ICANN84 | AGM – ccNSO Study Group: IANA & Disaster Recovery
Saturday, October 25, 2025 – 15:00 to 16:00 IST

CLAUDIA RUIZ

Hello, and welcome to the ccNSO Disaster Recovery Study Group. My name is Claudia Ruiz, and I along with my colleague, Joke Braeken, are the participation managers for this session. Please note this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Community Participation Code of Conduct, the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior, and the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy.

Please observe the following guidelines to participate in this session. I will also post them in the chat for your reference. 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 hand in Zoom. When called upon, virtual participants will unmute their microphone. Onsite participants will use a physical microphone to speak and should leave their Zoom microphones 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 Peter Koch, chair of the ccNSO Disaster Recovery Study Group. Thank you.

PETER KOCH

Thanks, Claudia, and welcome. This is Peter Koch from DENIC for the record. Actually, still to be confirmed chair, I believe. But let's start. Oh, okay. See, that is how it works at ICANN. The ccNSO indeed, yes.

Okay. Let's have a quick look at the agenda while I set up myself to have that same in Zoom. Okay. The Disaster Recovery Study Group, just to remind everybody in the room, is a follow-up on the work that the ccNSO did in the Policy Gap Analysis Working Group, and the PGA WG, as we call it or called it, came up with a number of recommendations for topics that should be addressed in study groups. This one is the first, and in the morning we heard that there will be another one on Accuracy with the request for volunteers soon. For both, the Council has approved the Terms of Reference, and as a study group, we're dealing with the details of that today and in the upcoming sessions. So let's again look at the plan.

Flow of the session, I just did that. That is the session for Wednesday, when we will have the Disaster Recovery session with a broader audience. We will deal with the session planning, and then under agenda item three, we will address the study groups' work plan, following from what I said a minute ago, the Terms of Reference conducted by Council. We will look into the scope and the tasks for that in a similar way, for those who were present in the morning as that was done in the brainstorming, next meeting. This is all administrative. Any additions to the agenda?

Looking at the committee members. Could the study group members just raise their hand so far as they are present? Jody? Yeah. Thank you. And we have, I believe, Katrina, on board. So as you can see, the number of members of the study group is not too high, and we will do our best to encourage a couple more people with this, and hopefully the session on Wednesday, I believe, to encourage more people to join, because we think, and the Council thinks, that this is an important topic.

Okay. Bart, can I hand over for you for—

BART BOSWINKEL Yeah. Let's do it. Can we go to the overview of the Disaster Recovery session, please? This is more really internal. There are two things. First of all, explain to everybody the flow of the session after last week's call with ICANN staff, IANA staff, Régis and Peter. We did have a brief call afterwards, and then go into the questions the study group wants to ask the broader audience. Can you scroll down a bit?

After some to and fro between, I would say, in the study group itself to understand the session itself, because this session was convened before the study group came into existence. That was one of the issues. There was a discussion about, how are we going to use the time with the community? Because at the end of the day, everybody agreed disaster recovery, business continuity of ccTLDs is a major issue and is important for all kinds of reasons.

The first bit is a welcome and explain of the purpose of the session and of the study group by Peter.

The second bit is having more a operational perspective on disaster recovery and business continuity, and that will be done by Régis. He's Régis Massé. Is it Masse or Massé? Régis Massé who is also the chair of the TLD Ops Standing Committee. Some of you will know that the TLD Ops has developed some tabletop exercises, specifically assisting ccTLDs in planning around disaster recovery and business continuity. So they do have some experience in it, and they do have a bit of an overview of issues facing ccTLDs. That was the starting point to set the stage.

Second bit is a IANA perspective on disaster recovery and business continuity. This will go back, and we'll touch upon it in a minute, on the initial paper from Kim to the PGA and the issues he's identified from IANA perspective, as Peter already alluded to in the policy gap analysis phase of the work.

Then we'll have Francisco Arias, also he's with ICANN. So, wearing an ICANN hat, I would say, he will provide an overview of ICANN EBERO and ESCROW program, and how it's used, and when it kicks in in the gTLD space. As a way of dealing with business continuity and disaster recovery and some of the issues in the gTLD space, which could or could not be used as a path forward or a example of how to deal with disaster recovery. So this is very GNSO- and gTLD-focused, but at least it provides a basis for discussion and exploration. So that will be Francisco. It will be short, as you can

see, and he will also share some experience to date with the program, especially with the EBERO, which is interesting, what I could see.

Then some personal observations, again, from Régis Massé as CTO from AFNIC. I don't want to preempt too much of your story, but recently, there were some major issues with one ccTLD, and I'll leave it up to Régis to explain a little bit more, not today, but at the meeting itself. And AFNIC, as such, was very helpful in, again, the continuity of that in that circumstance. And that's hopefully enough of a clear for you to attend the meeting.

This will be the next phase is really exploring… First of all, the first couple, the presentations were really introducing the topic of disaster recovery, business continuity. And then it's exploring the views from the community using, by now, the usual Mentimeter setup and questions. We'll go look into the questions in a minute. The goal of that bit of the session is to inform the work of the study group. It is not to conclude anything. It is just informing the work to the extent this might be a path going forward, and this is where there is interest in the community itself. So it doesn't preclude the group to look into other areas, but at least it sets the direction of interest of the broader community based on the presentations. That's the context as well. And then a wrap-up and next steps.

I'm specifically looking at the members of the study group. Does this reflect your recollection of the discussion from a few weeks or two weeks ago? This is the way forward. And if there are any

questions of all study group but also others, please raise your hand or your microphone. Peter, any final remarks around this bit?

PETER KOCH

Thanks, Bart. I was going to add again for clarification or partly repeat what you said early in your intervention. The fact that the session was set up about disaster recovery, and that is a very broad topic, an important topic, and can be dealt with or approached from different angles, the mandate of the study group—and we'll get to that later in this session—is on the role of IANA in that topic when it comes to disaster recovery for ccTLDs. So, it is not a one-to-one match. We should keep that in mind. But as Bart said, the study group will take into account what is discussed, and especially when the experiences are shared and ideas presented, we'll take that into account for its ongoing work. That will not change the mandate. So we're having a broader topic, a broader discussion, and taking a bit of that as input to the study group work. So that's just making sure that there is no confusion between the mandate here and the broader session there. Bart, should we go into the questions that we wanted to ask, a phrase here?

BART BOSWINKEL

Yeah. Can we go to the next page of the document? You see some questions. Again, for those of you not familiar, we're going to use Mentimeter again for this particular session. The most important

questions are probably the open questions, because this is where we can really receive or the study group can receive feedback.

Let me first go through the basic questions. Again, the first one is more or less an icebreaker, but it's also nice to understand people in the room, whether they work with the ccTLD or not or related, because this allows you to segment the responses later on in the responses. So that's the first one. It's just one minute, so we do have limited time.

The second one is, again, to check who is in the room, whether the people in the room are involved in disaster recovery of the ccTLD. And the way it was discussed by the study group, if you're involved in the ccTLD and you don't know anything about disaster recovery in your ccTLD, even at a high-level, then probably that in itself is already a reason to be educated around disaster recovery. So, that's the background of this second question.

You see there is still a comment there where the response to C and D are different. The question is, does your ccTLD have something like disaster recovery? If you don't know, that's really "I don't know and I don't know where to go to." Maybe you're an outsider. I'd have to ask, is more targeted at people inside the ccTLD itself. But they know it may be there. Maybe it's too subtle. This is one of the first questions for the study group. Do you believe we need these two responses? Can we combine them? Any sense from the study group or anybody else? So that's the first one. Peter?

PETER KOCH I was wondering. We don't seem to have any hands raised, right?

BART BOSWINKEL You want us to keep both responses or just one of them? Joke?

JOKE BRAEKEN Another option could be yes, no, not sure, and that's it.

BART BOSWINKEL Yeah, I'm fine. We don't need to spend too much time on this but—

PETER KOCH No. Actually, this is a survey of the people, not of the ccTLDs, because ccTLDs can be present with multiple heads at the same time. I don't remember where this came from, but I think this distinction could be useful, at least it doesn't hurt. I don't know is one thing, but I do know, I've heard it in the company, but I need to talk to my security department, finance department, whatever makes sense. At least people resonate on disaster recovery.

BART BOSWINKEL Then we leave it as it is?

PETER KOCH I think it doesn't hurt.

BART BOSWINKEL Okay. The next one is part of the ccTLD operation. Another one is which part is, in your view, most vulnerable? Again, this is multiple choice. Go ahead.

[ABD AL AMAN] Yeah. Thank you. Actually, for the second question, maybe one of the ccTLDs says that no, maybe don't have an idea what is disaster recovery. Also it is from day one, it should be disaster recovery sites that have different links according to IANA recommendation. But maybe it doesn't know anything about what you mean by disaster recovery. It doesn't know what is the importance of disaster recovery and other things. So what are the challenges that prevent him as a ccTLD to go for just a recovery site?

BART BOSWINKEL Watch the work of the study group.

[ABD AL AMAN] What I said is I want to know what are the challenges that prevent the ccTLD to have just a recovery site for continuity of the operation of the ccTLD? Thanks.

BART BOSWINKEL Thanks, [Abd Al Aman]. I think it's an important question, but we have 15 minutes, and in that session for these type of questions, we are very limited. It's a very pragmatic reason. I think if you have

ccTLDs, and that's the interesting part of combining the first and the second question, if you have ccTLDs who have no idea whether they have ccTLDs and it's a larger fragment, then I think the work of the study group, it sets something for the study group to really look into. In itself, is it quite a good indication? I think this session for that type of question is probably not the best opportunity, but there will be follow-up work from the group itself to really explore this, because I think then you hit on a very fundamental issue why this is so Important.

Going back to question number three. Again, this is a very pragmatic question as well, in that sense, looking into disaster recovery. So this is multiple choice, multiple options. And if others, we were asked to explain and we'll keep it open with a next set of questions so people can—we will use the Mentimeter option for open responses. So that's three minutes, six minutes in total. Sorry? No, this won't work because it's multiple options.

Number four, how confident are you in ccTLD's ability to recover from disaster recovery in 24 hours? Again, this is a structured question with a slider, and you can see the distribution. That's the advantage of a slider with non-confident, fully confident. Again, this is the sense in the room.

And then the final question on this page is a word cloud question. You've seen it this morning. Can we go to the next page?

Then the open questions. This is really into the work of the study group itself, how IANA best help you. Open. Again, the expectation

is that people will reply with labels, and could go from anywhere. It's, I think, something for Peter. If you see any interesting responses, ask questions to elaborate on their response. You don't know. That's the nice thing about this order, the open questions.

And the next one as well, again, open questions. This is something to elaborate depending on how much time we have. Are there any—

PETER KOCH [Abd Al Aman], is that an old hand? New one? Okay, go ahead.

[ABD AL AMAN] Thank you. For the question number three, what type of crisis you are looking for? It is internal one? Within my own community, it's power cut, it's connection cut, or it is out of our hand crisis, like war, something like this.

PETER KOCH Thanks for that question. Again, we are asking people. We are not asking formal statements from the registry. This is the sense of the room in a way for those participating, and we usually live with a certain ambiguity in the questions asked because we want to get much input. You're right that there could be different reasons for that. You take that into account, or use the open function, the Other, to add to your response, to your contribution, like that. This is not a formal survey. This Mentimeter is to get people shout into the room without having to shout. I'm not going to say don't take it

too seriously, but maybe don't take it too formally, and we all should have that in mind. Katrina has a hand up.

BART BOSWINKEL Katrina, go ahead.

KATRINA SATAKI Thank you. I hope you can hear me.

BART BOSWINKEL Yes, we do.

KATRINA SATAKI Thank you. I had three remarks. First one is regarding the question number four, if you could please scroll to it. Thanks. With what Peter just said, keeping that in mind. But still, would everyone understand what we mean by recover from a disaster? What kind of a disaster? Because there are disasters, and then there are disasters. Sometimes you can recover within 24 hours. Sometimes some disasters, as [Abd Al Aman] just mentioned, the war, for example, you can't recover within 24 hours. It's not about confidence. It's probably more about disasters. That's one thing.

Another thing is question number six, that's in the next—yeah, thanks. Maybe, again, let's rephrase it, not your ccTLD went down tomorrow. Again, maybe something like disaster hits your ccTLD, not necessarily that ccTLD goes down. Let's not be that pessimistic.

And number three, my third remark. Maybe we should move those questions around a little bit, because at this point, it feels like jumping from one topic to another. Thank you.

BART BOSWINKEL Any suggestions, specific suggestions?

KATRINA SATAKI Yes. I think some investigatory questions. Let's start by those questions, and then we go into how could IANA help? I don't know. Something like that. Okay, if we can go back to the previous page, maybe—

PETER KOCH Can I suggest that we start with question four and deal with that? And the other one was with a broader suggestion, I believe.

KATRINA SATAKI Yes.

PETER KOCH Given what Katrina just said, of course, what does recover mean? If the floods destroy your building, you will not have rebuilt it in 24 hours, that's not it, but it's restore operation or something. Again, we can wordsmith here. The question is, what are we trying to learn from the responses to this question? Because we're measuring

confidence rather than the actual ability. That's one thing. And if that's what we want, then the question is fine.

BART BOSWINKEL It's up to you.

PETER KOCH No, I'm waiting for—there's a hand raised. Yes?

JOKE BRAEKEN Thank you. So maybe let's move number four after number two. Does your ccTLD have a disaster recovery/business continuity plan in place? And then we ask, how confident are you? Or maybe number three, let's start by asking that one. I'll move it before number two, so what part of your ccTLD is most vulnerable? And then ask, do you have a disaster recovery plan?

PETER KOCH Okay. I inserted myself in the queue to respond immediately here. Before we discuss moving the question, I think we need to know what do we want to learn here? What's the purpose of the question?

JOKE BRAEKEN For me, it's two-fold. One is to warm up and maybe set the right scene and set the right mindset, that's one. Then we want to understand how prepared or even who are we talking to, and what

we need to concentrate on when we talk to the audience. Because maybe everyone is ready and everything is fine.

PETER KOCH Thank you. There was a hand in the room before that. I give you the floor.

BARRACK OTIENO Thank you, Chair. I think with respect to the questions, I'm fine with them, but I also wanted to draw us to a study that was done jointly by the regional organizations and presented to the ccNSO at the meeting in Puerto Rico in 2018. It could also serve as useful input to this particular process, and there were a lot of questions that went into the particular study. The survey took place between January and February 2018. So maybe later on, find a copy of the report to the secretariat, and then we can see if it will be beneficial to us. Thank you, Chair. The report is online as well.

PETER KOCH Thanks, Barrack. That's a good input to the work of the study group. Maybe because we need an output or need an agreement on the questions here now or in this session, maybe that is something for later to explore. Thanks for the pointer to that report. Jiankang, you're next.

JIANKANG YAO: Thank you. Before the first question, maybe we have some definition or description of what is the disaster? Because many people don't know what is the disaster of ccTLD. So if you have a standard, so what is disaster? You can give description, they can easily follow the questions. But if you have no such definition, we just have the idea of according the person himself. So we should maybe have some description or definition of what is a disaster. What is ccTLD disaster? Thank you.

PETER KOCH: Bart?

BART BOSWINKEL: Think about this set of questions, they don't occur in isolation. In the initial session, if you go back to the session, we don't have to, it starts with an explanation of what is disaster recovery from a TLD Ops perspective. So that sets the tone of what people can perceive and understand, at least from a TLD Ops perspective, but also from IANA perspective, what is disaster recovery and business continuity. I think what is important is these questions are raised in the context of the previous, in the presentations before the questions themselves. They provide the context that you were looking for, Jiankang.

JIANKANG YAO: Thank you.

PETER KOCH May I make a suggestion? I had the proposal from Katrina to move four between two and three, move it one position up. And Irina posted in a chat a slight wording change to restore operation or recover from operation, rather than recover from a disaster, so it is clear what is expected to work. I think both are reasonable. Can the group live with that? The proposal is we move up four what currently is three, and we change that, to clarify "recover from a disaster," say, "restore operation". I see nodding in the physical room. Okay. So then I think we have solved the question of four.

BART BOSWINKEL Katrina, are you okay with that? Because you're the remote—

KATRINA SATAKI Yes, absolutely. Yes.

BART BOSWINKEL Okay.

PETER KOCH Okay. So then we have six and seven, I believe, because five seems to be uncontentious. It's a word cloud, that's fine. Yeah, went down tomorrow. Katrina, could you come back with what your suggestion here was? You wanted to broaden it?

KATRINA SATAKI Well, I wish I could remember it now. I think I wanted something like—well, if the crisis hits or in case of a disaster, or something like that. But now I forgot, of course.

BART BOSWINKEL Let's review offline afterwards with Katrina and you and I, and then we'll circulate it through the group.

PETER KOCH Agree. We might do some wording adjustments here on that one. Same for seven, I believe? Or does anybody have any immediate suggestions? Pending the amendments that Bart suggested and taking into account the amendment that we agreed on, are people comfortable with the set of seven questions? This is just a Mentimeter exercise. I see… Yes, please nod. Okay, good. There's no hands raised, no opposition. I guess we're done to the extent that we reword six to clarify the intent. Everybody okay? Physical room nods. Okay. There was a vocal nodding. I like that. Okay, Bart?

BART BOSWINKEL Let's go back to the agenda. So we got the session for Wednesday. Finally caught up. This was a catch-up game. Study group's work plan. The next part of it, it's really going—and this was, again, catch-up. This is the start of what will happen post ICANN84 and move forward.

First thing I want to do is go to the Terms of Reference. Can you show the Terms of Reference, please? A little bit like, for those of

you who attended this morning's first session, the brainstorming with the study group on IANA WHOIS. We're going move a little bit the same. I'll quickly run through the Terms of Reference and a little bit about the background, and then we're going to do the exercise of what you believe is the most important aspect. Just scroll down the introduction.

As you can see, this goes back to the policy gap analysis work. This is the first of the seven study groups that we'll follow up. The second one is the one on IANA. This is the first one. And really, it's focusing on the role of IANA, but by now, it has a little bit more broader idea to provide some context around disaster recovery, etc., as well. So, no role formally defined either through policy practices or procedures from IANA. There are incidents where IANA is involved in disaster recovery, business continuity, and IANA was seeking for some guidance, whether either as a policy or something else. So that was the premise on which the study group started.

Again—and this is the importance and that's recognized by the Council, first by the PGA, but then Council and broader—there is a significant interest in ccTLDs being resilient and available even when disaster strikes. It sounds like an open door, but it's always good to keep this in the back of your mind. That's part of, I would say, the mandate of ccTLDs and why the ccTLDs do what they do. Can we go to the next page, please?

So, with this in mind, you can read the purpose. It's not to come up with recommendations on the role of IANA itself. It is

recommendations to the Council on how to move things forward. It's effectively exploring a potential role, but also other issues. The PGA, the working group, spend maybe one or two hours on this topic, and there is clearly a lack of documentation, lack of data, evidence, etc., to look at and to define a potential role, if any. And so one of the aspects or one of the tasks of this group will be to look into potential cases and where this occurred, and the role, etc., of IANA. That's clearly part of its mandate, and that's why it was created, really, to have an explorative role.

If you look at the activities and the scope of the activities itself, again, it's a starting point, and that's important to keep in mind as well, is disaster recovery is considered—and again, this is from the PGA but also from the Council, and this is again an open door, is considered wholly to be the responsibility for the ccTLD manager and its local community to address. So, in principle, there is no policy role with respect to the individual ccTLDs how they address or anything else, it is the primary role and the ccTLD itself is accountable for what it does with respect to its disaster recovery and business continuity. That's the way the system was built. But given this, it's very obvious that, in the current environment, ccTLDs, and specifically the smaller ones, will have not all the capabilities to deal with all aspects of disaster recovery/business continuity to keep it up and with all the vulnerabilities. So there might be a role to explore on how they could be assisted.

One of the observations as well is this goes back to what is in the underlying note from IANA is that in some cases, ccTLDs have

sought private arrangements with IANA. And the question is, should there be more policy or guidance in place or more procedural aspects, or is it fine? Again, this could be an area for policy development. That's one extreme. The other extreme is leave it as it is. It's open. It's really in between the individual ccTLDs and IANA. Again, this is an area for the study group to explore what it intends to recommend and the role of IANA, how they want to structure this, if at all. So that's part of its activities as well. Can we scroll down?

You can see there are other areas as well. So I'll pause here and see if there are any questions regarding this, I would say, scope of activities and the purpose of the study group before we go into the more interesting part of it. Anybody either from the working group or the audience?

MARK

Thank you, Chair. Just to affirm the need for what has already been captured in this document, especially in scenarios where countries are faced with conflict, sometimes we find ourselves in a scenario where there seems to be no one to who is going to take responsibility. Yet there are people that are actually affected by the many domains that have been registered in that territory. So this is very timely. Thank you, Chair.

PETER KOCH

Thank you Mark. May I add?

BART BOSWINKEL Yes, go ahead.

PETER KOCH In addition to what Bart said, I think this is a very good opportunity to think a bit out of the box. There were a number of I call it issues that triggered raising this issue to the wider community, but we shouldn't be constrained by the particular incidents in terms of justifying what was done or making that mandatory, even. It is about the role of IANA. Even the ccTLDs that have all these procedures in place might have particular requests. For example, if you have IANA somewhere in your recovery plan, because maybe you need to communicate, a role could be available for an exercise or rehearsal. So that might be an output that has nothing to do with taking control over the ccTLD or disaster itself. So it's the planning phase, not for the disaster, but for the plans, of course, the planning phase and having a role there. I don't think we are talking about you call IANA and they will come to your rescue. It can be all of the above. So we should add this customer service provider perspective in there. And I think the current text does that very well. Any other comments? Hands, feet? Irina, yes?

IRINA DANELIA Thank you, Chair. From the discussion in the group's mailing list, it came that there might be dependencies with the other topics identified by Gap Analysis Working Group, which are not seen as

currently working on. So, in the deliberations and the conclusions of this group, we might leave a space for their later comments or changes, but I don't want to preempt any discussion on the topics which are not currently in the scope.

PETER KOCH Thanks, Irina. I believe you're referring to the discussion regarding the revocation or—

IRINA DANELIA I'm referring to the discussion related to local presence requirement and whether it may or may not trigger any disaster recovery actions where IANA might have potential role. But I definitely think with it, we should not preempt the results of this discussion which will happen later on, not these days. But we should be quite careful with these items.

PETER KOCH Thanks. I agree we should be careful. As we said in the introduction that there is a number of recommendations that came out of the PGA Working Group—thank you—and I'm confident that once the study groups which are going to be staggered come to results, that Council will have a look at the collective results and then proceed from there, and any overlap can be taken into account. And of course, in the group, we are free to discuss this particular issue. My interpretation is that the mandate is not asking for adding compliance tools there to enable revocation, except that that is the

only way to solve the issue, right? We should have that discussion and continue. Unfortunately, one of the discussants isn't present, so we would have at least had to postpone that until Kim can join.

BART BOSWINKEL I think, unfortunately, we don't. We will have a little bit of time to go through the Zoom Room exercise and just to show and raise interest with people who are potentially interested in participating in the study group. So we'll share it. But this is definitely, for example, a risk area where you can identify. You talk about an instrument or a means to a certain end, and that means can be used for different ends as well. That's another way of looking at it. You can use the disaster recovery or the EBERO instrument as part of the revocation and other areas as well, but then it becomes a means to another end. But it's definitely a risk and identified as such probably in the project plan of the group is very valuable and that at least documents it. So my suggestion is we go briefly to the overview, then you know what we're going to do post ICANN84 as a first work or second work item, and then take it from there. If you agree, Peter, we go to the…?

PETER KOCH Yes, please go ahead.

BART BOSWINKEL I'll just run you quickly through it to raise your interest to become a member of the study group and to participate in the first

discussion. Can we go to the Zoom, the whiteboard? If you're in Zoom, you can look at it yourself as well. This is a simplified version. The way it works is the study group will discuss first the purpose and scope, etc. We don't have to do it now. We don't have the time. Can you share it? There we are. I'll increase the size so you can read it. I'll take you through it.

The way it works is you got different categories, scope and goals, requirements, key activities and tasks, milestones and deliverables. This is really building a kind of work plan, project plan, etc. And timeframes and durations of work and constraints and risks, like the one Irina just identified around the means and discussion, the EBEROs and etc. are used, and when we discuss it for other means and just disaster recovery and what is disaster recovery, there is a clear risk involved if you use a very broad definition of disaster recovery. That's how you can complete this and build.

The starting point is really scope and goals in a way it's defined already in the charter or in the Terms of Reference, but probably an ask, etc., partially as well. But once you start discussing this, and this is what we saw this morning as well with the IANA group, you can start, you add a lot of material which you can use. General purchase agreement. That's nice. I don't know who's typing this. For ESCROW.

So, the requirements, key activities and tasks. It's almost a cluster, and this way you can really start developing your work plan. And as

I said, in the meantime—and this is partially in the Terms of Reference, it's partially in what will come out of the work is milestones and the deliverables. If you look at the Terms of Reference, milestones and deliverables are also related and time points and duration, there is a kind of expectation that after a year, the study group has completed its work one way or the other. If you don't, then probably either you were too detailed or we got stuck somewhere, so we need to do something about it. But that was the general expectation that by this time next year, the final report will go to the Council. So, in that sense, there is this basic idea and commitment from the membership as well. It should not take more than a year this work, including drafting the report, including presenting at various meetings, etc.

We don't have the time to run through it, unfortunately. So that will be the, I would say, on the first meetings, maybe two or three, after the ICANN meeting. Because the interesting part of it, if you think about drafting a report, this already bind the sections. It's the work items you want to undertake, and just by defining them, it becomes easier. At least that's my experience. So I'll stop sharing here, then we can go back to the agenda.

PETER KOCH I believe the next points were the meeting cadence—

BART BOSWINKEL Yeah.

PETER KOCH There it's coming.

BART BOSWINKEL Here we are. You want me to go through it? Before the break… Before ICANN84, not the break. ICANN84, don't call it a break. This is not a break, as you can see. The study group agreed on a two weeks cadence. The idea is to start again and the meeting day was Tuesday, to start again on 11 of November. As we said, we will meet on a rotational basis, given the geodiversity of the group. The first meeting will be again on 9:00 a.m. UTC, knowing that it will not work for IANA who's based in in LA—no for Claudia—but definitely the study group members who participated until now, that time seems to work very well. So we start with 9:00 a.m. UTC on 11 of November. At that meeting, we'll share a proposal for other times. I don't know. We have this sheet, and we will see what time, but at least the next meetings will be on the 9th of December. As you can see, due to the two weeks cadence, if you would add 14 days to the 9th, it would be the 23rd of December. Probably everybody or a lot of people will be busy with other things. So we'll reconvene again on the 13th, again, Tuesday and up to the 24th, and that is a few weeks, two weeks before the Mumbai meeting. So that's the proposed cadence of the meetings of the study group until Mumbai. So that's it. Now back to you, Peter.

PETER KOCH: Okay. That leaves Any Other Business. Does anybody have any other business? No? I don't see any hands in the physical room nor in the Zoom Room. I do think the chair can thank everybody involved, including the staff, the group members, the observers, and everybody else in the room, and the meeting is adjourned. You may stop the recording. Thank you.

BART BOSWINKEL: One thing, if you're interested, contact Peter or the secretariat if you want to join in the group.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]