
ICANN83 | PF – ccNSO: ccTLD Financial Contributions
Tuesday, June 10, 2025 – 15:30 to 17:00 CEST

CLAUDIA RUIZ

Hello, and welcome to the ccNSO, ccTLD financial contribution session. My name is Claudia Ruiz, and I, along with my colleagues, Joke Braeken and Julie Bisland 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 and the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy. During this session, questions and comments submitted in chat will be read aloud if put in the proper form as noted. Interpretation for this session will include English, Spanish, and French.

If you would like to speak during the session, please raise your hand in Zoom. When called upon, virtual participants will be given permission to unmute in Zoom. On-site participants will use a physical microphone to speak. Please state your name for the record and the language you will speak if you are speaking a language other than English, and please speak at a reasonable pace to allow for accurate interpretation. Thank you, and with that, I will hand the floor over to Alejandra Reynoso, Chair of the ccNSO. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

Thank you, Claudia. This is Alejandra, and welcome everyone to the ccNSO room again. Before we start with the ccTLD financial

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.

contribution session, I would like to give the floor to our dear host, Ondrei, that on behalf of CZ.NIC will give us a presentation.

ONDREI FILIP

Thank you very much, Alejandra. Thank you very much, Alejandra. And let me all welcome you in this, I hope you will agree, beautiful city. We are really excited that after 13 years you return to our country. So, this is probably the most iconic view on Prague, but I'm sure you will see some more of that during this week. Next slide, please.

I was asked to say something about the local registry and not spend too much time on it, so I just chose one specific topic. I guess, you will agree with me when I will say that every ccTLD is different. There are no two others the same. So, I would like to just highlight some of the differences that I think are most important. That are the interesting features of our registry. So, after that, let's see if I will be able to explain you the difference that we have. Next slide, please.

The main kind of feature, the main different view that we have is a kind of strategy and a philosophy. First of all, we are no different than others, we are not for-profit association. We have roughly 1.5 million domains. But maybe one difference, we are really strongly focused on technology and security. So, maybe there's that. It's not surprise that we also put a lot of effort into the DNSSEC signing, so almost two-thirds of domain in under.cz are currently signed.

And with that strong focus, we are really trying to have many other activities. We are not just a registry, we are trying to be active in the

local area, and also, in the global area. We started a lot of project that we believe are good for the Czech Republic, Czech internet, but also, for the good of the internet as such. Some of them later became commercial activities, which I will explain, but never the focus was to start something commercially. No, we are not for-profit. The main focus was to help something, to address some issues.

Also, with kind of that philosophy of being strong and having know-how in technology and security, we also focused a lot on something which is nowadays called the digital sovereignty. Our registry was really trying to be independent, having its own robust infrastructure, redundant. Everything we do is either multi-vendor. We are kind of dependent on commercial companies, or we use a lot of open-source. Also, we produce a lot of open-source. So, that was our philosophy, try not to have a vendor lock-in, keep all the know-how in-house, and also, we use almost no clouds, no outsourcing.

This philosophy goes to that extent that almost nobody in the company has any other operating system. The Linux, for example, all the people working for CZ.NIC are using Linux. Even because we are also producing hardware, even the Wi-Fi in the company is covered by our own hardware. So, we are really trying to have them as much as possible in-house. Next slide, please.

Now, of course, the kind of flagship of our open-source development is our registry. As I said, we develop it for ourselves only. At the beginning, we had no other ambition, but since we made it open-source, many other registries, either with our help, but sometimes

even just independent of us started to use it. So, you can see the list of countries that are using [inaudible] registry. And again, it's completely open-source, completely in no hands. Next slide, please.

Then I spoke about infrastructure. So, just two sentences about it. You cannot see, but if you would see the detail, you would see that it's very robust infrastructure. The main backbone is run on 400 gigabit internet. So, it's really a very strong infrastructure, not just in the Czech Republic, but as you can see around the world. The total capacity of the DNS is more above one terabyte of DNS traffic. So, I don't say it saves everything, but we are really ready for quite high DDoS attacks.

And also, that is one of the reasons that this kind of infrastructure is used by the other registries as well. Although even those registry that are experiencing more times like Ukraine, for example. So we built it for ourselves again, so maybe we can give some capacity to the others. Next slide, please.

There's a lot of projects you have never heard of because they cannot touch you at all. Those were really meant to be for the local community, for the Czech Republic. First of all, we are running the national [inaudible] team of the country. So, we are kind of in charge of many security incidents in the country. We are running a national identification service called, MojID in our country. There's multiple identification, electronic identification services. BankID, which is known, for example, in Nordic countries. We have alternative to that.

We have also some open-source software for the locals, for communication with the government. That's the logo [inaudible]. We organize a lot of conferences locally like IPv6 Day. That's again tied with our technical focus. CSNOG, Czech and Slovak Network Operators Group. We are printing books and also, we are running the so-called Safer Internet Center of the Czech Republic, which is EU subsidized project to prevent child abuse. So, we are producing a lot of materials for small children, for kids, and even a little bit grown kids to prevent child abuse.

And with that, one of the movie series that we co-produce, Martyisdead won an Emmy award. It was first time of this country when some movie series won an Emmy award, so it was really great success for us. So, this is roughly the amount of audio and video we produce, but mostly locally, so you have never heard about it. Let's move to something you might have heard about. Next slide, please.

And this is the open-source project we do. I mentioned FRED already, but as you know, we have two high-speed DNS daemons, Knot Resolver, which is obviously a DNS resolver and KNOT DNS. We kind of believe we are the fastest in the world, but it's a huge competition I'm running, so I will save that claim for later. And also, the internet daemon called BIRD, which is the open-source implementation of BGP, USB for all the routing protocols, which is currently used almost in all exchange points in the world. I would say it's way above 80 percent of the world's exchange points, so really very popular software that runs there as a route server.

So those are the projects that you probably heard about, and we are quite famous for them. Maybe one more, which is not so visible. ADAM, it's for the analysis of DNS. Also, very nice tool if you want to analyze what's happening inside your DNS ecosystem. Next slide, please.

And last but not least, we are also producing hardware, as I mentioned. Again, this didn't start as a production of hardware. It started as a security research, since we had, and repeat it again, a strong security focus, and we are running the national cybersecurity team. We wanted to have probes in the network to analyze the traffic inside many networks, so that's why we created a home router, which we would be able to put to their homes.

And from that, suddenly it became a little bit more commercial activity, so now we are selling those routers at quite high price, but they are made in European Union, so they are popular by some group of users. So, that's probably the most expensive toy, but we like that project.

There will be a new version next month, which will run on 10 gigabit internet speed, so it's quite nice home router if you just think about it, if your home is ready for that. But that's what's going to come soon. Next slide.

And I'm slowly going to the conclusion of the presentation. As I said, none of these activities started kind of as commercial. But many evolved in that. For example, we provide deny lists and filtering of DNS resolvers. Obviously, we are collecting data from tourist

network. We are collecting data from the national cybersecurity team, so we provide deny lists. And also, we implement them into the DNS resolver. We develop and we run it on the infrastructure we have. So, that's a service we offer many companies, not just in Czech Republic, but also abroad.

Also, with that, we are very close to the identification system. We are running an eID node for the Czech Republic. If you are not familiar with that, all the electronic identification system in Europe are compatible. They are so-called eIDAS-Nodes that can transfer one identity to another country. So, we are running for the Czech government one of those. Again, with the knowledge of CSIRT of the cyber team, we are offering, penetrating, testing, scanning webs and finding some common issues on the website.

All the open-source software I mentioned, many people request support for those, because they are responsible companies, and if they are using some components, they want to pay for the support, especially the BIRD daemon is very successful commercially. It brings much more money than we invested it. So, that's also a very good example how something that started just for the good of the internet now returns. And we use those money for other projects, of course.

I already mentioned Anycast, so yeah, sure, we provide it. And also, we do some other things like we use Anycast for so-called VIP domains. If we are a registrar in .cz and you want to have really domain with good support and with perfect Anycast network, you can pay quite a reasonable amount of money. It's like 800 times more

than normally, and then your domain will be hosted on our Anycast. So, that's another source of income.

We also do auctions of the domain that expire. And last but not least, we are chosen also to be a provider for .gov.cz, which is the domain that is now being used or starting to be used by the Czech government for all governmental services. It's part of a much future project where they try to unite all the websites or the external interfaces of the government websites to the public. So that's it. So basically, that's how we work, how we operate. I know it was a little bit quick, but I don't think I have space. And also, you are interested in any details. But if you are interested, you can have some questions. So next slide, please.

Well, what is the budget impact? That's probably kind of a bridge how we can move to a financial session. Currently, the income from domains consists just for the first 54 percent of our income. So, the rest, 46 is done by the other activity. So, we are slowly being a registry attached to some other activities then vice versa. So, we are slowly moving to have more income from other activities than from the domain. It's just coincidence. But when it comes to the people, which, of course, is the biggest cost of our registry, it's roughly the same. Roughly 55 percent of our people are working inside the registry and rest 45 in other activities.

This is not very [inaudible]. It's just coincidence. Of course, for example, the money, the income from hardware has different margins than income from services. So, it's not easy to compare what

belongs to what. And also, I said many people are working on not-for-profit activities. That doesn't have any income at all. But that's roughly how the company is organized, and what are the activities we do. So that is all from my side. If you have any questions, I'm happy to answer.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

Thank you, Ondrei, very impressive presentation. Anyone has any question for Ondrei? I don't see any hands up nor in the Zoom room, but I think you have a few more things to say.

ONDREI FILIP

Absolutely, Alejandra. Next slide, please.

I have one more thing, and you can also see how we use those money. We joined together EURid. The registry for .eu in [inaudible], Zurich and Greek. And we are together organizing today's cocktail party. So, you are welcome to join it. We will be happy to host you. And I have quite important announcements. Since I said our company is really much focused on the security. This country is as well. And unfortunately, today there will be anti-terrorist exercise on the on the castle. So, if you will see a lot of police cars and everything around you, just don't be afraid. It's a part of the exercise.

Also, parts of the castle will be closed. They're closing them now from 3:00 to 9:00, so if you wanted to walk there, just check that the pass is walkable that time. After party, you will be able to walk through the castle freely. We will be in a little bit separate part of the castle in the

garden. So, there will be probably no noise, nothing. But just in case you see some police maneuvers, don't be afraid. Nothing is happening in this country. Thank you very much.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE

Now, you think Ondrei's talked the truth, but we talk about financial contributions. So, police exercises for another reason this evening.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

But all jokes aside, thank you. Thank you, Ondrei. Let's dive in now into the financial contribution session. Today, we will address what this working group is all about, the cost model. We will explain that in a little bit more detail. Also, all the results in the fact-finding exercise that we did. And a quick walk-through the updated guideline and principles with independent model. And finally, we will have next steps and closure.

With that, I would like to draw your attention that we will be using Mentimeter today as well. So, it's already on the top of these slides, the code. So, if you would like to get there already and have it at hand when we use it, it would be great. If not, we will still show the QR code later. With that, let's move on to the next slide.

So, what is this about? The second ccNSO Financial Working Group has objectives to review, explore and propose financial contribution models that are fair and equitable. Encourage ccTLDs to contribute at

a level deemed reasonable, and preserve the principle of voluntary contributions. Next slide, please.

With this, we move on to the cost model. And for this, I would like to give the microphone to Shani, who is joining us remotely.

SHANI QUIDWAI

Hi, everyone. Thank you for having me. The next few slides will walk through an overview of the cost model. The figures here in 2013, were developed a while back. The working group that we've formed has been meeting over the last few months to better understand how that model was developed, and essentially refine it for what made the most sense now. Overall, it largely resembles the prior cost model, but we have made some modifications where it made sense.

We'll go through each of the cost categories in more detail, but we essentially break them into different types of costs based on how clear and easy it is to measure them, starting with specific costs. Those are very clear, very easy to track and attribute and highlight kind of the value that they bring to the CCs.

Next, we have shared costs. These are costs that ICANN incurs for the benefit of CCs as well as the Gs, and we take a portion of those and allocate them to the CCs, acknowledging the fact that there is value for the country codes. Lastly, we have shared costs, which is an in-kind kind of service, essentially an offset where we're acknowledging that there is a direct value being brought to ICANN, and this offsets the calculation.

And then lastly, we have costs that essentially you can't measure. However, we acknowledge them and call them out. These are called global costs. An example of that is that ccTLDs strengthen ICANN's legitimacy within the multistakeholder model, and that ICANN provides ccTLDs access to a global platform. Both of those are considered a key value that is not—it's very hard to measure. So, we highlight them, but we don't include them in the calculation.

Overall, looking at the calculation, the total cost model we produced is \$3.6 million, which is fairly similar to the figure that had been produced before. And this amount is higher, slightly higher than the contributions that we have been receiving over the past few years. And Alejandra will provide more breakouts into that.

So, if we move to the next page, here's some specific details into the specific costs. The specific costs, as I mentioned, these directly relate and support the ccTLDs. This consists of the Policy Development Support Team, the Secretariat Support Team, and the Direct Travel Support that ICANN provides CCs at ICANN meetings. ICANN provides travel support for approximately 220 attendees to each ICANN meeting, each of the three public ICANN meetings. Seventeen out of those 220 are for the CCs.

And then lastly, there is an overhead calculation here. Essentially, this is the overall infrastructure and support that ICANN is providing. This is part of the calculation. Overall, when you compare these costs to the prior cost model that was developed, this is the cost piece that has grown the most, and that's primarily due to inflation. When the

prior calculation model was done roughly 12 to 13 years ago, the overall structure of the costs that we identified as part of the specific costs are generally the same. However, those costs have risen over the past 10 to 15 years due to inflation.

If we could move to the next page, we'll go into details on the shared costs. Shared costs are activities and categories that benefit ccTLDs and others in the ecosystem. So, therefore, we don't take the total costs here. What we've done in all of this information is provided in the ICANN budgets that are on the website. We take a portion of the governance costs, a portion of ICANN meetings costs, the IANA naming function costs, and IDN costs. And so, you can see those figures here, and then in the following pages, I'll provide a little bit more detail on how much of those costs are being attributed to the CCs in this cost model.

So, on the next page here, you can see the governance costs of \$660,000.

Ultimately, the way these were allocated, if we can move to the next page. The governance costs include the board support, the Nominating Committee, or NOMCOM, Ombudsman. Overall, these costs are projected to be \$5.3 million in the ICANN fiscal '26 budget. The ICANN fiscal year starts from July and runs through June. So fiscal year '26 would be July 2025 through June 2026. These governance costs for all of ICANN are \$5.3 million. In this cost model, we have taken 12 percent of those and essentially attributed or assigned that value to the CCs, and that translates to 660,000 US.

The 12 percent is developed by essentially looking at the number of voting board members on the ICANN board. And so, there are two CCNSO elected board members out of the 16 board members, and that translates to 12 percent. So, overall, 12% of those costs are included in the calculation here.

Next, we have the three public ICANN meetings. Those costs total \$870,000. And so, this is an acknowledgement of the overall costs and kind of the value that come from an ICANN meeting, the staffing and logistics, and the venue and things like that needed to run an ICANN meeting. This excludes the piece of costs that we've already attributed in category one, which was the Direct Travel Support. So overall, we take 6 percent of those costs. The 6 percent is derived by looking at the number of attendees at an ICANN meeting that are coming from the CC community as a percentage of the total. And so, on average, we've been seeing roughly 125 members attend out of the close to 2,000. We can move to the next page.

Next, we have the IANA naming function. These costs are projected to be \$5.4 million in fiscal '26. There are other costs associated with IANA. There is a separate operating plan and budget that is posted in the ICANN website. Because of the direct value specifically on the naming side, these are the costs that the group felt were the most appropriate to take. And so, we've taken a portion of those. Essentially, we're looking at the number of TLDs within the route that are CCs as a percentage of the total TLDs. And so, you can see that that's 21 percent.

There are 309 ccTLDs compared with the total TLDs of 1445. And so overall, the naming costs are projected to be \$5.4 million next year. And we take 21 percent of those and attribute those in the cost model, and that translates to nearly \$1.2 million.

Lastly, on this slide here, we have IDN costs of \$420,000. This is within the ICANN budget. There is a specific portion of our operating plan that covers this. And you can see here that this includes things like staff and third-party time to do researchers and panelists work. Overall, ICANN projects to have a million dollars in IDN costs next year. We take 40 percent of those costs and attribute them to the ccNSO based on the fact that there are 61 CC IDNs out of the total 151. Next page.

So, before we move to this section, I just kind of wanted to highlight that shared area that we went through, you can see that overall, what we did as a group was try to identify those costs that benefit the CCs and those types of activities that benefit CCs, and then try to identify a driver or a way to allocate a portion of those costs because clearly those costs are being incurred and there's a greater benefit than just the CCs. And so overall, this was the consensus that we came up that this was a reasonable way to identify certain types of costs and find a way to allocate or attribute a value to the CCs.

Moving to this next category, these are host in-kind service costs. This is essentially an offset or reduction to the cost model because we acknowledge and wanted to account for the fact that CCs and hosting countries specifically at ICANN meetings provide a lot of value, incur

a lot of costs and do a lot of activities that are benefiting ICANN meetings in the ICANN mission. And so, this has been estimated at \$600,000, but quite honestly, from all the feedback within the group, it's quite volatile.

It really depends on the region, and where the meeting is being hosted, and the level of effort and service that the host is providing to an ICANN meeting. But over time, this was an average that made sense, and what we ultimately agreed on. But you can see specific examples where this cost per meeting could be a little higher or even lower in some cases.

Next, and final category is section four. These are costs that we didn't measure. Ultimately, these types of costs are hard to measure, but considered mutually equivalent in this type of a model. And these types of examples are things that are hard to quantify, such as the fact that the benefit that ICANN gets from having CCs attend ICANN meetings and be part of the ICANN community ultimately strengthens and provides legitimacy to the multi-stakeholder model. And then also for CCs, ICANN providing access to this global platform to conduct work brings a lot of value and helps the CCs operate their country codes.

So, at this time, I'll pause to see if there's any questions or comments. Otherwise, I think, Alejandra will start with some of the Mentimeter.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

Thank you very much, Shani. Do we have any questions for Shani regarding the cost model? Roelof?

ROELOF MEIJER

To be honest, not a question, just a compliment. I think this is solid work, and I like the rationale behind it. So, compliments to the team who did this.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

Thank you very much, Roelof. Anybody else? If not, seeing no hands up, then can we go to the next slide?

So, as mentioned in the beginning, we will be using Mentis. So, if you didn't join us at the beginning, you can join now. I would like to take the opportunity while you do that, to remind you that this is a summary of the chair's report that I shared with you recently. So, if this sounds familiar, it's because it's that exactly. But we want to get your feedback and check with you if everything is okay with that.

All right. So, in your view, is the cost model reasonable? And we added a tiny table, so you can tell what we are talking about. We need to confirm this with you, so the work can move forward. Also, in one of the questions from the survey, there were some not sure. Also, when we asked in Seattle, they were not sure. That's why we wanted to explain it today in detail, so it would be clear. Now, while you still answer, I see that there are some still not sure. So, if anyone would

like to tell us why, we would appreciate it a lot to see if there's any room for improvement. Pierre?

PIERRE DANDJINOU

Thank you. I was one of those who voted for not sure even if I'm almost sure. That's okay. The only thing is that, I think there is a pure equivalence between the specific cost of the ccNSO on one side and the specific cost of what we all use even if we are not in the ccNSO, which is the route. And to me, this is unclear because the IANA function has been the second part, I guess, shared cost. But it's unclear to me what is the part of the IANA function in the shared cost. That's why I said that I was not very sure.

And we had this discussion last ICANN when there was a distinction between the domain name IANA function and the IP IANA function, and I was not very sure that it was a good way of moving forward.

BART BOSWINKEL

May I try to address it or otherwise, Xavier. Let me give a first shot and then you can chime in. If you go back, and this goes back almost to the transition. If you see, for example, the way IANA is working at the end of the day, yes, they have three main tasks. One is naming, secondly is IPs, and thirdly, is protocols. It's very clearly that it is of value to everybody, but it is of value, and that's I think the core of the [inaudible] is of a value to everybody.

However, and that's what the CCs always said, they want to participate or contribute financially proportionate. So, then you need

to start thinking, okay, what is the proportion that is really, really, really, really relevant for CCs? And that's the naming function. This is where IANA performs services, actions, activities and everything. This morning was a clear example, again, whether you assist us in all the ccNSO in developing its work. So, then you start to develop it.

So, this is not a recognition that it is separate. You can separate it out. This is just under the expectation that others pay a share, their share as well. So, that's why it's called shared. And it's not that you can separate it out and say, OK, we take this bit and we put it somewhere else. See if we can for the ccNSO or ccTLD related naming function we can find somebody else. That is the understanding. And once you go down that path, you need to find a reasonable algorithm to put some money or allocate money to it. And that's what we try to explain on the shared cost thing.

PIERRE DANDJINOU

Thank you. I go to yes.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

Thank you, Pierre. Any other? Oh, no. Okay. Well, with that, seeing no more hands up, I think we can move to the next slide, please.

So, here, I'm getting a little bit already into the fact findings, but I wanted to show just after this that from the survey results, what did the respondents say regarding the cost model? So, as you can see, it's very similar to the to the graphic right now, but it's mostly on the yes

and very few minority that no. Let's dive into the next one already. So, talking about fact findings, and let's go to the next one, please.

There were three instances where we gathered feedback. One was to analyze the data that we had available to us, and we saw an overview of the contributions over time. We saw them overall as ccTLD community, then [inaudible] region. Also, per governance category, per ccNSO membership versus non-membership, also per agreement and non-agreement just to see what we could find from the data.

Later, we showed you this data in Seattle, and we gathered feedback regarding motivations to contribute. We try to understand why there was a variation with a with the contributions of CCTLDs over time, and any general feedback that we could gather on your opinion on this topic. Finally, we did a survey. This survey, we had a 41 ccTLDs that participated. It is important to note, that there was a high representation of ccTLDs from the private sector. Also, more on the European region. Also, ccTLDs that are currently participants or active or engaged in the ccNSO activities, and also, contributing ccTLDs. It's worth nothing the bias of the information, but still it's information very valuable. Let's go to the next slide.

So, this is where we started with the data. This is the representation of the amount of contribution through the years, and the number of ccTLDs that contributed that year. As it was mentioned also in the mailing list, it is not the same ccTLDs that contributed each year. So, the fact that we see, let's say, 51 in 2016 and then, 62 in 2017 doesn't mean it's the same 51 that are there, and we added more. Sometimes

it varies. They either skip one year or they appear later, but it gives us an overall understanding that we have not achieved the desired contribution level that was set in 2013, that it was 3.58 million. We are under 2.5 million overall. Next slide, please.

So, from our session in Seattle, this is a summary of what we heard from you regarding motivations to contribute financially to ICANN. There was a support for ICANN's mission and values related to the multistakeholder model of internet governance, shared responsibility and fairness toward the sustainability of the ICANN ecosystem, community engagement and knowledge exchange as a value, capacity building that benefits smaller or developing ccTLDs, operational and strategic importance due to ICANN's role in the DNS security and the global interconnection.

There were some structural suggestions as a proposal of the—English is difficult, sorry. Differentiated fee bands. And there was also a minority of responses that expressed a skepticism or opposition to the model. Next slide, please.

So, with that information, we went to the survey and we wanted to confirm broadly because we didn't know if everyone had access to the session itself, which of the following statements resonated with them for the ccTLDs, and it was clearly confirmed that ccTLDs support the IANA function, value security and stability, benefits from the ccNSO in many ways, that they support the ICANN mode stakeholder model, and they also benefit from ICANN public meetings. Next slide, please.

In Seattle, we also asked, what would you change about the contribution model? So, there was some support for refinement and fairness regarding the band tiers. It was mentioned to introduce more bands or more graduation of tiers. There were suggestions of alternative approaches, maybe multi-year commitments or per registration model. There were some critical views. Some minority questioned the effectiveness of the voluntary model itself. Some were also satisfied with the current model, that no changes were needed and that the model itself is not the issue.

But the overall feedback does reflect a willingness to improve for greater fairness and sustainability and an acknowledgement of its limitations. Are we okay? Okay. Just checking the sound. Okay. Moving on. Can we go to the next slide?

So, as you saw from Seattle, we took also part of that feedback into the survey. There was this mentioning several times about to have a difference in bands. So, we tested it out in the survey and instead of asking the participants to check which current band model they were, we proposed the following ones that are shown there. And it was very interesting to see that from the participants, we had at least one ccTLD per category. So, this shows that this could be a potential improvement in the banded model. Next slide, please.

So, another thing we got from the Seattle was why your ccTLD changed its contribution over time to understand that. So, some said that the increases were tied to the growth and they wanted to be aligned with the guidelines. So, that's why they increased their

contribution. There were recognitions of value and responsibility. They were decreases due to internal and external factors. Some said there was organizational restructuring, limited resources, or inconsistent invoicing. Others mentioned dissatisfaction with ICANN's action or behavior.

There was a message there also of evolving trust and reassessment, though there was suggestion for caution and conditional approach to start contributing. And some were either neutral or unclear with why they changed. But overall, we had diverse messages. But the underscoring importance was transparency, responsiveness, and continued dialogue between ICANN and the ccTLD community. So, this took us to the next slide.

It's another question that we added in the survey and whether it was appropriate for ICANN to follow up with the ccTLD in case their contribution decreased. Not for the purposes of reaching out to request additional money, but to understand the situation, and many thought that was a good idea because the way we understood it from Seattle is that sometimes messages were trying to be delivered by changing the contribution, or there were some technical issues that could have been solved if ICANN had reached out to check what was going on. Next slide, please.

So, in summary, overall, of the survey, the respondents appreciate ICANN's efforts to collect feedback and acknowledge the complexity of the issue. Additionally, the path forward must involve better financial transparency, tailored engagement and flexible

contributions, a renewed emphasis on trust and value exchange, and responsible, efficient budgeting to reassure the community. Next slide, please.

So, overall, the fact finding, some key observations by the finance working group are that voluntary contributions, of course, are supported by the community. They are perceived as fair, transparent and value-based. Financial transparency is key. The working group will inform the ccNSO SOPC to ensure oversight of ICANN's budgeting and planning as they already are doing, but still let them know the community supports this. Engagement and trust recommends ICANN organization to actively engage with ccTLD managers, promoting contributions based on mutual value and the proposed guideline.

And with this, I finished the summary of the fact finding. I will stop here to check if there are any questions or comments. All right, seeing no hands up, neither here or in Zoom, let's move to the next slide. With this, we will now walk through the proposed guideline. And I'll ask Bart to do so. Please, Bart.

BART BOSWINKEL

Thank you, Alejandra. And maybe just for those, and just going back a little bit about the survey, if you're really interested, you strongly advise to read the report, the draft or the chair's report. It includes a lot of detailed information about the different governance model and how it may or may not impact, for example, the financial

contributions, which becomes relevant if you look into the guideline itself, the proposed guideline. So, next slide, please.

Its proposed changes, it's highlighting the proposed guideline effectively. The real highlights are that the voluntary contributions remain as the core element of the guideline. So, emphasize the voluntary nature of the financial contributions. That's what the working group took away from the survey, the discussions, and also, from its mandate. So, there is no change. A fair compensation, that is what the working group took away as well. ICANN should be reasonably compensated, especially for supporting DNS security and stability and its IANA naming function role.

That's again a core finding the working group took away and that we will see reflected in the proposed guideline, and the diverse context of ccTLDs acknowledge the varied operational environments. It also means, say, take into account the way they decide, etc. So again, that's been taking into account, and active engagement. Recommend ICANN to reach out to ccTLDs.

The way the working group discussed this is, and you can all imagine is, if there is a guideline and you don't hear anything, but only once a year you receive an invoice from an entity you may or may not hear it, the first thing you question is, who is this coming from? So that was more or less the thinking model that you will see and that will be reflected in the adjusted guideline or updates. So, can we go to the next slide, please?

So, the major changes are highlighted here. Again, what has changed is in the current guideline, the principles, especially the principles about the voluntary contributions, et cetera are somewhere embedded in the language. They have now been emphasized, so as principle two and the re-conformation that's the intention is that both say the value exchange model, that's the starting point of the whole discussion. The value ICANN brings to ccTLDs and the value CCs bring to ICANN. That's the starting point and then it's the voluntary nature is a second, I would say, starting point. These are the really, really preconditions.

Then the value exchange model itself, the specific shared and global value categories, you saw this as part of the cost model and it's been developed cooperatively as the basis to allocate expenditures. You've seen the results and then it's re-conformation of this as well in that sense. And now there is, say, based on the feedback received, it's made more explicit that ICANN should be reasonably compensated for the costs, say the specific ones and the shared ones. That's the next principles.

In the previous or in the current guideline, this is less explicit. So, in that sense, it's more a moral call upon ccTLDs to take this into account. So, this number four. Can we go to the next page, please?

There you can see the number five as well. So, it's recognized that ICANN undertakes these expenditures both in the specific and shared areas for the IANA naming functions, and also, the policy development role of the CC is always funded, et cetera, by ICANN. And

these are all benefiting the ccTLD managers and ccTLD operations. Again, so this is made more explicit in the proposed guideline. And finally, again, a re-conformation of the contribution model that it's based on and takes into consideration the domain names under management. And what is important to understand, and the working group did receive feedback around the domain names under management.

And also, if you look at the [inaudible] model is the final sentence you see in front of you. At the end of the day, it's bilateral between ICANN and the ccTLDs how much is contributed. And secondly, what is related is the point that if you once reach a threshold, it doesn't mean that you all at once need to go say, double your financial, your contributions. It should be gradual taking into account the differences, et cetera. Can we go to the next page?

So, principle number nine is similar and what is currently in the guideline. This might be especially relevant for ccTLDs who are both an ASCII and IDN ccTLD. And number 10 is the bit I said. This is, again, one-on-one from the current guideline. So, once you hit or reaching a higher band faced in adjustment. So, there is not the issue. Some people mentioned this in the survey, said what happens if I, for example, have 10 domain names more than is in the band. No, you have time to adjust, and there is time to adjust. You want stability instead of, let's say, fluctuation.

And then I think the major change if you compare it with the current model is, as I said, one of the conclusions was, yeah, if you have

somebody sending you an invoice once a year, and you don't know about this existence, that's not inviting. What is suggested, and it's very clear, say, from the working group to ICANN is that to use or to reach out prior to invoicing, and just checking like what you do with every account, check-in on a regular basis, and explain what you will receive, and why you will receive anything.

So, it's almost account management, and you would be very familiar, and you will avoid the situations like we had in Seattle that people for whatever reason did not receive an invoice for three years because there were changes in the registry or that people moved, et cetera. So, this is a way to address that major issue. And we do also, and the working group also recognized, and you see it in the chair's report, turn this into a little bit of a targeted approach.

There is a difference in approaching a ccTLD that's run by a government, and they have another budget cycle, and they have other sign-off signature lines, et cetera, than I would say a private company in approaching these ccTLDs, take this into account, and be aware with whom you talk, and you need to tell another story to the one group and the other, and there is a difference in the regions as well, as you will see in the chair's report.

So, that's the addition that's the underlying thinking of the additional recommendation or principle in the guideline. Next slide, please. Yeah. Oh, wait. Oh, yeah. First questions, comments? Yeah, go ahead, Roelof.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO Can we go back one slide, please?

ROELOF MEIJER Can we go back two slides, please?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO Oh, well, another one, please? Back.

ROELOF MEIJER I have two questions. The first one is about this number eight. I think that the non-yellow text is existing text in the present document, right? It's strange. Strikes me as a bit—I'm not a native speaker, so maybe I misinterpret, but should continue to be determined between ICANN and the individual ccTLD manager that somehow, to my feeling, kind of takes away the one-sided voluntary decision over ccTLD. Determined between kind of suggests that you have to come to an agreement with ICANN. But it's your text, maybe I just misinterpret, or maybe Xavier is very happy with that phrase because he suddenly starts laughing.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO It was not meant that way. It was mostly to stress that it's not between the ccNSO and the ccTLD to have that relationship, but rather the ccTLD and ICANN to have that relationship.

ROELOF MEIJER

Yeah, okay. That's a perfect bridge to my second point. I'm happy with all the changes, and I think it's good that ICANN itself interacts more with the individual ccTLD about the contribution. But up till now, the ccNSO or the ccNSO Council or the finance working group, we have been taking some responsibility to kind of talk to our peers, talk to the whole group, that it is important that we contribute. And I think that we—or I feel that we should continue to do so because sometimes a friendly nudge by a peer works better than a friendly nudge by the organization that's on the receiving end of the payment.

BART BOSWINKEL

I think you captured the reason for making the language stronger about should be reason be compensated. That was the underlying thinking that say there is a certain responsibility from peers to peers that ICANN should be compensated for.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE

Exactly.

ROELOF MEIJER

Let's have the interactions on the individual basis with ICANN, but also, let's continue to address this subject every now and then to discuss how we do it. Good work. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

Thank you, Roelof. Pierre?

PIERRE DANDJINOU

Thank you. Can we go back one slide, please? On the fourth. Yeah. Just to question, not sure that giving the example of ccNSO PDPs pertaining to the IANA function. I'm not very sure I follow this idea for two reasons. The first one is that, I guess, that some ccNSO PDPs may pertain to something else than the IANA function. No, that's not possible. They are always pertaining to IANA function, and only the IANA function, nothing else.

BART BOSWINKEL

There is no other policy rule for the ccNSO.

PIERRE DANDJINOU

So, okay. No problem. But maybe that's a problem for us, but we are not doing so much PDPs in the ccNSO. So, in the event that we don't adopt any PDP in the next five years, for instance, which is likely, will we have less to pay to ICANN?

BART BOSWINKEL

It goes back to—this is for example, that's one. Secondly, it goes back to, say, the core reasons for having these direct costs. It also pertains to travel funding. You can strike travel funding, for example. You can strike me. You can strike staff support. That's captured. But that's the reason. But if you really drill down to it, why does the ccNSO, its core function is policy development and providing the platform to ccTLDs?

And if we do it, then this is the priority, and that's my role in life to support these PDP.

PIERRE DANDJINOU

You're right. I don't want to be too long about that. But really, we mix the two ideas of one part of the contribution is going to the function of the ccNSO, which includes the elaboration of PDPs. And because you have the IANA function in it, it's mixed with something else. But no, I can live with that. That was just one point.

BART BOSWINKEL

And going back to Roelof 's point, what I've noticed, look, this was—we saw your hand, Xavier. This is for the room. That's why you just saw the chair's report, not the report for the working group. I think what is necessary that the working group needs to review and very closely in close reading the guiding principles. I saw some issues that they wanted to inform you, and use this session to get your feedback. So, that's why it happened this way.

PIERRE DANDJINOU

And just another very, very quick editorial point on point six. I'm not native speaker, but on 0.6, next slide. I think we missed a word somewhere. It's work to ensure and in support of the security and stability. I'm not very sure that I understand this part. But maybe I'm mistaken. If it's just editorial, I don't think you have to review it.

Maybe I'm mistaken or not, but this is not something to give to a committee.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

Thank you for the feedback. We will check that it's as clear as possible. Xavier?

XAVIER CALVEZ

On Roelof's point about the mutual agreement, there is a mutual agreement. You agreed to contribute and we agreed to receive it. As long as we can get the money on the bank accounts. The joke aside, I know that there's a few members of the ccNSO that have indicated that while willing to issue a payment to ICANN, sometimes they have limitations, practically speaking, to do it. So, that's something we want to be able to address in those specific cases.

I think the notion of PDP was more about the capability of a function of PDP development rather than a per unit cost of each policy. We wouldn't want to modify the model on the volume of hours put into PDPs, if you see what I'm saying. So, I think it's more about the principled capability than the quantity of a function. In combining both Roelof's and Pierre's points, I want to be really careful with the engagement, further engagements of ICANN with the CCs, because then Pierre is going to find them there. We reach out too much to his team, and he's going to reduce his contribution again.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

Thank you, Xavier. And Nick? Oh, Bruce, then Nick.

BRUCE TONKIN

Thanks, Bruce Tonkin. I don't know whether English is my native language or not. I'm going to say I'm Australian. With respect to clause or line six there, just running about the term compensated. One thought that occurs to me is that, often when you're looking for contributions, sometimes they can be cashed and sometimes they can be—in Australia, we use the term in-kind, because I can imagine that for some organizations, and some ccTLDs it may not be easy to provide a cash contribution, but they might provide a contribution in terms of people or labor.

An example for me is I know each meeting we have ever had managing and preparing tech day. It's a significant contribution. I just wonder whether you give it a little bit more scope beyond just cash. The terminology could be, at a minimum, should receive financial or in-kind support for its work.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

Thank you, Bruce. Good idea. Nick?

NICK WENBAN-SMITH

Yeah. Hi, Nick Wenban-Smith. I was wondering whether a guideline or an aspect which might focus into an individual ccTLD's decision as to its voluntary contribution would be the macroeconomic environment, because certainly, one of the factors I look at when I'm

talking internally at Nominet about the voluntary contributions would be, what's ICANN's surplus at the moment, and is it operating fiscally positive, or what's its outlook?

In a situation, say, post the IANA transition where a lot of the reserves had been run down, I think responsible registries were thinking actually, this is a situation where actually ICANN is operating in a sort of fiscally strained environment, or when there's a deficit. But when, for example, on the last third quarter figures, it seems that this fiscal year is going to produce a surplus in the region of \$12 million. Then in that case, us topping up our voluntary contributions would appear to make the overall fiscal surplus for ICANN and its non-profit thing worse. So, that is something that I think individual ccTLDs—well, certainly this individual ccTLD takes into account.

The other thing is that, it's only after the figures have been published for the whole of the ccTLDs, and what they actually contributed for the previous fiscal year do you know whether or not the full contribution is going to be made, or how much of the shortfall versus the allocated cost versus the recommended contributions are. I was just wondering whether it's better to get a bit more transparency on an ongoing basis as opposed to just waiting until after all the figures are in. So, those are two points. You don't have to answer them now.

The third question I was going to ask about these guidelines, and are we going to have a vote on them, or how do they get cemented, or is it simply the council will agree to reserve a period for comment? Because I think as a native English speaker, I am a genuine native

English speaker, I promise, I could take issues with some of the Americanization. But I think there could be a bit of editing, because I think there's quite a lot of words in there which are not very meaningful, but help to dilute, I think, what you're trying to get at for the purposes of these. I will shut up now. Thank you.

BART BOSWINKEL

Can we go to slide number 27 to some of the points? In the sense, Nick, they're all very valid, but at one point you need to make a choice. In slide 27, say some key observations by the finance working group. I can mention them. There you go. At the end of the day, and I think that's very important, the work of the finance working group is really coming up with this model and encouraging people. If you go down the path, what you just mentioned, it's about the reserves and how ICANN is spending, et cetera, that's really out of scope. And I think if this is a real concern for ccTLDs, then they should really engage and get involved in the SOPC, because they really look into the details, and I think a very good example was, I would say, two or three weeks ago, with the change of say when the adopted budget. Because of the SOPC, that process begets more transparent and you understand what is happening.

So, if this is a real concern, including the general overall operational spending, et cetera, is that a concern for a ccTLD? This is probably out of scope. That is out of scope of this particular working group, but there is space for this, definitely, and it's a long-standing committee

that works on it. That's the SOPC, and I think they've proven their value over time, but that's me.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

We still have a queue of people. So, we have Hilde, Irina and then Roelof.

HILDE THUNEM

Thank you. Hilde Thunem from Norid. That's the just say .no domain. First of all, I think the Finance Working Group has done a very good job in making an understandable model of sort of how to fairly share costs. And there are so many places we could decide to quibble, like, okay, in governance. Well, both we and the gTLDs get two board members, but they use a lot more board space in all their cases. But if you go down that route, I think you get bogged into details.

I think the sort of principle of how to think about how to share costs is good. I do like the focus on contributing to IANA. I think that's the easy agreement, is that, yes, the naming function is something that it's a service we all benefit from having. We can talk about how much value we get out of this circus. I think all of us here thinks it's valuable because that's why we come. But at least the IANA naming function is definitely something of value for all ccTLDs.

What I would suggest, as also not a native speaker, is that at the end of the day, when you are sure you have all the input, is to really work on the structure of the most important principles first, and then clean up the language. Do not let ChatGPT do their job, but sort of make it

into something that is easy for the 200 ccTLDs that are not contributing. I mean, one-third of the ccTLDs are contributing with about 60 percent of the cost we have calculated that needed. 200 ccTLDs are not contributing for various reasons. They're probably small. They cannot contribute to the same numbers. But still, the majority of the ccTLDs are currently from your graphs not contributing. And if we need to try to nudge more people, it would be helpful if it's easy to read why they should, and it doesn't look halfway like an American contract.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

Thank you very much, Hilde, point taken. Irina first, then Roelof.

IRINA DANELIA

Thank you, Alejandra. Irina speaking in my capacity of the observer participating in the work of this working group. I just want to respond Pierre's question on PDPs. As we heard today, there is gap analysis working group which just finished its work and it recommended at least two study groups to be launched. And this is activity which may or may not end up with policy development process. But it's kind of pre-policy development work which is definitely necessary for ccNSO and which also requires some resources.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

Thank you, Irina. Roelof?

ROELOF MEIJER

Yeah, thank you. I would like to react to Nick's point about my paraphrasing. Is it not a bit strange if ICANN is rich and making a profit that we just add to the pile. I sympathize with that view. I think there are two considerations. The first one is, I don't think we want ICANN to either kind of change their bookkeeping a bit so that they show a deficit unless we pay or more positively framed that they kind of overspend, make costs that they don't really have to make because we will cover them and we will not cover them if they don't make them.

But I think on the other hand, we also have to bear in mind that if that is the case, if we don't pay because ICANN is making a profit, somebody else is paying for the services we are getting, and they are probably paying too much. So, I think if this is the case we should pay up, and the other group should put some pressure on ICANN to reduce the fees that they are paying so that this profit is not occurring if it's not necessary for something.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

Thank you, Roelof. Do we have another hand? Ah, Xavier.

XAVIER CALVEZ

On the idea that Bruce was raising earlier, I think that the topic of in-kind contributions is absolutely something that was considered at the time that this model was developed in 2012, 2013, and acknowledging that those contributions exist whether the example that Bruce took of Tech Day, which is very obvious, but there's also a

lot of activities that certain CCs do in benefit of other CCs that also are in-kind activities and benefits.

And our conclusion when we looked at this type of activities is that they were very real, they were also very difficult to inventory completely as well as value in terms of costs as a result of which, that's what contributed to wanting to create this global costs bucket where we acknowledge the existence of a contribution and of a value delivered by the CCs to ICANN, and indirectly therefore to also other CCs, but don't try to value it.

Regarding Nick's point about macroeconomic factors, I very well understood from Nick that whether ICANN spends too much or ICANN collects too much, he thinks the contribution should decrease, which is a very good cost-saving approach. I think that the model was constructed to really focus on very fact-based elements, IANA, travel funding, elements like that, in taking your example, whether ICANN spends \$36 million on the transition, which every check or wire was painful to issue, I can tell you, or whether there's an excess, the reality of the travel funding is there, the reality of the IANA services is there, the reality of the other direct costs is there. And therefore, are “intangible” in those changing circumstances.

You've understood that the base of costs that was used for these items is much less than the costs that ICANN incurs, and therefore, the model focuses very much on those visible, understandable, real practical elements that I think most of you recognize in order to also remove subjectivity or “opinions” on the validity of those services.

BART BOSWINKEL Thanks, Xavier. We need to continue.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO Thank you very much, everyone. Sorry, Bart.

BART BOSWINKEL Shall we go to slide number 33.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO Yes.

BART BOSWINKEL Because now it's your turn to—you heard the conversation.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO And remember, join the Menti. The number is at the top of the slide. I believe somebody will be kind enough to put it in the chat as well, please. Considering what was discussed, and that we are taking that feedback, and that we will fine-tune the guidelines and the principles, are we going in the right direction? Is this what you would like to see in the end? And the options are completely agree, somewhat agree, disagree, or unsure. So, I'll give you a couple of minutes to go over that, and definitely, I thank everyone for the feedback especially regarding language.

We will seek a native English speaker. Maybe Nick will help us with that. I kind of heard he was volunteering. It's okay, I'm teasing you. But in any case, we will find someone to help us refine the language. We count with you. Thank you, Nick.

All right, thank you very much for your feedback. I see there's a general balance to the agreement side of things. So, with that, let's move to the next slide.

This is something that we also would like to share with you. It was also in the report, but this is kind of tell you how this was built. It's not final. But it's an idea that we have on refining the band's model. We know, and it's for sure that the first principle is that, all contributions are voluntary. So, the fact that there's a number there and that you fit it, it doesn't make it mandatory. But we perceive that there is a sense that it's easier to find a place if the bands were more refined. So, this is a proposal keeping the highest and lowest contributions the same, and just doing a redistribution.

So, there's one band added at the top because we ended with over five million, but then there is another band now that is over 10 million. And below, we added a few more bands to distribute better the ccTLDs that have domains under management between 10,000 and 150,000. So, with this in mind, I would like to ask your feedback regarding this. We still haven't thought about the voluntary contribution to put into each band, but we want to know if this is something that makes sense. So, can we go to the next slide, please?

So, here, is this something that you would feel good about if it happened or definitely not or still not sure. This will help us in the working group to make further analysis. This is taking also the feedback that we got from many that a refined band model was something that was requested. While people still give their input, if anyone feels comfortable to share what they are not sure about this or why not, that would also help. In the back, sorry, I cannot see you very well. Ah, Barbara.

BARBARA POVŠE

Well, I'm not sure because it strongly depends on the number that will be put to the amount. I mean, it's very obvious. I don't mind having more these fee bands, but it depends very much on the number that is assigned to a fee band. [inaudible] to a number of domain name.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

Completely makes sense. Nick?

NICK WENBAN-SMITH

Barbara made the point, I think, but I was also going to ask a question, which is, when you come up with the bands, assume that only the current contributors are contributing to get to the number which you're trying to cover in terms of the hypothecation of the value exchange model, which you described, because otherwise, it seems to be inevitably a shortfall. I made my point.

-
- ALEJANDRA REYNOSO It's contemplating everyone, of course. Barbara?
- BARBARA POVŠE Just another question, but this question is maybe because I didn't pay enough attention. But will it still be a self-selected model?
- ALEJANDRA REYNOSO Yes, always. Voluntary fully.
- BART BOSWINKEL That's the importance of principle one, or the core principle.
- ALEJANDRA REYNOSO That will never change.
- BART BOSWINKEL It is a voluntary contribution. And maybe this makes it clear, once you hit a—you can see it, once you go from, for example, from A to D, you're not expected to pay, and nobody expected currently, because it's voluntary. Even if you want to, you just grow into it.
- BARBARA POVŠE Just for clarification, I think, well, CCs are of different kinds, and we, of course, have to take into account all the services that we are paying for, and we value services differently. So, what we get from, I don't know, in our example, from center, then you compare the

contribution that you're paying for different services, the value, and that's why it depends on the expected amount to pay

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

Thank you, Barbara. We have half a minute, so let's go to the next one, please.

And just in case that you have been thinking about something that you would do differently, is there any suggestions that you have that you would change about the band model itself, as in more bands, less bands, or anything else, for that matter? We would really appreciate if you could give us some input on that. And while you do that, I will take the opportunity to say that after this, the next steps, is of course, a complete proposal of the banded model, a reviewed and final report to be shared with the community, and then it will go to the council.

All right. Thank you for the feedback. And while those come in, I would like to let you know that while we revise the cost model, it seemed like it didn't change much because we arrived to a similar figure, but what happened is that it was refined. We actually went down and to check into what exactly was that pertained to ccTLDs, and that was what made it look like it remained the same, but it actually was not the case.

So, it was higher number, but then when we trim it down to just what actually corresponded to ccTLDs, then it stayed kind of the same. So, I just wanted to make that observation. And with that, shall we? Final

slide. Do we have one more slide? Oh, the one I already spoke about.
One more, please?

BART BOSWINKEL

This closes the chain.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

Yes, I was forgetting. We need for you to please rate this session. I know we're on the limit. Thank you very much for attending, and while you do that, please remember tomorrow, for everyone that is a newcomer or a second newcomer, the newcomer needs a refresher. Go to the session, the first block tomorrow in the morning. You can find the room in the ICANN schedule. We look forward to seeing you. And do not forget, we have a party tonight. So, we'll see you there. Meeting adjourned. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]