
SAN JUAN – Joint Meeting: ccNSO & GAC
Tuesday, March 13, 2018 – 15:15 to 16:15 AST
ICANN61 | San Juan, Puerto Rico

CHAIR ISMAIL: Welcome back everyone. Can you please take your seats? We will be starting in a minute thank you. so welcome back everyone. This is GAC session 26, which is the GAC meeting with the ccNSO scheduled at 1515 for 60 minutes on Tuesday, March 13.

So thank you everyone for being back and, do we have the agenda on the screen, or we don't have, yes thank you. Thank you. So, basically we have work track five and so first Katrina if you want to welcome everyone and we can get start with the agenda. Sorry.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. My name is Katrina Sataki and I'm a member of the ccNSO Council and its be pleasure to be here with the government. We start with the progress on the work track five and the role of ccNSO and GSE on this process and I'd like to give the floor for a short update to my colleague Annebeth who is our cochair on that work track five.

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.

ANNEBETH LANGE:

Thank you and good afternoon. This is Annebeth Lange. One of the cochairs and work track five that works with geographical names as TLDs. We began in November 17 and completed terms of reference as we talked about this--- we also held an informal webinar on the history of geographic names at the top level which is [on the] web and can be useful for those who want updates on the issue.

So, we have meetings, teleconferences every other week and the last couple of work track meetings we have structured process is going to different categories of geographic names that that we obtained in the applicant guidebook of 2012 and comparing those categories and terms with the initial GNSO policies developed in 2007, so piece by piece we are going through the pros and cons essentially, so the positive and negative impact on the impact on the way the categories were treated in the applicant guidebook can be seen. And then we will then be looking at how we want to consider them in the next round. Either doing the same thing, in the future or changing what was in the applicant guidebook--- any sort of variations between initial policy work in 2007 and the final applicant guidebook content. And as we complete that we will then move on to what was contained within the applicant guidebook and then we will go down to consider categories that were not in the applicant guidebook and which will create more problems.

We do have we do have a special day session tomorrow morning in work track five here in [indiscernible] at 830 so those of you interested in the subject whether you are part of the working group or not are more than welcome to contribute and be there and hear it. If there are any questions I'm happy to try and answer them.

CHAIR ISMAIL: Just to let you know that we did not even schedule any GAC sessions tomorrow during the work track five session so we can free everyone from the GAC to be able to participate.

ANNEBETH LANGE: Thank you that's very good to hear.

KATRINA SATAKI: What has been your experience so far? any particular concerns or conclusions?

CHAIR ISMAIL: So, no conclusions yet. So as I was mentioned earlier with the ALAC as well we have two parts of the discussion, one that had to do with the process itself, and then discussion on the substance as well. With regard to the process we were expecting the working group to be function with the cross community

working group working group tools basically, but but then we got to know it by the PDP rules. But again the response we got was that if you would like to go by the ccWG rules which is like nominating five members and so on, we can do this but we didn't find any merit behind doing it alone, but having said that we have already nominated six GAC representatives on the working group, just to make sure we are well informed and they convey GAC views and opinions to the work track. But also we have many other participants who expressed interest in they should be able to participate as well, like the whole community.

On the substance I believe we are just getting started like the working group discussions basically and so I would, I mean I would leave it to GAC colleagues who are actively participating if we have anyone in the room and so they can way and also their views so yes please.

TAYLOR BENTLEY:

My name is Taylor Bentley and I'm from the government of Canada and I've had the pleasure of following this from webinars for a long time and I just wanted to ask a question because of course the document we are working from is comprehensive. When we were reviewing it in the sessionk there it is kind of a lot of text, a lot of views. It is difficult to digest I think especially for some of our newer members. And so I would

ask if the working group has considered a way to make that more user-friendly. Thank you.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: This will certainly be taken into consideration. I know that the Google document it's very difficult to be oriented what is in a because if you take it as a PDP, you cannot read it and if you have it as a Google document it's a long and really difficult to see, but I think the main thing, when you are thinking about this thing is to take the applicant guidebook and the chapter two on the evaluation, where the geographic names are mentioned, and what we try to do is set all the different categories up to what was the original GNSO policy and then what to do with it in the future and then even if you have problems going into this document, then the thing you can do as a member when you have suggestions on how to treat the different categories, that is the main issue actually in the future. Just send emails and we can get it into the document and the plan now is that we've got as much input as possible for those categories [or they are] already there is anything in the first instance to make an initial report and then it will be more like a document that is much easier to read. And after that it will be a consultation. So then you can see even clearer what has been done and what has not been done. We are fortunate to have a very good Secretariat, as Manal said. Also we started out with one thing a cross

community working group. But the problem is that in the bylaws it is no option. So then we have to change the bylaws to be able to make a PDP for the whole community and that is not there. So we will make the best of the situation we have and I will say that the atmosphere in this work track is much better and I have much more hope that we can find a solution that I had in the cross community working group. So the GNSO, even if they have different agendas and different wishes then we have and you have, we really try to find a common ground and the atmosphere between us is good. So I hope that as many as possible give their view that will help the result.

CHAIR ISMAIL: Thanks Canada and thank you Annebeth. Any further questions or comments? so shall we move on?

KATRINA SATAKI: Regions working group and the initiative to prepare frequently asked questions document regarding CCT LD delegation and transfer. The document is in good shape. I would say all different parties provided input to it and I hope it will serve as additional information to all of you who are looking into this issue trying to find answers to questions that bother you. We also submitted a glossary from our PDP working group we hope that this glossary of terms used in different documents including those that have

been prepared by ICANN and [IANA] so you can refer to where the terms come from and what they mean. Quite often the terms are, you cannot find any document that explains the meaning of the term, yet it appears an official document, but during our discussion of overserved regions working group representatives we came to an idea--- we provide some presentation, we explain where do these two letter codes come from, how they become ccTLD, country code top-level domains and what it means to be a country code top-level domain registry operator and how a registry operator cooperates, how they build their infrastructure and so on we thought maybe it would be something we could work together for Panama meeting so that we can run a session on this. We thought it would be useful and I hope that you in the GAC have the same feeling. Any questions on that?

CHAIR ISMAIL:

So actually Manal speaking here, I think this was a very useful exercise and it was worthwhile to spend some time on this FAQ because normally we receive many questions and this is one piece where everything is compiled and with this glossary I think this is very helpful as well and despite the fact that this was the working group for underserved regions, but I think it would serve the purpose also for newcomers and new representatives as well. So I would also bring it to the attention of colleagues

here in the room if they would like to seek information this is a very useful FAQ. So anything else on this topic?

KATRINA SATAKI:

Not from us. If not, we have been very efficient today. Let's move forward. Yes. When we are thinking about the ways to make these, are bilateral meetings more beneficial for both parties, thought it would be good to decide to have people from each of our groups who could work together and setting up agenda making sure that it's really a valuable meeting. So we have from Peter... Or both from Peter and from GAC... That they volunteered to do work and I hope they can now share some initial ideas and some feedback. How they think about this and how we could proceed.

PETER VERGOTE:

Okay, gladly. Thank you Katrina. Peter Vergote for the record. We haven't actually come up with an acronym happily... I think in the ICANN tradition we should do that. So Per and I have been exchanging our views the last couple of weeks and days. And although we have not met before we sense that there is a lot of common ground between us we share basically two things. It is, first we have the impression that the joint sessions between our colleagues from the GAC and ccNSO members it is an event that is isolated. It happens throughout an ICANN meeting then we

have some kind of a [void] and the reiteration at the next ICANN meeting and both Per and I believe that we need to create a kind of channel, vehicle that enables a more direct flow of common, how would I put it? common concerns or common issues or common topics that we would like to discuss so that we can more proactively prepare the agenda and the exchange the next use for the next ICANN meetings and the second concern we share is that we have noticed that on previous occasions that the agenda was really filled with topics and suddenly this topics did not get the same span of attention. We had a feeling we rushed at the end of the session a bit toward the last couple of points of the agenda. And so we think we both think that it is probably better to limit the number of topics and and have a more in-depth interaction between our communities instead of having a fully packed agenda and actually missing the opportunity for assistance. Currently Per and I are members of the agenda setting committee. We are still in early process. We are coming to the first time now prior to this ICANN meeting so also for us it's going to be a bit of learning curve may be the agenda community can be expanded in the future, but currently I think Per and I are willing to serve as kind of Explorer so to see how we can take things from here. But the most important thing I think is that through this vehicle we have a to interactive to keep discussing or liaising between ourselves and between meetings and the propose way would be that if GAC members

have any suggestions, any concerns, anything that they want to see treated, that they convey this to per and Per will one on one share this with me so that I can bring it to the attention of the CCNSO and ccNSO Council and of course vice versa. If my colleague ccNSO members would have a need for some topics or issues to be addressed with their GAC colleagues that they use me as the communication channel and I will then convey back to Per and I think that this might help us facilitate meetings in the future.

Unidentified speaker: I agree.

PETER VERGOTE: I think I covered what we shared yesterday but... Thank you if you have immediate feedback or things you want to share by all means, feel welcome to question either Per or myself. Thanks.

CHAIR ISMAIL: Thank you, Peter, Manal speaking here so thanks to Peter and Per for volunteering to do the volunteer function. And thanks to Katrina for the ccNSO initiative you reached out to us and asked that we start thinking about our meetings which was a very welcome initiative, and I hope that we will keep the thing going intercessionally as well as you rightly mention, and even within

the GAC leadership discussions we were thinking of whenever we are compiling the agenda for the following meeting that we can invite people from other So's and ACs like yourself to put really an agenda of interest to both sides. So thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much, Peter. I'd like to take the opportunity and ask GAC, maybe you already can give a couple of ideas for topics that you would like to discuss at the upcoming meetings. With us. Yes Peter please?

PETER VERGOTE: I have one, Katrina but I see that it's listed AOB. So I have not touched on it, but so that we will get to that point.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes please, Switzerland.

JORGE CANCIO: Switzerland for the record thank you. Apologies for being late but GPRS taking some time of our agendas. I guess that in future meetings we will be still meeting to discuss specially the treatment of country names. And all of the different flavors and fashions in work track five and how we react to the evolution of those discussions. Both on your side and our site. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes. Netherlands please?

NETHERLANDS: Thank you Manal, Thomas [de Haan], Netherlands Dutch government. I have two topics. The first one just as my Belgian colleague said we are here for the AOB because it is kind of important but I will not go into this and the second is more of this general idea. ICANN has done a lot to mitigate abuse and is doing much more now in mitigating abuse especially as we see the new gTLD that the percentage is growing despite all kind of guarantees, contracts etc. What I sense is that the approach within ICANN is kind of top-down. It's let's say obligations which dribble down to contracts and to the obligations of TLD's while I see that in many countries also ccTLDs there's a much more v bottom a process of voluntary working to mitigate abuse and I wonder if this good practice is approach which many countries have [could as well] brought into the process as a way of, for example we have this I think it is CC ops, or I think.

KATRINA SATAKI: TLD ops.

NETHERLANDS: TLD ops which I think are good volunteer mechanisms to tackle abuse and mitigate, and look at threats but also look at performance and metrics also on the other side. And so I wonder if this is something which not necessarily to the GAC, but also for the ccNSO in conjunction with GAC because we have of course also the interest in maintaining secure and stable Internet. To be put more into the process also in gTLD [remit]. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. Any other suggestions for topics? To discuss?

CHAIR ISMAIL: Yes Portugal please.

PORTUGAL: Thank you very much. I can have a discussion about the use of the CCT LDS use of secondary domain. I'd like to see how do you see, how do you think that will work or not. I would like to have a good discussion with you. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. I hope the agenda setting committee I see they are already writing down everything. Any other wishes?

maybe something that you feel you need to learn more from the ccNSO and something we could provide? Yes Netherlands.

NETHERLANDS:

Sorry to take the floor again, but Anna triggered me, and also I think this is very important because we have the discussion on the use of two lines of code on the second level in gTLDs and I think the ccTLD have a lot of experience would also you have in the second level of the two legs of code. What problems arise probably for 15 or 20 years of experience, whether this causes confusion or problems etc. So this is basically something which could feed in our discussions because there's a lot of lack of knowledge about what really are the problems in this case and thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you very much. Very small correction. 25, 30 years of expense. Thank you, yes. But in case you get any other idea, please feel free to contact our agenda setting team. Yes, Peter please?

PETER VERGOTE:

Katrina I think we're fairly on schedule so I just want to address already come the question raised by Thomas. One particular thing with regard to two letter codes as second-level domain

[names] that has raised... Issues I would say, or concerns is that if you block it, you get sometimes in problematic situations with holders of IP rights, because they sometimes explicitly want [the string] to use actively as a domain name and if you block it for reasons that you say well we don't really release anything related to country code on the second level then you are finding yourself in a problematic situation that at least something we have found a prior... Long ago before we release the [strings].

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you very much for the short comment. A lot more can be said on the subject but let's keep it for our upcoming meetings. Now we can with to the next agenda item. It is a short update on the work of our PDP working group on retirement of ccTLDs. I'd like to ask my colleague Stephen to present on this topic.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE:

Good afternoon Stephen Deerhake for the record. This will be a brief update followed by an appeal. Since ICANN 60 we've done considerable work on identifying retirement scenarios and as part of that process we have published for circulation within the PDP working group two publications known as scenario one, which looks in detail at changes of code elements in the ISO table and a document called scenario two which looks at what happens when there is removal from an assigned category

within the ISO table and no new ISO code is assigned. By way of housekeeping, the current chair Nigel Roberts is stepping down at the start of Thursday's face-to-face meeting as the ccNSO has pushed him up to the board. And I'm taking over at that point.

My appeal is simply that we needed GAC participation during the framework of interpretation, working group. We had a GAC participation in the form of Frank Bartsch from New Zealand. And his input was invaluable and we feel we would end up with a much better work project product if we could have GAC input on what we are doing as we walked down this road rather than just show up at your doorstep with our report and you're not having participated in it. And so if any of you are interested, by all means we would be most happy to have you join the working group. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you very much, Stephen. Are there any questions or any volunteers to participate in the work of the PDP working group? we do not do many PDP's. You should not be complaining. [Laughter] okay. No volunteers at the moment.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE:

An exciting show of hands.

CHAIR ISMAIL: [inaudible]

NIGEL ROBERTS: [indiscernible] out of curiosity how long is the list of ccTLD's at the moment? are there any... Or would this just... A proactive PDP?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: There are none currently, however what we are trying to do is to rationalize [IONA] policy with respect to this event when it occurs. It has occurred in the past five or six times maybe. And to put it mildly [IONA] policy for how these have been handled has been wobbly and our intent here is to give them appropriate guidance as to how this should be handled.

CHAIR ISMAIL: Manal speaking. I think we had very good past experience getting very early engaged with the ccNSO on their PD so I encourage GAC colleagues to maybe look at the PDP more closely and so if they would like to see the scope of what's going to be discussed and definitely we would be open for volunteers any time, not necessarily at the meeting here if you still want to get a look at what the PDP is all about again. But I encourage GAC colleagues to participate. So... Any comments on this agenda item before we move on? Yes Morocco please.

MOROCCO: Morocco speaking. Thank you very much. I have a question related to domain names with the name of countries. So is there any name that has been assigned to the private sector that are managed by ccTLDs so... I mean has the situation occurred in the past?

ANNEBETH LANGE: Do you mean here on the first level or second level you are talking about, second-level domains and under the ccTLD?

MOROCCO: Morocco speaking. I would explain what I want to say. With respect to the ISO list [176] that has the characters for the country I think it was the private sector that was managing certain country names. Is that still in place or is it not?

ANNEBETH LANGE: Oh yes so what you are asking about is whether it is private companies being ccTLDs. Yes that's true. The different ccTLD managers are very different. Some are led or administered by government. Others are ideal organizations not-for-profit. Most of them are not-for-profit but it's a lot of private organizations being administrative leaders or organizations of the ccTLD's yes.

CHAIR ISMAIL: Just very quickly Morocco to make sure we are addressing the full question are you speaking only about who is running the ccTLD or also about how the ccTLD is run. It could be a two character code and used as a gTLD... Used more as a generic domain name. So I am just trying to clarify exactly what the question was.

MOROCCO: Morocco speaking. Thank you very much Mme. chair. I think that once upon a time there were two character codes that were assigned or allocated to private companies. One way or the other. I mean these two character names represented strings the represented country names. So my question is not related to the management of the domain name, but that with the domain name held by the private sectors, did they exist or not?

KATRINA SATAKI: With each iteration we get closer to address your question correctly and answered. As my colleague Annebeth already mentioned, CCT of these differ. As they used to say, one size does not fit all. In our case, that is definitely the case. If you look at numbers then I think it is slightly different from region to region. But, in general as Annebeth already mentioned, there is

no one approach to how a ccTLD can be run and who runs a ccTLD. Yes there are many... At least in Europe for example, majority are run by not-for-profit organizations. Yes there are private companies. Yes there are governments that run, government run institutions. There are academic institutions and so on and so on. And sometimes, sometimes they change. For example initially they were run by an academic institution, then it moved to private company or initially run by a government and then it moved to not-for-profit and so on. So there is no one rule for how a ccTLD is run. Different... Or absolutely completely different structures. Have we answered your question?

Okay here we have [AOB] and in that we have several things I see we have cc the registries, and GBR. anything in particular you would like to hear on this topic?

CHAIR ISMAIL: You mean on the list of topics, or...? So you are asking anything else on those topics or any more topics that we need to do.

KATRINA SATAKI: We still have time. We can solve all the issues in the world.

CHAIR ISMAIL: Okay because I keep hearing that you have the best waiver for looking at the ICANN budget so it may be better if we learn how the ccNSO does it because everyone is facing the way it see ccNSO are doing it so maybe if time allows it would be a good way to present to the GAC how you do this.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much Manal for this question. Yes we do look into all of the ICANN budget and strategic documents for some time now. I think we established a strategic and operational planning working group in 2008, so they have quite an experience and they looked into many documents and they provide feedback, and the best thing is that every time they provide feedback during an ICANN meeting they meet with the ICANN team and try to discuss those open issues. Currently we have promoted the working group into standing committees or the SOP now, the strategic planning and operating committee. Yes again, as you know ccTLDs have different types of competencies and here we have people who are knowledgeable in strategic planning and budget planning and all the things that come with that. Therefore they are in a good position to provide feedback to this document. If you want to hear more specific comments that were provided for our SOPC on the current budget draft I can ask my colleagues to do so. If you just want to

know about the structure, how it is structured, then yes, that is what it is.

But that's not actually all that we are doing. We also take our responsibilities as a ccNSO participant very seriously and Stephen has done math to make sure that we follow the process that in the bylaws with respect to rejection action petitions. Because as you know there is a list of events, let's say, the trigger rejection action process. So for example ICANN budget is one of those things. So unless decision of participants, and GAC is one of the decisional participants, unless the decisional participants reject specific thing, ICANN budget for example it is adopted.

So we do not foresee at the moment any rejection action petitions. Nevertheless, we want to make sure that should the need arise we are ready and prepared. So Stephen, may I give the floor to you to allude more on... The scenarios that you have calculated?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Yes as a decisional participant the GAC should be aware of the process that is going to unfold between now and to the beginning of the next fiscal year with respect to the FY 19 budget. As you know, the comment period, excuse me, the comment period for the budget close last week. Staff report is due on 12 April. With respect to having a public, or in the event,

should I say, that one or more SOACs submits a rejection action petition subsequent to the ICANN board voting to approve the budget, the ramifications with respect to whether or not the empowered community administration can hold a public hearing during ICANN 62 in Panama, and it depends on when the ICANN board takes its vote to approve the budget. And there are basically two scenarios. There is a window during which the ICANN board can vote on this that would permit the ECA to hold a public forum if we needed to. The earliest day they can vote appears to be on 7 May. This would result in a rejection action period that would end on 31 May followed by a seven day rejection action petition support period which is the period during which the SOAC that has submitted a rejection petition has to solicit the support of at least one other SO or AC for that action petition to move on.

That would trigger, assuming they get the second SOAC support a rejection action forum period and that would end on 25 June which is the first day of the ICANN budget the second scenario involves the last day the board could vote and we would still be in a position to hold a public forum at ICANN 62 and about it for the board's 30th May. This would result in the rejection action period ending on 20 June the rejection action support period ending a week later on 27 June and the last of the rejection

action, actually the first day of the rejection action petition period would fall on 28 June which is the last day of ICANN 62 so rather than using the maximum 21 days offered in the bylaws for the community forum period, we would have to hold the community forum during the first day on the 21 day period allotted to us and in either event either of these scenarios, because of the timing of the development of the budget and the reality of how late to the ICANN board is waiting to approve the budget under either Would go into FY less 18 budget if in fact we ended up with the rejection action petition in process. I have no idea whether or not we will see any rejection action petitions submitted, let alone supported by another SOAC, but I felt... wearing my ECA hat that I should inform you that there is a window during which ICANN board needs to vote if the impact community is going to have an opportunity to hold a petition forum, community forum during ICANN 62 and I encourage the board this morning to observe this window in the interest of just having the community be able to discuss this in public rather than via teleconference. Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you very much, Stephen, are there any questions? If there are no... I see there is one item under any other business that is ccTLD registries and GDPR. I'm sure that you've hurt a lot on the topic. Tomorrow during our ccNSO meeting day we are going to

have a legal session where we are planning to discuss exactly that. And yes may I ask Peter who is the chair of that session to give you more information in case you are interested?

PETER VERGOTE:

Thank you Katrina. Peter Vergote speaking. The main goal of the session is to explain GDPR relevance's for ccTLD in general because GDPR is still often looked upon as a typical European regulation, that is highly going to affect European institutions or in our case ccTLDs. But actually we think the influence of GDPR is going to be far more widespread and especially when it comes down to open ccTLDs that accept registrations from all over the world. And I'm very happy that two of my colleagues who are not running European ccTLD are going to demonstrate that by means of a presentation and I'm going for being a representative of the European ccTLD, I'm going to highlight the impact that GDPR has on our operations. We have of course not been living in a privacy vacuum. And so it's more going to be an evolution than a revolution. But I think that both flavors can show the relevance of GDPR on the overall activities of ccTLD.

I have been informed by Per that it is unfortunately coinciding with a session here in the GAC. It's probably when you start drafting the communiqué. But if you are not able to attend our session, the slide decks will be available on the ccNSO website.

So you are most welcome to download the material later and to address any questions that you might have so that we can pick you up on that.

And I also have been told, maybe that already has been communicated but I have been told that tomorrow at 930 there will be an additional session on GDPR and the interim proposed [model] just for your information. Thank you.

CHAIR ISMAIL:

Thank you. I assume it is going to be an open session so it is going to be recorded as well? I mean, not only the material is available, but also maybe the recording of your session will be available?

PETER VERGOTE:

I don't know I will have to look to Katrina for that. I don't know whether all sessions are recorded. They are not scribed like here.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Definitely they are not scribed. They are broadcasted so while others are [communicating] you can listen to others in the broadcast. But I think they are recorded. I'm not sure. I'm not sure. Because, but I just saw something today, this morning

there was a recording... That yes, sorry I must say that since I am always there I never watch the recording.

CHAIR ISMAIL:

It's okay. Nevermind I was just making sure that GAC colleagues would be able to benefit from the session as well. Yes. As you may guess it is a topic of interest here as well. We've been discussing this for quite some time. We had submitted comments on the ICANN proposed model and we are also having this as one of the topics of discussion with the board later today. So. Any comments from GAC colleagues or specific points to be discussed on GDPR? Yes Switzerland?

JORGE CANCIO:

Perhaps a general question as especially European ccTLDs are more familiar with the GDPR and with the new requirements with this [regulation]. What would be the main takeaways that you could provide gTLDs registries, registrars with regarding what should be the priorities in adapting to the GDPR. that's perhaps a very general question. But I guess you've been in touch with them, so any information would be very useful for us. So that we, for instance in our role as the GAC we really learn from your hands on experience and don't invent new wheels since you already know how to go about it.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you very much for the question, being one of the European registries being directly affected by GDPR, I must say that I'm not sure if anyone can be familiar with the regulation because it's so complex. And actually different people interpret it differently even within, among European registries we do understand things differently. For me the major take away. I've read a lot of documents about, and explanations and explanatory notes everything on the GDPR for me the major take away is that it requires a change in the mindset. The way you think about personal data. And I'm not saying we did not care about privacy or personal data before, but now really it is about the way that you think about data that are, that you are processing. So why you are processing is there a reason for you to process data, the major thing you must understand, the data, the personal data you have, they are not yours. They belong to those people... Provided to you the data but I'm sure that Peter can give you more elaborate answer.

PETER VERGOTE:

Thanks, Katrina. Peter Vergote speaking. It's a difficult question indeed because you cannot in 30 seconds just give a brief summary or guidance like this is what you should do with GDPR. the good news is I do not anticipate starting 25 May that data

protection authorities will, together with an armed squad appear on our doorstep and say like hey, you are not complied with GDPR. I think the registry operators, registrars are not the most obvious targets in between brackets when it comes down to GDPR compliance. However there were a couple of things about registry operators and registrar should be aware of. And it is like what Katrina said. It is the change of mindset. Be aware of the regulation and what it brings along. And act accordingly. So I think that it should be feasible to come up at least we did this for our registrars, to come up with a list of let's say 10 bullet points or priorities that you should work on. Obvious things are that you will need a register for your process, processing activities. You need to be aware, am I a controller or processor? What is my relationship with my processor because you will have two need you will need a special agreement between you you will need to work on privacy design and by default. That is something novel. My advice would also be, you have probably heard that under certain conditions you need to appoint data protection officer, or a DPO. Even if it's not necessary or applicable for your particular situation this could be very handy that you have one single point of contact for all things that are connected to data privacy. The same applies for having emergency plans for data breaches. Even if you do not have to do that, having a data breach is something that is so disruptive for your organization that it is, whether within the framework or without the

framework of GDPR it is so important that it's very valuable to have that in place.

So, if you work on those priorities, the extra bonus is that in case that you get contacted, like or questioned like what have you been doing to be compliant with GDPR you can show to your local GPA that we are not unaware. We have been working. It might be that we are not fully compliant because GDPR is not black and white, there's a lot of gray matter. But at least you can come up with a believable story, like we are not unaware. We have been working on it and like everybody else we are having trouble getting to wrap our head around it. But we will eventually get there. So that would be my advice. Focus on a number of priorities. Do not try to grasp it all at once. But try to put in place some basic features.

CHAIR ISMAIL: Thank you, Peter. It's time to conclude the session. So do we have a quick intervention from the US?

UNITED STATES: I just wanted to thank you specific for that with respect specifically to who it is I know CCP is all work differently and have different requirements with respect to who is, but looking to the G space, there seems to be this expectation from registries

and registrars to have absolute certainty, and it does not seem to exist here in the CC space. So I don't know if you have any influence over our comrades with, in the generic space, but it seems to be this hurdle that nobody can get past. In terms of providing absolute certainty which is just not is how the world works. So I will stop there and see if you have any reactions.

CHAIR ISMAIL:

Thank you, US, and I do not dare to say we have up potential agenda item for the Panama meeting because by the time of Panama we nobody knows nobody knows where the process will be. And so thank you all for the interactive discussion and thank you Katrina, Anna Beth, Stephen, Peter, and everyone from the ccNSO. We value our mutual bilaterals and I can see we already have an agenda for our next meeting. So thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you very much it's always a pleasure to be here. Thank you and see you in Panama.

CHAIR ISMAIL:

For GAC colleagues, please remain seated, we will follow with the next session immediately. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]