BART BOSWINKEL: … related to this one. And that's again, important to understand in the context of delegation, and especially revocation, and plans for all ccTLDs. If there is disagreement locally, it should be resolved locally, in country or territory. Again, this is derived from RFC 1591. And then the final point, and that shows the limitation of, say – or say the basis for the limitation of the ICANN policies for ccTLD, say ccTLD are administered and managed locally. So local rules and policies for registration under a ccTLD so that it's a local affair. Duty of the ccTLD manager is to serve the local community and preserve security and stability of the ccTLD, and work with IANA to preserve the [billable] security and stability. So first and foremost, there is a local focus in a local government structure.

Okay. The basics again, and now I'm a little bit into the IANA functions contract, saying the delegation, relegation, and transfer is included as a service function for the IANA functions operator. Service levels are applicable. The role and definition in the different processes are defined. So the IANA Function Operator and the role of NTIA in its authorization role, and the policy [flora].

And there are some specific clauses in the IANA functions contract with respect to the delegation, revocation, transfer of ccTLDs. So use of existing policies, that's the RFC 1591 and some other relevant documents. Performance exclusions, so IANA Function Operator not allowed to make material changes to the policy framework. And no agreement, contract, etc., should be required to receive IANA function

services. So it should be independent, and that's been a long battle for the ccTLD community. But, say, the IANA functions should be provided to all the services. It should be provided to all ccTLDs, whether they have entered into a contract with ICANN, a exchange of letters, or have no formal documented relation with ICANN and/or IANA. And so these are the basic concepts around the delegation, as I've said.

So now looking into the process itself, the delegation of management of a ccTLD, I hope you can read it. The delegation – and this goes back to the framework of interpretation. The delegation, the definition of it is, "A process by which the IANA functions operator assigns management responsibilities for the management of a ccTLD." So that's the way it's defined.

And if you would drill down a little bit a first layer, if you would look at the current process, the prerequisite is a relevant entry (assigned code) in the ISO 3166 two-letter code list. So that's the ISO.

If there is no entry, if there is no assigned two-letter code to a geographic entity – so a country or territory – that two-letter code is not eligible for delegation as a ccTLD. Or if a geographic entity doesn't have an entry in the ISO 3166-1 list, it is not eligible as a ccTLD. That is a core principle.

So assuming there is an entry, then there will be a delegation request from the potential ccTLD manager. And that will be supported with relevant documentation. That relevant documentation includes support from the significantly interested parties, so formerly known as local Internet community. And there is other required documentation. For

example, around the technical capabilities, etc., of the ccTLD manager/operator.

This documentation that is request is processed by the IANA functions operator. And assuming all goes well, it will go to the Board to check and for authorization for the next step. And now is the interesting part, and it has caused some strong discussion, especially with other governments and with ccTLDs. The NTIA needs to authorize a change to the root zone. So from the ICANN environment, so from the ICANN functions operator, it goes to the Board for checks, etc., and authorization. And then it goes to the NTIA for authorization. And only if NTIA has authorized the change in the root zone, the root zone change will take place. And again, this process is well defined.

So what is important to understand? Based on the proposals from the CWG Stewardship, post-transition, there is no more role of NTIA as in the chain of authorization. So it will go directly, if all goes well, from Board checks and authorization to a root zone change, again following the process.

And this was felt at least by the ccTLD community. With the NTIA authorization gone, there is at least no eyes of third-parties involved. So it was felt by some that there was a need for a review mechanism. But as you well know, the review mechanism is not included in the proposal. What will happen is the review mechanism for the decisions around delegation of management of a ccTLD will be developed by the ccNSO through a ccNSO policy development process. And what is also felt by some in the community – and that's still an ongoing discussion, as far as

I understand – is more on how to implement it, but the need for comparable clauses on the service delivery in the PTI contract and bylaws. And these clauses would say the policy framework is developed outside of PTI and by the ccNSO by service levels, which are very important for the ccTLDs. And no performance exclusions. As I said, this relates to no material changes to the policies and no agreements or contracts, etc., to receive IANA functions services.

Then looking at the revocation, transfer of management of a ccTLD, again, the current process is revocation and transfer request by a new ccTLD manager, plus relevant documentation. In this case again, which is very important, support by the significantly interested parties. So that means includes the government and includes other stakeholders with a direct interest in the management of the ccTLD. And other required documentation.

If we talk about a transfer of ccTLDs, then the incumbent ccTLD – so that means the current ccTLD – manager need to provide informed consent to the transfer of the management of the ccTLD. Again, that needs to be documented, as you can imagine. And further, say, again, processing by the IANA functions operator, ICANN Board check and authorization, and currently NTIA authorization of changes to the root zone is applicable in these circumstances as well. And then the root zone change management.

And as you can imagine, post-transition, no more for the NTIA in authorization. Again, also in this circumstance, there is also, with respect to the decisions around revocation and transfer of

EN

management, there is a [filled] need for a real review mechanism. And again, this is not included in the proposals of either the CWG Stewardship or CCWG Accountability, at the explicit request and explicit instigation of the ccTLD community, because there needs to be a policy in place that needs to be developed by the ccNSO. And with respect to the revocation, again, need for comparable clauses. Again, nothing new here.

Now, finally, and this is an interesting one I wanted to include, although it's probably not on everybody's radar screen, but it is the retirement of ccTLDs. As you may recall, I said the ISO 31 list is dynamic. That means it reflects geopolitical development. Some countries go, some territories go, some are renamed. And as a result, the assignment of two-letter codes changes as well. I have included two examples, because it shows a bit of diversity of what is happening in [this realm].

The first one, as I said, is .NA, Netherlands Antilles. As a result of the restructuring of the Kingdom of the Netherlands in 2010, .NA went from an assigned code to a transitional reserve code. And as a result, .NA retired in 2015. So the ccTLD itself was retired. At the same time, two or three other codes were entered into ISO 3166. So as a result, you see there are some dynamics involved.

Another example – and that's probably a very interesting one – is the changes around .CS. First, it was used for Czechoslovakia, and at a later stage for Servia and Montenegro. So you see that the ISO 3166 Maintenance Agency sometimes first assigns a two-letter code to one country or territory, and then after some time has assigned it to another

country and territory. And this has caused some issues, not just in the – or has caused issue, probably most in other areas than, say, the DNS. I know this one has caused some issues, for example, in libraries. So this, again, shows that the ISO 3166 is not only used by ICANN and in the RFC 1591, but has multiple uses. So one is by libraries. Others, for example, by the postal union in the past and still, in currencies, etc. So it's a very broad standard. So it's important to understand this. Now, looking at .CS, what happened is it went from assigned to a formerly used. So that was with Czechoslovakia. Then it was assigned again to Montenegro and Serbia. And then it was transitionally reserved following the breakup of Serbia and Montenegro. So now .RS is the country code for Serbia, and .ME is the country code for Montenegro. And in the meantime, .CS for Serbia and Montenegro has been retired as well.

So why I'm alluding to this one is there is currently no policy in place. However, the practice has evolved over time. It is documented in IANA reports, and final report of the ccNSO Working Group. And in these decisions, the NTIA had to authorize the changes to the root zone as well. But the process itself is not very well documented. So again, this is an area where the ccNSO will develop a policy, and hopefully I'll get to that in a minute.

So looking at the impact and going back to the original question around this webinar, what's the impact of the transition on the delegation, revocation, transfer, and retirement of ccTLDs? What I see from where I sit – and as I sit, it's a very limited view – there are a couple of things that are relevant. First of all is the implementations of the Framework of Interpretation, which is a document, as you will see, that was developed

by the ccNSO which is not a policy in itself. It is a clarification of RFC 1591, which is the main policy document. So it didn't follow the ccNSO policy development rules, and it was never intended to create a new policy. It was there to provide color and depth to the existing policy, so to RFC 1591. But the document and the recommendations need to be implemented, including the language I was using in the presentation.

Secondly, there is an urgent need – at least by some in the ccTLD community think so, or they feel there is an urgent need – for additional policies. So a PDP will be launched by Helsinki – that's the expectations – on the review mechanisms for decisions relating to the delegation, revocation, transfer, and retirement of ccTLDs. And a second building block, there is a policy needed for the retirement of ccTLDs. And again, this was the urgency and the priority was trigged by the IANA transition and the discussions around it.

And thirdly, I think there is a need for clarity around – and that's at least the ccTLD community thinks so – there is need for clarity around PTI – so post-transition IANA – and its performance. So there needs to be a Statement of Work in general and the service level and expectations and monitoring needs to be developed, as this was an important role by NTIA, post-transition. The ccTLD community feels there is a strong need for service levels and for monitoring against them, and to include some of the current safeguards in the PTI bylaws and/or contracts. Yeah, that's what I just said, so the inclusion of current safeguards around performance exclusions.

EN

That's the end of our presentation. And these are the references, for those of you who would be interested to delve more in depth into the issues or the topics I've just raised.

Tijani, over to you again. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Bart. Thank you for this presentation. May I start by asking you a question?

BART BOSWINKEL: Yes, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: What we call the redelegation, what you call now transfer, was to give the responsibly of management of the ccTLD from a manager to another.

BART BOSWINKEL: Yes, that's correct.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: But the ccTLD remains as a code for the same country.

BART BOSWINKEL: Yes, that's correct. That's why –

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Now you are talking about – yeah, a moment. Now you are speaking about changing a ccTLD from a country to another.

BART BOSWINKEL: No. No.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yeah, you spoke about the one that was for Czechoslovakia and now it is for Serbia and Montenegro.

BART BOSWINKEL: Let me explain. And this goes back to [inaudible] and that's why I've included it. I was talking in the context of retirement. I was also talking in the context of what is on the ISO 3166 list. And if you go back to the – I will scroll back to the introduction, basic content. IANA is not in the business. Who gets which code is done by the ISO 3166 Maintenance Agency. It is outside ICANN/IANA/PTI/governments/ccTLDs. It is solely done by the ISO 3166 Maintenance Agency, under the rules of the ISO 3166 standard. And they have a process to determine what is and what is not a country.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. So the change was done at the level of the ISO management.

BART BOSWINKEL: Yes. Yes.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay.

BART BOSWINKEL: Yes.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much.

BART BOSWINKEL: And, Tijani, thank you very much for this question. It shows why I needed to include this. It is very important to understand that ccTLDs – so country codes – and who assigns them has nothing to do with ICANN. They are used for multiple purposes outside the DNS; as I said, for currency. And one of the reasons why it's so important to understand is the ISO 3166 list is dynamic. It changes gradually over time.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yeah. And the most important example for that is the inclusion of .EU, which is not a country, and yet it is now in the ISO list. That's why it is now a ccTLD.

BART BOSWINKEL: Yeah.

EN

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:	So thank you very much, Bart. This is a very interesting presentation. And I hope it was useful for our attendees, and I am sure it is.
	Let me now give the floor to Yeşim to present the pop quiz.
BART BOSWINKEL:	Well, I see Sébastien has a question.
TIJANI BEN JEMAA:	I didn't see his hand. No, we will start by the pop quiz, and then we will go to the Q&A session.
BART BOSWINKEL:	Okay.
TIJANI BEN JEMAA:	So, Yeşim, go ahead.
YEŞIM NAZLAR:	Thank you very much, Tijani. Yes, we do have some pop quiz questions.
	The first question is: Is the Framework of Interpretation a policy, as in ccNSO developed policy? If it's a yes or a no, please cast your votes now.
	And the correct answer is, Bart?

BART BOSWINKEL: The correct answer is no. As I said, it didn't follow the ccNSO policy development processes, as such. So that's more a formal answer. The second answer is – and I alluded to this in my presentation as well, although it's not included in the slides – the Framework of Interpretation is – and that's why it's called the Framework of Interpretation – is to provide color and depth to the RFC 1591, which documents the policy around the delegation, revocation, and transfer of ccTLDs. So the correct answer is no.

YEŞIM NAZLAR: Thank you very much, Bart. Let's move on to the second question.

Who assigns a country code to a country or a territory? UN, ICANN, ISO 3166 MA, or the country itself? Please cast your votes now.

Bart, could you please kindly tell us the correct answer for this one as well?

BART BOSWINKEL: The correct answer is C. And this alludes to, say, the question Tijani just asked and my response. What is and what is not a country is a geopolitical decision. But the ISO 3166 has a process to identify them. Once it's identified as such and it will be listed, then the ISO 3166 Maintenance Agency will assign a two-letter code to that country or territory. And that two-letter code will be used as a ccTLD. So the correct answer is C.

YEŞIM NAZLAR:	Thank you very much, Bart. Let's keep on going to our last question, question number 3.
	Delegation, revocation, and transfer of ccTLD is only relevant for ccNSO member. Is that a yes or a no? Please cast your votes now.
	And the correct answer is?
BART BOSWINKEL:	B. Maybe the best way to explain this is the delegation of a ccTLD. If you look at the definition, it is the assignment of the management of a new ccTLD to a manager. That manager, before delegation, could and would not have been able to be a member of the ccNSO. So the first step, in order to become a member of the ccNSO, is that you need to be a ccTLD manager. And that can only happen after delegation. So the correct answer is no.
YEŞIM NAZLAR:	Thank you very much, Bart. Please close the [inaudible] questions. Yes, over to you, Tijani. Thank you.
TIJANI BEN JEMAA:	Thank you very much, Yeşim. And now we go to the Q&A session. And the first question will be asked by Sébastien Bachollet. Sébastien, please go ahead. Go ahead.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Tijani, and thank you, Bart. I wanted to come back to one of the requests about transfer of a ccTLD. And now it's called significantly interested party. I didn't know that the local Internet community disappear. But what is the role of end user in that situation? And how, in each country, to balance to have the point of view of all the relevant parties? Thank you.

BART BOSWINKEL: Sébastien, I don't know. That's a local matter. And I know that a very short answer – what I've included here is a definition of what is at a, say, ccNSO/ICANN/IANA functions operator considered the significantly interested party. And the reason for doing this is if you would look at RFC 1591, as I've said, the basic policy document, it talks about local Internet community, and it talks about significantly interested parties. So in order to provide clarity, it is suggested to start using significantly interested parties. And these are defined.

How, in practice, this will be done at a local level is a local matter. It can be differently because, as I said, if you would go back through the core concepts, the ccTLD governance is, in principle, a local matter. So how this concept will be filled in, in practice, at local level, that's nothing for the ccNSO, for me, or somebody at the global level to decide.

So if end users want to be involved in local issues, they need to be involved in the local processes. I hope this answers your question. I know it's not the answer you expected, but…

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Sébastien, your hand is still up. Do you have another question?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Please, go ahead.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: It's not another question. Thank you. No, I was not expecting something else from you, Bart, on this issue because I know what is the point of view of ICANN. But I wanted to raise, for my colleagues within At-Large.

BART BOSWINKEL: Sébastien, sorry, for correcting, this is not ICANN's view. This is the view of the ccTLD/ccNSO community. I am not representing ICANN. As I said in the start, I am not representing ICANN. I am stepping in on behalf of [Katrina]. So don't make it…

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: But it's the same position taken by the Board of ICANN when the Board of ICANN was to take a position on the delegation, at that time re-delegation, of ccTLD. But okay, you are – and I get your point. But I wanted to raise this issue, because I think that my colleagues from At-

Large and from the ALSes need to know very well that if they don't participate at the local level in those matters, their voice will not be heard. And they have to struggle, because in general, at the end of the day, the significant interest party will be only the government. Then it's why we need to be strong. Thank you, and I hope that it's not too much disturbing what you were saying, Bart. Thank you very much.

BART BOSWINKEL: No, absolutely not. But it's good to point out again, this is a local issue. And I do understand that point of view, and I say again that, as I said in the introduction, the local governance of the ccTLDs is very diverse. The governance structures go from ccTLDs which allow a lot of input, etc., to those who are run by governments. So in that sense, yeah, I just wanted to make that point.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Bart and Sébastien. Alberto Soto, but before I give the floor to Alberto Soto, let me tell you about that. I know about some cases of delegation where they were asked to have the support of the civil society, of the private sector, and of the government. So I think there is a requirement in this.

BART BOSWINKEL: Tijani, I think that confirms my point. If you would go back to the slide, I can show it to you. But if you would look at the slide around the transfer or revocation, even on delegation, there is always a important role for

the significantly interested parties that, by definition, includes the local government, but also other stakeholders.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes. I am confirming, and I am saying that it is not only a local matter. To be able to make the transfer, the local manager or the ccTLD manager has to provide the support of all parties on the ground. Thank you very much.

I give the floor to Alberto Soto. Alberto, go ahead.

ALBERTO SOTO: Thank you, Tijani. I have three very quick issues that I would like to deal with. The non-registered ccTLDs, how are they coordinated with ICANN, and how do they operate?

Now also, I also understood that IDN ccTLDs cannot be registered in the ccNSO, or they cannot be part of the ccNSO. Is that correct?

And finally, I know that there are others that have been assigned. I know that they are very complex. I don't know how you're going to manage them. For example, the Malvinas is a collection of islands that belong to Argentina, and the country code was assigned by ICANN to .FK, as if they were independent. Thank you.

BART BOSWINKEL: Thank you for your question, Alberto. Could you please clarify what you mean by non-registered ccTLDs?

ALBERTO SOTO: Yes. I think in one of the first slides, there was – I'm sorry, there were some countries that were not registered in the ccTLD – I'm sorry, in the ccNSO. That's what I mean. It's those countries that were not in that place.

BART BOSWINKEL: Yeah. And so in principle, with respect to the IANA functions or to the IANA Function Operator, they are treated at the same level. There is no distinction between them. They all depend on the IANA Function Operator to make changes to the root zone. It's not only the delegation and transfer, etc., but it's also name server changes. They all rely on the IANA Function Operator. Does that answer your question? So there is, in principle, no distinction.

ALBERTO SOTO: Thank you.

BART BOSWINKEL: Does that answer your first question?

ALBERTO SOTO: Yes, the answer is correct. Thank you.

BART BOSWINKEL:	I forgot your second one. Go into your third question, around Malvinas and .FK, as I said – and again, this goes back to, I think, the misconception on the role of ICANN. ICANN has not picked .FK. That is the ISO 3166 Maintenance Agency. And as long as Malvinas, or .MV, is not included in the ISO 3166 list, there is no eligibility for delegation. And that's a geopolitical question, and that's why it was so wise at the time, by the people who have developed RFC 1591 that they should not get involved in these geopolitical questions.

So going back to that point whether or whether not .MV or .FK is the correct two-letter code has nothing to do with ICANN. It is an ISO 3166 Maintenance Agency, and the rules used by that Maintenance Agency to include or not include a territory or country.

And your second question, could you please allude to that one again? Because I have forgot. I haven't written it down.

ALBERTO SOTO:	Thank you, Bart. The answer is a really nice one. I think I understood that the IDN ccTLDs cannot be registered in the ccNSO. Is that correct?

BART BOSWINKEL:	Unfortunately, that is correct. And that's a very formal point of view. As soon as the policy on the selection of IDN ccTLD [streams] is adopted by the ICANN Board, there will be a Bylaw change which allows IDN ccTLDs to become members. It is a definitional question, and the interpretation of the definition of Article 9 of the current ICANN Bylaws. It talks about

the way it's defined. The IDN ccTLDs, yeah, do not fall under that definition, unfortunately. So it's still a matter of time. But in principle, they should be treated similar – and they are treated similar – as ccTLDs or ASCII ccTLDs. Those all are ccTLDs.

Does that answer your question?

ALBERTO SOTO: Yes, you answered my question. Thank you very much.

BART BOSWINKEL: Okay. Thank you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you. Thank you, Alberto, and thank you, Bart. Now we have a question from the chat. Yeşim, can you please read the questions?

YEŞIM NAZLAR: Sure, certainly. Thank you very much, Tijani. The question from Jason Hynds, "How does ICANN/IANA/ ccNSO reach out to the ccTLD operators update them on this topic post IANA transition? Is there a mandatory means of communicating with operators outside of voluntary membership to ccNSO?"

And there is also a comment from him. He says, "I'm concerned about how ccTLDs are apprised of developments that relate to their function

and concerned that local management may vary too much to what is useful best practice and up-to-date developments."

Thank you very much.

BART BOSWINKEL: Jason, thank you very much for the question. There are, I think, a couple of aspects to your question. I'll not go into all of them. First of all, with respect to the transition and stewardship and accountability discussions and developments, is the ccNSO has created what is called a ccTLD World E-mail List that includes all ccTLD managers. And ccTLD managers are informed through that channel. That's one.

Secondly, and that's related in a way, there is a active publication of these documents and other material, not only on the ccNSO website, also there is what is called Regional ccTLD Organizations, and by the IANA Function Operator.

However – and now I need to quote a former Chair of the ccNSO – you can bring the horse to the water, but you can't force it to drink. At one point, if a ccTLD manager knowing about his responsibility that he is to serve the community, as I indicated in the slides, and to preserve the security and the stability and needs to stay in touch with the IANA Function Operator; knowing this, and that is the role of the ccTLD itself, there is, in my view – and not just my view, but in the view of the ccNSO – also a point where a ccTLD manager itself needs to reach out and understand developments. Because at one point, they were delegated, the management of the ccTLD, to serve the community. And in that

service, it also means, in my view at least, that you need to keep yourself apprised of the developments.

And then going back to your second point, the ccNSO provides a platform around best practices. Maybe you listened to me saying there is not just the ccNSO. There are also regional organizations for at least the Latin American and Caribbean region – so that's LACTLD; the African region, AFTLD; the Asian-Pacific region, so that's APTLD; and for the European region, that is CENTR – who provide a lot of information and exchange of practices. And that includes some ccTLDs who are not member of the ccNSO as well. And there is a lot of information sharing in that respect.

But again, this goes to the point, at one point you can bring the horse to the water, but you can't force it to drink. I hope this answered your question.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Bart. We are already behind our time. Let's first go to the questions for evaluation. And I give the floor to Yeşim for that.

YEŞIM NAZLAR: Thank you very much, Tijani. Yes, we do have some questions. We have quickly put them on. Yes.

The first question is: How is the timing of the webinar for you? Is it too early, just right, too late? Please cast your votes now.

Thank you very much for your vote. I will move on to the second question. The second question is: What region do you live in at the moment? Africa, Asia/Australasia/Pacific Islands, Europe, Latin America and Caribbean Islands, or North America? Please cast your votes now.

Thank you very much for your vote. Now the third question. How many years of experience do you have in the ICANN community? Less than one year, 1-2 years, 3-5, or 5-10, or is it more than ten years? Please cast your votes now.

And moving on to the fourth question. How was the technology used for the webinar? Example is audio, video, or phone bridge. Please vote from five to one, five as very good, and one as very bad. Please cast your votes now.

Thank you very much for your vote. Let's move on to the fifth question. Our fifth question is: Did the speaker demonstrate mastery of the topic? Please currently vote from five to one, five as extremely strong, and one as extremely weak. Please cast your votes now.

Thank you very much for your vote. If we quickly move on to our sixth question. Are you satisfied with the webinar? Please again cast your votes, five as extremely satisfied and one as not satisfied at all.

And now we can move on to our last question. What topics would you like us to cover for the future webinars? Please type your answer in the blank space, and kindly do not forget to click on the icon just next to it to send your answers. Please send your answers now.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, thank you very much, Yeşim, for those questions. And for all, please try to put all the topics you find that it is adequate to cover it through our webinar. And even if you don't have time now to put it on the Adobe Connect, please send an e-mail to the staff about that. This will help us to define the new series of webinars. Thank you very much.

For Bart, I have a final comment. Perhaps it is because the ASCII ccTLD manager is, in the most times, in the most cases, the IDN ccTLD manager too. This is why there is a lot of complaints about the IDN ccTLDs not to be considered as ccNSO members. But I think it is not normal, because we may have a different manager for the ASCII and the IDN ccTLDs. This is only a remark.

BART BOSWINKEL: Tijani, may I respond? That was recognized a long time ago already. That's why, as I said, it is included in the policy. And it awaits adoption by the ICANN Board. But there are other issues that need to be resolved first with respect to the [inaudible] or selection of [strings] before that will happen. But it is already in the policy, so the recommendations, for two years. So noted, and let me reassure you, as soon as the ICANN Board would adopt the policy, IDN ccTLDs, all of them will be eligible to become member of the ccNSO.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:	Thank you very much. Thank you very much, Bart. I would like to thank you, because when [Katrina] wasn't able to make it for this webinar, she said, "Who knows more than him – more than you – about ccNSO and ccTLDs?" And I think she was right.
	Thank you very much. It was a very good webinar, a very good presentation. I would like to thank our interpreters, especially because we are over time for ten minutes. Thank you very much, our interpreters. And thank you for our staff, and thank you for all. And this webinar is adjourned. Thank you, bye-bye.
YEŞIM NAZLAR:	Thank you very much, everyone, for your participation. The webinar is now adjourned. The audio will now be disconnected. Have a lovely rest of the day. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]