LONDON – GAC Meeting: ICANN Overview on WHOIS
Sunday, June 22, 2014 – 14:30 to 15:00
ICANN – London, England

CHAIR DRYDEN: So for the GAC, if we can now move directly into our next agenda item 7, which is on the topic of WHOIS. And we have a lead on the WHOIS issue, Peter Nettlefold from Australia. But to give you a bit of context, at the last meetings in Singapore, we had requested a comprehensive overview of all of the activities underway in ICANN, and so this is to help, I guess, reinvigorate or focus us on contributing to the various processes discussing WHOIS matters as we go forward. But I will hand over to Peter, but I understand we have a briefing from ICANN staff to present that comprehensive overview to us. So Peter, can I hand to you and you can take us through the session?

AUSTRALIA: Thank you, Chair. There's probably very little at this stage for me to add. As Heather has said, at our meeting in Singapore, the GAC requested a comprehensive overview of WHOIS activities. For those of you who were there, you may recall that there was a discussion in the GAC that there is a lot of activity in the WHOIS space at the moment. And what the GAC was seeking was some sort of coordinated overview of all the little bits and pieces that are going on, or all the significant bits and pieces that are going on.

Probably one of the major ones is the Expert Working Group on new gTLD services which has basically been looking at a complete overhaul of the current WHOIS system and has recently released its final report

and recommendations, recommending just that, effectively a wholesale redesign of the WHOIS system. There's also quite a lot of other work going on in the WHOIS space. In advance of this meeting ICANN staff forwarded to the GAC an overview of all of the activities that are going on and their current status, and I think we're looking to Margie to give us a quick overview. I apologize I haven't had a chance to chat with you before, but we have 30 minutes for this session and it would be useful if we had at least a little bit of time for questions from GAC members, if possible. So if I pass over to you, Margie.

MARGIE MILAM: Sure. It's Margie Milam with ICANN staff. I'm senior director in the strategic initiatives department. As you asked for a WHOIS briefing, we have a half hour. I was going to dedicate the first 15 minutes on the current WHOIS, and we also have Jean-Francois and Fabricio Vayra from the Expert Working Group because that's the other part of WHOIS. Peter, I don't know how you want to have the questions. Would you like to pause after I finish my presentation, questions, and then move to the Expert Working Group? Okay. Okay. That would be great.

Next slide, please. So the GAC asked for a question -- asked about an overview of all the WHOIS activities at ICANN, and as you can imagine, it's very extensive. And I believe a more detailed document has already been circulated to the GAC. Olaf, I hope, has forwarded it to your list, where that provides a lot more detail.

But to give you an idea as to what the various initiatives relate to, back in the Dakar meeting in 2012 the ICANN board really took a look at the WHOIS issue in response to the WHOIS review team recommendations

EN

and essentially set us off on a two-path course. There are essentially two distinct lines of activities, one relating to implementing improvements to the current WHOIS system, and that's what I'm going to talk to you about today, and then the other one was to see if there was a better way to do this as the WHOIS review team recommendations were essentially working on an existing foundation. And so what the board did was ask for a fresh look, essentially to start at a clean slate and to see if there's a better way or next generation services that might replace the WHOIS system. And so that will be the Expert Working Group discussion that we'll talk about at the end of this session.

Next slide, please. Back one. Yes. So the implementation activities related to the WHOIS review team recommendations have been quite extensive and I invite you to take a look at some of the materials that are posted on the ICANN Web site. Essentially what we did is we tried to look at WHOIS from a holistic point of view to be able to educate everyone on what is WHOIS and what are the various requirements related to WHOIS. And we tried to centralize in one place all of the information so that someone who's unfamiliar with the issue could go and understand it and be able to get a grasp of what that entails.

The other thing we did in the WHOIS Web site, and I'll show you a slide -- a snapshot of the slide -- the Web site in a minute, is that we did a single lookup portal for all gTLDs. So right after the Singapore meeting there's actually now a lookup service where you can go on the ICANN Web site to do a WHOIS search for all gTLDs, including the new ones.

We also published the WHOIS primer. And I really invite you to take a look at this or send it to your constituencies because it summarized the entire WHOIS policy in one place, citing back to the contract language. And so what we did is we tried to simplify the understanding around WHOIS and actually hired a writer to try to translate the legalese from the contracts because we've heard how difficult it is to understand to -- you know, for a layman -- layman or woman to be able to understand what are the WHOIS obligations. It's been translated into multiple languages, so we took the initiative to be able to educate people from all over the world on WHOIS.

The other thing we're working on which I think is of interest to the GAC is the WHOIS online accuracy reporting system. And currently that's a project, a fairly significant project underway where we are trying to develop a reporting system to look at the accuracy levels of WHOIS. We currently have an RFP posted where we're seeking vendors to provide different services that relates to the accuracy reporting system such as validation and verification services. We're looking for vendors that can give us address validation or email validation and even take a look at how far you can go, whether you can actually do identity validation, if that's possible. And we're in the midst of an RFP process with a timeline of trying to publish a pilot report by September so that we can share it with the community and get feedback on whether or not it satisfies the needs of the community and examines WHOIS at the level that everyone expects.

The other area that I think is of interest to the GAC is the internationalized registration data. And this relates primarily to whether you translate the contact data into multiple languages. And

EN

that's a very complex issue where we have a series of working groups that are taking a look at that issue from different perspectives. So, for example, there's a study report that was just published that looked at the current practices in other industries to see how you might be able to apply that knowledge to our current WHOIS database and whether that's possible to do. And we're also looking at how you might actually publish information in different languages and different scripts. And so that work is currently underway. It will take some time to complete that process, but that is an important part of the work that we're doing on WHOIS.

Next slide, please. So what I have here is a snapshot of the Web site. And this is what I encourage you all to look at, where you can really -- you can do a WHOIS search. And if you can scroll down a little, there's lots of information that's available about WHOIS. You can find out about the policies. You can even link directly to complaints to the compliance team, if you want to send in an accuracy request. And the piece that I think is really helpful for the community is we have this knowledge center where we're uploading anything related to WHOIS gets put in the knowledge center so you have one place to look if you want to find the latest developments, the studies, the analysis that relates to the WHOIS issue. So we're very excited about this, and we're looking for feedback. We call it the beta site because we want to get feedback from the community, from the GAC, on whether this is enough information, whether you would like to see something else. But that's really the platform we are using to educate about WHOIS. Next slide, please.

EN

So just to dig deeper in the WHOIS accuracy reporting system because I know the GAC has asked questions as it relates to the new gTLD program, what we're trying to build is a system that proactively identifies records as inaccurate or not, use automated tools so that we could have fairly large sample sizes, and the idea is that when records are identified as inaccurate they would be forwarded to registrars for action for follow-up. And then we would also consider publicly reporting on the resulting actions.

So you'll see there's a chain of activity that happens to identify a record as inaccurate and then to apply the tools, forward it for action, and see if -- if the record actually changes. And so we see that as an ongoing system that will help monitor the progress with related -- with respect to accuracy levels in WHOIS.

Next slide, please. And so if you'll take a look at the RFP that we've published and prior to the RFP we had published for public comment a proposal where we sought the assistance of an NORC that had helped ICANN on previous studies to help us identify how you determine whether a record is inaccurate. I mean, it's not an easy question, to determine, you know, how you would look at a record to see whether it actually is inaccurate. And so we tried to come up with a methodology for that, taking into account some of the information we've learned from the SSAC, for example. They've done a fair amount of work in identifying how you might look at a record to see if it's -- if it's considered accurate from a syntactic point of view, from an operational point of view, or even from identity. So to give you an example, if the information in an address is in the wrong format, that's considered a syntactic error, and we're trying to see how we can identify that. An

EN

operational error might be that it's not a real address, and so we might actually look to see whether the address exists in a particular database. And then clearly identity is probably the hardest part, to see whether or not somebody actually -- the registrant actually resides after that particular address. And so the RFP is trying to determine whether it's commercially feasible to do this. We're trying to understand the costs associated with it so that we can determine how we're going to go forward and the statistical reporting.

Next slide, please. And so as I mentioned, this is an integrated system because what we're going to do is once we identify things, we're going to link to the compliance department's activities. So everything is going to be linked, and that's part of the complexity of what we're building here, is a system that identifies accuracy, it reports out to registrars, the compliance team takes a look at it, if there's a need to, and we're constantly reporting to the community what's happening.

As I mentioned, we've already launched the search tool and then we're in the process of looking for these commercial validation tools to see what's available and how we can implement them in the system. And then over time we'll -- once we figure out what we're going to identify, we will be working with the registrars and the compliance team to determine what types of procedures we're going to use to be able to follow up on inaccurate records.

Next slide, please. And so I think this slide is probably interesting to the GAC in that we're looking at different types of reports to publish. For example, accuracy levels associated with new gTLDs versus the prior gTLDs. I think that would be an interesting report that the GAC has --

might be able to use to see how the new gTLD program is improving accuracy levels. We're also going to take a look at registrars under the old versions of the RAA versus the new ones that have the more stringent requirements. And then look at compliance levels related to those.   And then we're looking at reporting at different levels for registries, registrars, and even registrants in different geographic regions. Because it might be that there's an educational issue there and in order to increase accuracy we may need to spend some resources educating either contracted parties or registrants in different regions of the world.   And so these are some of the reports that are under consideration as we build out the system.

Next slide, please. And then I'm not going to go into much detail on this, but it will show you what we're thinking about, how we determine the methodology for the sample sizes is going to depend upon, you know, what the costs are associated with doing some of these manual versus automated validation methods and also we're taking a look at how long it takes to turn around a report. We are currently examining whether we are going to do biannual reports or trimester based or something else. And it all depends upon what kind of information we receive when we get the responses from the RFP that we're in the process of managing right now.

Next slide, please. So here's the timeline that we're working under. Currently, as I mentioned, we have an RFP that's active. We're going to close that at the end of the month and start development. We are hoping to publish a -- a pilot report in September for discussion in the Los Angeles meeting in October. So that -- the pilot report may not be as extensive as some of the things that I've just discussed but I think it

will be enough information that the community can start looking at this and seeing whether it's starting to satisfy the need for reporting on accuracy levels.

Next slide, please. And so for more information, as I mentioned, in the WHOIS Web site there's a knowledge center and it lists chronologically all the documents that relate to WHOIS. And I think that's probably the best place for members of the GAC to go if they want to read up on some of the work that's going underway on this issue.

Next slide, please. There's also a lot of work related to implementation of the GNSO consensus policies. We have the thick WHOIS consensus policy that was adopted by the board, and they're currently in the process of developing a draft implementation plan. We also have requirements related to the new gTLD program and the WHOIS status information policy. And then another issue that may be of interest to the GAC is that we have a public comment period open right now on the WHOIS conflicts of law procedure, and as you may remember, this procedure is something that a contracted party such as a registrar or registry can come to ICANN and try to seek a waiver of some of the obligations as they relate to WHOIS if it violates their local laws. And so we're in the process of determining whether that procedure should be updated.

CHAIR DRYDEN: If I can just ask you to pause for a moment, Margie, thank you so much for taking us so far through the presentation. There's clearly a lot of information here. We do have a lot of new representatives in the GAC, so what we're trying to contend with is familiarizing colleagues with

some of the -- the key policy -- public policy considerations related to this and then demonstrate all the various tracks of work that are underway to appreciate really the complexity, both in terms of the policy issues that are there and then as well the complexity of having all these different processes, handling different aspects of it.

So I think we've -- we've, I think, given colleagues a really good introduction to the various tracks and some of those issues. And for GAC colleagues, when we talk about WHOIS, it's a lookup service essentially that allows you to get information about the -- the person or the entity that has registered a domain name and contact information and so on and so forth. And so this raises a whole host of issues. And ICANN's particular role is -- in this area is related to the Generic Top Level Domains. So that's really what we're talking about is WHOIS lookup services for Generic Top Level Domains. So we've heard about the importance of having accuracy of the data, and there are various ways of going about that and a range of views about how to ensure that there is accuracy of that data. There are issues about who should have access and under what considerations, so law enforcement considerations are really profound and so are privacy considerations. And then using different scripts in the database, that's yet another issue. So there are all kinds of aspects to this, from a user's perspective, from a public policy perspective. And because of the bottom-up Policy Development Process we see, for example, the GNSO list of areas of activity that are really important for us to be aware of. And it's important for us as a committee to be able to identify what our priorities are in order to engage in the various processes.

So I think because we have a short amount of time that we can pause there. Peter, did you want to go to hear a bit about the Expert Working Group? Would that be a useful next step? Because this is kind of an overarching initiative, yes, with the Expert Working Group.

So this will be a useful umbrella for us to focus on in terms of a process that the GAC I think should start really paying much more attention to now that we're finished with most of the other gTLD issues from the new gTLD program.

And maybe that's a way to help us come to grips with this at this stage. So I can hand over to you, Jean-Francois.

JEAN-FRANCOIS BARIL: Thank you very much. Maybe we can put the slides on, if there's a set of slides for the EWG.

So okay. Here we go.

Good afternoon, everyone. My name is Jean-Francois Baril. I'm the facilitator for this EWG. And thank you very much for this invitation to the GAC. An opportunity along with a few of my colleagues to hear, but a lot of them are sitting at the end of this room. We are pleased to bring a little bit of an overview of our final report which on the next-generation gTLD RDS, which has been posted on June 6.

Maybe as a little reminder, this was created under Fadi's initiative and the ICANN board requests on February 2013 to overcome a long-time deadlock on WHOIS. As it was a little bit explained by Margie, there are a little bit of difficulties we were trying to fix on WHOIS. But we have

had the mission to re-examine and define the purpose of collecting and maintaining gTLD registration data. Then consider how to safeguard those data.

The next point is how to propose a next-generation solution that will better serve the needs of the overall, overall global Internet community and finally establish a foundation to guide the ICANN community through the GNSO process to create a new policy for gTLD directory services.

So a lot of very direct descriptions, as you can imagine, during this time with EWG with participation from everyone as individual and in your case as advocate. And that's a big difference from what we have had. This is a habit within ICANN.

But also a lot of courtesy, cooperation, and compromise by all parties. And, of course, a tremendous, tremendous amount of work and commitment from everyone. So that's probably -- next slide to introduce or reintroduce the EWG team members. In addition to this volunteer and very qualified expert across the overall Internet ecosystem and all geographies, I would like to mention also fantastic support from the ICANN staff to make sure that we integrate all this vibrant discussion into our final report.

For these people very good balance between operational and down-to-earth experience and the necessary soft skills to make the impossible possible.

And in this case making the impossible possible means a strong attitude to build consensus. Looking at the big picture, to better serve the global

Internet community rather than promoting our own direct interests. But also capability to innovate and think out of the box, to find the best solution and to avoid status quo. This is probably the only magic that we've used to create these 180 press recommendations which are contained into this report.

Sorry for this very extensive report. In fact, 106 pages. Each time I'm coming here the report is increasing, but now this is our final report. So now you can start reading actively those pages. But, of course, even if we try to make it much simpler and shorter, the extreme complexity of this long-time situation is going to drastically improve the current WHOIS took much more time than expected.

So this report is, in fact, the culmination of intense 15 months of work with thousands of hours of in-depth research.

Next slide, please.

All right. Digesting 2600+ pages of comments, response from different surveys, researchers of all kinds. 19 public community consultations. 35 days at least of face-to-face EWG meetings. 42 EWG calls, at least, once again. And many, many more within the subteams.

This is without counting the number of interactions with outside expert and community members. And all of that was to do what? This is to answer one simple question. Between quotes "simple." Because when I have to think it's so simple, but it is: Is there an alternative to what Margie was presenting on the WHOIS to serve the overall global Internet community? So maybe to precise one thing because just before the publication, our intention was to include one dissent

comment from Stephanie Perrin, one of our team members. But because we think that we didn't have enough capability to discuss in depth this dissent, we were not able to publish it at the same time as the report. We will do that. Don't worry. We will do that. And make sure that we sanitize the things and we are inline. But the dissent will be published later on.

With that, I would like Fabricio Vayra to continue a bit more in depth on what is the content of this report.

FABRICIO VAYRA: Thank you, Jean-Francois. Next slide, please.

So the resounding answer to is there an alternative, the EWG thought yes. We thought that it was appropriate to scrap what is today anonymous access to usually inaccurate data for a new model, meaning the new model -- the old model should be abandoned. And as our handy trashcan here would like to tell you, he's full of garbage. And that's the complaint we've heard a lot about the current WHOIS. So it is time for an upgrade. It's been a long time coming.

Next slide, please.

So what does our final report have?

Well, it has 166 pages with over 180 recommendations and principles that really provides the details of our proposed model for a new registration directory service. Within that report, what we tried to do and within those recommendations we really tried to strike a balance between accuracy, access, and accountability, really making sure that

the data that was collected was collected and disclosed under a purpose-driven model, meaning that data is only disclosed for announced purposes.

And within this model, we're proposing that a certain minimum set of data be outside of a gate, meaning that everything that we consider today as personal identifiable information other than an email would be behind a gate.

The only things outside the gate for those who are not accredited -- choosing accredited access to the data would, basically, see a registrant email address and would see what we considered to be system data -- who the registrar is, who the registry is, who the DNS -- what the DNS is, what the creation dates, things of that nature. So, as you can see, we've really tried to safeguard personal data.

What this does is it introduces -- in order to do this, it does introduce two new contracted parties which would be the RDS provider itself and the validators. And the validators obviously go to the question about accuracy.

So, hopefully, that is improvement going forward. And the reason we're doing all of these things -- next slide, please.

Next slide -- is so that we have an opportunity -- we realize this is really, really detailed. It has to be to answer a very important question. We wanted to make sure that we tried to turn over every single stone possible. And now I think it's time to continue the dialogue with the community and make sure that you understand why we overturn the stones we did and why we recommended what we did.

So, to that end, here are dates and times during ICANN London when we're going to be available to, obviously, continue this discussion.

And some of the topics we're going to be talking about -- and probably some of the questions that you're already asking hearing me speak are, you know, what is public and what is gated information? What exactly is purpose-driven access by accredited users? What do you mean by validation and accuracy? How does this all fit into the recommended model? And what did you do, really, to provide extra data protection, privacy, and things of that nature?

So please come to our sessions tomorrow, June 23rd at 1515. And then we have some extended Q&A opportunities, as you see, again, on Monday at 1700 hours and Wednesday at 8:00 a.m. So with that I'll pass back to Jean-Francois.

JEAN FRANCOIS BARIL: Thank you, Fab. And just to go to the next step, the thing is for you to be more familiar with this report and good opportunities for tomorrow and Wednesday with all this Q&A session that we have organized.

But we will as EWG stay very, very focused on offering different opportunities to meet with the community through direct opportunities but also webinars.

Sure, this report is definitely not 100% perfect. But, once again, is the result of many, many compromises to balance very diverse and divergent needs but always with very impressive intellectual honesty. So that's what has guided us during this EWG journey.

Along with everyone within the EWG, I'm very, very confident that this report provides a solid foundation to support the overall ICANN community with respect to the WHOIS replacement and a real breakthrough moving forward. We're also very confident that this report will fit the ICANN board's directive and will be the beginning of a constructive dialogue and a fully successful GNSO PDP.

So remember I leave that -- I leave for you the two fundamental questions: Is the audience preferable to RDS WHOIS and, if you think not, can WHOIS meet the needs of evolving Internet, global Internet? With that I'll return to Heather.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you very much for those briefings. So I'll hand back to Peter to identify next steps.

PETER NETTLEFOLD: Thank you. And thank you very much for the panel of speakers. This has been very useful, I think, to the GAC. As discussed in Singapore, there's been a lot going on. And we thank very much ICANN staff and the Expert Working Group for their efforts in this area and your efforts to keep the GAC abreast of what's going on. I think the move in particular to a purpose-driven access model for WHOIS data is potentially the most significant change in the space that certainly any of us will have seen.

Where data is collected, validated, and disclosed for admissible purposes only and with some data elements being accessible only to authenticated requesters I think is going to go a long way to improving

EN

the balance between the need for data and the requirements for privacy and so on. And I think it raises a number of important and potentially sensitive policy issues for governments to do with data flows across borders. It addresses some of the longstanding issues the GAC has had to do with the accreditation of privacy and proxy services and so on. So very welcome developments.

For the information the GAC, we have potentially a little bit of time on Tuesday morning, I'm informed, at 9:30 for a GAC discussion on this, if needed. So I would ask GAC members today to potentially limit questions that you have -- your comments to questions for the panel so that on that overflow session, if needed, we can just focus on a GAC discussion, if there's any GAC inputs and GAC next steps. So are there any questions for our panelists today?

PARAGUAY: Thank you, Peter. Very quick, very specific. What is exactly EWG? Extended working group?

>>   Expert.

PARAGUAY: Expert Working Group. Thank you. Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Thank you for that, Paraguay.

PETER NETTLEFOLD: Netherlands.

NETHERLANDS: Yes. Thank you, Peter.

I will make it very brief. I think this is the first tool you introduced which I think it's from last year that the plans were made according to the ATRT recommendations and to improve the accuracy.

I think this tool will give tremendous incentive also for the market, the registries and registrars, to improve their accuracy and completeness. One question which is raised is, if you have an automated tool in which you look for, let's say fields and make searches, do you look only at missing elements? Or do you also look at patterns which are sometimes used for malicious purposes to enter fields with -- from which you know that it's maliciously wrong data? Thank you.

FABRICIO VAYRA: So how exactly we go about it we figured is an implementation process, right? So -- but whether we look at both syntactic and operational is one of the things that we actually recommended that you do both. And, to make sure that those both syntactical and operational were technically feasible, we actually brought in multiple vendors, international vendors who have tried to do exactly what you're talking about to show us their systems and how they actually do it at a high-level degree of accuracy. So we recommended they both be syntactic and operational. And we did go out to multiple vendors, including the universal postal addressing system to see how exactly addresses are put up and how they would be validated both syntactical and operationally.

PETER NETTLEFOLD: Thanks. United States.

UNITED STATES: Thank you, Peter. I appreciate it. I want to thank the panel as well for providing us with this information and Margie Milam, of course, as well. And I'm going to sort of make an observation here, if I may, that may disappoint you somewhat.

But, quite candidly, I think you have confirmed our worst suspicions, our worst fears that this is such an enormous amount of work going on right now on some key aspect or aspects, many aspects of WHOIS data.

And our concern is that we certainly know that we are struggling to keep up with it, to understand it, to be able to analyze and to be able to comment. So the GAC has not had a chance to discuss this as the GAC. I'm looking forward to Tuesday morning. But I thought, as long as I had you in the room, I would put my little hand up, at the risk of being shot down, to sort of express a concern that we don't believe that -- we certainly feel this way. I trust colleagues around the table might feel this way as well. We're not being given the requisite time to analyze and comment and contribute to all of these very important initiatives. WHOIS data has been a longstanding matter of concern, certainly to my government. And I know I have sat through years and years of meetings with GAC colleagues. And it's a seriously important set of issues that all of these initiatives. There are almost so many I lost track, as Margie was going down them.

So we're going to sort of consider making a proposal to colleagues on Tuesday that, hopefully, they will endorse and we can share with the board on Tuesday afternoon that -- that the fact that WHOIS -- issues related to the WHOIS data universe, if I may say, really are of critical, critical importance from a public policy perspective.

And I really do urge -- we would like to urge the board and other parts of the community to actually allocate sufficient time to do the proper analysis and get the proper public policy aspects weighed in at the same time. In fact we're going to probably propose that we devote a considerable amount of time in the L.A. meeting so that we all are able to travel to Los Angeles fully prepared to engage in the substance. Because, quite candidly, I will freely admit to you with apologies, I have not read your 166 pages in great detail. So sorry. Full disclosure here. And feel quite uncomfortable about that because it's just too important. So, just for the record, we are going to make that proposal. It's not an attempt to slow down work. It's simply to make sure that the community has sufficient time to actually tackle this work together. Thank you.

JEAN-FRANCOIS BARIL: So point very well-taken and well understood. We cannot expect everyone to have digested all this tremendous amount of recommendations. We have posted, so now it's available for everyone to start the process and get familiar. We're always committed and focused to be active and respond as much as we understand the issues.

And the Board has received our report, and that's for them to decide when is the appropriate time for the digestion to happen.

AUSTRALIA: Thank you, united States, and for that useful exchange.

Are there any other GAC members who have questions?

European Commission.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION: Thank you very much.

I don't think there are many questions, but of course we would again like to stress the importance of data protection in this field for the European Union.

As you know, there's too many purposes and too ill-defined for the collection of data. In addition, in some jurisdictions, like in the EU, the purpose is not defined for the collection of data but for the processing.

There's no reliable process for verifying the accuracy of the WHOIS data, which is a problem for the data protection perspective for us.

There is no clarity as regards the application of the term "applicable law" here. And further reflection is needed on the possibility for third persons, a third access to WHOIS data, particularly when it comes to law enforcement and other entities which might have legitimate interest.

And some of your restrictions, transfer of data to the gTLD directory service itself, would be considered as a transfer of data to a third country. And therefore, we have to take special consideration to this.

So thank you very much.

AUSTRALIA: Thank you, European Commission.

Colleague in the first row, apologize, I'm not sure what country -- oh, Kenya.

KENYA: Thank you very much for the great work that you have done.

I remember the last time -- the first time the subject much reviewing the WHOIS came up, there was an issue of the structure of the system and there was some proposals for a centralized database. And I must say I have not looked at the whole report, but I want to imagine that there will be a time to be explained, clarity on what proposals you have made on that.

Thank you.

AUSTRALIA: Thank you, Kenya.

Out the back again. Sorry, I cannot -- Is there a microphone that can be brought up the back?

Michelle is coming, I think.

>>   U.K., question. Brunella Longo, information management advisor.

I was wondering if there was anything in the huge work you have done that addressed the need for whatever type of legal investigation, legal proceeding, criminal investigation. The historical series of WHOIS data.

So going back ten or more years in abuses of personal data would be very, very important in order to enforce some legal processes.

>>   Yeah, so the report actually has a statement specifically on that that the system should accommodate those types of services commonly known as reverse WHOIS and WhoWas, but again, as we heard from the European Commission, that all needs to be balanced with privacy and data retention, data protection, et cetera. So if you read the report, there's kind of a back-and-forth corollary between those types of principles. So it is addressed.

AUSTRALIA: Thank you.

In the speaking order I now have Thailand, and then we'll move to close this session, and the GAC can continue to discuss on Tuesday morning.

So Thailand.

Thank you.

THAILAND: Thank you, Chair. I take the opportunity to talk to the EWG, the panel, because I believe that the translation and transliteration is one of the key important things for the GAC that might require the public-policy

involvement. And I do agree with Suzanne, also, as well that the topic is so complex, especially for the non-ASCII. We participate in the working group since the beginning on a weekly basis. And when counting on ASCII, if you want the WHOIS record to be able to well refine, so validate, so coming to the right core structures, I think the country need to be proactive, working with the Expert Working Group.

I will put this into the Tuesday agenda that we discuss internally in the GAC.

Thank you.

CHAIR DRYDEN: Okay. So thank you very much, everyone, for your comments, and to our speakers to come and present to us today.

This continues to be a matter of considerable interest to us here in the GAC, and thank you, Peter, for taking us through the session.

So we will continue in the GAC to discuss WHOIS at 9:30 on Tuesday. We have 30 minutes there. And I think that's an important opportunity for us to identify how to move our work forward and ensure that we are supported in that activity, given the volume and significance of the work that is taking place here at ICANN.

So thanks again to the panelists.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]