ICANN81 | AGM – ccNSO: Policy Gap Analysis Working Group Update
Tuesday, November 12, 2024 – 15:00 to 16:00 TRT

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Hello, and welcome to the ccNSO members meeting for the Policy Gap Analysis Working Group. My name is Claudia Ruiz, and I, along with my colleagues Susie Johnson, are the participation managers for this session. Please note this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior and the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy. During this session, questions or comments submitted in chat will be read aloud if put in the proper form as noted. Interpretation for this session will include English, Spanish, French, and Arabic. If you would like to speak during this session, please raise your hand in Zoom.

When called upon, virtual participants will be given permission to unmute in Zoom, onsite participants will use a physical microphone to speak. Please state your name for the record and the language you will speak if speaking a language other than English, and please speak at a reasonable pace to allow for accurate interpretation. Thank you very much. And with this, I will now hand the floor over to Jordan Carter, chair of the PGA. Thank you.

JORDAN CARTER: Thank you, Claudia. It's Jordan Carter here, .au, speaking for the record. Good afternoon, I'm very disappointed that we don't have as

much excitement as big a crowd of people in the room as we did for the DNS abuse session. It must be slightly less compelling material, but that is okay. Thank you all for being here. The purpose of this session is to give an update on the work of the Policy Gaps Analysis Working Group. And as part of that update to run you through one of the initial outputs of the group which is an overview document of the policy and guidance that applies to the question of how IANA deals with ccTLDs.

If we go to the next slide, please. We've kept this as a-- oh, we're going to be using Menti. I'm sure that will come as a surprise if you've been in any of the earlier sessions today. You might want to scan the QR code that's up on the screen in front to be able to use the tool later in the thing. We're basically gonna be asking you a few questions to harvest feedback from the group about the work to date. Can we go back to the code? Yeah. Thank you. Yeah, it will reappear just before we're gonna do the actual questions, so if you've missed it this time, don't worry about that too much.

Let's go to the next slide. I'm gonna cover briefly the background and role of the Policy Gaps Analysis Working Group. It's a relatively new group in the ccNSO. It was only put together after the meeting that we had in Kigali in June. And the first meeting of the working group was only in August. We're gonna give you a bit of an update on the work the group has been doing since the Kigali meeting and as I've already said, run through the overview document that's been prepared. And then just gonna give you a little bit of an insight about what the group is doing next and to get your feedback about that. So you don't have to work too hard.

After we've finished this, and at latest at 10 minutes to four, we'll be joined by from AFPEC who's gonna give a bit of an update on what happened in the tabletop exercise dealing with cybersecurity incident training that the TLD Ops group did on Sunday. So we should finish in time to do that and still have you out the door at four o'clock. I'll try to keep an eye on the chat, but I can't promise to do that rigorously as we go.

If we can go to the next slide, please. The origins of this work a couple of years ago lie in the case of the Lebanon ccTLD, .lb, where the easiest way to summarize what happened is to say that the, the entity listed in the IANA database as the manager did not want to be the manager anymore, but there was no replacement ccTLD manager organized. And there was a gap of policy or practice or precedent there to know what to do. And so the ccNSO said, well, we need to look into this and we need to work out if there are indeed any gaps. And out of that discussion, came some feedback from IANA that there are some gaps that they perceive in the work that they do working with us as ccTLD managers that could be usefully resolved.

So a small group of council members began to engage in this discussion, and then we realized that we actually needed to have a transparent, open accountable group with a proper charter to take any of this work forward. So that's why the yet another ICANN acronym, PGA WG, the Policy Gaps Analysis Working Group was established, and it was given three tasks.

Obviously, if you want to look at whether there are gaps in a policy or practice framework, it helps to know what is in that framework already. It helps to be able to know what all of the relevant documents are. And there was no compilation of that, there was no overview available to us. So the group has done work on completing an overview of the policies and guidance, and that's what we're gonna give you as a community a first look at this afternoon. Bart's gonna work you through that.

And then we'll make that document available for any comments and feedback and input that you might have. You might be aware of other documents, you might think that something is missing, you might not like the way it's been explained. So we'll have a feedback period open over the new year. So through till mid-January, there's no rush to have to have any input. So there'll be plenty of time to get into the details of that and offer any feedback. It's done as a useful tool for the working group in the first instance, but we hope it will also be a useful tool for the community.

The second thing was to identify any possible gaps in the current policy guidance or practices. And the third thing was to advise the ccNSO Council whether to do anything about any gaps that were found, and if so, what to do, what type of process might be needed. And so that's what was done, the call for volunteers happened.

If we can go to the next slide. This is just giving you a bit of a view about who is in the working group just for your information. It's a decent sized group with reasonable diversity in terms of regions and so on. If there are any working group members here in the room, could you just give a

wave or stand up or something so people can see you? There's some over there, there's some over there, yeah. So these are your trustee Policy Gap Working Group members. If you want to button hold them at the cocktail tonight to find out anymore or me or the secretariat, please feel free to do so.

The group has had probably six or seven meetings. It is worth saying, and could we go to the next slide, please, that the initial-- next slide, please. Thank you. We didn't get through quite as much work as we thought we might do in between Kigali and now. And the main reason for that relates to ccPDP3 on the retirement the appeals mechanism because the board came to the community with a lot of questions to answer as they get ready to implement it. And there's a very big crossover between the people who've been doing the work in this working group and who had to answer those questions.

So basically, we lost four or five meeting slots that we might otherwise have been able to do. So that conflict of resources is the main reason we haven't quite gotten as far as maybe we could have done. But since we have formed in August, we have done the two things that are on the screen now. To refine the draft overview document that sets out all of the policies, guidance practices that apply in this situation. And to start assessing the list proposed to us by IANA of potential gaps and start doing the work to propose methods to fill them.

And that's the part that we haven't finished yet. So we'll be carrying on with that work with your agreement after this ICANN meeting. And I just want to pause to re-clarify in case anyone is in this discussion for the

first time. What are these policies that we're talking about? What is this guidance about? It is not about how any of us run our ccTLDs. It is not about how we deal with DNS abuse. It's not about whether we have a model where you have to use a registrar versus if you can register direct to the registry.

These are the policies and practices that define how IANA relates to us as ccTLDs in the delegation, transfer, revocation, or retirement of a ccTLD. So these are the policies that create the framework within which IANA works with and for us as direct customers. It's just important to keep saying that so people don't get the wrong impression that this might be a bit like a GNSO-type situation where all of the policies that apply are made here at ICANN. So those are the two bits of work we've done in the few months since June.

If we can go to the next slide. The first one, and Bart will take you to this in a moment, is the overview document. It's meant to just pull together in a form you'll see in a sec. All of the existing sources of policy and guidance and advice. Many of you will have heard of RFC 1591. Can you put your hand up if you have not heard of RFC 1591? It's good. This is good. An old IETF document in RFC from 1994 that has some things to say about how the DNS operates and how the root zone is determined. And when I got involved in this business and said, oh, go read RFC 1591, and when you read that, you will have a moment of alarm because you'll realize that lots of it is out of date and completely wrong.

But what we've done in this document is start from there and just flesh out all of the sources of policy authority as they are today. And as I've

already mentioned, after we've presented it here, this meeting, we'll have it open for feedback for two months. So if there are any other sources of policy or things you wonder might be policy you can feed those into us. We'll be posting these docs on the website and putting an email out on the ccNSO members list with how you can give feedback and stuff. So don't worry about any of that practical detail right today. So Bart, I'm gonna hand over to you to walk us all through this document.

BART BOSWINKEL: Thanks. next slide, please. So you will not be able to read this, it will be included in the documents that we say in the PDF of this slide deck afterwards. It's fairly detailed. There is a bit of an introduction just to set the expectations about this document. So review it at your leisure, this is just introducing the document.

Okay, can you go to the next slide, please. Yeah, okay. So what you will see in the document, and this is an example, is you'll see I would say five categories. It starts with the mandate for the ccNSO to set policy. And this is really going back to the basics. The core is of course, the ICANN bylaws, et cetera, and also what is included, and this might be-- then you see the broader scope, but it's just to capture, say the relevancy of the documents for the ccTLD community, say local accountability for the ccTLD manager is derived from RSE 1591 from March, and it's also reflected, I would say, in the ICANN bylaw NSE. So this in a way, in a nutshell limits the, I would say the policy scope of the ccNSO, and it all

clearly designates the local accountability. So that's the way to read this table. So this is the basic one.

Next slide, please. Selection of country codes. Again, those of you who are not too familiar with the ccTLD space, again, these are the founding documents and why we use the ISO3166 code, so that's RC 5091 obviously. But what is relevant as well, for those of you not too familiar with IDN ccTLDs, you can see the policy framework or related framework on the selection of IDN ccTLDs. So that's the fast-track process. And currently pending is the ccPDP for on the deselection selection of IDN ccTLDs, which is on the board consideration and in time that will replace the IDN fast track. So you'll see, let's say, by this you'll see this is a, yeah, I would say a living document. It needs to be updated at times.

Next slide, please. I would say this is we're now into the core of the overview document. There are say around the processes of delegation, transfer revocation, and retirement of ccTLDs. And this is really about the delegation transfer and revocation is RFC as interpreted by the framework of interpretation. Again, most of you will know this. And the definitions are from the framework of interpretation and from the retirement policy, and the caretaker is taken from the IANA website. So you have a brief understanding what is meant by these various processes, and you can see the various links as well. Next slide, please.

So this is already the third one, category. And it continues, so pending is the board report on ccPDP4, because it will affirm that all these policies apply to IDN ccTLDS as well, and also to variants. The most

interesting part, I would say, of this whole overview is the, say, category number four with the possible mechanisms to assist ccTLDs to resolve a dispute with ICANN/PTI as the IANA function operator. And as we go through it, there's a wide range of mechanisms available. It starts with the IANA complaint process, which may end in a mediation procedure. Both are available to ccTLDs as direct customers of IANA through the IANA naming functions contract.

Next slide, please. Also, you have the IRP and reconsideration, which is still available for some situations which are not excluded. If you would look at the ICANN bylaws, you will see that delegations and redelegations are excluded for both the IRP and for the reconsideration process, implying that retirement is still available. And if you recall, for those of you familiar with the review mechanism, one of the recommendations is to update this fundamental bylaw to adjust the exclusion as soon as the review mechanism is in place. What is also available in this one is the ombudsman mechanism, which is generally available for all kinds of disputes. And then pending, as you will know, is the review mechanism, and Jordan already alluded to it.

Next page, please. So these are all the mechanisms. And then what is included, again, because once we started providing this overview are some voluntary practices, et cetera. And which have been developed by the ccNSO for the benefit of ccTLDs, not just with IANA, but more in general. So that's the advice on wild cards, the advice not to use emojis.

Can you scroll down, please, or next page. Guidance on the accountability relation. So this is more assisting ccTLDs and ICANN to

structure their bilateral relations. So one is the guidance on the accountability frameworks and or exchange of letters. And the other one is what we or what you discussed this morning was the ccTLD financial contribution. Again, this was developed by the ccNSO to assist ccTLDs in their relation with ICANN. And so for that reason, it's included. And then there are specific voluntary practices relating to IDN tables, et cetera, and the registrations. Again, it's voluntary, but it is advised as a result of the PDP4.

Can you go to the next slide, please. And there are other relevant documents. One is the GAC principles, and that's the only one. And there are archive documents to date, and this is the result of the framework of interpretation work, ICP-1 is archived, so it's not applicable anymore.

You see the decision tree or decisions around archiving these documents. And for example, if the IDN policy would get adopted and the fast track would end up in this bucket as well as archived and the IRP, et cetera, would be included as well. So this is the overall overview of, I would say, the work of the ccNSO since 2007, because the framework of interpretation guideline was the first one that was developed at the time.

So next slide please. And now we are going into the Mentimeter questions. So back to you, Jordan.

JORDAN CARTER: Thanks, Bart. So the thought is that this could be a useful resource for you if you're interested in what the policies, practices, guidances involved in structuring the relationship between IANA and ccTLDs. We know that for us as a working group, it's useful, but we think that sharing it with you allows you to make some value of it as well, if you think so. And then we were immediately curious perhaps about whether you didn't think back to think that might be useful.

So if we go to the next slide, that's the question. Whether you think having this single document that brings together all of this policy in one place is useful to you would be keen on your feedback. Yeah, we've got a bit of a practice as you know, when using these Mentee slides to invite people if they're standing out from the crowd about the logic behind their answer. We've got a couple of don't knows there, if you would like to share why you feel that way be great to hear from you, you might want to say, so now, you maybe could drop us a line. It might just be that it's a new area for you. I can see a hand being waved by an Englishman at the back. Nick, is that you?

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: It is me. Thanks, Jordan. And to give you a bit of a break from talking, but I maybe to be controversial, but don't know, even though I was part of the team which approved the document. So without appearing to be difficult about it, it's just an observation that many of us can live our lives and operate our ccTLDs without any awareness of RFC 50191, all the FOI, all of those sorts of things, and our lives aren't necessarily worse for that.

Having said that, if you need to know some of these detailed technical stuff, which are quite fundamental to the operation of a ccTLD, I think I would recommend not everybody in the registry spending all their time looking at it. But I do think that one person from your registry should be familiar with the fundamental policy frameworks, which decide whether or not we're ccTLDs, and they're quite existential in terms of can we be revocated, transferred, or those basic things. Very unlikely, very unusual, but potentially existential.

And certainly, when we look at the complaint mechanisms, if you are on the receiving end of an adverse decision from the IANA function operator, that is probably something that's nice to know is in your back pocket. And you wouldn't know you had that necessarily in this and had a quick look at some of these resources. Thanks.

JORDAN CARTER: Thank you, Nick. Yeah, this is not the world's most exciting story that's presented in this document, but it is a deep dive into a narrow but important part of how we all work together. So I would agree with Nick's advice there that if there's someone in your registry who's come to grips with this, that could be useful for you if something happens. Yeah, Bart.

BART BOSWINKEL: Maybe also looking forward, say, if at the end of the day the community thinks this is useful, reform staff tend to maintain it, but also post it on either already on this website, but definitely on the new website. So it

is available and generally available to everyone. So you don't have to-- you just need to know the link if there is something wrong. So in that sense it will become very public as well.

JORDAN CARTER: Thanks, Bart. And thank you for the feedback, I appreciate that. It seemed it might be useful for you or someone in your organization. Let's move on to the next slide, please. And I do also just want to note that that was quite a lot of information presented very quickly. The document is, is what, 10 pages and maybe a bit less, so it isn't too much to get to grips with. And if you are aware of something that we've missed, that would be awesome to hear about. So don't feel shy about ping the secretariat, and as I said, we'll put out a note on the ccNSO members list with link to the document and how to make feedback and what the deadline is.

The second thing is to think about the issues that we've been dealing with that we're starting to deal with. The one about Lebanon, I've already mentioned, and I've mentioned that IANA was tabling a few lists. And the point of this slide is to just say to you that there are a number of different ways that you can address these gaps. If we find a gap in policy that we have to change through a policy development process, which is the only way to change policy in the ccNSO, it's a high impact on the issue. That's what the left-hand arrow that's pointing up is about. It's about the impact on the issue.

Like it's a solid way to change something by changing the policy and the scope of work. It isn't a small undertaking to do a PDP, and the

resources involved are quite high for that as well. So that's the bottom access, the arrow that's pointing off to the right. So policy development is both high impact and high resource in different ways. It's also high risk because you know partly because of those other two factors, and it's fair to just share back with the community something that I said at the previous meeting and possibly the one before that as well.

Based on the discussions in the group so far, the appetite to do a PDP is quite low, so we aren't chomping at the bit to try and lead this work towards doing a PDP process. If anything, the vibe is to take small steps and to do things that are less resource intensive if we need to do so. And some of those are the other options that are on here. Having a working group within the ccNSO or prepare some advice or guidance is a much simpler, less resource intensive process that might just help sort out community expectations where a gap can be resolved in a satisfactory way by doing that. So these are some of the considerations that we've been starting to work through.

If we go to the next slide, we had a list of 10 or 11 issues that have come up to us so far. And what the working group is starting to get its teeth into is to define what sort of issue it is, what sort of gap it is. Is it really a gap in the underlying policy framework? Is it a sort of implementation gap? Is it a lack of established practice because it was a new situation or something else? And then for each of those, depending on the type of gap you have, either got some choices about how you could solve it or sometimes you don't have a choice. If there's a policy gap that needs to be filled by a change in policy, then the only process you can use is a PDP.

But for other types of gaps, there are other more or less resource intensive processes that you could take. So we've been discussing in some depth so far the data accuracy question, how important is it that the data in IANA records is accurate, why we have those public records at all on the IANA website. Like why do we need to publish an admin contact, a technical contact? Are there new types of contacts we should be doing and why is that information published? And if you've had anything to do with privacy law or policy, you'll know that that can be a quite important question.

You have to have a reason to be acquiring this information and publishing it. And it's a good practice for us to be very clear about why we are asking for the information that we're asking for and why we're publishing it. The third on that list discussed so far is about enforcement or graduated compliance options and where we're at the moment discussing it.

We see those three top ones on the left as being a bit related, because if you do have a purpose for these records and you are concerned about them being accurate so people can rely on what they read when they go to the IANA website as being true, then it might be that you need some consequences for people who are not keeping their records up to date. And at the moment, there isn't a set of stage consequences that are in place.

No one has proposed any either, to be clear. There isn't a back pocket answer to that question, but it could be quite helpful to know that there was something that might be done to follow up if data is known to be

inaccurate. We would want to estimate that perhaps up to 10% of the records in the database are not accurate. Just as an example, one of the possible approaches that was mentioned by someone was that maybe you could just publish the names of the organizations where the record isn't accurate.

Now, to be clear, that's not gonna go and happen, that's not a work through proposed method of action, but it is an example of something that could be done where records are not accurate. At the moment, IANA can ask for corrections, but nothing happens if the data isn't up to date. The fourth on that list is around ensuring eligibility assessment before practical changes.

This is the question about if things change on the ground where the IANA policy, where the policy framework assumes that IANA has a role in making a decision, like for example, a transfer of a CC from one entity to another, what should happen in such a situation? What happens if there's a sort of stealth transfer under the ground, and then all of a sudden, these new facts are presented to IANA when the whole point of the framework, at least in part, is that IANA does due diligence and assesses such a change. So that's where we're started to be discussing. We're yet to fully work through some of these other topics, which are ones that are also tabled from the AI experience that IANA has.

The way that we interpret the local presence requirements for a ccTLD manager, what to do when someone resigns, that's the one of the Lebanon case, what the minimum level of involvement should be by a ccTLD manager in operations. The question about how, if anything,

IANA should be able to do to support disaster recovery and the right of ccTLD managers to request confidentiality in their dealings with IANA or whether they should be able to waive that, for example.

So these are some of the issues that are coming out that have been brought to the group by IANA as real things that do come up in the operational relationships and dialogues that they have with people. And we had hoped that we would've finished working through those issues and come to you and the council this week and say, we've worked through that list, we think the top priority is issue X, and we think the right way to deal with that is through process Y. But we're not, we haven't finished, so we're going to keep going. But yeah, Bart's gonna have-

BART BOSWINKEL: Just one point. So what you see are, is the list of topics, and some of them you should be able to recognize. These topics were first presented to you by the Ad Hoc Council Committee. I believe it was somewhere in the Caribbean, but were we then-- oh yeah, it was San Juan with the hypotheticals. So that was the two hypotheticals. One was about the data accuracy and the resignation of a ccTLD manager. The working group took the results of this session and build on that, say, on the results of that session. So that's available, and that was input for the working group to move forward.

The same happened with the, if you recall, the session in Kigali. The ad hoc group presented three items, and that was the time that it was very clear that the working group needs to be established. And the method

used in Kigali was also the method used to run through all the other items to understand them. So in that sense, you see that your work together with the ad hoc group is taking into account by this working group and they building on that work as well. Just wanted to mention it.

JORDAN CARTER: Yeah. Thank you. So these discussions might seem like they've played out over a bit of time, but they're all starting to come together into this culmination of work. So if we can go to the next slide, please. This is just a bit of an example about how we are resolving the issues. We don't need to dwell on this slide in particular. It's just showing the sort of taxonomy or the categorization process we're going through.

So if we can go to the next slide. We're sort of gonna be asking in a minute for a bit of feedback on this, which is the next steps for the group. And we think there are two that we are reasonably confident about doing between now and March, four months or so.

The first is to complete the assessment of that initial list of potential gaps, coming to some conclusions within the working group about what sort of gap we think it is, what sort of method could be used to tackle it, and then prioritizing them and working out which one we think is most important to tackle first and why. We all know we don't have a limitless number of resources in the ccNSO. We know that we couldn't run five or seven new working groups to tackle five or seven of these issues at the same time. So we will be very disciplined about coming to

sort of the top one or potentially the top two for some sort of a piece of work to follow up.

And I would like us to have that ready to give to you for your input on and then to the council to make a call about at the meeting in March in Seattle. That's the deadline we set ourselves, barring any more unexpected arrivals of new bits of work that require the same people to be working on them.

The second thing that we will do by then is if there is any feedback that comes back from you on the overview document, we will assess that feedback and make any changes that seem to be needed, and then present a revised version of that document back to the community. And pretty confident about that one being an achievable goal.

The third one is that the gaps that we've been talking about, the ones we just went through the list of, they've come from the operational experience that IANA has in dealing with CCs around the world on a daily, weekly, monthly, yearly basis. But we are responsible for looking at the policy framework from all sorts of points of view. And there may be people who have identified other gaps in the policy framework or in the practices or guidance that affect how IANA deals with us. They might be gaps and it might be a topic where there is clear policy, but people want to change it.

Now, those kind of things are out of the scope of this group because this is about gaps. This isn't about deciding on new directions for the policy. It's about making sure there aren't any problems or holes in the framework that it can do its job in giving adequate guidance to IANA.

So, one person was talking to me about one of the regional TLD organizations that has lawyers getting together regularly. Lawyers often look at policy frameworks and identify gaps and stuff. So they thought they might do some work in assessing the framework and seeing if they have any gaps they want to draw to attention.

So if we have time, we might put out a call for any other input, like other gaps that people are worried about or have found or are curious whether there is one or not. And if we did that, it would be to accumulate those suggestions and time for the working group to start looking at them after the ICANN meeting in March. So we'll do that if we get time, but we also know that this is just a small slice of the ccNSOs work. We don't want to take up too much of your head space or time in dealing with this stuff. So those are the next steps, complete the gaps work and propose a method for a top priority issue and then to update the overview document and if we have time to be asking for gaps.

So if we go to the next slide, I think we're gonna get another Mentee thing. It's the same Mentee code. If we flick onto the next slide, I think it will ask you about what you think about those next steps. So if you think they sound reasonable, please say so. If you think they're the wrong things to do, please say so. And if you do think that they're wrong things to do, it'd be great to hear what you think the right things to do would be. Thank you for the no opinion visit, made it visible if anyone was actually voting or not. So that was good.

Just a reminder, those three things were to finish the analysis of the list of gaps and to propose the method of dealing with them, to update the

overview document if any feedback comes in, and potentially as a third one, if we have time to ask for any other gaps that people have noticed. And there is a do-not-agree there. If you are in the room and have want to share the logic there, that would be excellent. But I'm not putting you on the spot. You don't have to. There's no wrong answer here, it's just about trying to get a sense of the room. And it looks like 23 people have shared a view on this, if I'm reading that right. Come and tell us at the cocktail or later on if you think we're got on the wrong track, it would be really good to hear that.

We're gonna move on to the next question, which is about whether this work is stay as a priority. Should it stay as a priority for the ccNSO? We want your view on that. Council thought it was important enough to set up a group, and it seems to us that being, having confidence in the policy framework is important enough to be spending some time on. So it would be just useful to confirm that or to find out otherwise from the sense of the room. So it begins to look like the answer to that question is yes. These have been some structured questions for you. You may well have questions for me, for us. So I just want to open the floor. We've got seven or eight minutes left before our TLD Ops TTX update.

Does anyone have any questions for me or for about this work, about any of the stuff that's been in the presentation, about anything you wish to have been in the presentation but wasn't? If you do have questions, feel free to wave your hand in the Zoom room or in the physical room. And if not, I hope that we will have next stage of this work to bring to you for consideration when we get together in March, 2025 in Seattle.

Oh, there may be one more question. If we go to the next slide. And that's just a thank you.

The next slide is, please give the MPC your feedback. And this is a new QR code, I think, or is it not? Is it the same one? It's the same one. Helps them assess the sessions, helps them work out what to put on the agenda and so on. With that feedback, and we can keep it rolling in. I want to thank you for being here for this session. I hope you learned something. Appreciate the inputs. Andrea's looking like she's about to clap.

And Regis, do you want to come to the table? He'll be giving us an update briefly. How does this work, Claudia? Do we close the session and thank people and then open something else, or do we just keep rolling? Keep rolling. We keep rolling. So that's it for me. Thank you very much for your attention. Over to these two.

JACQUES LATOUR: So I guess this is my last chair meeting for TLD Ops. I remember all of our TLD Ops presentation used to be on the Tuesday morning at 9:00 AM with four people in the room that were sleeping. Remember that? Good old days. So I think we have slides coming up. So this is our quick update on our disaster recovery business continuity table. Topics are size we did on Sunday.

Next slide. Overall, it was a success. We had 60 people that participated in the workshop. The goal of the workshop was to do a tabletop simulation on a ransomware incident or a ccTLD. And Dirk and

Christophe, through the years, they managed to build a framework to do tabletop simulation that's based on the game. So we have role playing, we have the concept of rounds, and we have cards that you need to choose on every round.

And I think it makes the event more conducive for having a discussion to understand what are the priorities when there's an incident, a security incident that occurs. This is V2, I think, of the framework, the presentation, the cards, everything has been tuned and updated, and I think it works really well. So any comment?

REGIS MASSE: So as we did in Montreal during round Montreal ICANN66, don't hesitate to take the materials and adapt the materials to your context, your registry, and have this kind of simulation inside your registry, it can be useful. You can adapt the context, you can adapt the tip of attack, you can adapt the tip of answer because in the cards, what is important is there are four roles, management, technical, regulatory, and communication. So it's a way to include all parts of the roles of your company people during this exercise. It's not a technical one only, but it was the case on Sunday. We have the chance to have a lot of people different roles in their registry. So I think the exchange were very good.

JACQUES LATOUR: So the purpose of this is capacity building. So everything is built in a way that you can take this package, bring it to your company, your organization, and play the game inside. And I cannot stress this enough,

the more you practice responding to a security incident, the better you get. And if it ever happened, then you're more proficient in responding to an event than panicking and not knowing what to do. So it's really important you do that.

So today, I sent an email also to the ccNSO member. So all the PowerPoint collateral, all the pick the cards are on our confluence page, the ICANN confluence page. And there's also a link from TLD SSAC that you can have a look at. But this is meant to be brought inside the organization. You run this once-a-month short session, you build that capacity internally to respond to security incident, that's the goal here. And I think you're planning to do more over time, different scenarios.

REGIS MASSE: Yes, I think. So I will take the good idea of the ccNSO to have a Mentee now to see if the session that it takes was a succeed or not. I think the first return we had from the community was the people were happy to play this game. So yes, I think in the future, we have to find now new ideas, new delivery, new topics. But as we say, we are the community, we are not just this group, we are working with you. So if you have ideas, you have things you wanted to work with and work with us, feel free to ask, of course.

And next slide. Next slide, please. Yeah. So as we know, Jacques can be replaced, but we have to go on with these TLD groups. So there will be on Thursday morning, a proposal for the council. We have the proposition to have vice chair is becoming the chair, myself, and there is a proposal of one of the people, I led some suspense for the moment,

there is a proposal to have someone who will take the role of vice chair. So if the ccNSO Council accepts our proposal, we will have a continuity for this group. I hope it's useful for you and the community. So I will really want, and I ask you to thank Jacques for all what he's done as the chair of this group, please.

JACQUES LATOUR: Thank you.

REGIS MASSE: So I'll see you next time in Seattle for next TLD Ops round.

ROELOF MEIJER: I just want to make a remark. Jacque, Regis, Dick, and Christophe, and all the other ones who participated in setting up that exercise, thank you very much. We do exercises like this almost every year as IDN, and still this one was very useful and very educating. And it's also because it's with a totally different group. Normally, I do this with my colleagues, with the crisis team.

Now, it was with a different set of colleagues. So we got very good exchanges on how we would do this back home. So I would recommend to anybody who wasn't there and who was interested in keeping its TLD secure to participate in the next session. And Jacque, sad to see you go, but if this was your last thing at TLD Ops, wow. Well done.

JACQUES LATOUR: Thank you.

REGIS MASSE: Thank you, Roelof.

ABDALMONEM GALILA: Yeah, this is Abdalmonem Galila for the record. Actually, I will speak as a participant of this workshop. I will say the pro and cons of this workshop, by the way. The pros that we share the knowledge about what is going on, what we shall do in case of disaster, in case if we have some attacks or rather somewhere at our network.

What are the steps? It was very fantastic. Sharing knowledge between different participants within the groups, the small groups that were organized during the workshop was fantastic. I don't have any cons about the workshop at all, but it is very useful for TLDs in order to attend this workshop, in order to prepare for something that, that may be very important in the future or even currently.

But I would like to have, if there is some document or good practice document about what shall we do in case of this ransomware happened. I already know the knowledge from different ones inside the workshop, but if there is a document, I think it'll be good to share it with my friends, with my organization. Thank you.

JACQUES LATOUR: Thank you. So in the email that I sent, there's a link to the confluence page. In that page, there's a link to the main TLD ops section, and that

contains the actual playbook for incident response. And there's a framework in there where it says, when something happens, somebody declares an incident, blah, blah, blah, then you should have a bunch of plans already documented. One of them definitively should be a ransomware incidents response plan where you already did this exercise internally, documented the plan, you know how to respond to an incident. And that's all in the confluence space.

ABDALMONEM GALILA: That's fine. I will see it from this playbook while I am meeting these other events for this workshop. I will see it

JACQUES LATOUR: Okay. Yeah. Yes, please do.

ABDALMONEM GALILA: From this playbook.

JACQUES LATOUR: So it's all there. We didn't really spend time to review that document then, but in Montreal, we spent too much time doing that, and there was lots of feedback around that.

REGIS MASSE: And it's totally free of charge, so you can use it. Another question, remark on remote, I don't know. Thanks a lot. Thank you for listening.

BART BOSWINKEL: I'll do it. Yeah. Just for your information, the next session at 4:30 will not be in this room. It will be the meeting with the Board, and it will be in [00:55:23 - inaudible] in the primary ballroom. So that's next door, I believe. So the main hall. So be aware, the next session is not in this room, it will be in the main room. And tomorrow morning at 9:00 AM, we'll meet in the GAC room because that's the meeting with the GAC. And then for this evening, when we will meet, those of you who have not collected their tickets and have sent in their names, please collect it now.

As of 16:00 PM this afternoon, we are going to provide them to people on the waiting list. So a final opportunity for you. If you do not have your ticket yet, please collect it. As of 4:00 PM, they will be made available to people on the waiting list. Thank you.

JORDAN CARTER: And that's the end of the session. Enjoy the coffee breaks. See you next door at 16:30.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]