ICANN74 | Policy Forum – Customer Standing Committee (CSC)
Wednesday, June 15, 2022 – 09:00 to 10:00 AMS

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Hello, and welcome to the Customer Standing Committee session. My name is Claudia Ruiz, and I, along with Bart Boswinkel, are the remote participation managers for this session. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN expected standards of behavior.

During this session, questions or comments submitted in chat will be read aloud if put in the proper form as noted in the chat. If you would like to speak during this session, please raise your hand in Zoom. When called upon, virtual participants will unmute in Zoom. On-site participants will use a physical microphone to speak and should leave their Zoom microphones disconnected. Those not seated at a microphone may use the I/O microphone to speak. For the benefit of other participants, please state your name for the record and speak at a reasonable. You may access all available features for this session in the Zoom toolbar

Thank you all very much. And I will now hand the floor over to Lars-Johan Liman. Thank you.

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.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. My name is Lars-John Liman. I am the Chair of the Customer Standing Committee, and I note that we sit in a huge room with a lot of echo. So I will carefully try to note to speak slowly. That will hopefully help make it easier for people to read.

We don't expect a very long meeting here. You have the agenda in front of you. There are not very many people here, so I would like those of you who sit at the microphones just to mention who you are and in which capacity you are participating in in this meeting. And do note that observers are very welcome. So if you're just an observer, that is fine. So if we start to my far right over there, please.

OZAN SAHIN: Good morning. This is Ozan Sahin from ICANN Org. I'm attending in an observer capacity.

BART BOSWINKEL: Bart Boswinkel, Support CSC.

HOLLY RAICHE: Holly Raiche, ALAC liaison.

NAELA SARRAS: Naela Sarras with ICANN Org, attending as an observer.

MAARTEN SIMON:	Maarten Simon, SIDN. I'm one of the members of the Effectiveness Review Team.
JENNIFER BRYCE:	Jennifer Bryce, ICANN Org. ICANN representation on the CSC.
LAXMI PRASAD YAVID:	Good morning and namaste. My name is Laxmi Prasad Yavid. I am a liaison and a member of the CSC. I'm from the GAC.
BRETT CARR:	Good morning. I'm Brett Carr, member and Vice-Chair of the CSC.
LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:	And again I am Lars-Johan Liman. I am the liaison from the Root Server System Advisory Committee, and I'm also the current Chair of the Customer Standing Committee.
KIM DAVIES:	Kim Davies, PTI. I'm not a formal liaison to the CSC, but I am the only IANA staff member on site today.
JENIFER LOPEZ:	Jenifer Lopez. Good morning to everyone. ccNSO consider.

FREDERICO NEVES:	Good morning. My name is Frederico Neves. I'm a member of the CSC representing the ccNSO.
REGIS MASSE:	Good morning. I'm Regis Masse, CTO of dot-AFNIC. Just here as an observer.
ALEJANDRA REYNOSO:	Good morning. Alejandra Reynoso, ccNSO Chair. Just an observer.
SEAN COPELAND:	Sean Copeland, part of the Effectiveness Review Team.
PETER KOCH:	Good morning. Peter Koch from DENIC. Just a customer.
LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:	So thank you very much for that.
	And with that, we will dive into today's agenda. I will just highlight what we'll be going through. This is pretty much our standard agenda that we run through at our monthly meetings. So we do a roll call, and I would argue that we just did that. We will go through the outstanding action items. We will look at the monthly report that we've received from the PTI regarding the IANA naming function. We do that on a monthly basis, so we are now

looking at the May report. We are also under scrutiny by an effectiveness review team. And this is a regular thing in ICANN. All committees are, on a regular basis, evaluated for effectiveness. And this is just a normal run of this. And I will ask the team to present their findings. We will also quickly mention that we will have some turnover of the membership of the committee, and that is based on terms and term limitations. And the committee members are appointed by various other committees in ICANN. And we look at what's going on there and then we look at future meetings and Any Other Business if there is any.

So I will ask already here if anyone has any other business that you would like to discuss during that point.

I see the hand from Holly. Please.

HOLLY RAICHE: Maybe it's an update from somebody. I think, two or three meetings ago, there was a recommendation that, at some point, we actually review the metrics that we report against. Is that something that's on the agenda somewhere—or our agenda somewhere? Thank you.

BRETT CARR: It's covered within the Effectiveness Review Team discussion, if I remember right.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes, it is covered to some extent in the effectiveness review discussions, but I think it's something that is on a bigger plan and it's not on the agenda for today. But good note. So I will make a note to bring that up under Any Other Business. Thank you.

I will admit that it's somewhat difficult for me to keep an eye on the Zoom roster at the same time as I'm leading this meeting, so if you note that someone is raising their hand in Zoom, please … Brett is offering to keep an eye on that. Thank you very much.

With that, we will move right along, I think. And so, Bart, the outstanding action items. I think it's looking very good. Would you like to comment?

BART BOSWINKEL: No, they've all been completed.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Okay. Thank you very much.

So we will then go to the PTI report that we receive on a monthly basis. And I don't know if Amy or Kim would like to talk to that.

KIM DAVIES: I think, for practicality, it probably make sense that I do it.

Hi, everyone. So in terms of our performance in the last period, there was one notable exception to our SLA performance, and that pertained to our dispatch time for e-mails. We did provide a summary to the CSC by e-mail a few days ago to provide context to that, but I'm happy to restate it for everyone here today.

We did perform some routine maintenance on our root zone management system late in May. And as a consequence of that update, some configuration parameters were changed that resulted in the inability of essentially e-mails that are sent by the system to be successfully delivered to customers. The impact of this was that, in a few instances, e-mails that are sent to customers to authorize pending change requests were not delivered to their recipients. It also affected customers that were seeking to do a password reset. When you forget your log-in to the system, you can choose to have a password reset link e-mail to you. And those were also not being delivered.

We identified and remedied the issue once it was reported and we became aware of it. We believe we've put in place protections so that such an incident wouldn't happen again.

In terms of our SLA performance, based on the raw numbers that come out of our systems, it wasn't actually an observable event because the e-mails were actually being delivered out of RZMS. So where the e-mails are actually measured didn't reflect any particular delay. The actual problem was with the mail delivery

system that was beyond the scope of our root zone management system.

Recognizing that the intent of this particular SLA was how long it took to deliver, we thought it was only appropriate to manually adjust the SLA measurements to reflect the fact that there were significant delays in e-mail delivery, even if it was beyond the scope of this particular measurement. So we reviewed all of our logs and we made adjustments to reflect that in this report.

So you'll see that one of the categories … We've breached the SLA as a result of that adjustment. We also expect next month to have the same impact. Some of the tickets that happen late in May did not resolve until June, so the measurements associated with those tickets won't appear until the June report.

With that said, I'm happy to answer any questions or provide any clarifications.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you, Kim.

Are there any questions regarding this report and the incident? On the screen, you're also seeing the main table for the monthly reports in front of you.

So thank you very much for that report, Kim. I don't see any questions. I don't see any hands in the air. So thank you for the

report. I would argue, along with several of the comments that we received in e-mail, that this was obviously a one-off problem, and our role is to get involved when we see systemic problems that pertain over a longer time. So this is obviously a breach, but it sounds like a one-time breach, which is not cause for major concern, at least from my personal standpoint.

With that, and still not questions—oh, sorry. Jonathan, please.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Lars, sorry for the slow hand. I was just thinking about [nothing]. Given that there was a mention of the password reset, I'm sure I know the answer, but it's probably worth getting Kim to just reiterate that there was no security or other security-related implication with this issue. Thanks

KIM DAVIES: Thanks for the question. We do not know of any. As a consequence of this, the e-mails never left ICANN's systems. So it's not as if the e-mails were misdirected to the wrong party of anything of that nature. So we're not aware of any security concerns. Thank you.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. That was a good question and an even better answer. Thank you.

So with that, I would like to move to the next step, which is the CSC findings report. After evaluating the monthly report from the PTI, the CSC generates its own report. And we have a draft report, which I hope Kim can show to us soon—yes, there we go—where we report to the general ICANN community on our findings and evaluation of the reports of the PTI. So this is the proposed report. CSC members will recognize the format. It's our standard report with small changes in red. Most of the changes pertain to the date, but we have also managed this incident here.

And you have received this draft report in your e-mail, so my question here is if the voting members of the CSC are willing to accept this report as our final report.

UNIDENTIFIED MALES: Yes.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you.

And Gaurav?

GAURAV VEDI: Yes.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. We have unanimously accepted this report. Thank you.

And, Bart and Claudia, will you please circulate this as usual?

So the next agenda item is the CSC Effectiveness Review Team. I'd actually like someone from the review team to lead this point. Anyone?

Okay, then I will try to do it myself.

DONNA AUSTIN: Hi, Lars-Liman. It's Donna.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Yes, please?

DONNA AUSTIN: Thank you, [all, for stepping in and pushing] me. I have to go to another meeting at some point during this, but I'm happy to kick us off. And I think it might be most expedient if we have Bart do most of the driving on this.

But as you know, we kicked off the CSC effectiveness review, I'm going to say, six months ago or something like that. We've had a couple of conversations with the CSC itself. We've had a conversation with the PTI Board, and we're in a position at the moment to walk the CSC through the findings of our draft report.

And I think there's a couple of items that we'd like to have a discussion with the CSC about. But there's only, I think, maybe three or four issues that we think require a little bit more detailed conversation with you. But as has been the past with the previous review, we think the CSC is in pretty good shape, and we're very, very thankful for that.

So, Bart, if you can help us to just get through the points that we need to get to, I don't think there's a need to focus on areas where we don't think there's a problem. I think, if it's okay with the rest of the CSC Effectiveness Review Team, we'll just focus on those areas that we think we require further discussion with the CSC on.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: That sounds like a good plan. Thank you.

BART BOSWINKEL: Can you scroll down, please, to Item #5 and 6, I believe? That's really the core of the—yeah. Thank you. And it's really about the scope of the CSC and within the scope—so not the expansion of the scope but, going back to Holly's point, about the role of the CSC with respect to whether or not to review the SLAs on a regular basis. That's an item that was suggested by the CSC itself, for those listening or attending this meeting for the first time. The review team really likes to understand the view of the CSC itself with respect to its role regarding the review of the SLAs because I

think, in one of the conversations specifically where the PTI was indicating, yeah, it makes sense, at the same time, it's quite an undertaking. And is the CSC itself representative enough of the broader community to suggest changes, etc.? The counterargument to that latter one is that there is a clear procedure in place for updating the SLAs, which could or may apply. And maybe that needs to be changed. For example, if there is a suggested change to an SLA or a new SLA, it needs to go through a public consultation. The direct customers need to be informed, etc. So there are some safeguards in place that the CSC and PTI consult broadly.

But t that's where the review team was at. I think I captured it well for you, Donna and review team members. So it's more about what's the view of the CSC itself regarding the SLA reviews. And do you think it's something that is something you want to undertake going forward—so the regular review (not the individual one but the whole package of all the SLAs)? Thanks.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you.

Donna, any comments?

DONNA AUSTIN: Just to add to that, I believe this was something that was suggested by the CSC team as potentially something that the CSC

was interested in taking on. So that's why it's part of our review, if my memory is correct. I may have it confused with something else. But I think that's one of the reasons why we were looking into this.

And I would say that I think my recollection also is consistent with Bart that there was a little bit of concern from the PTI Board. And I think Kim might have expressed some concern as well.

So I think we just want to wrap this up by seeing how the CSC still feels about this and whether it's something that they're still interested in pursuing in some form or just being potentially part of what could be a review of SLAs.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. From my very personal review here, I think it's worth to look into on a regular basis to see whether there is an interest to make changes. And I think I would suggest the path forward here that we first put this on the agenda of the CSC at an upcoming meeting and that we look at how to first figure out whether there's a need to make any changes and, if so, how we go about to find the appropriate changes to make and go through the procedure of changing them. And the first step would involve reaching out the various stakeholder groups that are involved in this, including obviously the PTI, the ccNSO, the GNSO, and possibly other groups as well, and collect information from them about whether they see a need to make any changes. And if we

receive negative answers from anyone, then there's obviously not a need to change anything. And then we don't need to go into the endeavor of finding out what to change and how and [inaudible] to which new values and then go through the existing procedure of actually changing them.

Does that sound like a plan forward on this matter?

We have Holly, please, then Brett.

HOLLY RAICHE: Just to pick up on where Donna left off, this came from the PTI Board. it came from Xavier. Also, before we make a decision, I'd like to hear from Kim because it was part of the suggestion of the Board that it's not so much, "Is there a problem?" but "Is there a process in place?" so that, over time, we are looking at the right things and, if something is no longer needed or not appropriate or it has been overtaken, is there a way to keep updating it? I think that's what the PTI Board was saying, as my understanding of it: we just don't have a process in place to say, "Are we continuing doing the right thing?" I'm absolutely in no position to make that judgement, but I would like to think that people who are in the situation of making that kind of judgement would be able to say, "Well, over time these metrics are no longer relevant," or, "They are relevant and we're not picking them up." I'd just like to think there's a process in place to do that. Thank you.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you.

Brett?

BRETT CARR: I think the review of the SLAs would actually be a really positive thing for current members of the CSC to do. None of the current members of the CSC were around when the SLAs were originally defined. So an exercise to make the current members understand the SLAs in a deeper manner would be a positive thing.

I'm a bit concerned about the use of the word "regular" in the fact that we get to the end of the review and we immediately have to start again at the start again. And I don't think that's something we want to be constantly doing.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you.

Kim, would you like to comment?

KIM DAVIES: Yeah. Thank you. I think, to echo, it's healthy to have some kind of review from time to time to make sure that they continue to fill the need of measuring what's important to the community about IANA services.

I think just some additional perspective that is unique to me, I guess, is that all the measurements we do take do have a cost. We have to maintain systems and measurements to facilitate all those measurements that are provided to you every month. And in context of our next-generation root zone management system we've been working on, a not-insignificant amount of effort and time have gone into instrumenting our new platform against all these different measurements. And I know how the current SLAs were written. I was in the sub-team of Design Team (I think) C that developed. And it was a very small group. It wasn't broad. And it was done in a rush in compliance with the timeline of the IANA transition in general. I don't think all the measurements have had broad, deep review by a broader set of customers. So I'm not saying it's overdue, but I think it's worthwhile considering, from time to time, reviewing those SLAs.

I will finish by noting that, also, changing the SLAs in engineering work as well So in some sense, the status quo serves us quite well. So it's a mixed bag. But I do think for us to have meaningful measures for CSC to continue to review it, it does mean looking at it from time to time. Thank you.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you.

I see Jonathan Robinson in Zoom. Please.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks, Lars. I'm always struck and admire people's memory, actually—Kim on his detail on that Team C, and Donna for remembering the things she remembers from various points and all the ways. So that's helpful.

I think, from my point of view, my only contribution I want to make is that I don't disagree or have any concern about anything being discussed so far. I think what we need to do from a review team point of view though is to think how we wrap this point about because what we'll need to do is, if we are handing it over in a sense or finding a way forward for what we just did … So it's really probably a note to the review team to ourselves to make sure we tidy this point up if we no longer have a specific role to play in doing anything on this. So we need to close if this point from our point of view as well. It sounds like we may well be handing it over to the CSC to take care of, and that's fine, but we need to close it off from our point of view. Thanks.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you very much. What I hear from this discussion is that there is need or at least a willingness to look into this issue, and the CSC is probably the right place to start that discussion. I still think that we need to involve the customers in some way. We have representatives from the customers, and maybe that is enough to have the discussions inside the CSC. But at least I want

to lift that question and hold it out and see if there are any other comments. So I think the CSC needs to take this issue on board, and I still think that having a specific agenda point to discuss this point and the way forward at a meeting very soon is probably the right way forward.

I see some nodding heads here.

Yes, Donna, please.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Lars. Just to pick up on something Holly said, and based on the conversation, it sounds like there is support for the CSC conducting a review of the—or at least being a coordinator for the review—SLAs, given the intimate knowledge of how the SLAs are used and reported on. But I think, to Holly's point, the extent to which developing a process or understanding what the process is … And I think, Lars, to your point about bringing the users into the process or into any review, it's probably important. So it seems to me that there seems to be agreement that this is something that the CSC could potentially coordinate. And they have the expertise to do that. And then [they] find a process by which that could happen that ensures that there is the customer engagement in the process as well. So that's what I think I heard from the conversation we've just had.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you very much. I think we are in violent agreement about that.

Are there any other comments regarding this issue?

If not, then I'll ask Donna if there are any—or Bart, maybe—other issues from the review team that we would need to discuss here.

BART BOSWINKEL: There are two more, but these are more of, I would say, an administrative nature for the CSC itself. It's the frequency of its meetings of the CSC. There is, on one hand—again, this was raised by the CSC itself in a way—whether the current frequency of one call every month is the right frequency for its meetings. What was noted is, due to the geographic diversity of the membership—so members and liaisons—the attendance rate is not optimal. And that's natural also in looking at the agenda items itself. It's the PTI report/the CSC findings and, at times, in other topics: whether it's still valuable or not to have a monthly meeting. So that's looking at it from that perspective.

The other counterargument that was heard from the CSC Review Team is, if you do not meet, then the coherence and the expertise, etc., the value of the CSC may degrade very rapidly. And that's the way I captured it at least.

Donna, anything? Or Jonathan or Martin or Sean? Did I miss out on anything? That's regarding the frequency.

And the other one is attracting new active and skilled—and that's more looking forward—and adequate volunteers and appointment of alternates.

So that's, I would say, the membership-related issues. And one of the suggestions regarding the latter point was appointment of alternates and how the CSC itself looks at it. That was a point. I don't know what you want to discuss first. Maybe the appointment of alternates?

DONNA AUSTIN: Just to add on to what Bart said, in my mind, the topics that Bart has identified here all are somewhat related. And I think, when we come up with our final recommendations, we might … I think there's some interrelations with these things. So the frequency of meeting goes to that we understand that the nature of the work that the CSC does is very repetitive, so it doesn't always hold that you should necessarily have face-to-face meetings if there's not really a need to do it. But then particularly in COVID, we understand that, for cohesion, it's important for you to have that regularity of the meetings.

With the need to appoint alternates in the event that a member or a liaison couldn't attend a meeting, we kind of feel that the appointment of an alternate is actually a good idea because it introduces new people to the process. So that could be really helpful to something else that we discussed, which is about, how

do you get people interested in the work of the CSC and address some of the concerns around volunteers?

So I think there's a few of these items here that we could address just in isolation, or we can address them together when we look at the recommendations that we come up with. So I think we haven't really talked about this a lot, but it seems that, holistically, it would make sense if we thought this big picture rather than just the single points in isolation. But I hope that we can tie it all together so that it makes sense. And that probably didn't make any sense at all, but there we go.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. I will make a comment myself here in support of what you just said, Donna, and that is that there are, in the procedures document for the Customer Standing Committee, requirements for attendance for the members, especially the voting members. And those requirements are very high. So it can be difficult to actually meet them, and we've seen that in the review team's report also: there are comments about attendance.

And adding a secondary member from the voting parties would probably ease the burden on the sitting members, the primary members, so that they can, so to speak, take turns with the others when you're unable or have difficulties attending. And on the second one also I would like to reinforce what Donna said: having a secondary will probably ease the succession in the group. Right

now, when someone is replaced, we have an entirely new face step in as a primary voting member, but if we have a secondary, we would probably see a procedure where the secondary is moved up to be a primary when the primary steps down. And that would be very good for the continuity in the group. But that's my personal comments on this.

So anything more from the review team regarding the review report/draft report that you've seen?

If not, I—

BART BOSWINKEL: These three were the main topics that were still open, especially [inaudible] the first one we discussed.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Can you speak up, please? I couldn't hear you. I'm sorry.

BART BOSWINKEL: The main topics that were open for discussion for the review team, unless I missed anything. Donna or Jonathan or Maarten or Sean?

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: I see in here nothing, so I would like to close this topic and go to the next topic on our agenda, which is rotation of members. We

have a term date, which is October 1st, and we have a couple of members whose terms end on October 1st. And a couple of them are up. They can be reelected because their term limits for how many successing terms you may sit. So we have to members. It's Gaurav from the Registry Stakeholder Group and it's Brett Carr from the ccNSO. And I believe that there is a dialogue started with both the stakeholder groups to appoint or reappoint, as the case may be, members of the group. We also have liaisons whose terms run out, and it's Laxmi, who just left us because he has a conflicting meeting, and it's myself. And I myself will not be able to be reelected because I term out. So there's no time left for me to sit in this group, unfortunately, but I know that RSSAC is underway. We had our meeting yesterday, and it was on the agenda. The procedure for finding a replacement for me from RSSAC has already kicked off. We don't know the result yet, but as I see the process running, the result will be there well in time before October 1st.

Any questions or comments regarding this?

Bart, would you like to speak?

BART BOSWINKEL: Yeah. It's just here also a reminder specifically for the RySG and for the GAC: that they look into the succession of the election. I know, in another role, that the ccNSO will vote on a process later

this week. So that's the similar thing, but especially with the RySG and the GAC, [both are not].

Maybe, Gaurav, if you know if the RySG has looked into it?

GAURAV VEDI: Hi, Bart. So I have only notified the Registry Stakeholder Group and the GNSO Council with the expression of interest that I am interested in continuing with the next term of the CSC starting from October. So I still haven't received any further updates from them, but when I receive any updates, I'll keep the CSC members posted on that.

BART BOSWINKEL: Thanks. And there is also another issue [inaudible] and this is more again specifically for the membership: first of all, the ccNSO and RySG need to coordinate their appointments. So probably Gaurav will keep you posted if there is any outreach between the ccNSO and the RySG. Hopefully, this meeting … And then at the end, probably hopefully by the end of August, the full slate of the membership needs to be approved by the ccNSO and GNSO Councils. So maybe also in light of the ICANN75 potential meeting, if all of the appointing organizations could finalize their decision by mid-August, that would be great because KL75 is mid-September, [unfortunately] (ICANN75).

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:	Thank you. Now we happen to have the ccNSO Chair at the table, so see yourself as informed about this. Thank you.
	Any other questions or comments?
BRETT CARR:	And then of course when the new slate is finalized, we'll have to have a vice-chair and chair election as well, right?
LARS-JOHAN LIMAN:	Yes, that's true, but that will happen after the appointments, yes. And my vision is to have a physical meeting in Kuala Lumpur and probably conduct the election around that time. Whether it's just before or just after I haven't really figured out yet, but it will have to be in that timeframe. Thank you.
	Then we are running towards the end of the meeting.
	Bart, would you like to comment on the upcoming meetings?
BART BOSWINKEL:	Yeah. Just briefly, Meeting 63 is the 20th of July. For some, it's a nice time. For others, as you can see, it's a bad time. It's at 2:00 A.M., UTC. Meeting 64 is the 17th of August. A question for the CSC is whether they want to meet because it's really in the middle of the holiday season in the northern hemisphere. And then there's the meeting at ICANN75. So ICANN75 is from the 17th through the

ICANN|74
THE HAGUE

22nd of September. So again, if the CSC wants to meet as part of Meeting 65, we'll be at ICANN75.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. I propose that we cancel the August meeting and that we do try to have a physical meeting in Kuala Lumpur.

Is there any other opinions about this?

I see none, and I see no hands in Zoom either. Then let's do that. Let's cancel the August meeting and do the evaluation of the report/the approval of the report over e-mail. So do check your e-mail in that timeframe anyhow. And then we ask Bart and Claudia to set up a physical meeting at the next ICANN meeting in Kuala Lumpur.

With that, we reach Any Other Business.

Holly, you do you feel that we have discussed your item already?

And I see nodding from Holly. I hear a yes from Holly, who has a malfunctioning microphone just now. So thank you.

Any other Other Business?

I'm looking around the table, looking for a hand—yes, there's a hand from Amy. Please go ahead.

AMY CREAMER: Hi. Maybe as an agenda item for your July meeting, IANA would like to discuss our FY24 operating priorities for the naming functions with the CSC.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. That would be appreciated.

AMY CREAMER: I'll put that in the chat.

LARS-JOHAN LIMAN: Thank you. I'll ask Bart to make a note of that: that we put it on the agenda for the next meeting. He nods.

Anything else?

Going once … going twice … sold to the man in the yellow hat.

We are adjourned. Thank you all for participating.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]

ICANN|74
THE HAGUE