
ICANN82 | CF – ccNSO: Policy Gap Analysis Working Group Session
Saturday, March 08, 2025 – 9:00 to 10:00 PST

CLAUDIA RUIZ

Okay, hello and welcome to the Policy Gap Analysis Working Group session. My name is Claudia Ruiz and I am the Remote Participation Manager 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 in the chat. If you would like to speak during this session, please raise your hands in Zoom and when called upon virtual participants will unmute their microphone in Zoom. On-site participants will use a physical microphone to speak and should leave their Zoom microphone disconnected. For the benefit of other participants, please state your name for the record and speak at a reasonable pace.

Thank you, and with that, I will now hand the floor over to Jordan Carter, Chair of the PGA. Thank you.

JORDAN CARTER

Thanks, Claudia, and good morning, everyone, or afternoon or evening. We have a few people participating today remotely as well, so I'd encourage everyone in the room to join the Zoom. This is the Policy Gaps Analysis Working Group working session, so this isn't an introductory session. If you're here for the first time, you

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.

may have your head spinning a little bit, but that's the price you will pay for getting up to speed quickly, perhaps. And the main business on the table for us today is to finalize our recommendation around the prioritization of the issues or gaps that we've identified in our work since the Istanbul meeting.

Just in terms of admin matters, does anyone in the room or on the Zoom room have an update to their statements of interest? If you do need to update your SOI or to complete one, you can talk to the friendly ccNSO Secretariat members here about how to go about doing that. There we go. And that's the only admin matter that is before us today. I also just want to acknowledge Maria Camila, who's the Vice Chair of this group, who is joining us online. She couldn't be here in person today.

Let's move on to item 3, the second reading of the prioritization of issues. And I want to just put on the record the process that we've been through to get to this list. So if you go to the next slide, Claudia. There we go. So we had a list that was provided to us around gaps that the IANA team was experiencing a few months ago. And the working group looked through that list, assessed what methods might be used in the first instance by the ccNSO to tackle those issues. And that process largely led to the first response for any further work being the establishment of study groups to look into them earlier. None of the issues were identified as needing any other treatment at this point, including none being immediately triggering of a policy development process.

And so we were doing two things. We were understanding the issues in more depth, working out what method would be used to address them for future work, and then moving into an effort to prioritize the list. IANA told us that the list they had given us was in a rough order of priority in terms of the things that they find most frequently that they are running into were top of their list. In January and February, the group spent some time considering how to prioritize the issues and thought that the IANA suggested order would be one of those factors. We also thought that looking about the importance of the issues to CCs would be a factor we should take into account. And we also thought that the volume of work that would be needed to do might be a factor to think about as well on the basis that if there were any of these issues that it would be easy and simple and quick to deal with, that might be one we should expedite the focus on.

We had a not very successful experiment with a survey or an ordering mechanism that didn't work out too well because of the language that we used and a few other issues. But what the discussion around those two told us is that in deciding what to work on next, there's no mathematical formula that's going to give you your answer. You just have to actually decide what you're going to do. The suggestion that I put together after that discussion was that the first two off the block be looking at IANA public records and the role of IANA in disaster recovery for ccTLDs. And that was discussed in a call, I think it was earlier this week, wasn't it? It was on the 4th of March. Time speeds up when you fly halfway around the world.

And that, from what I could tell of the notes because I was in the air, that that was received favorably by the group. Is that a fair summary, those of you who were on the call? And because we run key decisions in a two-meeting format, that's why this is back on the agenda today. So there are no objective factors that will give us the answer for how to prioritize this work.

And the follow-on step, assuming that the ccNSO Council, after member feedback and the members' meeting, gives us the go-ahead on these, will be to prepare careful scopes for this work and the chartering of any study groups. And the priority of these two is as written there, IANA being the first, disaster recovery being the second. And it will be also up to the Council to make a call about whether to run one or two study groups at the same time.

Just at that point, I want to pause and ask if there are any questions. And then after that, I'm going to ask Claudia to go back to the big Google document just to show the list of the six issues. Because we either need to have some blinding insight around the table, that means we change this priority order now, today, or we confirm it. So before we go to that document, are there any questions or comments from any of the working group members so far about my summary or about any aspect of the work? It does not look like it right now.

So I just want to go through the list of issues, Claudia, if we could click to that Google doc. And if we just scroll up slightly and zoom, no, that one, and then just go a bit bigger. Thank you. And just look

at the first column of this table. It's really just to characterize what the issues are.

So the IANA public records is one of the ones that we were recommending. Eligibility before changes was the second issue. The local presence requirements for ccTLD was the third. What to do in the situation where a ccTLD manager resigns from that role, but there isn't a new manager ready to go yet was the fourth. And that was the issue that started this track of work with the situation with the .lb ccTLD. A couple of years ago now, disaster recovery and the request of confidentiality as part of dealing with ccTLD matters.

So those were the topics. Some of them brought together a longer list of topics into logical groupings. So the IANA public records one is one of those. But the end, the current recommendation is that we do public records, IANA public records and disaster recovery. So this is the moment of the second reading to ask if anyone has any comments about that recommendation. Has anyone got any lingering concerns or thinks we've got the wrong ones up there? Because now is your opportunity to say so. And the next. Okay, cool. Some hands. Who was first? Irina.

IRINA DANIELIA

Thank you. Irina Danelia for the record. Hello, everyone. I feel comfortable with these two items to be selected at the first area of attention. And I just want to add a comment that we can see that we cannot do more than two items in one minute, in one period of

time. So this was one of the reasons why we decided to select two of them and not more.

JORDAN CARTER

Yeah, thanks, Irina. That's a good point. We have only picked those top two. We definitely don't think more than two study groups would work. And we have not established any priority between the remaining issues. Peter.

PETER KOCH

This is Peter for the record. Good morning. That probably already clarified my question because I wanted to just heads up. I was confused about the competition between we have two prioritized, but for the rest, for the remainder of these, we're just accepting the issues without any prioritization. Is that the ask?

JORDAN CARTER

Yes, yeah. I guess you could say that we were noting them. What? Yeah. Because we haven't had any conversation about how to prioritize those ones. So they, if you like, remain items that we think there are some work needs to be done, but as to when that will happen and in what order, that is for future work to decide.

PETER KOCH

Yeah, thanks. That clarifies it. Thank you so much.

BART BOSWINKEL

Thanks. Just Peter for everybody's memory. If you scroll down to the-- and then we can go back to the proposed priority. It's the final sentence, the working group. There you go. The final sentence before Jordan, the working group also should advise the Council. So after one of these two is completed, then the others should be prioritized by the Council after consulting the community. So that addresses your point. That was when you raised it on the two meetings ago, I believe.

JORDAN CARTER

Thanks, Bart, for that clarification. So are there any other comments about these two issues? Nick.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH

Yeah, good morning. It's Nick for the record. So I don't have any particular comment about the prioritization. I'm just interested in the process of these working groups and whether there's a-- do you feel that you know how long this is going to go on for? And I speak as a perspective of veteran of the various PDPs and retirement and review mechanisms. And these are multi-year processes. Can we have some assurance that this could be a slightly more agile process through to recommendations to the Council and not 5-to-10-year processes? Because if there are 12 of these issues, and I'm just wondering which decade we're going to finish in, I guess.

JORDAN CARTER

Thanks for that, Nick. I would love to give an assurance, but we have done no work whatsoever on planning the study groups. So

it would be something I made up on the spot for you to make you feel better, which is not going to happen. But I think the constraint will be resource availability in the IANA team, because I assume we'll have IANA people involved with understanding the status quo and the gaps in more depth in the ccNSO Secretariat to support the working groups, and of course, in the volunteers who are prepared to spend some time.

If I am involved with any of these study groups, my intention would be to finish them in this calendar year, because it's a study group. It's to identify and delineate the issues, I think. If the scope of the group goes beyond that into recommendations, it might be unrealistic. But we do have two multi-day in-person meetings left this year after this week to do work. We have the wonders of Zoom and telecommunication. So my instinct is that it's intended to be a lighter and quicker process than a PDP process.

And having given Bart some time to think through those comments. Bart, can you tell us if there are any recent examples of study groups and/or how long you think they tend to take?

BART BOSWINKEL

The last one we did, and Peter Koch was chair of that, was the Emoji Study Group. That was a long time ago. It depends very much, and I think that everybody is aware of how they say the pressure on capacity. At the time, we had, I would say, a pace of one meeting every month, so you can increase it. That's one way of dealing with

it. I think what is really helpful, and that was a result of the Council discussions as well, is to turn this into bite-sized chunks.

In a way, what the PGA is doing right now is a very good example of how you could run it, because in a way what you do is a study group. You have to sort out a series of issues. You come up with recommendations how to address them, and that's effectively what a study group does. It doesn't come up with a full-blown recommendation to the community, etc. It comes up with a recommendation to the Council, because that's the result. How to move it forward.

I think the working method that you have developed with this one is probably a very good example of how you could do it. I'm trying to say the Finance Working Group is using that method of outline and drilling down and turning stuff into bite-sized chunks, which the group can discuss. That shows its results, I would say. If you look at when this group started, it was quite a large chunk of work, but you managed to do it in two meetings, so half a year. That's the way to do it.

JORDAN CARTER

One of the things that responds to that concern, Nick, is that we didn't just say, let's do all of these issues in one study group. It is trying to take a modular, short approach to doing the work. I think the outcomes of the study groups are likely to be an analysis of the issues, and a recommendation as to if there should be any next steps, and if so, what they are. For example, in the discussion around resignation, when that one comes up on the agenda, there

was a bit of an instinct that if you were to have a status for a CC that was permanently available to happen, i.e. a plan that happened if this resignation thing happened, that probably would require a PDP just to create some policy to deal with it.

So the study group might conclude that, or might conclude otherwise. With the IANA public records issue, one of the topics there is what happens if the data isn't up to date? What are the implications for the ccTLD involved? And having any such implications might require policy development as well.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH

Okay, so this is a follow-up question then. So let's say, so we're in ICANN82, so let's say by ICANN85, the study groups for the first two have gone through, delivered their recommendations, Council has looked at them and maybe even accepted them, say. What's the step after that in terms of implementation? Because I think what we've seen, I mean, it's supposed to be like a trigger word for anybody, but with the review mechanisms, like then it needs to go to the ICANN Board, then there's like public comments. And that's another period of more coming up for two years.

So I'm curious as to the working methodology to try to make sure that actually we get to some closure and outcome. I know those are dirty words in some of this ICANN policy work, but it'd be nice to tick these things off and complete finish on them in a reasonable period of time. And I just wondered, what is the next step after Council? So does it need to go to the ICANN Board in order to

become implemented? And have we thought all that through before we start down these tracks?

JORDAN CARTER

I think it's difficult to think that through before you know what the conclusion of the work is, because the answer, annoyingly, is it depends. If the answer is a study group, if the study group recommends a PDP to close the gap, then maybe the study group can prepare a draft charter for the PDP, and that can all be decided and initiated, but then the PDP has to follow the steps in the bylaws.

If the conclusion is a set of recommendations for IANA, and Kim and his team are like, yeah, well, you can implement that like this, and they agree that they've been working alongside the work, so they're familiar with it, and they're like, we're going to have a new guide in two months, then that's closed out. If the study concludes that nothing else needs to be done, the outcome and the closure is the report of the study group. So that's why I say it depends.

But I do also want to say that I welcome and endorse the need to be clear about what the outcome is, to close things out and to move on. And we also cannot assume that the next things to deal with will be things that are on this list. They may well be, but between now and when a decision is made as to what follows on, other gaps may be identified. One of the issues on the agenda today is to ask if there are any other gaps floating around.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH

I think this is interesting. And I suppose particularly in say, like, I'm just extemporizing really, but say like local presence, where it seemed to be pretty clear from the reading of 1591 that local presence is required. And that is different, say, from a lot of practice. I don't know if there's local presence, for example, for my favorite ccTLD to use in these examples is .aq in Antarctica. I don't know whether they have a local presence satisfied for their ccTLD manager. I suspect not.

But then looking at it with the framework of interpretation, which I did not read again recently, and I did not find it an easy read to try and work out in terms of clarity and if there's a gap between what actually is the policy and then what actually happens today.

And therefore, what is the gap analysis in terms of these? I just think it might be quite a lot harder. It's easy to look at it in terms of a bite sized issue. I just worry that when we look at the reality of analysis of some of the documents in RFC 1591 and the framework of interpretation and then practice, we can easily get ourselves bogged down and then struggle to get through these things in a reasonable period of time.

So I'm just trying to work out how we can set that up now as we go into this process. Is it worth, say, we give ourselves three ICANN meetings and then it has to finish? Do we set ourselves a hard deadline? Otherwise, these things just go on and on and on. And next thing you know, it's 2035.

JORDAN CARTER

I think that's a good topic for the Council to pick up. Yeah, I don't think it's within scope of this working group to determine the work method of the follow up work that we're recommending. But I think it's good that you've put those issues on the table and we do need to have good answers to them. I am a fan of a close out date that is established as part of the terms of reference and the group either evaporates at that point or has to be remanded with a very firm guide as to what it needs to do by when.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH

To be completely crystal clear, I'm very supportive of this study group methodology. I think the definition of insanity with some of these policy development processes is to repeat the processes and expect the outcomes or the time frames to be different. And I think we owe it to ourselves to try and work smart. And so that's just my main thrust of my comments, really, is to let's try and do that and be kind to ourselves and get through these things in a reasonable amount of time.

JORDAN CARTER

Agreed. Let me just go. Yeah, hi.

ABDALMONEM GALILA

Yeah, this is Abdalmonem Galila for the record. My question is here. Maybe I misunderstood something. I think reassignment is related to ccTLD data. I think reassignment is one of the methods to

recover from disaster. So I think the parent is disaster recovery and one of its arms is reassignment.

JORDAN CARTER

I'm sorry, I just missed the--

ABDALMONEM GALILA

What I say is one of the countries may have war, so ccTLD is totally down. We need to reassign the ccTLD from previous organization to another organization. This is reassignment. So we here now recover from disaster that happened for the ccTLD. So what I said that reassignment, ccTLD reassignment is one of the arms or the methods that used by disaster recovery.

JORDAN CARTER

No, a reassignment wouldn't be the method you use there because the reassignment case study is there's someone who's listed in the IANA database as the ccTLD manager. They come along to Kim and the IANA team and they say we do not want to be the manager anymore. Take us off your list. And no one else has said we do want to be the ccTLD manager. So it's not a situation where there's been a disaster recovery and it's not a situation where there's someone who is willing to be the ccTLD manager. Because that's a transfer of the delegation from one party to another. So that might happen in the course of some disaster recovery, but then they're not the same thing.

ABDALMONEM GALILA

So it is not data. It's not for ccTLD. It is a representative for ccTLD organization.

JORDAN CARTER

Yeah, the IANA public records item is about what is listed about the ccTLD in the IANA database. Yeah, it's not about the data inside the ccTLD's zone files.

Okay, so this is the last call for any other issues about the two priorities. Claudia, can you pop back to the slide that we're on? So it's dealing with IANA public records and the IANA role in disaster recovery. And unless anyone else is about to have something to say, we're going to confirm those as the two issues that are our top priorities in the order presented. So that decision is made. Thank you, everyone. Those are the priorities and then we will test that with the community in the session later this week. Well, I guess it's next week officially, isn't it? Further on in the ICANN meeting.

And in the chat in the Zoom room, Jofan had the point about asking whether DNS abuse was a topic. I think the next item is, in fact, about any other additional gaps. Let's move slides. No. Okay, so we don't have a slide for number four. Is item 4. It is, yeah. So if we pop back to the agenda slide, Claudia, and what we said all through this work, we have almost a standing item at the committee's meetings. So has anyone else identified any other policy gaps?

And Jofan, you have said, have we discussed and considered whether including DNS abuse as a topic for a policy gap is there? I

don't believe we have considered whether that is a policy gap or not. I think that it is not a policy gap in the sense that the policies we're talking about here are the policies that determine how IANA deals with the information in the IANA database, which is about ccTLD delegations.

So anything that would affect the use or misuse or registration or not registration of domain names is out of scope for this group's work. And I don't think anyone has argued that an entire TLD is DNS abuse. So my conclusion is that DNS abuse is out of scope. Does anyone disagree with that? Yeah, no? Out of scope, that one. But thanks for raising it.

Are there any other additional gaps that people have become aware of, noticed, got in mind? Should I put on the table, or Bart, could I ask you to put on the table the one that was raised in the last call of the group? Some people may have also been travelling like I was.

BART BOSWINKEL

Yeah. On the last call, those of you who attended, Stephen raised the point whether a potential gap between, say, in the current retirement policy, there is a section on retirement of exception and reserve codes, quote unquote, and that there needs to be a review mechanism in place because it's very closely aligned with it. And whether that was a gap, we sat on the call. It's for discussion and so tabled for now.

JORDAN CARTER

Thanks, Bart. I have Chris and then Peter with hands up.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

It's not a gap. It's going to get. As soon as the Board approves the thing, I've lost what the name of it is, the recommended review mechanism, that's current space is filled with that review mechanism, but it's already filled because you can, in fact, use the IRP if you choose to do so. So it's not that there isn't a review mechanism, it's that there isn't a review mechanism that was drafted by us, but there will be in time. So, no, it's not a gap.

And it's difficult to see how, even if you did think it was a gap, what would you do about it? I mean, you can't. By the time we got around to talking about it, it would be. Unless the Board is going completely mad, which I'm not sure that they are. I imagine that that review mechanism is going to be approved relatively quickly. So, no, I don't think it's a gap. Thanks.

JORDAN CARTER

Thanks. Peter.

PETER KOCH

Yeah, this is Peter for the record. Good morning again. And, yeah, I have to agree with Chris that this is not a policy gap because it's an implementation issue, an implementation gap. And it is not about the connection between the two policies. It's more about an issue that we've been talking in the Council and in the ccNSO about for a while now, that the policy that the ccNSO came up with hasn't

been approved by the Board. But that type of gap is out of the scope for This Policy Gap Analysis Working Group. So that needs to be dealt with at a different venue. Thank you.

JORDAN CARTER

Thanks, Peter and Chris. Stephen isn't online as far as I can tell or hear. So I think if he-- Oh, yeah.

ABDALMONEM GALILA

Yeah, thank you. Actually, me as the ccTLD of Egypt for the IDN1. When I would like to send an email to the administrative contact for Saudi Arabia.sa, I need to go to IANA database and grab the email address of this administrative contact. Why not having something to be unique, for example, for all administrative contact to have something admin@nic.sa, for other country admin@nic.bh, something like that. I think it will be easy to identify different contacts in the fly, away from going for IANA database.

JORDAN CARTER

So like you're suggesting a common role and domain for each ccTLD as a convenient way to contact them.

ABDALMONEM GALILA

Especially you will find it will be so easy if you have some suspicious behavior coming to your network from this domain name. So you will ask, send an email immediately to the administrative contact to solve these issues. Thank you.

JORDAN CARTER

And thanks for raising that issue. Kim, you have your hand up.

KIM DAVIS

Thanks for raising the issue. I think the other topic, one of the topics that we have under consideration is what I would describe as what is the purpose of public records. You just spoke to a use case where you as a ccTLD manager might need to contact another ccTLD manager. I'm hoping throughout the course of this work, when we get to that topic, we'll have a thorough examination of why do we even have public records? Why do we have points of contact? Because I think that's a pretty fundamental thing that we haven't really considered to date.

We've inherited what we have today as a paradigm that's existed for many decades in terms of having an admin contact and having a tech contact. But there's no crisp definition about what are these contacts for? What are the purposes for which we make them public, etc.?

And I think when we go through that exercise, it will inform some of the operational implementation outcomes. I think you're speaking to it like a very operational outcome from that analysis. But I think we should think about what kinds of reasons does it need to be known who the ccTLD manager is? For what kind of reasons do you need to contact them? And that will inform the ultimate implementation. Thanks.

JORDAN CARTER

Yeah, thank you, Kim. And we didn't show this on the screen before, but that first priority item that we've talked about, IANA public records, is actually a consolidation of three specific issues that IANA had raised with us. One is about the purpose of public records. So why do we do that? And that's important for us knowing why we do it. And it's also important for privacy law reasons. You have to know why you're collecting information and why you're publishing it. And the accuracy of the data in the records. So data accuracy was the second facet.

And the third facet was around the compliance regime that's in place around those. So the issue you raised will get discussed in that first study group. That's that one. Sounds like there are no other gaps on the table at the moment. So we'll just note the one that Stephen raised as something that he's invited to talk through more with the group at its next meeting, if required. Yeah, Bart?

BART BOSWINKEL

Maybe it's more a question is, if you look at the agenda and one of the things is what will be the next steps of this group. This group is mandated until this meeting, I believe. And it's more, say, we're almost at the end of this cycle. You can imagine one or two more meetings to really wind it up going back to Nick's point. There are plenty of opportunities to discuss it. I think there was a clear indication around Stephen's issue from the group is how far and when will you close that topic. And my advice would be close it because it's, yeah, look at where we are right now. Because

otherwise we have to wait again before informing Council and go to the next phase of, say, this whole process. Thanks.

JORDAN CARTER

So essentially your advice is that we don't think this is a gap and we'll just move on. Okay.

BART BOSWINKEL

Stephen will undoubtedly find a way to raise it again if necessary. But at least as a conclusion of this working group, close it because otherwise you keep the agenda open and open and open.

JORDAN CARTER

Okay, no, I'm comfortable with that. And that's consistent with the discussion we had. So thank you. We'll move on to item 5, which is going to be super brief. There are two sessions that we have, presentation responsibilities. On Tuesday, we will present a wrap up of the group's work to date, and seek any community comments, I guess, in response to those top two priorities and outline that the next step is the chartering of the study groups and calling for volunteers. So hopefully that's very simple.

And then the second thing, the GAC presentation, the ccNSO is spending 90 minutes with the GAC on Wednesday. Half an hour has been assigned to giving them an update on this work. We want the GAC to be aware of it. And so it'll be a distillation of work since the last update in November and telling them what the two priority issues are and that we'll be establishing some study groups

pending the ccNSO Council's decision on that. So that's just to give that steer, hopefully unsurprising and uncontroversial. Slide decks will be in my job tomorrow. Bart?

BART BOSWINKEL

Maybe one more. If you recall, you adopted the, I would say, the overview of all the policies and everything else on the 9th of November. I looked it up, and that's probably something to introduce as well to both the community and advise the Council to maintain it. Because that's one of the working items you had on your agenda.

JORDAN CARTER

Yes, that is a good point. And those of you who have been following through the work will remember that very helpful overview of all of the policies, procedures, guidance, etc. that apply to CC's dealing with IANA. So we can introduce, reintroduce or confirm that's been signed off to people. So that's the remaining items here.

Item 6 on this agenda, we'll move to, the title is slightly confusing because it sounds like the document we were just talking about, but this item is about some work that the group has looked at but not really committed to, where the fragmentation of the core policy documents is an issue that we've skirted around that Kim has raised with us. And that from a user experience point of view is quite difficult, you have to divine the intent of the founders in some ways or look at which bits of RFCs apply or not.

We've done the overview, but there's a question about whether it would be a good idea to pull together a consolidation of the policy, which is not the same thing as guidance about where to find it. It's literally having a one document one piece document, and separately. I think it's more than a year ago, Bart did start to do one and I started to do one. And I haven't connected with you Bart to ask why this is on the agenda today. Is it to show those to the group or to remind them they exist.

BART BOSWINKEL

It's also more say whether you want to continue on that item as well because it was part of your mandate as a working group to and it's the final open item. A one is, I would say this group hasn't discussed it because everybody was focusing on the prioritization and the topics themselves but this was an open item, and we introduced it two meetings ago, I believe. So that's why it's back on the agenda.

JORDAN CARTER

Okay, so the real thing I've been asked for comments on on this is whether you think this is a piece of work that we should continue with or not. And to pull the policy into a document. And with the bias towards that being an administrative process of a restatement of the current policy, not a bias towards the policy development process to reopen the policy. It's an important distinction I see a couple of hands Irina and then Chris and then Peter.

IRINA DANELIA

Thank you, Jordan. This is Irina for the record. My personal opinion is, we should not, because from the first glance, it's sounds like it's great to have the description of all the policies in one place. But I see there are two big risks. First, is it will be really hard to avoid interpretation of the policy. And secondly, the job that you and Bart attempt to do a year ago, it was a really good attempt, but it demonstrates that we will end up with, like, at least 50, maybe 100 pages document, which will be really hard to read and understand. So I think the outline of the policy we have done fits for purpose, and my suggestion would be stop there.

JORDAN CARTER

Thanks, Irina. Chris?

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Thanks, Jordan. This is Chris. Yeah, I agree. I think that at this stage, working on the study groups and figuring out the gaps and etc. etc. is important work. I know it's messy, but the framework of interpretation that we spent God knows how many years on, years of my life I'll never get back, that is there and it does attempt to provide an interpretation of the policy. And as Irina quite rightly says, every time we try and reword stuff, you end up possibly making new policy.

I'm not against doing it. I just don't think we should do it now. I think we should do the work on the study groups, figure out the gaps and then figure out whether or not we actually need to do it consolidation, because of the stuff that's come up from the study

groups is enough of an incentive to do that. That's my view. So I agree with Irina.

JORDAN CARTER

Thanks, Chris. Peter?

PETER KOCH

Yeah, thank you. And I think I'm joining the choir here in a way. I think I understand part of the motivation of that because, of course, there's a lot of documents written at different times, maybe using different parts of the language and so on and so forth. However, with the aspiration, and that makes absolute sense to have this, an administrative task. This is a bit like having a legal text and translating that into another language and in the end, you will have to say, if in doubt, the whatever language prevails, which would mean here that if in doubt, the historic documents, if I may call them that way, would prevail.

And so I don't think there is much of a gain in there. We should probably not mix the task, explaining the documents, as in, you don't rewrite legislation to teach the next cohort of law students. You adapt the textbooks to the spirit of the time. So they understand the context and the historic context, but you don't rewrite. Hopefully you don't rewrite your constitution, so that the law students have an easier job. Actually, they wouldn't, because they would have to go back and interpret that.

So bottom line is, I would recommend we don't touch these documents and don't assume change control over things we don't,

we probably don't have. And leave it as is, because there is a lot of precedent and decisions in that historic context attached to these documents that would be hard to transpose or translate into a fresh document. Thank you.

JORDAN CARTER

Thanks, Peter. Yeah, same, same. Yeah, I'm practically in the same boat. In principle, I think it would be nice to have a new rewrite of like a clean modern policy framework. But getting from here to there is not the top priority of work that we need to do. So it sounds like based on the intervention state that the group's view is to not proceed with that piece of work and to report that finding back to the Council. Is anyone upset with that outcome? And I do mean anyone. Can't quite work out your facial expressions there, Alejandra. Thumbs up. That's good.

Okay, I don't think that's a chunky enough thing to need to make it a two-reading outcome. And to borrow Peter's metaphor, we've written the textbook, because we've done the overview of policies, guidance, etc. And we have said that that needs to be kept up to date.

So I think that closes out item 6, and that takes us to item 7, which is next steps. Bart, I haven't looked at the work plan. Have we got anything else programmed for this? Because I think what we've done now is we've done the prioritization task, we've prepared the overview, and we've decided not to pursue a consolidated policy document, which were the three purposes of this group.

BART BOSWINKEL

Actually, I think we covered it all. So in that sense, the only thing that you need to do now is report that you have the consultation with the community pending, which is happening this week, or Tuesday or Wednesday, I forgot when, and then it's informing Council and recommending the actions. That's probably the final work item and then you can close the working group when they adopt your recommendations.

JORDAN CARTER

I think it would be good to have just one more meeting to do a bit of a retrospective on the process, just to see, to take a quick look back at what we did, and if there are any lessons for what we need to do next. Would it be also useful for this group to review the draft terms of reference for study groups, or is that something that the Council can take care of?

BART BOSWINKEL

My advice is let the Council do this, and you have enough people from this working group who are also in Council, and you can say what we include. So one of the things that we really need to do is report back in properly a one or two-pager, say this is the recommendations, including a proper scoping of the study groups and a working method advice, say, based on the experience of this group. I think this group needs to sign off on it as such.

So my advice would be do two meetings. One is do the document in two readings, and the second one you can use the first meeting

to run through the draft report, which the leadership and staff can prepare. And then the second one would be, say, final reading or second reading of the final report, and do a, yeah, I would say a review of the process itself, and so you can use that as well to inform the council.

JORDAN CARTER

That makes sense. That feels nice and achievable, everyone. And then we will have had a ccNSO working group that was chartered in July, started in August, and finished in April.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Just be careful, we don't want to set a precedent.

JORDAN CARTER

We do. We do want to set a precedent. Irina, your hand's up.

IRINA DANELIA

Just one more topic to discuss by this group might be the feedback we might receive during the meetings this week, next week.

JORDAN CARTER

Yeah, and that's a good point. And the other thing is I think perhaps in that report of closure for the group, one of the things we could identify is if there's any other analysis that the ccNSO should do, like how people should register any gaps they come across,

reminding the Council of the need to keep the overview up to date and so on. So, yeah, so two more meetings and then we're done.

And that is the next steps. We're up to item 8, any other business. Is there any other business from anyone around the table? Does not look like it. In which case, that's our meeting. That's the Policy Gap Analysis Working Group Session. Thank you all for being here. I hope you found it useful or interesting, and we'll see you all around the ICANN meeting. But for now, we're done. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]