
ICANN86 Seville | PF – ccNSO: IANA Disaster Recovery Study Group Work Session
Thursday, June 11, 2026 – 10:00 to 11:15 CEST

CLAUDIA RUIZ

Hello and welcome to the ccNSO and IANA Disaster Recovery Study Group session. My name is Claudia Ruiz, and I, along with my colleague, Joke Bracken, 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. They will be posted 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 this session, please raise your hand in Zoom. When called upon, virtual participants will unmute their microphone, and on-site participants will use a physical microphone to speak and should leave their Zoom microphones disconnected. For the benefit of other participants, please state your name for the record and speak at a reasonable pace.

Thank you, and with that, I will now hand the floor over to Peter Koch, Chair of the Disaster Recovery Study Group.

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.

PETER KOCH

Thank you, Claudia, for the introduction and the opening of the session. My name is Peter Koch, Chair of the Study Group. With me are the Secretariat, a number of participants on site, a number of observers at the end of the room, and we also have a couple of people online. So welcome.

You see today's agenda on the slide. We'll basically deal with the findings and feedback from yesterday's session and focus on -- well, we call it stock-taking, as in, where are we now? We announced that we're in the second diamond in the first half of that, but we want to progress, so that's what we're going to do during the course of this session. And the session will last until 11:15, so we have roughly 70 minutes left. With that, can we proceed on this? Any questions on the agenda additions? Doesn't seem to be the case. I don't see any hands.

We mentioned that yesterday, just to remind everyone, we are now almost in the middle of that second diamond. So we're transitioning from the developing phase and the delivering phase, and we're taking into account the feedback that we got during the session and after it by email, chat, or anything. Any questions to that? Any questions from the audience?

I understand we have drawn some attention on this topic due to a number of sessions that we had in the ongoing week. And we're happy about feedback that we got and additional interest, and also people who volunteered for joining the study group for the final phase. So that's where we are. And we hope to be done definitely

by Bali. But let's progress here and go ahead. Bart, anything to add for this one?

BART BOSWINKEL

Not really. Maybe one thing before we start. Any immediate feedback from the participants on the meeting yesterday itself, before we dive into the results of yesterday, and where we need to go? Any observations made around how it went, the consultation? So these are the slides from yesterday, the outcomes.

PETER KOCH

Okay, thanks, Bart. Also, all the observers in the room, and no matter whether you sit at the table or in the back of the room, usually this is a working session for the study group, but since we are very, very interested in feedback we're taking that into account so don't be shy in raising your hand and then we'll probably have a microphone at the edge of the table. But we're also not putting you on the spot, so you can first have a bit of the menu and then decide whether you intervene or not.

We're going through the Mentimeter results from yesterday. Obviously, we had a strong participation from Europe. Lesser participation from Africa, a vast number from Latin America, a larger number in Asia. And there were gaps that we had identified, so it's good that we got participation or interest from that region. Any observations from the team members on this one?

BART BOSWINKEL

One question, one of the reasons for including this question, so this is something for the study group to take into account, is one of the, I would say, desk research output was the diversity in regulatory frameworks. And so if you start linking this with the results of the consultation, you will see that in this case, a lot of people are affected of the ccTLDs, at least by NIS2. But there are other regulatory frameworks as well, which will be produced in time or will be made available. But at least it shows you there might be a little bit of bias towards NIS2, etc., due to the people who responded on this one. So that's the reason for including this question. Thanks.

PETER KOCH

Yes, thanks, Bart. Also, we should never confuse Europe with the European Union. But still, the pressure and the demands by NIS2 will probably have led to that. And, welcome. More people. If you had been in Sala or something before, I feel your pain. And thanks for joining. Good. Any other observations on this one?

PATRICIO POBLETE

I must apologize because I haven't been following the work of this group at all, so maybe you've done this already. In addition to imagining potential scenarios and doing a taxonomy on them, did the group analyze actual incidents that have occurred in the past and treat them as a case study to inform this consideration of possible scenarios? Because I mean, there must be by now a certain number of incidents that have occurred where people

might contribute their experiences, and the IANA might also tell whether they were involved or not. That's just my suggestion that this could be as recent as things that could have happened in the last few weeks.

PETER KOCH

Yes, thank you, Patricio. I think I might put Kim on the spot here because a bit of the input was given by IAN and observations they had. What I can say is that we did not dive into the very detail of particular examples, but they were used as examples. But maybe Kim can add to that.

KIM DAVIES

Yes, I think earlier in the group's work, we contributed some of our experience and understanding of the issues. I mean, the fact of the matter is, a lot of these kinds of scenarios are somewhat hypothetical. There are not a lot of true emergencies that have come to IANA. We might not be aware of things that never materialized as a root zone change or something that required that kind of remedy.

But I think whatever we can do to build our understanding better of real-world situations would be helpful. I'm not sure how to tap into that necessarily, but I think part of the challenge here is that we're just hypothesizing. And we can certainly foresee the kinds of scenarios, as was shared in the session yesterday, where you could foresee there is a role. But that actually happening is very rare.

PETER KOCH

Yes, thanks, Kim. What we did was when there were examples, and they are on public record, then of course they would have informed the work of the study group. But we did not have in our mandate to do a third-person post-mortem at that level of detail, because we're looking forward and trying to inform what might be the case. And again, since we're not making policy, but suggestions, we are trying to maintain a bit of a higher flight level.

BART BOSWINKEL

In addition to it, just look at the task of the study group. It was really around exploring a potential role, if any, of IANA in case of disaster recovery. This is not about reviewing various cases of actual disaster recovery or business continuity. But it sets the foundation, and then you start looking at, okay, if something is there, then what could be, or is there any role for IANA in which circumstances?

Now, the starting point is, in principle, there is no role because there is no policy. And that was the starting point of the study group at all. So in that sense, it is not really looking into existing cases because existing cases, if there is any role, it's probably because the system failed. And that was one of the findings, a failure of the failure mechanism, so the disaster recovery, etc. This is really when IANA comes into the picture, and that's one of the specific outcomes of the study group.

PETER KOCH

Thanks, Bart. So, back to this slide, and thanks for that interjection. So we got positive feedback, and we are happy about that, but we also note that a number of people weren't sure yet, which is a fair response. And we also understood that maybe the level of detail that we went into without supporting material yesterday might have been a bit overwhelming. We're going to publish all that supporting material with the final report or on the wiki at some point in time. So if people are interested in those details.

We think these scenarios are like working hypotheses rather than suggestions to prepare your own disaster recovery. But if anybody thinks that is useful for that, please be a bit patient and let us do the work and the report first, and then all the supporting information will be published as well.

And then, some people thought there might be missing scenarios, and we are still eager. We've received some signals where people would share in confidence, but if you have any idea about what might be missing or what other scenarios we should have taken into account, please let us know.

Okay, let's move on. We've gone through that yesterday, unless anybody has anything to say about any of these. Just to remind everyone that the findings, and we ranked them afterwards. We got definitely strong support for that finding. It's one of these, in hindsight, very obvious things, but it's good that we arrived at that

conclusion after doing a systemic research and got the support for that.

The preparation is key, which also supports doing some work in advance, and suggesting that rather than preparing for an emergency reaction. It probably resonates with the second one. So preparation and pre-arrangements seem to align in a way, although the support for that was less, and it would of course be interesting why people had given support for the first one but not so much for the second.

So if you have any ideas, from your own perspective, not second-guessing, but from your own perspective, we'd be interested in that. You can always contact the secretariat or the study group to share information.

And then the other one, remember there were some cases where the authority of the acting party was either contested or the responsible parties were unable to act, which is more of an administrative or political thing rather than a technical one. And that's it. Do team members have any thoughts about these ratings? Pablo.

PABLO RODRIGUEZ

Thank you, Peter, and greetings all. In my experience, Puerto Rico seems to be one of those great studies in which we were hit by two category five hurricanes within 15 days of each other. The first two statements, preparation matters more than the disaster, and pre-

arrangements are the cheapest, strongest fix, are definitely something that we support and that we experience. So I can speak from my own experience firsthand that that worked out very well for us. We were operational pre the natural disasters, during the natural disasters, and post the hurricanes, we were still operational. Thank you.

IRINA DANELIA

I think these responses demonstrate the general support of the direction of travel of our group. And the difference between first and second is just in the wording, because preparation includes not only pre-arrangement, it may include training other staff. So that might be the reason for different rating. So I'm absolutely fine with the outcome.

JODI ANDERSON

Yes, I agree. I think it just makes sense the way these go down. The first one's more generic; preparation matters more than disaster. Pre-arrangements is one of the ways that you can make preparations. There are obviously others. And then in terms of pre-arrangements, one of the things that we've talked about is arranging for who gets authority. So they just sort of go down in terms of getting more and more specific. So I think this makes absolute sense.

PETER KOCH

Okay, so generally, I hear from the team members that that is a confirmation of our direction of travel, and we seem to be happy with that. Okay, good. And I think I called it the consistency check yesterday. Any observations on that list? I assume that's generally the same direction. Regis?

RÉGIS MASSÉ

Yes, thanks, Peter. Regis Masse for the record. I'm just seeing the last line: None of these findings stand out to me. And it would be interesting if the people who have answered that would explain what are the findings important to them, maybe.

PETER KOCH

Yes, thanks. My reading of that was that they consider them all equal or almost equal. I did not read that as all equally bad or something. But still, if anybody had rated that or voted for that option, then of course, we'll invite people to share their thoughts. Anybody else? Then let's move ahead.

Again, this is a confirmation. We'll take it as a confirmation of the work and the direction so far. And of course, that's in line with what we observed. There is one yellow one, and again, we invite the person suggesting that changes are needed to share their thoughts, if possible. Otherwise, the support was very strong, and that's consistent. So we progressed the way with what we did, but we are always open, of course, to further information or guidance from the community. Any other comments on that one?

Then, should we go back to the agenda? Okay, then let's go into the stock taking because the next thing we do is refine the report that we've been working on. And we'll need to refine some of the findings and suggestions. Do team members have any other observations or suggestions for how to deal with the results so far?

JODI ANDERSON

I just think the responses indicated that we're on roughly the right track. As you say, it would be good to hear from people. There were a few things there, like the slide that said some people thought there was one thing missing, or some people thought that there was something else to say. As you said, it would be really good to hear from those people. Did we hear from anybody yesterday directly on those?

PETER KOCH

We have one.

JODI ANDERSON

Okay, so we've got some more information.

PETER KOCH

We had one in the chat, and then I think one or two people identified themselves, but it's not necessary to share confidential details. And actually, I'd prefer that people don't do that, but sometimes it's easier to reference a particular example, and people were not comfortable doing that in public. Again, since we're not

dealing with the examples, they would just inspire, maybe a certain scenario. It's not necessary that people disclose anything here.

JODI ANDERSON

Yes, I feel like we've just got a good tick for direction of travel from yesterday.

PABLO RODRIGUEZ

I was responding to Jodi's question. I believe that Peter Ben Ross [ph] had put something in the chat in reference to the question, upon reflecting from those who said that there was one thing missing. He put something in the chat.

PETER KOCH

I believe that was the preparedness bar. And my suggestion would be that the preparedness is orthogonal to what we, or as we discussed, is an outcome more than an input to the process. But of course, it's correct that that's important. Okay, so we do have these six dimensions, and obviously, pending some additional information, we seem to have gotten the right thing.

Again, admitted that we maybe have overwhelmed some of the audience with these six scenarios. We had support for those, and now we have the findings and the trigger work. So maybe we go back to the other document pages or slides 8 and 10 and look at those and discuss quickly which of these we are going to refine during the course of the work.

BART BOSWINKEL

May I suggest to the team members, think about these findings and think about if you look at the goal of the working group or the study group is really to explore the role of IANA, if any, in disaster recovery of ccTLDs. I think one of the major findings to date was, and that will probably be one of the headings of the final report anyway, is disaster recovery business continuity is first and foremost a matter of a ccTLD manager. Nobody else, only the ccTLD manager. However it's structured, in whatever regulatory framework it lives under, that's the assumption.

Then the second step is, and that was the starting point of when does IANA play a role? And then if you look at these major findings, how can the working group, the team members, detail any areas? So I think, and this was one of the outcomes as well, is the hardest case is about authority and not technology.

This is effectively almost the scenarios where the business continuity and disaster recovery of the ccTLD fail for whatever reasons. And this is almost the gray area, and where you hit the limit of the study group, and probably it's where you may need to defer to other study groups, and/or to a policy process to define it or another mechanism. So that was one of the outcomes as well of the discussions to date.

And then the third one is the size is a misleading guide. That's more for the audience, etc. I think the real space, and that would be my suggestion to the group, is to look into what can be done with

respect to prearrangement, if anything. Because one of the outcomes I know from the feedback from IANA is, currently, there are no prearrangements in principle. Because Policy doesn't allow it, nor does the practices allow it. So this is the area probably to explore a little bit further over the coming weeks.

And then you're really back to the goal of the working group itself is, can the group identify a role for IANA, if any, and in what space? And that's really in the prearrangement phase, and making life easy for everybody. But that would be my advice on the next steps. So that's more the suggestion going forward. Maybe that's something to discuss right now, whether that's a reasonable path or you want to do something else.

PETER KOCH

Thanks, Bart, that means we will probably triage these findings. And as you said, the size is a misleading guide -- is for us. And it's an observation, but nothing follows from that immediately. The preparation part, again, and thanks for reminding us of our mission, we could do lots of work there, but we're not tasked to have a business continuity preparation guide for ccTLDs. We're only looking at the potential role for IANA.

And then the prearrangements are here, and then we need to decide what to throw over the fence into other study groups that are at the edge of being scheduled. So it would be a recommendation to the Council. And what we need to refine here

is giving the justification and saying why we think this is out of scope, and we can't solve it at this point.

And also, to make that recommendation operational for the Council by saying, okay, here is the exact wording. And then the council will have to find another study group or any other means to do that. So the focus would be on the contested authority, like the policy part, and the other one on the potential prearrangements. That will be the two threads that I would see. Any other suggestions? Jodi?

JODI ANDERSON

Yes, I just wanted to say that your point, Bart, about the first and foremost thing in our mind is that disaster recovery is a responsibility of the ccTLD manager, provides a really great context for us to look at the rest of it, which is in trying to prepare for a disaster. If a ccTLD is trying to prepare for a disaster, everything it does is within its own mandate and with its own decisions, but there will be some things it's trying to do to prepare where it needs to engage with IANA. And so that's the space that we're looking in.

What are the preparations or the pre-arrangements that it needs to do that require it to engage with IANA? And that's our little space. What are we looking at there? And I think that our scenarios will help with that. What are those pre-arrangements that a cc wants to do for a disaster where it has to engage with IANA that would help in each of our scenarios? And I think that's our framing.

PETER KOCH

Thanks, Jodie. And again, to add to that, where that would help or where it couldn't help, which is then the part that we declare out of scope, right? And one important observation is probably also challenging the usual business continuity models, that this one has to survive the organization. We are talking about the business continuity from the perspective of the service rather than from the perspective of the organization, and that's both a policy challenge, but also an organizational and operational one. Any other thoughts? Pablo.

PABLO RODRIGUEZ

Thanks, Peter. When I reflect on the work that has been done and take an introspective look, the first thing that comes to matter is as a ccTLD, we should look at ourselves and think, "Am I one of those ccTLDs that could be exposed to a natural disaster?"

If you're one of those ccTLDs that lie in the Caribbean or in the circle of fire, such as our colleagues from Asia Pacific, such as Japan and others, who experience tsunamis and earthquakes, then you need to start thinking, "Am I prepared? Do I have a preparation strategy such that when such a disaster, natural disasters occur, I am ready and not have to run to IANA for help, but rather because I'm ready."

If all of that preparation fails, then what is it that we can ask IANA to help us with? There is no way of preparing for 100% of all the 100% of the disasters. But if you're prepared, you can survive

pretty much those. And again, an example of that is Japan, an example of that is what we did in Puerto Rico and other places. But if you're not that, you need to be aware that if you are exposed, if you're in the line of fire, then you need to prepare.

And an important point that I want to bring is a line of succession. What happens when the person in charge dies, is extremely hurt, and cannot take a decision? Who's the next one in line? Those are the type of recommendations that we could make to ccTLDs so that they can be prepared for this.

BART BOSWINKEL

May I change the perspective a little bit? Can you go to slide seven, please? What you see here is, I would say, based on the scenarios, you see a potential role of IANA. And I would suggest that the group ask Kim and team what is needed in not in the, I would say, where there is complete failure, so emergency authority, but in the areas where IANA could play either an advisory or a coordination role, if any, and what would you need in order to be able to play that role?

Because that would be the refinement and exploring what IANA would need, and maybe what the study could advise to the council. So go back to what would be the needs that you've identified through the scenarios, where IANA could play a role from a CEC perspective, now reverse it, and that's the refinement, what would IANA need in order from this working group or study group, as an advice, to be able to play that role? Whether you agree or disagree what IANA would need, that's another question, but at least list it,

and then you bring it together, but then you enter IANA's perspective again into the equation.

PETER KOCH

Thanks, Bart. That will be the six or maybe five questions that we would phrase per scenario. And I'm not sure that we're going to start with that today, but we'll take that, and also not putting Kim on the spot. So we'll phrase these questions, hand them over, give IANA a bit of time to respond, and then at some future meeting, receive the responses and go into that. Would that work for you, Kim, or for your team?

KIM DAVIES

I think so. But I would also add that our perspective on what kind of advisory role we could play is kind of informed by our customers on what kind of advisory role you want us to play. And I think there is fundamentally an issue of resourcing and having money and staff expertise and things set aside, whatever that might be. But I think it's coming to a common understanding about what the size of the role is, what the skill sets are, etc. And I think there is a lot of discussion to be had in that.

PETER KOCH

Yes, I don't think we are expecting a very pointed response. You would, of course, be able to offer a scale of potential involvement or assistance.

BART BOSWINKEL

The reason for raising this point, if you recall, when you started the discussion, there is no policy in place to do this. There is no practice in place to do this. And we're moving, or the group is moving towards, what is needed to enable that role? The details and the resourcing and etc. -- I consider them details at this stage - - but we're really talking about almost creating the environment where IANA could play that role. And what would you need in order to be able to start thinking through, because to date, there is nothing. So it's really taking that first step on building such a role.

IRINA DANELIA

In addition to that, I would love to ask IANA if all these rearrangements either were not made or failed. And we see a complete disaster, like in scenario two, hypothetically. What could IANA do to help in this situation? I'm not asking whether there is a policy, whether we want IANA to do this, and again, I don't expect the answer right now, but that would be the question. Are there any hypothetical things that IANA could do?

KIM DAVIES

Let's walk through these scenarios, I think, just to confirm what has been said on previous calls, but I know not everyone has been on our prior calls, that some ccTLDs have expressed a desire to have pre-arrangements with IANA in the past. That's not something

we've been able to do. And just, again, clarifying for those that hadn't heard that. Because there is no policy basis to allow for it.

And in many of the scenarios we're talking about here, it's kind of pre-reassigning the role of the ccTLD manager to a new party in a hypothetical future scenario. And it's just not something the policies contemplate as being possible. And that's why we haven't allowed for such arrangements to date. But that's certainly one of the things we're looking at discussing and exploring in this group.

PETER KOCH

Yes, thanks, Kim. And thanks for reminding us of that previous discussion that was already an outcome. I do think that the question or the suggestion was inspired by observing if the response is there is no policy, then maybe there is already an idea, and then a policy could be made to support that idea. Or there is a policy decision to not make that, but maybe another policy that would allow different -- so there is empowerment, but there is also the, what could you, technical in the non-technical sense, do here? But that's a good path forward for this. Irina?

IRINA DANELIA

My point was, if there is nothing IANA could do, then there is no need for policy.

KIM DAVIES

I mean, clearly, there are things IANA can do. And I think in absence of policy, we try to do the right thing as best as possible. And I think

that's evidenced by some of the original events that happened a few years ago that triggered the Policy Gaps Working Group, etc. We try to navigate a course where we communicate with the right parties. In that instance, it was the ccNSO leadership to validate what we're doing.

I think one thing that's perhaps more unique about this is the time pressure that some of these events would have that, potentially, quick decisions might need to be made because of the nature of the emergency, which adds another dimension. You can't be necessarily quite as deliberative of rapidly evolving emergency scenario. But anyway, that's just some quick thoughts.

PETER KOCH

Thanks, Kim. And thanks, Irina, also for clarifying. I do think that we already have made a couple of steps forward by refining through these scenarios how these potential solutions could look like. And again, these quick decisions, they probably need to be made quickly, still, in the case of a disaster.

But since we've identified that preparation is key, there is at least the potential to have a tool set ready to do that. We are not in that position where we say, "Oh, these things don't work, so let's make a law," because we know the law or the policy alone will not help to emphasize the point that Irina made. Anybody else on this one?

So the next step here would be we come up, say, with a straw proposal for the questions, discuss those in the study group with

IANA at the table, obviously, as part of the study group. And then, Kim, you and your team can go back and wrap your heads around those and make suggestions and responses to that. Anybody disagree? Okay. I think we can table that for the moment. We have a plan here.

The trigger framework. That's the one that we walked through very quickly yesterday, and we had identified that in the preparation already. So the point is, if the ccTLD's own measures work, then everything is fine after the disaster in terms of being back to operational, but outside help is needed if the return to operational is either only partly or the system put in place by that organization.

And again, we need to distinguish between the organization running the service and the service itself if the business continuity has failed, and they can't return to operations. And we're going to refine that as well, like separating the two. Any ideas on that? Jodi.

JODI ANDERSON

My main comment on this slide is that it's It indicates that an IANA role may be needed if everything's failed and you're sort of as we were talking about before, we're looking as to whether IANA can have a role in that situation and whether policy might be needed for that or something else. But I just also want to make the point that in that orange box, where you've got pre-arrangements so it can still be resolved, those pre-arrangements may be because

we've identified policy so that IANA can help with those pre-arrangements.

I think in terms of what the study group is doing and figuring out where some potential policy for IANA is, it's both at that front end, so that IANA can help with pre-arrangements, has the policy to help with the pre-arrangements, and at the further end, where IANA might need some policy to help with the backup if everything fails. We need to focus on both of those spaces.

PETER KOCH

Absolutely. Thanks, Jodi, and that's two different parts of the policy. And also, the hard part may be in line with throwing things over the fence into other study groups when it comes to decision-making. So we probably have to deal with that empowering part or enabling part, and then with the decision part, whatever the decision is.

The decision can be to declare the failure on behalf of somebody else, following some criteria or something. And if a backup is in place or a backup operator would be in place, a decision needs to be made to activate that. I think that's what you were pointing at, right?

BART BOSWINKEL

Again, if you just look at the goal of this study group, I would say the right-hand corner, lower-hand corner, so DR/BSC, disaster recovery and business continuity have failed. That is really out of

your scope. That's the whole thing. That's where you throw things over the fence. I think that was the outcome of the Mumbai and Dublin sessions as well.

It still can be resolved, so this is the real gray area, and this is another way of rephrasing what we just discussed, identifying potential roles of IANA where it can still be resolved and effectively where IANA's interference or role could speed up that process or solidify the process itself so that it still can be resolved. If it can't be resolved, then it's clear the policy would kick in or emergency transfers, etc. And that's way out of scope. And these are the hard cases. That's another way of looking at this picture.

So, going back to what we just discussed, the previous point is it can be resolved, and how can IANA help to resolve it quickly? And what is available, and what you could advise the community? And if there is a policy needed, that's another point. But not focus on where the system has failed.

PETER KOCH

Yes, thanks, Bart. What I tried to say was that the orange box isn't just a check. There might be decisions to be made at some point because it's nice if you have a backup, but if nobody can take the decision to install that or "restore" that backup, then the system would fail, and we don't want to go there. So, as you said, it's a gray area. There is a certain wiggle room, and then the study group

needs to refine exactly that and come up with potential criteria or something, again, following the input from Kim's team.

IRINA DANELIA

My previous questions were related exactly to the red box. And before making a statement that this is out of scope of this working group, I would suggest we look into it in more detail to make sure at least we all understand in the same manner what disaster recovery mechanism has failed. And after that, decide whether we can advise on anything on this or not. Just not to preempt the conclusions.

PETER KOCH

Thanks, Irina. And I wholeheartedly agree. What might be difficult here is that these boxes have a sharp boundary between the two. And what I hear you suggesting is that if there is a red part that is not in the scope and the other part that is, then what we need to do is to find these boxes that look the same size at the moment with a sharp distinction, which they probably don't have, finding that. And that's, again, the gray area that Bart mentioned, if I understand correctly. So that's the work to do.

IRINA DANELIA

Yes, and before putting these boundaries, I would be interested in more clear examples, steps, not like general words, but increased steps. There is no backup, yes? Registry failed. To keep DNS resolution, somebody, no matter who -- IANA or another -- at least,

what, zone file? If it exists? Are there any hypothetical things that can be done?

PETER KOCH

What I also hear you now say is that the preconditions need to be framed. If there is no preparation, because despite the discussion we had, there is no backup, escrow, or whatever you name it, then, of course, there is no point in having a process to decide when that will be reinstalled.

And then the delicate question might be, so if there is a TLD that has no precautions in place and something bad happens, and nobody can make a decision, well, then maybe that TLD goes out of service for some time or not. And that's something to think about, and then hopefully push towards another study group because it's getting more into politics, not only policy.

IRINA DANELIA

Yeah, I'm just trying to start from the service side, what is technically needed to be able to keep service.

PETER KOCH

Anybody else? Do the team members feel we have a plan forward to deal with these two packages? Framing the questions here in the previous one, the six questions we hand over to IANA, and then digest the responses, and in parallel overlapping -- well, not in parallel, because we need the responses, but then start also thinking about the discussion of what is in which box, and how they

maybe even overlap. I see nodding from the team members. Any other thoughts on this? Does not seem to be the case. Let's go back to the agenda. Exactly. Which means that we are almost in the next steps, aren't we?

The remaining point is the next meetings and AOB. And the next meetings, we had a schedule. First of all, we need to be careful that we don't stress the secretariat too much because there is this other study group, so we have these intersecting things. The suggestion is to restart in two weeks, or almost two weeks, Wednesday, 24 June, 06:00 UTC. And that depends on California and New Zealand. We could stick with the 6 am, which would probably be a bit difficult for you guys, or for anybody from the US West Coast or South America West Coast, or whatever. Or we rotate between 06:00 and 18:00.

KIM DAVIES

I would like to request that either we rotate the time slot or a different day of the week. That is Tuesday night for us, but also for unrelated working groups, we have recurring meetings at 3 a.m. and 6 a.m. our time. So that night in particular, every Tuesday night, Wednesday morning is very difficult for our staff to consistently attend.

BART BOSWINKEL

Would Tuesdays work? This is all on Wednesday. And I know you had some issues with your Tuesday evening.

JODI ANDERSON Yes, my issue's now gone. So feel free to change it to Tuesday.

KIM DAVIES Yes, I think Monday, our time, Tuesday UTC would be much better.

PETER KOCH Would that support a standing 06:00 or still rotating?

KIM DAVIES Let me validate it with my team, but standing would be 11 p.m. our time Monday night, I think it's more reasonable. I still think it's better that it rotates if possible, but if that's not practical for other reasons, then.

PABLO RODRIGUEZ I respectfully request to rotate to the 18:00. It's a lot better. For me, it would be 2 a.m. for this event and then 6 a.m. for IGLC. So it's a killer.

PETER KOCH Okay, so we need some details to check that we can't do here. I propose that we shift the reconvening session to the 23rd, then. That's Tuesday, if that works for the Secretariat and for people in the room. And in the meantime, propose a schedule going forward so that before the next meeting or in the next meeting that will be online, we'll have the schedule lined up until well we don't need up

until Bali, but at least into August, September, and we also might consider a mid-year break or something, depending on the progress.

But we schedule the meetings, and then we can still cancel or skip if we progress quickly enough. So the reconvening session would be on 23rd June, 06:00 UTC. Thank you. Any other business?

IRINA DANELIA

It's not another business. It's returning to our work plan for the future. Maybe I have missed, but what would be the process to come up with these questions to IANA? Shall we start discussing them via email? Not waiting till our next meeting, probably?

PETER KOCH

Oh, absolutely. Well, we can spread that at the moment. We have six scenarios we could develop. Or we pick one or two, the way we did that a day ago. It would be really good to have at least straw proposals for the questions to discuss in the next meeting. Absolutely. Do you want to pick one? We circulate the question on the list. Team members can pick one, and we go ahead.

BART BOSWINKEL

May I suggest not the upcoming week, but the end of the next week? I'll start circulating some straw paper, and then you can refine whatever you want to refine. That makes it easy, so we have something in front of you to discuss on for everybody on the 23rd, and then you can agree on the questions. So I will circulate

something in preparation of that meeting, the weekend before, so you can have a look at it, and then we refine it and finalize it on the call, and then it can go to IANA. Something like this, this is what you had in mind? Does that work for you?

IRINA DANELIA

This works. But my idea was that probably I should write down my thoughts, just to make sure we all go in the same direction, not necessarily waiting for your paper.

PETER KOCH

Yes, makes sense. Thank you. Then let's do that. If you have the time, do that. You can do that any time before. You doing it that weekend, given that we shifted to Tuesday, that would give us only one day for preparing this. But let's continue that which has been our modus operandi anyway, so that if you have the time and energy. And it doesn't have to be all six scenarios, if you only can do three or four, that's also great.

IRINA DANELIA

Not scenarios, it's just questions.

PETER KOCH

Well, questions arising from the scenarios. Good. That's an even more concrete plan. Great. Thank you.

BART BOSWINKEL

If you get something to me, say, by the 17th or 18th, I'll combine it and circulate it on the 19th of June, so you have it well ahead of the first meeting.

PETER KOCH

Works for you? Okay. Good. Thank you. Then we have a step and a time. Window for that at the next meeting. And any other business? Any suggestions from the floor? Any late input? No?

BART BOSWINKEL

If you're interested, you can still apply to become a member for the final phase.

PETER KOCH

If you apply today, you can be assigned tomorrow. No, if you apply by noon, you can be assigned in the afternoon. Because the council has a meeting in the afternoon, and that's the first opportunity. I'm not trying to sell things, but this time it's really pressing. Then, with that, I believe we can give you almost 10 minutes ICANN time back, an early coffee break. Thank you for attending. Thanks to the team for the discussion and the input. Thanks, everyone, for watching, understanding, and helping. And that's it. And thanks to the Secretariat for the support, and also to the AV team. Thank you so much.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]