

**ICANN
Transcription ICANN64 Kobe
Joint Meeting: ccNSO and GNSO Councils
Monday, 11 March 2019 at 12:15 JST**

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page
<http://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

Katrina Sataki: Good afternoon, dear ladies and gentlemen, so we're ready to start and Keith very kindly allowed me to open the meeting. And thank you for hosting us. Thank you for the lunch. And I hope that we will have some interesting discussions and exchanges here.

So with that let me start by - oh mentioning something that well I do not have an update to claim that it has never happened before but I think it would be certain to say that it's not very often that reviews at ICANN are done quickly, efficiently and in a way that they probably should have been always done. And here we're talking about the CSC Effectiveness Review.

Unfortunately Debbie and (Martin), who were our members on this review team are not up here but Philippe kindly agreed to introduce both - both sides of the story on behalf of the review team, so Philippe, may I give you the floor?

Philippe Fouquart: Sure. Thank you. Philippe Fouquart. Yes, so for those of you who could not follow the movie, the initial report of the CSC Effectiveness Review was published sometime in January, I think early January and was put to - put out for comments. There were four, at the top of my head, four recommendations in the report.

And we received five - I think five comments all together coming from both GNSO constituencies and from the ccNSO Council. All of them were supportive. There was one - a few comments of substance in the ccNSO Council's comment so we accommodated these comments in the final report which was published last week I think.

So we do have this final report for approval on the consent agenda for Wednesday's meeting. I'm happy to go through the more - the substance of the report if it's necessary. We've got four recommendations all together that are around the attendance of the CSC, capacity building of the new members, documenting the complaint procedure.

I should add that the final - changes to the final report are minimal compared to what was published in January so I think people had the time to review the document. It's not as if what was published last week was anything new. So I'm hopeful that we can move forward with this, next step being that this is used as an input to the IANA Naming Function Review moving forward. So I'm happy to take questions if there are any. Thank you.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Thank you, Katrina and thank you, Philippe. So Keith Drazek, the new GNSO Council Chair. Hi, everybody. And welcome to you all and thank you for joining us. This is obviously an important session that we do regularly at the ICANN meetings and that is extremely valuable.

And particularly in light of the new obligations that we have under the new bylaws, as following the transition related to the empowered community obligations and specifically on things related to the IANA functions, where we

as the customers of IANA in the naming space really have an opportunity and an obligation to work together in these new structures to ensure that the bylaws are being followed, that performance is being met, and that the expectations are being delivered upon.

So thank you very much, Philippe. And if anybody has any comments or questions, observations, feel free to weigh in at this point.

Katrina Sataki: Yes thank you very much, Keith. If I may, it's Katrina here again, yes I see that Byron also wants to say something. But going back to the formation of the CSC, Customer Standing Committee, I think one of the most important things that we considered at the time was that we really need experts and really highly qualified professionals working on this piece.

The idea was that it was not a beauty contest where we can select people based on, I know, some other criteria because this is - registries both gTLD registries and ccTLD registries are - we are the direct customers of IANA and for us it's really important that the system works. And therefore we need professionals to be working on this CSC.

Another thing that was highlighted in the report was, for me, yes, I have to admit I wasn't following the - such important thing as attendance, for example, of those CSC calls and meetings. According to their charter members and liaisons had to attend the meetings or at least nine meetings per year if I'm not mistaken, and not be absent for more than two meetings in a row.

Well unfortunately with the liaisons, we see that they tend not to attend those meetings and - well I think that really this - what's highlighted in this report and we really need to take that seriously and address those issues. And that's why the comments submitted by the ccNSO Council they propose a way forward saying that once a year CSC reports to the appointing organizations highlighting the attendance of their appointees explaining the

importance of the matter and sorry, you need to appoint people who do the work who participate and pay attention, not just somebody who's there for any other reason.

And I see that Byron, who is the chair of the CSC, wanted to say something. Byron, please.

Byron Holland: Well I'm not sure what to make of your comment about the - having not won the beauty contest, but...

Katrina Sataki: No, I mean, it just happens automatically on top of professional qualities.

Byron Holland: Byron Holland, ccNSO Council, and Chair of the CSC. First, I just wanted to recognize Philippe and the rest of the team for the work on the Effectiveness Review. I think it was actually really effective interaction between the two parties, they sat in on a number of our meetings, certainly asked a lot of questions, went through the documents in a very fine-tooth way, but it was also just a productive and constructive collaborative interaction so I just wanted to say thank you for the team.

In fact, we just got out of the CSC meeting where we had our initial discussions about your recommendations. And I'm happy to say they were all positively accepted and on our dance card for our next meeting is how are we going to start to work through them. So I just wanted to say on behalf of the CSC, thank you to the review team.

Katrina Sataki: Thank you very much. Are there any other comments or questions? Well I have only one wish that all the reviews are carried in the same way, efficiently and quickly and with really valuable result. So thank you. Let's move forward then. And the next one, it's a follow up from our meeting in Barcelona when we highlighted all our experience with IDN - evaluation of IDN TLDs.

And we also expressed our wish that the approach is for IDN ccTLDs and IDN - evaluation of IDN ccTLDs and IDN gTLDs is harmonized so that people understand the principles. And we also promised to do a summary of what we've done and if that's okay with you I'd like to give the floor to Giovanni who has prepared a presentation so he will walk you through our experience and give some suggestions for possible ways forward. So may I ask the presentation to be uploaded?

Woman: Joke, could you please send the presentation to me?

Katrina Sataki: It was sent to (Kim) last week.

Woman: I haven't received it, I'm sorry.

Katrina Sataki: Okay that means that probably you can locate the presentation, we will move forward with the next - oh, Giovanni, can you send the presentation to Joke? And we will move to the next agenda item, that's CCWG Auction Proceeds. So what - be really happy to hear update - latest update. Yes, Erika.

Erika Mann: Thank you so much. This is Erika. Let's quickly check if we have the slides? Can we show them, Marika? Or Joke or whoever is doing it? So just maybe to - how much time do we have? Five minutes? Ten?

Katrina Sataki: Yes, five.

Erika Mann: Five. Okay so very quick. We're in the final phase. We had the public comment period concluded I believe it was the 26th of November. We received five good comments. The challenge we face is that some of the previous decision we have taken, I will give you in a second one example, are to some degree modified or there are recommendation and comments to modify some of our original recommendations we have made as a team. So we have to make up our mind how we are dealing with these public comments. We are in the middle of evaluating them.

And my idea is, and I hope the group is going to support this, that we finalize everything by - in Marrakesh. I really want to push it as quickly as possible because I don't think it's worth to have this enormous amount of money, in principle, available but then just keep it in, you know, somewhere and not make it really usable.

So give you one example of one of the challenges so that you have an idea, so we debated what we call mechanism, which are financial structure, how the money can be granted in the future to different projects. So we discussed four, one was in-house, one was a merger with a different entity, an entity familiar ideally with our environment. Number 3 was a foundation. And Number 4 was the idea to outsource it to an experienced entity.

Already during the first phase when we - the working group evaluated the number - the fourth mechanism and outsourcing was excluded, so three were left. And then for the final recommendation the model to have it in house inside of ICANN or to have ICANN entity - a department merging with a separate entity were the frontrunners and the model to have it as a foundation was practically put a little bit to the back burner. We still asked for comments during the public comment period but it was now on the back burner model.

We received comments from stakeholders and so to actually favor Model C above A and B. So this means - gives you a typical example how we have to re-discuss this. And there are advantages for all of the models. So what we are doing we will have a discussion actually today, this afternoon, and we hopefully have another one on - until you see the different models, and then we hopefully will have another discussion on Wednesday and then hopefully we can finalize everything - the ideal scenario in Marrakesh. That's it. I think that's a quick overview for you.

Katrina Sataki: Yes thank you very much. Are there any questions?

Erika Mann: Let me raise one question, and what I really would urge you to do, so we do I believe we have Marika can remind me, I believe we have 26 participant members and we have 46 something or 48 participants. We have seen over the last month a quite serious drop in attendance.

So what would be really good from your point of view if you would have a, you know, just ensure that you reach out again to those who are appointed to serve on this Auction Proceeds CCWG that they really attend and that you have regular feedback because I think the worst case scenario is that we will have a sudden debate at the very end where everybody wakes up and is saying, you know, we don't want this; we want none of them what you discussed, we want something totally different.

I don't want to see this happening. So it would be really great to ensure that you as the leadership really ensure that, you know, people who are supposed to participate, participate; and second, that you have a constant feedback about the work.

Katrina Sataki: Yes, thank you very much, Erika. Well rest assured we do receive periodical updates. Ching, who is our co-chair of this, he's not here, but Peter, who's also on this CCWG, he's a counselor and he gives - every time he gives very good feedback and explains what's going on. So we do know what's going on so thank you very much. And Keith.

Keith Drazek: Yes, thank you very much, Katrina and Erika. And the comment there was I think a general comment about the entire group, not specific to any party. And to be clear, we had this conversation yesterday internally in the GNSO Council and we all have action items ourselves to go to our groups to make sure our groups are all participating as well. I think the key point here, from Erika, is that this is a critical phase when some decisions are going to be made and recommendations finalized coming out of the public comment

period so it's just very important in this CCWG that we have everybody engaged, so thank you.

Katrina Sataki: Yes, thank you very much. Peter, would you like to say a few words from our perspective?

Peter Vergote: Sure. Thanks, Katrina. Yes, I just want to emphasize the importance that ccNSO is actually participating in this debate. Like Erika said, we are not caught off guard, although that in principle we should also realize that it's funds that are not as closely related with ccTLD contributions than for instance, money coming from the GNSO.

But that being said, I think that what is important to note is the considerable progress that has been made especially in - during the months November and December. And so I'm fairly confident, like Erika, that the work will be done in time. And on a personal practical point of view, I think we also should look after this meeting when this meeting comes if we need to further look for participation by ccNSO councilors. Thanks.

Katrina Sataki: Yes thank you very much. Are we ready with the confusing similarity? Yes, thank you very much. Let's go back to this agenda item and let me give the floor to Giovanni. Giovanni.

Giovanni Seppia: Yes, thank you, Katrina. Giovanni Seppia, dotEU Registry, ccNSO councilor. Wait two seconds for the presentation. So last time we had this meeting we highlighted that in the top level domain environment ICANN has different approaches in terms of evaluating confusing similarity so it's not only about IDNs but is at all levels. So for instance, we consider when a new CC is delegated to the best of my knowledge there's no assessment of confusing similarity at all.

If we get into the IDN ccTLD, the IDN ccTLD fast track is about to celebrate 10 years anniversary since the time it was launched. And any applied-for IDN

CC string is evaluated against three combination of characters. First is any combination of two ISO 646 basic version characters, or other existing TLDs, or applied-for TLDs.

The approach that was chosen at the time the IDN fast track was launched 10 years ago was quite conservative and that was on the basis of preserving the security and stability of the DNS infrastructure. Next slide please. So the evaluation of the confusing similarity is initially done by the DNS Stability Panel. And after let's say some evaluations the CC community proposed to ICANN to introduce a second layer for evaluations as initially the evaluation of the DNS Stability Panel did not foresee any appeal process.

So if a string is found to be confusingly similar, after some years ICANN introduced to the community, we introduced so we managed to introduce an extra let's say evaluation layer which is another shot in the beautiful ICANN environment which is EPSRP which stands for Extended Process of Similarity Review Panel which is a panel made of linguistic experts.

And this is on the basis of the fact that the CC community provided ICANN with several studies that are made in these area at neuro-scientific level so that there are some scientific grounds to determine if a string is confusingly similar to another string. And therefore, this EPSRP panel upon request of the applicant in case the string is found confusingly similar, conducts a review of the requested IDN CCs. And this is something that has been done recently in some cases.

So next slide please. So as I was saying, the reasoning behind having this extra evaluation is to provide the entire framework of the IDN CC fast track with real scientific basis to understand and to determine confusing similarity. There were three strings submitted to the attention of the EPSRP upon request of the applicant. And two initially rejected strings rejected by the DNS Stability Panel were approved following the evaluation of the EPSRP assessment.

And one string ended having mixed evaluation because the panel found this string being confusing similar with two other strings, one non-assigned string and one assigned but not being a CC in the uppercase version but not in the lower case. And so the panel was not able to determine because of this mixed outcome of the evaluation if at the end we can assess that string being confusingly similar in full or partially.

One of the - what we have discussed within the CC community and the - on the basis of the IDN experience is to have a way to let's say free a possible pending applications by allowing the applicant to submit in the process a set of mitigation measures so that will enable the applicant and the registry of the IDN CC string to mitigate possible confusing similarity and eventually then prevent confusing similarity cases.

Next string - not next string - next slide please. Yes, too many strings. So we over the years we have made a comparison about string similarity in the overall ICANN environment, as I was saying. And we start from the CC - the ASCII CC where there is a request for delegation of a new CC. There is no string similarity performed to the best of our knowledge.

While in the most recent round for new gTLDs, the applied-for gTLD strings were evaluated against - and these are the four points - existing TLDs and reserved names, other applied-for gTLD strings, strings requested as IDN CCs and additional tests for two character IDN gTLD strings, so this is what was written in the evaluation manual. The test was quite - based on algorithms and was called (SWORD) and was a test that was meant to give - or not to give - a nonbinding similarity score.

The test is just visual similarity so it doesn't evaluate the string from let's say sound, meaning, context. Those elements are not taken into account, they were not taken into account in the last new gTLD round evaluation for confusing similarity. And so in this case the approach was more flexible,

softer, against the conservative approach that was introduced and is still there for CC IDNs.

Next slide please. So out of the 1900 - a bit more than 1900 applications for the new gTLD program, the, let's say, there were two main, let's say, contention sets (unintelligible) similarity, which were Hotels and (Hotes) and Unicom and Unicorn. While all the others, and many more, as listed on the - in this slide, they were approved because all of them they were not deemed to be confusingly similar.

Next slide please. So a possible way forward is to establish a cross community working group to investigate a bit more confusing similarity approach in the whole TLD environment and enable ICANN to have a consistent and uniform approach to assess confusing similarity and eventually introduce also the scientific approach that we were highlighting in the IDN CCs because again, nowadays there are sound studies about confusing similarity among languages and I believe, and we believe, that ICANN should follow this path for any future assessment of confusing similarity in the IDN environment.

And that's mainly because at the end of the day confusing similarity is meant to protect end users, consumers, and consumers, end users, are all the same all around the world. So at the end of the day we don't see why there are so many different approaches or no approaches at all in the ICANN environment to evaluate confusing similarity. And I think that's it. I'm happy to answer any question.

Katrina Sataki: Yes, thank you very much. Just wanted to say that, yes, we would like to hear your opinions if you see any value in working together to that. Rubens.

Rubens Kuhl: Rubens Kuhl, Registry Stakeholder Group. Just a comment regarding the 2012 gTLD Program, the string similarity review was not the only tool that was used, that was also the string confusion objection. And the criteria for the

string confusion objection had a more ample latitude than just the visual criteria so the criteria could be sound, could be meaning. And actually a lot of applications were terminated by the string confusion like (Ecom) which was ruled as similar to Com, as Com was already delegated that terminated a TLD.

There were contention sets like Kid and Kids which were put together into a single contention set instead of being two different contention sets. And there was even (rulings) in different script or different language, like Shop where the - I don't remember what the Chinese or Chinese version of Shop was (ruled) that similar to the English word Shop.

So there was more to that but that's required the interest party either an existing TLD or another applicant to file a confusing objection. But so but it was not only the string similarity review that was then automatically by ICANN, TLDs could invoke other mechanisms and a lot of them did and got an outcome based on that. Thanks.

Giovanni Seppia: Yes, thank you. Yes, perfectly right. What the slide was referring to is the initial evaluation mechanism, that's what you just mentioned is an (uphill) process that was indeed part of the new gTLD. The slide was referring to the first evaluation layer.

Katrina Sataki: Thank you. Philippe then Michele.

Philippe Fouquart: Thank you. Philippe Fouquart from the ISPCP. Yes just out of curiosity really, you refer to - Giovanni - to a scientific method for the CC side. I was wondering whether they actually had like - if this is criteria or how there would - in terms of being more conservative or more liberal compared to (SWORD), how would you gauge that, how would you assess that? Just again just for my information. Thank you.

Giovanni Seppia: Yes, thank you. It's a very good question. So the main point is that first of all I'm not in favor of conservative, liberal stuff or whatever, I'm not vouching for any of those. I think it's just a matter of consistency in the domain name environment. In terms of the studies that were produced, those are neuro-scientific studies so based on neuroscience. There is an area of neuroscience that studies how people perceive the language.

And I was - I myself was put to test early in the morning and later in the morning to detect the confusing similarity among scripts. And I can tell you that in the evening I mess up completely and I confused everything. In the morning I was quite awake like most of us and so I was able to distinguish several set of characters, but in the evening to me they looked all the same.

But it's indeed there are criteria and those criteria were also applied by the EPSRP panel which was made and is made of neuroscience experts appointed by ICANN. And they had certain criteria to apply via not only, you know, serving group of people but also on the basis of their studies. So there is quite a sound basis for that that is passed over this neuro-scientific language discipline.

Katrina Sataki: Yes, thank you. Let's move forward. Michele.

Michele Neylon: Thanks, Katrina. That sounds almost like an ultimatum. Thank you. Now this is just my own personal opinion, it's not the position of the Registrar Stakeholder Group, but when - whenever I see this - these results of string similarity tests and I have to try and disconnect my brain completely because I'm sorry but I do find singular versus plural confusing. And I know that my sales staff find singular versus plural confusing. And I know my customers find singular versus plural confusing.

What I don't understand is how on earth a bunch of overpaid people managed to reach the conclusion that they were not confusing. And I would just hope that if there is ever a next round of new TLDs that a bit of sanity

prevails because while some of the decisions that were made I fully understand and back; that one I fully do not understand and fully do not back. It makes no sense to me. Thanks.

Katrina Sataki: Okay. Thank you. So I have a question, and this is for folks who are active in the Subsequent Procedures group, and Rubens, maybe a good question for you. I'm curious, is this issue or this topic one of the things that's currently under review and under discussion in the Subsequent Procedures group today? And my follow up is, you know, the call that in the TLD space for consistency seems like a logical thing to me. And I'm just curious based on what's going on in the Subsequent Procedures work, is there an opportunity to develop that kind of consistency before things are finalized for the next phase? So Rubens, thank you.

Rubens Kuhl: Rubens Kuhl. There were two angles of consistence that were mentioned here that were looking by the Subsequent Procedures Working Group. One was IDNs where there was some recommendations coming out from the Subsequent Procedures Working Group where there was a specific recommendation that ICANN should also look into applying that consistently to gTLDs and ccTLDs. I believe that's exactly the words from the report.

And from the singular plurals, if I recall correctly, most of the general trends among the working group was to consider them similar, different from the 2012 round. So similar - most people in the community, both sides are converging, and asking for convergence as well. So it seemed that currently people are saying the same thing all around. That's my impression.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks, Rubens. Very helpful. And so one of the things that we heard from Giovanni was, you know, a suggestion or a call for a cross community working group to look at this issue. And I guess what I'm wondering is, is there still an opportunity rather than perhaps setting up a new group to have engagement on this topic within Subsequent Procedures if you - as you're saying there's still sort of some convergence happening anyway, maybe

there's an opportunity to use that already existing group. So just wanted to put that out there as a possibility.

And we have Flip and then Julf.

Flip Petillion: Flip Petillion for the record. I just wanted to point out to two cases, the Hotels (Hotes) case and the Rep Repts case where there has been concrete use of the neuro-scientific approach together with a linguistic approach. And that was actually done with a few to calling for consistency not only for these cases but for the future. And I would very much encourage everybody who is interested in that very delicate and complex topic to have a read of these reports that were filed in these cases because they're a good example of what you're actually looking for.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Thank you, Flip. Julf.

Julf Helsingius: Julf Helsingius. Based on what Giovanni just said, I have a simple question. How do I make sure my domain application is processed in the evening and not in the morning?

Katrina Sataki: Well I'm afraid you can't.

Keith Drazek: And we have Marie.

Katrina Sataki: Yes.

Keith Drazek: Marie.

Katrina Sataki: Marie.

Marie Pattullo: Thank you. Marie from the BC. I would very much support some consistency here. This is a personal view, I haven't asked my constituency, but if they disagree I will be very surprised. I would also fully support the comments that

Michele made about the plurals because to me, again personally, they are nonsensical and from a consumer point of view.

When I'm speaking to people that are not involved in our wonderful world but are involved in the real world, you tell people a domain name, you tell them where to go. And who is going to retain in their head the S? So our job is - part of our job is to look after the global consumer using domain names. So if there's anything we can do, and I do realize, Cheryl, that you hate us for this because I was watching your face, but if there is anything we can do in SubPro to gently suggest that plurals may not be the best way forward, I think that would be greatly appreciated. Thank you.

Katrina Sataki: Yes thank you. Thank you very much. Unfortunately we have to try to speed up the session. Next on our agenda, there are comments about ICANN's 2021 - 2025 strategic plan FY'20 operating plan and budget. Are there any common concerns? So our SOPC Working Group as always has submitted their comments. I know - how should we proceed with that taking into account that we had excellent lunch and didn't start on time?

Maybe, Giovanni, really very briefly the comments that - Giovanni is the Chair of the SOPC, that's why I refer back to him.

Giovanni Seppia: Yes, very briefly indeed the SOPC, Strategic Operating Planning - Committee of the ccNSO has produced comments on the ICANN fiscal year '20 operating plan and budget on the ICANN draft strategic budget 2021-2025 and also the two-year planning process. We had an interesting meeting yesterday with the Finance Department where we were provided some updates regarding the strategic plan and also the way they are going to present as it was also said in the opening ceremony this morning, the operating plan 2021 and 2025 which is going to be presented to us in a high level format by June and in its full extent by the end of the year.

So there were, let's say there was the main concern of the CC community, the SOPC, let's say numbers was about the fact that especially for the strategic plan we do not - we fail to understand the criteria that ICANN has used to select one - the objectives and the goals that (tie) in the plan because there are several times, there is reference to the fact that those objectives and goals were selected among wide range of objectives and goals and there's no reference to those that then turned down against those that have been selected.

As we heard this morning, and it's also present in all these plans, there is some sort of pressure on ICANN. They mentioned several times about challenges in the future and that their strategic plan is crucial.

So the SOPC did comment that we would like to have a better understanding of what the criteria for selecting those objectives and as a overall comment we also stress again that it's quite important to improve the narrative of those plans if they want to improve the level of engagement of the community especially from non-UK, non, let's say, English mother tongue because those plans are not so easy sometimes to go through and read if you do not own the language but also if you do own the language sometimes the narrative is quite challenging. Thank you.

Keith Drazek: Thank you very much, Giovanni. I think in the interest of time we probably should make a - take an action item to do a comparison of the comments that were submitted from our respective groups. That was an excellent overview and summary. I'm going to ask Ayden if you have any - just very brief comments because we're running short on time, but I think it would make very good sense for us to, now that the comments have been finalized and submitted, to compare the two and to identify any areas of common cause for concern. So Ayden.

Ayden Férdeline: Thanks very much. Ayden Férdeline for the record. And I'm the Chair of the GNSO Council Standing Committee on Budget and Operations. And we also

reviewed the proposed operating plan and budget for the coming fiscal year. We had many similar concerns as to what you expressed in your comment. One additional comment that we had was that we asked in our comment for ICANN to provide more clarity around what is included in the contingency. And so we did ask that moving forward rather than being just one single lump sum for contingency we asked to understand how is that actually comprised.

One comment that - I'm making this now in my personal capacity - that you made in your comment that I thought was very interesting and that I would like to understand better and that I plan to take back to the standing committee was you said that in order to reserve the - replenish the reserve fund over the coming years there's going to be some kind of optimization amongst ICANN Org. And so what is the plan for that? What is that going to look like? And so I think that's a very good question that you asked and certainly something that as an action item I think we would like to be looking into as well.

But absolutely, I think Keith raises an excellent point that we should certainly look to conduct a more thorough evaluation of both of our comments to see where there is overlaps and differences and hope to work with you closely over the coming year as well. Thanks.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks very much, Ayden. Okay so we need to move onto the next topic is a question on selecting the IFRT membership, how to move forward with the review in light of the situation with the ccNSO not being able to identify a non-ccNSO ccTLD manager. And so we've talked about this actually during our Council prep session yesterday. It's not a GNSO Council issue, it's a question for the appointing groups.

And we did have a conversation about the concerns that were raised by the NCSG and Rafik, I'll let you speak to it if you'd like. But I think the takeaway was that the NCSG is prepared to go back and have some further

conversation within their group and perhaps come back. Rafik, anything to add?

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Thanks. So Rafik speaking. Yes, so I mean, it's nothing really - didn't want to broke the process so it's not really against ccNSO, just people were kind of cautious about the bylaws. So we'll come back and hopefully I hope this week we can respond. So we try to convince our members why it's important to get this moving.

Katrina Sataki: Yes, thank you very much. And please let them know that we are very determined to move forward with the change in the bylaws language because with our growing membership we expect even more problems in the future of trying to get a non-member on board. Yes, I think we'll - unfortunately we will have to skip progress on emoji. I think let's move to the last one, status of EPDP. I'm sure E stands for exciting.

Keith Drazek: Extremely exciting. Thank you, Katrina. Yes, so I think it's important to note that I think we all know that the EPDP delivered its Phase 1 final report to the GNSO Council. And the GNSO Council approved that recommendation, that final report on the 4th of March so Phase 1 for the community at this time is effectively complete. From a policy making perspective, there will be implementation work that needs to take place moving forward.

But right now the EPDP Working Group, or the EPDP team is focusing on transitioning from the Phase 1 work to looking at Phase 2 which is targeted to the development of a standardized system for access and disclosure of nonpublic data for Whois.

And so that is essentially as important as Phase 1, it doesn't have the same time constraints imposed by and external deadline that the temporary specification caused for Phase 1 but the GNSO Council and the EPDP team are working hard this week, already have had several meetings and have more to come to identify a work plan for Phase 2 that will drive discussions

about timeframes and resource allocation, the amount of hours needed per week, for the EPDP team to be able to move forward as expeditiously as possible on the Phase 2 work.

So you know, good work going on this week, good conversations, and a commitment from the GNSO Council and the EPDP team itself to, you know, not lose momentum, recognize that perhaps the intensity of the work in Phase 1 is not sustainable but to recognize and to commit ourselves as a community to, you know, working very, very hard to try to deliver Phase 2 as quickly as possible. Happy to take questions.

Katrina Sataki: I'm not sure you're happy because we're running out of time.

Keith Drazek: Yes.

Katrina Sataki: Michele, anything you'd like to...

Michele Neylon: Thanks, Katrina. Michele for the record. The EPDP Phase 1 was chaired by Kurt Pritz and in common with the other co-chairs and all the members of the EPDP group. As we've said repeatedly they did amazing work and spent a crazy amount of time doing it. EPDP Phase 2 needs a chair. And this is me personally again, I'm not speaking on behalf of anybody except for myself, it might be something that some ccNSO people might be interested in looking at because you guys don't have skin in the game whereas a lot of people within the GNSO do have skin in the game.

And this is quite contentious so finding a chair who is neutral to a degree would be helpful. So just throwing that out there if you've got any ccNSO people who need a new hobby, maybe their broadband isn't that great or their TV channels suck, I don't know, or maybe in the case of Nick it's like he's so worried about other things and this would be a nice little distraction. Backstop, baby, backstop. Sorry.

Keith Drazek: Okay. Thanks very much, everybody. We have to wrap this up because there's another group coming in so just a couple of final thoughts. I have one comment that I'd like to make and I think Katrina has a couple more. But I just wanted to acknowledge the service of Adebisi in terms of being the ccNSO Council liaison or ccNSO liaison to the GNSO Council.

I understand that you're moving on to bigger and better things, so I do just want to thank you very much for your engagement and your service and we very much appreciate everything that you did to keep us connected. So congratulations on your next gig. Thank you.

Katrina Sasaki: Yes, thank you very much. Well you actually said one of the things I wanted to say. Thank you very much, (B) and welcome to the Council. I also wanted to say that we have appointed new liaison to the GNSO and that's (Martin) - (Martin Simmons), here he is from dotNL and he will keep doing the great job. And with that thank you very much for having us here. Looking forward to our next meetings and thank you very much. Bye.

Keith Drazek: Thank you.

END