

**ICANN
Transcription ICANN Kobe
GNSO - RySG GeoTLD Group Planning Session
Sunday, 10 March 2019 at 13:30 JST**

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page
<http://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

Man 1: So hello everybody. If you want to come up close, this is an absolutely huge room. A bit scary. So please feel free. I'm going to keep this - we have pretty much all afternoon. Two sessions. One here right now, and one on the second half of the afternoon, just on the other side of the hallway in (unintelligible), if I remember well. Welcome everybody. I think we should just start maybe with first slide. Do I have control, or...

Woman 1: If you want to.

Man 1: No, I don't need to control anything. For the record, (unintelligible). This is the latest map of what we have of all the geo top-level domain names. I'm not really sure if I really got everything on the map with a geo top-level domain names, especially the Arabic and Chinese, the many Japanese ones. So if there is a mistake, please let us know if we have missed something. Don't cut - yes, okay.

Man 2: There's something (unintelligible).

Man 1: Yes...

Man 2: (Unintelligible).

Man 1: No, okay. That's...

Man 2: (Unintelligible).

Man 1: Okay. We note this, and put this in a minute or send this round, so you can then use the map for your purposes if you want to have a presentation or something like this. So I'll make sure that .cat and .frl is there, and - sorry, next slide. I'm a bit all over the shop. So we're going to run a - first, a review of the year, and you're going to do that, Dirk, for us, of 2018. I'll talk about a few of our goals for for 2019.

You'll do the housekeeping and talk about the membership, the finance and et cetera. And then then we will have some updates on the different work that we're doing with the rest of the community (unintelligible), the work track five, and et cetera. So, Dirk, do you want to start?

Dirk Krischenowski: That's the second part, and, yes, that's the third part of the - you all got the agenda for the three meetings. There was a slight change. The meeting on Friday is not from 8:30. It starts at 9:00. So that was - that's wrong now still. I very recently got this information. So 9:00. It's on the Web site, it's already there. 9:00 on Wednesday. Okay. Dirk Krischenowski from .berlin and .hamburg, for the record.

I think it's time at this meeting to do a short review of the 2018 year for our geo top-level domain name group, and then hand over to (Sebastien) to an outlook and strategy for the 2019. And we're happy to answer your questions and get any input on the things. So I think for us of the 2018 was a quite successful year. We had one new member. That was .corsica, but they still need to send in the membership form.

But they have been announced to become a member on the meeting in Strasbourg. And we had to sponsorship in our Strasbourg meeting from (unintelligible) to remind. So there's attention from the community to be part of the group. And to see what the group is doing and to support the group.

We have managed to stay number one resource on GeoTLD topics on the Internet. That's really good. If you look for GeoTLDs or geographic top level domain or anything else for these TLDs or so, you always come to geo top level domain group as a main resource. And that's why we got some requests from interested parties. But we come later to this point. So we did last year a big outreach with brochures, handout, to all 3000 participants at the Barcelona meeting.

So I think nowadays everybody should know who's the GeoTLD group, who's member, what do we do. What's our purpose? And so on. Thanks to .cat, who let the brochures printed and put it into the conference packets. Yes. We had been playing an active role in many relevant topics, like GDPR and Geonames. And last year our voice was asked by the community, and often also by the governmental advisory committee, especially on the Geonames.

We provided input with studies like, like the GDPR overview with 39 GeoTLDs giving the data of their experience with GDPR, as being this has made it to the responsible persons in ICANN. And that was really good. And we had a - three nice and with very strong participations meetings throughout the year. A lively exchange between the members at the group's meeting, but also in between.

So I think it was a successful year. I hope you can all agree on that. Any questions? Any remarks to 2018? Any highlights you thought should be mentioned? No? Okay.

(Sebastien): Next slide, please. So this year has been a - I mean, they all are. But this year has been quite an interesting year for us. And in particular in having to defend our skin, having to defend our models of GeoTLDs for the future, for future rounds and also in general in the way we can survive and work in this community. One of the things that becomes very apparent is that we're a small group.

We're a group within a group of registry stakeholder groups, and there's a bit of a, a few nested Russian dolls in there. And we need to make our voice louder. We need to make our opinions felt a bit more. We need to not find ourselves in a situation where other people take decisions for us. We're - this group has been existing for a number of years. I think the first time we met informally was in Toronto seven years ago? Eight years ago? Something like that. It's time to get that.

Now, I'm also very conscious of the fact that we're all volunteering here. We all have day jobs and it's - all these things take a long time. But we need to find better ways to make our voices heard. And that goes to us and managing this group and being part of that voice. But it also goes to everybody, to you in helping us, drafting those opinions, making those opinions heard. Raising alarms when you hear them. Informing us and exchanging that information, much more than what we're doing now.

Today we're meeting four times a year, because not everybody can attend. There's cycles in that some of us are there every meeting. There's others that come in and out, which is completely normal. It's part and parcel of what we're doing. But we need to up our game here. Now we've been thinking of different ways of doing it. We didn't really want to start organizing monthly calls or biweekly calls.

There's enough calls that everybody's attending. I happen to live in Australia, so thank you very much, but my 3:00 in the morning slot is already pretty booked. It's - I see (Leann) in the back also smiling. Thank you very much. You understand exactly what I mean. So it is not going to be about that. But we do need to find better ways to do this. And some of the ways are going to be by trying to find and employee people to help us with this.

If as a group we can't find time in our busy agendas to do it, we were going to have to delegate that to somebody else. And we've got (Conrad) is going to

talk about it. We've got enough funds to do these things. But we need to start doing them. And we need to participate also where we can and as we can into other people's discussions.

Second part of this first half-session, so the second quarter of this game this afternoon, we're going to invite a few a few of our friends from the CCNSO, from the GAC -- hopefully also from the registry stakeholder group, the registrar stakeholder group -- to discuss with them a bit where we're at, we're we want to be, where they're at with these topics that are of interest to us. And see how we can find synergies and pull those efforts together.

Can you go to the next slide? So this - this is - this first point of focus is something that quite important to us. Again, we're always and continuously conscious of the fact that some of you are less interested in the round two than others. We don't want to make it - this all about round two. But then when we express this often to people that already have their TLD and are not going to grow any other TLDs in round two say, "Well, no actually, we're also interested in the round two, because the more TLDs out there the better it is for all of us."

The more GeoTLDs out there. I'm not sure that that goes for all the TLDs. But the more GeoTLDs out there, the better it is for you each of us individually. We need - or we need - we want to acquire more members. There's already - there's still a number of GeoTLDs -- current GeoTLDs -- that are not members of this group. They should come around. There's a few that I've met in the hallways this morning and that are not in this room that I need to drag in.

We're going to organize on Wednesday a .cities conference, taking the good example of .cat and (unintelligible) and what you guys organized in Barcelona with the city of Barcelona. We wanted to reproduce this every time we're meeting at an ICANN in a location that makes sense. I think that Kobe --

because of all the GeoTLDs in Japan -- makes sense. And this is where we're going to try it.

I think that Montreal will make sense. I know that there's quite a bit of interest from Canadian cities and provinces - and from North American cities in general. And so we want to do this exercise to get new members, to get interest. To also understand and get a better understanding of what the future of GeoTLDs is going to be, inviting these people. So Wednesday's may be a bit short notice but invite all your friends.

As Dirk said, by the way, the agenda had 8:30, and then suddenly yesterday had 9:00 in the morning. I'm going to be there at 8:30 anyway, but be there at 9:00 and bring your friends. We want to stay that number one resource on GeoTLDs. So what does this mean in this day and age, the number one resource?

It means pretty much ranking top of Google wherever we are wherever you are in the world, and making sure that our sites is doing that. If you happen to try it from home and it doesn't, please alert us and see what we can do about it. Again, we want to be the reference. And the next thing that we need to do within the community is making sure that we're on top of all the participation that we can have and that we can do.

So again, we can't find ourselves in a position of having other people deciding for us matters that are vital to us. This first one fell on me, I guess. When Work Track5 started and it was decided who the members of - the executive Work Track 5 was going to be, we missed it. I missed it, we missed it. I didn't know. And we should have been there. We should have been raising our hand. Decisions have been taking in that Work Track that would have probably gone a bit differently if we had been there.

In the end Katrin picked up the flag as a participating member of the Work Track, and did an absolutely fantastic job. I'm not just saying it myself I've

heard from other people in this room and outside of this room. Picking up the pieces and fighting for GeoTLDs and the fact that we still will be able to have GeoTLDs in a future round, in spite of very strong pressure from other groups.

I'm not going to name them, but from other groups in this community that had an interest not so much in seeing GeoTLDs disappearing, but had an interest in removing all the barriers that have been put around GeoTLDs to protect geo names and let anybody register for anything. All this in defense of - sorry I'm talking in complicated terms here. But all this in defense of - let's say, of (unintelligible) interest. We should have been more - we should have been on the table in that conference. It's okay that we're not, it's fine.

Again Katrin was able to put some time and a huge amount of effort to save the pieces there and come to a result in the end which is very good. I'm very proud of - it doesn't mean that everything turned around us and all the comments and all the results are going to be around us But at least our voice was heard. And we were able to say what we needed to say. And we need to keep on doing this.

Now, with what I just said before about having difficulties finding members' time to help us doing this and having to hire somebody else to do it, this is one topic that I absolutely want to make sure that we cover and want to make sure that we can pay somebody to read the stuff that comes out of this community. To pick up when we need to comment and prepare those comments.

Usually once a draft has been produced - once somebody's gone through the effort of doing a first draft -- we can get attention of a number of you guys in order to go in and edit that and give comments. And that that's fairly okay. I'm happy with it. But I need - we need somebody to do that first legwork. Now, again, Katrin has picked up that work and has been doing it for a year now. Four years? Sorry?

Oh, no, you've been at the - specifically on Work Track 5? Yes, two years, okay. I don't want to have to rely on Katrin like that -- Katrin who works as a consultant also, and needs to have time for her clients -- just like that because nobody else raised their hand. So I'd like to make a proposition here. I'd like to find a way -- and we haven't discussed what the terms would be or whatever -- but I would like to find a way as the GeoTLD group to employ Katrin at least until the next ICANN, until Marrakesh.

If you have anybody within your circles that would be relevant to do that job, I'm more than happy to talk to them and see and all these things. And I've discussed this with Katrin before. I think you're comfortable with the idea, too. But in the meantime I don't want to keep on having to ask her to do stuff that takes her time. She's not at the table here. She hasn't been elected by you guys.

Just because we can't find anybody else doing it in the group. Questions? Comments? Good. So I will have that discussion with Katrin this week later. I don't know exactly, but we'll find some time. We'll come back to you guys with the terms that we come up. It'll be transparent. Just a small note. We did in the past talk to (Wim) to do this. (Wim) (unintelligible) who's doing it for the registry stakeholder group.

But since then -- and particularly since the passing of Stephane Van Gelder -- (Wim) has been very involved with the registry stakeholder group doing it. And I don't think that vis a vis the rest of the members of the registry stakeholder group it is fair to ask (Wim) to do it for us. And so I haven't even spoken to him about it. He was definitely a candidate. He would have a great guy to do this.

And obviously the registry stakeholder group recognized that faster than we did. But it's that sort of profile that we're looking for. Again, if you have that somewhere hidden, please tell us. Other things that we were supposed to do

- yes. So we want to up also (unintelligible) the conversation between those meetings. That's by animating the Web site. We had done some work last year with Maria Farrell to help us.

We need to keep on pushing that. She's also a busy person. But we need to find some more time for her to do this. Again, there's budget to do this. Ronald will be able to speak about it. In the case of Maria, actually, sometimes not even a question of budget. It's a question of also her sending us her invoice. I'm not sure she has. But - so we, again, we want to up this voice of ours to gain credibility.

I don't want to have to hear like we heard two months ago that basically we were a minority opinion in discussions that we're having, when the discussions were about GeoTLDs and the future of GeoTLDs. We can't be a minority opinion. And there can't be any doubt about the fact that we should be consultant. And we have something to say about it. Any questions? Very good. Maybe we go to the next slide, and housekeeping.

Ronald Schwaerzler: Okay. My name is Ronald - Ronald Schwaerzler from .wien, .cologne, and .cern. I'm the treasurer of the GeoTLD group. And I give you some status on our accounts, membership, and other administrative things. Next slide please. So it's one of eight pages that our members - or our member list is long. I just then decided to really give you this overview. Our member are Paris, Amsterdam, London, Brussels, Berlin, can we have the next one?

London, (unintelligible), Tokyo, Hamburg, New York City -- or NYC -- Sydney, Melbourne, (unintelligible), Africa, Durban, then Joburg and Capetown around by the (unintelligible) registry, DNS Africa. Does not run any TLDs on its own. It's an observer, and it's a registry back-end provider. So it's also possible to join our group as a registry back-end operator. Then we have .swiss, .quebec, and TLD box, the Austrian registry service provider.

Same as DNS Africa. We have Bayern, NRW, Miami, Budapest, all run by MMX, (unintelligible) and Istanbul (unintelligible), the Canadian Internet registry authority, not yet running an own TLD. They're running back end. And they will have some TLDs in the next round. So it's also possible to be a member - no, an observer for the future if you will be running some TLDs.

And we have then Stockholm, (unintelligible) and Barcelona, .gal, Wien, Cern, and Cologne. So summary, Asia Pacific, we have three members. Africa five. European Union 27. North America four. South America zero. So we see a very clear focus on the, let's say, northern hemisphere, and especially many TLDs Europe.

Next slide please. The financials. We had - out of all these memberships we had membership fees in total, you know that these fees are based on number of domains and the management of €27,000, all paid, good - not very punctual. But finally any member has paid. The costs in total were €17,750. The largest parts of it were the fees or the costs for the accounting, tax declaration, et cetera, in Belgium.

The membership fee to the registry stakeholder group is calculated on the numbers of domain that's under management of our largest member, which this year -- since this year -- is .tokyo. So the number of domains from .tokyo are taken as the basis for the membership fee towards the registry stakeholder group. We had the brochure, the designed, the - not only the design but also generating content, et cetera, for - at about €4000 to print and distribution at about €8000.

Web site hosting, implementation of mailing list, et cetera, for €1000. And the banking fees, wire transfer fees, et cetera of €162 sums up to something over €9249. The balance, then, is -- for 2018 -- is €9249, giving a bank account balance by the end of the last year of €27,000. So this is our current account balance by the end of last year.

This is what (Sebastien) mentioned before. We have some, let's say, reserve funds, being a not-for-profit organization, which in some point of time could cause trouble tax-wise, because we are not allowed to make profit. So we have to spend the money. I don't say we want to spend or waste money, but if there are projects -- if there are necessities -- we at least have some money that we can spend on useful activities.

Next slide please. What did we do communication-wise last year? The (unintelligible) groups mailing lists have been deleted. So whenever you want to reach representatives, primary contacts of our memberships and observers, you can send an email to members at geotldgroup. This contains 67 addresses.

And if you want to reach people organizations that are generally interested in the GeoTLD -- let's say -- ideas, including representatives of the members of servers, it is 113 addresses, and send an email to openlist at geotldgroup. I'm not absolutely sure but I tend to be absolutely sure. You can only send to this list if you're a member of this list. So it's not that someone from the outside can spam us.

So if you're a member of one of these lists, you can send an email to, and you will get heard by the members of these of these two mailing lists. Next slide, please. I want to remind you, we have a Web site, and we have a members area there. So whoever has been named by the members has got a login and can access the private section of our Web site where we have the protocols, where we have some internal documents like studies or KPIs or whatever.

So if your login does not work, or if you want to be added, talk to your primary contact, who will send an email to office at geotldgroup to me, and we will add this login to your employees, partner, whatever it is. I think it's already a rich find of documentation of materials. We do not to want to put open, in

public. So there is some information on the Web site that is only accessible to the members. Please use this.

Next slide, please. And some interesting development over the last five, six, seven months. We received some mails, inquiries about who could help us with getting an own GeoTLD for the next round. Most of those - some of the people were not aware that these are - it is being done in rounds. They talked about, I want to have dot, what was it? I don't know. Kiev or (unintelligible). And they proposed we should -- as a group -- do a GeoTLD like this.

So the three of us got these emails. And all companies are consultancy companies. And this is somehow not fair if we as the (unintelligible) receive demands. (Miriam), you somehow nodding, yes? I think one special inquiry we directed to you because it was a French - I think French, or was it Basque?

(Sebastien): It was the region of Occitania, which is on the border between France and Catalonia. And I sent you both - yes? Fantastic.

Ronald Schwaerzler : I got it in CCs. I know that you got it.

(Sebastien): I sent the guys contact details. But we can talk about it. So he was looking for a .oc, actually. And I explained that that was impossible. But (unintelligible) going to talk to both of you about it. But we'll talk about it after.

Ronald Schwaerzler : But this is exactly the problem. We as consultants would get some inquiries. And we don't - sure, we want to. But it's not fair to have an advantage. So we decided to do on our Web site a directory of consultants, where we can direct any of the inquiries to. It is already on the Web site. I have asked people who I know and (Sebastien) and Dirk also approached some.

And if you go to the Web site, I think it's on the next slide please. Yes, it's a little bit small. But on the right side, you see our Web site, and then the consultants -- consultancy companies -- are listed in alphabetic order. And it should be the logo. It should be the name of the consultancy company. And it should be, let's say one or two sentences describing. So if you're searching for TLDs, German-speaking, go to Domain Works, go, and whatever.

Whatever you want to tell your customers in, let's say, three or four lines, please send it to geotld - office at geotld dot group. Address it to me directly. I'm responsible for the edit of the Web site. I will add it to this consultancy page. And whenever there is some demand, some request sent to the (unintelligible), we will direct any of these requests to that Web site to decide whom this requester wants to address it's -- or his or hers -- request to. Next slide, please.

(Sebastien): Just one more second on that. So any member of (unintelligible) can be in that list. We're not going to invite the rest of the world. Please send us your information if you're interested to be listed. I don't need your CV. If you say that you offer consultancy services in GeoTLDs, you can be in the list.

Ronald Schwaerzler: Okay. And then another invitation to make the whole Web site more lively - more interesting to customers. We have since -- let's say -- one years, two years, a page on our Web site which is named top sites. I'd like to call references, however. And I think it was (Sebastien) who did just add some links there from New York City, from Melbourne, from Vienna, for Berlin, Hamburg. They have partially been outdated.

There are for one TLD there are 20. For the other TLD there are two links. So we discussed it in our weekly or biweekly (unintelligible) calls to have -- negotiable -- it limited to 7 entries per TLD. And my proposal is to do this last in first out. So if you send -- let's say -- I have four top references for .paris. I will edit them and put Paris to the top. So and then if .london wants to be on

the top, he has to send me another updated version tomorrow that he will be on the top again.

So it's somehow -- let's say -- at least motivation for the active ones to get on the top of their top references list. Make sure that the links are not broken. Make sure that the sites that you're referencing are still there. We have some -- or we had some -- entries that were not active anymore. But we have deleted these non-active links. And I think it is a good reference for a city TLD, for a GeoTLD, a regional TLD to show which activities are done under this top level domain.

So please be active. Please send your top references to me. Please don't game the system. Don't say, let's exchange the third one with the first one. This is not a new entry. So you will not be listed to the top. But whenever you update it, you will be listed on the top. And I think it will be a lively -- or I hope it will be a lively -- subpage of our Web site then. Next slide, please. Yes. I think that's it.

(Sebastien): Yes, I've added that. It's just - we added in the footer a list of upcoming industry events of the domain name industry. That was an enhancement. And on the next slide, the most viewed content on the Web site was quite interesting. The last 12 months the most viewed Web site was for a rural domain, which has had (unintelligible).

And it had incredible access visitors and so on. That's quite interesting. And from all the GeoTLDs (unintelligible) was the top one to be visited, interestingly. Just one must a bit of housekeeping. Does everybody receive the emails that we send through the mailing list, knowing that it's changed in the last 12 months? So have you received email? And if you haven't, can we at the break just look at it and...

Ronald Schwaerzler : Not your email address has been changed. And I edited it two days before. So let's check whether you will receive it or not.

Dirk Krischenowski: Dirk, for the record. Can I add those (unintelligible) I saw your hand. The invitation I think was the PDF, was the agenda for our three meeting parts.

Ronald Schwaerzler: They're for the Kobe meeting.

Dirk Krischenowski: You got it? Okay, to clarify.

(Sebastien): Okay, can we have the - well, sorry. Is there any question about the housekeeping? Anything? As we've done in the past years, after this meeting, Ronald will send everybody the invoice for 2019. We're using the same rules that we've been using in the past years. You'll send that in the next two or three weeks. Please have an eye on it. I'll take a mental note to remember to pay it on time this time. And that's it. So any question about any of that?

Then we'll go to the next item. You guys have a bit of time if we're running five minutes late? Thank you. Okay. So, Katrin, did you want to - did you have slides for Work Place 5?

Katrin Ohlmer: This is Katrin Ohlmer for the record. So giving a brief update as in the last sessions about the policies, where we stand right now. So we filed the common last September for Work Track 1 to 4 about subsequent procedures. Since then we did three groups, which consolidated and reviewed all the comments. This has just been finished last week. And also we did an analysis on an additional report, which has been published also last October.

So those two tasks have been completed. However, when we had our first four meetings yesterday with Work Track 1 to 4 and Work Track 5, it looks like some parties within the broader community are interested in doing further reviews and getting another comment period before the report. The final report is then due to be presented to the GNSO council. I have the slide with

the comment later on. So currently it looks like the - doing all those comment periods and digestions, there were a couple of new proposals out there.

And since the call for comment wasn't really clearly articulated, do you want A or do you want B but instead there were also the options of saying what is your opinion on topic blah. We now have the issue that we received quite some answers. But we also got quite some new proposals. And this is then rising new questions, which might lead to this further comment period this year.

Concerning the time frame, I will present that in a minute. If you could - so this is the current status of Work Track 1 to 4. And maybe you can turn to the next slide. Work Track 5, I think (Sebastien) characterized it pretty well .There's been a very intense debate with a broad variety of comments and positions in Work Track 5.

And what was really interesting to see that since Stephane is not anymore among us, the way of how registry stakeholder group drafted comments and invited the broader membership to draft comments changed a bit over time. This is why we met today in the morning to determine how we can improve the communication and get procedural improvements when drafting comments to make sure that we know that there's supposed to be the comment which has to be drafted.

And sent to seek input from the broad variety of the registry stakeholder group. Currently it lies within very few members. And they necessarily do not cover the broad basis of the registry stakeholder group. So we made pretty good progress. I think (unintelligible) attended that session as well. And I think we collected many good ideas, how to really start earlier, get more members engaged, determine what really has to be commented on, where we might have blind spots.

For instance (unintelligible) stuff where we probably don't have affiliations with, or we don't know exactly when a comment is due. So (unintelligible) from the registry stakeholder group will provide some feedback from the session. And among some of those proposals was also that the brand registry stakeholder at the brand registry group and the GeoTLD group, they should somehow do a profile, who they are, who would be their contact person in the registry stakeholder group if, for instance, there's an issue, which is really dedicated to brands.

The (unintelligible) and registry stakeholder group can directly approach (unintelligible), for instance, which is probably well known to everyone. But in terms of the GeoTLD group, I would then volunteer and, say listen, if there's anything associated with us, let's talk and contact me And I can then channel and determine what to do with these kind of comments. Also we debated that we will some metrics. Who registry stakeholder members are, and what their competencies are.

So right now, if we were to draft a comment about the finance plan of ICANN, can we don't know who the finance guy -- for instance -- for (unintelligible) is, or, or if he has (unintelligible) Verisign. In the past, that has been really tremendous effort mainly led by Verisign. So these kind of improvements we debated about in this morning. Back to Work Track 5 now.

So yesterday we had a pretty lively debate about the status quo. So we as a Geos, I drafted a comment on behalf of the GeoTLD group. And I only got aware, let's say, a week before the comment period closed that the registry stakeholder group drafted already a comment as well. So that was a bit unfortunate for both sides, because there's been many efforts on the registry stakeholder group.

And then they only found out that this was not the position of the GeoTLD. And at the same time, we as the GeoTLD drafted our own comment. So to synchronize those efforts, we spent quite some times on telcos and over the

mailing list to then find a compromise in between based on a lot of effort also by (Wim) to incorporate the GeoTLD comments and some registries then decided to file a separate comment also because their position could not be as represented in the registry stakeholder comment as they initially thought that would.

So and I talked with (Sebastien) about that earlier. I think that was one of the first situations where we found out that we should engage more and more actively, and monitor which sessions are really - or not sessions, but comment periods are really important for us. And where we have different views than the other registry stakeholder group members or other parts of the community.

And that we can't afford just to let those chances. So it's about picking and choosing and not commenting on each and every one open comment period. But really determining which ones are crucial for us as GeoTLDs and which one we can just let go because we are aligned with the majority of the registry stakeholder group. So back to Work Track 5. We had this debate yesterday. Staff and the coaches started to analyze the comment which has been received few weeks ago.

Currently, they are in between and they have this traffic light structure saying yes, we're all aligned, there's some new proposals, there's dissent, and so on. So we try to structure all the comment received. This will be properly done in the forthcoming quarter. But it's a bit more structured, the Work Track 5 comment. But still there was the opportunity to file some general information and responsibilities and thoughts.

And so we also might figure out that we need to have certain more discussion on some topics. And the Work Track 1 to 4 and Work Track 5 has to be interlined with each other, which will happen then in second quarter. So my expectation is that probably we will see more discussion in the second

and third quarter, with a comment period then opening in third quarter being most likely then reviewed in the fourth quarter of 2019.

If you could have the next slide. So this was the initial timeline. You can see the big green dot, which says ready in third quarter of 2019. But as mentioned, it seems that we have to digest bit more furthers from some approaches and ideas of community members. One slide further please. So this looks like the - like a potential new timeline for collecting the final input. And then the next timeline, so we had - we talked about that yesterday.

So we're just missing now is the timeline which comes after this timeline, right? So we only see that the comment is then due to be handed over to the GNSO council for the vote. But not the ICANN board vote and ICANN (unintelligible) implementation and all, everything with which follows. But for me it's relevant that apparently between now and the fourth quarter of 19, there will be decisions taken also relating to GeoTLDs, the existing one and the potential new ones, which are of vested interest to us.

So we would really have to take care that our position is at least heard and represented. And of course we can't - we will not be the ones who say we have to do it this way or that way, because it's ICANN and this community decision making process. But we should improve and really have our voice heard. So this is it on Work Track 1 to 4 and 5.

Any questions so far? I know it's a lot of stuff. If not, can you please next slide? So we have the, (Sebastien), you want to talk about the EPDP, or is it...

(Sebastien): Not really, no.

Katrin Ohlmer: Okay, so just briefly on the EPDP stuff...

(Sebastien): No, I will. I will. I was just joking.

Katrin Ohlmer: You will? Okay. So you use that if you want.

(Sebastien): I was just being facetious. So you would have seen the PDP report that came out two weeks ago, I want to say. Maybe three, I've lost track of time.

Woman 1: Last week.

(Sebastien): Was it last week? Oh, maybe I saw a slightly earlier version that. We had, was it with you (unintelligible) we had a discussion the other day about it, and it's probably far from being a perfect report. It's not the end of the work. It's only a door to more work to be done. And there's a number of topics that were way too difficult that been pushed away to that second phase of the PDP.

My understanding is that there is some kind of an open tender until end of March -- March 22, I seem to have heard -- to see how and who will lead that next phase of the PDP. I was joking about it before. It's an incredibly complicated and excruciating process. For any of you that have spent any time listening to it, it is just absolutely incredibly complicated.

And the opinions and the needs of everybody around the table are so diverse and in opposite direction that it is very difficult to come up with something. I think -- and I was a completely silent partner here so there's nothing to my credit, if only at least I didn't bring more trouble to the table -- this has been a topic on and off in its core, which is the data that that we pick up and we handle, that has been discussed for the past 15 years in this community.

And several working groups have tried and had to throw the towel, because they were getting nowhere with it. There are several acronyms in this community that are being used that came out of these working groups to start with. It's been at the core of what we're been doing and here - doing in this

community for the past 15, 20 years. And here we had a year to come up with a number of results and resolutions. It is as perfect as it will get.

I know that there are a number of things -- and particularly the part of the stuff that is thrown in the bucket for the second part of the discussion -- a number of things that are going to be very contentious. And a lot of things that are sort of left in the initial report and I'm thinking for example of that access for law enforcement, for governments. How are we going to be able to do this? Who is going to take care of it? Is ICANN - and there's a lot of things that that are sort of understood in the way the report is drafted, but they're really not understood in the way it's going to be done.

Probably something that should be drafted slightly clearer. It is to be discussed in the future, because there's no solution for it and there's too many problems behind it. I heard Chris Disspain earlier say on the other side of that the room that there was a lot of people -- him included -- in in this group that was also trying to make sure that we weren't throwing too much into that second basket and just deal with the easy questions and throw away all the hard ones.

It wasn't the case. We initially went through a lot of things. And got something that is acceptable at least at this date. I think that we should comment on it. I haven't really put my head and my thoughts too much into what we should do. I think on this one just because we were with participating in it in some form, if anything, to say that we like what we're seeing, or we appreciate the progress, or something like that.

I personally wouldn't advocate going and picking at any of it. But if anybody has a diverging opinion on it, please let's talk. Let's sit together and I'm ready to listen and pass that back on to the discussion. I think that - has everybody seen it? Read it? Oh, not too much. Okay, well just say, in very broad terms, there's been a review of all the data that we're all collecting.

There's been a simplification of that data to try to keep it on the registrant and have an alternative contact as an admin contact. There's still all the things that were agreed last year about closing the who is as a public tool that still exists. There are still the problems of who do we show the information to? We're still working on the same principle which is best judgment. We receive a query. If the query looks like it's a legitimate query, and there's a number of purposes that have been discussed in that meeting.

Everything is listed on what could be legitimate and what is not legitimate, and how to handle this. It's basically in line with what those of you who are CCTLDs have been doing for years. Basically in line with what everybody else has been doing for the last year. I haven't seen or felt anything that was radically different. If anything, there is a reduced number of data points.

We're all going to have to work on that, and more particularly on the registry side, but on the registrar side, too. Review the way we're doing things. Could it have been less data points? Could have been different? Yes all of that is absolutely sure. But this is where we landed now. Again, I'd like for pure formality for the group to say something about it in a comment.

I don't personally don't have anything negative to say to it. Or rather, if I did, I know why we landed on that (unintelligible) there, and I don't want to have to reopen that, so I'll leave it that. But I'm happy to hear your thoughts. Good. We need to move on. Thank you very much, Katrin.

Can we have this next slide? Yes, (unintelligible). So as I discussed earlier, we wanted to open - in an attempt to open our voice to the rest of the community. We wanted to have a dialogue with other members of this community. And we invited the registry stakeholder group, and I don't see anybody yet. I thought (Sam) might show up, but she might still (unintelligible).

Woman 1: (Unintelligible).

(Sebastien): Yes, at the same time. So there was a bit of conflict. So the registrars, and we've got (Graham), who joined us 10 minutes ago. And we also asked (Juergen) and (unintelligible) from (unintelligible), but also as CCTLDs to come and discuss with us and see - help us understand maybe from other points of view in this community the elements that we're trying to forward. How they might hit blocks from - oh, sorry.

One last one (unintelligible) who's been here all along as a member but is joining us now for the next 45 minutes sitting in for (Jorge) for GAC. Sorry. And so we wanted to have an open dialogue to discuss a bit where we're going with the things that we're - seem to be fighting in the community. And see - try to find synergies and try to find where we can align with these other groups to make sure that we recognize and see exactly where the friendlies are.

And I haven't personally invited the ones that I was feeling more that we were headbutting with. We might invite them in a future session. But at this point we'd like to be able to see where the friendlies are, to make sure that we're walking in the same direction. So registries - well, because it's us and we're not in agreement with all the registries. Actually a lot of the fighting already at that level.

Registrars on topics, for example, as the PDP and GDPR and everything that needs to be changed. There was a lot of interaction early on between registries and registrars and seeing how we would handle that conversation. I think that we found common grounds and then went to fight with the others. And the CCs, there's obviously a lot of synergies.

A number of us that are - please you're very welcome, if you want to join, too. Absolutely. This is a very big table and we're very few. And so, yes. We wanted to hear from you. (Graham), do you want to maybe start talking about

the - I guess, the topic of Work Track 5 and things like that are less your remit, but GDPR and DPDP and we came up with?

(Graham): Sure. Although I apologize. I'm probably not the best person to talk to Geo specific stuff, because it's maybe one of the bits I know the least amount. I'm (Graham) I'm from (unintelligible), by the way. If people don't know me I'm the chair of the registrar stakeholder group. I guess what's worth noting -- maybe to back up slightly -- is you know, through all of this EPDP process I think there's been an amazing amount of collaboration between registries and registrars.

We're not always aligned on every issue, although for the most part that Venn diagram is pretty overlapping. But I think our respective teams have been able to work together really well and get a lot done in a very short amount of time. And so that also includes some input from the Geos as well. Probably there is more learning to be done among registrars about Geo-specific concerns. But by and large I think that whole process was about as excellent as anyone could expect it to go. In terms of collaborating.

Not necessarily in terms of output or, you know, how the EPDP has gone. But I think we can feel collectively pretty good about the process that we've undertaken. I don't think I have anything groundbreaking to offer on thoughts on EPDP. And I certainly about the Work Stream 5 stuff. You know, registrars in general, as unsurprising, are concerned about our risks and concerned about our registrant privacy.

And you know we'll keep paying attention as much as we can there. It's not - we're not ideologues, I think, on most of this. I think most of my membership is extremely pragmatic. They want to run their businesses. They want to serve the business verticals that they do -- be that wholesale, retail, brand, or something else -- and we want to do that with the least amount of risk and the most amount of opportunity.

And, you know that's our bent inside the EPDP and everything related to that. And if there's pieces of that they we're missing, we'd love to hear about it. And we'll try and share what we can as well.

(Sebastien): Is there - it's been not quite a year. It's been 10 months since we turned on (unintelligible) level, the - 10 months already? Maybe closer to eight. The - we turned on the measures. Is there anything that you have as feedback from your operations as registries to the registrars? Or anything that has been done differently? Answers and questions and whatever?

I have a little one. It's been a bit of a headache for me personally as a registry, and more importantly as a back end registry operator, is that we're finding ourselves in a situation where we're - the who is as existed before should have been a who is from registries and from registrars. And I think that there's a different understanding from the registrar side. And that the register should have the information that they have and published the information that they own, and the registry should have their own information - publish their own information.

And found a number registrars were actually picking up the information directly from the registry and showing, oh, just because it was the easiest way to do it, I don't think it's a problem with yours particularly, because you're big boys. But with smaller shops. And that in terms has a GPS suddenly became a problem because again the clients -- people would tend to go to the registrar.

And the registrar had an easy answer with Whois when it was accessible but no longer has it. And then there was a bit of finger-pointing. It didn't last very long. I think that things fell back on their feet - not immediately, but at some point around September, October, after the summer holidays when people were back in and at work, and it seemed to have worked a bit better. But that was a problem definitely they were having.

And we were having also almost the reverse GPR problem. So a number of brands that absolutely wanted to be able to be there - out there on a Whois. And screaming at their registrar saying, "Why are you not showing this information anymore?" And the registrar, she'd scream back at us, saying, why are you not showing, and, you know, the whole story.

But apart from that, yes, I tend to agree. The conversation - in the beginning it was a lot of headbutting before the EPDP, because we were both at the coal face. But things have smoothed out and working fairly well.

Andreas Musiclac: Good afternoon. Andreas Musiclac, member of the executor's board of DENIC. So what are our challenges? And, let's see. So GDPR is a challenge, but as far from the CC side, we are much ahead of the GTLDs, from my point of view. And the good thing is that with the implementation last year, we have not so much to implement so far. We do still do a step by step implementation for the members, because being a member organization, registrars are members at the same time

So if there are still implementation, we do that on a very low scale because registrars have to implement on their side. But there are still many things to do. But what we can see as a result -- and you have to bear in mind we have 16.3 million DE domains in the zone -- and we have only 50 requests so far. We have now issues at all with our authorities.

I think from our point of view it was very good cooperation with registrars, because in the Whois you can see now the registers and also the registrars, on the other hand, they have only a few requests from the GDPR side of things we are fine. And we would like that ICANN would follow our approach maybe. You want to tell something to CPC? I think this important, Jorg? Yes, because this is the next challenge we see as - yes, only short. Or I can do it.

Joerg Schweiger: All right. Hi, my name is Joerg Schweiger . I'm from DENIC as well. I wasn't not sure what to wait, see what I should comment on. So I was just handed

over to comment on CBC. Okay, I'll do that. GDPR seems to be one of the challenges we were facing. If it comes to regulation nowadays, the European Union sets up another regulation that is due to effective I think in January 2020. That seems to be giving us at least some nightmares or considerations, because it more or less requires us to take down domains as ordered by consumer protection authorities.

Those authorities are not named now specifically, and basically in Germany for example, the situation is like that that you do have all different also federal states who do have their own consumer protection authorities. So we would be facing takedown requirements or takedown orders from all sorts of different authorities. And there's no such thing as a - what do you call it in English? A court order that is necessary to take down those domains before you're supposed to take it down.

So basically what we are required -- and that is across all over Europe -- is to take down domains as ordered by some authorities. And to make it even worse, this is a formal act by the state. And we might even be required to pay for that order. So this is something that could really be very interesting. And we don't see a reason - we don't see a way how to circumvent this legislation as it is a regulation and we are quite annoyed what is coming down our way.

(Sebastien): (Miriam), did you want to take maybe the mike, so your (unintelligible), yes, but the whole world is listening to us.

(Miriam): Yes, it was just to add something that maybe could help here As .be, Belgium has already been implementing something about it. They shared it - in the center with other CCTLDs, and that's very interesting because they kind of are taking the problem ahead to make sure that all those authority won't be imposing the way of, you know, shutting down the domain name. So they have a new process during which they are kind of evaluating the request and then making a decision. And it's quite interesting and could be shared here if we need some.

Joerg Schweiger: Thank you very much for the comment. I'm aware of the Belgian approach. And their advantage really is that the authorities do take liability. So if a domain is taken down faulty and there's no malicious activity connected in any way with that domain, then the authorities as far as I understand would take liability. And this point certainly is not being addressed by the regulation. But it's got to be addressed by the very specific implementation in the different states. And I do not see that the Belgium model -- even though I would really appreciate it to be implemented in Germany as well -- would come into place in my country. And I'm skeptic about it's that this will be - would be implemented in any other European country. But we'll see.

Andreas Musciac: And to add to this, there can be also for cross-border requests, so, which means the - probably the authority that can be requests from Germany to Belgium. And in addition, why we stress this issue here? Because we know that our accredited registrars in Germany there's no, really - they're not aware of the CPC. And this can be really a way that's why we think it's important if we say we are the friendly party, we should discuss topics like this here. And that only less than one year until it's effective.

(Miriam): Just to add on this cross-border thing. My understanding of the legislation is that each authority - each country has to designate and really precisely name the authority that would have the possibility to ask for this. So if it's not one of those authorities, then you won't have to do it. Well, that's our understanding. And that's the way we will interpret it, definitely.

Joerg Schweiger: This is interesting, because regulation is usually also in the country can have a different flavor, let's put it this way. And we know that probably in Germany we have probably 16 different authorities, because we're a federated state. So we're not really aware what is the outcome of how it will be effective in January 2020.

Dirk Krischenowski : Does this CPC anyhow interferes with our contracts with ICANN? There's something we need to take care or implement? Implement for sure but take care in the direction to ICANN?

(Sebastien): It could be, so, (unintelligible) don't run an ICANN contract. But things as simple as, for example, putting a domain on hold, you need - there are clear contractual things that you can do and you can't do And statuses for that domain. It's not just about, you know pushing a delete button and seeing what happens. These sorts of things, like, do you have any - this is the first time I hear about this, by the way. Thank you very much for bringing to the table. I was blissfully unaware.

But and again - we're not a European company. I don't think anybody would, so thank you very much for bringing to the table. And this is a very good reason why we should do these things more often. Yes, so, anything like that. And the other question you keep on talking about authority. Are we talking about the police? The tax office? The whatever? Or they're purposely being nondescript today to say anybody that has a badge?

Joerg Schweiger : Well actually I can only speculate on any effects. I think there will be some effects, as you do have certain rules that applies to GEs. They may interfere with CPC. One thing that I consider to be quite crucial is that again I would have to speculate in the sense that CPC is not very clear in itself. So for example, there is a regulation saying -- as I mentioned before -- competent authorities.

But the individual European state would have to define what a competent authority is. For example, they're saying that a domain name can be seized, all right? So what is seizure of a domain name? It could be takedown. It could be a disconnecting the domain name. So there could be all different kind of things. It could be ruled that the domain name should be redelegated to a different address, should be transferred to the consumer protection authority.

So they're all different precautions within the law, as far as I can see it. But they still have to be filled in by the individual states. So I can just speculate if, to which extent, and depending on where you're operating if it would affect your operation or not.

(Sebastien): Consumer authorities. Okay.

Joerg Schweiger: The point here is, registrar, I'm not aware of this regulation so far. That's why we bring this on the table. But you mentioned that, so how the (unintelligible) registries, because as last resort registries has to take down domain names. We are not aware of how you manage (unintelligible). So probably does Berlin, because it's located in Germany. So one authority can manage .berlin, but about .com, we have no idea. This is another topic which is not clear. Or the regulation does not address this point.

(Sebastien): Okay, thank you very much. I hear from (Sue) that we have one minute. We're in our last minute. We're going to have to close this down. Again we're meeting in 15 minutes on the other side. In room C.

Woman 1: Room C, yes. The letter C.

(Sebastien): But get out on the left, grab a coffee, and in room C. Yes, I'm not sure if there's (unintelligible), anyway. Thank you very much. Thank you guys for coming. We might try this again and start the discussion. Thank you.

END