GULTEN TEPE OKSUZOGLU	If you can please take your seats, thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO	Hello, everyone. Welcome back. Please take your seats. We're about to start.

GULTEN TEPE OKSUZOGLU   Hello, and welcome to the ICANN82 GAC meeting with the ccNSO on Wednesday 12th of March at 10:30 local time. Please note that the session is being recorded, and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior and the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy.

During this session, questions or comments submitted in the chat will be read aloud if put it in the proper form. Remember to state your name, and the language you will speak in case you will be speaking a language other than English. Please speak clearly and at a reasonable pace to allow for accurate interpretation, and make sure to mute all other devices when you are speaking. You may access all available features for the session in the Zoom toolbar. With that, I will leave the floor over to Nicolas Caballero, GAC Chair. Over to you, Nico.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Gulten. All right, good morning, everyone or good afternoon or good evening, depending on what part of the world you're located. Welcome to this joint GAC, ccNSO session here at ICANN82 in this beautiful, and occasionally drizzly Seattle. So, for those of you who might be new to this particular tango, I would say between the GAC and the ccNSO, we're going to bridge the gap. Not the one between the Space Needle and the Pike Place Market, though that's a lovely walk, let me tell you. But the gap between government and government advice and country code needs.

We've got a packed agenda, so let's get right to it. First up, we'll be diving into the policy gap analysis. Now, I know gap analysis doesn't exactly mean a thrilling Friday afternoon, I would say, but trust me, understanding where our policies might be missing a few teeth is crucial. So, we've allocated 30 minutes for this. Let's try to keep our comments, as usual, concise and focused. We're aiming for precision, not a philosophical debate on the nature of gaps and things of the sort.

So then, moving on to the main event, our engagement session on ccTLD models. We know the traditional sit and listen approach can sometimes feel a little bit like watching paint dry. So, we're trying something a little different today. We prepared a more interactive format, and Alejandra is going to be in charge of explaining all that. Think of it as less of a lecture and more of a lively exchange of ideas, perhaps with a sprinkle of healthy debate, I would say. So, we're aiming for 60 minutes of genuine engagement, where both the

ccNSO and the GAC members can really share their perspectives. We want to hear from you, not just to hear [adieu]. So, with that, let me give the floor to my distinguished colleague, Alejandra. Over to you

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO   Thank you very much, Nico, for the introduction, and thank you for having us here. It's always a pleasure to have these joint sessions. And without further ado, I will pass it over to Jordan to go through the policy gap analysis.

JORDAN CARTER   Thank you, Alejandra, and good morning, everyone. My name is Jordan Carter for the record. I work for .au, the Australian domain administration, but I'm here today in my capacity as the Chair of the Policy Gaps Analysis Working Group of the ccNSO. And I'll try to remember to speak at the right speed for the interpreters. And because I know there are a lot of new starters in the GAC room, I am going to do a little bit of the background and context sharing just to clarify what this is about.

About two years ago, one and a half to two years ago, there was a case with the Lebanese ccTLD where the IANA listing, the listed ccTLD manager did not wish to be listed anymore as the ccTLD manager, but there was no entity that was ready to have it handed to them. And so, this case, which was sort of dubbed retirement or resignation rather, not retirement, we wondered whether it was a gap in the global policy framework that defines how IANA relates to

82 | COMMUNITY FORUM

the ccTLDs. We formed an ad hoc group to look into that question, and we realized after some interactions with IANA, that there was a little bit more that needed to be investigated here, and that doing it informally with an ad hoc group was not the right approach.

So, after the June meeting in Kigali last year, we set up a formal working group, called for volunteers, and kicked off work on three key questions which are there in front of you. The first task was to prepare an overview of all of the policies and guidance that define how IANA and ccTLDs relate. It's worth just restating that the policies that we're talking about, the policies that are in the competence of the ccNSO only define that relationship between IANA and ccTLDs. They don't define how ccTLDs manage their registries, or what the policies are about DNS Abuse or who can register a name at the second level and beyond. It's only about the IANA record about the ccTLD.

And so, some of that is in old documents like RFC 1591. Some of it is in more modern documents like the framework of interpretation report that some of you will have heard of from the mid-2010s. But actually, there are bits and pieces of policy and guidance and practice in quite a lot of places, and no one had pulled together a comprehensive overview of that. So, the first task of the working group was to do that. The second was to investigate that, and to talk with IANA, PTI, as the people who are day-to-day dealing with these policies and the impact they have in a practical sense to understand what they saw as potential gaps of policy or guidance or so on, because they are dealing with these issues every time a

ccTLD contacts them. And in their experience, it turned out there were some areas they wanted us to look further at.

And so, the third task of the group following that would be to advise the council of the ccNSO whether to act and if so, how on any gaps or issues that were identified. So, the group did its work. It published a draft overview document around the time of the Istanbul meeting in November. It looked at the gaps, it looked at working methods, it made some prioritization recommendations, and it has almost completed that phase of its work. Almost these three things are done. So, if we can move to the next slide, please.

The overview document was finalized in January from the working group's point of view. It is available online at that address, and I'm sure these slides are or will be available to you all shortly afterwards. It's a possibly 10-page document. It might be a little bit longer than that. It's a set of tables that direct you to the relevant policy and guidance that apply to particular aspects of IANA ccTLD.

The second output was around analyzing gaps. The working group's considerations did conclude last week, and we road tested the recommendations of the work with the ccTLD community that was attending in the ccNSO yesterday, and broadly that community is happy with these two recommended follow-up pieces of work. So having looked at the existing frameworks, looked at where there are gaps or issues arising, two areas lend themselves to further work. One of those is around the IANA public records that are maintained for ccTLDs. Analyzing what is the

purpose of these records. It helps to know why you are collecting the information and why you are publishing it.

Issues to do with data accuracy in those records. Sometimes ccTLD managers do not keep them up-to-date with IANA, and then how to maintain them because if people don't keep them up-to-date at the moment, there is no process to deal with that situation, and perhaps there should be because it is in the public interest that the contact details and other details relating to each of the ccTLDs in the root zone are accurate, complete, and kept up to date. So, that was the first of the two issues that the working group has recommended more work be done.

The second one is whether there is any role for IANA in the disaster recovery process for ccTLDs. Obviously, natural or human induced disasters happen from time to time, and sometimes they affect the internet infrastructure. If the ccTLD has not managed to put in place a suitable disaster recovery framework, it may be that people turn to IANA and ask for help, and there is no policy or framework guiding the exact appropriate roles of IANA here. It is sort of to the extent that anything is done. It has been ad hoc or customary things that have emerged through time.

The working group recommended that rather than launching straight into any kind of a policy development process on these two issues, that the right thing to do would be to organize some study groups. And the reason for that is our group had maybe 10 or 12 meetings, and it was a relatively quick process to take a first analysis and triage of these issues and look at the ones that we

thought would be most important for ccTLDs for the ICANN community. Which ones perhaps we could make a quick win on if there was anything we could resolve quickly. And the second of those might fit that criterion. It wasn't our job to delve into depth in enough detail to work out whether a PDP is needed.

So, the council will consider that recommendation about the study groups, and assuming that that is agreed, we'll then charter those two groups and call for volunteers to do the more detailed analysis of what the issues are here, what existing practices, whether the guidance that's in place is suitable, whether there are any gaps in the global policies that apply to IANA to give effect to what the research shows should be in place, or whether there's a need for changes to or development of policy which would then trigger a policy development process.

Compared with some past ccNSO PDPs which have taken several years, those PDP processes have always included this research component as part of the work. So, if policy is needed, and I don't know the answer to that, neither does anyone else, doing the study process first will make that process slightly quicker. So, the working group was tasked with the three things on the previous slide to prepare the overview and that's done. To analyze the gaps that were apparent and to recommend future work, and it's done that as well. So, our expectation is that the group will close out with a report in March or April. It will ask the ccNSO council to put in place a process to make sure that the overview document is kept up-to-date as policy changes or as guidance changes, so it remains

a current and authoritative package of guidance about how IANA relates to ccTLDs, and that largely is all I needed to say to you.

There's just one more point really. It is that in these gaps, in the final report, we're also going to say and kind of reiterate an existing position, which is, if people do think there are gaps in the policy framework, what should they do about it? And the answer is that they should come to the ccNSO council and raise those issues with them through the chair, through Alejandra. There are questions that come up from time to time about policy. It's always best, this is maybe an [Anglosphere] term, but to come straight to the horse's mouth to get the answer. The ccNSO council is the place to get the answer through the chair if you have any questions about the global policy framework.

You can of course talk to IANA as well. The ccNSO and IANA have had a very close and collaborative relationship in working through this work. And Kim and his team do a good job. So, I think that's all I had to say. I think it was only the two slides. Welcome any questions or comments through the chair? Back to you, Nico.

NICOLAS CABALLERO   Thank you very much, Jordan. The floor is open for comments or questions. I do have a question myself before opening the floor. When you talk about recommendations, when you talk about the study groups, right, to look in depth at the IANA public records, very important issues for sure, public records for ccTLDs, and the other one that could potentially be extremely important for GAC members, that is the IANA role, if any, as correctly pointed out again

in parentheses there, in disaster recovery for ccTLD, how long, according to your experience, that's the most important thing I would say, right, according to your experience, how long do you think it might take? Are we talking about decades? Are we talking about two years? Are we talking about six months? Is there a time limit for those study groups? Because these are two very important issues. I would say, depending on where you're from, it could be extremely important. So again, my question is regarding the timing for this

JORDAN CARTER   I don't want to make any commitments on that, because we haven't run study groups on these sorts of discrete issues in recent times, but the intention is that they will be relatively prompt, and that depends on getting a set of volunteers who are available to work on them, a bit of the staff time from PTI IANA to support the work, and from the ccNSO Secretariat as well. But my sort of thinking to date suggests that it is something we would like to, at least one of them to close out this calendar year, because it's a research and analysis process. Some of it can be done by desk, some of it can be done in ways that don't require meetings to run through things.

The meetings of the working group will be to bring that work together and to test it, but we haven't drawn up the charters, we haven't stepped out the timeframe, and we haven't determined the details of the process. So, we will be able to answer that question in an indicative way at the meeting in June in Prague, because by

then we will have done that chartering and built those project plans, but these study groups are not intended to be at this point a multi-year effort. I will say that also in both cases, there is already practice and policy there, and this is analyzing how it's working, at least in a primary way. There shouldn't be an assumption necessarily that it will lead to changes in IANA's role in either of these things.

It's kind of out of scope for IANA to become the backup registry operator for ccTLDs as an example, so the study doesn't need to go into the day-to-day on-the-ground operations, that's out of scope for IANA, and in the other area I don't want to get into any of the details, but it's not intended to be a multi-year process.

NICOLAS CABALLERO   Thank you so much. No, no, no, I never meant there was a specific IANA role. The question was more focused on the timing. Thank you for that, Jordan. I have Australia and then India. Australia, please go ahead.

IAN SHELDON   Thank you, Nico. Ian Sheldon, GAC Australia, and the GAC's liaison to the ccNSO. Thank you, Jordan, for this update. It's fantastic to hear where this work has gone since your update to us at the last ICANN meeting. I think my question, you might have answered it already, but I remember in Puerto Rico, we heard about the extraordinary role that .pr played in the recovery of the disaster there. And so, my question was on the second of your study groups.

Is it on IANA's role in helping ccTLDs recover from disasters, or is it potentially around support for ccTLDs in shepherding the country through disasters?

JORDAN CARTER

Thanks for the question, Ian. I'm just pulling up the document that steps it out to give a bit more of a color to what the issues—because IANA did raise this issue with us, and there were sort of two aspects to it. As I've already said, it's generally a local responsibility to have the operational procedures in place. But when that isn't addressed, if something happens and there is a problem with that approach, often IANA is expected to do what it reasonably can to address threats to the operation. So, the question to dig into there is what, if any, requirements should be established around this, and/or the ability to sustain ongoing operations of the domain.

So, I think it's looking for how big can IANA's role be, and then the other area that has come up in the past is that ccTLD managers have sought to make private arrangements for IANA on special procedures to perform, so they could seek to predefine conditions under which IANA would seek to recognize another party to manage the domain as an example, and should there be any policies regarding how those arrangements are made? Should there be types of engagement that IANA can't do? So that's a bit more of the flavor. It isn't to replace the on-the-ground efforts, and it should always be the case that governments, ccTLD managers, other authorities and stakeholders in the country should be paying attention to disaster recovery and business continuity as a part of

82 COMMUNITY FORUM

what they do, given the massive importance of this infrastructure in the internet economy. Thanks.

IAN SHELDON   Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO   Thank you, Jordan. Thank you, Australia. I have India next.

T. SANTHOSH   Thank you, Chair. This is Santhosh for the record. So, seven years back, there was a policy discussion on two-character method of the second level domain. So, for example, it will be .in at second level domain. Does this policy analysis has done any study on the two characters of the country code. Where are the details? Because in India, we are unable to get to know that how many delegations have been made at the second level domain. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO   Excuse me, Santhosh. The question is, does this policy analysis has done any study on the true character of the what exactly? I couldn't hear your question. Could you repeat, please?

T. SANTHOSH   You are right. So, does this policy gap analysis has done any study on the second level domain of any country code?

JORDAN CARTER

The short answer to your question, sir, is no, it hasn't. That hasn't been one of the topics that has been addressed so far.

NICOLAS CABALLERO

Thank you, Jordan. Thank you, India. The floor is still open. We still have five, actually six minutes for Q&A at this point, and then we will start with our engagement experiment, the tango thing I talked about at the beginning, the tango between the GAC and the ccNSO. But at this point, the floor is still open for questions for the ccNSO. I don't see any hand in the room, and there's one—oh, no. I'm sorry. Bangladesh, please go ahead.

DR SHAMSUZZOHA

Thank you, Chair. This is Shamsuzzoha from Bangladesh. I just want to note that I think it's a great work that the gap analysis is done by the ccNSO. But is there any survey from the working group, especially in contracting with all the ccTLD managers, because as I understand that not all the 100 percent of the ccTLD managers, their administration is part of ccNSO. So, is there any wider survey done by the working group to actually do this gap analysis? Because my understanding is that such type of survey would really help to understand and mitigate any potential gap in the policy process. Thank you.

JORDAN CARTER

Thank you for the question. No, we didn't do a survey of all of the ccTLD managers in the world. This is the first time the ccNSO has looked at this question of whether there were gaps in the

82 | COMMUNITY FORUM

framework in a sort of planned way, and we used the method of surfacing the discussions at the ccNSO members' meetings, to which any ccTLD can participate, whether they are a ccNSO member or not. But we started this work with a focus on the operational experience of IANA, and the gaps that that had suggested. We are very keen to hear from ccTLDs anywhere in the world if they are experiencing gaps in this framework, which defines how IANA and the ccTLD relate to each other. It is possible that future work may involve a survey to ask questions about that, but this phase of the work has not done so. Thanks.

NICOLAS CABALLERO   Thank you again, Jordan. Floor is still open. Any other comments or questions, thoughts? And I don't see any hand in the room. I don't see any hand online. So maybe we can move on to the next part, to the fun part of the session today. And for that, I will give the floor to Alejandra, who's going to explain how this tango experiment will—more than Tango, I would say some sort of speed dating experiment we'll be implementing. I would prefer to call it speed dating instead of Tinder, in order to see where the match is, but I'm not saying any of you uses the app, but don't get me wrong. But can you explain how this dynamic, how this will work? Please go ahead, Alejandra.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO   Yes, thank you, Nico. This is Alejandra Reynoso, and I do hope you enjoy the next part of the session. But before getting into the exact details on how this is going to work, I would like to share with you

some thoughts on the aim and the goal of this activity. So, if we could go to the next slide. Thank you very much.

It is always our intent to describe the ccTLD community, and we are a very, very diverse community. As you will know in the GAC, governments are different. ccTLDs are different. We differ by region. We differ by governance models, by the registry model, by the number of domain names that are registered, by the number of employees. So, there are no ccTLDs alike, though they do have the same goal that it is to keep the internet going. They do it in very different ways. And to illustrate how different ccTLDs can be, I have a few graphs to show you. If we can go to the next one, please.

So, this is to show the diversity of the ccNSO membership. From the ccTLDs that are registered in the IANA database, only 37 percent are ccNSO members. And as Jordan was mentioning, the work that the ccNSO does, it's always open to all ccTLDs regardless of the membership, except, of course, things that are reserved for members. But I mean, they can participate in the activities. Next slide, please.

Here it's a very high-level overview of the distribution of the governance models across the ccTLDs. Below each of these categories, if we refine it, it will get more complex. But this is to be able to check where a ccTLD may be. We separate them as academia or academic. If they are within a government or regulator entity, if they are contracted by a government, or if they are a private entity. Again, below these labels, it could get a little bit

more complex, but it's just to give a rough, rough idea on how ccTLDs are distributed. Can we go to the next one, please?

So, here we can see a very interesting graph. Some ccTLDs have agreements with ICANN, either exchange of letters, MOUs, sponsorship agreements. And from those, around 23 percent of the whole ccTLDs in the IANA database have such exchanges of letters. So, this is just to give you an idea that no ccTLD will be like any other, and the aim of today's activity, it's to learn more about this. So, if we could go to the next slide.

Now I will go into the rules of engagement today. So, the objective with this activity is first to learn about the different ccTLD models, and the second is to encourage networking between GAC and ccNSO members. The idea is to have a more informal conversation to be able to let you understand how some of the ccTLDs work around the world. As Nico was saying, this is based on the speed dating concept. So, we will prepare for you eight different possibilities for you to choose from. And unfortunately, because of logistics, this part of the session cannot be recorded, and we cannot have notes taken, because we would like you to get out of your seats, and actually move around and talk to people.

So, there won't be either remote participation. I'm very sorry for our remote participants. If this activity sits well with you, then we can think of a way of doing it [hybridly]. But the idea is, if you look around the room, you will see these whiteboards with numbers in them. Those are the meeting points. So, in each meeting point, there will be a host and a presenter, and the dynamic would be for

each participant to choose one of these meeting points. I will describe them promptly. After 20 minutes, we will exchange the meeting points, so you can go to another meeting point, and check how that structure works. In the end, we will go back to our seats and wrap up the session, and I would like to know your feedback regarding the activity itself. If we can go to the next slide, please.

So, these are the eight meeting points. Four of them are in the topic of the operation. So ccTLDs that use or don't use a backend provider. So, in the first meeting point, we have a large ccTLD with backend provider, and the presenter there is Bruce Tonkin from .au. and the host and moderator will be Sean Copeland from .vi. In the second meeting point, we have a small middle-sized ccTLD with a backend provider, and that will be with Pablo Rodriguez from .pr and Marco Hogewoning. Thank you. In the third meeting point, it's a large ccTLD with no backend provider. That will be with Nick Wenban-Smith from .uk Ian Sheldon.

And the fourth meeting point, it's a small middle-sized ccTLD with no backend provider, where we have Martha Diaz from .bt and Christine Arida. So, I'm going through one of them just to give you time to think which meeting point you want to join. And in the second topic, we have governance of ccTLDs, the governance model. So, in meeting point five, it's the type of ccTLD, it's academic. So, for that meeting point, we have Margarita Valdez from .cl and Nigel Hickson. The sixth meeting point, it's a private ccTLD with Demi Getschko and Everton Rodrigues from .br and Manal Ismail as host. And seventh meeting point, it's a

government-related ccTLD with Molehe Wesi from .za and David Bedard.

And finally, meeting point eight, it's a contractual ccTLD or under contract with a government, where we will have Thiago Dal Toe and Biyi Oladipo from .ng. So, I hope me going through all this, the description of the meeting points, I have given you enough time to consider which will be your first point. I would really appreciate if you consider that if there's a meeting point that it's already crowded, that you would distribute yourselves better in the room, so that everyone has a chance to have a meaningful conversation because larger groups tend to be more complicated for the host and the presenter. So, with that, shall we?

NICOLAS CABALLERO   Thank you so much for that very detailed explanation, Alejandra. One important thing is that we could have done this differently. We could have had the regular presentations and the lecture kind of thing, but we just thought that by engaging in a more dynamic way would be more interesting for our distinguished GAC members. Bear with us. This is the first time we're doing this. If it goes well, we might or might not keep on doing it. So, it will depend on how it goes today. So, we will have exactly for the first round, we have 20 minutes. Then we'll have some sort of bell or something kind of like rounds in a boxing fight. I'm joking, I'm joking. This is just an example, right? And then we'll go to the second topic, right?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO   To the second round.

NICOLAS CABALLERO   Ah, to the second round.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO   All topics will be open.

NICOLAS CABALLERO   How many rounds are there going to be?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO   Two rounds.

NICOLAS CABALLERO   Just two rounds.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO   Mm-hmm.

NICOLAS CABALLERO   Okay.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO   Twenty minutes, 20 minutes, and then we wrap up.

NICOLAS CABALLERO	Perfect. And then, we'll get together to wrap up and see how it goes and we'll decide if this is an appropriate format for the GAC, and any kind of feedback we might get. So, let's dive in. Thank you so much. And you can get to choose now for the next 20 minutes whatever station or ring for the rounds.
ALEJANDRA REYNOSO	Meeting point.
NICOLAS CABALLERO	Meeting point is more accurate, I would say. So, there we go.
UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE	Hello, everyone. If you could please start wrapping up. You have one minute left. Thank you.
UNIDENTIFIED MALE	Ladies and gentlemen, this is the end of round one. So please wrap up your discussions, dialogue, meeting date, and you are expected to go to a next meeting point. Again, the different meeting points are listed on the screen in front of you. So, we'll give you a couple of minutes and then we go to round two. Again, in 20 minutes. Thank you.
	Ladies and gentlemen, again, I'm sorry to interfere in your date, but you have to go back to your seats. The next step is wrap-up of this session, and we will be using Mentimeter for that event. So, your

82 | COMMUNITY FORUM

feedback will be captured. We have a few minutes to go back to your seat, and the longer you take, the longer it takes to go to lunch.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE   Thank you, everyone. If you could please take your seats. Thank you.

NICOLAS CABALLERO   Ladies and gentlemen, please take your seats again. So, thank you again, everyone. Please take a look at the screen. We have this menti.com. All you need to do is scan it, use the QR code, and enter the code. We have three very quick questions in terms of feedback for this session. Please go ahead.

Okay. So, that's basically the end of the breakout session. My personal opinion is that, I never had such a good tango dance in different—actually, I had time for two tango dances. One with group eight, and the other one with group six. It would have been good to be able to take a walk and see how the other ccTLDs work. But this is a proof of concept. We needed to know how you see it, this kind of exercise. If it would be a good fit for the GAC. And for that, we have the Mentimeter. Alejandra?

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO   Thank you, Nico. I did see that everyone was having a very good time. And with this, I would like to ask you if you could describe with one word today's networking session. So here, while you are typing those, they will appear in a word cloud. So, if the word repeats, it

will get bigger. But in any case, we will take this as our input for future engagement engagements. So, I see it was very informative, understanding, innovative, fun, dynamic, fresh, good, useful, interesting, engaging. Well, it dances a little bit.

NICOLAS CABALLERO   The tango thing.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO   The tango thing. To be continued. Good use of our time. That's very, very encouraging. Thank you. Provocative. I'll give you some more time to add your words. Anyone that stands out for you, Nico?

NICOLAS CABALLERO   Well, thank God. I see the word engaging there, because that was the intention right from the beginning, to have an engaging, active, and informative, which I also see on the screen, informative, engaging, interesting. Really glad to see that, and we have more than 120 responses so far.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO   Illuminating as well.

NICOLAS CABALLERO   Oh, nothing to do with Illuminati. So, maybe we can go on to the next.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO   Let's go to the next one. So here there are some statements. We would like to know how much you agree or disagree with the following ones. I enjoyed the networking. I liked the format. I learned something useful. I value the dialogue. I would like to do this again. So please, in the scale you have there, choose one for each of these statements so we know where we are. I'm very pleased to see that most of the answers are on the strongly agree category.

NICOLAS CABALLERO   Maybe we should also include their forget about it, right? That's again a possibility, but—

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO   Yeah, exactly. That's why this is a range. So, if the last one says, I would like to do this again, but they can strongly disagree. All right.

NICOLAS CABALLERO   Can you give it like one more minute or something because there's 125 participants, but I only see 60 something for this little round.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO   So, and this is the last question. It is a free text response. We are very interested in knowing which topics would you like us to address in the future. So, please, if you could put them in the menti, we will gather them, and then we will structure how to address

them with the GAC Chair and the liaisons to see how we can fit them in our future engagement. Nico?

NICOLAS CABALLERO   You can always put keep the format as it is. That's another possibility. I would put that. but I don't vote. Remember, I'm just the GAC Chair. I'm always in your hands. But to me, it was very engaging, very interesting. And I would put, let's do it again.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO   So, going through those, I see ccTLD work on DNS Abuse, registry capacity, lots of DNS Abuse, okay. Domain Metrica. Would we go to hear the ccNSO related issues that GAC has? Yes. DNSSEC. More dates, you got it. Nico? How does your ccTLD engage with law enforcement? ccTLD data accuracy. Training. And we'll give you one more minute to give you the time to put your text there. Commonalities, mm-hmm.

NICOLAS CABALLERO   Oh, yes. Monetize, best case. That's a good one. RDRS, WSIS+20. Yeah, lots of interesting—we have a good pool of ideas to choose from for next session if it happens to actually happen. So, that's all we have time for. Thank you so very much. I really liked this. Our idea, as I said before, was to have a more engaged—I'm not saying our sessions are not engaging, but the idea again was to have a more active, a fresher way to look at things, and there's more

82 | COMMUNITY FORUM
ICANN

interaction. There are more chances for GAC members to ask different people different questions about different issues.

And that, again, was part of that. Because in the end, we only have a 90-minute session. And I think this was again, this is my humble opinion. I'm not, speaking on behalf of everybody in the GAC. I'm just giving my opinion as the GAC chair. Any final thoughts, Alejandra, Ian? And again, thank you so very much for this. Fantastic.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO   Well, thank you, Nico, and the GAC for having us here. We really enjoyed these joint sessions. We take your ideas on board. And with that, I think this meeting is adjourned. Thank you all.

NICOLAS CABALLERO   Thank you so much. So, please be back after lunch. Please be back in the room at 1:15 for the communiqué drafting romance.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]