ICANN85 Mumbai | CF – ccNSO: Working Group and Community Updates
Tuesday, March 10, 2026 – 13:15 to 14:30 IST

CLAUDIA RUIZ

Hello and welcome to the ccNSO Working Group and Community Update Session. My name is Claudia Ruiz and I am the Remote Participation Manager for this session. Please note this session is recorded and is being 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. They will be noted 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. Interpretation, there is no interpretation for this session, friendly reminder.

If you would like to speak during this session, please raise your hand in Zoom. When called upon, virtual participants will be given permission to unmute. On-site participants will use a physical microphone to speak. Please speak slowly and thank you very much.

With this, I will hand the floor over to Alejandra Reynoso, Chair of the ccNSO. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO

Thank you very much, Claudia, and welcome all to the ccNSO Working Groups and Committees Updates. Today we have a very interesting set of committees that would like to let you know what they are doing and what are their plans for the future. I'll give you also some updates outside of that, but we will have contributions from the TLD Ops Standing Committee, from the Guidelines Review Committee, from the Universal Acceptance Committee, and the two Study Groups, one diving into IANA's role in ccTLD disaster recovery and the other in IANA public records.

So, before going to the committees, let me tell you a bit of a heads up. Soon we will have a new tool that we will be able to use to request joining a Working Group. So, the way it will work is that you will need your ICANN account, and in the ICANN account, through the ICANN services menu, there will be an ICANN join option.

So, there you will find a list of groups, and the one that interests you, you will be able to, well, choose it from the list and this will alert the secretariat of your intention of joining a group. Later, the secretariat will reach out to you regarding the final appointment by council. So, this is not yet available, but we wanted to let you know that it's coming your way, so you're aware, and once it's available, we will send a note through the mailing list so to let you know that now you will be able to use it.

With that, I want to let you know as well that the ccNSO committees and Working Groups all are now in a rotation of Continuous Improvement effectiveness review. So, far, the Working Groups

that have been already reviewed are the Onboarding and Involvement Standing Committee, OISC. This is a former Working Group that later evolved into the OMC. That's the Onboarding and Mentoring Committee. Then the BNSW Standing Committee and the Meetings Program Committee were the latest to be reviewed.

The next one in line is the Internet Governance Liaison Committee, and then you can see all the rest of the committees that will be reviewed. The idea is that we have a periodic review of every committee to check whether they're still fit for purpose or they are doing as we are expecting or if there's anything that needs to be, well, improved.

With that, if you're currently interested in joining any of the Working Groups, please do write an email to the ccNSO Secretariat, and if you want to learn more about the work that is being done by the Working Groups and what's going on in the ccNSO, please subscribe to the ccNSO newsletter to get at least a monthly input on what we are doing.

So, with that, I don't know if there are any questions. Looking quickly in the Zoom and in the room. If not -- oh, yes, Biyi?

BIYI OLADIPO Good day, everyone. My name is Biyi Oladipo. I just wanted to find out, it's just a clarification that on the new tool for joining, would current Working Group members and committee members be required to use the tool, or they'll be automatically on boarded and

on their ICANN join, you can see the services that they're subscribed to. Just to clarify.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO I don't think the tool is meant to show you to which groups you are subscribed, but maybe I'll defer this one to Claudia that I see her hand is up.

CLAUDIA RUIZ Hi. Thank you. So when you go into ICANN join, you will see the Working Groups and committees that are available for you to join. So, once you see them there, you can subscribe, which is basically opening a ticket. And once we go through the process, because you still have to be appointed by the council, then you will receive an email letting you know that you have been registered and et cetera.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO Yes, but I think that the question was more on if here in this ICANN join tool, if each person will be able to see to which groups they are already subscribed.

CLAUDIA RUIZ I believe when you log in, you can see which groups you belong to, but that's a good question. I'll try to get an answer for you in the meantime.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Yes, thank you. So, we will know a little bit more later and let you know. Thank you, Biyi, great question. And you still have your hand up. Oh, there you go. Okay. So, with that, let's move on to Régis to talk about the TLD-Ops.

RÉGIS MASSÉ: Thank you. So, good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. I'm Régis Massé, I'm the CTO of the Dataflow Registry AFNIC and I'm also the chair of the TLD Ops group. And today, yeah, I said to do the clicker, first challenge.

I would like to talk about TLD-Ops, what is it, what it matters and what is that achieved about over the last 10 years and where it could go next. As its core, TLD-Ops is really about something simple but essential, making sure that TLD operators are not alone when they face security or operational incidents.

So, that is where TLD-Ops comes in. It provides a trusted framework for registry operators to communicate, cooperate and support each other when it matters most. If I had to describe the purpose of TLD-Ops in a few words, I would say it has four main roles. It helps coordinate responses to DNS related incidents.

It provides secure emergency communication channels between registry operators. It allows people to share best practice and it helps strengthen the resilience and continuity over the global DNS. So, TLD-Ops is not only about reacting to crisis, it's also about

preparing for them, learning from each other and building trust across the community.

So, how does it work in practice? TLD-Ops operates within the ccNSO environment with support from ICANN and participation is limited to authorized technical contact from ccTLD registries. That is important because trust is really at the foundation of this initiative. When sensitive operational of security information is being shared, people need to know they are speaking within a secure and reliable community.

Participation is voluntary but clearly the more registries that are involved, the stronger the network becomes. In practice, the community relies on things like encrypted mailing lists, secure contact directories and communication channels. This may sound quite basic, of course, but during an incident, having the right contact information and the ability to reach the right people quickly can make a huge difference.

So, TLD-Ops is both a community and an operational tool. It is built on trust but is also designed for action and that is important.

If you look at the participation today, the numbers are encouraging, but they also show that there is still work to do. Overall, TLD-Ops includes 70% of the ccTLDs all over the world. So, on one end, that tells us that TLD-Ops already have a real footprint and that many registries see value of being part of it, of course, but

on the other hand, it also tells us that the network is not yet as inclusive as it should be.

And in cyber security, that matters because resilience is stronger where more people can exchange information quickly and securely. So, one of the key challenges going forward is claiming to bring more registry into the community, of course. We have got the list. We are not on the mailing list yet.

I think this moment is a good moment also to look back because TLD-Ops has now been around for about 10 years. It was created 16 years ago, but I will focus here on the last 10 years. And over those 10 years, it has gradually become more structures and more useful for the community. I hope so.

A Working Group was established. A term of use of charter was put in place. Registration procedure was created. A steering committee was formed and dedicated online spaces were developed. And beyond governance, TLD-Ops has also produced a number of very particular outputs. Playbooks on disaster recovery, on business continuity, for example, or on DDoS mitigation. And also worked on tabletop exercise, including exercise during ICANN66 and ICANN81.

And more recently, maybe some of you don't know that, it organized a cyber security workshop during ICANN84. And during ICANN84, let me say a few words especially on that. The workshop focused on cyber security awareness with around 40 participants

attending on a Sunday morning. And it's a big deal, 40 people on a Sunday morning.

And I think that is important for two reasons. First, because awareness still matters. Not all registries have the same threat environment and all of them have the same internal resources of level of maturity when it comes to cyber security. And second, because workshops like this help to create a shared culture and that help people from move to, from, sorry, this is a technical issue from somewhere else too.

This is something we all need to be prepared for. And it's one point very interesting in cyber security. The workshop had three main goals. Raise the awareness of cyber security among registries, prepare practical best practices, and to introduce Open-Source tools that can help strengthen security in a realistic and cost-effective way. And the last point is very, especially valuable, because not every registry has large terms or large budget.

So, showing practical access to this is very useful contribution, I think. In that sense, ICANN84 was not informative, but also a capacity building for some registries. It's the slide just to give you the list of the same committee members again. One of the members is just here in the room. Thank you, Ali, for being here in the room with us. I'm not sure if you can see this, but as you can see, we lack diversity. So, ladies, technical ladies, you are welcome to join the group, of course.

So now I think it's the right moment to introduce the next group. The next group is going to tell us not only what has TLD-Ops done, but also what should TLD-Ops become next. We have defined several priorities within the group.

One is to review the charter and see what still works, what needs to be updated, and what should be clarified. Another is to bring in countries and registries that are not yet part of the mailing list, of course. And a third one is to review the website and approve it where necessary. And the website of the ccNSO website, especially, was redesigned and rebuilt, and thanks for that.

So, we have just to review and see if we have to improve some of the things. And finally, we want, going on, there is strong focus on developing better information sharing tool, especially when it becomes to contact and communication between registries. So, it's not just housekeeping, but it's really about making TLD-Ops more relevant and more effective in the future.

And the last part, I just check the time. Okay. I don't want to get the time of the other panelists. Another important part of the discussion today is the question of the community expectations. Because the value of TLD-Ops depends on whether it addresses the real needs of the registry.

First of all, one idea mentioned for this year is the presentation in particularly interesting, I think, I hope, sharing feedback for a French national cybersecurity exercise conducted in 2025. It was a one-day crisis simulation. More than 1,200 organizations in France

played the same crisis game the same day. And we played it at AFNIC and we have adapted the scenario, the global scenario of ccTLD context.

So I think it's important, it may be interesting for the community to have this kind of exercise because exercise is often the best way to improve readiness. They allow teams to test produce and you know all the gains that we have with exercise. But as the scenario was adapted, especially to the reality of registry operation, it becomes even more useful.

And we can have the authorization at AFNIC to give all the materials to the community. So, you can use it on your own if you want to in the next future. So, I will propose to make this presentation during the ICANN87 in October to be sure to have time to prepare the things.

But we've got for the steering committee, we have two questions. What do registry expect in terms of cybersecurity information exchange? And the second is what topic should the Working Group focus in the future? There are many possible areas where the group can contribute. But the most important thing is that these priorities should reflect what the community always needs.

And that is also the final message of the presentation is so important. The group needs volunteers. TLD Ops is community-driven. Its future depends I think on people who are willing to

contribute ideas, share experience, help development resources and take part in the work. Without this engagement, we can exist.

TLD Ops still can exist. But the action will be weaker. With that engagement, TLD Ops can continue to evolve into something even more useful or more impactful I hope for the community.

So, just to conclude, TLD Ops has already built something I hope so. And thanks for the last chair of the group, the last chairs of the group over the past decade. He has created a trusted space for communication and coordination. He has helped strengthen operational security cooperation across the community and he has particular resources.

And now it has the opportunity to move into a new phase, one focused on renewal, border participation with new updated tools and stronger collective resilience. But TLD Ops matters because no registry should face operational or cybersecurity challenge in isolation.

And if you want the DNS ecosystem to remain resilient, then building and serving communities like TLD Ops are essential. So, thank you very much for your attention and I look forward for the discussion or your questions and to having your opinion about all the things for the next decade. Thank you very much.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO Thank you very much, Régis. Any questions, comments, already early input on expectations or topics to be addressed?

SHARON

Yes, please. Hi, my name is Sharon and thank you for the presentation. I'm here from .au. I just wondered whether you mentioned the cybersecurity exercise that was carried out last year. Are there any learnings from that exercise, something that's available to the broader community? Is that something we can all access? Because I'm sure there's things that we could all learn from such an exercise.

RÉGIS MASSÉ

Just to be sure, you spoke about the exercise, we play the table talks exercise, that's it. So, you've got on the website all the materials to play with that. And if we have just a few feedbacks at the end, because at the end of the exercise we met Ritex with all the groups in the room and I think maybe some of you can speak with the players in the room who have played that.

Ah, okay, I didn't understand that. I thought you were talking about the exercise, but if you speak about the, my French colleagues tell me that I didn't understand well the questions. You speak about the French exercise, we could, yeah, okay, sorry. About it, yes, there is a Ritex published by the national agency in France and the idea of the presentation in this year is also to make a wrap-up of this Ritex in France before giving all the things.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you. So, with that and not seeing any more hands up in the room or in Zoom, I will give the power now to Sean to talk about the GRC.

SEAN COPELAND: So, hello, and if I'm not talking loud enough, please let me know. Better? Yeah, okay. So, for the people that are new in the room, the Guidelines Review Committee is the, to reference Jordan earlier this morning when he was talking about the geeks in the back room, we're the policy wonks in the back room.

We deal with things coming from council, things coming from the community that require a policy or thought towards a policy, and we work towards authoring that and bringing it to the community.

The other thing that we do within the GRC, which I am thrilled about personally, is the council has allowed us to play with Continuous Improvement and test different things out with the community, and it does make the GRC a little bit more interesting than merely just policy.

So, usually we are up here talking about one of our Continuous Improvement exercises. This time it's a little bit more on what we have been working on and bringing things to the table. Obviously, a number of years ago we brought forward a SOI-COI process within the community. We had a need for it. At that time, we were a little bit ahead of what ICANN was doing, and now when ICANN published their Code of Conduct earlier last year, we brought that

forward into our current SOI and aligned what we are doing with the greater community, if you will.

There is no substantive change to what the SOI says, so when you get it and you're reading it, keep that in mind. You will see that we will be asking for a little bit more information. That goes into alignment with the type of information that ICANN itself is asking across the board.

The other one that is on there, under recently completed, it was a little bit aspirational. We had really thought we were going to get to it this weekend. We did not finish, and that, funny enough, is a Continuous Improvement Framework and working on the criteria and indicators.

For those of you that are aware, there was a process within ICANN where across the community we were working on Continuous Improvement. We defined framework, and then we brought it back within the community to see how we would adapt it to ourselves. There are five points to that framework, and right now we are about three-quarters of the way through the criteria and indicators, and that will actually land in your mailbox probably in about a month, month and a half, depending on how council reacts to it when they see it. So, that's aspirational.

On the other hand, in 2018 when I started being a member of the ccNSO community, writ large and joined this particular community, one of the items was on there and had been on there

for some time, and that is the board recall and director removal guideline.

I'm pleased to say that the one thing that I told Katrina back many years ago that I would retire over is actually going to be coming to the community not intending to retire. Sometime in the next 30-60 days you'll start to see the Board recall and director removal guideline in your mailbox. There's been a lot of work done on that. You will see diagrams, flows, and ease of information in that process.

We will go over that probably more in detail in Seville. You'll see a redo of the Board seat 11 and 12 nomination guidelines. You'll see that it will be broken up, and again there will be a process flow that will make the guidelines much easier for you to digest.

And then from that you see that we are working on the council selection guideline, the ccNSO members meeting guideline, and of course the accountability on diversity and accountability, which are ongoing work items for ourselves. But the intent to show you is that we are actually making functional progress along with what we are doing in the Continuous Improvement field overall.

And one of the reasons that we're able to do that is we actually use a Continuous Improvement methodology of a split run meeting where smaller groups within the GRC are working on specific items to complete them.

So, when we are doing a guideline and it's come to us from council or the community writ large, what happens is we draft a proposal and we spend a great deal of time looking at that proposal in light of what Annex D says, what our current practices are, and we make a best effort to provide a draft to council.

When we have finished that, the council gets a copy of that, and then the council members go over it, review it. If they're content with that, then they send it off to the community, to you guys, what the draft looks like. And if you guys have accepted it or you have concerns, it'll either come back to us for further adjustments or it will be adopted as actually policy for the ccNSO.

So, again, you're going to get the SOI guideline. When you're looking at it for your feedback, please do provide the feedback and same too with the Continuous Improvement Framework. So, to give you an idea of the Continuous Improvement, besides doing things such as the World Cafe or the open space, we do other things in terms of looking at qualitative and quantitative metrics and how we view the community.

So, and this is an example that is fairly straightforward. One of the principles goes along, are we fulfilling our purpose? So, we have criteria, the cooperation and learning within the community. When you look like an event like today, this is actually a cooperation and learning event. So, you see an exchange of information ideas, as was just happening earlier. You look at the relationships that are

built in person, the relationships that are built in line, and we can see that both in quality and quantity of how that is working.

And of course, you see the encouragement for collaboration across regions, and you see people bringing ideas to the floor, asking different questions from different regions that are relative to them, that cause the rest of us to kind of think about that in terms of our own space. So from that, we develop indicators, be it in satisfaction surveys, reviews, questions that we ask to see how we are actually doing as an entity.

One of the newer things that we have been doing, of course, is the reviews that Alejandra mentioned, where we do a particular type of survey done in a particular way where we are actually asking the person questions and taking down their responses. And that is done to gather information that is substantive in us understanding how the community is working.

So anyways, in all of that, we're always looking for volunteers. We are a very small group with a fairly large workload in relative terms. Yeah, I get policy is not for everybody, but we do have this Continuous Improvement side of it, and that's a lot of fun. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO Thank you very much, Sean. Does anyone have any comments or questions for Sean? No? All clear? Just check, double checking and the zoom. If you think about something, then maybe in the end

we can also have a little bit of space for that. So with that, now we are passing the power to Abdelmanem, who will talk about the Universal Acceptance Committee. Please, Abdalmonem.

ABDALMONEM GALILA Yes, thank you, Alejandra. This is Abdalmonem for the record. Universal Acceptance Committee was established since 2023 to provide the ccTLD community a platform in order to interact and share information at the global level and with other community groups under the ICANN umbrella for the topics and the matters that are related to IDNs and Universal Acceptance.

Also, for the topic of sharing, the main task also for Universal Acceptance Committee is to share information among ccTLDs and those other community groups. Based on this, we have Universal Acceptance libraries that have plenty of articles, reports, YouTube videos, inputs from ccTLDs that are related to Universal Acceptance readiness.

At the same time, we have sessions, a joint session between the Universal Acceptance Committee and the GAC-uaID workgroup. For this meeting, ICANN 85 had a session yesterday with the workgroup where we discussed one of the emerging technologies that could help to accelerate the adoption of Universal Acceptance, which is AI.

For liaising with other workgroups under the ICANN umbrella, we had liaisons with the Universal Acceptance Steering Group and

after UAEG, we had a nominee from the Universal Acceptance Committee to the UAE Acceptance Workgroup that was formulated early 2025 by ICANN CEO and Board in order to plan for the future activities, future work of ICANN related to Universal Acceptance adoption.

Looking back for ICANN82, Universal Acceptance Committee invited the community to explore the key driver for ccTLDs in order to achieve Universal Acceptance and we also explored the opportunities for sharing experience and during this ICANN82, we heard a lot of topics related to digital inclusion and the world that insists that government should be involved in cooperation with ccTLDs in order to go for Universal Acceptance.

That was the idea for ICANN83 to start from. So, for ICANN83 session, this was to explore how governments and ccTLDs can help to overcome the Universal Acceptance barrier and drive broader digital inclusion considering ICANN82 outputs.

And from there, from ICANN82 and ICANN83 outputs, we went for ICANN84 to have a joint session between Universal Acceptance Committee and GAC Universal Acceptance Ideas Workgroup and this was to explore opportunities for coordination to enhance Universal Acceptance readiness and strengthen Universal Acceptance related efforts across both communities.

We considered three main topics here for this joint session. We had the topic of policy leverage, we have the topic of technical adoption, we have the topic of capacity building. From all of these

outputs, we went for ICANN85 objective. We had a working session in preparation for the tech day session that was yesterday that has AI as the main topic for the panel discussion and explored the opportunities for AI in order to help ccTLDs and help the community for Universal Acceptance adoption.

And from this, we intend for OEC after ICANN85 to complete our working plan according to our inputs from ICANN 82, ICANN83, ICANN84 and this ICANN85 and finalize our comments to the report published by Universal Acceptance Expert Workgroup to have our input from the point of view of ccTLDs and to go for Universal Acceptance Day event, assist, promote and contribute.

Yeah, if you are interested to join the work and the activities of Universal Acceptance Committee, Universal Acceptance Committee membership is open for any ccTLDs that may be a ccNSO member or not ccNSO member and maybe it is working for organizations that operates ccTLDs, you are welcome to be here.

And from this position, I would like to invite all of you in order to go for Universal Acceptance Committee, Universal Acceptance Library in order to navigate what should your registry or your environment should be in Universal Acceptance Committee and why does Universal Acceptance matters. Yeah, that's for me for today on behalf of Universal Acceptance Committee. Thank you, Ms. Alejandra.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Abdelmonem. Does anyone have any questions or comments for Abdalmonem regarding Universal Acceptance Committee? Double checking, let me check on Zoom. Okay, so there we go. Now I hope the power is with Peter, hoping this is not another secret plan and please go ahead.

PETER KOCH: Yeah, thank you Alejandra and good afternoon, everyone. My name is Peter Koch, I work for DINIC and we run the German country called Top Level Domain. I'm also on the ccNSO Council and that got me the extra job of chairing the ccNSO Study Group on IANA's role in the disaster recovery, which is why I'm sitting here and talking to you and hopefully engage in a discussion afterwards.

Quick background, what is this? We had a policy gap analysis Working Group during the last year or one and a half that identified a couple of questions that needed further investigation and the conclusion was to set up a number of Study Groups and Study Groups don't make policy but they explore the field and make recommendations to the council and to the ccTLD community.

The ccNSO Study Group on the IANA's role in the disaster recovery, or ccTLD disaster recovery I should say, is the first of currently two and I believe Jordan will be after me to talk about the second. We currently have a handful of members, we started roughly after last ICANN meeting and I'll say a bit about the timeline during the rest of the presentation.

I'll start with a methodology that will be applied to this one, it is called the double diamond method and that has nothing to do with high pressure and also nothing to do with carbon but with the rhombic shape of the diamond and there are two of them which means that there would be four phases that I go through in a second and we are at the end of the first one so I'll share that information.

Let me skip this slide and go further because that makes more sense. So, these are the four phases, the discovering phase and this has broadly and that's the first triangle that widens. We started without having that methodology and found out that there's so much information about disaster recovery, business continuity and this and that and there's lots of definitions around, there are lots of regulatory information available all over the globe and you can easily lose yourself or yourselves in that pile of information when we actually have something to deliver.

So luckily, somebody like Bart discovered the methodology and suggested we use that and we could luckily transport much of the findings that we have to that date and carry that over into the methodology that will be applied because as always methodologies should support the work and not the other way around.

So, here we are, we've discovered so far a number of data points that will steer and inform our following work. We've been doing a lot of what we call desktop research as opposed to say interviews

or other methods of information gathering and the desktop research led us to, as I said, a number of definitions about these.

Most of you will know the ISO 2701 standards, standards on business continuity and also a large amount of information regarding different regulatory frameworks that exist and we are now looking into these intermediate results and will shape them in the second phase, so that is another triangle that then focuses again and here's your first rhombic shape and synthesize these into clearer parts of the problem, like we're separating that and we'll work on definitions that will help us in the second half, like the third and the fourth phase to then actually develop solutions and deliver the result. And that means here we are once again.

So, to put it on a timeline, week one to four and we start from this meeting more or less or two weeks prior to this meeting, so we're at the roughly at the end of the discovery phase, where we've, as I said, gathered lots of information that we need to digest and sort and we also and have also started identifying potential stakeholders and in the preparation of the engagement.

So, the second phase, the defined phase, again for four weeks, projected for four weeks, will be problem statements that be distilled from the findings and KPIs for the framework, I'll get to that in the end, but that's more for the steering of the process itself rather than for the technical substance of the output.

Third phase is going to be a bit longer, like six weeks in that case, and that widens again because it develops the document, so here's

the first half of your second diamond and then there is currently 10 weeks projected for the final phase, the deliver phase, which includes drafting and preparing the text and the document and that of course takes an amount of time because we usually do two readings of documents in the ccNSO, which is why that might take longer. It should be finished no later than the end of this year, 2026.

Okay, let me do this. So, more on the substance, right, so stakeholder mapping, that means we need to identify the stakeholders, which is partly easy because if the ccNSO, sorry, the ccTLD managers, then there is potentially a role for IANA in disaster recovery, but of course there might be other stakeholders like your local regulator or your local community significantly interested parties as we tend to call them in total.

We'll assess the situation, so we've discussed business continuity, disaster recovery and looked at some of these regulatory frameworks and the indication was that, or one of the findings was that the ISO standards are quite widely used, even though they are not necessarily mandatory all over the globe, but they are a good guidance for further work.

After that, we'll map the responsibilities under these regulatory frameworks for ccTLDs and we'll provide the overview of the landscape and we've done that while we were here and one of the findings was that there's a huge amount of diversity in multiple dimensions. That means we all know and assume that the sizes of

the TLDs and that means the staff available and other resources available is very divergent.

The organizational structure, being governmental, being private, being something else, is diverse, but there's also no one-to-one mapping between sizes and the organizational structure. We have business models and two or three other dimensions and the first finding and the important finding, I believe, or the team believes, is that there is a large amount of diversity when it comes to requirements and potential responses to disaster, which is what disaster recovery is for. So, we're not expecting to find a single silver bullet as a potential recommendation in the end.

The regulatory and compliance scan I had already mentioned. There's lots out there. We are lucky, I believe, that we found examples of regulation really across the globe. NIS2 in Europe is rather prominent recently because we've mentioned that in other presentations already, but there are many, many more and they were collected and, in the end, of course, actually we started with that a bit with fact finding from the side of IANA.

Why was the topic presented in the first place? Because there had been requests by individual ccTLDs to help, requests to IANA to help in certain situations which actually informed or inspired the whole process and we've taken that into account as well.

So, next slide and here. Yeah, what I said, we're going to widen this and take this into account, work on this. I'm skipping the details

because it's a bit repetitive and, in the end, there will be the recommendations.

Usually what we do in the ccNSO when we develop a policy, but we don't, but we copy that, we do a testing, like a stress testing on our recommendations. So, that's the phase where we brainstorm a bit about what could be wrong, what could be edge cases and the edge cases will be tested against the recommendation and everything should be covered, which doesn't mean that we would have a response immediately for all the single cases, but it's kind of a methodology that has proven very, very helpful in this environment.

And that's basically it here. Yeah, we got that phase four anyway. So, this is again for the risk management here is not your risk management, it's the process risk management. As we see there is a high likelihood of lack of stakeholder availability, I believe that is, and that has only a medium impact because we've done already a lot of the desk research. However, on the other hand, and you've grasped that maybe from what I told you, there's a high risk of scope creep because as I said, once you start walking around finding information, you can easily use yourself.

Hopefully the methodology will bind the team and help focus on producing the results. And resource constraint, as always, we are always talking about volunteer fatigue and everything else, and also there are now two Study Groups. We very much rely on the

perfect support by the ccNSO Secretariat, but they can't do so many things at the same time anyway.

So, there is orange and red, we need to keep that in mind, but I think we're on a good track. And that should bring me, yeah, success metrics, I think we can skip that. Brings me to the final slide or to the next presentation almost. Speaking of volunteers, as I said in the beginning, we have roughly a handful of participants, luckily very active participants, but we wouldn't mind having a few more heads, especially from regions that are not currently, quote-unquote, represented on the team.

So, if you're interested in joining the team, it isn't too late. Joining in the final phases might be a bit difficult because of learning curve, but we could sustain, of course, a few more heads and hands at the moment.

If you're super quick, you might talk to the Secretariat immediately, and I'm now putting stress on you, there's a council session at the end of the week, formally we could appoint people there, but never mind, you also should have time to consider what you do, and then talk to me or any other of the Study Group members or to the Secretariat if you consider joining for the three remaining phases. That's it from me, any questions?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO Thank you, Peter. Questions? I see Roelof.

ROELOF MEIJER

Roelof Meijer, .nl. Peter, first compliments for the presentation. It seems like a very, very thorough approach. My question to you is how does the group feel about the balance between what seems to be a huge amount of work, for instance, with the kind of a scan of the regulatory and legislative frameworks that apply to all the ccTLDs, which are completely different, I think, in many countries, so the balance between the amount of work that the group is going to do vis-a-vis the chance that the outcomes will ever be used?

PETER KOCH

Very good questions. I'm looking at Bart, but I think I can confess how the working worked. Yeah, because Bart is going to talk about his friend, I believe.

BART BOSWINKEL

First of all, the scan will not be exhaustive, so that's important, and you have nowadays, say with AI, you can do a lot in scanning public sources around what is available around, for example, the various regulatory frameworks.

Through that way, we've uncovered about 21 frameworks ranging from NIS2 to some voluntary frameworks in the Caribbean. They all deal one way or the other with business continuity and disaster recovery, so that's your starting point. We're also using material from the finance Working Group.

The finance Working Group has done a lot of research regarding ccTLDs and having data on the diversity of ccTLDs, and that's easy

to map because you can do that regionally, and regionally, you can apply the frameworks as well, so that material, and that's what we discussed last on Saturday, is already available, and that's it sets the dimensions in which you have to look at business continuity, so the desk research is there. The only thing what you really need to do, and that's the next phase of this group, is be creative in how you use it and start prototyping, and that's the third phase effectively what Peter was referring to.

So, at the end, give you a, I would say, a succinct and reasonably graspable outcome of what are the core elements of business continuity as a ccTLD, and how IANA could or could not help or assist, because that's also a question, and what needs to be done to improve it. So, that's the method. I hope I addressed your question.

PETER KOCH Yes, thanks, Bart. And maybe let me add one thing or two things on the framing the expectations. So, what would not happen is that the outcome will deliver the requirements for any single TLD. We're doing demographics, but on the individual TLD, the findings might be wrong, but overall might not be 100% precise or correct, right?

This is about what are the regulatory challenges that a ccTLD could be faced with in total. The community of ccTLDs could be faced with these and these questions, which would then sooner or later translate into questions to IANA or others, but IANA is our focus, so that we are prepared to see one of the regulatory requirement is

blah, so ccTLDs might have this or that request or requirement from IANA when planning the help, and then of course they are in different sizes and so on and so forth. Bart?

BART BOSWINKEL

Maybe one more point. There it comes. I could use my phone, but this is -- can you hear me? Through the microphone, I mean. I think one of the more fundamental starting points that the Study Group discussed and looked at is at the end of the day, a ccTLD has a function, a stewardship function.

As part of that stewardship function, there is this notion that, yeah, you need to ensure continuity, and I think that's the starting point, and depends very much on the environment you're in, and that's what we say, that's the other end of it, depends very much in the environment you're in, how that environment will shape your stewardship and what you need to take into account. This will set different pressures on different ccTLDs.

One way you could argue, if you have a clear regulatory framework, it makes it easy. You know what to do. If you're in an environment where you don't know what to do, and I'm really speculating, you have to find it out, and this could help the work of the Study Group, could help you as ccTLD to find out, okay, these are really core elements that you need to address. So, that's another way of looking at it. Thanks.

ROELOF MEIJER: Yeah, thanks Bart, and maybe a suggestion, but just out of the top of my head, maybe it would also be useful to kind of come up with a response or a recommendation, and what should you do as a ccTLD to make any intervention, in the case of disaster recovery, by IANA unnecessary? Because I think if you take your role within, of course, what are the possibilities within your country, but if you really take your stewardship role serious as a ccTLD, IANA should have no role in disaster recovery, is my opinion.

BART BOSWINKEL: Yeah, maybe, do you mind, Peter?

PETER KOCH: I was going to respond saying that the role might be the empty set, or the role might be zero, as you said, but that would still be an outcome that would be in scope, right, and there might be others who want to "help", but again, shaping the expectations, the Study Group might not produce very detailed recommendations, right, it would be high level, and we're definitely not making policy, and for whatever IANA would, however IANA would be involved, that might need policy, so that it would have to be addressed after the findings, but of course, it ranges from here to there, and it's more an enabling thing that we are working in, rather than a regulatory part, because there's no space for that.

ROELOF MEIJER Thanks for clarifying that, and taking so much time to respond to my question.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO All right, no problem. Any other questions or comments? Yes, yes, oh, Jordan.

JORDAN CARTER Yeah, so Jordan Carter, .au, for the record. Just following up on Roelof's point, it isn't the mandate of the group to try and develop a full disaster recovery playbook for the use of ccTLDs, yeah, so just making sure we're, I thought you'd probably get that, but just making sure we're all on the same page about that.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO Well, with that, and since you already have the power in your hands, I'll give it on the floor to you.

JORDAN CARTER The power. Hi, everyone, Jordan Carter again. I've got a one-slide update for you on the IANA public records Study Group, and that's because the previous Study Group started in Dublin in October, and our Study Group started on Saturday afternoon, so we have done much less work, but I just want to use a moment to remind you, or tell you, if it's the first time, the three interrelated topic areas of this Study Group, because IANA public records as a headline is not very informative.

So, there are three interrelated things. One is IANA Records Data Accuracy, and the reason that that, you know, the authoritative records that IANA publishes determine who the authorized manager is. If your company name, if you're running the registry and the company name is different in the IANA records, you could have a problem.

So, it is the central root zone registry is the authoritative record of who the ccTLD manager is, and sometimes the operational reality does drift away from what is listed in the public register, and, you know, in IANA's lovely neutral language, and I'm quoting, this can be caused by a number of underlying reasons, such as a lack of awareness or deliberate attempts to circumvent the global policies about who is a ccTLD registry or how to do a transfer. So, it's really important that these records are accurate. So, the Study Group will look at the level of accuracy of the records.

The second related topic is what is the purpose of these records? I've just described a relatively important use case. These records are the authoritative listing of who a manager is. They also present contact details for the ccTLD, so they are a way to get in touch, a way to find out how to get in touch with the CC.

There may be other purposes, and, you know, just as in privacy law these days, if you want to collect information, you need a purpose for doing so. It's probably useful for us all to be clear about what the purposes are for these records. And it may be that that discussion will uncover purposes that are not being met today that

lead to new record types or something. I don't know, but that's possible.

And the third thing is what to do if the data isn't accurate. What is the enforcement position? At the moment there is no way to enforce this problem. If people allow record accuracy to drift, they can be asked to update it, but there are no consequences for the data being out of date. Maybe there should be, maybe there shouldn't be. If there should be, what should they be? So, those are the three topics. That's what the glib headline of IANA data at public records sums up.

We are also following the double diamond approach that Peter teased out, so I don't need to do that again. We're in data gathering mode, the discovery phase now, and we'll move in a bit to the defined mode in the run-up to the ICANN85 in June. And we can use some community sessions there, I hope, to be able to test where we've got to on that.

And then in the longer gap between 85 and 86, we'll do the develop thing and have community sessions at ICANN86 to test any proposals or conclusions that we're coming to about what to do in any of these areas. And we will finish on time no later than the 18th of December this year.

That is the update. Substance comes next time. Are there any questions?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO Thank you very much, Jordan. Any questions or comments? Look, I see your hand up in Zoom, Jordan. Self-question?

JORDAN CARTER That was from last time.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO Okay. Yes, please, Pierre.

PIERRE BONIS Thank you very much, and thank you very much for the presentation, Jordan. I had a question about who is going to make proposals to IANA in case there would be enforcement IDs. Would it be the ccNSO, the group? Is it an open consultation?

JORDAN CARTER Can I play the question back to make sure I've understood? Are you saying, in essence, who would be able to complain that data was not accurate?

PIERRE BONIS No. I understand that IANA is launching a consultation.

JORDAN CARTER No. This would be the Study Group consulting IANA. So, we need to ask IANA what the records are. We need to ask them why they think they collect them.

PIERRE BONIS But the Study Group is the study of the ccNSO?

JORDAN CARTER Yes, yes. So, this is the ccNSO.

PIERRE BONIS When you, for instance, you say after 15 days of not updating the data, IANA should erase the .fr, for instance, which would be a very bad idea, of course.

JORDAN CARTER Yes, that would be a bad idea.

PIERRE BONIS Who is going to propose that to IANA? Because at the end of the day, this is a policy.

JORDAN CARTER I would be the first.

PIERRE BONIS But who is going to propose that to IANA? I don't understand what we are doing with this very important work regarding the change of policies in IANA.

JORDAN CARTER

I think the answer to that is, at the moment, the ccNSO is responsible for the global policy framework that defines how IANA relates to ccTLDs. There is nothing in that policy framework that explains what escalation there is and who is a decision maker and what happens in such a situation.

So, the only ability to sort of remove a cc is for, and Eberhard knows this off by heart, it's the substantial misbehavior as set out in the framework of interpretation. So, we'll come back to you in a sec. So, the Study Group may end up suggesting that there should be some policy that answers your question. But the Study Group -- ccNSO policy. So, ccNSO is the policy authority that can tell IANA how to deal with this situation. Nobody else is. Now, I had Eberhard's hand before, and now I have Bart's as well.

BART BOSWINKEL

May I provide a little bit more in depth to what you just said, in response to Pierre.

JORDAN CARTER

Let's just deal with Eberhard first, because he was hand up well before you stood up.

EBERHARD LISSE

It's actually quite easy. The only recourse that I can, and or IANA has, is to accuse a ccTLD of substantial misconduct. And we know all it's defined. I know it when I see it. And it includes a period of non-rectification. You are supposed to be given notice that there is

an issue, and if you don't rectify it. Now, the question is whether an incorrect record would amount to substantial misconduct.

If that is the case, then IANA has already got a method to do it. If this is not the case, the IANA function operator, sorry, does not have it. If it is to be, then we require a ccNSO policy. So, we have a policy, we need to develop another policy Working Group. I volunteer to be on it. And of course, only the ccNSO members will be bound by it.

In other words, if somebody doesn't want to keep its records clear, they could just leave the ccNSO, and they would not be bound by it. And then the IANA function operator, could not invoke substantial misconduct. This is as far as I understand FOI, RFC 1591 as interpreted by 1591. I agree that having proper record is an important thing, but we should be very careful before we allow ICANN and the IANA function operator to interfere with our livelihood, our mechanisms, whatnot.

JORDAN CARTER So, most of what Eberhard said was accurate, but there are different views about the binding nature of any CCPDP outcomes on IANA. I think the conventional understanding is that those are binding on IANA in all circumstances.

EBERHARD LISSE Sorry, I didn't say IANA, I said of ccNSO members. IANA is as part of ICANN bound by ccNSO policy.

JORDAN CARTER Yes, it will treat all ccTLDs under that policy, whether they are members of the ccNSO or not.

EBERHARD LISSE Only ccNSO members are bound by policy, the non-members are not. That was discussed in our group repeatedly, you can leave the ccNSO and then you will not be bound by policy. Nobody knows what's going to happen then.

JORDAN CARTER Nobody knows.

BART BOSWINKEL Just to, this is a potential, one of the outcomes. If you would go back to the report of the Policy Gap Analysis Working Group, there is a whole list of potential ways of dealing with issues. One could be just as a practice that, which is currently the practice for compliance, that IANA sends a postcard to ccTLDs. Is it still, whether they still exist in country, if the address is correct.

That's not a compliance mechanism. The ultimate one is what Eberhard was referring to, is revocation. I think it was discussed with the PGA, probably is not the answer to this as well. Whatever is in between is open and to be suggested as by this Working Group to the council and to the community first before it goes anywhere else.

If there is a policy needed, it will be following the ccNSO policy development process. It could be going into the direction changing the revocation as the ultimate, ultimate sanction mechanism, but that's a change of policy, so need to go through policy development.

Could be something simple as like the finance Working Group has suggested, just reach out to ccTLD, check if the addresses are still complete, a step further than sending a postcard.

JORDAN CARTER Or you could go a step further and if someone's data was wrong, it could be flagged on the website or something.

BART BOSWINKEL Something like this. So, there's a whole range of methods available and the Working Group, the Study Group will suggest some of these outcomes.

JORDAN CARTER And if any of the recommended outcomes do require policy, then a PDP is the follow-on. The hope is that by doing the research through the Study Group, if a PDP is needed, some of the work that would need to happen would already have been done, which may lead to a quicker PDP. That's why we've chosen the Study Group approach for this topic and for the disaster recovery one that Peter just reported on. So, thank you for the question.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO All right. Any other question from anyone else for any of the other committees or Study Groups? Yeah. Who has the power? I don't have the power. Now I have the power.

So, well, if you have any other comments or questions, now it's time to raise your hand. But while we're closing this session, I would like for you to pay attention to the QR code that is in the display or to get into the menti.com website and use the number that is there so that we can gather your input.

Also, a kind reminder, if you're interested in joining any of the initiatives that were presented today or the others that we have open in the ccNSO, the mechanism to do so is writing an email to the ccNSO secretariat expressing you're willing to join a group.

The other mechanism that was presented before on how to do it more through your ICANN account will come in the future, so it's not available right now. But when it does, then we will let you know through the mailing lists.

And seeing no more hands up in the room or in the Zoom room, I thank all of our panelists for their updates and for their hard work. This is how the ccNSO gets its work done. It's through all of you and all the volunteers who contribute. So, a big round of applause to everyone. And this session is adjourned. We can stop the recording.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]