
ICANN85 Mumbai | CF – ccNSO: Internet Governance Liaison Committee Session
Saturday, March 7, 2026 – 10:30 to 12:00 IST

CLAUDIA RUIZ

Hello and welcome to the ccNSO Internet Governance Liaison Committee session. My name is Claudia Ruiz and I along with my colleague, Joke Braeken, are the remote 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 also post them in the chat for your reference.

During this session, questions or comments submitted in chat will be read aloud. If you would like to speak during this session, please raise your hand in Zoom. When called upon, virtual participants will unmute their microphone in Zoom. On-site participants will use a physical microphone to speak.

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 Annaliese Williams, Chair of the IGLC. Thank you.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS

Thanks, Claudia, and good morning, everybody. Thank you for participating and hello to the people online. I would just invite the people who are sitting at the back of the room, there's plenty of room at the table, so come and take a seat around the table if you would like.

BART BOSWINKEL

Janis and David and Tatiana, come and sit on the table everyone. Yuri, Yumi, down the back. Come on, come on, don't be shy. Come and sit on the table.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS

Thank you. I feel a little bit less lonely now, so thank you. Today is the working session of the Internet Governance Liaison Committee and for those who don't know or who might be new, the Internet Governance Liaison Committee is a committee of the ccNSO which is designed to encourage and facilitate the participation of ccTLD managers in Internet Governance Processes, including those sorts of outside of ICANN.

So we will start with one admin item to discuss, the IGLC effectiveness review. Joke, did you want to talk about that one for us and tell us what's happening? Thanks.

JOKE BRAEKEN

Hello everyone, Joke here. So, happy to speak about this IGLC effectiveness review. ccNSO council has determined to conduct regular effectiveness reviews of all the ccNSO committees and Working Groups and this review is mandated by council. A small selection, small committee will conduct a review following a call for volunteers and I see Bart wishes to chime in.

BART BOSWINKEL

The reason is it's been deferred to the civil meeting very recently. The reason is we couldn't get the group to meet in person. Two of the four people are not in Mumbai right now, so it doesn't make sense. Only having two interviewees or two interviewers for the full group is a bit of a stretch, especially if you look at who is one of the interviewers, that's Alejandra, so she has a very full agenda and Sean is the other one. So, it will start in Seville.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS

Thank you, Bart. Are there any questions about the review?

BART BOSWINKEL

I don't know whether Alejandra or Sean has the experience. It is very interesting because people start to speak about it. Don't consider this anything like going to the doctor or something. This is really promoting your work almost.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS

Thanks, Bart. So, we have the agenda on the screen, so I'll just go through what we're going to be doing today. We're doing the next stage of our work plan exercise and then we will talk about the other IGLC sessions that are happening at ICANN and discuss the proposal for the coming ICANNs. So we might move on to the next slide, please.

JOKE BRAEKEN

Annaliese, if I may, can I help?

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS

No, sorry, I was just confused about where I was in my slides. I'll just close that one and look at the one on the screen, I think. So yeah, well, I've covered that briefly this morning, but the role of the IGLC is to encourage ccTLDs to get involved in the conversations and processes around Internet Governance.

So, we meet between ICANN meetings to share information, work to share information amongst ourselves, but also with other stakeholders. Many ccTLDs are closely engaged in their national Internet Governance Processes and many work closely with their governments as well and participate in other national, regional and global Internet Governance Processes.

So, I think most people here today are members of the committee, but I think there are some people, some guests at the back of the room, so that's who we are. Today we will be doing the next phase of our forward work plan. So, the work plan gets updated annually

and we start with a heat mapping exercise where we just invite all members to share what are the hot topics in Internet Governance in their countries and in their regions. It's sort of like a -- sorry, did you want to speak? Okay, sorry.

So yeah, we've done the heat mapping phase, sort of the gathering ideas. We have shared that with the broader ccNSO members and asked for input to whether there were anything missing. And then from that step, we kind of have a look and see which topics are common across the regions, across all regions or most regions. And then we choose a few for further exploration.

So, we've done a napkin pitch exercise where we explore a particular question or a big idea and ask what would be the benefit for ccTLDs and for the ccNSO more broadly in the IGLC exploring that issue. And then we sort of brainstorm about things, potential actions that we could do to sort of fill a gap or fill a need for the ccTLDs or ccNSO. So we've done those phases at our online meetings.

Today, we are going to be doing the last stage, which is exploring the impact versus effort to ask ourselves which are the items that will go into our draft into our draft work plan. So, do we have some slides for how this one today is going to go?

JOKE BRAEKEN

So, Annaliese, here are the four topics that IGLC has previously selected. So, future of Internet Governance, sovereignty, online

harms, and resilience. And those are the four topics that IGLC explored via a napkin pitch exercise. So what they did is look at the impact and the benefits for ccTLDs, what is the impact and the benefits for the ccNSO, and how can IGLC potentially deliver?

So, any idea that came up was added into the napkin, but now it's time to converge and to do a prioritization based on the ideas raised via the napkins. So to that end, a document was circulated to the IGLC mailing list with a draft assessment of the impact and the effort.

If you could go to the next slide, please. There we can see how the impact effort analysis will be conducted. So, the impact is how directly does the action benefit ccTLD managers in addressing this theme? Whereas the effort is what are the resources and what is the coordination and the time required for IGLC to deliver on this action? So those two elements determine whether IGLC will indeed undertake the activity, and if so, when?

We prepared a series of questions via Mentimeter. So, you're kindly asked to scan the QR code on the next slide or join via the browser. So go to menti.com and then type the code that you see there. And then in a minute, we will bring up the first question and can discuss the results based on results showing up on the screen. Thank you.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS

Does everybody have their phone and have access to the Menti?

JOKE BRAEKEN

Annaliese, if I may? There's a little bit of a scoring guide, which we shared here. What we do first is to assess the impact of the, of the actions. So, low impact means that the topic is relevant to a small subset of ccTLDs or other groups, and other groups are better placed to deliver. Versus high impact is where ccTLDs across regions face the issue indeed, and IGLC needs to support the issue to navigate the theme. So, that is how the impact will be assessed.

What I will also share in the chat is the background document for those that were not involved in the previous exercises to help guide this this conversation.

So, on the next slide, we have the question regarding the impact assessment. Unless there are any questions, happy to answer. Seeing none, then maybe you can go to the exercise. Thank you.

BART BOSWINKEL

Looking for three more responses. If you look at it, you can see 23 out of 25 have responded on the right-hand lower corner, and they've noticed the distribution as well. Where you see the higher bands, et cetera, you can see the how people have voted. So, it is an indicator of the distribution of it as well. So the midpoint, that's the average, and the other one is the distribution. So, that's a telling point as well.

JOKE BRAEKEN

Did you want to speak? Perhaps there's anybody that wishes to speak regarding their assessment? Why was the assessment made?

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS

Does anybody want to comment on the results, or talk about how they rate it? Yes.

PABLO RODRIGUEZ

Thank you, Annalise. Greetings, all. I think that the future of Internet Governance is quite important to any ccTLD operator, but also to the users. So this issue, without a doubt, or at least these results in my opinion, reflect some of that concern, right?

That it is a great topic, an important topic that should be addressed, and that and along with sovereignty as well. And it's something that for most of us, in not only North America, but in the Latin American region, in the Caribbean region, is also quite important topic to attend to. Thanks.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS

Thank you. Any other comments? The future of Internet Governance was one of our priority things last year as well. This is an issue that sort of carried over. The reason we do the heat mapping every year is to allow us to sort of track issues over time see where new issues are arising and sometimes new ones come up. So, I think sovereignty is one that we haven't seen before. But the future of Internet Governance was our priority last year as well.

Resilience is another one that sort of comes up regularly. Anyone want to share how they rated the issues and why? No? Sorry.

CHARLES NOIR

Yeah, Charles from CIRA for the record. So, I indeed agree with the notion that the future of Internet Governance is important for our community. But I also I chose sovereignty as well as something that we're watching very closely, certainly from a Canadian perspective. I think there's a great deal underway if you would, in the world.

And I think most countries, at least my interactions with GAC colleagues from a number of different governments are thinking quite closely about how that fits into their both legislative but regulatory framework. And so, I think it's something we should be keeping an eye on for sure.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS

Thank you. So, the next -- or are there any other comments before I move on? Go ahead. Thanks.

PETER KOCH

Yeah, this is Peter, for the record. I think I gave everything a medium or especially the online harms, for example, looking at the question, which emphasizes on ccTLD managers in your region. And we maybe need to take that into account judging the things. Otherwise, I agree that future of Internet Governance is very

important, but in Europe, I must say we have a very strong regional organization that already does this.

So that would be a duplication in a way, doesn't prevent IGLC from doing that, but the impact in comparison to what happens at the regional level is maybe a bit lower, but still fully appreciate the work done here. Just that maybe took the question too literally, but anyway.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS

All right. So that is the impact. I think that the next stage is to think about the effort that would be, be put into any work that we would be doing against any of these themes. So, we sort of think about if something's high impact but is low effort, then we would sort of think that that is something that we should pursue.

If something was medium or low impact and high effort, we would be thinking that perhaps we could spend our time more wisely on another theme. Welcome. Thank you. So, do we have another slide for working through the effort part of this exercise?

JOKE BRAEKEN

Absolutely. If we could go to the next slide, there's first some instructions again regarding the scoring guidance. So, low effort means that it can be delivered through existing IGLC meeting structure, member contributions and staff support, for instance, updates or newsletter contributions, those kinds of things.

Whereas high efforts means that IGLC would require perhaps new infrastructure multi-meeting work streams, et cetera, external partnerships. So this basically refers to the commitment, the time, the resources, et cetera, that IGLC would need to deliver on the on the actions.

So, in the next slide, that's the second question. You will see a similar type of question as you just used for the impact assessment. And the question here is what resources, coordination and commitment does IGLC need to deliver results on the topic within the next 12 months? And again, you see the four themes that IGLC previously identified with the three scoring options, low effort, medium effort and high effort. Thank you.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS

It looks like it's kind of stabilized. So, if anyone wants to sort of finalize their results, but it's looking fairly stable. And it looks like future of Internet Governance is sort of medium, slightly towards high effort. People have rated sovereignty a higher effort, exercise, online harms, medium and the resilience themes on the lower side of medium. Did anyone want to share why they ranked their results the way they did?

DAVID MCAULEY

David here from CIRA. Yeah, I put sovereignty as a high effort just because I think it's such a nuanced topic. It means different things to different people in different regions. It involves multiple

different stakeholder groups. There'd be a quite a, I would imagine a wide diversity of views on this within the GAC, for example. And yeah, in general, it can be challenging to bring this very woolly concept down from the clouds to engage with like the practicalities of it.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS

Yes. It could, but it could also be as you know, potentially as simple as sharing views from amongst different ccTLDs about what it means in their country or region or what it means for their registry. I think it is one of those issues that is sort of lots of jurisdictions are considering it and what it means. It could be interesting to explore what it means for ccTLDs and anyone, anyone else want to share what they, what they rated and why?

PABLO RODRIGUEZ

Thank you. I pretty much agree with David because in each region, it means different things. I remember when governments would rival the TLD operators because they felt that if the TLD represents the country, is a country code, consequently, they are the people, they are the group that represents, they have been elected to represent the people of that country.

Therefore, that particular TLD belongs to them. So, who is responsible for what and how and to what level, to what degree, and so on. It changes. In Europe many of these questions are

answered and it's pretty clear and so on and so forth. In other regions of the world, it's not so clear and the rivalries continue.

So, it is a very delicate subject to, to handle. And with respect to the online harms and the resilience, in my perception, in my opinion, it is something that ICANN and the ICANN community and the ccNSO, without a doubt, has been very actively working on that. And in my opinion, again, it has done a pretty good work at informing, educating, and so on. Thank you.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS

Thanks. Yeah, Peter.

PETER KOCH

Thanks, Annaliese. This is Peter from DENIC. So, I rank sovereignty very high for the reasons that the colleagues already shared to very complex lots of different meanings and so on and so forth. I'm a bit surprised by the result for resilience. I had it in the medium because I think it's not an easy win, but maybe it is because people have different ideas about what the meaningful results would be.

And I'd be interested in colleagues sharing what these results could look like, and then maybe it's one of the easier ones. And actually, my judgment was in the different direction. Future of Internet Governance looked 'easy' in comparison to the others meaningful results there.

Yeah, we plan for like plenty pot and other things and WSIS+20. So, the roads are clear, not necessarily every stop. But that's not so

much the case for resilience. I'd be interested to hear what people think are the meaningful results for resilience. Thank you.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS

Thanks, Peter. Anybody want to share? Oh, sorry. Jaijit, we'll go to you, please.

JAIJIT BHATTACHARYA

Yeah, I just wanted to double down on the sovereignty part of it, because essentially what it means is the ability to subvert the will of the nation. And if that's happens to the internet therefore that's a challenge on the internet already and which is why one of the ways to challenge sovereignty is by cutting off resilience and access. And therefore, three of the issues are kind of highly correlated, which is future of Internet Governance, because it should ensure that each people of each nation have the ability to access internet and does so freely without other people's deciding how the internet should be used in that particular region.

And hence resilience becomes an important part of it because the ability to bend the will is by cutting off access, which is essentially resilience. And I just want to put to the table that the three are correlated. The efforts may not be as complex because we can break down dimensions of sovereignty and then start addressing at least a few of them, which may not be very difficult.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS

Thanks. Jaijit. Anybody else want to share?

JOKE BRAEKEN

Thanks, Annaliese. I just had a look at the summary document that was previously posted also in the chat with some information regarding the napkins and resilience was indeed the most debated topic by IGLC during the previous sessions. And it spanned really from technical resilience to regulatory resilience, economic resilience and even environmental resilience was suggested.

So, power consumption, climate impacts, economic resilience, extending domain renewals during disasters et cetera. So, the big idea was to first define what resilience means in the IGLC context, and then perhaps coordinate with other groups within the ccNSO, but not necessarily such as TLD Ops, the committee that takes care of, words fail on me, the disaster recovery processes and measurements. So, IGLC could definitely address the theme from a certain angle, but other committees within the ccNSO might do so as well from their respective angles. And there was a suggestion to focus perhaps potentially on smaller ccTLDs and island states in terms of the resilience topic and explore the theme from that perspective. Thank you.

PABLO RODRIGUEZ

Thank you, Annaliese, and thank you, Joke, for reminding us. Without a doubt, there is a number of dimensions, dimensions to this topic, but as Joke correctly mentioned, I think this is a very

important topic for the Latin American and Caribbean region, especially for the Caribbean region anything related to the external environment climate change to resilience regarding, with respect to the internet infrastructure to the resilience to managing how do you recover from natural disasters, that type of thing remains.

It's not a topic that is unknown to us. We have dealt with it in the past specifically in ICANN61. In Puerto Rico we had experienced Hurricane Maria. we discussed that topic, but it doesn't it has not weaned down since then. It has gotten worse, so we need to continue to work with this topic and explore this topic along with the so many other important dimensions of it. Thank you.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS

Thanks. Okay, any other comments from anyone, anybody wanting to share or to -- go ahead, Desiree.

DESIREE MILOSHEVIC

Thank you. Just wanted to follow up also on the comments that were made earlier and to say there was a little bit of a problem with the slider when it came to resilience. So, I personally would have scored it higher, but for me, the slider was stuck. So that's one vote more if it changes anything.

But what I wanted to just add is that when we talked about sovereignty and the that topic is worth reminding that some paragraphs in the Tunis agenda, especially the paragraph 35 which says that we recognize that existing arrangements for Internet

Governance have worked effectively and that the private sector and the technical community have a role in day-to-day operations of the internet whilst governments and other stakeholders are working, engage in public policy and governance discussion.

So, I think that that paragraph is really important when we talk about sovereignty in terms of having this operational role. And of course, there are many other aspects. I just wanted to highlight that. Thank you.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS

Thanks, Desiree. Any other comments or thoughts? So yeah, this is just sorting through the brainstorming that we have done up until now. It doesn't necessarily mean that we have to do anything on these issues or that we would. This is sort of how we sort of narrow down our focus. So yeah, it's not an obligation that we do anything against any of these. But we do have options to explore them and to work with other parts of the ccNSO that are also considering these issues from a different sort of aspect.

We, in this committee, sort of follow the policy and the regulatory angle of issues. But some of these issues are also being considered by from a more technical focus by other parts of other Working Groups and other committees. Anyone, any other comments, or do we have a slide that sort of synthesizes where we stand after the impact and efforts?

JOKE BRAEKEN

Thanks, Annaliese. There are two additional questions that will follow, but happy to make a summary after the meeting and circulate it with the group. Thank you. We can go to the next question now. This is really a prioritization across all topics.

And the next question refers to again, the four themes, of course. And the question is if IGLC does not act on any of these topics in 2026, would it, what would we start again? What would represent the greatest missed opportunity or risk for ccTLDs? See answers coming in. What this question aims to do is really to distinguish between topics that are in principle important and those where an action has immediate consequences.

So, it's really about urgency. So, if any of the topics is not addressed in a timely manner, is there a window that closes? What would be the impact? And it looks like sovereignty is rated as the most urgent topic here.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS

It looks like those numbers have stabilized. No, we're still having some movement. Yeah, sovereignty has come out well on top there. Interesting, I think I'll be interested in how we pull together the analysis and compare it with the impact versus effort. Anyone want to comment on them? Okay.

JODI ANDERSON

Jodi Anderson, .NZ. I wanted to vote for future of IG. I did vote for sovereignty. I think future of IG is something that continues to sort

of bubble under as an important topic for IGLC. I think in IGLC, we just need to sort of keep on that. It'll always be something that's an important and also really useful in a good -- IGLC is a good space to discuss future of IG.

But I think in terms of the question 2026, last year and the year before future of IG sort of bubbled to the top because of what was happening in the world. But for 2026, I feel like with the geopolitical situation, sovereignty is just getting... it's just the one that's bubbling to the top, it's the one that people are talking about. Sovereignty is the reaction to what's happening in the world. And I think it'd be really useful for us to have discussions on sovereignty to unpack that a bit, and that's why I voted for it for 2026.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS

Thanks, Jodi. Everton?

EVERTON RODRIGUES

Thank you, Annaliese. Just very briefly, I voted for sovereignty because I feel that somehow the future of IG will be in any way discussed at the IGLC one way or another. This is a topic that is part of our ongoing work, but when it comes to sovereignty, what concerns me the most is that although it's been very discussed a lot in many areas and under many different heads, sovereignty still has very different flavors around the world and depending on who is talking about what.

So, a clarification about sovereignty from the perspectives of both of the IGLC and from the ccTLD world would be much appreciated, so this could be a very concrete output from the IGLC just to give a better overview of what we are talking about when we are talking and discussing about sovereignty. So, thank you.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS

Thanks, Everton. Any other comments or thoughts?

PABLO RODRIGUEZ

Well, it is important and I agree with Everton's comments because sovereignty, it's not an independent subject from internet governance, it's a subtopic of it. So, speaking of sovereignty is also speaking of the future of IG. Thanks.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS

Yes. I think there's a lot of interrelation between the themes. Joke, did you want to speak?

JOKE BRAEKEN

Just want to refer again to the Google Doc with the summary of the napkin pitch discussions where IGLC previously discussed on what it might mean for ccTLDs and what it might mean for the ccNSO and how IGLC could deliver. And indeed, IGLC then determined that it could mean different things in different countries and in different contexts.

And there are, for instance, the regulatory approaches to challenges faced by ccTLDs, but the big idea really is for IGLC to be a safe space for ccTLDs to share information, to share use cases, whether that is from a regulatory, technical or linguistic point of view. And stress that sovereignty doesn't mean isolation necessarily, but rather autonomy in a collaborative model. And universal acceptance and multilingualism emerged as sub-themes, but there were also sub-themes identified there as well.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS

Yeah, I think it might be one of those issues that if we do start discussing it amongst ourselves and what it means from various perspectives, it might sort of throw up more ideas as well for us to think about. Is there another question or was that?

BART BOSWINKEL

Just maybe if you recall, and some of you will recall it, you have organized a session and I think that was with Pierre and when he was chair of the IGLC on sovereignty. So, it might be very useful. I don't know, I can't recall when it was. It was after the pandemic, I recall, but look back to that session and what was discussed and see how you can build on what was done at the time.

Because I recall it was a very interesting one because that clearly showed the diversity of approaches, especially I think at the time the presentation of Molehe Wesi was very interesting because it showed the South African approach to sovereignty, which was a

little bit different than the usual approach that people have to sovereignty. So maybe we'll see if we can find the presentation of that session, and it's something to take into account as well. I think it was about four years ago.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS

Thanks, Bart. It would be good if we could sort of locate that and share it. Do we have another question for the Menti or have we finished this?

JOKE BRAEKEN

Yeah, there's indeed one final question. Question two is, or the final question is regarding on which topic does IGLC add unique value? So, you do not want to have overlap with other groups. IGLC has a different approach, a different perspective. So, which of these topics is suitable for unique delivery by IGLC?

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS

It looks like those numbers have stabilized, but if you haven't put in your answer yet and you would like to, please do so. It looks like again sovereignty has come out twice as high as the next closest. Go ahead.

PABLO RODRIGUEZ

Thank you, Annaliese. And I think that it is a little bit difficult to say that what is that one particular topic that we discussed that no one else does, right? We're all discussing the same topics from different

perspectives, from different dimensions and so on. But without a doubt, this is the one place where we can discuss about sovereignty from the perspective of that internet governance side of things, which makes it more particular of us than any other groups. Thanks.

LAURA MARGOLIS

Thank you, Annaliese. Well, as Pablo said, I think it's very difficult to find like a unique point, because we are all discussing the same topics, just with different views, but the topics remain the same. So maybe I would add one more option here that none of them. Thank you.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS

That's a fair comment. I don't see any other hands. So, Joke, what is the next step? We will analyze all of the four questions and share some results with the group?

JOKE BRAEKEN

Indeed. So that leads into the IGLC work plan. If we go to the next slide, you will see that IGLC has a session later this week during the ccNSO members meeting. So, the session is not focused on the IGLC work plan. However, it might be a good opportunity to showcase the work of the group and to quickly check with the community regarding the direction of travel, if there's any concerns or comments regarding the discussions to date.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS

Thanks, Joke. Yes, we have a session on Tuesday as part of the ccNSO members program. Going back to our sort of a broader theme of regulation and how that impacts on ccTLDs. So, we will have four speakers for that session. We sort of focused a lot last year on the WSIS+20 had sort of been our primary focus.

So, we will be going back to exploring regulatory themes and what's happening across four different CCs. So that's 10:30 on Tuesday. So, I hope that you will all come and participate in that one. I think it'll be a good session and a good opportunity to sort of share with the broader ccNSO membership about the discussions here today and the discussions as part of our sort of heat mapping and napkin pitch and where we have landed with these exercises.

JOKE BRAEKEN

On the next slide, I don't know if it's a little bit premature, but it's definitely something worth discussing. The proposal would be, since the resilience topic was so discussed intensively during the napkins, and while of course we didn't have the results of today's Mentimeter polling just yet, the idea was to perhaps have a resilience session at ICANN86 in Seville or at ICANN87.

And noting that there are different CCNSO streams working on the resilience related topics, as TLD Ops mentioned previously, IGLC of course, but also the study group on the role of IANA in ccTLD

disaster recovery is dealing with the theme. So perhaps it could be an idea to have a session and explore where IGLC overlaps with or complements with or diverges from existing work on business continuity and disaster recovery. Any suggestions whether that would be a good idea or is there any concerns that you see?

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS

Anyone want to comment on this one? Check online. No. Yeah, this could be a good opportunity to, you know, sort of add the IGLC perspective to this issue and collaborate with some of the other groups who are already considering these, considering resilience. But any thoughts, questions? People think that is a good idea or not a good idea?

PABLO RODRIGUEZ

I am of the belief that doing something is better than not doing anything, right? So, I think it is a great idea.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS

And yeah, go ahead. Thanks, Peter.

PETER KOCH

Yeah, this is Peter for the record. As the chair of this study group, I might be a bit biased. And I would first like to get the backing of the committee members, but I would assume that they think that's a good idea.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS

I think it's a good idea. I think it's a good opportunity to collaborate with some other groups. And, you know, resilience is a theme that we've seen multiple times on our heat mapping exercise. So, it's something that is of interest to across the regions. But I'm not seeing -- go ahead, Bart.

BART BOSWINKEL

I'm looking at Peter now. Shall we share the regulatory overview as an example of one of the findings of the, it's not complete, it's not exhaustive, but gives a rough idea about, we can discuss it tomorrow morning with the group as well first.

One of the things they've done, the study group is looking at various regulatory frameworks that deal with business continuity and disaster recovery for ccTLDs. And that ranges from this to for the European region, so for the EU effectively, and related to areas where there is none. And it's not just them. I think they looked at 21 different regulatory frameworks and summarized them.

So, you will see various, I would say, obligations for ccTLDs and how they play out across the world. And the impact on business continuity and disaster recovery.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS

I think Peter's just going to --

PETER KOCH

Yeah, I suggest we discuss that in the study group, because that it is, it is supposed to be an internal working document. And if we start sharing it, that might be a bit confusing. There's no secrecy behind it, but the message that would be, the subliminal message that could be read into that is something that we should talk about first. Thank you.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS

Of course. Joke, did you want to...?

JOKE BRAEKEN

Yeah, I just wanted to refer to this napkin pitch analysis on page 15. There's really an overview of the different dimensions, where there's overlap regarding the work by the different workstreams, so by TLD-OPS, so by the Disaster Recovery Study Group. So it gives a little bit of background on the context regarding the different dimensions. I think it is being displayed now in the Zoom room. Indeed. So, you see here a table. Thank you.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS

So, any comments or questions? Thank you for preparing this. I think it's good to see the sort of the areas of a focus of the different groups. In terms of... I'm not sure if this is a question for Bart Boswinkel or whether it's a question for Peter, but in terms of what this group would be asked to do, or when would we be looking to sort of to collaborate across the groups, if we are going ahead in

the next meeting or the one after, what sort of the time frame for discussing or agreeing the approach?

PETER KOCH

So, this is Peter again. So the study group is time-bound, and I'm looking at Bart, by the end of this year, kind of, ish, subjunctive. So, we should do it between this and the survey meeting and maybe have a conversation between the chairs and staff and maybe some members of the committee.

BART BOSWINKEL

I think tomorrow morning the Disaster Recovery Study Group will meet. So this is probably one of the topics to discuss, whether they want to be willing to go ahead.

One of the things they need to do anyway is present some of their intermediate results, I think, on Wednesday, and around that time, say, if there is a, I would say a sense of this group to move forward, probably this might be something to present at that meeting as well, either by the two of you, say, that we start preparing, then it's a matter of preparing, etcetera, for, yeah, my suggestion would be Seville, and then do it a two-block one, because then you can separate the two things a little bit, then you can separate the two a little bit, but by then you're supposed to start presenting the direction, really the direction of travel of the study group, and then work towards a final report, and that will be ready by Oman. So, that's the planning for you.

PETER KOCH

Yeah, thanks for the reminder, Bart, as always. So, bottom line is, this is the advertisement. Maybe members of this committee could be interested in what the study group is presenting on, as Bart said, on Wednesday, to understand what the scope is there, and also what potential connections or commonalities are.

So you're invited to that presentation session, as it's an open session anyway, but it might be -- no, not tomorrow morning, I mean the presentation session, right, and to understand what this is about, and what IGLC could do complementary to that, more in the governance space rather than what this is, because you also saw the TLD ops there, which is very operational.

Study group is looking specifically into IANA's role, but that's already covering a bit the policy space, because if IANA would come into play, then there probably would be the need for a policy, but the broader governance space is then maybe not left to, but the prerogative of this committee, which goes back to the commonalities and potential overlaps, and I think we are fine, there's enough to do, so we can share work between the three groups. Makes sense to you, Annaliese?

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS

I think so, yes. Thanks, Peter.

PETER KOCH

Thank you.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS

Any comments or questions from anybody? Don't see any. So, it seemed to be agreement that we will look at how we can do this, so we'll provide further information on that one again as well in coming days.

Do we have another slide? No? We can pop back to the agenda, if we have that one handy. So, we have made quite good time today. I think it's a smaller group than we would normally have at this thing, but I think perhaps the time zone has, some of our regular participants may not have found this time zone particularly friendly, but we have come to the end.

Is there any other business that anybody wanted to raise today? Don't see any hands online either. Everton, go ahead.

EVERTON RODRIGUES

Thank you, Annaliese. Just to bring something that I have already brought on our meetings, but I would like to use this opportunity as well to promote food for thought around the theme of child protection, legislation, and discussions around these surrounds, on the surroundings of the responsibilities of ccTLDs.

So I wish I could also, as I have promised to discuss this in Mumbai, unfortunately it wasn't possible for me in person this time, but still, I think this is an important topic that ccTLDs should also be aware of what the discussions are around the globe. And I would like to

make myself available for further conversations with the head of the IHLC or around anywhere else that we can find appropriate to have this conversation. Thank you.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS

Thanks, Everton. The online harms question has generated quite a bit of discussion in our regular meetings. There is a lot of activity in this space, a lot of governments looking at regulation, so I'm sure that, as a committee, we will continue to discuss that. But thanks for that, Everton.

The other thing is that I think the clocks have changed or are changing, so we will have to look at it. I'm not going to winter and summertime, so we will have to look again at our meeting time and send out some invitations for forward meetings. But our next meeting will be on -- did you want to speak, Tatiana? No, okay, sorry.

Our next meeting, our next committee meeting, will be on 25 March at 20:30 UTC. Again, just a reminder of our session at 10:30 on Tuesday. We have four speakers to speak about the broad theme of regulation or regulatory initiatives in their countries.

We are ahead of schedule, but I think if there are no other comments or contributions, we might draw the meeting to a close. Thanks. Joke has just popped the reminder in the chat for the Tuesday session. Thank you for your participation and your contributions today. We will analyze the results of the Menti

questions and circulate those back to members. Thank you, all. I think we will close the meeting.

CLAUDIA RUIZ

You can stop the recording. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]