
ICANN80 | PF – ccNSO: Policy Update Session
Wednesday, June 12, 2024 – 10:45 to 12:15 KGL

CLAUDIA RUIZ:

Hello, and welcome to the ccNSO Policy Update Session. My name is Claudia Ruiz, and I am joined by my colleagues, Bart Boswinkel and Joke Braeken, and we are the remote participation managers for this session. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior.

During this session, questions or comments submitted in chat will only be read aloud if put in the proper form, as I've noted in the chat. I will read questions and comments aloud during the time set by the chair or moderator of this session. Interpretation for this session will include English, Spanish, French, and Arabic. Click on the interpretation icon in Zoom and select the language you will listen to during this session. If you wish to speak, please raise your hand in the Zoom room and once the session facilitator calls upon your name, kindly unmute your microphone and take the floor.

Before speaking, ensure you have selected the language you will speak from the interpretation menu. Please state your name for the record and the language you will speak if speaking a language other than English. When speaking, be sure to mute all other devices and notifications. Please speak clearly and at a reasonable pace to allow for accurate interpretation. This session includes automated real-time transcription. Please note, this transcript is not official or authoritative.

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.

To view the real-time transcript, click on the closed caption button in the Zoom toolbar.

To ensure transparency of participation in ICANN's multi-stakeholder model, we ask that you sign into Zoom sessions using your full name, for example, a first name and last name or surname. You may be removed from the session if you do not sign in using your full name. Thank you. And with that, I will now hand the floor over to Session Chair Jordan Carter. Thank you.

JORDAN CARTER:

Thanks, Claudia. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. My name is Jordan Carter. I'm from the .AU ccTLD, AUDA, and I'm the Session Chair today for this session dealing with the global policies that apply to ccTLDs or, more accurately, to IANA in dealing with ccTLD issues. I'd like to thank in advance Kim Davies from IANA to be with us today.

And we're going to be doing mainly a bit on the policy GAPs work that we've done in the last couple of sessions. But we're going to just start with giving you a bit of an update on the board progress towards consideration of the outcome of PDP3 on the review mechanism, so Alejandra's going to do that. As we get into the session, we will be using Mentimeter, so please, whatever device you use to do Mentimeter in this very interactive session, please have it ready to use. So, let's move to the next slide, which I think is Alejandra's slide. It is. Over to you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Jordan. This is Alejandra speaking. Just a quick update on how is the status on this ccPDP. The ccNSO Council received some questions from the board caucus that were regarding some clarifications. 20 are to provide a little bit more information, and 23 are just to confirm if the understanding of the text is the correct one.

For these, the Council set up a small group of councilors jointly with working group members to prepare the responses, which will be then approved by Council. And then there would be a later webinar to inform the community and ensure that there will be no policy change. And finally, the Council will approve these responses and send it to the board caucus back. There will also be a set up meeting with the people involved, so we are assured that everything is clear and that we can move forward. Thank you.

JORDAN CARTER: Thank you, Alejandra. Are there any questions about that update for Alejandra before we move on? I don't see any in the Zoom room, but Atsushi?

ATSUSHI ENDO: This is Atsushi Endo from .jp, JPRS. Quick question. Could you explain what is board caucus? Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Yes, thank you, Atsushi, for the question. A board caucus is the name they use to board the working group that is the one handling the ccPDP.

ATSUSHI ENDO: Thank you very much.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: You're welcome.

JORDAN CARTER: Thank you. If there are no other questions on that one, we will move on to the substantive issue, which is the policy GAP analysis. I'm going to run you through a background and a reminder of what we've already discussed on this topic at the Hamburg meeting at the end of last year and at the San Juan meeting at the start of this year, and then we're going to get into some follow-on discussions where you'll be using the Mentimeter.

If we go to the next slide. I'm just going to praise you this now to remind you that we are not making policy today. You might remember the hypothetical discussions we had in San Juan. Today is about exploring thinking on topics and getting a sense of the room on them, but nothing is going to be binding. So, I say that for two reasons. One is to encourage you to be creative and engaged in the answers and questions that you're providing, and the other is to reassure you that there's a very long process to make policy through a PDP. This is not that. This is sensitizing the issues and developing our understanding as a community with what the issues are in our policy framework.

So, looking back to Hamburg, we introduced these three key points. The ccNSO is the part of the ICANN community that is the policy authority for the global policy framework defining how IANA relates to ccTLDs in the root. So, it's our job to make sure those policies are fit for purpose and deal with all of the issues that they need to deal with. We considered whether there needed to be work to consolidate the existing policy, which is spread over a bunch of different documents, which is often referenced in RFC 1591 as being the foundation, but RFC 1591 is substantially out of date.

And so, whether it would be better to have one framework, whether there were any GAPS in the policy framework, and to think about ways to deal with future unknowns. And there was a recognition that there might be some GAPS. This was inspired, you'll remember, by the case of Lebanon, where IANA had to act in that situation in a way that wasn't immediately, apparently, dealt with by the policy framework.

So, that was an illustration of a GAP. And so, a small group was established to consider this situation and to look at how the ccNSO might respond. Move to the next slide. In between, I think, late October, when Hamburg happened and the San Juan meeting this March, the group mainly started to develop an overview of the policy framework and pulled together the session that we had in San Juan, where we've looked at transfers or changes of management and data accuracy in the root zone database. And we did a bunch of questions and polling of participants, which you may remember, in which to help get us into the thinking here, we'll run through the results of.

The first hypothetical was the Democratic Republic of Finestra. We don't need to go through the details, but it was about someone stopping being the manager with a pending date. If we go to the next slide, and we can actually skip this one because we'll come back to it. After we teased through the hypothesis, the question was whether there was a GAP that needed to be filled. And as you can see from the results, there was a strong agreement that there is a GAP in the policy framework in this area, with some people disagreeing. And the next slide tells us, yeah, sorry, that was the conclusion on that first hypothetical.

The second hypothetical was around IANA records being published and whether they need to be published and then whether they need to be accurate or not. So, we explored that hypothetical. And there was strong agreement in the room that it is important for a ccTLD to keep its records up to date. Very little disagreement with that. And then there was a view, again, there was agreement that there is a GAP there in the policy framework, what its requirements are for that accuracy and publication, with some people disagreeing as well.

So, if we move to the next slide, what we're doing is we're carrying on this discussion today. It's not all that long since the San Juan meeting. And the small group, there's a very big overlap in the small group working on this policy GAPs issue and the people who are also dealing with the issue that Alejandra mentioned. So, it slowed down the work a bit. But what we have done and what IANA has done, Kim and his team, has come up with a sort of list of the issues that they see in doing their day-to-day work of dealing with ccTLDs where there are GAPs or

uncertainties in the policy framework. And that's what we're going to be exploring with Kim's help today.

As I said before, we're not making policy. This is a thinking exercise to help drive future work. And so, the encouragement is to be creative, feel relaxed about raising any questions or comments. It's nicely anonymous in the Mentimeter, so you can put anything in that you don't have to be accountable for asking or suggesting. And it is really important for the work. And Bart's going to give you a little bit of a practice run through in a moment.

So, please do participate in the Mentimeter. And it will make the session work entirely. So, we're dependent on you doing that. If we go to the next slide, I think it might be a sample that Bart will talk us through. Oh, no, it's the login details. So, Bart, do you want to take over?

BART BOSWINKEL:

Please log in first. I'll give you a few seconds. And the reason for doing this practice is we added another feature which is offered by Mentimeter, and it's called Upvoting. If you support any suggestions from one of your fellow audience members, you can add something like a plus one, something like what you do, I think, in some of these social media as well. I'm not a social media fan at all, so I don't know how it works. But that's how it works.

So, let's do a test run quickly. Can you go to the next slide, please? So, this is a question that has nothing to do with today's session, but this is

just for practice purposes. So, Upvoting. So, please, if you have any suggestions how to travel lightly, just enter them in your device. And then, give you a few more seconds. So, we have multiple entries. There you go. So, you can see how it works. You enter a comment observation in Mentimeter, and they will be shown. And if there are more than 10, we go to the next page as well. So, we can stop, and we can go to the next slide, please, Joke, from this bit.

So, this should show you that you could submit or support. It's, no, maybe the thumbs up. You know, it's-- can you go back, Joke, one slide, please? Yeah, and if you scroll down, what will happen? No, responses without votes. Joke, can you-- I need to go just a minute. That's a good thing that we test this. Bear with me for a second. You should be able to do it now. And it should show on your screen, maybe update it. Otherwise, we leave it as this, because this takes too much time. So, that was the end of the upvoting. We'll just leave it with this, and go ahead, and we.

JORDAN CARTER: Okay, we will fly by the seat of our pants and see if the upvoting works later on.

BART BOSWINKEL: But we lose too much time.

JORDAN CARTER:

Okay, as long as it will work later, we'll be all happy. Let's go to the next slide, Kim. So, we're going to make an attempt to do three topics in the course of the next hour or so for this. Each time, Kim will give a bit of a presentation. There'll be a chance for questions and thoughts from you. Hopefully, the voting will work, and then we'll work through the most upvoted questions. And then there'll be some polling questions in the Mentimeter to get a sense of the room after the conversation has happened.

It doesn't matter if--. The third one is probably the most exciting of the three topics. And don't worry if we feel like we've only just begun to discuss it. It's a big topic that will need more than the time we have available. And we will need to save the last few minutes to explain how this work is going to be carried forward. Sneak preview on that, there'll be a chance for you to volunteer to do some of the work in a new working group that we'll be establishing.

So, topic one of the three is on the purpose of public records. And I think we can go to the next slide, and I'll hand it over to Kim Davies, who will do the presentation.

KIM DAVIES:

Thanks, Jordan, and good morning, everyone. So, this topic really is the lack of any kind of framework or structure around why IANA publishes certain data. So, with that said, let me step back. As part of our root zone management obligations processes, we publish public records. There are the sort of WHOIS database type records that list WHOIS ccTLD manager is, its address, it has points of contact, names,

addresses, contact points. It has a URL, it has a WHOIS server, RDAP server, all sorts of things associated with that TLD that we publish.

Additionally, there are public reports, reports concerning delegation and transfer of ccTLD. A lot of the practices that we have in this area are essentially inherited after many decades of doing it that way. And I suspect many of you have the same story within your individual ccTLDs about the construct of your public WHOIS service, if you have one, and the kinds of data that you publish. But when it comes to looking at what we do at the root zone, it is essentially informed by historical practice. It's not that there is a standing definition of what should be published in relation to a ccTLD or any other kind of framework that specifies parameters within which IANA should be working.

Now we assume that by virtue of the fact every ccTLD is a piece of critical internet infrastructure, that there is a public interest purpose in publishing some data. I suspect it would not be considered acceptable that you can operate a ccTLD anonymously. So, I assume that there is some level of public disclosure required. But to what extent, I think, is not something that we as a community have actually explored in a significant way, nor is it memorialized anywhere. And it's not just the identity of the ccTLD manager here. As of today, we have two points of contact that IANA publishes in association with each ccTLD, an administrative contact and a technical contact.

However, there's no definition of what that actually means. All we can say today is that we have these contact points. They are mandatory and they will be published. But it is up to the ccTLD to essentially make an

assessment unguided as to who would be appropriate to put in those records. There's no standing advice that says, for example, an expectation is a technical contact would be responsive to these kinds of questions or these kinds of queries. Indeed, there's no obligation for those contacts to do anything. A ccTLD manager could conceptually create contacts that just go straight into the spam bucket and not do anything with them. So, this doesn't seem like a great state of affairs, but there is no guidance around those contacts either.

Another facet of public record keeping is historical data. As of today, we don't publish historical data for ccTLDs other than those archive reports relating to delegation and transfer. Internally, IANA does keep historical records. We keep fairly comprehensive records dating back to when ICANN was established. And then we have partial records from prior to that based on from John Postel's records and University of Southern California records. But it's not published. And again, maybe some historical dimension of ccTLDs should be published. But again, that's not established through any framework or requirement.

And I guess the last question on here to contemplate is, are these policy questions or are these operational questions? And if they're operational questions, to what extent is IANA empowered to make decisions in these areas? For example, could IANA completely change the contact model, get rid of admin and tech contacts, perhaps add a security contact, or do any number of things? Could we eliminate fax numbers because who uses faxes these days? Any number of aspects there.

So, these are questions that I have, and I think GAPs, whether they're policy GAPs or not, I think that is why we're here to discuss it. But I think this is kind of the scope of the problem, which is fundamentally there's not a real definition around a lot of the aspects of the things we do in terms of public record keeping. And that's something that we probably want to explore. Thank you.

JORDAN CARTER:

Thank you, Kim. If we go to the next slide, I think this is our first Mentimeter. The question is, do you have any questions? And the way to ask your question is to type it into Mentimeter. It is not to do it verbally because we're hoping there'll be a few, and we're hoping that we will have the chance to upvote on them. But if there are not very many questions, then that model will not work. But it is working because someone has asked whether we should have any questions. You can upvote something by clicking on the thumb beside it. Eberhard, yes.

EBERHARD LISSE:

Eberhard Lisse from .na. To lighten up the mood while we are doing this, aren't we not supposed to work by consensus?

JORDAN CARTER:

Is that a question? Do you want to put it in Mentimeter?

EBERHARD LISSE:

No, I wanted to lighten up the mood a little bit, but I failed, obviously.

JORDAN CARTER:

There are a few that are starting to flow. Obviously, it takes a little while to get your head into this. Well, there is one question which I'm going to ask Kim, which is, would you have suggestions for all of your questions, Kim? Do you have views in response to the questions that you've asked us?

KIM DAVIES:

I mean, I think I do, for the most part. If for no other reason than there's kind of an assumption, an operating assumption we have today about why we do it the way we do. If we felt it was completely wrong, we probably would have advocated for change much sooner. So, I think, today there's not been a lot of criticism or concern about the current model. So, there's an underlying assumption that it's probably reasonable. But that relies on a set of assumptions I have that might be false. But as I said earlier, I think, for example, you shouldn't probably be able to operate a ccTLD anonymously.

And I think that there is a public interest reason for accountability, if no other reason, that the legal entity who is responsible for a ccTLD should be public knowledge. And associated with that, its place of operation or its contact details should be associated with that so that people can establish contact with it, oversee it, or fundamentally, you know, do any number of operations with the ccTLD manager.

JORDAN CARTER: Thank you, Kim. I don't know exactly how the display works. I think, does it scroll?

BART BOSWINKEL: Yeah, but you can stop.

JORDAN CARTER: It just scrolls through. So, on my phone, I'm just looking at the, I've got them sorted by top questions. And one is the question that asks whether archive law is relevant. Do you have a view about that, Kim?

KIM DAVIES: Not 100% sure what's meant by archive law, but I think perhaps this is the question or perhaps it's related. But, you know, one thing that comes to mind when we explore this issue is data privacy requirements and things like that. Once you're no longer involved with the ccTLD, for example, is there like a right to be forgotten or something along those lines or, is there a compelling business interest in maintaining and possibly disclosing those records or things that have happened in the past?

JORDAN CARTER: Thank you. Don't forget, as well as asking a question, you can use your thumbs up, the upvoting in the app to prioritize things. One person has asked, would you publish historical ledgers for ccTLDs on a ledger tool like blockchain?

KIM DAVIES:

I mean, I would. I think that kind of question would involve exploring the use case. It's more of a question of what is the utility and is that the right mechanism to do that? I suspect that question could be unpacked into multiple pieces, but setting aside the mechanism blockchain or whatever other tool you might use, I think the more fundamental question is, do we want to publish historical data about ccTLDs, period? I think that's an open question.

JORDAN CARTER:

Thank you. I'll just keep running through these as they come. I think we've got about 10 minutes or so to run on this one. Are the questions asked by Kim linked with the GDPR or is there another reason? My pitch in response to that would be that we should decide what information we think needs to be available and why, and then any publication of that information needs to be consistent with privacy law. So, I don't think these questions are generated by the GDPR. Do you want to add anything to that?

KIM DAVIES:

I think I would just add that I'm no GDPR expert, but I think any kind of business records retention needs to be justified with a proper business purpose. And to that end, the fact that the proper business purpose for these public records isn't documented is not an ideal state of affairs. So, I think having an elaboration upon why IANA collects this data and

why it publishes a bit more than at a very general level that it's in the public interest to do so, I think would be a valuable improvement.

JORDAN CARTER:

So, you can already see that this is teasing out questions that will be food for thought for the group that follows up on this work. And it's okay if people don't have answers to all of these questions, or are responding to the question with more questions. Eberhard?

EBERHARD LISSE:

Eberhard Lisse, .na. This is surely an introductory piece and very nice, but it's as always, a bilateral engagement required between each individual ccTLD, because we, for example, will not allow any of our data to be published at all. .na would like, or the management company of .na would propose that no information that is not absolutely required to be published with regarding to us.

JORDAN CARTER:

The statement is on the record. Thank you, Eberhard. And that's the kind of decision or stance that each of you should think about with response to your own TLDs. How much of information are you happy to have published? And what do you think should be published in the root zone database? There's a question, would there need to be policy that defined IANA scope to make operational decisions on topics like this?

KIM DAVIES: I don't know the answer to the question, to be honest. I think that the current reality is the policy we have is not comprehensive. And out of operational necessity, IANA needs to make day-to-day decisions within what we conceive to be compliant with the policy as it does stand, and within the general intent of ccTLDs generally. And we've operated this way for decades, whether that needs to be ring-fenced in a very formalized way, I'm not sure that it is. But I think, you know, why are we here today and why is this activity happening at ccNSO? We recognize there are a lot of policy GAPS and we think that there is a need to explore them. So, I think we do think that there is a meaningful improvement to be made in this area.

JORDAN CARTER: Thank you. Another question asked, will policy affect Gs and CCs equivalently?

KIM DAVIES: So, this is an excellent question. I will say that our operating practice, where possible, is to treat them the same. However, should there be a specific provision relating to CCs being treated differently to gTLDs, then we will operationally accommodate it. For example, ccTLDs have passed a policy that says revocation means one very specific thing. gTLDs use revocation to mean something quite different. So, we just have to use that term in different contexts, whether we're talking about a ccTLD or a gTLD. But where possible, we try to have a common approach. So, I think to take the contact model for TLDs generally, my preference and my desire would be to have a common contact model

for the root zone database that equally applies to gTLDs or ccTLDs. But again, if that's not viable and if there is a specific need to customize it, the ccTLD is in a different way, then we can do that.

JORDAN CARTER:

And if we do get to the point of doing any policy development here in the ccNSO, it would only be about defining what IANA needs to do in respect of ccTLDs. We don't have the mandate or the power to make policy for the gTLDs. These questions are excellent. There are more that have come in, and they will be all available afterwards. But right now, we're going to segue to the next topic, because we're already--. Sorry, we're going to not do that. We're going to actually ask the question.

So, this is a polling opportunity for you to share a perspective on the question that's there, which is, do you believe it's important to define the purpose of public records from a ccTLD perspective? So, do you think that we should do the work to define the purpose of these public records? You choose your answer in the unranked options of the Mentimeter, and you drag the one you think is the answer to the top. You can rank all of the options if you want to, but you don't have to. So, we'll take a 30-second moment for you to--.

Okay, there seems to be a reasonably clear opinion there. There're 35 responses there, and there seems to be a view that it is important for this to be done. We're going to ask you why on the next slide. So, I think we might move to the next slide, and this is another chance for you to write something in the box. So, why did you write that relevancy? If you

thought it was important, why did you think it was important? If you thought it was not important at all, why did you think that? And you can upvote the answers again as well.

We're getting responses in here. We're just going to work out whether we can do the upvoting, but it's historical reasons, transparency, completeness, GDPR, a few privacy law issues, transparency is coming through a few times, and future historians, and Diana needs guidance from the community. Is the upvoting--? I don't know. If you move slides, will that open the upvoting, or will it-- No, the upvoting isn't working on this one, but that is okay because we've got this record of opinions, and what all this does is create a body of understanding and perspective for the small group to follow up on. So, thank you for all of those inputs.

If we move to the next slide, I think there might be another question, which is around the GAP. Is the lack of a definition of purpose to maintain these public records, does this illustrate a GAP that needs to be filled? So, if you think we should do the work to create such a thing, you should say so. See if we can get up to the 35 responses we had last time. There's definitely more than 35 of us in the room, so are you voting Katrina? You should. As many perspectives as possible will help the work that is to come.

We're stuck on 30 at the moment. But again, the perspective is fairly strong that there's agreement that this is a GAP that should be filled, with some people disagreeing, a bit of neutrality as well. So, that is the sense of the room on that question, and I think we'll move on. So, if we

go to the next slide, and we're on to theme number two. So, that second is about 25 minutes, half an hour. So, we'll definitely get through number two, or make a call depending on how the discussion goes, whether we delve into the more exciting theme three. But theme two is about eligibility assessment before practical changes. How's that for code word? We'll hand that over to Kim to explain. Go to the next slide, please.

KIM DAVIES:

So, one of IANA's fundamental tasks is to evaluate prospective changes to a ccTLD Manager and assess whether such changes comply with policy requirements. RFC 1591 states a number of properties that a ccTLD Manager must have, and we've operationalised those properties into a set of requirements, and those requirements are what we assess whenever we receive a change request.

So, if you're asking to transfer a country code top-level domain from party A to party B, we will assess using the framework of interpretation, such requests and make a decision on whether to make such a change to allow ccTLD management to move to a new party. But that idealized version assumes that every time inside a country, a fundamental change to the way the ccTLD is managed will be presented to IANA in advance. IANA will conduct its process, IANA will ultimately approve the change, and then within the country, they will then act to implement the approved change.

However, the reality is not always like this. The truth is that fundamental changes to how ccTLDs are operated or managed can

happen prior to IANA being asked to review such changes, and the real question here is what happens then. If IANA is presented with a change request that has de facto already happened inside the country on the ground, what is IANA's role? Is it to continue to assess it against the policies as if it had not happened yet? Is it to modify its procedures to recognize that in fact this change has effectively already happened, and what does that look like?

Do we waive certain requirements because the change has already happened, or do we evaluate them all fully as if it hadn't? And what happens if in that evaluation IANA deems fundamentally this cannot be approved? To give you one specific example, it's a clear requirement that ccTLDs need to be operated in the jurisdiction of the country. So, let's say that a ccTLD manager has moved the ccTLD completely out of the jurisdiction, taken it outside of the country and moved it to a new country.

That is the practical reality that that is where the ccTLD is managed now, but it would be in contravention of the policy if they then after the fact present a change request to IANA to recognize them as a ccTLD manager, demonstrate that all the staff over here are doing the work. Would there be any basis whatsoever for IANA that, well, should IANA recognize that state of affairs or reject the request knowing that essentially, we have knowingly bad data in the IANA database?

We might know for a fact that the listed entity no longer operates as ccTLD, but we at the same time cannot accede to recognizing the new operator because they're fundamentally incapable of meeting the

policy requirements. And I guess the last point on this slide is also how do we avoid creating perverse incentives? So, if we do agree that some aspects of an evaluation should be waived in such a scenario, how do we avoid incentivizing that behavior?

I think an assumption is that's not an ideal state of affairs, that we shouldn't be encouraging it, but frankly if I want to transfer my ccTLD and I have path A, which is apply in advance, go through a somewhat rigorous assessment, hope for the best, work the system to get the approval and then move forward, or path B is, I'm just going to move it inside my country without even telling IANA and once it's all done, I'm going to come to IANA after the fact and have a much easier time.

As a pragmatic option, maybe I'll choose that second path, but I don't think that that is something we want to incentivize. So, I think that's a general reflection of the issues here and I look forward to the discussion.

JORDAN CARTER:

Thanks. We will use our normal Mentimeter process, but we've got two hands for people who have a question. Nigel Roberts, you indicated.

NIGEL ROBERTS:

Thank you, Jordan. I just wanted to congratulate Kim on this setting, and it's definitely the right thing to do here, but I think when we're looking at here, it says changes, you really mean change of manager. For example, if my ccTLD decides to change its contract for any CAS provisioned from Netnode to Nominet or vice versa, that's not really

what we're talking about here. We're talking about fundamental changes such as a de facto change of manager, and we all know at least one ccTLD where that happened maybe 20 years ago and the IANA database still shows something different. Is that right?

KIM DAVIES:

I think it's not just changes in manager. I agree, we're not seeking to have any wider oversight over day-to-day operational changes. That's not the intention here, but I think it's not just the ccTLD management change. I think it's any time where IANA has a responsibility to vet that change. So, RFC 1591 has a requirement that the administrative contact is in country, so an administrative contact change is subject to review. Even on a more technical level, we have a responsibility to check changes to the name server configurations comply with certain technical requirements. So, I think there's all manner of changes, but it's not going beyond what is currently our mandate. Thanks.

NIGEL ROBERTS:

You mentioned administrative contact. That is the policy that the organization has an administrative contract in the country. Not necessarily the territory, in the country. But it's an administrative contract, doesn't have to have the staff there. Not applying to us, we are staff in country.

JORDAN CARTER:

Let's move on with this.

NIGEL ROBERTS: I just want to make that clear because it seems that there's a thinking that, and I've seen this in recent redelegation requests, that the operations need to be in country and I don't see that in the policy.

KIM DAVIES: So, I'll just flag that this is a separate topic that we have on the list that is not for today, but jurisdictional requirements is another GAP that this team has found that we'll talk about another time.

JORDAN CARTER: There are much more than three issues on Kim's list. We're only going to get to three today, if we get through today. So, Paul Hjul, I see your hand up in the Zoom room.

PAUL HJUL: Hi, just easier way to show my hand. I just want to sort of go into the fact that there is a distinction between ccTLD managers who are members of the ccNSO and those who are not. It isn't an obligation for country code managers to join the ccNSO, but within the bylaws, it says, in order to join the ccNSO, you have to comply with the policies of the ccNSO. So, there is already that distinction that exists. And I think it's really incumbent upon things to sort of say that the room for IANA to act is by necessity going to be limited.

So, you've got a delegation request that doesn't meet the technical requirements or whatever, the IANA declining to act is sort of almost a

norm. But in some of the contentious issues that can arise where you've got a manager who's refusing to cooperate with new management, and it's been gone through a community process and so on. Surely, part of the reason why the ICANN bylaws created a ccNSO is to create a forum in which there can be consensus built upon ccNSO policies that are voluntarily adopted by cc managers. And those cc managers who decline to adopt those policies are effectively choosing to not be part of the club.

And I think it's all of the how do we interact with a situation where there is bad data or the like. I think we do need to sort of come back to the fact that yes, the idea that IANA does not want to decide who is a country, or decide who gets to speak on behalf of a country or anything like that, should not lose sight of the fact that if there is consensus policy building and voluntary membership of a body, and that sort of thing, that obligations be fulfilled. Or if you agree to a policy, or if you ought to agree to a policy, you shouldn't be able to try and leverage at a later stage when there is a transfer request or the like.

Again, I'm not wanting to overly be limited to one specific scenario, but rather to the general principle that sure, the IANA can really want its hands to be tied for good technical reasons. But that shouldn't be an excuse to allow there to be incentives for policy violations that have been voluntarily entered into otherwise.

JORDAN CARTER:

I've got a couple of hands already. I've got Pierre Bonis, and then Eberhard. Do you want to respond to any of that? I wasn't asking you.

I was asking Kim. I don't want us to get derailed into a discussion about the scope of the ccNSO. So, I'm going to rule that out. But is there anything else in that that you want to talk about?

KIM DAVIES: I'll defer to the room. Please, go ahead.

JORDAN CARTER: I didn't see Roelof before I saw Pierre and Eberhard, so can you keep it quick, please, gents? Pierre, Eberhard, Roelof.

PIERRE BONIS: Yeah, thank you very much, Jordan and Kim. The question I had was, it lacks to me one question, that is, who is allowed to ask for re-delegation? Because most of the time, when there is a problem of re-delegation, especially for, let's say, African ccTLDs, it goes round and round and round because IANA is not very sure of who is asking that. There is somewhere else in some other countries that pretend that it cannot be done, etcetera. So, I'm not sure it's the detail of the process that we should work on. But at the end of the day, if IANA wants to be a neutral operator of the root, even interpreting who has the right to is too difficult for IANA. So, maybe there would be something to do to clarify who has the power to ask, once and for all. And I think it would be an easier job for you after.

KIM DAVIES:

So, I suspect we don't have the time to pick that apart, but my quick reaction is that anyone has standing to ask, but they might not be successful. So, I mean, that's our practices for pretty much anything in the IANA functions, which is that, we do not gate your ability to ask us to do a change request, but you need to demonstrate you comply with the policy and meet the policy requirements before we will accede to making that change. So, for me, I don't think there's confusion, but maybe there's something we need to explore there, underlying that question too.

JORDAN CARTER:

And another issue which we won't dig into today that relates is one of transparency. Should change requests become public is a different issue. I'm just saying that's an issue. We don't need to talk about it today because we're not going to have time. Eberhard, and then Roelof.

EBERHARD LISSE:

Two things. There is no such thing as a re-delegation. It's a revocation and a transfer. Revocation can only be done with or without consent of the incumbent. Without consent can only be done after substantial misconduct. So, it's very clearly defined policy and practice. The framework interpretation is not de jure policy, but de facto policy. Then to my colleague from Rebecca, I think it was Australian. It's very clear your own ccNSO members and only ccNSO members are bound by ccNSO policy as long as they are ccNSO members. Immediately they're unhappy with policy, they can drop out and then they're not bound by

it. It's just that people who are new to this business are clear on what's happening.

JORDAN CARTER:

It's important to say that this conversation is about the policies that apply to IANA in dealing with ccTLDs. So, people can join or not join the ccNSO and they can choose to apply or not to apply ccNSO policies about how they do their business. But no one gets to tell IANA that it has a different policy framework than what the policy framework is. So, I'm just going to say that and then we're going to move on. Roelof, and then I had a hand over here and I really want us to get back to the structured Menti tool to get these questions onto the record for permanent follow-up. This is an interesting discussion, but it isn't actually going to help the future work. Roelof?

ROELOF MEIJER:

Let's just make sure that we don't have tools deciding how we run these meetings. But thanks, Jordan. I'm just wondering, maybe it's already the first question. Changes on how they can happen before IANA is out. So, they're already implemented. I'm wondering if that doesn't mean that IANA doesn't have a role, but maybe I'm wrong.

Secondly, I'm wondering if these are not such exceptional cases that it is impossible to give generic answers to the questions. I'm not sure, but still, I think maybe that's the case. And thirdly, if something like that happens, I think per case it's better to seek advice also from external parties. Just don't decide on your own without consulting other

parties. And one of the parties to consult might be the ccNSO or the ccNSO Council if you need some privacy on the subject or something. But yeah, to me, I think I said it in the previous ccNSO meeting as well.

Let's be careful not to try to deal with exceptions and try to develop policies or at least answer generic questions on exceptions because it's better to deal with exceptions one by one. And if they occur in a specific reasonable frequency, then develop policy.

JORDAN CARTER:

Thanks, Roelof. That is why one of the pieces of work we agreed earlier was how to deal with unknowns or exceptions and not try and have a thousand-page policy that pre-thinks through every single issue. Kim, do you want to respond to any of Roelof's points just then?

KIM DAVIES:

I think the main thing is I don't consider these scenarios as one-offs. I mean, they happen somewhat with regularity. So, where there's been a fundamental change that's already happened inside the country and then IANA is asked to recognize it after the fact. I think if you look at the corpus of re-delegation reports and if you look at the transfer section where they have to explain how they're going to transfer the ccTLD, you'll find a lot of commentary that, well, they've actually already done it. So, this isn't a hypothetical, it's not a one-off, it is a common practice.

JORDAN CARTER: All of the issues that Kim has raised, these three topics are ones that have got enough regularity and become a big enough problem for IANA that essentially, he's tabling them with an implication that it would be quite nice to have some help in resolving these issues. So, yeah, I agree we have to do what you suggested. So, over here, I had one more and then I'm going to go into the Menti phase of this.

NANA KOFI ASAFU-AIDOO: Yes, thank you very much. I think my question centers more on national security, social and economic impact of IANA's policies on sovereign nations. When the policies were designed or created, I think most of them were done at a time that the internet did not have the same social reach or economic impact or even national security importance. So, I think with that in mind, I want to know whether the panel thinks that it is time for IANA to take strong steps toward changing the policies to give great and serious consideration to the national law of sovereign nations. So, this is my question when it comes to the transfer of ccTLDs. Thank you.

JORDAN CARTER: Do you want to make a response there, Kim?

KIM DAVIES: I mean, I think that I'll just say that ION doesn't set policy, it's this community to set policy. So, in so far as there needs to be a recommendation to change how we evaluate those aspects in relation

to ccTLD management, I think that needs to come from the community, not from IANA.

JORDAN CARTER: As facilitator of this session, I also don't have a view in response to your question, but I think it is an important one to be discussed. I don't have a view in response to your question either that I'll offer now. My job here is to facilitate this conversation. Just for the record, though, could you tell us who you are?

NANA KOFI ASAFU-AIDOO: Yes. I'm Nana Kofi Asafu-Aidoo. I am the executive director of the Ghana Domain Name Registry, which is the legal entity designated to manage the .gh domain in Ghana.

JORDAN CARTER: Thank you. Thank you very much.

NANA KOFI ASAFU-AIDOO: And I guess I have to rephrase my question to put it to the community, for the community to push for the legal frameworks of sovereign nations to be given great consideration when making policy.

JORDAN CARTER: Thank you. I think people have heard you on that one. I appreciate you raising it. Let's go to the next slide, please. Whoever is driving the slide.

Sorry, is it Joke? So, we've had a bit of a discussion and a few questions. The next slide. Okay, we don't have. All right, we've had a little bit of a Mentimeter meltdown and we don't have the form to raise questions. So, I will actually do what Roelof said and not rely too much on the tool. Are there any other questions that anyone wants to put on the table about the presentation? We've had a few raised verbally. You probably have a sense of the set of issues. So, we might actually just do this voting that's in front of you now.

So, the question is, do you believe that eligibility assessment is important from a ccTLD perspective? Please drag your preferred option to the top and then click submit down the bottom to make sure your vote is registered. 14 so far. We've got 26 happy campers who've cast a vote here, 27. And the theme again is coming through that this is an important issue for ccTLDs.

If we can move to the next slide. And why did you think it was important? Is this one a chance to type in a quick reason behind your vote? And then once you've typed something and you can click next step and that will be open for votes. Does that mean we need to? Can you, Joke, do that? Can you press enter so the voting becomes available? So, you can continue to ask questions and now on your Menti you should be able to upvote.

You get to have up to three votes here and then you submit your vote. And domain management sanity was one answer. Maintaining the integrity of the namespace. A few votes for people shouldn't make changes without IANA approval. There's a bit of confusion about the

question. Security and stability. Proper technical capacity for the stability of the internet and so on. We might move on from this one. I think we're going to get the GAP question.

So, this is again, do you think this situation represents a GAP? Has the discussion and or Kim convinced you that there is a GAP here? And please add your vote. Up to 25 votes there. Again, there's a agree view that's emerged through this voting with again a bit of a disagreement as well. Not all of one mind, which is a good thing. But let's move on. I think that'll be, that's us. Theme three. This one might be the most exciting one and the one that we'll have to be quite quick with. Kim, over to you to set the scene.

KIM DAVIES:

Thanks. So, I mean, in response to various different facets of what we do and, data quality issues, for example, that we talked a lot about during the last ICANN meeting. Some of the things we've already talked about today and things that are yet to come. We've talked about jurisdictional issues as an example of one that we have on the back burner for future discussion. But what these all have in common is that IANA really lacks a set of comprehensive tools to deal with them.

Essentially, we have two options where IANA becomes aware of a situation where a ccTLD manager is not compliant with policy requirements or what have you. We have asking nicely, writing to them, speaking to them, saying, we noticed that the contact details you have in the IANA database no longer work. Can you pretty please fix them? We noticed that you're operating the ccTLD outside the country. Can

you pretty please fix that? Or, and the other extreme end is revocation, as Eberhard alluded to a few minutes ago, which is that there's a set of parameters around the ccTLD manager being found to be fundamentally out of compliance with the policy. It's serious.

They've been given an opportunity to cure the problem and have been unable to do so. Then and only then does sort of the ultimate sanction possibly come into play, which is stripping them of responsibility for the ccTLD. But there's nothing really in between those two options. There're no mechanisms or approaches on what IANA should do, should it become aware of an issue and asking nicely hasn't really done the job. And the question, I guess, fundamentally is, is there any options between those two extremes?

I actually frankly don't know the answer here as to what should be involved. I think because we lack, there's no contractual relationships between IANA and the ccTLDs. There're not contractual enforcement possibilities in the same way that there is for, say, gTLDs. So, I think that this is definitely worth exploring. And then I guess in the last point as well is that maybe there's sort of a naming and shaming aspect to this, that maybe there's no enforcement per se of some of these issues. But if they're not cured, maybe IANA is simply very transparent about it, that we report out that we've identified that for these ccTLDs, they have broken records.

For these ccTLDs, we've come to understand that it's not being operated in compliance with RSC 1591 and we just make that public. So, anyway, that's the problem statement for this one.

JORDAN CARTER: Thank you. Hopefully that's got you thinking. If we move to the next slide. Oh, we've still got the old. We can't help it. So, people can add new questions?

JOKE BRAEKEN: Yeah.

JORDAN CARTER: So, you can ask questions if you've got them about this and you can also do it through the microphone to address the group. It'll be a little bit tricky. We should be able to scan recent ones. Yeah, sorry, hand up over there.

AITE BULE: Yes, my name is Aite Bule [ph]. I just want to paint a scenario and to find out if there's-- to gain some knowledge about how to be handled. So, we have a ccTLD. The sponsoring company no longer exists. Admin contact, technical contact can be reached somewhat, but the sponsoring company no longer exists, basically. Are there any checks to see if the sponsoring companies that are registered are still functional or still valid? Number two, what happens to fix that data? Does that become a transfer because it's a new company that's managing it regardless of if the people in there are the same? The sponsoring company has changed. Is that a transfer or how will it be handled by IANA and how will the community suggest it is handled?

KIM DAVIES:

So, in response to that scenario, I think that basically we do not have a program of proactively continuing to reassess whether the current ccTLD manager is still a legal entity or anything like that. However, through the course of our operations, we come to know these facts typically at some point. It's reported to us either by the ccTLD manager themselves or a third party or just through our general awareness of the industry in a particular country.

So, whenever we become aware of that situation, we do reach out to the parties that we understand to be involved in the ccTLD manager and advise them again to ask nicely, like, please fix your records, but that's all we really have. There's no real enforcement behind that today. As to the process of transfer, it really depends on the nature of the transfer. If it's relatively minor administrative change to a different entity, but substantially the ccTLD operation has not modified, it's still the same staff doing the same work, and maybe there's some sort of legal change, but it's not fundamental, then we have a very streamlined process for that.

If, however, it is really moving the ccTLD to a whole new entity, the ccTLD is being operated in a completely different manner by a different party, then that's where we do our full transfer process, where we evaluate all the different aspects of such a request.

JORDAN CARTER:

Thank you. I've got a few people who've put their hands up now.

AITE BULE: Is a follow-on to this?

JORDAN CARTER: A follow-on?

AITE BULE: Yeah.

JORDAN CARTER: We'll do that first, and then I've got Chris and then Eberhard.

AITE BULE: Okay, so in a scenario given, if before the old company is transferred to the new company, there's a law that actually designates another entity in that location to be the designated entity to operate a ccTLD. How does the current policy deal with that?

KIM DAVIES: I mean, I think we're talking about hypotheticals that we'd have to understand the real specifics of an individual case and look at it on a case-by-case basis. It's hard to give a general answer to that kind of question.

JORDAN CARTER: Thanks, Kim. Paul, your hand was up for a while, so I'll actually go to you next.

PAUL HJUL: Thanks. Just so that it's known, I'm South African, I'm not an Australian. The thing though, and I mean, it does come up quite often, and Kim posed the question, does the IANA have any options other than the two, the nuclear option of revocation, and asked nicely. I think the marking the record as of dubious or contested or coming up with some appropriate terms so that any third party knows that a particular country code manager is not entirely on board, would be a third option that I think should exist.

But again, to come to my earlier comment, I don't think that sight should be lost of the fact that it's not only the IANA and the performance of the IANA function that comes into play in dealing with some of these situations that are not hypothetical. So, in any hypothetical situation where there is some form of controversy or unwillingness from a transferring party, if that party is a member of the ccNSO, then they've agreed to ccNSO policies.

If they choose to leave the ccNSO because they no longer want to be bound to ccNSO policies, then that's an indication of the direction that they're wanting to go. And then it may mean that it has to end up going to the revocation side of things, or it may mean whatever else. But I don't think that it is apposite, particularly not for the ccNSO, to sort of buy into this idea of, or we either ask nicely and let whoever have leverage have leverage, or we run into trouble.

And I just sort of think that that approach of saying, yes, the IANA's hands are tied, the IANA needs to be kept out of the fray, there was a question in chat about who does arbitration, there isn't anybody, and I think an arbitration mechanism would introduce other problems. But there should be within the ecosystem, channels to prevent strong arming by a holdout and there is at least one country where it is a big issue, and it is a live issue right now. But I think the threat of a country code manager going rogue, and being a holdout is not that remote a problem.

And while some individualized solution will always come up, there should be some boundaries of principles that says, you shouldn't be able to go rogue. And if you do, consequences of some shape or form will come, there are sanctioning tools that can be used.

JORDAN CARTER:

I think the point is that at the moment there aren't, there's one tool that can be used, which is revocation. So, that's the question really is, should there be more? I think we can take it from your comments that you think that there should be. I'm going to move on to, I think I've got Chris to Spain next, then Eberhard.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Thanks.

JORDAN CARTER:

And then we're going to do a bit of voting.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Thanks, Jordan. Two things. First of all, I just wanted to pick up on what you just said and what Paul was saying. Look, the ccNSO, should it choose to do so, and it never has, could make policy around the way that ccTLDs should behave. But it's meaningless in essence, because it isn't binding on ccTLDs. So, waste of time. I wanted to ask Kim a question on the naming and shaming thing.

Kim, if we go down that path, do you have an opinion about whether that is policy, and we would need to create policy, or we could use that as an implementation of what is in essence the current policy? Because I'm just looking at the way we would reach a point where we could achieve that if we decided we wanted to, and whether you feel IANA would need to be guided by policy, or we could simply say, look, it's an implementation thing. Thanks.

KIM DAVIES:

I mean, I don't have a view one way or another. But as with many things IANA, I think with that doubt in mind, I would want to make sure that if it's operationalised, it's done with awareness and consent of the community. So, we wouldn't want to surprise anyone by starting to do things in this area without it being aware and the opportunity for comment.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

If it wasn't clear, that's a given in my view. Thanks.

JORDAN CARTER: Thanks, Chris. I have Eberhard, and then I think I have Nigel, and then we're going to move in. No, I just have Eberhard.

EBERHARD LISSE: Eberhard Lisse from .na. I'm actually managing Director of ccTLD management, which I doubt Paul is. And it's rather sad to have to go through this every ICANN meeting, every ccNSO meeting again. IANA is a function, not an entity, and policy relates to ccNSO members. Individual ccTLDs may or may not have a relationship with ICANN. Some have exchange of letters, some have framework of agreements, very few have contracts.

The ICANN is not a supernatural national organisation, otherwise a state organisation. It's a company, and it is bound by US law. There are 253 jurisdictions. You cannot have a company in the US follow each jurisdiction, and some jurisdictions are more jurisdictions than other. The main important thing is, is the domain working? Are registrations being taken? Are renewals being done? Is it secure and stable? If that's the case, who cares whether that ccTLD manager is alive or dead, other than his family and friends, and we all from an emotional basis.

In Nigeria, the ccTLD manager has died twice in a row, and it didn't affect the operations really, other than that they lost their passwords. What happens in a company, happens in a company. What happens in a country, happens in a country. If the Ghanaian government doesn't want to shell out money to buy .gh from Nick Leno, then they must pass

legislation and enforce this legislation, and then Nick Leno will ask for an agreed transfer, a consented revocation and transfer. If that's not the case, if the domain name is administrated according to the RFC 1591, we should be concerned with service, not with ownership.

JORDAN CARTER:

I know there's lots of provocative and thought-provoking stuff that's been said today from a range of different sources, which is awesome, and all I can promise you is that we're going to do some voting to see what you think about the importance of this, and we will be coming back to this as we go through the year. I'll say more about that shortly. So, can we move slides? I think we're going to get a poll about whether you think this is important or not. Are graduated compliance options for policy requirements important from a ccTLD perspective? So, is this an important issue? Someone's got their hand up. Yeah, sorry. Yes.

MURTALA ABDULLAHI:

Thank you so much. My name is Murtala Abdullahi. I'm the Cice President for NiRA, .NG country code. I would like to put in a record. I don't know the gentleman over there. He keeps mentioning Nigeria has the issue with the loss of password. We have never gotten that. We don't have any issue with loss of password. For a record, I would like to put it straight. So, we don't have that kind of issue. So, I think you can stop putting that reference, please. Thank you.

JORDAN CARTER:

Okay. Thank you. That's on the record. Have we moved into the voting? We have moved into the voting. Do you think this is important, this issue of graduated compliance options? It looks like people do think it's important. Can we move to the next? Sorry, we're just coming up to lunchtime and we will finish on time. And I think we might skip this one, skip the voting as well. And then I think the next one more. Do you think that this is a GAP that needs to be filled?

So, do you think the lack of anything other than ask nicely or revocation is something that we should do some thinking about? See if we can get this one over 30 votes, say. Up to 22. If you've lost your Mentimeter, you can still join at menti.com using the code that's at the top of the screen. 29 votes. Again, impressionistically, this is again showing agreement, but the strongly disagree bar is a bit bigger this time. So, I think that code reflects some of the discussion that we've had. Thank you. 30. Got it. Thank you.

Let's move slides. Okay. So, we've explored some of these issues. All of the input will go to a new group that we're setting up to deal with this problem. There's been just an ad hoc group of ccNSO Council members dealing with this since the issues with LB came to light last year. It's clear that there are lots of different facets of these issues to explore. We've done three of, I think, 11 topics that Kim is seeking input from the community and maybe there will in the future need to be some policy work. So, it isn't really suitable to have just an ad hoc group with no transparency, no formal mandate or anything working on these issues.

So, the ccNSO Council is going to make a decision about establishing a working group on this at its meeting later this week. If we could move to the next slide. I remember if we've said anything about the working group. Yeah. So, the group is going to be mandated with three jobs to do. One is to pull together the existing policy framework, such as it is into a single document, the policies and the guidance, and to present that to the community at or before the next ICANN meeting.

So, today, if you go and hunt out RFC 1591 and you read it, you'll find, gosh, that isn't how things work. And you'll be right. And then you'll be a sleuth, an investigator to try and find all of the guidance that is necessary. But we've done some work in the small group already of pulling together a comprehensive overview of where you find these things, where the decisions were made. And that'll be finalized and presented by this group.

The second thing is to keep working through these GAPs and to try and come up with a view for the Council and the community to work through in Istanbul about which, if any of those GAPs should be solved, should be filled, and by what means to do so. And that means it might recommend that we need to do a ccPDP on some of these topics. It might recommend that we need to do a study and publish a report to clarify something, a bit like the framework of interpretation working group from about 10 or 15 years ago.

There may be some other methods. It may be that it's a request for IANA to engage the community in creating some operational guidance. So, just giving those examples. So, those are the three tasks of the group.

What's the next slide, Kim? Joke? So, we'll work together, the group will work closely with IANA to do this GAP work and to look at how follow-up might be done.

We'll do a working session in Istanbul in November about this. And it'll be to do what's required. And it may be that we also run a webinar or two to help keep exploring the issues in between now in Istanbul, because from June to November is a reasonably long GAP. So, there'll be time to plan some things. And if we move on to the next slide, it's a poll. So, essentially, we're asking you, do you think it's a good idea to set up a group? And then that'll be taken into account by the Council when it makes a decision on Thursday.

And assuming the Council does decide to set up a group, if there's support for that, we will then be calling for volunteers, which should be open to anyone in the CC community, whether you're a ccNSO member or not. So, if you could have a go at the, I don't know if you know what you'd call this? The sentiment slider and Mentimeter and then submit that. It looks like we've got fairly strong support so far with 15 people having reacted to that. Thank you. That's a clear, yes, good to have a group. So, let's move on to the next slide.

Membership will be open to all. One working group member will be a councilor to keep that link. IANA staff will be involved. ccTLD regional organizations could nominate a liaison if they wish. And the group will be open and open to observers from any part of the community. So, yeah, if GAC members want to follow the discussion, they can do that.

If At-Large members want to do so, if any GNSO people are interested in what we're doing, they can do it as well.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Jordan, can I make a quick comment on that when you mentioned the GAC?

JORDAN CARTER: Yes.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: From my own personal experience as a chair of a similar working group years ago, we really want to encourage very strongly the GAC to participate.

JORDAN CARTER: Thank you. All right, we've clicked to the end, which is good because it's quarter past twelve, which is the end of the session. If you have any impressions about the session, you could scan the code, add some views. And I realized that dealing with some of this stuff is challenging thinking to do. So, thank you very much to all of you for making it through the session firstly. For the insights, comments, thoughts you've offered. It's a big journey that this is the early stages of. Thank you to Kim for the preparation and the ccNSO staff team. I hope you're having a good ICANN meeting. I hope you have a lovely lunch break. We'll call this session closed and the next session, I believe, begins at 1:45. Thank you all.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]