

---

PANAMA – GAC: GDPR Overview  
Monday, June 25, 2018 – 11:00 to 12:00 EST  
ICANN62 | Panama City, Panama

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: So thank you again everyone. We are now starting our discussion on GDPR we tried to prepare a slide deck to help us structure our discussion. I hope GAC colleagues were able to attend the GAC webinar that was held prior to our meeting here but we will try to bring everyone up to speed if we can go to the next slide please, just to quickly share session objectives for bringing all GAC members up to speed so that we can have a common starting point or discussion.

I hope that we bear in mind any questions that we would like to share with ICANN board. We are meeting with them on Wednesday from 10:00 to 11:00. Also it would be good if we can identify any GAC consensus or agreed messages that we can share with ICANN Board and also cross community sessions that will take place tomorrow. And most importantly any messages will help us in drafting GAC advice as an appropriate.

So moving on, those are quick highlights or overarching principles. The GAC would like to maintain WHOIS to the greatest extent possible while complying GDPR. This is protection regulation which maintains data privacy. What data

---

*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.*

---

would be put public? And what would be maintaining nonpublic, and who can have access to nonpublic data.

Moving on quickly, also the GAC is concerned with effective access to, this includes law enforcement, consumer protection and cyber protection professionals. And intellectual rights holders. GAC would also like this to see publication contractibility and cross referencing of registration by registrants. Also availability of contact information for legal entities. And finally addressing specific needs of law enforcement such as confidentiality of requests and volumes.

So having said that if we move on please we have identified three areas of discussion or three buckets. First the ICANN's contractual temporary specification. Temp. Spec. And unified model for continued access for full WHOIS data. And also proposes a role for the governments which we need also to discuss and have some input on. And finally the new GNSO expedited policy process. EPDP the process by which the temporary specification would be converted to consensus policy within one year. I hand over the bucket to Catherin. Is it you? Laureen.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

And with this morning's discussion I am afraid we are in the land of horrible acronyms. I will take a moment to try and drill down

---

a little bit where we are. Because of the EU privacy regulation that necessitates a change how the WHOIS information is going to be made available to the public.

ICANN where are those living now? Living in the contract through a temporary specification and the keyword there is temporary. Why is it temporary? Because ICANN bylaws mandate if you don't go through formal process and do things in emergency basis. You can only have those contract changes living temporary in the contracts and therefore you need a community process to make those more permanent. What is that process? That is what we call the expedited development process. And part of that expedited development process among all of the issues that are going to be packed into that process besides WHOIS. Information is going to be handled so it can meet the interest of law enforcement and other legitimate users. Besides that there is going to be this big question about how legitimate users get access to the nonpublic data and what bucket is that going to be living in? That's going to be this access model another phrase that is used in connection to that is the accreditation. We are sort of on the same level of basic understanding with that I am going to turn it over to my co chair Catherin.

---

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: If I may very quickly to note after each of the buckets we have some brainstorming questions and also at the very end we have the questions that were posed for the panelist that will be discussed during the cross community sessions tomorrow. With those questions please keep the discussion going. Keep it interactive and we need to have some concrete outputs by the end of discussion.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We know that people in the panel in particular countries, super knowledgeable person. And we would like that she kindly make necessary pose after each important point that she present to the meeting allow the people to reflect and raise questions. Otherwise she is so knowledgeable that could continue for half an hour that they may be difficult to digest. Bear with us or with me I am not as smart as these other people. Do us a favor slowly and give major points that GAC needs to pay attention. This EPDP discussed everywhere. I don't know how we can do that. Please kindly bear with us.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: The three buckets will be presented by three of us. And committed to one pose after each bucket so that we have the dialog going. Over to you Catherin.

CATHRIN BAUER BULST: Thank you very much and that important reminder. These are very complex issues which is why we thought very carefully about the structure of this. If I can have the next slide please. As Manal was mentioning, we are now going to go into a bit more detail on each of the three buckets that were identified. First, and at the end of each of these sections we will have a slide with questions for your reflection and discussion. And also overview to preparing with the GNSO and with the ICANN board. So that will be an opportunity to for us to go over each of these in bit more detail. If I am going too slow please raise your hand and make me slow down.

On the temporary specifications, so a lot has happened since we last sat together in San Juan and adopted GAC files. The most important development ICANN Board adopted how the WHOIS is handled. And those temporary specifications on the process have effect of imposing new temporary requirements of contractual nature. So in essence these specifications have impact of modifying the community development policy on the WHOIS on temporary basis for all the regular registries.

What happened in the board in adopting these also adopted resolutions which it decided to defer action on number of pieces on GAC advice? And we will get to content in a minute. But to

---

suffice to say there were number of piece of advice that were not addressed in temporary specification. On the process still the way these temporary specification function is that them being emergency mechanism. They are only valid for period of 90 days, so three months. And the end of the 90 days the board wants temporary specification to stay in effect they have to be extended. They can be extended for another 90 day period for a total of up to three times. That takes us through an entire year of potential temporary specification being enforced.

Each of the points where the temporary specifications are extended the ICANN Board can choose to adopt an entirely new set or indeed modify the existing ones. Every 90 days there is review point where the ICANN Board takes a decision, does it want to modify or even adopt a new or additional set alongside.

Now that for the process I am now going to the content. So let me first address what they do contain. They do contain a number of obligations on the registries. How the WHOIS data is to be handled. They reduce the set of publicly available WHOIS data to a smaller amount than what was previously available. Most of the information on the registrants is now redacted. And also obliged the contracted parties to collect the full data set. Even though it's not published it's still collected and also passed along to all the registries. That's the obligations under the temporary specifications. And also obliges the contracted

---

parties to move to a new way of dealing with WHOIS data. Called RDAP the kind of layered access.

For the non-publicly available data, the new protocol could support an access based on credential to the data that is no longer available. From a technical side that is particularly important point for us. That means there is a functionality in place that could eventually enable access to nonpublic data in uniform matter across the contracted parties.

Now that is what it contains. There are some other aspects but I am focusing on ones that I believe are key to GAC. Now turn to what they do not contain. In particular there are a number of important points for the GAC which we had identified in the San Juan communique having been particularly important. Instead included in annex as issues that still need to be addressed by the community without specifying how they will be addressed. In particular what is not included is how to obtain access to the nonpublic data. The specifications include line contracted parties have to provide reasonable access. That's the extent they go into detail. So now left to each of the contracted parties which there are more than 2,300. To determine how they will grant this reasonable access to whom and which purposes. So that is not included. The temporary specification to do distinguish between legal and natural person.

---

And they do not address a number of specific law enforcement needs in particular when it comes to issue of confidentiality of the queries and the query volumes whether or not there is a possibility to form to impose a high number of requests for law enforcement investigations.

There is a number of now turn from the content to the impact that has had on the public interest which we identified. There is a number of impacts. I want to highlight two in particular. Now the access to nonpublic data is subject to a decision, an individual decision of the individual registry or registrar whether they grant access. What exactly the procedure is for requesting this access? So now it takes instead of look up through central portal.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

What this means on practical level when someone is trying to find this information what they see is information redacted for privacy. If I have a website that is engage in deceptive behavior and I want to find out who is behind that website and I look up the information in WHOIS and what I am seeing is redacted for privacy. What I have been hearing from law enforcement colleagues, police officers don't even know they can ask for this information much less who to ask. One of the issues that is going



---

to be a big topic of discussion is well we have this new policy, has it had any impact?

And one argument that we have heard all right, there hasn't been much impact, we are not getting much requests at all. That isn't quite sufficient an argument because one of the reasons people aren't getting requests is A, people on the frontline doing investigations don't even know they can make requests. And B, they don't know who to make the requests to the 2,300 registries and registrar. What we have here is information vacuum and lack of information where key information can be accessed; A, that can you access. And B, who you should be asking. I just wanted to flag that because it's very important.

CATHRINE BAUER BULST: Thank you. And second point here is when the law enforcement can identify whom to request the data from there are different challenges arising from lack of confidentiality. First of all because you need to make a written request instead of doing an inquiry. And also a natural limit to what the registry or registrar can process.

We now move to the next slide we will now take a couple of minutes for discussion on these particular aspects of the temporary specifications. And here we propose to discuss two

---

aspects with you. First of all the GAC advice if we are happy with what has happened to that advice.

And secondly on strategy, what should we do now with GAC, should we issue new advice? Or take other actions to basically reiterate our needs as they need to be reflected in temporary specifications. And one question we might want to ask of the ICANN Board in particular. Secondly, we want to discuss with you the temporary specifications and possible questions that we can ask both of the ICANN Board and GNSO in particular what the plans are around how we will be dealing with temporary specifications. Will these just remain solid throughout the year? Will there be changes made at each 90 day period? Will they be updated or modified?

It will be very helpful to plan for the period ahead to see what the plans are in respect to that in particular. Access and accreditation. And then we also would propose to ask a question to the GNSO about their assessments of the temporary specification. And maybe at this point it would be useful to pull up the GAC advice slide.

So Catherine if I may as we get this up just to provide a little bit of history on GAC advice. So we have provided in San Juan ten points of GAC advice. Six of which were accepted. And four of which were challenging because of the timing because we were

---

asking for concrete things that are not currently reflected in the temp spec. So have agreed with the board to have those four points deferred. The board deferred it's decision on those four points of GAC advice as Fabien has on the screen right now. And the board decision was deferred on annex. So we really need to see how we can follow up on the implementation of this annex to have the GAC advice fully reflected. So thank you.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

To further compliment we already identified those three buckets earlier that we are talking about. The unified access model, temporary specification and expedited and within those three buckets it's not even clear where the follow up on GAC advice would fit. So it doesn't have a natural home in any of the three as of yet. And that's something for us to consider going forward.

I would propose to briefly stop here and whether there are questions on what I said and secondly whether there is input you wish to provide on the questions for discussion in particular how we should move forward with respect to the temporary specifications.

IRAN:

As Manal mentioned four elements of those GAC advice have been deferred for later decision, am I right? Do you believe that

---

we need to further emphasis action on those four or we should carefully examine the reasons given by the board not being in a position at this stage to proceed with acceptance of that. And if we push the decisions what are the rationale behind that. And is this is very important. So I wish to mention that there may be no point to push for something that we may receive the same advice that we need time, we need to evaluate that and so on and so forth.

Three time extension, in that one year maybe you come later on to the answer in that we need to go to the EPDP. Unfortunately this EPDP coincides with the new gTLD now the process is for the progressively or preliminary and at the same time there are many issues that GAC would be very, very busy and involved on those may be difficult to select what are the priorities for us GDPR is important and top priority. But on the other hand the others as well. We have to see this one unless this one here should be postponed for another year and whether or not could have this temporary for more than one year. Otherwise if you can't do that we have so select something and advise that priority for us. This is the question that I wanted to know, do you think we still need more GAC advice? And if yes, why? And how?

Thank you.

---

LAUREEN KAPIN: Thank you. Jorge also had a question.

JORGE: I think it's more comment than a question. We are discussing the three buckets that you mentioned on slide three. The temporary spec. And unified model and EPDP. Two of those three buckets are two channels. So temporary spec and the EPDP are channels.

Insert modifications to the WHOIS system and the access and equity system. And the second point the access and accreditation model is main substance I think that is urgent to resolve of the GAC advice. So I think that that's important and probably part of our discussion should be where to best concentrate our efforts because, okay we have this proposal from ICANN out there and also have to decide where to channel that discussion into first modification of the temporary spec and in parallel or more in the long term if one year is long term the EPDP. So I will leave you that for the moment. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Just very quickly to reflect on what has been said. I personally concur with what (indiscernible) said regarding four pieces of deferred GAC advice. I think we need to work on their implementation. So if we can concentrate our efforts on how we

---

get the annex basically implemented this would resolve the whole issues. And I think so far until things are made more clear we will have unfortunately I mean participate in both processes. The EPDP currently with the temporary specification but also we need to reflect on the unified access model as it proposes a role for the GAC. So this is also very important that we weigh in our views. Question remains how everything would fit at the end. This is question that we may also need to formulate and ask in our sessions. Thank you.

CATHRIN BAUER BULST: Thank you very much. And I think this sounds very sensible. Something else to flag here perhaps. There is still a lot of questions with respect to EPDP and how this unified access model will proceed. And perhaps it's best that we try and ascertain where these conversations are going to be going because there is not even a scope defined for the EPDP. But just to reiterate it's safe to say from GAC perspective at least from US perspective means to access in legitimate purpose in timely fashion is utmost priority. And I am a bit concerned going through the EPDP process it would take some suspect 12 years and some additional time to implement.

So timing is of concern and the number of issues that have been articulated already. Questions regarding law enforcement, the

---

confidentiality of question and having access. And some of these other concerns about legal and natural persons as well as email whether or not we can learn from other experiences which I understand some research being done in Europe at the moment that we can really make some progress in the near term rather than longer term. Perhaps we can find based on information we get how the EPDP is going to proceed and how the conversation on access model will proceed. Appropriate buckets to address continued concerns. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Okay Catherin you want to say something. I am just mindful of time. And I think we are getting to the unified access model and EPDP so maybe we can proceed.

CATHRIN BAUER BULST: I think what you say is very much something that we might see emerging. On the workload question because that hasn't yet been addressed. There is this traffic force that has been created within the GAC. And with that I will pass it for Laureen for the next bucket.

LAUREEN KAPIN: The unified access model.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Just comment on what the US said. I think it's very important to the GAC to have what we ask for implemented as soon as possible. The faster we provide input the faster we can get faster results. The speed by draft has been proposed is also welcomed. So the unified access model proposal was just posted before the meeting here. I hope everyone had the chance to skim through it or read it thoroughly.

Let me start by other recent developments as well. ICANN community has been developing model regarding access in specifics. So we have accreditation and access model from the business and intellectual contingency. And also advisory access and recently published ICANN for high level framework for unified model. This was posted on 18th of June, and plays out series of questions to frame the discussion basically including comparison between the proposed structures versus other models that are being proposed by the community as well.

So unified access model is to provide access for law enforcement and other governmental authorities but also we need to define categories of private third parties who will be bound ultimately by codes of conduct. The discussion also includes authentication and process and technical details for authenticating user and providing access. Scope of data for



---

authenticates users and also transparency compliance of code of conduct. And reaching out to European data protection board to build legal certainty. And then ultimately finalizing the report.

We tried here in the following slide to highlight the proposed role for the GAC or individual governments but I would urge everyone to go through the paper itself, read it word by word for the sake of our discussions. And maybe we can also invite ICANN to present the proposal if needed. We can do this on Wednesday morning we have the time.

So quickly highlighting the proposed role for governments. First identifying broad categories of eligible user groups and it's proposed that European economic area GAC governments to help with this task. Then identifying specific eligible user groups. And this proposes to be done by ICANN org and governments through the GAC. And also determining law enforcement authentication requirements in national jurisdiction. This is task for each and individual government.

And determining global authentication requirements for law enforcement in accordance with applicable legal frameworks and also for Interpol and Europol and identifying relevant authentication requirements. And here ICANN is proposing to do this in consultation with the GAC. And if the GAC is unable ICANN can work this through the global community. And finally for

---

third party common safeguards across all codes of conducts. And this also done in consultation with the GAC and the European Data Protection Board.

So I think it's important that the proposed role for the government got it from the paper itself and we will continue to have the discussion today, tomorrow, through Wednesday. Now key elements for ICANN's proposal and those are things that the GAC needs to keep an eye on which is the role of government and the GAC of course, within this proposal. Also the query based access to data which may be inconsistent with the GAC advice that Catherin highlighted earlier.

And also the login requirements that may compromise the confidentiality needed by law enforcement authorities. So again it's more of key words to brainstorm on and come up with concrete questions if we want what procedure, means will be used to develop and delivery and implement the model. So what is the exact process? Is it (indiscernible) type of process? Is it going to follow the same EPDP temporary specification? Again there is a question about the process itself. And also how the GNSO views the unified access modify and where it fits in the temporary specification. The EPDP. So again, and of course, as highlighted earlier and the most important thing is how effective the most effective way for GAC to communicate views again through whatever process for the unified access model and also

---

for the expedited PDP by definition as the name going to indicate it's going to be very fast and weigh in views quickly.

So let me pause here as we are committed to pause after each bucket and again see if there are any immediate questions or reactions.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes, I think perhaps it's my view or my country's view we have already certain deficiency in the PDP. Now when we go to the EPDP we may have more deficiencies. There are many priorities before us. One of the priorities that people discussed this morning was geographic name is very important. The other priority is this new subsequent procedure. The other priorities that we have to reply to the CCW accountability board. They wanted to push us to reply this week and we told the CCW that's impossible for GAC to reply. And now there is EPDP on temporary specification. So many things. We can't make magic. The sources are limited. Not that we don't want to work but we are limited in deciding on many things that we have to consult many organizations inside the country. So we have to see what we can do.

And then Catherin, I am sorry, I am not convinced why we could not work or continue these temporary arrangements for more than one year. We waited months and months and now we are

---

under pressure. We think everything in hurry. It is something that we don't want to follow that to the expression (indiscernible). Quickly done, badly done. This is very important for us this process. In particular for the law enforcement. And particular for the confidentiality and many other things. I think we pushed from all directions. So this is something important that we may not be ready for the one year to prepare the EPDP even if push everybody in GAC, perhaps to be more active in that which is currently not possible. Two o'clock in the morning nobody in Europe to start many people have problems with their families at night, dinnertime and there is meeting. So please consider that priority.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you. I think one year is one dated by the bylaws; this is where one year comes from. So it's temporary it has to be finalized within one year and this is a good point to transfer to you Laureen for the EPDP and for the sake of time.

LAUREEN KAPIN: I will be expedited in my discussion of the expedited EPDP. I will give you visual aid. Those that might be intimidated of going over access unified model. I would urge you all to take a quick look at it. And there is lots of white space. See lots of white space. So I want to give you a concrete visual aids. In terms of

---

expedited policy process. This is an issue that is currently I will use the vernacular, "up for grabs". The topics of discussion how this process will take place, who will participate. And when I say who, I mean which stakeholder group and how many representatives from each stakeholder group will be participating and also the scope. What is going to be the subject matter? Will it just be the temporary specification being confirmed or also include this unified access issue.

And just to reiterate because currently there is no central way for third party users to gain access to nonpublic information even if those users have legitimate purpose such as law enforcement and cybersecurity folks, IP rights holder and etcetera. And the public at large. Currently there is no centralized system. There is a real priority for that to be handled as soon as possible and because of this expedited development policy is going to be as soon as possible. Process one of the things we should really reflect on is whether we want to take the position that the access model and accreditation issues should be handled within that process.

And here I will echo the United States comments this will be best done as soon as possible. In terms of discussing this, here is what you need to know. That there is going to be community discussion about both of these topics, who should participate and what the topics are going to be in the expedited PDP during

---

this meeting. And second, could we go to the previous slide. I promise to get to this quickly. There is small group formed within the GAC already. That way we are a little bit ahead of the game. Yay us! There is small group who has come forward and said yes we will participate in this process. We will help formulate the GAC views and communicate with the GAC to find out what the consensus views are. In that regard we have small team ready, willing and able to take on this task. That is great. And now we can move on to the next slide.

So here are issues for discussion. What should be the GAC's role? And in this regards I want to flag one of the key issues is, should the GAC have equal role to other stakeholders i.e. current proposals that is being floated certain stakeholders within GNSO would get three and and at first blush you might be thinking that is not fair. If we don't think it's the right balance that is something we can advocate for. That the GAC should have parity with the GNSO stakeholder groups. After all these general data protection issues would balance privacy and other interests such as keeping the public safe.

That is the essence of the public policy issue and what is the GACs deal with and second which I already flagged a key issue about scope. If there is going to be expedited process as GAC as he pointed out is handling so many other pressing interests. What should be the scope of the EPDP? And what are

---

the really time sensitive issues that need to be dealt with? The temporary specification itself and then I would pause it based on feedback we already gotten that this issue of how third parties including law enforcements, cybersecurity, IP right holder and other users with a legitimate interest. That those issues need to be tackled with this process as well.

In that regard, we have questions on this slide to the GNSO and questions to the board to get their thinking. This is a new process that hasn't been done before. As I said it's up for grabs and up to be defined by community input and we are an important part of the community.

So that's the quick expedited discussion on the expedited PDP I take a pause and give you the opportunity to weigh in on these issues.

NIGEL: I am not clear is this meant to be across community PDP or a GNSO PDP being expedited?

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: It's GNSO PDP and it's expedited in the sense of having a few steps missing to make somethings faster. So it's more or less a PDP but a little bit faster. Follow up from CTU and then I will give you the floor.

---

NIGEL: Is there precedent for other communities to advocate for representation on the team in a GNSO PDP? And how much representation?

LAUREEN KAPIN: This is the first time this has been done. I think the door is open for us to advocate what is the best interest for this very unique process that is being commenced to deal with an issue that has been the subject of a flurry of important community discussions in a very compressed time frame. It's a unique process and I think it is open for us to press for what we think is the right balance here.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Just to add a few things, as Laureen rightly mentioned this is uncharted ground. So we haven't been through an expedited PDP before. In normal PDP the participation is so no limits on number. Since this is meant to be expedited so the direction is having a smaller size working group to have things move faster. Also I have to tell you I have been told that we were too fast in proposing five, whereas they are still discussing and no one else is proposing anything. And I told them because we are trying to be as fast as the PDP so



IRAN:

We already had difficulties with the PDP. In any case, we have annex A to bylaw. Annex A1 and annex 2. So we will be bound under the rules of GNSO and also a risk of being marginalized because of the dynamic participation of those people that have support materially and in other ways and GAC people don't have support materially or timewise. This issue is important for GAC. It should not be seen as government issue. People of the country. The government wants to do that and government wants to no it's not government people. So I don't know if there is possibly to do that. Representation 1 or 3 may also not work. Those 1 or 3 maybe utmost neutrality. I think GAC should take different procedures. I suggest that GAC consider establishing a working group online to consult with each other once we have a view on the matter agreed by the people to those representatives either 1 or 2, or 3. I believe minimum three not one. And having commitment of participation. Because we have a better experience in the group dealing with working group five, track five, we need to commitment of participation. This is very, very important. While we don't want to go out of the PDP process or EPDP or GNSO we need to put more possibility that expressing our views I would say in a so called equal basis. This is very important.

---

This is not something light that we could forget about GAC this is something really for the security, for the privacy, the confidentiality, law enforcement. Again I suggest to establish online working group to consult and try to collect the ideas and through those representatives that GAC decides those then we communicate that to the group and those people should undertake that. Would not communicate anything more than has been agreed by the group. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you. I have the US. We have one minute left and two slides so if we can and Indonesia. If we can go to slide 16. And meanwhile US you have the floor.

US: The ability to move quickly as is necessary for this EPDP but to echo some of the concern from my colleague from Iran, WHOIS user is going to be lost in the way that the PDP is currently being envisioned with only one representative and one alternate for the different parties. That is at the core of our concerns at this point in terms of access. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you US. I have Indonesia.

---

INDONESIA: Who is GDPR

CATHRIN BAUER BULST: Only decision so far temporary injunction to require the German base registrar to collect data sets and ICANN has asked for reconsideration and the court has decided to do full review of it's own first decision on refusal of decision. We have two more sessions. I will be happy to explain more on the sidelines after this. Thank you.

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Thank you Catherin. We can definitely try to as we invite as ICANN to present the unified access model they can maybe also speak about this point Indonesia. Meanwhile just to bring to your attention we are at the time and we have another session starting now. But we have already circulated the cross community session questions on email, on the GAC mailing list. So those are all the questions for the session we try to highlight a few questions that maybe of a specific interest to GAC colleagues, what concerns remain about the temporary specification. What needs to be fixed? What practical issues have you encountered? Those are questions that are going to be

---

posted tomorrow during cross community sessions. And again we need guidance for GAC participation on those sessions.

So yeah. If we also move to the last slide and let me propose this, tomorrow we were supposed to start at 8:30 with 15 minute slot for overview of the overall agenda for the day. I will try to do this at the end of today and avail the 15 minutes in the morning for GDPR discussion. We are supposed to have afterwards 30 minutes which the last half hour we have promised IPN to present their model. Allow us to have 45 minutes in the morning to continue discussions specifically on questions for cross community sessions. But maybe also if you can think over it and bring more questions tomorrow that we need to discuss it will be helpful also.

So Catherin please go ahead.

CATHRIN BAUER BULST: Without further I want to reiterate these questions are really shared with you not just for discussion here but for your consideration as input throughout the week for the different sessions. To help gather your thoughts and still flag one session that still shows up incorrectly. Today at five there will be first cross community session which will be the community input session to the EPDP charger drafting team.

---

So that is the schedule has been switched. Originally that was slot for RDS review team to report. Now it will be a session to discuss all the issues around what to do with the EPDP. What the scope will be. That will be today at 5:00. Key session for you all to attend and provide input on so your views are heard on behalf your government. There will be further sessions but that will be tomorrow's sessions. I saw a number of you taking pictures of slide. We will circulate the slides via email right after this session you can review them. And also be available on GAC website. Pitch here for using GAC website where you will find this and other material. Thank you

MANAL ISMAIL, GAC CHAIR: Reiterate the importance of session today at 5:00. It's going to take place here in the GAC room. So please make sure to be there and communicate your views regarding the EPDP. So any further comments? Anything else to add?

So if not then let's conclude the session at this and I hope we can continue the discussion. Please keep the questions in mind and come back to us tomorrow maybe with some views. As I said we will start at 8:30 and we will have 45 minutes of GAC discussions and then 30 minutes for IPNBC proposes. Please remain seated with GAC colleagues. We will proceed high level

---

governmental meeting. It's just half an hour and then we will have lunch break. So thank you for bearing with us.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**