

**Transcription ICANN62 Panama
Joint Meeting: ccNSO & GNSO Councils
Wednesday, 27 June 2018 8:00 EST**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording. 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>

Heather Forrest: Good morning, colleagues. If we can have a thumbs up from the tech team that we're ready to go. Awesome. Thanks, guys. And a smile too. Good morning, everyone. This is Wednesday, I think, good stuff. Everyone heard the question mark at the end of my voice, that's great. So this is our joint meeting of the ccNSO and GNSO Councils. My name is Heather Forrest, I am here from the GNSO with Rafik Dammak and Donna Austin and...

((Crosstalk))

Heather Forrest: Everybody else, of course.

Katrina Sataki: Good morning. Good morning, Heather, good morning everyone. And here are we, the ccNSO Council. I see several councilors around the table. My name is Katrina Sataki, I'm the Chair of the ccNSO Council and we of course have plenty of other councilors present and we're happy to be here. Thank you for this cool welcome.

Heather Forrest: We've lowered the temperature in the room so that our faces are frozen into smiles. So thank you very much, everyone, for joining us this morning. We have our agenda in front of us on the screen and the Adobe room is open and running. We've done our welcome, we will have a discussion about the CSC, the Customer Standing Committee, some items to discuss in relation to reviews, Internet governance engagement group proposed charter, emojis and TLDs, Work Stream 2, the two supporting organizations as decisional participants and then any other business. So with that, why don't we go ahead and get started on Item Number 1.

And just so we're all mindful I think we have an hour, is that right, Katrina?

Katrina Sataki: Correct.

Heather Forrest: Yes okay all right. So then why don't we get started with the Customer Standing Committee, and I might turn that - Katrina, would you like to start on that one and then...

Katrina Sataki: Yes, thank you very much for that. I think we're moving pretty smoothly. As you know we need to either reappoint or select one new member to CSC each so it's selection must be made by ccNSO and (IRDG) and then the full slate must be approved by ccNSO and GNSO Councils. But before that, as you can see according to this agenda on your screens, first we have undergone this charter review process, again, another thing that was planned in the bylaws. We had a very good team of experts working on the charter. They did a great job, they have sent us their report and proposal for the amended charter.

The ccNSO Council is planning to adopt the report and charter today, later today during our face to face Council meeting. But probably I could ask somebody from the team, Donna or Martin, to give us more information about the work.

Donna Austin: Thanks, Katrina. Donna Austin, I don't know about the rest of the team but I'm kind of happy that we're done provided that both councils approve the revised charter later today. I think it's been a good process and I think it's been helpful, certainly I don't want to speak for Martin but we were involved in the original development of the charter when the CWG on IANA transition was working on it so it's, you know, in some sense it's nice to see that what we had envisaged is actually working and I think large part of the credit of that goes to the CSC that was actually stood up as a result of the process so thanks to Byron and his team.

So our plan from GNSO Council side is to approve the charter today. And I think in our resolution we have a recommendation that the ccNSO and GNSO do some kind of joint communication to say that we've approved it and then we need to understand who we send that to. But obviously the CSC but whether we need to forward it to somebody else as well just to have it recorded whether it's in the Bylaws or whatever I don't know. So yes, so I think that's - we're on track to get that done today too.

Katrina Sataki: Thank you very much. Byron, Byron Holland who is the Vice Chair of the ccNSO Council and is the Chair of the Customer Standing Committee, Byron, would you like to say something on the process, the result or anything?

Bryon Holland: In terms of the charter review itself?

Katrina Sataki: Anything you'd like to highlight.

Byron Holland: It's gone very well. No, in all seriousness I think the team has worked well with Alain and Kal and Jay and much of our work on this first - in this first period has been about trying to develop some of the processes which were not clearly outlined at the start, and I would say much of that early work has actually been accomplished and certainly in terms of the charter review, I think - I'm not speaking on behalf but certainly from my perspective the

charter review went well and some of the issues that would have been hard to foresee have been I think addressed in the output of the charter review team so I think from our perspective it's gone quite well. And I think the suggested changes and updates will make it even more efficient and better now. So we've been very supportive of the outputs of the charter review team.

Katrina Sataki: Thank you very much. Are there any questions regarding the charter review process, the outcome? Okay apparently not. Then we can move to upcoming reviews. We had two reviews that have to start this year, no later than 1 October, and that's the CSC effectiveness review and IANA function review. Yes, we have already started thinking about this IANA function review, not so much about CSC effectiveness review yet but at least in the ccNSO definitely are aware of our obligations and everything that needs to be done. It would be interesting to hear how you view the process.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Katrina. So I think this point is really about one of the recommendations that came out of the charter review that, you know, we considered wasn't in scope but we thought should be dealt with, and this is the team of Debbie, Martin, myself and Philippe that we put together to look at, you know, potential overlap and duplication of these two efforts and how we could potentially look for opportunities to streamline.

So we've had one call around that and we're having another conversation tomorrow and I think what we're - I think the path we're headed down is to hopefully let the IANA function review do the heavy lifting so we'll try to make sure that whatever we think should have been covered in the CSC effectiveness review if we can manage somehow to have that undertaken in the IANA function review I think that's where we're - what we're going to try to make happen.

Katrina Sataki: Thank you very much. On Sunday our internal working group guidelines review committee had a meeting with Trang and she also showed us timeline

from ICANN's perspective. And it looks like these two reviews, CSC effectiveness review and IFR review, every 15 years they will be carried out in parallel. I'm not sure I will be here in 15 years, that's - it's - it seems like a really very long period of time but time flies and yes, next - one of the next agenda items we will talk about reviews and see what we can do to make sure that Chris pointed out review our self to death, yes, the expression because it really shows what we're doing at the moment.

Okay, any comment, any questions regarding these two reviews? Yes.

Donna Austin: So, Heather, if I may, so Trang, you're in the room, the IANA function review, I know that expression of interest has come out or some kind of notification but the GNSO hasn't paid any attention to it. Is it possible if you could give us just a - the high level points of what we need to do to get ready for that and what the - particularly from a GNSO perspective what that commitment is?

Trang Nguyen: Thanks, Donna. This is Trang Nguyen, ICANN Org for the record. Yes, you're correct; the IANA naming function review is to be convened by October 1 per the ICANN Bylaws. We're expecting to send out the official call for the appointing organizations to start initiating their internal processes to appoint members and liaisons to the review team. That request is anticipated to go out early part of July and that would provide all of the appointing organizations approximately two months to carry out their appointment processes.

There is a Board workshop or Board meeting scheduled for September 16 and we're hoping to put in front of the Board a resolution to trigger the review at that point in time so these timings are just to make sure that to the extent possible we have the review team composed by the time that the Board triggers the review.

There is a diversity requirement in the bylaws for the composition of the review team which is that all five ICANN regions need to be represented.

That is a responsibility for all 12 appointing organizations although, you know, the RySG and the ccNSO obviously have a much vested interest in this because of this review being a naming function review those two organizations represents the direct customers of the naming functions.

So to that extent, we also suggest and recommend that the ccNSO and RySG utilize the existing process that you all have for the CSC election process and coordinate to the extent possible to ensure geographic diversity in your appointments. From a GNSO perspective, the GNSO - other parts of the GNSO aside from the RySG, are also required to make appointments, so for example, the Registrar Stakeholder Group is supposed to appoint one representative, Non Commercial Stakeholder Group one, and the Commercial Stakeholder Group one.

And the GNSO Council is asked by the Bylaws to select one representative from all of those appointments' to serve as a co-chair on - for the review team. The ccNSO has the same responsibility of having to select one of their three representatives to serve as the other co-chair.

Donna Austin: Thanks, Trang, that's very helpful.

Katrina Sasaki: Thank you very much. Any comments, any questions? Yes, and then let's move forward about - all spoke a little bit about the CSC members and liaison selections, the role of both councils so both councils have to approve the final slate of the CSC, that includes members and liaisons. Yes, Donna.

Donna Austin: Thanks, Katrina. Something just occurred to me, so when we talk about the final slate, this is - the CSC has now been operating for two years so we're - so what we're looking for here is only half of the CSC so to speak...

Katrina Sasaki: No, no...

((Crosstalk))

Donna Austin: The full slate? Okay.

Katrina Sataki: We have to do that annually. We do not have to approve the full slate every time when we have some change on the CSC but once a year we have to approve the full slate so that's...

Donna Austin: Okay.

Katrina Sataki: Okay, then I think we can move forward with the - with other reviews. And currently there is - there are two documents for - published for public comments the short term and long term options on amending schedule of reviews. And well luckily the deadline has been extended by the end of July so we still have time to prepare our views and be really interesting to hear what do you think?

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Katrina. Heather Forrest. So indeed we had - I haven't seen that in writing but in the SO/AC chairs workshop on Sunday we asked for more time to submit our comments, the deadlines were initially something like the 9th and the 19th. In any event, on I think there's two parallel tracks here. In relation to short term reviews, the GNSO Council had particular concerns around the inclusion of the RDS Whois2 review team in the short term options paper. That having been removed we have significantly less concerns in relation to that one.

In terms of long term, I'm confident that we will have something to say here in that this does impact our longer term effectiveness, let's say, having been through the exercise of the strategic planning session earlier in January. We need some time to sit down and think about that so it was really very much - it was very sincere, my request for additional time, let's put it that way. Thanks, Katrina.

Katrina Sataki: Thank you very much. And thank you for doing this. I'm not a big fan of asking for more time but this time it was really, really necessary because well this concerns all of us. Really there are a lot of reviews and really difficult to find people who are willing to contribute so much - spend so much time on reviewing things and (unintelligible).

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Katrina. Heather Forrest. I thought it would be a timely opportunity to provide an update in terms of the SO/AC chairs and our latest information in relation to SSR2 because we have recently had an update on that. So you will remember that the SO/AC chairs have been working very closely together since - frankly since Abu Dhabi, and very collaboratively too, I'll say that. It's actually blossomed into a very helpful and collaborative relationship.

In relation to SSR2, so we did have - and you would have seen the emails that went around, we did have a bit of an update from staff that that group is back underway, there's a facilitator appointed and they're getting ready to go. We were asked, and we did consider and in fact I don't know that we replied, we were asked from the - by the facilitator, what sort of ongoing relationship we expected - we were expected to, let's say, or we expected from the facilitator how often did we want to receive updates from the facilitator? When should the facilitator escalate things to us - us being the SO/AC chairs.

And we had an opportunity to discuss this on Saturday evening when we all first arrived. And my perspective on that is this, I think the sooner that group gets onto doing its work without the interference of the SO/AC leaders, I think the better off it is. The whole point of appointing the facilitator, in my view, was to get them working independently again and empower them to do their job and get us out of the way frankly.

So that was my input in relation to that. I do think we probably have an action item there that we need to follow up with that email because we were - as I recall we were all of the same mind that the sooner that group got on its way the better off they were, and I think we envisioned that the - in fact I know - I

shouldn't say I think - we envision that the facilitator would be appointed for a very short term experience, in other words, that that was really a get the group started as we had initially advised, coalesce around leadership and move forward, resolve existing differences and move forward. And we hope that that would happen in very short order and that the facilitator could fall away and the group would just get on with its work. So that's an update on that one.

Katrina Sataki: Thank you very much, Heather. It's Katrina here. I'd like to reiterate what Heather mentioned about the collaboration of SO/AC chairs, there's really truth to that that every cloud has a silver lining and this cloud situation was around SSR2, it really helped SO/AC chairs to start working together as a group, discuss things, find solutions and move forward, so that was a really very helpful exercise for the chairs as well. So I don't know if I should thank the Board for that but it was - it really helped us to feel ourselves empowered community and group of decisional participants, so to speak.

Okay, so what do you think about ATRT 2 - ATRT 3? I assume you have appointed your members? We have one, Demi. Demi is ready for work on the ATRT 3 team, but so what do you think about that?

Heather Forrest: Katrina, thank you. So there are two factors that weigh heavily on the GNSO - or one that weighs particularly heavily on the GNSO in relation to ATRT 3. I think we are of course awaiting the - now the extended deadline on it long-term options in relation to reviews. I don't think that ICANN Org will kick off that review until all of that feedback is received in relation to those two options papers.

While the GNSO has appointed its representatives to ATRT 3, we very tragically lost one of our representatives about two months ago. We have not begun the process of dealing with that partly to let wounds heal and partly because of these outstanding reviews.

So as soon as we have a signal that that will begin to get underway I think personally I'm concerned that if we start looking for other people and we have no view as to when this thing will kick off then we have more people sitting around; as it is, the GNSO Council leadership has reached out to those individuals who were our slate and said, we're very sorry, we're doing our best but here's an update and we'll keep you posted. So I would hesitate to replace a lost member until we had certainty in relation to that.

Katrina Sataki: Okay thank you, Heather. Any other comments, updates? So it is our understanding that the next draft of Operating Standards will be out somewhere in December, by the end of the year so we will have another round of public consultation on this one. We are moving forward, definitely moving forward, maybe not as quickly as we would like to but that's the process for us.

Okay, can we move to the next agenda item? I know that the GNSO Council has decided to step out from this Internet governance working group and apparently you're not much interested in this new engagement group and they propose a charter. Nevertheless, we included this in the agenda, I think that this might be interesting to know what's going on and I know, Rafik, maybe you could - or Young Eum - Young Eum, you, okay. Young Eum, please.

Young Eum Lee: Thanks, Katrina. The engagement group has received the questions that the ccNSO has posed to the group and we are actually in the final stages of cleaning up the - our responses and we will have the responses ready basically the questions have to do with the purpose, the effect of the group on ccNSO, and the merit or the - what the group has been doing is really worth the ccNSO getting involved with and I think we - we think we have clearer and relatively satisfactory answers to that and we hope to get it to you by today. Thanks.

Katrina Sataki: Yes, thank you very much. And one of the things that we were thinking about how to - how to put all these efforts on Internet governance happening around ICANN how to try to put them all together and start working together and maybe could do it more efficiently and that was one of the questions. Heather.

Heather Forrest: Thank you, Katrina. Just to clarify so there's not any confusion or misconception in relation to this, just based on your opening comments. It's certainly not the case that the GNSO is not interested in this group or this work. I think where the GNSO Council has questions is purely in relation to the charter and I notice the comments just made as I understand it, the group is still operating as a CCWG, that has the engagement group charter been accepted yet? My understanding is it's still in the process of revisions, so I think we are very interested in that process.

We were particularly interested in the questions that were raised by the ccNSO in relation to the charter and are continuing to engage in that charter process. So it's certainly not the case that we're not interested in the substance, it's the vehicle, it's the form and that is really what motivated our actions and continues to motivate our actions. So just so there's no, you know, misunderstanding, we certainly support the work, it's just the mechanism for doing that work. Thanks.

Katrina Sataki: Thank you very much, Heather, for this clarification. Yes, it's duly noted. Thank you very much. Okay, can we move forward? Then next update again, from us, emoji in TLDs. And I know that gTLDs are not allowed to have emoji in second level domains. There's no such limitation for ccTLDs, and recently this - the issue of usage of emoji at the second level - second level domain names emerged, several articles have been published and that's why there was a request we received from the CT of ICANN to look into the issue.

And the Board also asked the GNSO and ccNSO to look at the issue and evaluate all possible risks that come with the use of emoji. In San Juan we

had two interesting sessions, one during the Tech Day and another one during ccNSO Members Meeting Day, when we listened to presentations from SSAC where they shared with us their findings on the issue. And as a result we have established a study group with the clear scope to look into the issue and to seek comments from ccTLDs that currently allow the use of emoji and see how, you know, to learn more about their views on the issue and if they seek any risks and if they do how they try to mitigate them.

So that's an interesting group and ready to start working on this issue. If you're interested to participate you're always welcome so that's - in any way we are going to share the findings of this study group with the rest of community. So any questions regarding that? Heather, please.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Katrina. I'll just make a quick note, so very much what you have described in relation to the activity in the GNSO, we have a GNSO Council meeting this afternoon and one of our agenda items is an update from the SSAC in relation to this so this is something that we'll be talking about today. We've had a small group of councilors liaising directly with the SSAC and that will be the culmination of their work together. We've also been following your activities in relation to this through Philippe, our liaison to the ccNSO, so it is again, on our agenda today and we'll come back after today's Council meeting. Thanks.

Katrina Sataki: Yes, thank you very much. Next agenda item that we have here is on CCWG Work Stream 2 recommendations, so apparently they will come up with a list of recommendations. And we will have to look into these recommendations and either adopt them or decide not to adopt them. And what happens next especially what happens if some recommendations get adopted, some do not get adopted, some SOs ACs adopt them, some do not adopt them, SO/ACs adopt them and then Board rejects them, so do you have any views on that and have you thought about the process and everything? Heather.

Heather Forrest: Thanks, Katrina. Heather Forrest. So I think it's important to note here that in relation to the comment period, which recently ended, I believe it was mid-May, the comments that were filed were filed by the individual SGs and Cs of the GNSO so while we come together on certain matters here in the GNSO Council, we will need to think about this as a group because the views on those recommendations will largely come from the constituencies and the stakeholder groups. So there's internal discussion to be had in relation to that. Thanks.

Katrina Sataki: Okay, thank you. Any other comments, questions, well, it is early of course, but the room is very cold. Yes, Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: Okay it's Rafik speaking. I think for that part we know the Board position because they send their - I mean, they raised their concern directly to the CCWG and my understanding it was Sunday they worked on that and some - a few recommendation was really about implementation. So we know mostly what the Board think about the approval of the recommendation.

Katrina Sataki: Okay thank you. Any other comments? Okay, if no, let's move to the next agenda item, it's about ccNSO and GNSO as decisional participants. And first is empowered community procedures and processes, as you know - we - there are five decisional participants and we have one representative per decisional participant, they from empowered community administration where they receive all those incoming notices and they deal with them and have to make sure that decisional participants work together and properly oversee and interact with the - with ICANN.

All representative - well by the full chairs are on empowered community administration, I believe that's the case for the GNSO. In our case we have an internal guideline where we can appoint - select our - and somebody else, not the chair, and in our case Stephen Deerhake from dotAS is our representative on the empowered community administration and he's the guy

who has read Annex D and knows everything about rejection action, approval action and everything. So he is the one who keeps an eye on the process.

So any comments from you, Stephen?

Stephen Deerhake: Thank you, Katrina. Thank you, Heather. Stephen Deerhake for the record. Since San Juan there have been two rejection action petition notice periods that have gone without any rejection action petitions being filed, actually three, one involved a bylaw change that the GNSO did; the other - the second was for the updates to the strategic plan and the third one which just expired earlier in the week on the 21st was regarding the FY'19 budget.

In addition, the ECA certified the selection by the Address Supporting Organization of Ron da Silva to his reappointment to Seat 9 on the ICANN Board. I do not anticipate much activity going forward between now and Barcelona but of course any time the Board meets we could be surprised. So that's my report on ECA activities to this joint meeting. Thank you, Katrina.

Katrina Sataki: Thank you very much, Stephen, any questions, any comments? Well at least we, from the ccNSO perspective, we see some ways how we could improve communication between ICANN Org and the community on these - all those rejection approval action notices and everything, and we would like to propose a template perhaps that we could be filled in every time when such a thing comes and on our plate so that we could probably would make - things easier for the community to see the timeline when they have to put their act together.

So we're going to work on that and I hope we will have some proposal by Barcelona we could discuss with the community and then with also with ICANN Org. Stephen, please.

Stephen Deerhake: I might add for the record that there seems to be a bit of a communication back and forth between ECA and ICANN in the timeliness of getting certain

things posted as required by the bylaws. And I'm going to try to get that sorted going forward between now and Barcelona.

Katrina Sataki: Thank you very much. So I hope by Barcelona we'll have some more...

((Crosstalk))

Katrina Sataki: Okay, yes thank you. Any questions? No? Okay, with that we're moving to the last agenda item, that's any other business, any other business anyone? Yes please.

Tony Harris: A question on the topic not on the agenda, so point of interest for me. Tony Harris from the ISPCP on the GNSO Council. Just out of curiosity, does the ccNSO have any interaction with the Uniform Acceptance Steering Group since the issues that they have addressed have particular impact on things like IDNs. I was just wondering if you have any interaction with them and any results?

Katrina Sataki: Yes, thank you for the question. Every now and then they present to the ccNSO community ccTLDs in the room during our face to face meetings but I'm not sure we have received any updates - any recent updates from them. I think last time they presented was a couple of meetings ago. I know the several ccTLD representatives are very active on the Universal Acceptance group. Any from the ccNSO would like to provide more details on that? Okay, apparently not. I'll try to find out and come back to you with more definite answer on your question. Thank you.

Nigel, please.

Nigel Roberts: Just a little announcement. As most of the ccNSO know, I'll be stepping down from the ccNSO Council at the end of today but I suspect you'll still see me around so thank you for working with us.

Katrina Sataki: Yes, he's stepping down from the Council and moves forward to the ICANN Board. Yes, Michele, please.

Michele Neylon: Thanks. Michele for the record. Are we applauding the fact that he's leaving or are we applauding the fact that's...

((Crosstalk))

Katrina Sataki: Apparently you started applauding before I announced he's moving forward so yes...

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: Yes, I just wasn't sure, you know, like hey, we're so happy we got rid of him finally, it's taken 20 years but now he's gone. Anyway and after that I do want or raise another topic which is...

Katrina Sataki: Yes please.

Michele Neylon: Okay, sorry, Nigel.

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: Well I know I'm not and you know I'm not but for the purpose of decorum and all that we're just going to pretend that I am. No, okay so another topic I did want to just raise and put on your collective radar, as it were, as you are probably aware, there's this wonderful four-letter acronym that has been eating up and consuming a bit of time for many of us in the..

((Crosstalk))

Michele Neylon: Hey, dude, I'm - if I was to do an alcohol test right now I'm not sure I'd pass, you know, it is very early. The GDPR is obviously having an impact on us

both in terms of the GNSO and elsewhere and I know that colleagues of the ccNSO have been delaying with it. So the GNSO Council is at present trying to finalize the wording and the text and everything else in order to launch the EPDP to deal with the temporary specification.

The reason I raise this is because based on the fact that many of the ccTLDs have had to make changes both in terms of contracts, processing agreements, Whois display and various other things, it will probably be expected that at some point during the process of this EPDP that that group will probably reach out either to individual ccTLDs or to the ccNSO as a whole for some - I'm not sure whether the best term is input or shared experiences or something.

That might also happen outside of the remit of ICANN through center and elsewhere but just to bring that up with you, plus if any ccTLD people have any words of wisdom that they want to share and how they've managed to fix the world we would love to hear about it since we're struggling.

Katrina Sataki: Yes, thank you very much, Michele. As a rule, ccTLD people are very wise. And they are very eager to share their experience with others. And I know that some ccTLDs might be very interested to participate in EPDP. Currently we at the ccNSO have not considered any proactive steps in this direction but if we receive official, unofficial or any other requests from our friends and colleagues at the GNSO we'll be happy to review and happy to help our ccTLDs to - that are interested to engage and provide their expertise.

Okay thank you, any other business? Michele?

Michele Neylon: Yes, just another one and Michele for the record. This is not specific to GNSO related to the ccNSO but this is as a dirty filthy registrar of ccTLDs, sitting in a room surrounded by a bunch of ccTLD people, has the ccNSO looked at or made any comments either formal or informal to the European

Commission in relation to their rather - I'm looking for a very diplomatic word for this...

Katrina Sasaki: You'll fail, don't.

Michele Neylon: Oh of course I'll fail. With the rather odd approach to how they're handling Brexit? Because one of the issues that for those of us on the commercial side of this is that if the EU Commission continues down the path that they seem to have embarked on, the level of confidence in the dotEU ccTLD will be dramatically reduced.

Katrina Sasaki: Yes, thank you very much, Michele, for this question. I'm going to say that the ccNSO has no say but - okay, we cannot advise neither the UK people regarding Brexit nor European Commission regarding how to handle Brexit. So this is not for the ccNSO to comment. But yes, again, individual ccTLDs may have their own views and may be happy to share them in diplomatic or maybe not so diplomatic terms.

Michele Neylon: And possibly not on a record as well.

Katrina Sasaki: Possibly not on the record.

Katrina Sasaki: Yes, Peter, please.

Peter Vergote: A quick response to Michele. Center has both formally and informally commented on that, formally to an opinion in the European Economic and Social Committee, that's feeding input into the (Rafit) project. And informally to every single meeting that we had with the Commission. I think they get our points. For them they feel like a really, really small part in an enormous machine, but they understand the message and I think they might currently even be looking at seeing if they can build in transition measures. But mind you that the (unintelligible) center that you mentioned, will only be triggered with a hard Brexit, that obviously any negotiations could involve a phasing out

in the probably best possible scenario so it's not a cutoff date one day to the next.

Michele Neylon: Thanks. That's helpful. It's just I'm hearing now that they've somehow managed to create a rather interesting scenario where on the one hand they will be cutting off access to dotEU domain names and then they will be broadening the eligibility for dotEU but they've left a gap of nine months between the two which is a rather interesting way of dealing with it.

Katrina Sataki: Yes. Thank you. Just to make sure that everyone in the room understands what we're talking about according to the EU regulation there are certain eligibility criteria to register a dotEU domain name so you have to be a resident of the European Union and in this case if the UK is leaving the European Union, residential, UK citizens will not be residents of the European Union and hence will not be eligible for a registration domain names and that might impact a large portion of EU domain names already being registered to UK citizens, so that's just to understand what we're talking about.

Nigel.

Nigel Roberts: Yes, I'm going to take this offline with Michele because it's a subject of joint interest but just for background, this has to do with the legal interpretation of a binding law; the regulation is not just a regulation it's a legal provision that binds every single person in every single member state of the European Union, including the United Kingdom after March next year, according to the withdrawal bill. So very interesting situation but it's not a question of the Commission can decide to do something or not something; it might end up being something that a court gets to decide on the interpretation of a particular clause in a particular law.

Katrina Sataki: Thank you. So any other business? If not, let's wrap it up.

Heather Forrest: Hey, this is Heather Forrest. Katrina, thank you very much, thank you very much, colleagues, from the ccNSO Council very much appreciate this opportunity to meet with you. So you may be aware that we progress our discussions today on the EPDP and GNSO Councilors, we are shifting to Room 8 because this room will be occupied by a high interest topic session. So we will convene there. Colleagues from the ccNSO, have a lovely rest of the meeting, it's always fantastic to engage with you and all the very best. And Nigel, we congratulate you.

Katrina Sasaki: Thank you very much. It was a pleasure. Thank you.

END