sub-group because then everyone has got slopey shoulders and no one grabs it, and we expect you to do this by that day." That's just – I can live like that so I'll be happy with that.

And also I'd like to see a summary of the sub-groups I didn't sit in on; I didn't sit in the registrar's. You said that was good. I'd love to know what came out. And to brief the people who were not here from our group, to provide those with those notes.

I would also just personally look into .tel because I think if we could give out good practice guidelines, I don't know whether there's an annex or something that might be useful as well. Thank you.

Bill Smith: Others have done it as well, but I would also applaud Emily, both how you handled things here I thought was excellent and then in addition, I really believe bringing, as Kim said, I think you've done an excellent job bringing the team together.

And what I said in the registrar/registry meeting for those who weren't here is there was a great deal of frustration early on, and as James said, we have found a way to work together. And I think

that what we're doing, while we may not have said it, is we recognize we have to rise above our parochial interests like what we really care about and what's really important to us in terms of the constituency we represent.

And the reason we need to do that is we need to come to consensus on something. As James said in the meeting this morning, we can fail by either just not having anything that's very definitive cause that's all we can agree on or by coming up with a report where we've got lots of splits on things. The way we can succeed really is by coming to consensus and saying, "Look, here's the way it is. The system looks like this. There are these gaps." And I believe we can do that.

And if we do that – again the James point – we can demonstrate to the organization – the .org – how you work in the multi-stakeholder environment to really build consensus. I suspect the ATRT had to do something with this as well – don't know. But I think it would be… We can demonstrate some leadership.

Here I found this week that there was a surprising level of cross-community recognition that some kind of positive action is desirable and necessary, and I haven't seen that before. I think part of that though is because of the outreach we did in going into people, asking for input and then in essence when we would get… they'd try to push us into a corner, we didn't necessarily fight back out.

We'd let them know we're just trying to do our job and we're going to be fact-based, we're going to be balanced, we're not blaming – those types of things. And I think that actually helped sort of build some of that. I, too, was surprised with the session this morning. I found it very good. I suspect James had something to do with that.

James Bladel: I'll go ahead and say yeah.

James Bladel: Take the credit while you can. Another thing that came up several times, not just by Jim Galvin, but in different context, was use cases. Another way to look at that is, if not use cases, what are the intended uses? And that actually goes back to something that the Article 29 group sent into ICANN back in 2002-2004 timeframe a couple of times, I believe, saying, "You need to declare what this data is used for, for us to have any idea whether you can require it."

So I think that's something that we heard from different constituencies. And we may be able to formulate it slightly differently to address both of them.

We also heard pretty clearly again in different places, there's the protocol, a schema, the service, or in fact in the case of Telnic, multiple services. I took a quick look at the WHOIS policy from .tel. It is kind of interesting. I don't think it would apply

necessarily as it stands; I think some things might have to change, to necessarily large things, but if you get qualified for the enhanced service, you can only make five WHOIS requests a day, as an example. The details don't… But I think there was a lot of stuff in it when I looked at it that was quite interesting.

The other thing – couple other things. There was general surprise with our assertion that policy is basically missing in action. I think in every group the initial reaction was, "No, it exists." Yet, I don't think we've had anybody come to us and say, "And here it is." I did actually go back though and look at the green paper and the white paper. I'll admit I didn't read them thoroughly.

But WHOIS is mentioned twice, I think, in those documents, both of them in the green paper, not in the white paper, which is the later paper, the later one. The green one was the draft; the white one was the final one, if I have it right.

And the reason that WHOIS – the information is in there is for trademark and IP protection, specifically around the marks tied to domain names. That's where it really came from, from that information in the green paper and the white paper. So in the written record that I've looked at, that's really what it is.

I don't think there's any mention of security practices. Why you might want to… Okay? Any of the stuff that WHOIS is actually used for today. It's missing. And I spoke with Bob after this, the last session and he's frustrated because the work he's been asked

to do is very narrow look at how to basically, how to internationalize WHOIS, pieces of it.

And he feels that there's no way to do the job because he's not allowed to look – the group is not allowed to look outside sort of the charter they've been given and I see that potentially and I think it's something I'm seeing in other areas that ICANN may break down problems in ways that are ineffective and not conducive to coming to solutions.

In the next month I think the RFP is the most important thing and I'd like to be able to spend more time at home.

Emily Taylor: Thank you. Michael?

Michael Yakushev: What I would like to add, I think interaction with GAC and not only today but also in the future is important, given the role that GAC will acquire and discussion that will be carried out there with the decision of the new gTLDs. So everything which correlates with the new gTLDs would be a very big challenge also to introduce the unified or uniform WHOIS policy. And I think there are more questions than answers by now.

Then my favorite topic with ccTLDs, so how it should be implemented and the moral of the IDNs. The IDNs, what requirements to WHOIS policy should be introduced or new,

should be introduced to the requirements of who has given them their IDNs domain names.

What I would like to suggest as our next steps – so I would agree with Bill that we should do something new, and I would rather prefer we will have a couple, four weeks and then months before our California meeting. I would suggest the sort of brainstorming when everyone from the group would give his or her own sense of recommendations.

There could be stupid recommendations, radical recommendations, obvious recommendations, but it is the true list of where we could altogether discuss what is more relevant, what is less relevant and how it could be put down in the final report.

For example, just the thing that we discussed during our first meeting here about the regulator, so do we need someone in ICANN, a group in ICANN or just a person in ICANN who should do such as a provision or it is not. So anybody feels like this.

Emily Taylor: Lynn?

Lynn Goodendorf: Looking at my notes – first, having worked with different organizations on security policy, it's not unusual to have what's called informal policy. It's kind of like common law where it's understood but it's not formalized. So I just want to tell you that

from my experience in security policy, it's not unusual and it doesn't mean the policy is invalid or doesn't exist.

To me it was very clear from the dialog we had that it would make sense to formalize the policy. And formalizing it doesn't mean changing it; it just means taking it from an informal status to a formal status. I think the enforcement of the policy is significant, and bear with me, I'll share an experience with you that I had in a training class where it was in Atlanta and we're known for how bad our traffic is.

And the instructor said – I mean, this was early in the morning – and the instructor said, "How many of you have broken the law this morning?" Well, nobody raised their hand and then he said, "How many of you drove here in a car?" And just about everybody raised their hand. And he said, "Okay, I'm going to ask the question again. How many of you broke the law this morning?"

And, you know, we almost all acknowledged we had broken the law and he went on to make the point that people gear their behavior to what they perceive is enforcement. And so, regardless of what the policy is or the law is or the rules, people make decisions and behave based on what's being enforced.

And we got some good feedback about the compliance issues and the business constituency – there was a separate session with the Compliance Team and their presentation was a little different. It wasn't radically different, but it was a different slide deck. And

the business constituency is a big advocate for expanding that Compliance Team, not just for WHOIS policy, but generally compliance overall. So I just wanted to share that.

Another ccTLD that has been brought to my attention but I don't know anyone there is in the Netherlands, .nl. And I understand that they don't allow proxy privacy services – that's what I've heard. I haven't validated it and my understanding is though, that they have an exception case-by-case basis if someone feels that they can't publish their contact details, but there are very few exceptions granted.

So, for instance, somebody can't say, "I don't want to publish my details cause I'll get spam." That's not a valid exception. So I think that's interesting but I don't have any contacts there so if any of you do, I think it's worth us trying to reach out to .nl.

And I agree with Sharon that we're at a stage where I would be very comfortable with Emily with you taking the prescriptive approach and just assigning tasks to us individually.

And on the RFP, when I started looking at the time, I mean, I think we can make it but it's going to be very tight. So we don't have two weeks to get this, to finalize this draft and I'm going to work as fast as I can and I know that Olof and Alice are prepared to assist me. But I do have a great sense of urgency of getting that out.

I had told you guys before, I had been building a list of companies, so I feel like, if not here in Singapore, as soon as I get back I'll be

able to distribute that. And from what I can tell on past RFPs that ICANN has done in addition to distributing it to companies we think might be interested, we can also post it on the ICANN website. I think that's a good idea.

And then Olof and Alice, if there are any other suggestions you have for us, I think we all appreciate it.

Emily Taylor: James and then Olof.

James Bladel: I just wanted to say, based on my experience with ATRT, take what you feel is a reasonable amount of time to submit once we've selected a vendor for the RFP and to get a signed agreement executed take what you think is a reasonable amount of time and triple it because that's about how much time it's going to get through all of the approval processes and to get through ICANN Legal and to get it executed. I'm just putting that out there so that the expectation is realistic that they don't tend to turn these things around very quickly.

Emily Taylor: There was one piece of guidance given to us by Denise Michelle which was to – and my suggestion – she was saying if we use ICANN's standard terms, and I've got no idea what they're like, but this is the advice. If we use ICANN's standard terms, then ICANN can turn it round very, very quickly. So one possibility

might be to publish those as part of the RFP. Have to sign up to these if you want to bid.

Olof Nordling:

Yes, a quite important point because normally if we follow standard procedures for RFPs, it's a matter of having them out. Therefore, 45 days when it counts to reviews. It would be ludicrous in this situation to do that, but you're independent from that so you would have to decide for how long time it should stay open because during that time, we have to wait for the proposals we get by the end of closure of that window before taking a final decision on a contractor.

So what are we talking about? Two weeks or three weeks? I mean, it's completely unclear.

Emily Taylor:

Please go ahead, Lynn.

Lynn Goodendorf:

I'm talking to myself here. I'm thinking I lost my train of thought. And I made a note about the standard terms of contract. Yeah, I think we need to actually think about is it realistic to have this consumer trust research ready in time for our September meeting? I mean, I'm willing to push it. I know what I was going to say.

We have an American expression called "Grease the skids" and you know, greasing the skids would be like for the contract

execution we're anticipating we've got to do this very quickly, so is there anything else? This was a good suggestion from Denise. Is there anything else we can do so that once we get the responses and we pick somebody that we can just, you know, not waste any time.

Emily Taylor: Thank you. We'll go to Susan and then I'll… Susan?

Susan Kawaguchi: Makes me sorry, a little worried. I'll never get used to the mic. So, in SSAC someone stated that the policy does not really duplicate the AOC requirement for publicly available and accurate WHOIS information, so I think we need to dig into that a little bit. And then they were very concerned with the information being publicly available.

So I was a little bit… That concerned me and when we went on to the registry meeting, Jeff Newman said explicitly AOC is not policy, it's not contractual and did not feel that our expectations were in the registry contract. So I think we should dig into that a little bit and see if that perception is accurate.

And then when we got to the CSG, it was pretty clear from several people that they felt like the registry and registrar agreement really comprised the WHOIS policy because it's the only part that is contractual and enforceable, and some GNSO consensus policies, but those seem to be more minor.

So we, you know, should focus on what's there and I completely agree we need to make the recommendation that a clear and concise and available policy is provided by ICANN, but we really should, for any of the compliance issues that we're seeing, we should really rely on those two documents, which we're sort of been doing anyway, but that came out pretty clear.

Steve Metalitz mentioned page 32 of the Budget and Operating Plan for WHOIS. There's some money there and I haven't looked that up, but that would be interesting. The GAC made it really clear that proxy registrations are a big concern. And .us does not allow proxy at all. And actually last year I was contacted and gave some input to the GAC on a wish list for ccTLDs and that was one of the things – not that they acted on that request.

I think .us was already doing that. They may be trying to implement that throughout all the ccTLDs, which if they take the first step in that direction, not saying that proxy should go away completely, cause there is definitely a benefit and a use and a need for them, but putting some process to that.

It sort of comes to mind that people kept coming back to the fact that it's really the registrant who has the responsibility for the accurate data, and maybe we need to think outside of the box and figure out a way that there's more consequences in one way or the other for a registrant who does not provide WHOIS data. I mean, there are some things can be done - you can lose your domain name. You have a responsibility, but I don't think very many people take those seriously. So I think we should look at that.

And then also in the community, there seems to be a wish to really look at, treat availability and accuracy completely separate and then distribute the cost of validation. My mantra's always been that it's not an $8.99 domain name – facebook.com is definitely worth more than that. But I also don't think that any domain name is really an… the cost of registering a domain is not $8.99; it's subsidized somewhere. And so maybe that's one of our recommendations is that there should be a minimum cost. I know, I know. Hey, I'm just trying to make your registrar more money.

Emily Taylor: We're allowed to put out our ideas.

Susan Kawaguchi: I mean, from a business perspective, we pay five times that, but I get a lot more.

Emily Taylor: Okay, what would you like to see done in the next month… sorry, have you got…

Susan Kawaguchi: Probably gonna make him have a heart attack.

Emily Taylor: Trying to kill James.

Susan Kawaguchi:	So no heart attacks, okay? That's not going to happen and I realize that. So I'm looking forward to the July visit to MDR for the compliance. I've had a couple additional discussions with a couple of members of the Compliance Team just in passing and I think they're excited too. They're a little bit afraid of us showing up, but…
James Bladel:	They won't show me anything so the really good stuff, I'm gonna have to, like, to get coffee or something and then they'll…
Susan Kawaguchi:	They will treat you fairly. I promise. So one thing I will do is sort of flesh out more questions cause unfortunately you get one answer and then you think of 10 more questions. And then I think we should flesh out the report more in the next month and Dakar. Are we going to Dakar?
Emily Taylor:	Yes.
Susan Kawaguchi:	Okay. Does somebody know what that requires to do to go to Dakar? Shots – that's the part I fear the most. It's not that bad.
Emily Taylor:	Thank you very much. Omar?

Omar Kaminski:	Well, me the last talk, it's hard not to be redundant or obvious. But I will take the risk and say that Emily is a great Chair and Alice and Olof are great… has been great helping us. And also it's an honor to work with you.
	About applicable laws, I think it's a big issues, still is a big issues for us and a big challenge. The input of GAC and the ccTLDs were very important. About the [curiosity], I'm convinced that we should work a way to validate the data between data base and what's more, the ccTLDs policies could be the key issues for this. Thank you.
Emily Taylor:	What would you like to see us do in the next month? Is that what you…?
Omar Kaminski:	Sorry, Emily?
Emily Taylor:	What you think we should be achieving in the next month.
Omar Kaminski:	In the role of our study team?

Singapore
no.41
19-24 June
ICANN 2011

Emily Taylor: No, the whole Review Team.

Omar Kaminski: I need to think about.

Emily Taylor: Okay. Thank you. Okay, yep?

James Bladel: So I want to do a do-over here because I was the only one on the table that didn't thank you and compliment the staff and so I'll just go ahead and pile on there and say thank you and great job and well done and hopefully everybody's gotta recharge because we're gonna need you here in the next couple of months, so thank you.

Bill Smith: I think we should adopt standard procedure from the U.S. House and Senate where you just start everything with, "Ask the Chair to amend and revise my remarks." So then you can say publicly one thing and then in writing, put exactly the opposite in, which is done.

Oh, and Lynn's comment, "grease the skids," I wonder if we can do things in parallel. As an example, put the RFP out and at the same time to anyone who asks or who indicates they want to, respond we would provide them ICANN standard's terms so that they would know whether they could begin the legal process to determine whether they could comply with those. So I think that

would be a suggestion and generally anything else we could do to parallelize it. It's the only way we're going to bring the dates in from just the standard stuff from project management.

And to Susan's comment about Steve Metalitz's comment on the budget item with respect to WHOIS, I believe that has something to do with what's going on at the IETF but I'm not sure, and I do think we want to – some of us at least – want to take a look at that and see what ICANN staff is planning cause they have dollars allocated to doing something new in WHOIS.

Emily Taylor: Thank you. Sarmad, did you want the mic?

Sarmad Hussain: So just thinking aloud, we have three different issues regarding WHOIS – the accuracy, the availability and completeness. And I think in all these three dimensions we separately need to look at the policy and the implementation and compliance and so have this matrix just to organize all this. Again trying to organize my thoughts, so the three different levels of operations and three different levels of things for which the operations are for.

The reason I'm pointing this out is we've been talking about compliance, but we shouldn't be generally talking about compliance; we should be very specifically talking about compliance as far as availability is concerned; compliance as far as accuracy is concerned and compliance as far as completeness is

concerned. And separately on how effective that compliance is for that particular part for example.

Emily Taylor: Thank you. James, did you want to say something, then Olof.

James Bladel: Yeah, I just wanted to lend some support for something I thought was a really great idea which was from Michael. But if this group were to go back and hopefully with some fresh eyes now that we've all run the gauntlet of all the different aspects of all the different communities and we've heard all the different things, if we maybe could just take a swing at what… And, you know, they don't have to be pretty or – what's the word. Help me, lawyers – legally constructed, robustly constructed language or something. Let's just put some words on paper and let's…

Emily Taylor: Or even have a hope of seeing the light of day, I think if we constrain ourselves by what we think might be possible or others might agree to, we'll miss all the good bits.

James Bladel: So here's how I interpret – and maybe I misunderstood – but, here's how I interpret it. Building on what you said, building on what I think I'm hearing from Bill and some others about transcending the controversy. So if each of us were to pretend as a

thought exercise that we were the wisest and most benevolent dictator that ICANN has ever seen…   Or as Bill calls it, you know, Tuesday…

But if we could all just maybe put that hat on and say, "You're charged with fixing this problem, but you can't alienate one or more of your constituents, you know, subjects or you're gonna have a revolution on your hands," or whatever, so what would that look like? What would the solution… how do you untangle that knot, Solomon, you know, and really just kind of put yourself in that position. What would you do to solve it?

And I think that if we have – if we have truly learned to transcend our individual interests and our individual agendas, then perhaps we will see that we have a lot of common elements in those things and I think that that would really put a lot of weight behind what Michael's suggesting and would really grease the skids for that final report. Because then we will find that, after that I think it will start to write itself. Thanks.

Emily Taylor: Anybody else? Olof, you wanted to say something.

Olof Nordling: Well, actually, that was about Olivier and he will bring up that. But, well, while I have the floor, our appreciate of working with you because it's not always easy to meet the timelines and to get it all right.   And sometimes things drop between the cracks as it

were. But we truly appreciate it. Also, your patience with such occurrences and we look forward to working with you and congratulations to getting up to this kind of speed because I'm truly impressed on what I've heard and seen over these days. I think you did exactly the right thing. That's pretty obvious that you'd work, wouldn't you?

Emily Taylor: Yeah. Thank you. That's very much appreciated and all of your kind words. Of course, being British, I can't actually cope with being publicly praised at all, but I do appreciate it very, very much indeed. I think we should all just pause at this stage and acknowledge that Olivier Iteanu had to resign due to pressures of other work and to formally thank him for his contribution and his participation in the group.

I don't know what will happen and whether or not his constituency will put forward another suggestion. Is that going to be happening? So we would then wait on the decision of Rod and Heather I guess and hopefully we might be asked our point of view. So we should look forward and anticipate that.

This has been really, really helpful and my take away from this week has been, like Olof said, immensely impressed by all of your commitment to this and your willingness to just work together. I think that we've really made incredible strides in a short time in our ability to do that and I think that that's… yeah, as you said, James, we're going to need that in the next few months.

EN

Because we're kind of done the easy bit and now we've got to really… we can't shy away from the difficult issues anymore. We've got to actually face them now.

I take onboard what some of you have advised me about being more prescriptive and I will be. Also I think one of the conversations I had with one of you about – we seem to be more comfortable doing things in a grip and learning from the discussion paper with is actually… you know, took ages, but we got through that very, very well and amazingly in my view, after editing by committee, we ended up with a paper that was better than the original draft and I have very little experience of that happening in real life.

So that, perhaps, gives us a working model. If I may, I haven't thought about it right now, but I'd like to appoint… We've done a good job in just throwing down what we think the contents of each section are and I think I'd like to think about the best person to offer the first draft of each section and then when it's actually given to you as an individual, there's no kind of, "Well, someone else is doing it."

It's, I recognize, really difficult for us all when we leave this weird circuit, when we're all thrown together and forced to think about this, and we go back to our working lives, that it's very difficult for us to find the time. But if we can do our part and do what's asked of us in the time allocated, I think that we can really push this on.

Priorities over the next month – what I've heard is yeah, we need to get the RFP out as a matter of urgency and I think we'd all thank Lynn for just shouldering that as you have done. And what I'd like to suggest is that we let you run with it. Ask us for comments but don't wait for them because I think you can take the lack of feedback as some people are comfortable with what you are doing and it's our individual responsibility to shout and make inputs timely way if we're uncomfortable.

James Bladel: Are there any other significant issues that we know of at this time that have been raised? I don't have any.

Lynn Goodendorf: I got some excellent suggestions from both Kim and Sarmad and I'm going to revise accordingly and re-circulate. And then also getting this standard terms and incorporating it – Olof, if you can help me get a copy of that, that would be great so that I can just insert it into the draft that we have now. But I think it actually is close to being ready.

Emily Taylor: I think that's my impression and so, you know, being prescriptive, run with it. If we've got comments, make them. Olof?

Olof Nordlig: Lutz, he hasn't been able to join the bridge since he has a customer or a contractor relation he needs to be able to be contacted. But he has provided comments in the Adobe Chat and one thing is that he has heard that some LEA organization announced a WHOIS requirement document which should be discussed or presented here in Singapore. Anybody aware of that?

Emily Taylor: I was thinking local education authority. I'm thinking, "Why are they doing anything?"

Olof Nordling: This is Lutz. Anyway, and also he says at the preparation of the meetings, although he could only attend partially, but his impression is that the preparation of the meetings was far better from the RT side and the comments are far better than in San Francisco.

Emily Taylor: So I think that's… We're pretty much done now. Thank you all very much. And in the next few days I'm going to make suggestions or no – be prescriptive – about drafting bits of the report and let's just get moving on that. Okay, thank you very much everybody.

[End of Transcript]