
ICANN77 | Prep Week – Geopolitical Legislative and Regulatory Developments Update
Thursday, June 1 2023 – 12:30 to 13:30 DCA

BECKY MCGILLEY:

Hello and welcome to our session, Geopolitical, Legislative, and Regulatory Developments Update. My name is Becky McGilley, and I am the remote participation manager. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior.

Interpretation for this session will include the six UN languages, Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian, and Spanish, plus Portuguese. Participants may access the interpretation via the Zoom toolbar. Click on the interpretation icon in Zoom and select the language you will listen to during this session. We will save designated discussion time at the end of the presentation for questions. Thank you all for joining us today. Next slide, please.

This session is a collaborative effort between several of the ICANN functions. The Government and IGO Engagement Team, known as the GE Team, is a small global team made up of subject matter experts who evaluate governmental and IGO activity from the perspective of potential impact on ICANN's management of the unique identifiers and the delivery of ICANN's mission.

GE works closely with our colleagues across ICANN, including the ICANN Legal and OCTO Teams, as well as the Global Stakeholder Engagement regional teams and the GAC support team on issues of importance to

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.

governments. The information we present is a reflection of all of GE, as well as the efforts of those other functions.

So today, you will hear from a portion of the GE Team, Veni Markovski, who covers UN and ITU activity, Nora Mari, who is in Brussels-based, deals with legislative questions globally, and we will hear from Albert Daniels, our colleague in GSE Latin America and the Caribbean, who will be providing an update on the Caribbean region today. We also have several members of the ICANN staff on hand to provide responses during our Q&A time set aside at the end.

Today's presentation will begin with an overview on current IGO processes, most notably WSIS+20 and the Global Digital Compact, among other ongoing IGO processes. Following that, we will provide an update on legislative and regulatory developments. And as stated before, we do have the time set aside for questions and discussions at the end. Next slide, please. And now, we'll hand it over to my colleague, Veni, for a comprehensive overview on current IGO processes.

VENI MARKOVSKI:

Thanks, Becky. And I just wanted to ask everybody to make sure their microphones are muted because when there are even the slightest noises, they take away the camera and the microphone, and I see at least one person has their microphone on. If we can move to the next slide, please.

Yes, so we're going to be talking today mainly about a couple of items happening at the United Nations. And if we have time, we'll go back at some point and talk about the ITU. Before we continue, there are some

abbreviations that I may be using during the presentation as well as my colleagues, so they're on this slide. SG or UNSG is the UN Secretary General. GDC is the Global Digital Compact. WSIS or WSIS is the World Summit on the Information Society. IGOs in general is Intergovernmental Organizations, and UNGA is the United Nations General Assembly.

And we'll talk about two of the big processes that are taking place at the United Nations in the next couple of years. And we'll start first with the WSIS and WSIS+20. Can we move to the next slide, please? Thank you.

So the WSIS was a two-phase summit hosted by the United Nations. That was, and I quite, initiated in order to create an evolving multi-stakeholder platform aimed at addressing the issues raised by information and communication technologies through a structured and inclusive approach at the national, regional, and international levels.

The first phase took place in Geneva in 2003, followed by a second phase in Tunis in 2005. WSIS resulted in some frameworks for the future of internet governance, namely the Tunis commitment and the Tunis agenda, in which governments committed to the multi-stakeholder model of internet governance and established the Internet Governance Forum.

The Tunis agenda provided a framework to recognize the roles of the different stakeholders in the multi-stakeholder model of internet governance, such as the technical community, the IGOs, the business, civil society, governments, and others. And the success of WSIS is

attributed partly also to the creation of the Working Group on Internet Governance, which happened after the first phase of the WSIS, the members of which were appointed by the secretary general, and it produced a report. We're going to put a link to the report in the chat so people can take a look or copy and keep it for future references.

And the report provided a working definition of internet governance, which is, quote, internet governance is the development and application of shared principles, norms, rules, decision-making procedures, and programs that shape the evolution and use of the internet by governments, the private sector, and civil society in their respective roles.

Additionally, in point 12, the WGIG report made clear that the scope of internet governance extends beyond ICANN responsibility for the DNS and IP addresses. Then this was continued with a process called WSIS+10, which happened in New York in 2015, so 10 years after the Tunis part of the WSIS. The WSIS+10 was intergovernmental negotiations within the UN General Assembly, which produced an outcome document. We're going to put the link in the document in the chat as well.

What this outcome document was, it reconfirmed the multi-stakeholder model of internet governance. It extended the internet governance forum, the IGF, for another 10 years, and, which is important for the community to know, this was a closed process, close negotiations. It wasn't open for other stakeholders, but just member states through their permanent missions to the UN in New York.

And therefore, we come to the WSIS+20, which is going to be taking place in 2025, 20 years after the WSIS in Tunis. And people are already talking about it. We actually had a session in our previous ICANN meeting in Cancun organized by the community about WSIS+20 and we reported also in our GE information session.

So based on the experience from WSIS+10, we want to tell you that we expect that it will be still intergovernmental process and negotiations within the permanent missions or between the permanent missions at the UN. Some governments have already began engaging technical business and other communities to discuss WSIS+20. We've been approached as well to share what we know about the development of the internet in the last 10 years and what has changed.

Needless to say, in 2015, ICANN was going through the IANA transition. In 2025, it would be a long time ago that it happened. WSIS+20 review has been included on the agendas of several recent meetings or conferences such as the high level strategic dialogues at the ITU WSIS forum in March. And as I mentioned during ICANN 76, we anticipate more discussions will be taking place around WSIS+20 in around our meetings and in between.

We are more than happy to provide any information. We actually published a paper on WSIS+20 review process in, I believe in March this year. So we'll put another link in the chat so that people can download this paper. And by the way, the link that we are putting is to the whole publication page of GE. So feel free to download the other papers that we have produced. Can we switch to the next slide, please? Thank you.

So the second process that I mentioned in the beginning is the Global Digital Compact of the GDC, which will happen at the summit of the future that is taking place at the UN next year. And it is the anticipated outcome of this meeting. The GDC is a kind of an agreement between member states. It will represent what the secretary general said is principles for an open, free, and secure digital future for all. We are interested in the GDC process because it could have implications for ICANN's mission, for the multi-stakeholder model of internet governance and the future of the IGS.

The office of the UN secretary general envoy on technology or the tech envoy is gathering inputs from member states and stakeholders through two processes, informal consultations or deep dives, and collecting written submissions. And more can be found on the tech envoy's webpage to which we're going to put the link in the chat. If we can move to the next slide. Thank you.

So these are some highlights that we see from the deep dive on Internet governance. It took place in April. There were a lot of organizations participating. But what is important is that these deep dives, as they are called, are informal. There is no recording. And none of the participant statements are published on the GDC website.

Some member states, IGOs like the ITU and non-governmental stakeholders, such as ICANN, RIPE NCC and others, participated and addressed these meetings. Many of the statements were supportive of the global, open, and interoperable internet. The existing multi-stakeholder structures, including ICANN, IETF, and others, and expressed support for the continuation of the IGF beyond 2025. And

some support was expressed with regards to the positive role the multi-stakeholder model has played in the internet goals.

There were only a couple of dissenting voices with people saying that there is need for internationalization of internet governance. But overwhelmingly, the majority were supportive of the multi-stakeholder model and of ICANN, some of them. Can we move to the next slide, please? Thank you.

So these are some quotes, which I don't feel just reading them, because they are on the screen. And I believe we're going to publish the presentation, so you will be able to read them. But Kenya, Iran, and the Netherlands, these were statements during the deep dive, as well as written statements. And I believe we have one more slide. Can we see the next slides, if I'm not mistaken? Yeah. These are quotes from the U.N. Secretary General policy brief, which he published, and we're going to put a link to the policy brief as well in the chat.

He published policy brief number five, titled, A Global Digital Compact, An Open, Free, and Secure Digital Future for All. And we have some observations of the policy brief and are working on a blog entry with more comments. But we would like here to talk only about those two instances in which the policy brief mentions ICANN.

So in the Annex 1.5, ICANN and the IETF are named as multi-stakeholder forums. And ICANN and the IETF are not forums, they're organizations. And in point 63, as you see, it says internet governance objective and actions, for example, would continue to be supported by the IGF and relevant multi-stakeholder bodies such as ICANN and the IETF.

While we need to let you know how ICANN has been supportive and supporting the IGF, it has not been asked by the UN if it would like to support, quote unquote, internet governance objectives and actions in this newly proposed digital cooperation forum which the secretary general has announced in the policy brief, whose functions and workings have not been defined and are still unclear.

And so a few words about the digital cooperation forum. The forum would support member states and private sector and [inaudible] stakeholders to, among others, identify and promote policy solutions to emerging digital challenges and governance gaps, and also to highlight policy priorities for individual and collective stakeholder decision-making and action. It's supposed to be an annual event, and the DCF would accommodate existing forums and initiatives in a hub-and-spoke arrangement and help to identify gaps where multi-stakeholder action is required.

The secretary general also wants to establish an advisory group, but it doesn't say that it will be a multi-stakeholder advisory group. And he's looking for inputs for the GDC, which will be discussed by the member states. So we don't know what the compact will shape up and how it will come at the end. We are following what's happening in New York. We are reporting to the community as soon as something needs to be reported back to you. And I'll finish with that. I'll skip the ITU part, because really nothing has happened in the last couple of months. Most of the things at the ITU is coming in July and then in September. So let's see if I have, I might have another slide for the ITU. Maybe we can skip that. Next slide, please. Yes, perfect. And now I pass this to Nora.

NORA MARI: Thanks, Veni. Next slide, please. So I think it was Albert meant to present.

ALBERT DANIELS: Sure, Nora, I can present since the slides are up on the screen. Thank you, Nora. Thank you, Veni. As mentioned earlier, I am Albert Daniels, a member of one of the global stakeholder engagement teams with ICANN. Our team covers the Latin America and Caribbean region, where we have 49 territories that we focus on. Today, I will be giving some perspective on the 32 territories of the Caribbean, because those are the main territories that I cover on our global stakeholder engagement team.

Now, in any discussion of the Caribbean, it's very important to have a visual idea of what we are dealing with. And this is what I'm going to hope to accomplish with this slide. What you see on the screen is in the top part, the bottom of Florida, right next to where it says Gulf of Mexico. And then to the left of the slide, you see some territories in Central America, which at the bottom connect to South America. And the Caribbean, essentially, is all of those territories between Florida at the top and South America at the bottom.

It's a very complex and interesting area, because it includes one territory, Belize, in Central America. The Caribbean also includes three territories in South America, Guyana, which we refer to as sometimes British Guiana, Suriname, which can be called Dutch Guiana, and also Cayenne, which is referred to as French Guiana sometimes.

And then in between South America and the top, you see all of these islands. And some of them are actually a single landmass split politically into two, for example, Hispaniola. Hispaniola actually includes the Dominican Republic and Haiti. And we have St. Martin, which has a French side and a Dutch side.

And what you find across the Caribbean is an intermixing of different types of national status. Many of the territories, approximately 16 of them are independent territories, but several of them remain dependent on former colonial powers, such as France, the Netherlands, and the United Kingdom.

And then we have Martinique, Guadeloupe, which have relationships with France. We have the ABC Islands, Aruba, Bonaire, and Curaçao, which have relations with the Netherlands. We have Puerto Rico, which is connected with the United States. You have Anguilla and Montserrat and others, which still maintain some connections with the United Kingdom.

And of course, there are several languages which are spoken in the Caribbean, English, French, Spanish, and Dutch, because of this sort of relations with other territories. And this creates a situation that leads to quite a bit of diversity. Next slide, please.

So what we have is physical diversity, which leads to geographic diversity in the Caribbean. And this creates a situation where we don't have a single political space or a single geographic space, and it makes it a bit challenging to have a single legislative space. However, there are some sub-groupings in the Caribbean, which have made attempts to

harmonize legislation, particularly legislation that can impact what we do with internet governance, and of course, what we do at ICANN.

There is a grouping known as CARICOM, which is short for the Caribbean Community, and that comprises 20 territories, 20 countries, and there's another grouping referred to as the OECS, which comprises 11 countries. Now, there are approximately 16 million citizens in CARICOM, and the pillars of CARICOM are economic integration, foreign policy coordination, human and social development, and security. And on the other hand, when it comes to the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States, the essential pillars are to accelerate regional integration, and there are several regional bodies that have been set up, regional bodies for communications, regional bodies for legislation, and so on. So there is that attempt, again, to create a homogenous region, and other pillars of integration in the OECS, the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States, to reinvent the economy, to value the environment, and to build resilience and advance equity and inclusion.

Now, I say all of that essentially to refer to the HIPCAR project, H-I-P-C-A-R, and the URL is on this slide, and I will provide in the chat later on. But this project was launched in 2013, specifically conceived by the International Telecommunications Union, CARICOM, and an organ of CARICOM, which is the Caribbean Telecommunications Union. And this project was initiated in response to requests for member states for help in terms of some of their legislation, because what we found was that there was no single standard for legislation in these Caribbean territories.

So the main objective of the HIPCAR project was to produce regional model policies and regulations in several areas. These areas included electronic commerce transactions, electronic commerce evidence, access to public information, privacy and data protection, cyber crimes and cybersecurity, the interception of communications, universal service licensing, and also interconnection and cost modeling. So these guidelines and model legislation were made available to the CARICOM territories, and of course, they were also made available to some of the OECS territories. Next slide, please.

But even with these models being available, what we find is that not every single territory in CARICOM or in the OECS actually use those models to adopt legislation. So as far as we are concerned, the countries that actually have enacted legislation with regard to data protection, for example, are Antigua and Barbuda, the Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, and Bermuda. Next slide, please.

Continuing on, we also have the Cayman Islands, which is an overseas dependency of the United Kingdom, Jamaica, which is independent, St. Kitts and Nevis, which is independent, St. Lucia, which is independent, St. Vincent and the Grenadines, which is independent. Also Trinidad and Tobago, which is a republic, all of those territories are a sample of those which have legislated data protection documents. And you see down below that in Anguilla, Dominica, Grenada, Guyana, Montserrat, Turks, and Caicos, they have been no specific legislations that have been put in place for data protection.

So this is just to give the sense of how complicated it is actually in the Caribbean to have a unified legislation on matters related to data

protection, privacy, and internet governance generally because of the political situation where we have a mix of territories that are still dependent on countries like the Netherlands, France, the United States, and the United Kingdom, and also a number of territories, 16 of them approximately, which actually are independent and basically are sovereign to do as they choose in their respective territories. So there is work happening. A lot is going on. Next slide, please. And sorry, I think maybe we can go back one slide. I think there was a slide that was missed. We can just go back one.

Right, this is a slide that I wanted to refer to. On the 9th of January, 2022, the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States actually initiated a sort of follow-up to the HIPCAR project. And the idea behind this follow-up is to move to the next stage, at least within the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States, to try to establish further legislation in more territories in respect of e-commerce, data privacy, and so on. So if you can just advance two slides, please. And then at this point, I will hand over to my colleague, Nora, who will continue. Thank you very much.

NORA MARI:

Thanks a lot, Albert. So I will provide some updates about activities in the European Union, legislative initiatives and non-legislative initiatives. The first one I want to talk about are two regulations concerning the use of geographical indications in domain names. We provided updates on these two regulations in previous plenary, but basically these two regulations aim at providing protection for geographical indications that I also call GIs for wine, spirit, drinks, and agricultural products, and for craft and industrial products.

For those not familiar with the term geographical indications, basically GIs are terms that establish rights for specific products whose qualities are specifically linked to an area, a geographical area where they are produced. Typical GIs that most of you will recognize would be Prosecco, Feta, Champagne, Parmigiano.

The commission proposed these two regulations in April 2022. And with these two regulations, proposed an information alert system for the use of GIs in domain names that would apply to ccTLDs administered or managed by a new established registry. And the system would be created under the European Union Intellectual Property Office. So called EUIPO.

With this system, upon submitting an application for a GI, the GI applicant would inform about the availability of their GI as a domain name, or the system would also alert the applicants when a domain name containing an identical or a similar name to their GIs is registered. With the introduction of this system, ccTLD registries would have to provide the EUIPO with all the necessary information and data to operate this system.

So this regulation was proposed in April, 2022. And as you may recall, under the European Union, you have to then the European Parliament and council that analyze the commission text and come with a final text, with an agreed text among these two co-legislators. One of the two has almost concluded, has concluded actually, the one on craft and industrial products, and the one on agricultural products is entering its final stage.

So these, we brought to the attention of the community, these two proposed regulations, because there were discussions regarding expanding the scope of these two regulations, and then the application of this other system to gTLDs. Basically, if that were the case, there were the risks that this introduced process would sit on top of the current dispute resolution processes provided by ICANN, and also might have interfered with the current review of the UDRP.

When it comes to the craft and industrial product regulation, there is not such extension. And actually the two co-legislators have deleted the provisions concerning ccTLDs as well. When it comes to the regulation on GIs for agricultural products, negotiations are still ongoing. And in that case, the European parliament has proposed an extension of the scope of the regulation to gTLDs. Next slide, please.

So another quick update on the NIS2 directive, which is a legislative proposal, legislative law actually now, is no longer a proposal, that most of you are familiar with. So the NIS2 is law, and now member states have to implement it into their national legislation. As you may know from previous updates, directives are not directly applicable in member states, and member states have to implement the international legislation. So member states are due to go through this process and have the directive implemented by October 2024.

And basically, they do have coordination mechanisms to help with a uniform application of the directive. As we mentioned in previous plenaries, of interest of the community mostly is article 28, which introduces provisions regarding collection and access to domain name registration data. The way it's crafted, the article may leave some

leeway to member states for a different interpretation of the provision, for example, of which data is to be collected. So there is a coordination mechanism in place among member states at the minute is called NIS Cooperation Group. It was created under the NIS and the works continue under the NIS2. And there is a work stream specifically on article 28, which we look at trying to have a uniform interpretation across the various member states.

In the meantime, the directive also tasks the commission with providing implementing acts that will specify cybersecurity risk measures, reporting obligation for DNS providers. So the NIS Cooperation Group is looking as well at providing input to these implementing acts. And I think they will probably provide input around September '23. They are expected to send input to the commission.

I don't have another slide, but I want to give another quick update about the debate that is taking place in Brussels and that concerns basically the European Commission is looking to establish a mechanism that will compel large platforms to pay telecom operators for the development of network. This is a debate that is happening also in other jurisdictions. In the UK, I think Brazil is also looking at it something similar. We are looking at it because such regulation may through the introduction of price signals at the peering and transit layer may have an impact on net neutrality.

So there has been a debate about it in Brussels for some time and the commission has opened a couple of months ago a public consultation that now is closed. It closed on the 19th of May and has collected input

from various stakeholders to basically [inaudible] their thinking on whether proposing a legislation or another type of initiative.

In general, the input for these initiatives is not be so welcomed by various stakeholders including some member states. And the European Telecom Regulator has raised, let's say, some skepticism about the need of such a regulation as well as potential dangers concerning, again, net neutrality rules.

So now the consultation is closed and it is a bit unclear what will happen next. But for sure after the summer break, it would be clearer, the direction of travel of the commission, if they will propose a legislative initiative or something else. It is worth mentioning that there will be European elections in June '24 and a new commission. So the timeframe for such a proposal is quite strict for proposing a legislative proposal and approve it. So yeah, that, we will see after the summer.

And that's it for my presentation. Back to you, Becky.

VENI MARKOVSKI:

It will be probably me this time, not Becky. That's okay. We would like to open the floor for questions. And I believe there are some questions in the chat. And let me just open the chat and see exactly. There was a question by Bill, what is the definition of similar when it comes to the main names? We're already seeing that variants defined in the RZLGRs are seriously inadequate in this regard. I'm not sure if what is meant here is actually related to the EU legislation. So if it's possible to put a comment in the chat so that we answer. And in the meantime, Nigel

Hickson has asked, very interesting on GI. So is it thought scope may be amended to include ccTLDs or is commission view?

ALBERT DANIELS:

So let me see. So for the two regulations, there are two, one on craft and industrial products and the other one on agricultural products. For the one on craft and industrial products, the co-legislators have deleted the provisions that would apply to ccTLDs too. So it will no longer apply to ccTLDs, although there is a review clause to review in 18 months if there is a need of applying such regulation to ccTLDs.

When it comes to the one on agricultural products, no, it still applies to ccTLDs and the parliament would like to extend the scope of the regulation to GTLDs as well.

VENI MARKOVSKI:

Thanks, Nora. And Bill has made an additional comment. So the question is what is the definition of similar when it comes to domain names? And with regards to similar, it's about geographic names which will be subject to notifications/restrictions/etc. How do we decide what is similar?

ALBERT DANIELS:

So it's important to know that geographic names and geographical indications are two different things. So let's see the question. So it would apply to geographical indications. So Prosecco, Feta, this kind of geographical indications. And someone who has a legitimate interest in a GI will notify the EUIPO. And so when something is registered that

contain the GI, it's then up to the owner of the GI to potentially raise a claim.

VENI MARKOVSKI:

Thanks, Nora. And I think there was one more question, one second. Okay, so there were a couple of comments who were interested on hearing on GIs. I think you responded to that. And you got thanks from a couple of people, Nora, for the answers. I'm almost sure I saw another question but I'm going through the chat and I can't see it now. So I think it was from Ashley, if I'm not correct. Why is the coordinating group sending their input on article 28 to the EC? What role does the European commission, I guess, play in terms of national implementations? Was it the EC that created the coordination group? I don't know if you know the answers to this question.

ALBERT DANIELS:

So basically, the NIS cooperation group is made of member states' representatives. So it's up to the member states then implement the regulation and it is a mechanism that was established since the NIS to have kind of a coordinated implementation because directives, sometimes articles may be interpreted in different ways.

And for example, in this case, it very much concerns us since article 28 could be potentially interpreted in different ways. So it is a mechanism that member states agree on how to interpret the specific provisions and there is an exchange of information regarding the national implementation of the law.

And then the role of the commission in the national implementation. So as mentioned, the actual directive provides for the commission to introduce some of these acts called implementing acts, which basically specify more in detail, the meaning or the mechanism of the tools that certain provisions in you binding legal instruments, how they should actually be implemented.

So instead of doing that in a legislation, it's done in a second moment. And they generally provide more in detail how something should be done by a member state and they can adopt such acts for binding union legal acts.

VENI MARKOVSKI:

Thanks, Nora. I wanted to say something which I saw also noticed in the chat, which I should have addressed, but Bill Drake mentioned that in fact he spoke and many others spoke also at the UN deep dive on internet governance and were supportive, not only supportive of the IGF, but also critical of any idea that it could be replaced with a multilateral body of similar kind, a meeting space or a forum. Thanks. I don't see other questions at the moment. There is a follow-up by Ashley. "I suppose my question is also whether or not the EC has the authority to disagree with the group's input and/or change it." Same question, can the EC disagree with the member states' implementation?

ALBERT DANIELS:

So this is an informal mechanism. The NIS cooperation group that is meant to be a practical tool. It is sort of in the interest of member states

to have a coherent application of the tool. Then when it is implemented in the national law, there are mechanisms at European level that the commission may bring infringement procedures against member states in some cases. But I would say this happens for very sort of important, in very sort of meaningful circumstances. Otherwise there are generally more informal mechanisms of communication.

VENI MARKOVSKI:

Thank you. I don't see other questions. Let me double check in the Q&A. Nope, and you got thanks from Ashley. And sorry for all the questions. Well, having said that, I skipped in the beginning something which was related to the ITU. I will very quickly tell you that we are following the ITU. In July, there is an ITU council, which is scheduled to decide on some of the resolutions, the council resolutions, but also on the council working groups, including the internet and council working group on WSIS. We will let you know what's happening, I guess, at the next ICANN meeting, if not earlier through a blog or tweets or something, depending on what's happening.

We are expecting that some member states who have been very active in the past would continue to be active with regards to proposals that touch on ICANN's mission. If that happens, obviously, we'll react quickly and we'll let the community know.

We see these kind of sessions to be a two-way flow of information. The sessions and the publications are part of ICANN's commitment to the community as expressed in the charter from 2019. And the sessions in

the ICANN meetings are to serve as an intersection point between the community and ICANN Org.

We, the government engagement team that's covering the UN and the ITU, will be in Washington in, what is it, 10 days. So if you guys are there, feel free to reach out and we'll be more than happy to talk to you. For those who are not going to be there, we urge you to reach out to your national governments, foreign ministries or foreign offices and see whether they have enough knowledge and expertise on issues related to internet governance. And if not, maybe it could be helpful to provide them with such.

With that, I want to thank everyone. Or do you want, Becky, to say a few words at the end?

BECKY MCGILLEY:

Thanks, Veni. I just wanted to conclude and say thank you all for joining us today. It was an insightful webinar and really big gratitude for the incredible teams that made it happen, our language services and tech team. They're the magic behind everything. And also to our speakers, subject matter experts. And Nora, would you like to?

ALBERT DANIELS:

Yeah, just a very quick point. I put in the chat basically a response to one of the questions regarding the application to ccTLDs for the regulation on craft and industrial products. I put the wording of the current agreed text, so that is more clear regarding the terms of the application.

BECKY MCGILLEY: Okay, great. Thank you everyone.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]