ICANN85 Mumbai | CF – ccNSO: DNS Abuse Standing Committee Work Session
Saturday, March 7, 2026 – 13:15 to 14:30 IST

CLAUDIA RUIZ

Hello and welcome to the ccNSO Domain Abuse Standing 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 the session, questions or comments submitted in chat will be read aloud, if put in the proper form as noted in the chat.

If you would like to speak during the session, please raise your hand in Zoom. When called upon, virtual participants will unmute their microphone. On-site participants will use a physical microphone to speak and should leave their microphones disconnected. For the benefit of other participants, please state your name for the record and speak at a reasonable pace. Thank you, and with that I will now hand the floor over to Bruce Tonkin. Thank you.

BRUCE TONKIN

Thank you. It's Bruce Tonkin. I'm the Vice Chair of the ccNSO Working Group. Nick, I notice, is online in Zoom, joining us from the UK, and we have some other participants online as well, which is great.

Welcome to everyone that managed to make it to Mumbai, despite various travel disruptions, but it's good to see that we've got a good attendance here at ICANN this week.

Next slide. Okay, that's the agenda for today. We're talking, get feedback on a couple of the subgroups within DASC, work plan going forward, a little bit about other sessions that are on at ICANN this week, so hopefully be a fairly short meeting today.

Next slide. Have we gone to, there we go. Yeah, this is just a reminder, so that this Working Group of the ccNSO is a standing committee. It's the DNS Abuse Standing Committee. It's not a policy development committee. We're not developing policy out of this group, but the purpose of this committee is really information sharing. We've been doing it for several years. The original motivation was to show the rest of the ICANN community that by and large, most country code operators have very low levels of DNS Abuse as a percentage of the volumes of registrations, but each of us deals with it in a different way.

But collectively, we feel that it's not an area that is a high concern in the ccNSO community. But we do value the opportunity to share information, and we've set up a number of things to do that for mailing lists, a repository of information, and also, we have a

session at each ICANN meeting. Often, we get guest speakers in, and they might talk about different aspects of that.

So, next slide. So, at each ICANN meeting, we've generally had a different theme. So, ICANN78, we're focusing on what tools are out there to get information on DNS Abuse reports, and how can we measure the level of DNS Abuse in different ccTLDs.

In ICANN80, this is where the GNSO community developed some changes to the registry agreement and registrar agreements and defined the concept of DNS Abuse. ICANN82, the topic was, does it make a difference if you do validation either before or after a domain name registration, and how does that have an impact on the level of DNS Abuse in the ccTLD?

And ICANN83, the view I think is that a lot has already been done to keep the level of phishing and malware very low in country codes, but a number of country code operators are increasingly looking beyond just traditional phishing and malware attacks, but also looking at other types of scams, whether they're things like fake shops, whether they're things like domain names and websites being used to commit financial crime of one form or another, and getting a sense of the community that a number of country codes are working in this area and would like to share information on how they address those topics.

Another topic that's, I guess, of interest to many of us is how Artificial Intelligence tools can be used to help identify abuse, and at the last ICANN meeting we ever had on Tech Day, we had a

session where a few people presented different approaches that they are using, where they're using artificial intelligence to help them identify DNS Abuse.

Next slide. We wanted to do a couple of polls of the people in this room, mainly to see whether some of the tools that we've developed so far are being effective and being used and whether we should continue. So, we've got a couple of quick polls. We're using a software from a company called Menti. You can either scan the QR code or go to menti.com and then enter the code 36252095 to access that poll. So, I'll wait a couple more minutes for people to do that.

Okay, next slide. So, one of the things that this DNS Abuse Working Group did was to set up a mailing list for ccNSO members to join, to share and receive DNS Abuse related information, which could be providing updates to an information repository, also an ability for people to contact each other if they had reports of DNS Abuse.

I'm told by the ICANN staff that there's virtually no traffic on this mailing list. So, we'll know that whether there may have been people that have joined it. I certainly don't recall seeing any messages on it if I have joined it. Not a lot. No, you haven't seen any either, Chris.

So, the first Menti poll is -- if we go to the next slide. So, the question is, firstly, do you actually know this mailing list exists?

And then the second question, presumably if you do know it exists, is to let us know whether you find the mailing list useful or not.

So, I am going with disagreeing and I find the moment so I don't find the mailing list useful. Okay, looks about that half the room know about the existence of the mailing list, because I just told you about it. The other half of the room wasn't listening.

The second question, perhaps more relevant, is do you find the mailing list useful? Sort of about, I guess, as a rating out of five. So, it's sort of a two out of five. So, I suspect the general consensus is that the mailing list, given it's got no traffic on it, is probably not something that's particularly useful, partly because I think we've all got lots of mailing lists and I think if we are sharing information, we'd probably use the main CCNSA mailing list.

Another initiative of the DASC, the DNS Abuse Working Group, was the concept that maybe we create a library or repository of information that we can share for topics that might be useful for ccTLDs. So, presumably this is somewhere if you had maybe some open source software or descriptions of how you tackle DNS Abuse, et cetera, this could all be stored in the library.

So, we created a working or subcommittee, I think, of the DNS Abuse Standing Committee to create this library. This has been led by David from Verisign representing .cc. I don't think David is online, at least I can't tell at a glance. He was unable to travel to this meeting.

Again, we're interested in if anybody's using this library. So, across to the questions. So, the next Menti poll. Next slide. Okay, so the first question is, do you know about the existence of this abuse library? If you do, do you read or browse the content in the library? And have you ever submitted information to the library?

Okay, looks like at least half, better than half of the room listened to my earlier comment that we have an abuse library. But the usage is pretty low. Again, you know, it's probably not the right way that people tend to use or share information. I think these days, if you're wanting to find information, you're probably using things like ChatGPT and other ways of finding information out. But the idea that you'd go to a repository is probably not the way most people access information today.

Next topic. One of the things that we had asked at a couple of our ICANN meetings was what's the sort of next topics for this Working Group to address? As I've mentioned, in earlier times, we're more focused on the tools and the threat intelligence feeds that each of us was using to identify DNS Abuse.

The focus initially was on things like phishing and malware. And I think most of the CCs have something, or larger CCs tend to have something proactively to address those things. And smaller CCs, what we did find in the earlier surveys is if you've got a small ccTLD with a few thousand names, and the probability of finding DNS Abuse was sort of less than 1%, it's pretty rare that you actually got to see much DNS Abuse for the smaller ones.

Three a year for you? Yeah. So, we polled, this is a poll we did in Istanbul to see what did the CCs think that we should work on next. And these were the different topics. So, AI and financial crime came out as the top ones in blue there. And as I said at the last ICANN meeting, we had some sessions where people talked about how they were using AI to combat DNS Abuse.

I think increasingly we're seeing AI being used to create abusive materials. The sort of phishing emails in particular are now hard to tell the difference from a real email from a supplier. And probably the AI-oriented materials got better spelling and grammar than material that's actually been written by the original company.

So, the next slide. So, at ICANN84, which I think was Dublin, we also again did a poll, and this was the results of that poll. We first asked just the country code operators in the room what they thought the priorities should be.

And again, AI came out strong, along with scams and cryptocurrency scams and fraud were the topics. Then we asked the room as a whole. We had quite a few people in the room in Dublin. So, next slide. So, this was asking sort of in the whole room and very much the one that came out top here was fraud prevention, along with sort of sharing things like lessons learned. There was interest in some ccTLDs make their own files available, others don't.

.au doesn't make its own file available. And whether a ccTLD block list, I assume that's sharing a list of names that you might block. I

think the concept there, sometimes names have been created for a specific purpose, maybe as part of a cryptocurrency scam or something. And then if you share that list of names with other country codes, maybe they can keep an eye out for them and perhaps not register those names if people tried to bounce from one ccTLD to another to commit fraud.

Next slide. So, in terms of sort of taking all that into account and then looking at the work plan, one of the things is to sort of consider the GNSO has got a couple of policy development processes running. One of those is to look to see is if there's a report of abuse on one name, what action should the registry or the registrar take to see if there's any other names that might be similar or with similar characteristics.

This essentially comes down to looking for patterns. And so, we thought in Seville that we'd focus getting input from country code operators as to how do they investigate patterns of abuse across their ccTLD. Is it based on patterns associated with domain names or are there particular email addresses or particular DNS name servers? Or do they get bursts of registrations from particular registrars?

What is the sort of patterns that registries and registrars look for across the CC community? And that might inform some of the work that is about to start in the GNSO. And then the other aspect is how do registries collaborate with registrars?

In the case, a lot of us work with registrars, so we don't directly deal with the public, so to speak, that register domain names. Those names are generally registered with registrars and a lot of the registrars also use resellers. And so, they have a lot more information than most of us as registry operators do to detect abuse.

So for example, I could look for credit cards that might be a common element of fraudulent registrations and things like that, that they've used a stolen credit card and used the stolen credit card for lots of different names. That information is not available to the registry operator but may be available to the registrar or the reseller. So that's kind of what we're planning to do going forward. Perhaps I'll pause there and I guess seek input from anybody on what you think we should be focusing on for the next ICANN meeting in Spain and Seville. Not seeing any hands. No?

Okay, next slide. So, this is starting to talk about the policy development work that's just beginning in the GNSO amongst the gTLD community. The GNSO is trying to seek the involvement of other parts of ICANN in their policy development process. They included an invitation to the ccNSO to appoint some members of their Working Group. I think that request went up to the ccNSO council and the council agreed to nominate some people. That process came back to this Working Group.

We had several people put their hands up to be members or participants in the GNSO PDP. The people we ultimately selected,

one was Nick. He's the chair of this Working Group within the ccNSO and has been chair now for several years. So, he, I guess, collectively is across a lot of the activities that the ccNSOs have. See country codes have. So, he's one of the members.

The other member is Eberhard, who's sitting on my left here. Eberhard has been running the tech day for probably many years now and is also aware of some of the different approaches country code operators have taken to DNS Abuse. I agreed to be an alternate part because I'm in a completely different time zone to Nick. So depending on the time of Working Group calls, if Nick can't make it because it's a terrible time of the night, I probably can. An example would be this meeting where I'm physically here and Nick as well. That's right. You don't mind the late-night calls.

CLAUDIA RUIZ Bruce, there's one hand up in the Zoom room.

BRUCE TONKIN Yes. Let me just finish this list and then I'll come to that hand. And also, we have Diego from .co Columbia, which is in a different time zone to either Eberhard, Nick or me. So, Diego is also a participant, but I believe he's not physically able to attend the meeting here in Mumbai. So, those are the appointees. We've also been keen to sort of represent that there's no ccNSO position on the PDP. And so, we're not sort of voting in favour of any particular solution that they might choose, but we are available to assist with information.

And probably any idea that's been suggested at the GNSO probably already has been tried, maybe successfully, maybe not in the CC community.

And we can certainly point people in the right direction to say, well, this has been tried. You should speak to this particular country code if you'd like to know more about that particular method. The hand in the Zoom room. Nick, go ahead.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH Hey, good morning or afternoon, Bruce. Can you hear me okay?

BRUCE TONKIN Yes, loud and clear.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH Perfect. Okay. Thank you so much for doing the tag team on the chairing of the group. So, that's much appreciated. And it's always difficult, I think, to chair a meeting remotely because you can't really get a sense as to kind of what the mood of the mood of the room is quite so different so easily. So, thanks very much for that.

Just a couple of additional context points, I guess. So, firstly, in terms of the forward agenda for Seville, as you know, I like to sort of forward look sort of six to 12 months about, okay, what are we going to do? These sessions are always much better when we put a bit of time and thought into the planning and scheduling of it and

marshalling resources and visiting speakers and things to participate.

So, that's kind of what we're looking at. And I think where the group was at in terms of the partnership with registrars for combating DNS Abuse is that it had come up quite high over the years, but never the sort of the top priority. And we've handled now several sessions on AI and fraud and sort of phishing deep dives.

And so, it seemed to be the time to deal with sort of, okay, we'll mostly deal with registrars. How can we as ccTLD managers operate hand in glove or better with our registrars in terms of combating abuse, preventing it, mitigating it. There're some case studies of what works well for the general community benefits.

We've had some very successful partnership collaborations with the registries, stakeholder group from the gTLDs. So, we've kind of dipped our toes into the dark side of gTLD world. So, maybe we should go even darker and start to talk to some of the registrars and the gTLD registrars as well.

So, that's kind of the thought there, but obviously we want to do this with the understanding and approval of the community as a whole in terms of this is a worthwhile session to have. So, that's really where we're looking at for that, just sort of raising it as an issue for the future.

And so, checking in with everybody that they understand the direction of travel, the reasoning for it, and can support attendance

at that session. Because we've been very lucky to have some really great sessions, but I think it's partly because we do that bringing our community along with us. So, that's basically the thought process around that.

The other point I wanted to touch on, or there's a couple of other points, but with the Working Group list and the repository, as you could see from the polling and we can see from the very low traffic, a lot has changed since we set up those things four years ago. The world has moved a long way forward. It's a much bigger topic of abuse.

There're many different forums where these questions are being discussed. And if ours isn't really very useful for the community, which it doesn't seem to be, then let's not waste our time trying to maintain and curate it and promote it. We've tried very hard over the last four years. If that's not working, then I think we quietly clear that out. And I think it takes a bit of bit of bravery to stop doing something once you've started it. But I think maybe that's the headspace the DASC leadership is at, at the moment.

So, thanks very much for inputs on those things. The other point I wanted to touch on just briefly is the survey. As you know, we've done some global surveys of ccTLDs, a questionnaire of about 50-60 questions, definitions of abuse, how much abuse have you got, how do you treat abuse, trying to get a bit of a picture regionally, and just generally looking at ccTLD attitudes to abuse measurements and mitigation strategies.

So, we did the first one in 2022. The second one was in 2024. I'm chair of the survey subgroup. So, we have started looking at a 2026 survey in terms of dusting off the questionnaire from 2024, starting to think about additional input. So, just a heads up that that's coming later this year, and that we will circulate the kind of provisional survey questionnaire for community comment over the next few months.

So, that's what that group has been doing. Just to make sure that everybody's sort of up to speed on all of that sort of stuff. Obviously, very happy to take any questions or report back. But just for completeness, just sort of add those points. But thank you very much. And I'm very sorry to not be in Mumbai.

BRUCE TONKIN Thanks, Nick. You're missing some nice warm weather down here. I think it's like 30 degrees today. I'm sure it's not like that in London.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH Oh, no, it's beautiful. It's at least 30 degrees here in Oxford. It's the sun is shining, the sky is blue. No, it's about seven degrees and raining.

BRUCE TONKIN Okay, if we can just jump back, I think we've got a couple of slides and what else is happening at ICANN this week. Sorry. Yes, please go ahead.

PETER KOCH Thanks, Bruce. This is Peter for the record. I have a super question. So, I'm asking it for a friend. I am, the friend is not familiar with the GNSO policies here. And we had three flavors of people. I understand, I believe, what a member is. I understand what the alternate is, my friend actually, right? And the observer. But what's the difference between a participant and a member? And what does that mean for the "influence" over the process? Thank you.

EBERHARD LISSE Technically, the members vote. Nick is not there, but he can access remotely. I have a conflict on Monday, for example, with Tech Day. So, Bruce would be on those sessions and able to vote. Diego, as an observer, can participate and provide input, but would not be able to vote. I anticipate that Nick and I are going to abstain from everything.

So technically, that should explain it, but it makes no difference. The idea is that people from the DASC can provide insight and I can provide less insight. I can provide some interest from the technical side, so that we sort of can take what they come up with, that we can bring that into Tech Working Group and Tech Day to disseminate this to the ccTLDs who are interested.

It's just a matter of voting and not voting, but since we're probably going to abstain anyway, it makes no difference. Nick is actually a candidate for vice chair, should he be elected, that might be that we can elevate Diego to full member. They said if the vice, if whoever has delegated the vice chair can appoint another member.

BRUCE TONKIN: Thank you. The context there that I think the GNSO Council this week is going to formally vote on the current person that's the acting chair and then there's another vote, I think, to be vice chair and Nick has put his hand up or nominated as a vice chair of that group.

EBERHARD LISSE: And I've seconded him already.

PETER KOCH: Thank you. My friend appreciates the clarification.

BRUCE TONKIN: Yeah, I think that the membership, it's probably more of the GNSO issue that they're trying to balance the stakeholders and so they're trying to say the number of votes in each stakeholder is balanced basically.

EBERHARD LISSE: The way I understand it is that we actually don't need to be involved because we have no position and no view and it doesn't affect us, but it's interesting and we can provide insight and what comes out of it might, some ccTLD managers also manage gTLDs so it affects them in a way, but many of us are interested in what's happening there so that we can provide, if something good comes out of it, we can all benefit from it.

BRUCE TONKIN: Yeah, and I think many of the registrars, certainly that the larger CCs use, those registrars are usually gTLD registrars as well, so that's definitely an impact.

EBERHARD LISSE: We don't want to put any administrative complications in the way of a registrar to leave their money with ccTLDs.

BRUCE TONKIN: Okay, so any other questions about that PDP process, policy development process? No? So, this afternoon there's two working sessions of the, where am I looking, on the right-hand side of this diagram, so 7th of March, there's two sessions, one at 3pm and one at 4:30pm. Those are the first two sessions of the GNSO Working Group and then there's another two sessions on Monday.

The PDPs are open, so any CC is more than welcome to come to the room and watch, I guess. In terms of the ccNSO DASC, there's this session that we're in now, which is the first one. The second one is

we have a session with some presentations for the whole ccNSO at 1:15pm on Wednesday, and this is a joint session with the Registry, I'm trying to remember what the S stands for, but the Registry Stakeholder Group in the GNSO, so sharing information there on the Wednesday. So, again, I hope you'll all be able to attend that one. Is that the last of our slides?

CLAUDIA RUIZ

Bruce, I believe that Nick had his hand up, but now you put it down, Nick.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH

I was only going to say, in terms of the PDP, I think both Eberhard and myself are very cognisant of the fact that, you know, as ccTLDs, we don't have a huge amount of skin in the game for gTLD policies, but we're also aware that gTLD policies can, in time, become de facto standards across the ccTLDs, so we are interested.

I don't think it's like regular voting is my understanding of the GNSO PDPs, there will be consensus calls at certain critical points, and if we are going to vote, as you know, as Eberhard correctly said, we don't have a position on a lot of these issues, we'll have to check in with Council about, you know, is it appropriate for us to vote or abstain on various issues, but I do think we've got an interesting perspective and voice at the table to contribute to those discussions, so we're very welcome to do that and pleased to participate across the community.

I think one of the great things about the ccTLDS, and thanks, Keith, for the comment in the chat, you know, there's a lot of good work in the ccTLD community, and if we can collectively, you know, whether you're a gTLD or a ccTLD or a registrar, we're all interested in reputational high standards and reduction of abuse, so if we can contribute together more effectively, then I think it's beholden on us to try and do that, so I think that's part of the overall sort of strategic thought process and initiative from the discussions that, Peter, you would have been there in the Council discussion on that exact topic about whether or not to engage.

So, that's broadly the sort of strategy, and we're very keen to make sure that everybody understands that and that there are appropriate sort of guardrails around how we engage and influence those sorts of things, so thanks.

BRUCE TONKIN: Thanks, Nick. Any other questions? Go ahead, yes.

KRISTIAN ØRMEN: Kristian Ørmen from .se. Nick, I heard you say, or I think I heard you say that it could be de facto standard for ccNSO, and I could have misheard you. I just want to, like, clarify that a ccTLD policy will not be a de facto standard for .se. Yeah, thanks, Kristian.

NICK WENBAN-SMITH: Yeah, it's a good challenge, and it's a good point. I think when it comes to ICANN standards for gTLDs, we are fiercely independent

as ccTLDS. Each of us has our own sovereign jurisdiction and stakeholder relationships, governmental relationships, so we, quite rightly, in the most polite terms, say thank you very much, gTLD policy, but no thank you, but what I'm trying to say is that, particularly as you will know, our large registrars are also registrars for gTLDs to a large extent, and maybe to a much bigger extent than they are for the ccTLDS individually.

So, therefore, if there's something which is a sensible policy for the large registrars to effectively prevent or mitigate abuse, and we're not doing it as ccTLDS already, there will be some pressure to conform, and it's not like the formal pressure, and we can always just say no, but I think we have an interest in making sure that if there are gTLD policies, they are not going to be something which is going to be sort of contrary to the way that the ccTLDS operate, i.e. we want to make sure that these are implementable, if appropriate, so that's more the sort of line that I was sort of seeking to take, so it's a tricky one, I agree, it's a tricky point, but does that help explain, I mean, maybe other people have got a view as well.

BRUCE TONKIN Eberhard, I think, has got a point.

EBERHARD LISSE Let's be clear, words matter. Standards are being set by the IETF, that's not it. Policy for the GNSO is set by GNSO, policy for the ccNSO is set by the ccNSO, policy of the GNSO does not affect the

ccNSO. However, de facto standard is the wrong use, we don't even like best practices.

We have got 180 ccNSO members since today and 253 ccTLDS, so we have got 253 different standards, best practice or whatever. However, since registrars, as Nick just said, are usually the big registrars, at least the ICANN accredited registrars, have their way of doing things, I personally don't want to put administrative hurdles in their way in giving me their money.

In other ways, if I can implement something that makes things easier and makes sense, and I'm going to do it, if it doesn't make sense, if it's too expensive, we are not. No ccTLD will be forced, no ccTLD will be expected to conform to anything that they don't want to. It's very clear about it.

It's just that in the real world, what the GNSO registrars do affects especially the ccTLDS that have got ICANN accredited registrars, because they don't like to have 253 models, they like to have one or two. It's already difficult enough to get somebody to email, because it's all automated. So, don't worry, nothing will be set for the ccNSO or ccTLDS.

BRUCE TONKIN Thanks, Eberhard. Peter, I think you're welcome back.

PETER KOCH Yeah, thank you. So, this is Peter again. So, on my previous question, I heard clarification from Eberhard and also from you,

Nick, in neutrality, informing the process, likely or potentially, well, it was a bit stronger than that, abstaining from voting to not influence over-duly.

I might be confused, but I have a bit of a difficulty to understand how that approach is compatible with taking a chair position. And Nick, don't get this wrong, I trust you're doing the right thing. But still, if the explanation is we want to be informing and not have an influence, I think you can have a little more influence than being one of the co-chairs. But again, maybe I'm misreading the GNSO policy process here. Thank you.

BRUCE TONKIN Eberhard, just respond to that.

EBERHARD LISSE I think it's very good to have a neutral chair in such a thing who has no skin in the game personally. But it's unlikely that we are going to get the vice chair. But I'm just saying, I think it's a good idea because we have absolutely no horse in the race.

BRUCE TONKIN And I assume you'll be voting in the vice chair election, will you?

EBERHARD LISSE Of course, I have seconded him, but that's the only vote I'm passing. No, we are, of course, always in contact with council and

discuss our proposed way of doing things and so on. So, we're not making this without discussing this with council first.

BRUCE TONKIN Kristian?

KRISTIAN ØRMEN Kristian speaking. Just a quick follow up. I do understand how the policies works and so on. Just want to clarify that. I just had to react when Nick was saying de facto standard. I think that needed to be addressed. Personally, I'm more afraid of unreasonable abuse requirements being put on registrars, for example.

There's a huge pressure in the community to put a lot of stuff into policies that goes way too far. But just for clarification, I was just reacting to Nick's de facto standard because I wanted to make sure that that was not what we were thinking as a community.

EBERHARD LISSE I'm with you on that exactly.

BRUCE TONKIN Thank you. Any other questions on the process?

NICK WENBAN-SMITH I wasn't going to say it's not a question in the process, but just to follow up on what Kristian was saying. This is exactly why, and I

think it's really important to be transparent about all of this and how we're approaching it. So, I really welcome this discussion.

And it's exactly why I think it's such a good idea to have a ccNSO DASC session on working well with the registrars, which is what we talked about in the forward work program on exactly these sorts of questions. There're policies, there's standards. I happen to know that the .UK EPP implementation, for example, is different from how gTLDs do it. And that does create some issues for us.

And perhaps if we'd been more thoughtful about it, we would have aligned it more with gTLDs, but we didn't. And that's just one of those sorts of things. So, I think, yeah, it's a good point. You're completely right. Maybe I misspoke in terms of de facto standard, but there's sort of, I guess there's a sort of a critical mass of opinion or process.

And at some point, you just have to be practical about the realities of what it is. And where, as Eberhard said, where it makes sense and it doesn't increase costs and it makes us more competitive and raises standards, then it's pretty irresistible to not adopt those parts of it where our communities agree with it. But we all have our own independent governance structures and we'll have to make that decision as ccTLD to ccTLD.

BRUCE TONKIN Thanks, Nick. Any other questions, comments? No, I think we are done. Thank you, Joke. Thank you, ICANN staff. We now finish the

session and for the next session will be a PDP at 3 o'clock, I think, for those that are interested.

CLAUDIA RUIZ Okay, you can stop the recording.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]