

---

ABU DHABI – Joint Meeting: ICANN Board & ccNSO  
Wednesday, November 1, 2017 – 13:30 to 14:30 GST  
ICANN60 | Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates

KATRINA SATAKI:

Good afternoon, everyone. Please take your seats. It's our pleasure to welcome Board members here in our room. I really appreciate this. I really like to see you here with us. With that, we start our meeting today. The first agenda item is administrative. That was a topic that we want to discuss from the ccNSO perspective.

We've noticed that for the several past meetings there is some difficulties of scheduling these bilateral meetings with the Board. We set up one time slot, and then when our agenda is already ready, very close to the meeting – one month before the meeting – this slot has been moved. This time, that was also the case. Unfortunately, we had to cancel one of our sessions because of this unexpected move.

From the administrative point of view, we would really appreciate a fixed slot that we could put our agenda and we always know where we are and when we meet.

So, thank you. That was just a wish from our community.

---

*Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.*

---

STEVE CROCKER:

I'm going to say a couple of surprising things. First off, I don't actually know how this was all done. We have a Board operations team, but they're not the ones that schedule the interactions with each of the – I don't think they are – with the supporting organizations and advisory committees, so there's a different process behind the scenes. I'm sure we can ask and find out.

It's a symptom for sure of the huge overload, 350 sessions and so forth, and I can well understand that it's problematic. Well, actually, I don't understand that it's problematic. So, the second surprising thing I want to say is why is it a problem if they're shuffling? Isn't there a one to one? You get the time back that was there. I don't mean that ... It may sound like a dumb question, but I just don't understand, and it will probably be helpful – it's not important whether I understand it – probably important to carry that as a message in ... Not just that we need a fixed slot, but also what the impact is, so there's an understanding by the people who are doing it, so they have a sensible conversation both internally and with you guys.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Let me just tell you that this is a problem because if we have a set agenda – for example, we have to group some items together for a one-and-a-half hour long session, then if there comes some

---

session that we need to put somewhere in the middle, we have to reshuffle everything.

As I told you, this time we had to cancel one of our sessions that was planned just because we could not accommodate this late request in any other possible way.

Well, if you say it's not possible, it's fine, but we would like to know – anyhow, we would like to know in advance and prefer that this slot is not moved. It may be different slots probably next time, but it still would be good to know the slot well in advance.

STEVE CROCKER:

I'm not saying that it's impossible. I see our CEO has arrived and this really is an org matter in the sense that staff is responsible for that. The issue is late rescheduling of these interactions has an impact on the rest of the schedule for this group, so the requesting to be able to know the slot time in advance and have it remain fixed, and I realize – I don't actually have any idea what the dynamics are or even who does this. That's just an action item to follow up.

JORDAN CARTER:

Thank you, and sorry I was two minutes late. The scheduling is done by the community, so I'm not really sure. I don't want to

---

blame anyone else, but it's very important to us that we provide the time slots, and that's why [inaudible] time slots. So maybe that's something that is my fault. The scheduling is set by the community.

We're running 350 sessions here right now, which is by any means a lot. I know there will always be conflicts and changes, but maybe there is a [inaudible] we can facilitate the discussion to improve, because I can understand that if we change things too much, it would be problematic for anyone.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

This is Chris. Let's not spend any more time on what is essentially a scheduling issue. Let's ask Katrina to get someone to send a note to the people and see if we can get it clear that it's complicated and difficult. I'd just like to acknowledge the fact that this rescheduling has meant we've come to the ccNSO room and my deal with them was that I'd do that, provided they provided M&Ms, so thank you very much for the M&Ms.

JORDAN CARTER:

For the record, I don't have any M&Ms.

---

KATRINA SATAKI:

Did you request any? Thank you. Yes, let's not spend any more time on this administrative issue. We just wanted to bring this to the Board's attention and ask for some more predictability. Maybe a little bit strange to ask predictability from ICANN Board, but we'd really appreciate it. Thank you.

Next agenda item that we wanted to raise with the Board is about ccNSO concerns related to the latest NomCom appointment, process.

We sent a letter and are quite really concerned with the way NomCom dealt with the appointment. However, I must say that this all was the result of clearly miscommunication. We also have learned – our lessons from this, I'd like to thank the Board for the letter of apologies they sent to the ICANN nominee. I also would like to again, once more, apologize to Miss [Mull] for this event. She had been brought into this. Yes, as I mentioned already, this really very unfortunately miscommunication between two groups within ICANN.

Again, as I said we've learned our lessons and we, apparently, at some point after discussions within our community and within the ccNSO Council, we will initiate some changes in the Bylaws.

There are two ways to address the issues. One, as we write our requirements, our hopes, our expectations from NomCom appointments into the Bylaws, or taking into account that our

---

ccNSO Council is very diverse. It's formed from all five ICANN regions; three members on the council from each ICANN region. So maybe we do not need any additional diversity that NomCom could provide to us. These are two possible scenarios we're going to discuss. I just wanted to let the Board know that we might initiate some change in the Bylaws.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Thanks, Katrina. Are you looking for any response from us? Okay. So, the Bylaw change is obviously something that you guys can do. I have to say you remind me – I'm sure Steven will know this. Did we get ... The ccNSO Bylaw is not itself part of the enhanced community Bylaw program, is it? So, we can change it. Come on up, Steven.

STEVEN:

Believe it or not, Chris, I've not completely researched that. To give you guys some further input on this matter, I reached out to the NomCom at their public meeting the other day and I had rather frank and intense, but very productive conversation, with them on this matter and it's clear, as Katrina noted, it's all about communication, communication, and communication.

Both parties, myself and the NomCom incoming Chair came away with the realization that we have to chat at various points

---

during the selection process. We now clearly understand that we need to do what you guys do, which is annually send a letter to the NomCom stating these are what we think we need in terms of requirements for a candidate. So, we have some work to do obviously on that. I looked at your letter; I like the idea.

Further, I think we need to get the situation resolved where they make their selection and don't tell us until they tell the candidate publicly. Well, they tell the candidate early on, but they don't tell us until about two-and-a-half months later.

I think it would be very useful if we had not a final veto, but a final looksie on some kind of redacted format as to what that candidate that they think is their candidate fits what we think we need.

Further, I just lost my thought on that. You look like you're about to ask me something.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Well, let me respond and see if we can take this a bit further. I think it's really, really important to thread these issues properly so things don't become conflated.

If you were to change the two levels of appointment that are problematic, appointing somebody to the council who is from a ccTLD, that's one level of problem. The second level of problem,

---

the worst level of problem, is appointing to somebody to the council who is from a ccTLD that already has a member on the council.

STEVE: Correct.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Now, there are two different problems with that. With the second one, which is what we would have had here, there are issues of voting – more than one member voting, etc. That is something you could, by law – legislate, if you will – I think without an issue.

STEVE: Yes.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I think it's slightly more difficult to say – to try to Bylaw mandate that the NomCom should not appoint anybody associated with the ccNSO, ccTLD, unless you're going to be very specific at the level you're talking about. Ever worked for, has worked for, whatever. Last point. And thirdly, introducing the concept of the ccNSO having the right to reject a candidate is a fundamental



---

change to the principle that the NomCom is there for. That's a third thing that you'd need to think very carefully about.

STEVEN:

If I can address those points, it's not my intention with what I described with the final lookie to have the ccNSO have a veto power. So I don't think that's an issue. The approach that I'm thinking we need to go for is to have the opportunity to look at a redacted CV and advise them. It's like, "Guys, we don't think this one is really going to work. Maybe you want to go back and think about this again, but it's up to you."

And with regards to the two variants on ccTLD related appointments, the situation we have here is what I call the overloaded representation problem. That, in my book, is a huge problem. Council could self-correct by supermajority throwing off the existing member from that TLD, but I don't think we want to go down that path.

With respect to if they come up with a candidate they feel is the most qualified candidate who happens to work for a CC who is not represented in council, I personally don't have an issue with that. That's just the way the ball rolls on that one.

Further, I've also had an interview with the external reviewers because they were very interested in getting some further

---

background on this. And I still can't remember what my last point is, so I'll step away. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you very much, Steven. One more comment on this and then I think we can move forward. I think the fundamental principle of appointing councilors to the already diverse group of people that we have is to add some more diversity, and if that principle cannot be achieved, then...

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Let me just say that I agree. Some of us were around at the very beginning of the ccNSO, which is at the same time as the very beginning of the Nominating Committee because it all came in at ICANN 2.0. Some of you will remember the discussions at the time that the new ccNSO council – the ccTLDs who were about the launch the ccNSO said that they weren't comfortable or prepared to have some kind of nominating committee putting three council members on.

The minds were changed because the principle was explained – or rather it was explained that having some non-ccTLD people on the council, whether they be from the gTLD, whether they be from wherever – even just independently – was a valuable ... Was to provide valuable input to what might otherwise be a very

---

inward-looking council only concerned with matters from the ccTLD's point of view, and that point was accepted by the ccTLD community.

So, there is a sort of fundamental understanding amongst ccTLDs that actually what is supposed to be happening is the non-ccTLD people are put on the council by the nominating committee but that is not in the Bylaw nor is it in the remit of the NomCom at this point.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. Mike?

MIKE SILBER: Well, I think that, Chris, is exactly the question here. I think nobody is disagreeing with the principle. The question is how do we actually execute?

I would've thought that the ccNSO representative to the Nominating Committee would take that forward. I know that there was written instructions, requests, motivation to the NomCom previously and that seems to have been ignored. But, the question is how [inaudible] and I would encourage the ccNSO to focus on that question because I think the principle is well accepted. Does your rep to the NomCom take it forward? Do you write every year to the NomCom and remind them of it? Do

---

you put it in the Bylaws, put it somewhere else? I don't have a specific view, but I think that really is the critical focus.

What I would encourage you to do is the same way as the Board every year sends a letter to the Nominating Committee saying this is the sort of person we're looking for. Yeah, usually it's the same as we do most years, which is somebody with integrity, good looking, well-versed in all sorts of issues, dresses elegantly, whatever it may be, I would encourage you then potentially to put a letter like that together for the Nominating Committee and saying this is the sort of person that we're looking for to be seated on the council. That might be a way to do it.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Yeah, thank you very much. Again, as I already mentioned a couple of times, this was very unfortunate miscommunications. We would have loved to provide this information every year, if we knew that it got lost when we provided it the first time. Unfortunately, we did not know that. But, Steven?

STEVEN:

Mike, the letter that you propose, I discussed previously and it's not going to be on our action item list. I just remembered what I forgot previously. It's administrative in nature.

---

Given that we did yesterday in part of our discussion have a go-around about the issue that Council is now going to be one person short for some period of time because current NomCom said, “We don’t have the time to do this. We’re kicking it down the road and giving it to the next one,” I just wanted to advise Board that we will be running one person short probably for a considerable period of time and the question is: does this cause any sort of a crisis with regards to Bylaws, etc.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Okay, thank you. I think we can move forward and next agenda item that we propose is about the ccNSO participation in the GNSO subsequent procedures work track five. It’s related to geographic names. The use of country and territory names, geographic names, as top-level domains.

This is a very hot topic we discussed it where the ALAC, with GNSO, and also at great length with GAC. Apparently, at this moment, there’s no common position, nor common understanding, of how to move forward. But we all are awaiting for a letter of response from GNSO [inaudible] respond to all our concerns and will try to address them and their response to all three of us, so it’s ALAC, ccNSO, and GAC.

I don’t know if there’s anything else we would like to tell to the Board. Yeah, we do realize that the views, even in our

---

community, differ. Maybe not as significantly as in GAC or in other communities, nevertheless we do believe that we may try to achieve a better solution than in the current applicant guidebook – the solution that we achieved in 2012, and that is written in the applicant guidebook. But if this proves to be impossible, then we believe that we should go back to the same rule that is currently in the applicant guidebook.

I have appointed Annabeth Langer from dot-NO as our coleader on work track five. Unfortunately, she has lost her voice and found another one. So, Nick, anything you would like to add maybe about positions from regional organizations. Voice gets instructions from ...

NICK WENBAN-SMITH:

Sorry, I was just getting my instructions straight. We had the first meeting of the work track five this morning for quite a long session. It was very well attended and I think it's gone off to a really positive start in terms of the feeling in the room.

The overall leaders of the subsequent procedures for new gTLDs as Jeff Neuman and now Cheryl Langdon-Orr went to great lengths to give us comfort that even if the CCs participating were a minority that in terms of the way that the GNSO formulates a consensus policy recommendation that that is taken into account and I think we all felt better for hearing that.

---

They made it very clear that also if there isn't a consensus, then we stick with the 2012 guidebook, so there needs to be agreement on an improvement before a change is made.

And I think from the perspective – Annabeth's perspective through me – is that one of the problems the GNSO sees with the guidebook and the geographic protections is that they do not agree that that was achieved through bottom-up policy process. They think it was inserted later on unilaterally by the Board.

Having gone through this process, and if we managed to retain the geographic protections that we seek and we've made in our statements, the advantage of that is it will then form policy and it will form a policy recommendation which should then stick and would give us a bit more comfort and satisfaction that the protections we need will be actually GNSO policy embedded in a formal way for the future, which I think is a very nice place for us to be in.

It was a very well attended meeting. They have over 80 volunteers already and they only just started asking for volunteers. There's another 50 or so observers. There's very wide participation from all around the world, and from the GAC and [inaudible] have 12 I think from the ccTLD community and there's also a sprinkling of people from ALAC. But it is dominated

---

by GNSO. Yeah, very interesting, very nice piece of work. Everyone is obviously encouraged to join in.

Katrina and Annabeth's colleague from Norway is going to try to help coordinate the workload because obviously it's a heavy workload and the way that the meetings get scheduled, it's sometimes antisocial times of the day for people, but we try to share that around amongst people for whom it's not quite so antisocial because they live in that time zone, so that's the sort of thing we're looking at now.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. Wait, Nick, we have a question from Chris.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Hi, Nick. Geographic names kind of splits into some obvious sections. You've got the name of your country and then you've got the name of your cities and then you've got the name of perhaps rocks or mountains or whatever you want to call them.

It strikes me that there may well be different approaches and different views to those. If I could just contain it to those three for the sake of this discussion, those three levels of name.

Is there intention, do you know, to try ... I suspect to try and reach consensus on all three of them at the same time might be



---

quite difficult and it may be easier to reach consensus on country names and city names, perhaps less easy to reach consensus on what is an acceptable third thing, etc. I'm just wondering if you have any clue yet whether or not the working group is intended to split that work up or just to try and do everything in one lump.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Well, the discussion this morning was purely on what good looks like in terms of the output. What are the goals, what are the problems we currently have? What's within scope of that group? I think the general feeling is we will collect all the inputs, thank you very much, and it starts with quite a wide net.

Then, there has already been the suggestion which I think will be adopted that actually [inaudible] clarify the different categories [inaudible] maybe a white list for some things, maybe a black list for some things, maybe sort of a gray list with non-objection procedures for something in the middle [inaudible]. But, that's part of the substantive work. We're not there yet. We're just in the very early stages of the first meeting.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much, Nick. Any other comments or questions? If not, thank you, we can move to the next agenda item. It's about

---

our joint ccNSO/SSAC response to the Board’s letter on EPSRP guidelines.

Yes, we noted that the Board’s resolution that this response had been approved, and apparently you are satisfied with the work that the ccNSO and SSAC produced. Any comments on the next steps, what we, the community, need to do, what you expect from us, when you will come back to us and so on?

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Well, we’re more than satisfied. We’re delighted. And we’ve passed a resolution already to accept the report. We passed that resolution on Saturday. So, I guess – I’m not 100% sure, but Bart would know better than me, but I guess this next steps are now back to the ccNSO to ... Or do we have to actually do something to documentation before you can proceed with implementing, Bart, with the EPSRP? ICANN org has to do what?

Just say, for example, I was an applicant who had a TLD that happened to fit within this criteria. Imagine what that might be. Can that now be dealt with or do we have to wait for something first? Would you do on the microphone? Thanks, Bart.

BART BOSWINKEL:

It is my understanding that ICANN org will need to organize the experts to live up to what is in the implementation plan, the

---

changed implementation plan. If you look at the language in the implementation plan, it talks about that the applicant may submit proposes for mitigating [inaudible], that ICANN org will then consult with the applicant and with experts to test whether or to check whether these mitigating [matches] do indeed meet the criteria. So, it's criteria and mitigating [matches] and experts.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

So, can I suggest then what might be a good idea is if you've got a liaison group together in the ccNSO and perhaps the relevance – you couldn't be sending notes to the relevant staff people saying what is the next step, but make sure you keep on top of it, so it doesn't get lost in the general melee of other things.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you, Bart. [inaudible]. Yes, wait a minute, Cherine.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

I really want to congratulate both the ccNSO and SSAC for moving this issue forward. I think it's an excellent way of finding compromises, and to the benefit obviously of applicants. But it's been hanging on for a number of years now and it used to be finding it difficult to walk in the corridor because a lot of applicants would come to you and say, "What are you doing

---

about it? What are you doing about it?” Now, I feel very proud and I just want them to approach us because, “There you go. The ccNSO and SSAC got together and solved the issue and provided a way forward.” So, I think that is really to be commended and thank you so much for making this happen. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you very much for your kind words. However, I think it wasn't just about finding compromises. It was about ... Initially, I think, I had a feeling it was about, again, miscommunication. We sat together, so we managed to find a common understanding. It was not as much about compromises as it was about really discussing things and ... Yeah, I see your hands. I just want to finish my sentence because my colleagues always point out that I do not finish sentences because I give floor to those who wave hands. Just finish the sentence, which I forgot of course. Goran, please.

JORDAN CARTER:

First of all, I really would like to extend a very big thanks to Katrina and Patrik, and also to the part of my team I think helped a lot in the communication.

---

We had a meeting in Copenhagen, I think. When I asked myself the question, I had two groups of people who I thought were very competent, very enthusiastic, and came up with two different versions of reality.

I realized that that is not their fault because everybody was working according to their own charter, their own set of principles, in their ways. And unfortunately – and that was partly due to the flow chart [inaudible] project. We realized there was no interconnection in between until they sort of reached the Board.

That is I think something we have to think about in the system. How do we manage better to have conversations before a decision is made? In an accountable world, where nobody can represent everybody until we have a decision.

So I think that the magic of this is that we got smart people to sit down in a room and talk to each other, and therefore we can establish a process to making this going away.

What I take with me from that is this was ad hoc solution for this particular problem, but together we need to figure out a way that we don't make it ad hoc so it becomes transparent, and it becomes predictable and therefore avoid those kinds of problems going forward.

---

Unfortunately, I often use this case as an example of both why it was bad that it happened, but also as a good example of how we can sort it out. So, thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. I also would like to thank you for bringing us together early morning in Copenhagen.

JORDAN CARTER: It was early morning.

KATRINA SATAKI: It was, yes. You slept. I remember that. But you let us to discuss things and that was actually the most important part. So we discussed, and then, yes, thank to our staff, especially to Bart and from ccNSO and secretariat and Steve Sheng from SSAC support team. They were really very instrumental, so thank you very much first for bringing us together, and second giving us staff resources to help us bridge the gap. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you, Katrina. Seems a lot of thank you notes to each other, so probably I should just shut up here.

---

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Taken from what Goran just shared, I think it's really an ad hoc solution. Over the years I think seven or eight years of the IDN fast track [inaudible], I think to take away [inaudible], very simply is that one IDN/ccTLD fast track is always ... It's open, so I think a lot of learning from this process that actually this type of opening of the TLD application actually works. But, my second point here is that this IDN ccTLD fast track, so you get a quick yes or a quick no, but in some cases, you have a quick yes or a quick no, and then turn out in a few months time later, it turned out to be a slow yes or a slow no. In this case, we witness over years of changes needed. As you just pointed correctly, reaching across the [aisle].

So I think we should definitely take the lessons, and since the IDN guidelines is being reviewed and it's open for public, for comments, I definitely encourage those who are interested should be part of it. But once again, my thank you notes. So you know that I vote actually differently, but I think this great learning process is very worthwhile. Thank you.

---

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much, [inaudible]. Any other comments, questions? No? Technically, that's all of the topics that we had. Before I propose any new topic, maybe there are any questions from the Board you'd like to ask the ccNSO.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I have one. I'm interested – and I don't necessarily get into a really deep discussion, but I'd be very interested to hear from any ccTLD managers about what they're doing in respect to GDPR, and whether they'd like to tell us what they're doing in respect to GDPR.

KATRINA SATAKI: What is GDPR?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I'm not sure how to spell it, never mind if I know what it is.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah. It's General Data Protection Regulation. Oh, I see Nigel is willing to share. Yes, please, Nigel.

NIGEL HICKSON: We're either fortunate or otherwise that although we're already not in the EU we are covered by GDPR, the General Data



---

Protection Regulation. We had a meeting with our data protection commissioner who came over to [inaudible] about three months ago, two or three months ago, and I just say don't panic. It's not going to be as hard as you think it is. It's not rocket science. There's a lot more fuss, sound and fury, being made than ... I see Pierre is nodding. If you'd like to carry on, that was the point I wanted to make.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes, Pierre?

PIERRE DANDJINO: I just wanted ... If Nigel says that it's easy being a lawyer, that's really easy to do. I think there is a lot of experience to be found in various, especially European ccTLDs that have to comply before the GDPR with data protection laws and that had done that over the years for some of us. For ten years, we have implemented data protections in the [inaudible] and we are really ready to share this experience because it's something that works and that is not too difficult to implement technically.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. Goran?

---

JORDAN CARTER: Thank you very much. We have started to send out letters to different CCs, especially in Europe. We're opening up the avenue for information sharing with each other. This goes two ways. You can ask us questions about what we're doing as well. We really appreciate your experience and knowledge about how you implemented the access to your WHOIS systems. I probably broke any law by saying [inaudible]. But we really appreciate that cooperation.

You have often a knowledge that we don't because you're local in those countries. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. Yes, [inaudible]?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Something I would like to share is just that we are doing a lot of things, but we're actually not really sure if the outcome is really compliant, and the most problematic thing for us currently is that we will live in a state of uncertainty until May 2018 because we just can't be sure whether or not what we're applying, be it retention of data, be it publishing in the WHOIS, we're just not getting a written consent by any data protection officer saying, "This, what you're doing is really what we want." And that is going to be a problem that we probably face all.

---

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: May I make a comment? Can I say it's even worse than that? Because the way it works is that the [inaudible] then will tell you what they think. There is a [inaudible] that someone will take that to court, and I don't know how many court instances you have in your country – it could be two or three – and then it eventually will end up in European court.

So, the answer or the interpretation of this, lies in the court systems in the European court, which usually takes three to five years. I just want to make your day even better.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Probably you did, but to my knowledge, not really, because it's even worse. I'm with DENIC the dot-de registry. In Germany, federal laws apply, so I'm not even reporting to a federal data protection officer, but to a regional one and that is the one in the state of [Hessin]. So I may be confronted with a situation where the guy in [Hessin] who is responsible for me states that my operation is compliant, whereas somebody in [Hembroke] might say it's not. And yes, finally, I obviously need to take it to some arbitration or some higher court who'd finally say what you do is right or wrong.

---

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: For the record, you win.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. Roelof?

ROELOF MEIJER: First of all, happy to share what we're doing. We had [inaudible] WHOIS for quite a few years. So if anybody is interested to know how that works, we're willing to share that – quite willing to share it.

I recommended we don't look at this thing as if it's big, hairy and dangerous, because it will probably make us either freeze, flee, or fight – none of the three which I think are good solutions.

I think a few of you have experienced [RDPA] is relatively cooperative in making clear what is acceptable and what is not acceptable. We feel that that helps, as both the registry of dot-NL with [inaudible] and the backend service provider for [inaudible] forced open WHOIS until recently. We were in a kind of jam and we now have had, let's say, clear guidance from [RDPA] and I think we should all use it as a starting point. We are finishing the last things that we need that we think to become fully compliant and we don't think it's very complicated.

---

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you, Becky?

BECKY BURR: Roelof, can I ask you a question? Does your tiered access system provide any mechanism for credentialing so that known users with use cases that are determined to be legitimate and proportionate can get on there or do you require an individual by individual search?

ROELOF MEIJER: Okay. I don't want to give a very lengthy answer, but it was quite a lengthy process. Access to our tiered [inaudible] is on the basis of a contract, so for instance, our national police force had to sign a contract. That contract was vetted by the previous DPA, which was something they didn't want to do for us, but we told those national organizations that want to have access that we would only provide it on the basis of a contract that had been agreed upon or vetted by the DPA and that's how it worked in the end.

So, each and every one of the organizations that have access to our tiered [inaudible] more open [inaudible] they get all the data and they can do [inaudible] per day. Still limited, but more. They [inaudible] on the contract and that contract is published on our website.

---

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. Does that answer the question?

BECKY BURR: Absolutely, that's great.

KATRINA SATAKI: Nick, in your own capacity, I assume.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Nick Wenban-Smith, Nominet UK and not the voice of Annabeth for once. I was just going to say a little bit that the center has – that the European ccTLDs has a trade association as a [inaudible] regulatory working group, we have been discussing data protection for more than ten years, and specifically with the GDPR we have all been working in a group quite cooperatively to discuss how each of us are approaching GDPR. We don't all approach it the same, but I think it's the nature of these principles based regulations that there can be any number of different reasonable solutions which will be equally acceptable.

All I was saying is I'm actually, with another hat on, a member of the Registry Stakeholder Group and I'm speaking on the GDPR panel tomorrow and I'm going to try to explain some of the

---

subtleties around this because I think there's a lot of myths, and frankly, total inaccuracies going around about what this actually means. So I think we're going to try and work through it.

For those of us who also have gTLD registries, I think we are suffering some significant concerns, but from the CC side of things, I think we're all pretty comfortable about where we are.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

So, could I ask the room a question then? For those of you who are ccTLD managers, if you European or you believe that the European regulations will apply to you, how many of you actually as a ccTLD actually run what we would all know is open WHOIS rather than one with some form of tiered access? How many of you run an open WHOIS? Almost everyone in this context runs some sort of limited information WHOIS with no access or WHOIS with tiered access. Okay. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you very much. Are there any other questions or issues you'd like to raise? Jordan?

JORDAN CARTER:

Jordan Carter, dot-NZ. I just wanted to actually say thank you to the Board for the priorities blog that came out under Cherine's

---

name. I was asking a few questions in Copenhagen and was surprised by the different answers from staff and Board and stuff. I don't know if you found it helpful to write that down, but I certainly found it helpful to read it. So, thanks for sharing that thinking with us.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Thank you, Jordan. It was actually not easy to write. I have to admit that. Because you have to think of the structure. And I think now that we have a structure which defines our responsibilities, activities, and priorities for the year, we'll be able to update that more often and easier way. So, thank you.

And the key for it really was not only transparency but hopefully the community will look at that and think do the Board priorities align with our own priorities, and getting feedback on that would be quite good. I mean, the whole idea of transparency is that there is an engagement and getting some feedback we will obviously adjust our priorities if those are not aligned with the community's priorities. So, thank you for your comments. Really appreciated.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you very much. Now we're smoothly moved to the part of thank yous, and therefore we would like to use the opportunity



---

to thank Steve on behalf of the community, on behalf of all ccTLDs and behalf of ccNSO for your contribution, for you being here with us for us. We really appreciate it. We wish you all the best, and when we thought about something memorable to give to you, we decided that each of us will bring a piece of their country.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Soil, [inaudible], bricks.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes. Well, no, we decided to make it a little bit more picturesque. So, those are postcards. And Byron also has worked with you and his ...

STEVE CROCKER: As you can see, Chris had to nudge me to wake up because I was anticipating taking my rest prematurely. It's been a real pleasure. It's been a very, very intense experience for 15 years all told and between SSAC and the Board, hundreds and hundreds of fantastic people and life experiences that I would not have ever dreamed. So, thank you all.

---

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. Almost done. We just want to say that incoming Chair, Cherine, we're also looking forward to working with you and hope it will be just as successful and great as it was before.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you very much. I think these are big shoes to fill. Steve is a pioneer of the Internet, but I think the transition from Steve to myself has been very smooth. He's been very, very good. In the last year or so, he gradually transferred responsibilities. I think we have a strong board and a strong leadership, and as a team, I'm sure we will rise to the challenges. I really look forward to the future with great confidence and enthusiasm, despite the immense challenges we're facing. I think together with the community we will rise to that challenge and I'm very confident about that. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. Thank you for coming to our room.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: We've also given Steve something to read when he no longer has all those board papers to go through.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**