
YESIM NAZLAR:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to all. Welcome to the third webinar of the [inaudible] Atlas III webinars, and today we'll cover an onboarding to the ccNSO. Our presenter today is Bart Boswinkel. Bart is president of policy support, ccNSO relations. We will not be doing a roll call for this webinar. However, we are taking attendance for the first ten minutes on this call. After that, your participation will not be valid entry for the required attendance metrics. If you are only on the phone bridge, please join the Zoom room as soon as possible, as this is an attendance requirement.

We have French and Spanish interpretation for this webinar, so a kind reminder to please state your name when speaking, to allow for the interpreters to identify you on the other language channel, as well as for transcription purposes. Please also speak at a reasonable speed to allow for accurate interpretation.

All lines will be muted during the presentation and opened for questions and answers at the end of the presentation. If you have noticed, we are running this webinar on Zoom. The features are similar to Adobe Connect, but in order to view the participant list and chat ops, please click on the bottom of the screen. You will only be able to see the chat transcript from when you joined the call, nothing prior to that. To raise your hand, please just click on the raise hand icon.

And now I will hand the floor over to Joanna Kulesza, co-chair of the Atlas III capacity sub-group. Over to you, Joanna. Thank you very much.

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.

JOANNA KULESZA:

Thank you very much, Yesim. Thank you for the introduction and for so skillfully setting the Zoom room and our participants up. Thank you very much, Bart, for joining us again today for the second session of the third webinar that is planned to build the capacity of our potential and upcoming Atlas III participants. We are very much looking forward to discuss the ccNSO. Yesterday's edition proved to be most informative, and I believe there were good questions that were asked, so I'm very much looking forward to hearing the talk about ccNSO and to the participation from our members here. It is my understanding that they are most welcome to ask their questions during the presentation, having previously flagged their interest with the right-hand icon. Thank you very much. Over to you, Bart.

BART BOSWINKEL:

Thank you again, Joanna, and good morning good afternoon and good evening to all. Before I start this presentation, I would like to ask you a question, and it's more an indication of the pace I need to go through the presentation. I see a lot of names who I haven't seen before, and that's because I'm very much associated with the ccNSO. But who has been involved, engaged, of you, with the ccNSO? If you just could raise your hand, so click the raised hand icon. It's also a nice exercise in using Zoom. That would be nice. I see it's fairly limited. So for those of you who have been engaged, please bear with us. You can lower your hand now.

I hope I will add some detail to your knowledge, and if not, you know after ten minutes you're dismissed. Let me start off with the introduction to the ccNSO. Next slide, please. Oh. Can somebody mute?

YESIM NAZLAR: Bart? I'm sorry for interrupting. If you can please give me one second, I need to make sure that the lines causing the background noise are muted, so others can hear you. Okay, I think we're good to go now. Thank you.

BART BOSWINKEL: Okay, no problem. I was just going to ask you the same question. Let me take you through the agenda. What I intend to do, and I think that worked well yesterday at least, is to provide you some views on the ccNSO, so not one particular view but from different perspectives. And you look at the agenda ... I'm sorry? I'll continue. Different perspectives on the ccNSO.

As you can see the agenda, and you will see it in the headings of the slides, it's very much around and focused on the ccNSO itself, but as I said from different perspectives. I'll not go very much into the detail of the substantive discussions currently undertaken within the ccNSO and by the ccTLD community. Just at the end, I'll highlight some key topics which are very much on the agenda of the ccNSO right now. So next slide, please.

Looking at the ccNSO, probably a good starting point is to look at the bylaw definition around the ccNSO. And the core part, or what people perceive to be the core part, is highlighted. So it is considered to be a policy development body which is responsible for developing and recommending policies regarding country code top-level domains. It's very important, and I want to stress and emphasize, it is about country

code top-level domains only. And because it's only for this country code top-level domains, it sets the limitations to it, and probably what is relevant as well is to understand what country code top-level domains are, and I'll go into a little bit more details around it.

A second important role of the ccNSO, according to the bylaws, is coordinating with other ICANN Org supporting organizations as the GNSO, and the ASO committees, and constituencies and others, and committees means the At-Large, the Government Advisory Committee, and the SSAC. So that, from the ccTLD perspective, is done through the ccNSO.

What also is included in the bylaw definitions, and I'll touch upon it later on during the presentation as well, that the ccNSO may also engage in other activities authorized by its members, and as you will understand later on in the presentation, that this is probably the main area of activity. Please bear this in mind, that the bylaw definition is just a limited perspective on the role and functions of the ccNSO itself. The ccNSO is mainly focused on and, I would say, houses the country code top-level domains. Next slide, please.

To understand what this means, I thought it would be useful for you to understand what is a country code top-level domain?. A country code originally – and this came up yesterday and I'll go into a little bit more details around it – is not just ... Originally it included the ASCII, so Latin-script two-letter codes, top-level domains like dot-UK, dot-GT for Guatemala, and dot-JP for Japan. Currently, it also includes IDN ccTLDs, but I'll touch upon this later down the presentation. What distinguishes these country code top-level domains from the gTLDs is that the two-

letter codes are included in the ISO or assigned to the name of countries which ... And territories and geographic areas of political or geographic areas, included in the ISO 3166-1 standard, so listed in the ISO 3166 standard.

To make this visual, or to visualize this, there is a maintenance agency for the ISO 3166 standard that assigns two-letter codes to a country or territory that is included. So, for the United Kingdom that is dot-UK, and the UK is selected by this, or assigned by the maintenance agency. The importance of this is that this mechanism and why we have country codes goes back to the early days of the DNS, and so that's the late 80s, early 90s of the previous century when people involved in the DNS decided that, say, they are not in the business of deciding what is and what is not a country, and they were looking for a mechanism or a standard that could be used to take on this part, and they ended up with the ISO 3166 standard.

What is important to remember as well, the ISO 3166 standard is not only used for the DNS, so for country code top-level domains, but it's also used for example when ... Say, for currencies. So that's one of the reasons why one needs to be very careful with just assigning country codes and keeping them in the DNS while other applications are still using them.

Going back, and to summarize, one of the major issues or major topics around country codes, or the ccNSO, is that it is [inaudible] there for country code top-level domain managers, and the assignment is not done by ICANN but is done externally through the ISO 3166 standard.

You just heard me mentioning country code top-level domain managers, and looking at the ccNSO, it is the managers that are members of the ccNSO, so not the ... And the managers could be anybody, but in principle, most by now they're entities which are recognized as such, and they are appointed locally and nationally. As a result – and that's one of the major differences again with the GNSO – the rules, etc. around country code top-level domains are defined locally, so in-country, in-territory, of all the specific ccTLDs.

As a result due to the differences in local laws, customs, policies – governmental policies that is – the rules vary significantly and this also results in a diversity in the ccTLDs and the way they manage around business and governance models. Some ccTLDs are run by academia, others by governmental agencies, another category is not-for-profits, and a few are run by for-profit businesses.

It also has an impact on the governance models as you can imagine, due to the differences in local laws and governmental policies. And custom governance models vary across the globe as well. And as a result of the business models and governance models, there is a difference in administration and registration policies, again across the whole continuum of ccTLDs. Taking from this slide, ccTLD top-level domains are the constituent ... Is closely linked with the ccNSO. Next slide, please.

Going back to what I said at the start of this webinar if you would look at the ccNSO and the role it plays ... I started off with the perspective from the ICANN bylaws. Now I want to touch a little bit on the perspective from the ccTLD managers, how they view the ccNSO.

As I said, and if you'll recall, the ccNSO, the ccTLD, or the members of the ccNSO, they determine what the ccNSO is undertaking as activities, if authorized by its members. Over time, since the creation of the ccNSO in 2003, the functions of the ccNSO have evolved, and it's from policy development and policy related work moved into other areas and other activities as well.

So, starting with the policy-related work, as I just said, the policy-related work includes, for example, the work around IDN ccTLDs, and the creation and establishment of IDN ccTLDs. Some of you will have heard about the IDN fast-track and currently, there is a discussion taking place within the ccNSO around the IDN overall recommended policy, which builds on the fast-track process, and there have been a lot of developments within the fast-track. I'll touch on it later in the presentation.

Another area of policy and policy related work I would say is the use of country and territory names as top-level domains. This is clearly an area where there is overlap between the discussions taking place within the GNSO and with the GAC, and the ccNSO or the ccTLD community. And a third area, which is important is the emoji, the discussions around the emoji, use of emojis as second-level domains. Again, this was initiated, or at the request of the ICANN board.

This is an interesting area because it highlights a difference between the ccTLD and the ccNSO, and the gTLD and the GNSO. If you would, say, for a ccNSO or ccTLDs, the use of emoji is mandated – or not mandated, is dealt with at a local level. So, the policies, say the registration policies, etc., are defined locally, and not through the ICANN processes, and

that's a difference with the GNSO, where the registration policies, etc., are clearly defined through the GNSO policy development processes. So that's what we expect to the policy-related work.

Another example – and this shows the flexibility I would say of the ccNSO – is the ccNSO has undertaken extensive examination of RFC 5091 which I just alluded to which is the main policy document around the delegation, transfer, and revocation of ccTLDs. This policy-related work, I would say the framework of interpretation, is around an interpretation of a policy document that was developed almost 25 years ago. That's a way how the ccNSO is dealing with the ccTLD community, deal with policy and policy-related work.

A second major function that has evolved over time is to provide a platform for the ccTLDs and others to exchange information to provide networking opportunities and to share practices, new developments, etc.

The way this is done is through the ccNSO member meeting days, which take place at the ICANN meetings, so the two days of the ICANN meeting dedicated to discussions of the members. And these meetings are open. It takes place through Tech Day, and some of you may have heard of Tech Day. Tech Day is a third day, and it focuses particularly on the operational and technical aspects of running top-level domains, and also focuses on security issues as well. And again, these meeting days are open, and it usually takes place on the Monday of an ICANN meeting, so there are three days of information sharing and networking opportunities.

There is a ccTLD cocktail, which is limited only for ccTLD managers and people working with ccTLDs.

And then finally another clear example of this exchange of information and sharing best practices, and illustrates how ccTLDs work together with other ccTLDs, is the TLD operational security work, the TLD Ops. It started off as an email list to alert on the ccTLD community about security incidents, but it has evolved and now organizes once a year a workshop, and the last workshop was about assisting ccTLDs in developing disaster recovery plans, etc., and they do table-top exercises. This shows you how the functions of the ccNSO has evolved, but clearly, are in the interests of the ccTLD members.

And finally, and this goes back again to the ... Which is represented in the bylaw definition, is the ccNSO represents the ccTLD community in the ICANN ecosystem with respect to other supporting organization advisory committees and the ICANN board. Through the ccNSO there are regular meetings with the ICANN board. Other supporting organization advisory committees. But also – and this is an interesting aspect – is through the ccNSO, the ccTLD community provides input to ICANN processes, like the strategic and operational planning processes.

The ccNSO has been active in this area since 2003, first with the working group and now what's called a committee, also it's important to understand the ccNSO is assisting individual ccTLDs in defining their voluntary financial contributions to ICANN. In the past, they've provided a guideline that was agreed with ICANN, and to assist ccTLDs to look at the level of their voluntary financial contribution, so again that's an

important aspect, and again, mandated through the members. This is how the ccNSO looks like from a ccTLD perspective. Next slide, please.

Finally, about embedding the ccNSO. You can look at this slide at your leisure. It should not be a surprise after you've already had two other webinars, and two other consecutive webinars, you can see that the ccTLD registries or the ccNSO appoints two members to the ICANN board. It has one member on the NomCom, and it interacts with the other advisory committees and supporting organizations, which are organized and represented in this slide. I will not spend too much time on it. It just shows you how the ccNSO is embedded in the larger ICANN structure, in the larger ICANN ecosystem. Next slide, please.

You heard me talk about the relationship between the ccTLDs and the ccNSO, and its role within the ICANN ecosystem, and this is a perspective again from a ccTLD manager. Why is the ccNSO considered relevant? Why are the ccTLD managers member of the ccNSO?

First, it provides structure for that interaction with other entities within ICANN, including ICANN Org, or ICANN organization, and the ICANN board. One of the real reasons, or one of the reasons, why ccTLDs are interested in ICANN is because ICANN runs the IANA naming function, currently through PTI and in the past under contract with the US government. And for that reason, ccTLDs are clearly like gTLDs, are direct customers of the IANA naming functions. It is of existential interest to them what is happening with the IANA function and the DNS. So that's one of the reasons why ccTLDs are interested in the ICANN ecosystem.

I touched upon it briefly before. There are approximately 250 different country codes, I'll go into the number a little bit later. But they're not just country codes, [inaudible] 59 IDN ccTLDs as well, and for all those, they are all related to the IANA naming function, that is the reason why they can be used as top-level domain. So that clearly shows that the bottom-line interest of the ccTLDs in ICANN. Next slide, please.

Now looking at it from another perspective, why is the ccNSO relevant probably for others? And that's just looking at the numbers of domain names. Currently, there are roughly around 350 million domain names under management, and as you all know a large proportion, over 100 million, are registered as dot-com domain names, so under management by Verisign. However, if you would look at the total number and see how it's divided between the ccTLDs and the gTLDs, you'll see that of the 350, over 150, so approximately 44% are country code top-level domains. So, registered domain names under management of ccTLDs. So, from that perspective, from a DNS perspective, ccTLDs are important, and especially if you would [just count] dot-com, you will see that a large proportion is registered with the ccTLDs.

Another way of looking at it is of the top 10 largest TLDs, so that includes generic and country-code top-level domains, seven of them are ccTLDs. As I've said, by far the largest is dot-com, but the second largest, it depends on whether you count them or not –some do some don't – is dot-TK, Tokelau or others would say dot-CN is, and the third largest, or the fourth, depends on your counting, is dot-GE for Germany. From that perspective, the ccTLD community and hence the ccNSO is relevant.

Top ten, if you would look at the details of the top ten ccTLDs, they got approximately 65% of all domain names registered. So this gives you a bit of a broader perspective on the relevancy of ccTLDs, and of the ccNSO in general from a DNS point of view. Next slide, please.

After talking a little bit about the ccNSO and its context, I will now zoom into the ccNSO itself. What is important to remember about the ccNSO, is effectively it's a two-layered structure. It consists of a membership, which are the ccTLD managers and a council, and I'll touch upon both, but I'll first go zoom into the ccNSO membership and its structures.

This again clarifies the relation between the ccNSO and the ccTLD managers, who can be and who are the ccNSO members. ccNSO membership is currently limited to ccTLD managers with a two-letter code. Hopefully in the near future, IDN ccTLDs will be eligible as well, but currently, it's only limited to two letter codes.

Membership of the ccNSO is voluntary. Only ccTLD managers who have agreed to become a member are member of the ccNSO. It is not by definition that all ccTLDs are managers.

Looking at the membership, what is the role of the membership? First of all, they are the volunteers. They provide, and people working with ccTLD managers, participate in the activity of the ccNSO and also in other groups. For example, the cross-community working group on auction proceeds, or even under the GNSO SubPro working group on country and territory names – or on geographic names, excuse me. That's probably the main role of the membership. They provide the people who really make it work, who really make the ccNSO work.

The second role is to elect councilors, and that's provided in the ICANN bylaws in other concerns, so 15 out of the 18 councilors are elected by ccTLD managers. I'll go into a little bit more detail in a minute. And they also nominate candidates for board seats 11 and 12 and this is a voluntary arrangement. It shows you the relationship and is an indication of the relationship between the ccNSO membership and the council.

If you would look at the letter of the ICANN bylaws, the ccNSO council selects the board members. However, when the ccNSO was created there was a voluntary arrangement between the council and the membership that the members would nominate candidate board members, and those members who were elected by – say, the board members or candidates who were elected by the ccNSO members would then be appointed by the ccNSO Council. Again, in principle, it's the council. However, by voluntary arrangement the membership appoints the board members on seats 11 and 12.

Also, a reported role is if there is a ccNSO PDP – and I'll go a bit more into details – the members do have the final vote, and not the council, and again this is a major difference between the GNSO policy development process and decisions of policy development process.

Ultimately in decisions, though, policy development process as far as I understand, the GNSO Council has the final vote before recommendations are sent to the board. In decisions, though, it is the membership who have the final vote, and this is a yes or no vote, but still, it is a final vote, and there is a quorum rule to so to ensure the membership is comfortable with the policy recommendations. And

finally – and this is related to the point on the final vote – 10% of the members may ask for a call for a vote on all ccNSO council decisions, effectively meaning that if there is a call for a vote either due to timing issues, there will be no decision.

For example, if you would look at the empowered – some of the rules within the Empowered community, so Annex D, but also that ultimately the ccNSO council is accountable, also on substantive matters to its membership. Again, if you go back and summarize it, the ultimate power within the ccNSO is with the ccNSO membership. Next slide, please.

I saw one of the questions was: how many members are currently within the ccNSO? As I've said, there are approximately roughly 250-plus ccTLDs, so excluding the IDN ccTLDs. 172 out of these 250 are currently members and the membership is still growing. You can see the distribution among the five ICANN regions, that I think ... Look at it at your leisure.

I just want to note one thing is the membership number is a little bit distorted. Let me explain why. There are some ccTLD managers who are manager of more than one country code top-level domain. I'll give you two examples. One of them is Norid from Norway. Norid is not just a manager for dot-No, so Norway, but also for dot-BV, Bouvet Islands, and for Svalbard, dot-SV. But they are only member from the ccNSO for dot-NO.

Another example is AFNIC, which is the ccTLD manager for dot-FR, for France, but also for six other ccTLDs. But they are only a member for

dot-FR. So, that biases or that distorts the number of members a little bit.

In principle – and this is also something that you need to keep in mind when you talk about country and territories and that complicates the matter a little bit – there are more countries and territories listed in the ISO 3166 than there are just plain countries. I believe the number of countries in the world is limited to 192. The number of countries and territories and geographic areas of political interest are, as I said, over 250. You'll see that some countries have more than one ccTLD, but that's because they have territories. I will not go into details, but you can look it up in the ISO 3166 standard. Next slide, please.

There are also IDN ccTLDs. This complicates the story a little bit. The IDN ccTLDs through the fast-track were established or could be delegated since 2009. Since 2009 by now we have 59 IDN ccTLDs, through the fast-track process, for 41 countries. And if you would look at the criteria which we discussed yesterday at the other webinar, you'll see that for IDN ccTLDs, there are more managers eligible per country or territory.

If you would look at the definition of what an IDN ccTLD string should be, it should be a meaningful representation of the name of a country in a formal language of the country and in a non-Latin script. That's why you will see that for example for India, they are 11 IDN ccTLDs all with different scripts, and for other territories and countries as well. As I said, they are – and that's what you see – they're currently non-eligible for the ccNSO as members, and unfortunately, this is due to the bylaw

definitions and that should change in time. I see there is a hand up. Please go ahead. [Haroun], you have a question?

YESIM NAZLAR: [Haroun], are you able to speak? Let me try to unmute your microphone if you are not able to. Okay, you are unmuted now. No, not hearing anything. Would you like to continue for us, maybe? I unmuted Haroun, but no response as of yet.

BART BOSWINKEL: I'll continue.

YESIM NAZLAR: Thanks.

BART BOSWINKEL: I see another question. If it doesn't work, then we'll ... About dot-MI Malaysia, [inaudible] Arabic. Just going back to that question, and it shows you what it means in ... This has to do with the definition of IDN ccTLDs or when is a string eligible? As I said, an IDN ccTLD, or IDN cc, country code, IDN cc, needs to be a meaningful representation of the name of the country which could be an abbreviation, like dot-MI, which is a meaningful representation of Malaysia as well. It needs to be in a formal language of the country, and Arabic is presumably a formal language of Malaysia, and in the Arabic script. In that sense, it makes perfect sense, if these conditions are met that Malaysia in Arabic, or MI in Arabic, is an IDN ccNSO. Let me continue.

As I said, the IDN ccTLDs are not eligible yet. It is part of the second PDP, but I'll go in a bit more details later on why it hasn't happened. But as long as the bylaws haven't changed, IDN ccTLDs cannot join the ccNSO. Next slide, please.

Closing off, I'm now going to the second layer of the ccNSO, the ccNSO Council. If you would look at the bylaws, and again this is a bylaw perspective, in principle the council is responsible for managing the policy development process, or processes of the ccNSO.

By now you've understood the number of policy processes is very limited within the ccNSO, and the role of the ccNSO for its members has evolved, and hence the role of the ccNSO Council has evolved as well.

So, what does it do, the ccNSO? It manages in principle the ccNSO affairs, meaning it looks into the creation of working groups, reporting lines of working groups, appoint members and vice-chairs to working groups. It interacts on behalf of the ccNSO with other entities, like with At-Large or the GNSO Council. It is responsible for organizing the meetings and interaction with others, so meetings meaning the ccNSO members there. And it represents decisions of, and again I've alluded, within the ICANN ecosystem.

Formally, it selects the ICANN board members, but as I said, the voluntary arrangement is that when members elect and the ccNSO council selects the board members, which will then be designated by the empowered community, or EECA.

And finally, which is an important role as well of the ccNSO Council, is appoint the ccNSO chair and vice-chairs annually. Effectively, that's

what is captured under managing the ccNSO affairs, but always taking, and always being accountable to the ccNSO membership. Next slide, please.

If you would look at the ccNSO Council, as I said there are 18 members. Three members from every ICANN region, and then three appointed by the NomCom. Membership is staggered, meaning that annually there is a ccNSO council election process in each of the region. The next one will start in the August timeframe, and the new councilors when elected will take their seat in March, in the first meeting in their calendar year of the ccNSO, and the ccNSO Council at the end of it.

The chair of the ccNSO is Katrina Sataki. She's on the right-hand side. She's from Latvia, Europe, and she's been the chair I believe for four years. We have two vice-chairs. One is Byron Holland from Canada. He's on the left-hand side and he's been vice-chair for four years now as well. He used to be the chair of the ccNSO. Since March we have a new vice-chair, Alejandro Reynoso from Guatemala. Again, you see that the geographic diversity is also reflected in the leadership team of the ccNSO. Okay, enough about the ccNSO Council. Next slide, please.

As I said and started off, the ccNSO is one of the three policy-making bodies within the ICANN ecosystem, specifically for policies relating to ccTLDs. To understand – and again, the limitation of the policy development process, and again a major difference with the GNSO is it only in principle sets policies with respect to top-level domains. How they are selected, how they are delegated, how they are revoked, and how they are transferred, which is currently underway, how they are

resigned. This is reflected, this limited scope of the ccNSO policy development process, it is reflected in the ICANN bylaws, in Annex D.

It is not about setting policies, how ccTLDs register domain names or transfer domain names under management, which a major difference with the gTLD. For that reason, because of the limited scope, as you probably all are aware, there is a lot of activity ongoing within ICANN around the implementation of the GDPR, the Data Protection Regulation from Europe, which affects the WHOIS services, etc. Because the ccNSO policy development is so limited in scope, the ccNSO itself has no role in that area. Implementation of GDPR and everything around WHOIS is excluded from the policy development process, which has to take place and is done by individual ccTLDs. And because of this it is not on the ccNSO radar. So again, to highlight some of the differences, and to understand the scope of and the role of the ccNSO.

Policy developed through the ccNSO policy development apply to ccTLD by virtue of membership. However, this is also important to keep in the back of your mind, there are major exceptions. For example, applicable law, local custom or public policy, which is always paramount. If a policy developed through the ccNSO would force the ccTLD to breach applicable law, then applicable law is paramount and the ccTLD cannot breach the policy developed through the ccNSO.

So that's the limitation in scope on the policy development process. If you would look at the process itself, it's very heavy-handed. One of the reasons why it's so heavy-handed, or why I say this, is because of the membership vote after the council.

For example, the membership vote has a quorum rule, which means that 50% of the members need to vote, and there is one vote per country territory system. There is no difference between ... To ensure there is no first-class and second-class membership. As a result, membership votes are very difficult to organize, with over 172 members. It means effectively that you need 87 members to vote. For example, normally an ICANN meeting around 50-60 ccTLD managers show up, so it's quite cumbersome to organize it.

As part of the process there is a structural engagement with the GAC. The GAC needs to be informed that the ccNSO is undertaking a policy development process, that we end by the time before the council expresses its view on the policy recommended, the GAC is asked for their opinion as well. That's again one of the safeguards but makes it very heavy-handed.

If you look at the number of PDPs, to date one is completed. That was more an exercise, that was about a bylaw change. [inaudible] we talk about IDN ccTLD overall policy. It awaits a board vote since 2013. However, this was done by mutual agreement between the ccNSO and the ICANN board, pending the evolution of the fast-track process. Before the policy would come into play, the issues around the fast-track process which encountered had to be resolved, and only very recently the final issue has been resolved.

Finally, to end this slide, there's currently one PDP on the way on the retirement of ccTLDs related on the development of independent review mechanisms which is excluded from the IRP by definition. Next slide, please.

Some references which you can look up at your leisure if you're interested and to say the work of the ccNSO. Next slide, please.

So as I said, some key topics under discussion right now. Where are the ccTLDs? What are the interests of the ccTLD community in the ccNSO? First of all, very clearly, I will not go into much detail, is the PDP on the retirement of ccTLDs and the review mechanisms decisions, so it's clearly policy work.

Another topic which is policy and policy related work, which I touched upon briefly was around the IDN ccTLD overall policy, which is on the brink of being reviewed now the final issues with respect to the fast-track process have been resolved, and the ccNSO and GNSO have been asked to look into issues or to resolve policy issues around the variant management of IDN TLDs, so each for their own [inaudible].

A second policy-related work which I've touched upon briefly already which comes to a conclusion is the work of the emoji study group, which is around the use of emojis as second-level domains. This is one of the illustrated differences between the GNSO or gTLDs and ccTLDs. ccTLDs are not on the contract with ICANN, given the nature and I hope that is clear from this presentation. They are accountable to their local Internet communities, and they abide to national policies, etc. As a result, some accept emojis, which is prohibited according to the gTLD contracts as far as I understand.

The ccNSO is not trying to interfere, but at least tries to inform ccTLDs who accept emojis as second-level domains about the risks etc., and vice-versa inform the ICANN community on the considerations of the

ccTLDs who are doing so. Again, it shows you the role and illustrates the role of the ccNSO as such.

ccNSO is also very much focused on its role as a decisional participant. So in post-IANA transition and as member of the empowered community, it still works on implementation of the different powers now handed to the decisional participants as probably some of the other SOs and ACs are doing as well, and it's looking into implementation of workstream two of the accountability of cross-community working group recommendations. That's been put on hold, awaiting for development.

Currently the ccNSO is under an organizational review, and the recommendations from the independent reviewer have just been shared with review working party for feedback and will be discussed at the Marrakech meeting with the broader community, and as such again illustrates the broader context of the ccNSO or ccTLDs participating in work track five of the GNSO PDP on subsequent procedures, and on the cross-community working group on auction proceeds.

And finally as I already mentioned, the ccNSO has been very much engaged and involved in ICANN strategic and operational planning processes that since 2009, there is a working group that regularly, or effectively always, has provided feedback on and input on ICANN's budget, operational plan, and strategic plan. Next slide, please.

Finally, if you want to learn on a regular basis, there are different ways to learn more about the ccNSO. One is the ccNSO monthly newsletter,

and you can always of course consult the ccNSO webpage and everything on it, and the ccNSO Wiki space. Next slide, please.

Now, you see my picture. I'm the guy who's on top left, as you can see. The other three lovely ladies are the ccNSO together with me, we are the ccNSO secretaries. If you have any questions and you do attend ICANN meetings, you may see us walking around, please do not hesitate to contact us, either in person or – next slide, please – to this email address. That was my presentation, thank you.

JOANNA KULESZA:

Thank you very much, Bart. That was most interesting, most helpful, thank you also to the members of the team who have joined us in the chat room and in the chat box. I see one hand up from Haroun, I'm not sure if he has [inaudible] question before. Let's try it again. Haroun, if you have a question, would you be willing to share that question with us via audio, please. The floor is yours? Haroun? No, I don't think Haroun can hear us. The hand has been up for a short while. Are there any other questions we have not been able to address, and any other participants would like to ask now? I don't think we have any more questions. I think we have covered everything perfectly, Bart.

Thank you again for joining us, thank you for the declaration to respond to any upcoming questions if there are participants might have another question, to encourage them please to directly reach out to Bart, or to myself, and we would be happy to convey the message. Thank you very much, that's it from us, and I am very much looking forward to seeing you during the next webinar, which is scheduled for next week. The

details are to be found on our At-Large website. Thank you very much, everyone. Good evening, good afternoon and goodbye.

BART BOSWINKEL: Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Bye-bye.

YESIM NAZLAR: Thank you all for joining today's webinar, this webinar is now ended, and have a lovely rest of the day. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]