ICANN85 Mumbai | CF – ccNSO: IANA Disaster Recovery Study Group Work Session
Sunday, March 8, 2026 – 09:00 to 10:00 IST

CLAUDIA RUIZ

Hello and welcome to the ccNSO IANA Disaster Recovery Study Group Work Session. My name is Claudia Ruiz and I, along with my colleague Joke Braeken, are the participation managers for this session. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Community Participant 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 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.

On-site participants will use a physical microphone and should leave their Zoom microphone disconnected. For the benefit of other participants, please state your name for the record and speak at a reasonable pace. Thank you, and with that, I will now hand the floor to Peter Koch, Chair of the IANA Disaster Recovery Study Group. Thank you.

PETER KOCH

Thank you, Claudia, and good morning, everyone on-site and online. My name is Peter Koch. I'm with DENIC, and as Claudia said, I happen to be the Chair of this Study Group.

So, we have an agenda, and I hope people outside can hear us. We have some members of the committee at the table, and I didn't see anybody else. I see a lot of people online, but none of the other members, but they may or may not join depending on their time zone and availability.

So, quick walk through the agenda. This is the preparatory session. We will have another open session on Wednesday, I believe, which will be part of this session as well in terms of preparation. So, we'll have three major items. The fact-finding, where are we? We'll spend roughly 20 minutes on that. Continuing work that we've been doing in the previous online sessions.

Agenda item three, emerging themes. That is a lot of work that staff, Bart, has done collecting the information that the Study Group has discussed, and we'll present that. That's, again, another 20 to 25 minutes, and then we'll have roughly 15 minutes for agenda items four and five. That's the preparation of the Wednesday session, and something that came out of number five, something that came out of yesterday's Internet Governance Liaison Committee meeting, we found that, and we'll go into the

details when we are at that agenda item, and then we'll talk about next meetings and the usual, any other business.

So with that, Claudia, can we scroll back or maybe just get to the slide set for the second agenda item? Any questions or amendments for the agenda? I don't see any hands. Okay, then we are happy, and we can start with the fact-finding, where we are. Bart.

BART BOSWINKEL Thanks, thank you. Good morning, everybody. Good evening and midnight, wherever you are. Fact-finding. So, the Working Group initially, so the group was charted, or the Study Group was charted, and it started to focus really a little bit on business continuity and disaster recovery, its scope, et cetera, and that was defined, and there is documentation available.

At one point, this group and the new-to-be-formed study groups really started to use more of a structured approach to the work of fact-finding, taking next steps, et cetera. It's a method from design thinking, so you start very broad and try to get as much basic information, fact-finding, and desk research, talking to people as possible before you really start redefining and revisiting the scope of, say, the task at hand, and the task at hand is understand if and what is the role of IANA with respect to disaster recovery of ccTLDs. That was the initial purpose of the Working Group.

And this is more or less the transition from the fact-finding to redefining or restating the problem space and looking at the goal of the Working Group. So, that is a brief introduction.

Next slide, please. So, in that introduction, and based on some queries from the Study Group, and Kim already replied, and this is an extract from the main responses Kim gave to the questions from Irina, and so these were the findings, I would say, an extract from the findings, which is in the documentation, the major, I would say, points, so the capability threshold for the declaring emergency, and no documentation that provides IANA a specific basis, and that's the starting point for the discussion as well.

Kim, I hope I captured it succinctly and everything else, and this is really the core also of the study group's mandate. So, these were the initial findings regarding IANA's role. Can we go to the next slide?

Now, what is interesting is, and based on the work of the ccNSO Finance Working Group, if you start looking at the ccTLDs landscape, so that's one of the other factors in this whole exercise. Can you go to the next slide? And one of the first things is really, and especially with respect to disaster recovery and business continuity, is scale distribution. It is interesting, and we never realized this, but the ccTLD community is truly diverse.

So you have, if you look at the 250 plus operators, ccTLD managers, you will see that approximately 140 have fewer than 20,000 domain names under management. This implies they have relatively very

small operations. And so, they're very, I would say, resource constrained, probably. So, we'll get to another one. And so you have a fairly large middle group of 85 ccTLDs with 20,000 to a million domain names. And then there are over 30 with over a million domain names.

So these are what we call in, say, are considered the larger registries. And another interesting point is they account for about 95% of the domain names under management from in the ccTLD space. And the ccTLD space in general, and that's another thing, it accounts for about 40%, I believe, of all the domain names registered. So, this gives you a rough idea of the distribution.

Next slide, please. If you start looking and drill down, again, this is another perspective on ccTLDs, how they are run, their governance models. Again, you have, I would say, three main categories for various. So, government-related regulatory bodies, academic universities, and then private. And private means, in the sense of what a lawyer would say, legal, say, under an especially continental lawyer, they are under private law. That means it could be a foundation, NGO, for-profit, it really doesn't matter. Their legal structure is determined by, say, by law.

So, this is, again, if you look at the distribution, and I think at least that was one of, say, although I knew, but from a personal note, there are far more government-related ccTLDs managers than I initially thought. And we'll get to it in a minute. And you can see the key characteristics as well, but they play a very important role

in the sphere of business continuity and disaster recovery, as you will see in a moment.

Next slide, please. So, looking at business continuity, disaster recovery capability, again, one of the desk research we did is, if you look at the services ccTLDs provide, they range a lot. Some of them are relevant for, say, from a perspective of business continuity, disaster recovery. Some are less. And based on that research, I would say these are the main ones that stood out, at least in compiling the data.

And then the question is, if you look at it, how, to what extent are they included in business continuity and disaster recovery plans? And that is what this slide is about. So, you see that around the DNSSEC, there is an adoption rate of around 68, provisioning, et cetera. You can read it for yourself. Again, this is really about the core businesses processes of ccTLD.

And another way of looking at this, and because that, again, this sets the landscape in the ccTLD environment, is to what extent do ccTLD managers themselves run their own business, or have they outsourced it? So, as you can see, again, there is a breakdown, and this is approximate. This is desk research. So, we haven't asked them, but it gives you a rough idea. So, what is, some have all the services fully in-house, others do a mixed, have a mixed operation, and some of them have them completely outsourced, so that the ccTLD manager itself, its responsibilities are very limited.

So, again, you can read this after the meeting. Again, this gives you a rough idea, and this will co-determine, is one of the factors that determines the business continuity and disaster recovery and how you have to deal with it, and also probably going back the direction of travel of the Study Group. So, again, basic fact finding.

And then, again, the capability gap, if you look at it, so this is more say adoption rate, and there is an assessment of whether this is a real gap, yes or no. It gives you a rough idea. Maybe it's more like flagging issues. Next slide. So, this was the ccTLD landscape. One of the important factors the Study Group identified was a ccTLD does not operate in a vacuum. They operate in their own environment. They operate in a regulatory landscape, also a regulatory landscape regarding business continuity, which impacts business continuity and disaster recovery.

So, if you look at it, and again, this was desk research across the globe, and this is a bit of a scale, so you have a very strict regulation or directive. This is probably the strictest of all of them, and that's implemented in strict national law, and then it goes down in impact to no regulation at all, and if you look at the numbers of ccTLDs which are affected, it's, again, this is an approximate number, so gives you a rough idea of the regulatory landscape in which ccTLDs have to operate.

If you look at the regional distribution, and this is now combining the landscape and the ccTLD landscape and the regulatory framework, you will see, say, of all the ccTLDs, how they are

distributed and how the regulatory frameworks impact them, and which one does impact them, and again, basic facts, not facts, but approximations, but at least gives you a rough idea of the Study Group, a rough idea of what we really have to deal with and dealing with, and this was also the reason why, say, the overlap with the IGLC around resilience, because you can see through the regulatory framework, there is a clear interaction with the internet governance discussions, et cetera.

And if you look at the key regulatory frameworks, to what extent, what do they require with respect to business continuity and disaster recovery, again, you can read this at your leisure. It's available to the Study Group in one of the documents.

Next slide. I think that's it, isn't it? No. One of the, and this was, Peter and I have discussed this, but to leave it open, but probably this puts a little bit more color on the regulatory framework, is if you look at them, the, there is only, I would say NIS2 is the only one which is really DNS-specific. The others are broader or have nothing to do with the DNS or other critical infrastructure. It's just that.

So, that's one. Secondly, and again, the enforcement gap, although, and this is, I've excluded this a little bit, but say, NIS2 does have, and through national legislation, does have an enforcement mechanism. If, say, for most of the ccTLDs, there is no enforcement with respect, even if there are under a regulatory

framework, there is no enforcement. It practically means their compliance is not, yeah, it's really almost voluntary.

And then the third one, and I think this is also relevant for the most ccTLDs, if you look at the regulatory framework, if there is ever a mention of international standards, they refer to these two standards. And again, there are other standards probably, but from a regulatory framework, this is the commonality. So, these were the three major findings, if you look at the regulatory framework and to what extent they impact disaster recovery and business continuity of ccTLDs. Next slide, please. Yeah, go ahead.

PABLO RODRIGUEZ: Thank you, Bart, and greetings, all. While the slide already passed, something that I would like to bring to the attention of those present is that there is a commonality between those individuals that tend to do their in-house work with their business model, specifically those that are mostly government or academia.

They tend to do their management of their TLD in-house. And so that gives us an idea of a focus we're to look for in order to do more capacity building and whatever other policies we can try to invite them to adopt, you need to keep in mind that these are particular groups in which they need to be approached in a particular way. So, it is important to keep that in mind. And thank you, Bart, and Peter, for all the work you have done. This is a very nice, very good job, well done with this presentation.

BART BOSWINKEL Thank you. So, first of all, from the Working Group, but also from others in the audience, are there any questions regarding the data that was presented before we go into the next item? Jodi?

JODI ANDERSON Not a question, just an update. At our last Study Group meeting, I promised to get back to you on where New Zealand was at in terms of the regulatory spaces that we've got a nice big desk-based document on.

A few days after that meeting, New Zealand actually published a couple of documents. We've got a new cyber security strategy reaching out to 2030, which was published at the end of February. And there's been an action plan published to support that strategy and consultation has just opened on that.

And in that there are, the DNS is mentioned, so .NZ, the country code top level domain is mentioned with proposed mandatory requirements to enhance cyber security applied to that as critical infrastructure. And I think it's the… I haven't actually properly dug down into it. We've got people back in Internet New Zealand currently doing that so as to respond to the request for consultation. But so that we can be included on that table, I'll send you some information on all of that stuff and just let me know what else you need.

And can I just sort of shout out to anybody who might be listening in terms of if there's any CC, this is a request from somebody back home, if there's any CC that is ISO 22701 compliant, especially if you run your own registry, please reach out. We want to talk to you. So, that's just popping that in as a request out into the ether. Yeah, let me know. I'll send that through and let me know if you need any further information.

BART BOSWINKEL Otherwise, what you could do is you have access to the documents just added to the domain documents. It's in the repository.

JODI ANDERSON I will do that.

BART BOSWINKEL That's easier. Because this is just a summary of the documentation that is available to the Study Group members.

JODI ANDERSON Thank you. Yeah, I just wanted to mention that and also use the opportunity to do a bit of a shout out. Thank you.

BART BOSWINKEL Anybody else? Yeah, Irina.

IRINA DANELIA: Yeah, good morning. Irina, for the record, it was mentioned the materials of the finance group two as a source for some data presented, but further there were data regarding disaster recovery plans, et cetera. And maybe I missed, but there was no source of data and where these statistics and percentage come from. So, it may be worth just mentioning.

BART BOSWINKEL: Included in the slides. This goes back to the documentation, again, available to you. And there you can see the references and where, because that was the desk.

IRINA DANELIA: Perfect. Thank you. And secondly, when you demonstrated the groups of ccTLD government, academia, non-for-profit .ru is not a governmental body. I personally work for a non-for-profit company.

BART BOSWINKEL: Now move it. That's why it's an approximation.

PETER KOCH: Yeah, maybe let me add or re-emphasize that this is not to, first of all, there's no judgment attached to this. And this is not to compile an exhaustive list that categorizes each and every single ccTLD. The idea is that we get an idea of the clusters and the commonalities going back to the idea that when Kim said there

were some requests for arrangements that we wanted to find out where might people be coming from and what drives them.

And as Bart demonstrated there, there are lots of ccTLDs without a regulatory regime that requires this, which is neither good nor bad, but it demonstrates the freedom and the incentive, like people doing it in their own responsibility or following compliance or not being "incentivized" in any ways. That's to demonstrate the cluster.

So, there might be ambiguities in the data. And when we get that information, we're going to correct that, but we shouldn't strive for perfection on each and every one. And to the extent that we provide the impression that we represent data about individual CCs, we should probably blur that a bit and make sure that this is all. So, apologies.

BART BOSWINKEL Any other observation? Yeah, Pablo?

PABLO RODRIGUEZ Thank you, Bart. It would be interesting to take a look at those ccTLDs who are not following a particular regime. And it would be interesting to find out if they're academia, if they're government, or if there's something else.

Again, I insist on that because as we may have seen, and Bart, you have seen when we did some of the outreach to the Caribbean, Latin American community in Caribbean. And I suspect that in

other parts, in other regions of the world as well, you will find that these individuals who are not following a particular regime of policies are also doing in-house work and are also lacking resources and so on.

So, it would be an interesting thing to look into that direction because it would give us an idea of where to look for, to pinpoint a particular group of ccTLDs. Thank you.

BART BOSWINKEL: Anybody else? No? Okay. Then we go into, so this is the question and we now move into, I would say, part four of the -- yeah, item three. Yeah, sorry. So, the emerging trends. You saw the presentation and the members of the Study Group have seen the material as well and people online as well. So, the way of doing this is probably, it's a bit of brainstorming but not in the usual way of shouting around and putting post-its.

I would invite you to just reflect on the data that you saw and, for example, some of the suggestions. Pablo was a good example of a suggestion that what you think needs to happen and what is emerging from the data that we showed to you. And I'll just give you a few minutes to come up with two or three suggestions or one emerging and I'll do a round robin and see if we can cluster them and then we can take them and see if there are any trends that emerge from your brain power.

So, first step is to give you two -- how much time do we have? I'll give you three minutes to come up with two or three suggestions or observations from the data. Just write it up for yourself, either in your laptop or a piece of paper, and I'll do a round robin and everybody at the table is invited, even if you're in the back of the room, invited to come up with some observations. So, it's a bit of a true work session.

So, starting now. Three minutes.

One more minute.

Okay. Thanks. Let's do a little bit round robin and maybe mention the observations you have made. Charles, do you want to participate or -- you're going to listen. Maybe Régis, can you start off with one or two of your observations?

RÉGIS MASSÉ: Not such an option at this time for me.

BART BOSWINKEL: No? Jodi?

JODI ANDERSON: Observations. I think, I mean, the sort of the obvious thing from all that, at least to me, is the theme of diversity. I mean, there's, you know, diversity of ccTLDs, diversity of -- there was slide after slide

of diversity of how ccTLDs are set up and how they operate and the diversity of the context they operate in.

So, I guess, and this is not a fully formed thought, but the observation I have is that whatever we come up with in the Study Group or whatever comes out of this, it must be flexible. It must be sort of something that all of those types of situations can work with. It has to be something that's not one size fits all. It has to be something that can be picked or chosen or used if it's right. I hope that makes sense. That was sort of the obvious thought that I had.

The second one is just sort of partly comment, partly question. We've got our little fact-finding document. I think the title of it is Fact-Finding Disaster Recovery. It's just a sort of a little notes document. And I noticed that some of your slides picked up some of the stuff from there. And right at the top, it's got sort of one. Irina's questions. And I just, there's a couple of questions there that I don't feel like have been answered yet.

And to me, those are, you know, when we see all of that data and the answers on the screen, these are still sort of some of the outstanding things for me, you know, in terms of things like what ccTLDs have IANA in their disaster recovery plan? What are their private arrangements that some CCs have with IANA? What could IANA hypothetically do? I don't know if those are going to be the things that we're discover later in the week with CCs, but those to me are still the burning questions. So, that's just a comment there.

BART BOSWINKEL With respect to the second question you asked about private arrangements, that's effectively, there is none. That's what Kim confirmed at one of the sessions.

JODI ANDERSON Okay.

BART BOSWINKEL Or the calls already.

JODI ANDERSON Right, yes. I wasn't at that call. I missed that. Thank you. I appreciate that answer.

BART BOSWINKEL Maybe we include that as a point as well. But that was clearly, and it's in the notes from that meeting, that was from the start. And that's the, I would say there is no documentation for a role. And that implies there is no private arrangement.

JODI ANDERSON Okay, got it. Thank you.

BART BOSWINKEL At least that it's addressed.

JODI ANDERSON Appreciate that. Thank you.

BART BOSWINKEL Maybe Kim or Irina, any observations?

KIM DAVIES I'll save Irina. She just arrived. So, I think the one observation I would make is that the diversity of ccTLDs we're talking about is not represented in this room. And I think insofar as we're all pretty good about knowing what best practices amongst the ccTLDs that are here. And I think the biggest challenge is those that don't, those that need a lot of handholding, those that probably don't come to ICANN meetings for the most part.

And possibly there's an element of this as reaching out by some mechanism to get a better sense of what that particular community would need or want from this exercise. Because I'm not sure, I think we can make assumptions and certainly me and my team have talked to some of them individually one-on-one. But even then, I wouldn't want to presume to know what would be most beneficial in this area for them.

So, having recognized that there is a big community of those kinds of ccTLDs that do probably need some handholding that are not across best practice, how do we integrate them into our thinking? Thanks.

BART BOSWINKEL Thanks, Kim. And I think this is where there is a clear overlap with you as well, with your group. That's why you're involved with TLD Ops, with all your table exercises. But it's a good observation. Thanks. Antonia, any observations from your end as a member of the Study Group? Antonia? No? Go to Peter.

PETER KOCH Yeah, thanks, Bart. In a way, I think I'm echoing Jodi's observation of diversity here. We see different categories and different distributions. We see long tail versus even distributions. And again, that is kind of a signal without having to drill deeper. Following up on what Pablo said, these combining categories, which is intersectional, and I mean that in the mathematical and not in the contemporary sociological sense, that is maybe something to drill down, but not too far.

Again, it's a signal that needs to be interpreted in the future. And of course, then, in the spirit of correlation versus causality, again, there might be some implicit, or there should not be an implicit judgment. We had the size of the TLD, actually, that's not the size of TLD, the number of registrations in there doesn't necessarily imply the professionality of the back end, because we had also observed that some of those might be fully outsourced to then provide just that work on large portfolios and may indeed have some disaster recovery or business continuity things in place.

Again, this is not about the judgment, this is about where might people be coming from as an information for us to design potential solutions, but we need to find the question. Okay, thank you. Thanks, Bart.

BART BOSWINKEL Pablo?

PABLO RODRIGUEZ Thank you, Bart. And without a doubt, I agree with Peter's comments and Kim's, as well as Jodi. The diversity is going to be directly related with the way some TLDs will behave. An NGO has a particular objective, and it's going to behave in a particular way, and it's going to dedicate more resources to one thing than another, versus a commercial non-for-profit, a commercial for-profit is going to be perhaps more agile than the government-run TLD, and on, and on, and on.

So, I support and I like the idea that taking a look into that diversity of business models is going to affect the way in which they apply resources to one objective or another, and how that may affect the disaster recovery results. Thank you.

BART BOSWINKEL Irina?

IRINA DANELIA

Just what Jodi started with, that we see a very diverse picture. It's not new, it's confirmed again, and there might not be any prescriptive approach that would feed all the TLDs. And there definitely might be zero for IANA in disaster recovery, given this diverse landscape. And the challenge is really to find out what registries might want or need from IANA, because not all of them are easy to reach and to ask this question. That's, I said, there is a main challenge.

BART BOSWINKEL

Ondrej, any response? Although you're not a member, but you may have some views or observations.

ONDREJ FILIP

I'm not a member, I'm observing the first time, so maybe I will have asked a question, but, and maybe I don't understand absolutely the scope of the Study Group, but I would expect an information about how many disaster situations happen in the registries, and which categories are they related to? Because I think Kim said a very interesting and important point that most of the small registries don't have the disaster recovery plans, and they might be probably most probably affected by such situations.

So, do we have any information about frequency of those situations? And Kim, do you have any kind of, not data, but at least examples, what happened? Is it just, you know, pure DNS-related or complete loss of registry? What are you talking about?

KIM DAVIES

I don't have stats off the top of my head, at least. You know, emergencies that, I mean, there's emergencies that don't elevate to IANA's attention, and I think that's certainly in scope for this group as well. But in terms of ones that elevate to the level of an emergency for us, typically maybe one to two a year, I would say a good percentage of those, possibly half or more, are mistakes in DNSSEC that immediately require changes to the DS records, usually some kind of technical configuration issue that requires immediate action to restore service.

Beyond that, emergencies are infrequent, like, of the form of natural disasters, significant connectivity issues in the country, often like war-related impacts, like, again, it's sort of a, there'll be some kind of significant connectivity loss in the country that impacts infrastructure in a very significant way that requires some kind of restoration.

The worst I recall in my situation was Haiti. That was, what, almost 20 years ago now, but that was a complete loss of connectivity power through third-party intermediaries. We managed to contact ccTLDs manager staff on-site through satellite phones and things, but that was, if I recall correctly, like a few days later, but it took some time and a lot of exceptional effort to restore service there. Yeah, there's not that many.

I wouldn't want to necessarily draw too many conclusions because they're so innumerous and not really statistically relevant. I think

just giving you a flavor of them, but I think based on those kinds of things, we can conceive of potential scenarios and potential needs relating to restoration that might result from that, at least when it comes to IANA.

BART BOSWINKEL: Thanks. Maybe Régis, do you have any observations from your end from TLD Ops around potential occurrence of disasters and business continuity?

RÉGIS MASSÉ: Yeah, Régis, for the record. What is important here is to, okay, I'm part of this group as a TLD Ops chair, of course. The DR/BCP was a subject we addressed several years ago to help ccTLDs to fight against that and be prepared and training about the DR/BCP, but it's one of the subjects, it's not the only subject.

The main goal of TLD Ops, and I will represent it on Wednesday, no, on Tuesday, during the ccNSO session, is to share about security between ccTLDs and security issues. The DR/BCP is not the only subject. So, yes, I'm very pleased to be part of this group. Yes, I think we have some things to do with this group, with TLD Ops, but I think the main goal of TLD Ops, if you remember that, is to share security issues between ccTLDs to help each other.

The DR/BCP is one of the subjects we can address, but not the only one. So, I think we can work with the group to give information and to give feedbacks and maybe creating a new tool or a new game to

be prepared for the DR/BCP. But I think it's the way we can work with.

BART BOSWINKEL And for the record, I recall we had -- and going back to your point, and then I have one observation from Jordan, again, under this agenda item. I recall there was a ccNSO session that led to the creation of TLD Ops around disaster recovery. And this was after some earthquake, one in Japan, and I think also after Katrina. Or, yeah, was it Katrina or somebody else?

PABLO RODRIGUEZ I remember the 2011 Japan tsunami, and then there was Katrina. And 2017, '18, actually, in ICANN61, we talked about Maria.

BART BOSWINKEL Yeah. And at that event, there was another earthquake in Japan, which part?

PABLO RODRIGUEZ And actually, the day before Hurricane Maria, there was a huge earthquake in Mexico as well. So, yeah.

BART BOSWINKEL So, these are events. I don't know to extent IANA was involved in those events, but it definitely was an issue from a CC perspective.

PABLO RODRIGUEZ: If I may, I would like to wonder if situations such as the war situation that is going on in the Middle East should also be considered as a disaster, and that it could affect the way the IANA records are going to be affected. Thanks.

BART BOSWINKEL: Thanks. Okay. One point, and then we go to the last couple of, and thanks for your feedback and input, because I think that gives the direction for the Study Group. One observation from Jordan, work output that sets out high-level goals, but then gives an early, an array of examples how to do that goal that match the very diverse capacities in the community could be a nice way to go. Thanks, Jordan. Beth, agreed with the dangers connected with war. Thanks for your feedback and input. Let's go to the next point on the agenda.

PETER KOCH: Yeah. Thank you, Bart. That's agenda item number four, the draft presentation for the session on Wednesday. Can we have… yes, here are the slides. Do you again want to go through them?

BART BOSWINKEL: Yeah, you can do it. Just scroll so people know what is happening. Again, this is a quick summary, follows a little bit the structure of what Jordan presented yesterday.

Next slide, please. Again, this is the framework that we've been working on. So, first is discovery and define. We're now in the intersection between discovery and define, and then go into, and that's probably post-severe develop and deliver, and deliver is the recommendations, findings to the community. So, that's the end goal.

A little bit of the time, gives you a rough idea of timing and discover. So, that's week one to four. This is when this was drafted. So, that is four weeks ago. So, this is, Reed, you should read the ICANN meeting around it. I think I've done it in one on the other one.

Next one. And this is where we are and what we've done to date and where we have landed more or less alone. So, you've got the regulatory compliance, scan role of IANA, role of ccTLDs on the different frameworks that was part of the presentation, current state of the assessment and stakeholder mapping engagement. That's something to do going forward if there are other stakeholders involved as well. We focused on IANA, focused on ccTLDs. Maybe there are other stakeholders that need to be addressed. That's still part of the, I would say, of the fact finding.

So, next slide, please. And this is, so, this is, again, what we're going to do right now. So, finding synthesis, statement development. Again, you can read it. It's next slide. And then the next one and the next one. Maybe you should, yeah. So, this is what you can see and this is the risk that we've run into. That's about it. Question, yes, comes. Fairly high level. Go ahead, Irina.

IRINA DANELIA Are we trying to get any feedback from the ccTLD managers on their, on what they really might need from IANA in order to help with disaster recovery?

BART BOSWINKEL My advice would do that in the next phase because you can ask them, but it's, you are still looking at the landscape and have more pointed questions. You only have 15 minutes as part of the Working Group updates.

PETER KOCH Yeah, to add to that, that the 15 minutes, because it's only an update, we get one slot in a longer session. So, it's not a working session for us and getting the input on the spot would not even be anecdote. It's just random thoughts. So, we need to give people enough time to respond, which relates to what Bart said.

We need a bit more pointed questions or options. And also, so we are in the wide middle of the first diamond, so to speak, and need to get to that, to the end of that, to ask for more concise feedback, I believe. So, I'd follow that advice. Do the team members agree or have other thoughts?

JODI ANDERSON Irina, were you asking whether we're going to do that in the session or just whether we are going to actually go out to CCs and get some

more of that information? Because if that, then I agree with you. I think we do need to do that, and I think what you're saying, Peter, is that we're going to do that, but we're just not going to do it this week. We're going to do it some other way, and have we thought yet about what that way is? Is it a survey? Is it going through TLD Ops? That would be a good conversation to have.

BART BOSWINKEL Irina?

IRINA DANELIA My question was definitely about the session, and I understand that there will be other ways to get this feedback, but each meeting, each ICANN meeting is unique in terms of participants because it happens in different regions, and in Seville, you will not have the people you have here, so it might be a chance not to miss.

BART BOSWINKEL What might be useful is that you, in your finding or in your remarks, make very clear that this group will reach out at one point between now and Seville, because that's doable, to seek information and feedback around, say, how people are handling and dealing with business continuity and disaster recovery. So, the format is still unclear, but that you will approach them.

PETER KOCH

Yes, we will approach them, but what we also could do, and I suggest we do, is that we could identify ourselves during the session and encourage people who are in the room, and everybody else, but primarily taking the chances of presence, identify ourselves and ask people to come, and they don't have to provide the feedback right now, but just that we get the contact and the sense of how many people may be, and maybe even we get one or two more participants in the Working Group. Is that a way forward?

Okay, then let's do that. We don't need more slides for that, but it's just a remark at the end that I'll make. Okay, thank you. Anything else on this agenda item?

JOKE BRAEKEN

Peter, have my hand up?

PETER KOCH

Oh, I'm sorry. Go ahead.

JOKE BRAEKEN

Thank you very much. So, at the start of the session, Alejandra Reynoso will be the session chair. She will also remind people to reach out to the Secretariat in case there are volunteers for any of the groups, but maybe it's also a good opportunity to remind people if they are not subscribed to the ccNSO members or ccTLD community mailing list to please reach out to us and we'll make that happen. Thanks.

PETER KOCH Yeah, will do. Thank you. Pablo?

PABLO RODRIGUEZ Another way that we can also try to get some of this information is by reaching out to the regional organizations and perhaps reaching out to them to give us an idea of what some of their members are doing for disaster recovery and so on. I believe that some of that information has been collected already by some of these regional organizations.

PETER KOCH Yeah, I think that is an excellent suggestion. At least the regional organizations will be able to identify contacts that the group could approach to get exemplary information, right? Like the thought leaders in certain spaces in that direction. Does that make sense? Okay, thank you.

Then finally, I think we are at the agenda item number five, which is kind of quick. So, we have the IGLC chair in the room, Annaliese, and we have the TLD Ops chair in the room. During the IGLC meeting, the topic of resilience came up and there was a train of thought that there are three different groups, IGLC, TLD Ops, and the Study Group with different scope and focus and mission, but working on the same or at least similar topic or theme, not topic maybe. TLD Ops, very operational. IGLC, it's more the high-level

governance aspect, and this is a response to maybe or maybe not regulatory requirements.

So, we were thinking of having a joint session without making concrete plans then how that would look like, but I would like to ask the members of the committee what they think about that approach. And the meeting would be, we haven't even decided whether it's an interim virtual or a session at the next. Potentially in Seville, but that would involve the preparatory session.

BART BOSWINKEL The good thing to know, it's a little bit like what we do right now in this meeting. It could be something like the registration trends together with strategies that you combine it into blocks, say block five and six, so you have 120 minutes around it. So, you can really dive deep into the theme itself. That was the thought at the time when this arose, I think two weeks ago.

PETER KOCH Yeah, do Régis or Annaliese want to add anything? Régis?

RÉGIS MASSÉ Yes, thank you, Peter, for this proposal. I think it's a good idea because remember when we are starting to work in the Study Group, we have to define what are the roles of each group and what we expected from TLD Ops or from this Study Group of things. And as the IGLC working on this kind of topics too, I think it's very important to synchronize what we are doing, what we are

expecting from the groups themselves. And yes, in Seville, I think having a working session on that is a very good idea. Thank you for that.

PETER KOCH

Yeah, thanks Régis. And just to avoid any confusion, this is not to install a liaison and coordination bureaucracy. It is, no, come on.

One of the ideas is that the TLD or TLD managers or who else is in the room, get the different flight levels separated and get an understanding on where we are, at what level we are addressing what issues and where they can contribute and what they can expect as outputs from our various works. And be informed, indeed. Okay, so anything else on that? We seem to have violent agreement.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS

Thanks, Bart and Peter. Not much to add but just to note that the theme of resilience is one that comes up consistently across the regions when we do our heat mapping exercise. We have done a session, I think, on resilience but we haven't really dug into it in huge depth. Whenever it does come up, it's always noted that there are other groups within the ccNSO looking at this issue. But there is potentially some value in exploring it from the different perspectives.

The IGLC focuses on the broader Internet Governance aspects, so the policy and regulatory perspectives. But just to note that it is

	one that comes up, identified it as a priority across every region, most regions, and it's come up for several years.
PETER KOCH	Thanks, Anneliese. So, that brings us to next meetings.
BART BOSWINKEL	Anneliese, are you giving an update as well on Wednesday or is it part of the session?
ANNALIESE WILLIAMS	So, I think we're just doing it as part of the session, like at the end of the regulatory session on the Tuesday.
BART BOSWINKEL	Yeah, and do you do an update on Tuesday, sorry?
PETER KOCH	Yes, I will.
BART BOSWINKEL	It would be nice, for example, if one of you could mention this, that this is the thinking for the Seville meeting, because then it becomes interesting as a way forward.

PETER KOCH

Okay, then finally, next meetings. So, the idea is, as always, after an ICANN meeting, there will be, yes, new terms. We usually have a cool-down phase after the ICANN meeting also to give everybody, but especially staff, a bit of a, not necessarily a rest, but time for doing other work.

So, we'll reconvene on April 1st, no joke. We'll continue with our fortnightly schedule. We are a bit resource-constrained on the staff side because the other Study Group has also started and we need to be intersecting with the other, so that will be the other Study Group one week and us the other every other week, so that's for the few that are in both, and more importantly for Joke, Bart and Claudia, so that they don't have to run two sessions at the same time. And the exact dates and times will be sent out sometime after the meeting, so just, you know, there is a break until the end of this or the beginning of the next month.

Any other business? I see none, no hands in the Zoom room. Then I would say, thank you. The meeting is adjourned. You may stop the recording. Thanks everybody for joining and staying and have a great meeting.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]