
JOHANNESBURG – ccNSO Members Day (part 3)

Wednesday, June 28, 2017 – 13:30 to 15:00 JNB

ICANN59 | Johannesburg, South Africa

BART BOSWINKEL: Welcome back to the second part of the Accountability sessions. The reason for starting now is we ran over schedule this morning. Fortunately, we do have the opportunity to do it so, Jordan, take it away for your second part.

JORDAN CARTER: Thank you. Good afternoon, everyone. My name is Jordan Carter, .nz. One of my jobs, for better or worse, is to be the ccNSO-appointed co-Chair on the Accountability Cross-Community Working Group.

After lunch when you've just had some food and are maybe feeling a little bit sleepy – for those of you who actually did come back, thank you – it's not always the best one, so I'm going to try and keep moving to keep you awake. I may walk up to you and demand answers to difficult questions with my microphone as well if you're really unlucky. But if you're very attentive, I won't do that.

This is quite a long slide pack. I'm not going to work through every slide. It provides you with a comprehensive summary if

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.*

you want some detail, but I'll just focus on some of the slides here.

When we put this session together, the first thing to start with is that there was a question about whether this second phase of work on accountability should continue through FY18 (from the 1 July this year until 30 June next year). The reason that the request came through from CCWG about this, some of those reasons were discussed this morning, people were very tired after the transition. There were a lot of people who just needed to take a break and focus on their day jobs. That means that the progress of the work has not been as quick as people were hoping.

Now we're not going to debate or discuss whether this should be extended in this session for a reasonably simple reason, which is that the ICANN Board has already decided to extend the stream of work, Work Stream 2, through to 30 June 2018. Bernie, you're looking at me very concerned. No? Not concerned. There was a request put around the SO/AC Chairs a number of months ago, and it sounds like that has been agreed. So we won't detain on that.

What I will do instead is give you an update on this Work Stream 2 work. The basic point I'd like to make to you is a similar one to what Chris Disspain made this morning. Because there is a

smaller group involved with scrutinizing the proposals that come out of this work than there were pretransition, it's important for us as CCs to pay attention to the proposals and to have input on them.

One of the ways you can have input is on public comments, and one of the slides I'll show you is the areas of work for CCWG that are yet to have had public comments. Those will be areas where over the summer and autumn [northern] of this year you'll be able to get some input. But we'll work through the slides, if I can make the slides move. I don't think I can do it. Is that me? Oh, I can do it.

Okay, so these are the topics that the CCWG is working on. These are the remaining areas of accountability work that more work needed to be done on: transparency of ICANN. The guidelines for good faith is a topic that we discussed at the Copenhagen meeting, and that was about when the community could be very sure that it would be safe in working on removal of Board members or recalling the whole ICANN Board.

There are proposals to improve SO/AC accountability. We had our whole session this morning about some of the powers that we will have as the ccNSO as part of the Empowered Community, and one of the pieces of work that needed to follow

up granting us those powers was to make sure that we would be accountable in using them.

There's the question of human rights in the ICANN environment. There's making sure that staff accountability is enhanced in this post-transition phase, diversity of participation in the ICANN community, improvements to the Ombuds office. There's the review of the cooperative engagement process, and there's the question of jurisdiction-related matters.

I'm not going to focus on all of those today. This is a very detailed slide, which I'm sure you can all read clearly from where you're sitting, which kind of shows the progress of the work. The only thing I'd take away from that is that some areas are more advanced than others and those areas where we've seen a public comment. So transparency, good faith, SO/AC accountability, and human rights are the more advanced areas. Jurisdiction has been taking a little bit longer because of the obviously political questions that jurisdiction gives rise to in the ICANN environment. This report is produced every couple of months. You can find it on the community ICANN website.

This is the public comments. The reason to show you this slide is just to show that we've already had public comment calls on a number of these topics so if you wanted to make public comments on those, sorry. It's unlikely I think that there will be

second rounds of consultation on any of those topics. Is that fair, Bernie? That's not fair. Do you want to tell us which ones might be opening up for a second round of public comment? For the remote participants, it may be that there will be a second public comment called for on the transparency questions, and diversity has already also announced they'll do two consultations.

If you're interested in enhancements to ICANN staff accountability, if you're interested in how we should improve diversity of participation in ICANN, if you are interested in improving the Ombuds person function or the review of the CEP which is a part of the dispute resolution or IRP process, you can look forward to public comments on those coming up in the next few months I would expect. I'd be surprised if any of these public comments started after November this year because we need to get the work closed out.

So that's all that is. If you're interested in those topics, the opportunity to add public comments based on draft proposals from the CCWG is still to come. We can make sure that we post those calls for input on the members list of the ccNSO as we have been doing.

These next set of slides are update slides on the progress of each of the groups. I'm only going to focus on a couple of them. We just had an update on IOT this morning. SO/AC accountability,

what I just wanted to say on this is that we are obviously an SO. A working group of people has come up with three tracks about improvements to SO/AC accountability, and they built it in part on input from the ccNSO. They did a survey earlier in the years. The ccNSO Council provided some comments back on it.

There are around 25 best practice or good practice recommendations that are in those proposals, which if you are interested in that topic about how the ccNSO might lift its already good levels of accountability, please do go and read the report. Because it's best practice, it isn't going to be imposed on the ccNSO or on any other SO or AC. They're not going to say you have to make these changes. That isn't going to be arising from this strand of work. But what this slide does is summarize some of the feedback that came through in the public comments about the proposal. The group is going to be reworking, looking through those public comments, and then probably finalizing the proposal after that.

Good faith we talked about last time. Human rights, there's an impact assessment being prepared by the ICANN staff so if you're interested in that topic, there will be more information coming later.

Jurisdiction, I don't want to spend too much time on this topic because it hasn't been one that people have raised with me or

the other ccNSO members on the group. But there's a small subgroup of the CCWG working on this, and one of the debates in that group has been whether to look at where ICANN is incorporated or whether it should become like some international intergovernmental organizations that are immune from legal action in local courts. The group kept cycling back through these discussions. It has become clear in the last few weeks that there isn't going to be any consensus to either move ICANN's location of jurisdiction and headquarters, which is currently California in the U.S., and there isn't going to be a consensus that emerges on the idea of making ICANN immune from legal action.

There are lots of reasons for that, but the easiest one – or that makes sense to me anyway – is that we just spent \$30 million and a year and a half developing the IANA stewardship transition and putting in place new Bylaws and the kind of processes we were talking about before lunch based on the quite flexible and robust options that we have already under California law. So far, no one has shown any fundamental practical problems with that jurisdiction.

What the Jurisdiction Group is going to keep doing is working through looking at aspects of how ICANN works and testing whether if there are problems identified, ways to solve them. The [steer] that the group has got from the whole CCWG is you'd

have a very high barrier to climb over to suggest to anyone that solving any of the issues you might discover would involve relocating ICANN to another country or making it immune from legal action.

I think that's a reasonable summary of where that group is at. It's political. The various governments are involved in the discussion. Sometimes the politics gets well away from what ICANN generally and what we are focused on in the ccNSO. But I'm sure we can talk about that more after the session if you want to.

I'll flick over the diversity stuff and the only thing I'll say about Ombudsman, who here has used the ICANN Ombudsman? Has anyone here used the Ombudsman service? No? Okay, well, the only thing I'll say about that is that there was an independent review done in the last couple of months of the Ombudsman function, and it has made some recommendations for how to strengthen that, make the Ombudsman more visible in the ICANN community as a focus of upholding fairness in the work of ICANN. If you're interested in reading that, the report is available. They were waiting for that independent report before coming up with their recommendations on how to change or improve this area of work.

Transparency, there's an ongoing debate and dialogue, including between the ICANN organization and the subgroup of the CCWG that is working on this. It's not an area I'm an expert in, in any way, but once again, there's a comprehensive draft report available and the group is working through the concerns that the ICANN organization has raised.

Staff accountability, I won't say a lot about that either. There will be a public comment probably on it in July or August. The group is proposing a modest set of changes to improve ICANN – everybody is choking on “modest” – set of changes to make more transparency around how ICANN staff performance and accountability happens and to create a way for people to safely raise any concerns that they might have with things that staff has done.

That's probably more significant for the contracted parties who are in a different relationship with ICANN than most of us in CCs because most of us don't have contracts. ICANN doesn't make policy that tells us as registries how to operate. It can't enforce contracts against us and so on. But for people where that isn't the case, sometimes they feel like they can't say what they would like to say or raise concerns they might have in case they get victimized, etc., and some staff feel the same way about some community participants. So working through how to just

do all that better is one of the topics for the staff accountability stuff.

I'll skip over that one, and I won't go through a lot of this. With the extension of the work into next year, what has basically happened is that the budget that was allocated for 2016-2017 has been stretched over 2016-2018. There hasn't been a huge new infusion of funds or costs. Less work was done than expected. In fact, Bernie is pointing out there's no increase in total costs. It has just been spread over the two years.

There was a request that the chartering organizations approve an extension of activities for FY18, and the ICANN Board has made that decision this week and has agreed to the extension. So we don't need to make a decision about that per se anymore.

Bernie? Yeah, I think we will, just to get your arms some exercise, we will do at the end of this session a little call to test the opinion in the room about the continuance otherwise of this work. If you want to read the budget stuff, please do it.

The timeline that the group is working on is to have everything finished ready for adoption, CCWG approval and/or approval by the SOs and ACs by the June meeting next year. This work does need to have to end. It isn't an endless process. In future if there are accountability issues, the ATRT review processes can deal with those. So if work isn't finished by then, it just won't get

finished. That's the basic message that the co-Chairs are giving to the subgroups in the CCWG. If you can't make progress on any of these topics over the course of two years, it needs to go through a different approach.

Bernie? Yeah, the topics remain. It isn't that they'll vanish. It's just that the CCWG approach won't be used to try and finish solving them. The latest that subgroups will be finishing work is March next year, but we hope for that to happen by November this year, which is why I said earlier that public comments should be done this year.

In terms of finalizing that report, there isn't going to be a huge, long public comment period, hopefully, at the end of the process that generates substantive input and then a huge revision of the proposal. What we are looking for SOs and ACs to do is to review the components of these proposals as they are finalized and to be involved in the finalization process so that when we do a public comment period of the whole proposal at the end of the work, it will be about making sure that if there are any inconsistencies between recommendations, these are caught or any technical flaws in the way the representations are caught. But the key message there is don't wait until June next year to have a read and think about this stuff because, if you do, it will be very difficult to take your substantive feedback into account at that point. Do it earlier, is the message.

That's a diagrammatic representation of how that process is expected to work, which you can look at, at your leisure. The information is available in the community.icann.org blog. You can find stuff on the front page. There's information about all of the subgroups, the participation. If anyone is interested in any of these areas, it is not too late to sign up and participate. The group would welcome any further participation that you'd like.

I'd like to finish by thanking all of those who have been participating, who have represented the ccNSO, who have added public comments, who have expressed views to this process. We will get there. It will finish, I promise.

Are there any questions or any topics anyone would like any more info about? Peter?

PETER VAN ROSTE:

Hello, Jordan. My name is Peter Van Roste from CENTR. I was wondering if you could clarify something that apparently was mentioned in the GAC update on accountability in relation to the trade restrictions put in place by OFAC, the U.S. agency that deals with those things, webinar ICANN would be helped by those restrictions or not and whether ICANN could be relieved from those restrictions. The reason I'm asking is that some ccTLDs could be affected in a positive way, hopefully.

JORDAN CARTER: Thanks, Peter. OFAC is an agency of the United States government that occasionally imposes sanctions on other countries. The question is whether ICANN has an exemption from those or whether those rulings might have an impact. That is one of the topics that the group is still working on, and I don't know what the conclusion of it is. Bernie probably does know, which is why he has put his hand up. That is one of the examples of issues that need to be resolved and where there are possibilities to resolve them within the U.S. Bernie, do you want to speak a little bit more about that one?

BERNIE TURCOTTE: I believe that the situation that is now is that ICANN has been asking for individual exceptions to OFAC and they've been granted all the time. But the point is, it's a continual request cycle. Obviously, several members where the ccTLD is held or controlled by the country are concerned about that and are looking for a situation where they're not always hanging on "will this request get approved or not?" as an exception. As was pointed out at the GAC meeting today, however, the United States is not the only one that has a series of sanctions. The EU has a series of sanctions themselves against a number of countries. Thank you.

JORDAN CARTER: Thanks, Bernie. Are there any other questions or comments on this? As I said, the slide pack does have a pretty comprehensive set of info, so there's more detail there. Alan?

ALLAN MACGILLIVRAY: Thank you, Jordan. It's Allan MacGillivray from CIRA. I just want to make a general comment before we go to the raising of the cards about the extension of the mandate. There was a GAC session at 8:30 this morning where the GAC secretariat updated the GAC on the whole new gTLD process. He carefully chose his words, but fundamentally he upbraided them for not participating in the process. Apparently, there were a number of policy leads, and that prompted a few mea culpas from the community, which the pith and substance of were "we don't have time because we're doing Work Stream 2."

I just want to draw a link between this and what I see as a lack of enthusiasm of the GAC to join our own PDP process. I just want to put on the record that the longer Work Stream 2 goes on, the longer it will prevent the GAC from engaging in other processes in our community. Right now, that is a priority for them, and I think we should just keep that in mind when we're talking about these issues of extension. Thank you.

JORDAN CARTER:

Thanks, Allan. I think that's a good and important comment. At the priorities session that is being organized that's happening at 5:00 PM tonight next door in Ballroom 1, Thomas Schneider, the Chair of the GAC, is going to make the rather important point that many GAC reps only have four to six hours a week of time to spend on all of their ICANN stuff. And the way we organize our work as a community seems to require a rather more time-heavy involvement in following all of the different processes that are going on. Working at how to deal with that is something that the whole community needs to do.

But certainly for myself, if I'm standing here in a year saying, "Can we have an another extension," I would really urge you all to say no and I will be saying no in every forum I can. This work has to conclude.

Bernie, you have a comment on this as well?

BERNIE TURCOTTE:

Yes. As you put up that timing slide that takes us to the end, quite relative to what you were saying Allan – that one – basically what we're aiming for is that by the end of this calendar year, we should really technically be freeing up most participants. Now this being said, the GAC has told us earlier

today that their main concern is the Jurisdiction Group and they're going to be focusing on that. However, if we look at this, the reality is once you consider how long it really takes to get a public consultation out, to get it done, and to get the results in, if they're not ready to give us something by December of this year, they might fall into the category of things we say, "Sorry."

JORDAN CARTER:

Which won't make them happy but does create an incentive to dissolve the work, one way or another. If there are no other questions or comments on this, can I encourage you to find your green and red cards, just ask for an indication on that question generally speaking.

The question is, are you content with Work Stream 2 continuing for the year until next June? This is not seeking an open-ended mandate. This is the one-year extension that the Board has already approved. Are you content with that, or do you want us to try and undo that decision? I don't know how we would do that, but it's important to know what the view of the room is.

I don't have my thing, so this will be my pretend green one. Can you put your green card up if you're content with that extension going ahead? Want do a bit of a count, Bernie? This is almost green. Peter is sort of whitely pink instead of green. Okay, thanks for that count. Thank you.

If you are discontent, if you want this not to happen, please put up your red card. Okie-doke, no opinion there. If you have no opinion on this, put up your yellow card. Okay, it's a unanimous decision.

Okay, look, thank you, everyone, for that. I hope that wasn't trying to make you stab your eyes out or anything like that. I realize it's the after-lunch session, and this accountability conversation has been going on for a long time. Let's turn to something altogether more exciting. I'll hand it back to Bart to take us to the next item. Thank you.

BART BOSWINKEL:

Thank you. The next one is – thank you, Jordan – the real exciting news: the ccTLD financial contributions to ICANN. Again, as I said, this will be just an update on the procedures and moving forward and on the contributions to date. This not the discussion that was in the agenda on the financial contributions as a whole by the ccTLD. That is deferred to the Abu Dhabi meeting, in in Abu Dhabi there will be a second round on this topic. Xavier and Becky, the floor is yours.

XAVIER CALVEZ:

I'll introduce the subject. This is Xavier CALVEZ, CFO of ICANN. I'll introduce the subject, and then I will let Becky Nash, the VP of

Finance at ICANN, go through the small presentation that we have. Then we'll go through questions.

Quick introduction: we wanted to provide an update on the contributions that have been collected so far and an overview of the [total] amount of contributions by year up to FY16, which you have a portion of FY17 also. So we have updated the historical contributions of the CCs to ICANN to be able to make sure we display that information correctly, and you have contributed some comments to make sure that's the case.

Overall, quick comments on the billing process that we apply, a couple challenges: Peter was earlier talking about OFAC. OFAC is one thing that we need to take into account when we bill the country code operators who request a contribution. We do need to conduct a test that the countries requesting to contribute are not under an OFAC restriction. That's a step in our process.

Another specific challenge is the fact that it's a voluntary contribution, so there's a step, of course, of receiving an expression of interest in contributing and then, on the basis of that expression of interest, to then issue a bill. There's no, of course, contract to go by, and we're in a sitting or waiting position to receive that interest. And then once we have received that interest, then we can bill. It doesn't mean that the process cannot be affected changing a bit to have a more proactive

process. But on the basis of the current approach and the fact that it's a voluntary contribution, we're on the receiving end of an intent to contribute and then, once we have received that documentation of that intent, then we bill.

Again, we will want to seek with your input ways to improve this process to make it easier for everyone. With that, I'll let Becky go over a quick update. Thank you.

BECKY NASH:

Thank you, everyone. This is Becky Nash, and I'm from the ICANN Finance department. If we can have the next slide, please.

We just have a short update on the overview of the billing status for the voluntary contributions for FY16, which is ICANN's fiscal year, and FY17. Then we're going to cover a timeline that we're proposing for a future process starting with the FY18 invoicing process. Then at the end, I just have a call to everyone to confirm if we have a correct e-mail address for any billing contacts and then Q&A. Next slide, please.

In covering the invoicing process for FY16 – again, when we say “FY,” it's the fiscal year of ICANN, and ICANN's fiscal year is from July through June of the following year. So for a fiscal year ending June 30, 2016, it would cross years from 2015 to 2016 that we then are accounting for the invoicing.

We recognized that during our campaign for the FY16 process, it was not as effective as we would have liked because it appeared that we did not have that many e-mail addresses that were correct. So ICANN Finance, we were late in sending out requests for updated e-mail addresses, which is a new step that we will be doing each year now. As a result, our e-mails that we send out asking for voluntary contributions or if a CC has an interest in making a contribution, those e-mails went out late, so most of the responses back resulted in us sending invoices out much later than we would have liked to.

However, we have worked on finalizing that report. We've published it twice on the ICANN.org website, meaning that we had an initial draft that got published, and then we just made an updated publication on the 16th of June. However, we are still noting that there are a few entities that have a few outstanding payments, and we're just following up on that. We intend to do one more publication just to have it as complete as possible. And I just reflected that there's a link there for anyone who would like to go and take a look at the report that's been published. Next slide, please.

So now, we're starting on making sure that the FY17 process is ongoing and up to date. Again, we acknowledge that we are later than we would like to be in making a request for contributions for our FY17. We did begin sending out the e-mails

in May, so we did a large number of e-mails. Hopefully anyone who received it has at least acknowledged that we have the correct e-mail address.

We do thank everyone who has responded. Our next step will be to send out reminders in the July-August timeframe, so if you have not already contacted us, please note that you'll see another e-mail from us. And then our expectation will be to begin to process payments through August 31st for the fiscal year of ICANN ending on June 30, 2017. Our procedure will be then to publish the report by the 30th of September. So that is a date that we're committing to, to have the publication on our website. Next slide, please.

After covering FY16 and then FY17, we've developed a timeline that we're proposing for the FY18 and future years at this time, unless there are some other suggestions that come up later after more discussion. Our proposed annual timeline is that each year, again our new fiscal year for ICANN starts July 1st, so we are anticipating that every July and August, we would like to reconfirm e-mail addresses.

There are sometimes contacts that change, and again that is one of the issues that we identified for the FY16 process, was that we didn't have the correct e-mail addresses. We will work with the

team here, Bart and his team, just to continually try to reconfirm e-mail addresses.

Then in September of each year, again our process will be to publish the previous year's report by the 30th of September. We'd like to make that a regular schedule, and what we will do is include all payments received for invoices issued through the 31st of August, and then we will report on our website the report one month later.

Following that in October, again, we will send the e-mail communication that we typically send, requesting for voluntary contributions or commitments or reconfirming commitments and specifying exactly which year of contribution that pertains to.

This is a little bit new, that starting in November through January, we would like to start issuing invoices for those amounts that have been committed or requested, and we would like to start to receive payments. We would just like to highlight that as we do this for this upcoming fall timeframe, it could appear as if it would be two contributions in one year. That's not our intent. Our intent is to get on a schedule for future years that permits everyone to manage their finances well and to have proper timelines for communication and e-mail communication.

If we haven't received any type of e-mail communication by the following new year, in February we will start to send out e-mail reminders. And then we do have this window of opportunity of each year, again March through June, of processing additional invoices and receiving payments.

The last timeline here is just highlighting again that June 30th is ICANN's year end, when we do have an external audit and that we report all of our funding and disclose the amount from the ccTLDs. Next slide, please.

This last slide of this short update is just a reminder that for any group that had an issue with their e-mail address this year, we really apologize. We did discover that over time, our e-mail database wasn't kept up to date. We feel that we've done two major updates and have continued to ask for confirmation of e-mail addresses. Should anybody feel that we're not in contact with you from ICANN org, I've listed our e-mail website here. You're more than welcome to contact me as well, but that is our e-mail address that we receive all of our billing and accounting e-mails at, and we will be sure to update our contact information.

That is all that I had for the update on the billing process, and we'd be happy to take questions. And if maybe we go back one slide to the timeline, in case that's helpful.

BART BOSWINKEL: Any questions for Becky? Peter?

PETER VERGOTE: I just have a quick question. Suppose that I want to check that you have my correct billing address. Can I also send a mail to accounting@icann.org? I presume that we receive your invoices, but I just want to check to be on the safe side.

BECKY NASH: Yes. That is our main contact e-mail box, and we will respond should you send us an inquiry. And we would very much like to receive e-mails confirming that we have the correct contact information for billing. In some cases, we had other contacts that may have been applicable, but it wasn't the right person or e-mail address for sending an invoice.

PETER VERGOTE: Okay, thanks. You'll have it in your box within five minutes.

BECKY NASH: Great. Thank you.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Any doubt, just e-mail us with, “This is our e-mail address.” Even if you think we may already have it, just confirm, and then it will be a good confirmation and we’ll confirm to you that we have it.

BART BOSWINKEL: Any other questions for Becky? Eduardo, you have a question? No? You just waved your hand. Xavier, you want to add anything?

XAVIER CALVEZ: Just to conclude, we will try to develop a few options of potential improvements to the process to make it easier for both you and ICANN. As I said earlier, the voluntary aspect of the contribution, the OFAC checks, the fact that we have a fiscal year that is different than a calendar year, that also creates challenges for everyone, for you and for us.

So there are a number of challenges in the process. It’s not rocket science, but there are a number of challenges in the process, and I think it would be helpful to try to find any improvements to this process that simply make it easier. My biggest challenge I think is that the voluntary aspect of the contribution makes it that we need to receive positive confirmation from you that you want to contribute, which is logical. How we organize that positive contribution is something

that I think we can potentially improve without trying to burden you in any undue tasks.

But nonetheless, for us it is important to receive a request. What is the format of that request? How do we make it happen? When do we make it happen? How do we document it? It's what we need to find improvements for so that we make it as smooth as possible process, and we intend to do that between now and Abu Dhabi. And now that we know that all of you will be in Abu Dhabi, then we can plan for it.

BART BOSWINKEL:

As you may have heard – and then I want to conclude and hand over to the session Chair of the next session, Christelle. As you may have heard, part of this session has been deferred to the Abu Dhabi meeting, and the overview you will provide will be probably one of the major – will provide the overview that is needed as a basis for a fulsome discussion at the Abu Dhabi meeting. Thank you for committing to the 30th of September so people do have the time to review it and prepare for the Abu Dhabi meeting. [Peter,] you have a question? Then I want to wrap up.

[PETER VAN ROSTE]: Two short questions, actually. The first one is, I thought I understood, but then I don't anymore, because you're looking for active e-mail addresses but the whole process starts with somebody sending you their intent to pay a voluntary contribution. So you have an active e-mail address.

XAVIER CALVEZ: What we do is that we send a little bit of a blast e-mail asking, "Do you want to contribute?" And we have noticed that if we don't send an email, nothing comes in, or that we are being told, "But you didn't invoice me. What happened?" Well, if everyone is waiting, nothing happens. So we have taken the approach of initiating a request for, "Do you want to contribute?" And that's the e-mail that we're talking about.

[PETER VAN ROSTE]: Okay, that's good. Then in their intent to contribute, do registries have to repeat their intention to stick to the ccNSO-approved guidance? Or is that an open field?

XAVIER CALVEZ: The contribution that each operator makes is completely voluntary, both in the principle and in the amount, so you don't have to reference the guidelines. What we actually prefer is specifying the amount so that there's no confusion as to where

you would fit in the guidelines and that we have to verify that to define what amount to invoice and so on. So you can reference the guideline, which is helpful to know that you want to meet the guidelines for example or use the guidelines as a reference, but the amount of contribution is really what we would like to receive as a positive confirmation, as well as the fiscal year that it pertains to if it's a little bit around the end of a fiscal year, to make sure we're clear on that. That would be also helpful.

[PETER VAN ROSTE]: Alright. All clear. Thanks.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Thank you.

BART BOSWINKEL: Just in addition to that, Peter, say we are a bit involved on the sideline and sometimes you see, “Can you please send me an invoice?” And we always need to go back and say, “What is the amount? Which fiscal year?” So it's a bit unclear. But at least there is a communication that has started, and I think triggering that communication is where the real issue is. So, once you say in the mail, then it's a matter of time and it will be resolved. But the question and the point Xavier was alluding to is, how do we get the communication going?

Because there are some ccTLDs, “I will not respond, just send me an invoice” and which amount, etc., and they’ve indicated something three or four years ago, which is sometimes helpful, sometimes it isn't. And on an individual basis, you can manage it, but not for all of them. I think that’s the whole point. Okay, Becky and Xavier, thank you very much. I'm looking forward to your overviews in the future. Christelle? We’re now into probably one of the highlights of the meeting, the ccTLD news session chaired by Christelle.

CHRISTELLE VAVAL:

Good afternoon, everyone, and welcome to the ccTLD news session. We will have three presentations: one on the celebration of more than five years of environmental management by Giovanni Seppia, .eu.; the second one on improving domain name utilization quality by Dr. Ning Kong from .cn; and the third one on the registry software, a modern solution for TLD registries by .rs /.cp6 by Danko Jevtovic. So, Giovanni, the floor is yours.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA:

Thanks a lot. Thank you, everybody, and thank you for the opportunity to make this presentation. This is a part of my job I'm very proud of and something that we have embedded in the

culture and modus operandi of EURid since – as the title says – over five years. I'm just trying to move to the next slide. Okay.

It's a process that started about five years ago, and so what we realized five years ago was that we were doing a lot of activities, and some of these activities in the guidelines were some references to environmental principles. And then we decided to put everything under a sort of umbrella, a framework. And in Europe, there is the so called Eco-Management and Audit Scheme (EMAS), which is a voluntary management tool for companies and other organizations to help them to evaluate, report, and improve their environmental performances.

As I said, it's purely voluntary, so it's up to any organization to set the objectives and try to achieve those objectives via a series of actions. We have started the process at the beginning of 2011, and we managed to get registered in Q1 2012 for three years. The registration was then renewed in 2015, and we are at the end of the second three-year term.

As I said, we are very proud because this is something that not only helps you to be nicer to the environment, but also it helps you to, let's say, look at what you're doing from a different perspective. Next slide, please, because it doesn't function. Okay.

There are some pros and cons of this scheme. As I said, it helps you to structure your environmental efforts. You have to produce an environmental declaration that you have to publish on your public website, possibly in more languages. In our case, it's published in three languages. It helps you to define specific green objectives, and over these five years, we have set more than 15 environmental objectives.

But also – and this is very important – it enables you to comply with other rules and standards. Some of them are security standards. Because when every year you run the audit for the environmental registration, the auditors who are external auditors look also at the other security rules and standards that the organization must follow. That's why I'm saying that it helps you also to comply with rules and standards that sometimes you may overlook.

It also helps you to explore some areas of your activity, what you're doing on a daily basis. That can be incorporated in the scheme. And also, the environment is a very trendy topic, so it helps the organization to profile itself in a very positive way on social media, on marketing level, PR level. It's a great opportunity for reaching out to more people, telling not only what you're doing, but also that you're doing that meeting some environmental standards.

Some cons are that it's an incredibly bureaucratic process. We're talking about quite a good amount of documents that you have to produce every year to prove that you have done your work, to prove that you are compliant with the standards set by the EMAS scheme. And a paradox is that you may have tried your best to save on paper because if you decided one of the objectives of your organization is to reduce the consumption of paper, but then comes the moment when you have to go through the audit and you have the auditor in the house, and they ask you to print a million copies of different documents. And then you have to nicely tell them, "I'm sorry, but those numbers are going to completely kill my saving paper actions." And they smile at you and say, "Yes, but we need them." And I say, "Okay, let's make a deal." And you have to really make a deal and make sure that whatever they print, whatever you're asked to print is not part of the count of how much paper you have consumed.

It's also not easy to find metrics for certain objectives and some deliverables, but as I said, it's a very voluntary scheme, so you may decide yourself what are the metrics against the objectives, and also to refine those metrics and objectives during the year, because during the year you also have the opportunity to update your environmental declaration. Next slide, please.

What are the top achievements for us? What have they been so far? We managed to successfully renew the registration every

year until this year with no nonconformities, which is very important. Part of the exercise was that since 2014, we have fully audited according to international standards our CO2 emissions, and we have completely compensated, offset our CO2 emissions via different projects I'll speak about later.

We have also decided – and it was one of the main objectives too – that whenever we were participating or organizing an event, to do it according to the United Nations environmental program standards. We have followed these environmental program standards when we plan and design an event so that there are some procedures when you ship things to an event, when you manage things on the spot, when you choose the venue, when you choose the hotel, and so on.

We have increased staff awareness about environmental standard and best practices, and we have also recycled all unused items that we had produced for fairs and events. We also have launched our Facebook community, which is a Facebook green community which is having good followers. And as I said, we have gained a lot of PR follow-ups for the different actions that we have then profiled via our PR channels.

And just to give you an example that one of the latest PR that we have published about our environmental objectives and the fact that our EMAS registration was renewed in 2017, again over 200

[PICS] from different media in the European Union countries. Next slide, please.

Those are some pictures that showed support to some green projects that we have done over the past five years. And yes, from time to time, I go and plant trees around Europe. And those pictures were taken in Germany, close to Nuremberg. And we also have supported our other reforestation projects or projects for the nature, like very nice project to support some endangered species in Spain and another one in Bulgaria. This was done in partnership with a very nice organization which is called Naturefund. They're based in Germany and they do a lot for protecting the environment. Next slide, please.

As I said, since 2014, we have assessed our CO2 emissions, and this is a process that goes in parallel with our environmental registration standards. It's asked to follow some international guidelines which are set by the United Nations Environmental Program. Offsetting your CO2 means that at some point, once you have quantified how many CO2 your company has produced over a year, you have to decide how to compensate them.

If you want to officially compensate them, there is an online platform where you can see and pick up some of the projects to compensate the quantity of CO2 that you have produced. This is what we have compensated the CO2 emissions in 2015, which

was a hydropower project in Vietnam. And we have decided this year that to compensate the 2016 CO2 emissions, we are going to support a clean water project in Uganda. Those are official projects so that you get a certificate that your CO2 emissions are compensated. Next slide, please.

And this is also another example of what we have been doing. At some point, we have seen that in our storage rooms, there were a lot of rollups that we have used for events and fairs, and also there were some bags. Those are bags from the EuroDIG event that we have supported last year. Everything was recycled, so out of the rollups, we produced some nice little bags. And of course, the metal part of the rollups was reused, but the plastic part was transformed into those nice little bags. And the EuroDIG rucksacks stayed as rucksacks, but the EuroDIG logo was gone, and so we reused those bags in other events that we have done this year.

Those are just some examples of what we have been doing in the past five years. I think it's very interesting, and it's very rewarding at some point, not only to think that we can do something to support the environment even in the special industry we are working, but also to set some standards and examples. So, again, it's one of the activities in my daily job which I'm most proud of, and I would recommend any of you to think about doing something to support the environment.

Maybe some of you are already doing that, but it's really great to see how much people are liking you when you do this kind of action. It's not only domain names, but also it's supporting the environment via what we are doing on a daily basis. I'm happy to answer any question. Thank you.

PIERRE BONIS:

Hello, Giovanni. First of all, congrats for this presentation and for the corporate social responsibility, the way you do it in EURid. You talked about your carbon impact. I just would like to know what is the [perimeter] of the activities that you include to calculate your carbon impact? Because we have been this kind of work at AFNIC for now four years publishing our carbon impact every two years, and it makes a huge difference to have all the full technical operation and the travels abroad or even the people coming to see us, etc. And it's not always the same result, so I would like to know what was your choice.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA:

It's a very good question. Thank you, Pierre. We have taken into account everything. So it's really technical, travel, events, anything that we do has been taken into account. And an interesting element of the exercise is that because we do reforestation projects during the year, at the time there was the

calculation of the CO2 emissions, there was a deduction because we had already supported some environmental projects.

But everything has been taken into account, and this includes the four offices that we have, any kind of possible emission due to the activities, including the technical activities, including datacenter, including again travel and when I'm traveling to an ICANN meeting which is not in Europe.

And you find out a lot of things, like in Europe, most of the airlines already compensate the travel so you do not have to recompensate the travel you make in Europe. But that doesn't apply to trains or travel by car, so you have to do the calculation yourself. So it's quite a lengthy process, I must say. It requires about three months of work of different people and external consultants to put together all the data and determine the number of the CO2 emissions.

CHRISTELLE VAVAL: Are there any questions? So now we will have the presentation of Dr. Ning Kong.

NING KONG: Thank you. Hello, everyone. This is Ning from CNNIC. Today, I want to introduce some works from CNNIC and from China how

we do the anti-phishing work to improve the domain name utilization. Next, please.

First, I want to share some status of Chinese phishing websites in China. Next, please. Yes. In this slide, you can see in the last year, 2016, the number of the Chinese phishing websites is about 150,000 in China, which is even bigger than 2015. So we think that phishing is a very serious problem for the domain name industry. Next, please.

We do some analysis work, and in this slide you can see what the phishing websites in China target. And we can see that the online shopping and the financial security and the telecommunication, for example with Taobao, the similar Amazon in China, and Bank of China and China Mobile. Such kind of website very popular for the phishing. Next, please.

Okay. We want to talk about what kind of domain names phishing websites more like. You can see the most popular domain name in China for phishing is .com, and the second one is .cc and the third one is .pw. You know .cn is very popular in China, but for the phishing it's not very popular. We are proud of it. We think that the reason that CNNIC, the registry of .cn, implement a very strict real name verification policy. I think maybe this is the most important reason why phishing websites do not like to choose .cn. Next, please.

We also analyzed the life duration of phishing websites. You can see more than half of phishing websites, their life duration will be no longer than three days. But we calculate the average life duration of Chinese phishing websites is still more than 10 days, it's 13 days. So that means even phishing websites can be detected and tackled within three days, but there are still a few phishing websites that can last more than ten days. Next, please.

And here, I will introduce the work we do for the anti-phishing. In 2008, CNNIC initiated a nonprofit organization. We called it Anti-Phishing Alliance of China (APAC). CNNIC is the secretariat of this organization. Next, please.

In this organization, we call for the members of China, and you can see now we have more than 500 members. These members come from not only the online shopping, the financial industry and the telecommunication industry, but also the cybersecurity companies, browsers, and also registries and the registrars. Next, please.

The duties of the APAC, the first job that APAC will accept the report from the public about the phishing website of our members. That means APAC only focus on the phishing problem about the member companies. Another thing that APAC also does is some research about the anti-technologies and the

researches, and also, we do some international exchange with other organizations, for example the APWG. Next, please.

For the APAC, most of the public's report from the Chinese phishing websites will be accepted by the secretariat, and then the secretariat will relay these kind of reports to a third-party technical recognition institution. This institution will make sure whether the report is real or not. They will make some judgment. Next, please.

In this slide, I will introduce how the APAC treats the phishing websites. If the Chinese phishing website whose domain name is registered in China, and if the website is totally faked, then APAC will contact registrars and try to persuade their registrars to [client hold] the domain name. And if the registrars do not cooperate, then we will contact the registries and then registries will [server hold] it.

If the total website is not phishing but only one or two pages may be hacked for the phishing, APAC will contact the registrant and then the registrant will delete the phishing webpage. If the domain name is registered outside of China, for this situation, APAC will contact [browser] members and cybersecurity members, and they will inform some warning information for the users. Next, please.

For APAC's [jobs] last year, 2016, APAC detected and handled about 100,000 phishing websites. If you remember, the first page is about the whole number of the Chinese phishing website, it's about 150,000. APAC handled 100,000. Next, please.

Okay. Last several slides, I will introduce some works from CNNIC. After we initiated the APAC organization, CNNIC had Technical Teams focus on anti-phishing technologies and we researched and developed proactive phishing detection system. The phishing website detection is technically about pattern recognition problem and it needs some kind of machine learning, technology, and big data analysis work. We try to let our technical people research this kind of technical research work. Next, please.

In these slides, you can see how we do the proactive phishing detection. We try to list several factors which can more help for us to detect the phishing websites. For example, the title of the webpage and the favicon, the logo image, and the copyright notice, and also the domain name resolution information. After our Research Team's analysis, we found useful tips.

For example, the favicon, you can see the very small icon in the picture is a P. P characters is a favicon, and we found that because the phishing websites try to be as same as possible of the original website. Almost all the phishing websites will set the

favicon. That means if a website does not set the favicon, most such kinds of websites are not phishing. With these factors, we can usually ignore about 20% of websites. It helps us to quickly detect a phishing website.

The domain name resolution information can help us to make sure, for example some websites are very similar to other ones, but it's not a phishing website. Maybe it's another website for the same companies or maybe some companies. We try to make sure we don't do the wrong detection. We use by the domain name resolution record and logs. Next, please.

By our proactive phishing detection system, our system in the last year, we detected about 40,000 phishing websites. If you remember the previous pages, APAC handled about 100,000. Our system helped APAC to detect about 40% of the phishing websites. Another thing that if you remember my previous introduction about the average life duration of the Chinese website is about 13 days. By our system which our system detected the phishing website, their average life duration is about four or five days. Next, please.

Based on our technical and research works, we regularly report some reports about anti-phishing. For example, the APAC about every month published phishing website treatment analysis

report. If you have interest, maybe you can [access] en.apac.cn to browse more information. Next, please.

My last slide is some kind of suggestions for the anti-phishing works. First, we think that the phishing problem is a serious problem for the domain name industry, and how to do better and how phishing works, first we need to have technical [methods.] We hope that more ccTLD registries may have interest. We can communicate and cooperate together to develop a more fantastic technical system to help us detect a phishing website.

Another thing with that, for how to handle – after we detect a phishing website, you can see for the APAC works we have to contact the registrars, the registries. I think it's necessary for us to have cooperation with government, with registries, registrars, to make sure after we detect the phishing website we can shut it down.

The last one is that we think that the education is very important. For example, CNNIC developed a little funny online learning about the anti-phishing information, the online games. You can see the picture, happily learn the security of anti-phishing, something like that, and the young students like to play it.

After the game, the young people can know what is phishing and how phishing work should be. That may help us to strengthen the education work. Next, please.

Okay, thank you. Any questions?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thanks a lot. It was a very interesting presentation, and compliments for the work that you have been doing. Can I just ask you? There was a slide where you said the actions that the APAC is doing in case of registered domain names. When you refer to domain register in China, you mean register? Because registrant is in China. Is the registrant reference or registrar and registrant?

NING KONG: If the registrant [uses] the registrars within China or the registries within China.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay, I understand. Thank you.

CHRISTELLE VAVAL: Are there any other questions? Okay.

NING KONG: Thank you.

CHRISTELLE VAVAL: Thank you, doctor. Now, we will present the registry software, a modern solution for TLD registries by Danko Jevtovic.

DANKO JEVTOVIC: Thank you. And that's close enough. Danko Jevtovic from the .rs as mentioned, and now we will have something a little bit different, because those two large registries are improving either our environment or the domain name space. In the meantime, we are a small registry based in Europe, only ten years old, and we have a bit less than 100,000 domain names. In the meantime, we were fighting against our legacy, old technical systems and finding a way to improve them.

Because this ICANN meeting is in Africa, we thought that it might be interesting to bring some of the learnings from our experience and they might be helpful. This is the last slide, I think. Okay, that's it. Better. Can we have the next one, please?

To summarize what was our situation – and I think that some of the small registries might recognize themselves – we had a previous Yugoslav domain name, and the software base, our registry system was based on the old academic software that was running for free without any registrars and other advanced

things. On top of that, in the year 2008 when we started, we built some client-server Windows application and piggybacked registry-registrar model without using standard EPP. We didn't have any plans for DNSSEC, IDN, and other things, so we had to improvise.

We had also a complicated situation with transition from .yu to .rs, so we had to put in a lot of code to handle those things. And then we had another sunrise for .serb, the Cyrillic IDN that was the second Cyrillic TLD. The software got too complicated to handle, and we decided that we have to do something about it.

We have lots of security uncertainties about this old software and how it will run. Thankfully, we managed to make a backup site. Our system was rather safe and we didn't have much of the problems with running the software, but it couldn't go on with that. Next slide, please.

We started to see what the requirements will be, and can we use some other solution or we have to develop something on our own? We needed modern modular web software solution. We needed web-based interface and to be responsive, to be able to use even from the mobile phones and other devices for our registrars.

We of course wanted to have standard – or as standard as possible – EPP for that it help some of the work in the center that

tried to standardize the EPP extensions for the registries in Europe. We wanted to simplify our procedures and we wanted our software to be as secure as possible, so we tried to build in the security by design by using these OWAS principles.

It was also an interesting thing that we later all said when we – actually the software was coded, we were running statistical code analysis on the full software to see if there are any hidden unsecurities. And of course, the system had to be affordable for us because we have a bit less than 100,000 domain names, so we couldn't go for the fully commercial, expensive solutions that are sometimes offered. Next slide, please.

Our dilemma was, should we go with somehow to improve the old code, to build something proprietary, to go for some of the custom solutions? And we didn't know what to do. We considered the very popular Czech FRED open source software, but at that time when we were trying to make decisions, it was needed to be modified. We don't have Development Team in our registry, so we found out that we need someone to maybe use that software and support us. One of the options was possibly to outsource the registry operations, but the general feeling of our board that our national registry operation cannot be outsourced, so we have to have the full control of the system. Next slide, please.

The solution was, well, it is five years now, it's the sixth year of the process, so it was difficult work for us. In 2011, we decided to split the project phase and the phase of tendering and making the software itself. In the project phase, we wanted to have strict requirements. We made the tender and awarded the project to be done by Belgrade School of Electrical Engineering. It was a team led by a local professor with lots of international experience working for some U.S. companies.

In 2014, the project was done and it was accepted. We were quite happy with it, and we made international tender for the software. We actually didn't specify whether the software should be created new software, should FRED be possibly modified. We were hoping that someone will offer that but with support and adjustments to our needs that were laid out in the tender.

At the end, the tender was won by a local company that was already working with us improving the old software, so they had the knowledge. It's a small software company. In Serbia there are a lot of software engineers now and outsourcing is a good industry for Serbia, but it's also one of the challenges because lots of people who are doing good software in Serbia don't want to work for local companies. They're charging American salaries selling to American companies, so it's better business for them.

So at the end, the contract was awarded, and in 2015, the software was written per our specifications. In 2016, we decided to tender and buy completely new hardware and to have fully complete new implementation. Next slide, please.

The new system is fully configurable functionality, so TLD rules can be set and configured. It's fully EPP based, EPP enabled. We are not running DNSSEC now. This is the project for this year. We are preparing it ourselves now, but the software is DNSSEC ready. Registrars have secure access with two-factor authentication and one-time passwords for special operations.

We have something we call a secure domain name. Every time a registrant registers a new domain name, we e-mail them to verify that e-mail address of the registrant is true. We have a secure mode so a registrar can put a domain name into secure mode, so any modification has to be verified by the registrant. And we have all sorts of notifications that are sent both to registrar, to registrant, and possibly administrative contact depending on the notification. The system is much safer for the end users.

It's quite high performance and reliable. Having in mind our number of domain names, the workload on our service is negligible, but we tried to scale the tests so we can run by a much larger registry than ourselves. And the system is multi-

language by design, so all the documentation, project, and software is written in English, and of course it's customized also in Cyrillic and Latin because we use both scripts in Serbia. We are very proud of our system, and we think that it fits not only small TLD but any TLD registry. Next slide, please.

Somehow, half of my slide is missing here. It's not an Adobe Connect problem, but my slides are like that. The hardware infrastructure is based on virtualized VMWare system. We have experience with that. We are using Windows servers because we were happy with Microsoft SQL server and Windows servers, and it was not our requirement, but the winning offer offered a similar system and we were happy to have the knowledge about that.

And we have now fully active-active configuration. Currently, we are running in two datacenters, both of them in Belgrade but on different sides of the large river running through Belgrade, and it is possible to support more than two sites on the active-active configuration. Next one, please. Can you press [another one?] I think it's missing something.

Okay, this is for PowerPoint. These are a few screens just to show the ease of use of the system because it's web-based but it's nothing too detailed for you now, of course. Next.

Okay, so transition time. Transition was done June 26th last year, so I'm presenting this only now because we needed a couple of months to be sure that we don't have any real problems. Our registration system was down for five hours, but of course, DNS resolvers were up all the time.

We didn't have any major problems. We had a few funny problems because that moment we started this new verification of domain name process, and it happened that that very day, our hosting provider for the website had some technical difficulties, so connection from the location where our website was hosted to where the registry system was hosted had difficulty in communication. Some of the verification didn't go through. But people have a 40-day period to verify the domain name, so it cleared soon.

We noticed that because we introduced this new notification system, our registrars demanded some additional improvements on that, so we had to rethink that part of the system, which was not a problem but it was a new feature and we decided to improve it, and it was done right after that. Next slide.

To near the end of my presentation, what were the lessons that we learned? That first of all, security by design is very important because we now feel much more confident in our system. We did

the static code testing. Parallel with creating of new software, we immediately requested for all the testing procedures to be done and for all the models independently in the whole system completely to be tested. We even created universal EPP testing tool that is scriptable that was used to verify the operation of the new system.

Our lesson is that process for us was very long. I mentioned it started in 2011, but actually, we were preparing for that since the beginning of our .rs operation. It was really a huge struggle for us, and it was a major cost for our registry because we are small. We succeeded by planning ahead, but at the end, it was not an easy thing for us to do.

Our further plans are IDN extensions for .rs. This is now very easy to do, but we have some of the specific Latin letters in our language we'd like to support. DNSSEC is of course a priority, and we plan to do some marketing-related extensions so our cooperation with the registry and the marketing can be more efficiently done and integrated with the system.

One of the reasons why I'm presenting this is in this last sentence: because we are a small registry, it was hard work for us. We think that there might be some registries in a similar position. We are a not-for-profit foundation that is nongovernmental, but we would like to increase the capability

of our system and we think that the modular structure is very good.

If there's any registries that would like to cooperate on that, in first line think about a registry that might be in a similar position of being small and having a need to have a modern system, we are very open to find a partner to exploit the solution we made so far and to bring it up further. That's about it. Yes, that was it.

And I have just a number of information about Serbian registry. Last year, report in English, because the new registry system is mentioned in it. If anyone is interested, there is a number of copies on my desk over there, so we will be more than glad to keep in contact. Thank you. Any questions?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Stephen Deerhake, American Samoa. Thank you for the presentation. I note that you considered FRED. Did you look at anything else, like COCA for example?

DANKO JEVTOVIC: FRED was one of the options we considered most because we feel that we will get good support from the Czech registry that is very good at development. But actually, we were not focused. The time we did the tender, we didn't require any specific solution. We did international tender, we were open to any

solution that could offer to fulfill our requirements laid down in the project. We didn't go too much into any other open source solution.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: We have a question from a remote participant for Dr. Kong. John McCormac from HosterStats.com is asking, “Very impressive presentation. Does it cover new gTLDs?”

NING KONG: I'm not sure. I will check it. But I think we will cover it because our APAC focus on all the members of our APAC members. If our member’s website uses a domain name that is a new gTLD, we will cover it. Yes.

CHRISTELLE VAVAL: Okay, so thank you, sirs, for the presentations. We have a few announcements. Don’t forget tomorrow there is a public council meeting, and also, we have two interesting sessions after this one that you can attend. They're on the operational side of ICANN’s OPS plans and budget, and on who sets ICANN’s priorities.

KRISTA PAPAC:

Thank you very much, Christelle. Thank you to all the presenters. With that, I would like to conclude our two ccNSO member meeting days, and I would like to thank our Meetings Program Working Group, especially the Chair of the Meetings Program Working Group, Alejandra, for her constant involvement and her contribution to the meeting. Thank you very much. And I'd like to thank all the speakers, all presenters. I'd like to thank all those who proposed cross-community sessions and helped us to organize them. We have three cross-community sessions, so two today, and yesterday we had full house at the GDPR. Thank you very much, Peter, Giovanni, Jordan, and others who helped organize that.

Thanks to all of you who asked their questions and shared opinions, and thanks to all of you who listened and showed your preferences by different colored cards. Thanks a lot to our local host again, and thanks a lot to our generous sponsors, and especially I'd like to thank Young Eum who brought prizes for winners of the quiz. Well, they all went to her own team, but that was a fair competition.

Really, thank you very much for making this meeting successful and interesting for all of us, and see you all in Abu Dhabi. And not only – well, before we meet in Abu Dhabi we're still here around. So our ccNSO members meeting days may be over, but

there are still other interesting sessions that I hope you're going to attend.

Thank you very much, and see you around.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]