MONTREAL – GNSO - (RySG) GeoTLD Group Working Session
Wednesday, November 6, 2019 – 09:00 to 10:15 EDT
ICANN66 | Montréal, Canada

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:	It is Wednesday, November 6, 2019, at ICANN 66 in Montreal. This is the GNSO RySG GeoTLD Group Working Session at 9:00 a.m. in Hall 511C.
DIRK KRISCHENOWSKI:	Good morning, all together. We are having now, in this room, until 10:15, the third part of our GeoTLD Meeting here in Montreal. I see the usual suspects in the room. The main topic of this morning will be a presentation made by Katrin about the survey on abuse we recently were running. The aim or goal of the session is to decide if and when we present some results of our study, or a short summary, during the abuse session from, I think, 10:15 to 12:00. I would then start with Katrin's summary of our survey. Please go ahead.
KATRIN OHLMER:	Are you going to switch to my slides? Okay, perfect. Thank you. As Dirk mentioned, I have this topic of the DNS abuse survey, but I would like to start with a brief policy update—what happened since we last met in Santiago de Compostela.
	Next slide, please. What happened since then is that the Work Track Five, which deals with the geographic names on the top level, came to the final work and prepared report—was calling for support or non-

support among members. This resulted in a consensus call, and we received consensus for the final report from work track members.

So, the next step, then, was to forward that report with the consensus status to the whole working group—the former Work Track One through Four, which is called now Subsequent Procedures—SubPro group. This will be now discussed within the whole group how to proceed further, and if there's support among that group. That happened already on Saturday. Don't remember what the day today is. So, that happened on Saturday and the last two sessions took place on Monday.

Next slide, please. The status is that we will continue our work over the next weeks and month, with two further meetings every week—not meetings, but conference calls. From my point of view, the biggest topic is to discuss whether further comment periods will be necessary. I put together all the topics where potentially, further comment periods could be conducted upon.

I highlighted the ones which might be of interest to the GeoTLDs, which is the global public interest topic. How do we really take care of that, as such as the community? Then we have the string similarity. For instance, if there's an applicant which follows a very similar-looking or sounding application to a city or geographic region, do we want to develop a position on that?

I think this is one topic we should take care of, and also about objections. For instance, if there's an application for a string which equates a geographic term, but none of our members filed the application for that, do we want to engage in how those kind of

objections can look like, and if the GeoTLD group has certain rights or mechanisms, how to file objections.

This will be the main topic over the next few weeks, to determine whether we are going to have comment periods, and if so, which topics will be part of that comment period. My expectation is that this comment period that's supposed to run in the first quarter of 2020 was analyzing the comments and producing the final report to the GNSO Council by the end of the first quarter. Correct me if I'm wrong, but this is a very ambitious time frame, so we will see whether this really will pan out.

Also, I think that this really depends on the number of comments we will receive. So, if there's, let's say, 5 or 10 comments, this is pretty easy to dig through, and then determine whether we should continue with our conversations in the SubPro. But if someone decides he or she or they will file a few hundred comments, then of course this is different thing. Honestly, I don't think that is going to happen, because we had a pretty long debate about pretty much all topics. But still, this might happen.

So, what I saw during the past few days is that some SOs and ACs are not really happy with the so-called consensus of the Work Track Five report. My expectation is that we will pretty likely see some comments, even before the potential comment period is going to open again, and also, during this comment period, and maybe even afterwards, in terms of potential GAC advice or GAC comment—however that could be filed.

So, my personal thinking is that we are pretty well-advised to continue with monitoring the development in that group. But to be honest, I received an email from Sebastien one week, two weeks ago, asking me how many more involvement, and invoices, and activities I'm supposed to produce for this topic. I answered him that it's ICANN, so honestly, if I would have a crystal ball, I would be much wiser. Of course, it's a decision by the group, so it's not my decision whether the group wants me to pursue any further any activities here or not.

So, I would put that out for comment, and let either the group decide today, or during the next weeks on the mailing list, how to proceed with getting engaged in SubPro or not. I will participate anyway. I could represent the GeoTLDs, but I could also just represent us and/or our clients. So, I'm totally agnostic. Of course, I do have a personal view on that, but in terms of … if the group does not want to spend further resources, and activities, and energy on that topic, I'm fine as well. So, I would like to put that out for comment, and that's about this topic for the moment.

DIRK KRISCHENOWSKI: Any questions, comments on geographic names and the subsequent procedures status?

[BENJAMIN]:   [Benjamin] from [Valideus] We started with this topic, so I think we should go until the end, and I think the gTLD group has enough money to support this action.

MARIANNE GEORGELIN: I also believe that this is important, that we stay attached to those subjects, and that you continue your work. I don't know how we're going to make this decision all together, but I think it's very important, and I thank you for the work you've done.

KATRIN OHLMER: Thank you. I don't know how … The ExCom then has to propose how to move forward with that topic. Then, we will probably see some communication from ExCom over the next few days, weeks, how to proceed with that, probably. If there's any content-related questions, please reach out to me. Also, we will have the opportunity for today and tomorrow to reach out to SOs/ACs who might have some issues with the Work Track Five report, so we can probably talk to some people still.

DIRK KRISCHENOWSKI: I think it's an important topic for us, that we save the position of the GeoTLDs within the Applicant Guidebook, and the standing within ICANN community, because they will become further members of our group in the future, but only if the GeoTLD standards has the same value in a couple of years when they come. As you know, we are constantly under fire from various parties, who want to diminish the value of geographic names on the internet. So, we from the ExCom still think that it's important, but we will have from January a new ExCom. Okay, then. We are going to the abuse topic.

KATRIN OHLMER: Okay. During the meeting in Santiago de Compostela, we agreed to do an abuse survey—how we as GeoTLDs deal with abuse among our zones. Can you switch to the next slide, please? Thank you. This has been performed, then, in October—was 22 answers. So, I think what we all were probably a bit surprised to see that the expectations we probably had did not really match the results.

Before discussing how this could have happened, I would like to go to the results. But my understanding was that we pretty much all have very, very low cases of abuse, if at all, and that we are very responsive if there's a case of abuse. Apparently, there are some variations of how that came out. Next slide, please.

I'm just going through the six questions and answers we got in. The first question was along the line of the ICANN contractual obligations, if we monitor abuse. Apparently, that's the good news. All of the GeoTLDs do that. Next slide, please. But what we saw, that not all of the GeoTLDs maintain statistical reports. At least one answer mentioned that they don't keep any reports. Next slide, please.

This continues over the next answers, then. If the GeoTLD monitors abuse, do they keep those reports for the time being? Three members answered, "No, we don't maintain statistical reports. We probably have them, but we don't keep them for a certain period of time. Next slide, please.

Also, the question has been raised—if the statistical reports are maintained for the duration of the registry agreement, unless the ICANN contract or anything else determines that there's another period

sufficient or required. One member answered, "No, we don't do that." Next slide, please, which is really, then, very positive again, that all members are willing to share the reports with ICANN upon request. Next slide, please.

Last slide, which is really interesting to see the comparison or the weighting of how many members do have how many cases over the last year. I think this is really enlightening that we are not … We hear a lot of stuff on the hallway, how many strange things happen. And the PSWG says, "We are really concerned," and so on. So, many members in the community really have the feeling that a lot happens related to abuse. I think we agreed to do this survey, also to show that this is, at least for the GeoTLDs, not really true. I guess for the brands, it's even different picture, but still gives better relation to what we are really talking about.

So, a quarter of all members haven't had any abuse over the past year, which is very good result. And then, we have one to two cases, which is another eight members. If we collect them more, more than 50% of all participating members have less than three cases per year. Then, there are some members who have a bit more cases, but still very low numbers. Sue, can you go to the next slide, please?

What I would like to open the discussion up is we expected, actually, that this number of abuse cases is probably what we more or less would be expected, but in terms of how do we deal abuse is probably a bit different, and the question we had on the list was, "Are members willing to share why they answered differently?" I think I put that to the list,

and Sebastien put that also to the list, but we didn't receive any feedback—neither public nor private.

The initial idea was to have a very nice slide deck, and be able to provide that to the GNSO Council as preparation for today's abuse session. Since, apparently, it looks like not all members meet the contractual obligations, or interpret them different, or probably some are not obliged to meet those obligations, we thought that it would be wise to discuss this beforehand, and not present that to the broader audience at ICANN. If there's some way of misinterpretation, we should probably sort that out, and probably do a new version of the study, then.

So, I would like to open that up now, to discuss how to proceed with those figures, if we do want to reiterate the study, or if we do want to make some annexes and still publish it, or if we do want to keep it up for ourselves—how to proceed with that. I think for the next session, it's too late anyway, to have that in the slide deck, but still we could get to the mic, probably, and mention something, if we were to agree where those figures derive from. Thank you.

RONALD GEENS: Just to comment on these numbers of detected abuse cases, in the light of the discussions we had this whole week, if there are, let's say, five bad actors, and I detect all of these bad actors, am I then the best registry operator worldwide? The numbers just say we had only one case, which means we only detected one case. We probably didn't even detect 100 others. Giving a low number means that you either have low number of cases, or that you don't detect all the cases. So, presenting

numbers like this is always kind of … What do we want to prove? So, I would be very, very cautious in presenting these numbers, point number one.

Point number two, in the light of the discussions that have gone on that week, with this framework drifting around somewhere, singed by large registry operators, registrars, etc., I personally think that the discussion about all this abuse can go into a completely other direction than proving we are the good ones, or the mediocre ones, or something like this. So, I personally would not present these numbers.

KATRIN OHLMER: Thank you, Ronald. Just before I continue … On your first topic, what I understood from ICANN is that when they received our Compliance audits last year, they monitored against their DAAR figures. In some cases, they reached out to registry operators, if there's a mismatch between the stuff we filed with ICANN and the observations they made. I think, on that one, it would be a pretty surprise for me if there would be a variation. I think our figures are proven to be very similar to the ones ICANN made, so I wouldn't have any issues with that.

But of course, the question for me is rather, do we want to influence this whole discussion which takes place, by whatever activity, like presenting our findings or doing something else, or do we want to step back and let others be present in this discussion? Dietmar?

DIETMAR LENDEN: Just a couple of questions on this slide we're on at the moment, with the possible interpretations of why the figures might be as they are. From the audit, how many members are you aware of that didn't meet their contractual obligation? Basically, the last audit—the one in last year—all registries passed the audit. But do you know of how many GeoTLD operators were questioned by ICANN on the numbers that they had actually presented to ICANN?

I know from a brands perspective, there was quite a few brands that got pushback from ICANN, saying, "Hey. We used Spamhaus—" so, the DAAR data—"and it actually says that you actually have got possible DNS abuse in your TLD," which was very odd, considering that's not actually supposed to be possible. So, that was interesting.

And then, the second one is … The point is, not all members are bound to these contractual obligations. Spec 11 (3)(b), I think, is in everybody's contract, is it not? I don't know if that interpretation would be an accurate one, because I think everybody has to abide by Spec 11 (3)(b), unless I'm missing something. I don't think the geos or the brands had any special dispensation with regards, Spec 11 (3)(b). So, the interpretation might be slightly off-kilter, off-center.

KATRIN OHLMER: Thank you, Dietmar. On your first question, we haven't discussed this. If there are members who received a back-and-forth with ICANN Compliance last year. To your second question, there are actually members which do not derive from the 2014 round. So, that's why there

could be members who answered differently because they are not contractually obliged to fulfill the Spec 11 (3)(b) stuff.

DIETMAR LENDEN: Yeah, they don't have the new gTLD contract. It's a legacy contract?

KATRIN OHLMER: Yeah, exactly.

DIETMAR LENDEN: Okay. That's a good point.

MARIANNE GEORGELIN: I think it's interesting. The last slide—the one in which it appears that we face very little number of abuse … Yes, this one. I think this one is interesting. I want to make a parallel with what happened with the GDPR, especially the second phase, and the discussion around the access to the data. We discussed that around us, and we realized that we have very few requests in this manner.

So, it's a little bit the same. And I think our voice here is important in the debate, and we should keep being part of those discussions, because again, there is not that much abuse at the GeoTLD level, just like there weren't that much requests of personal data on our WHOISes. It's not plural, but okay. I think it's quite interesting to say we have this differentiation with other generic TLDs for instance, just like brand could have, and then geos.

KATRIN OHLMER: Thank you, Marianne. So, you suggest to talk to people on the hallway, or during sessions, that we conducted a survey among members, and the result is that probably half of the members who replied have less than three cases?

MARIANNE GEORGELIN: Yes, maybe. Maybe that's the way to do it. I'm not sure that … I don't know where all those discussions on abuse are going, but if it's more contractual obligation for gTLDs, then I think we have to discuss that. Do we want more obligation with this regard? It's a way to say there's maybe no need for that on our side. It's the same for the Unified Access Model. At some point, we say, "Okay, do we really need that?" It depends on our strategy. But that's interesting of, we won't

KATRIN OHLMER: Thank you. The line is Dietmar … Sorry, I don't have your name.

[CHRISTOPHE:]   No problem. Christophe, DNS Belgium.

KATRIN OHLMER: Okay. You're second, and then Donald.

DIETMAR LENDEN: Hi. I would definitely suggest that this message is brought to the DNS abuse group, because a GeoTLD is a good reflection of validated or restricted TLDs, and shows the advantages of being a restricted or validated TLD. That's an important message to put across, that in the next round, that restricted and validated TLDs should be encouraged, as opposed to being dis-encouraged, or not allowed, or pushed back on.

So, I think it's definitely worthwhile, pushing forward the message that from a GeoTLD perspective, DNS abuse is lower—maybe not necessarily—as Roland mentioned, maybe not necessarily talk about the numbers, because numbers can always be skewed, and people can view them in a very odd way, but just to say the message is we are clean.

We are generally a clean environment, compared to maybe an open TLD—not to say open TLDs are bad. Don't get me wrong. I'm just saying that in comparison to an open TLD, a closed, restricted, or validated TLD is a better option. So, I think it's definitely worthwhile being engaged in the conversation and bringing forward you experience and expertise in that as well.

KATRIN OHLMER: Thank you.

[CHRISTOPHE]: First of all, I would like to suggest to rename it—not call it DNS abuse— because DNS abuse is about abusing the DNS system or the DNS infrastructure. You will get comments about that, I'm pretty sure. This

is about a [fraudlous] usage of domain names, and that's also what DAAR tries to monitor.

The big issue we have with DAAR—as you probably know, we also run .be, so a CC—is the complete lack of transparency. We know some of the sources, but there is no detail, or it's not drilled to the detail, whereas there is a difference between spam, malware, and CnCs. So, we have a lot of numbers there, and they are very hard to interpret, and also to match on your own abuse figures. So, that's what I wanted to point out to you.

KATRIN OHLMER: Thank you.

RONALD GEENS: Just to echo what Dietmar and Marianne said, in full accordance, we should raise our voice. We could probably say only three of our members have more than 10—call it abuse cases, or fraud issues of the DNS infrastructure, which will give another message. All but three members don't have more or less any cases. Don't give the details, but say, "We are very, very, very low in this kind of things, and we did a survey, and we have some additional data."

The other things, Marianne, that you said—it isn't an issue for us—could go into the reverse direction. So, why do you care of have additional contractual obligations if it's not an issue for you? Someone could interpret it that way, also. If you don't have the cases, it doesn't matter what's written—which obligations you will get into the contract in

future. I would like to have no additional obligations in the contract, to be very clear. Saying we don't have any cases could put in a situation, "So why do you then raise your voice? If you don't have any cases, then it doesn't matter what you have in your contract." I've heard people saying that.

KATRIN OHLMER: Thank you. Just one brief comment on the language thingy. Why did we name it that way? We pretty much stick to the Spec 11 (3)(b) wording, so just to avoid any confusion with the broader audience, who's not really involved in the abuse topics at all, that's been the decision at that time. On the other-hand side, of course, I think we do all agree that we don't want any further activities or implications on our contracts, but of course, I think that's not in our remit to make that decision.

While, of course, we could say, "Listen, there are only two or three cases, so I don't bother at all," it might well be that some form of systems or whatever—contractual obligations which do very well affect us in terms of reaction time or whatever—I'm just thinking out of my head—would affect us, even in terms of, on the business side. So, I think it doesn't do us any harm to talk about that. And I like the idea to say that we only have three members with more than 10 cases. This is a nice framing. Maxim?

MAXIM ALZOBA: Actually, speaking about DAAR, ICANN also confirmed they don't check what goes in. Also, all kinds of false positives, including the domains

which have no records. Basically, it cannot be used anyhow, and it circles in ghost state, via different RBLs. Basically, it's not a reliable thing.

Also, the sum of the sources use crowdsourcing. For example, we had a case where five guys' accounts activated in different time, but they sent at the same time message that our nic.tld was a fraud source. So, what should we do? Should we just down our .nic site? Most probably not. The thing is, I would recommend from PR perspective to say that despite the quite high number of registrations counted in thousands and tens of the thousands, we have an extremely low number of cases, which could be counted on fingers. Instead of saying, "Yes, we have some issues …" No. We don't. We almost don't have it.

Also, speaking about restricted ones, we need to send the message, I think, to say, "If you are talking about restricted TLDs, let's assume it a ccTLD. Do we really want all citizens to bring out passports or IDs? It's the only way to restrict. Do we want these kind of things in the TLDs?" Most probably, law enforcement will say yes, but the probability of registrations will fall significantly. Thanks.

KATRIN OHLMER: Thanks, Maxim. I'm fully with you on the DAAR stuff, but thankfully it's a different working group we are also having fun in. I think we're well-advised not to refer to the DAAR stuff, because really, the figures are so different, at some point of time, to the ones we determine in our reports. Further comments? Questions?

DIRK KRISCHENOWSKI: We have collected almost the document—arguments that you were bringing forward. It's a question of where we bring this to attention or how we bring it to attention to the ICANN community. Should some one of us go for the next session, and on the open microphone present these figures with the arguments heard as a short summary of that? Could be something I would love to see. Or should we write a summary, and publish this, and send this to the relevant stakeholders within ICANN in the next week or so? That would be another thing.

I heard that we shouldn't be ashamed about the numbers—that we should say, "Yes, we do monitoring. You see how good the GeoTLDs, which have public interest obligations and so on, and probably a higher price—how this works out. Yes, we have abuse, but we are well aware, and we do manage this." Manage is not in the obligations, so we don't …

KATRIN OHLMER: Monitor.

DIRK KRISCHENOWSKI: Monitor is in the obligations, so that's important not to say "manage." What is your opinion about this?

RONALD GEENS: I would do both. I would go tell and do a publication, wherever we can get room for that—not only on our website, but writing it to other

communities. Publish it on, I don't know, Domain Insider—wherever we can get it.

KATRIN OHLMER: So, how about CircleID? This would be the outlet where we could … Do we still work with Maria Farrell?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Whenever we ask.

KATRIN OHLMER: Yeah? She could do a short and sweet update with some findings, and then we publish that on CircleID. So, we could probably then, as a compromise announce—or if we talk with people here—announce that we did some research on that, and we will publish some further findings on that in the next forthcoming whatever days, weeks—however Maria would be available for doing such an article. Does the ExCom take care of that, or who speaks then with Maria? If you need further data from me, just let me know.

DIRK KRISCHENOWSKI: Further comments on the proposal to … Okay, then some one of us will stand up in the forum and talk about our … No, we said, both, I think.

KATRIN OHLMER: I think nobody opposed to we talk with people—with stakeholders—while we meet them, but we don't go public with this announcement right now.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: We are.

KATRIN OHLMER: We are? Yeah, okay.

RONALD GEENS: Sorry. At least my personal opinion was going there and tell that we have done a survey, there is very little abuse in our trust at the TLDs, however you name it—the arguments that we had here. And you can announce there will be a detailed information about that in CircleID or whatever, in the upcoming days, weeks—something like this.

KATRIN OHLMER: Okay, got it.

DIRK KRISCHENOWSKI: So, everybody's fine with it? Okay, wonderful, good. We have some minutes left, and there are some slides left also in our presentation. They come in an unsorted way. The next topic we had not discussed were the premium names. We're putting some sources together where you can find prices and get daily, or weekly, or monthly, or even yearly reports about which domain names, especially in the new gTLD have

been sold, and for which price, and by which provider—if it was a private sale, or other sales as well—the resources.

Then, we had in the premium names, the next slide, please. We in Berlin were doing a trial, where we will have in the next few days the results. We're putting all three- and four-letter domain names into the EPP Premium space, which means be available at the registrar level for $90 for the three-letter and $60 for the four-letter, with a nominal renewal fee of €30. We have done that a half year, and we will look if this is more valuable than letting them free-float in the market. So, that might be an interesting thing, how that low-level premium names could maybe benefit your sales, or maybe not. We will see it and publish this for the next GeoTLD meeting.

The next slide is … These are some slides we collected here. Donuts has yesterday started with selling 1.1 million domain names for much, much lower price—up to 90% cheaper than before. I haven't seen any articles how that was perceived, but it's an interesting thing, where even Donuts sees that the high-price strategy, especially this high, high strategy—$500 ones, and yearly—might not work out at the end of the day, and going back to that lower price, or one high price and then the nominal renewal price. So, that might be an interesting experiment they are doing there, and we will probably see the figures there. Any comments on premium topics? Okay.

Then, we had some … Okay, one topic in general, in all meetings— working with ccTLDs and governments. Anything in this field you would like to report or share with the community? Nacho, please.

NACHO AMADOZ: For .cat, there was an announced by the government a month ago that .cat would be the official domain name of the public administration so to speak. This is part of an agreement that we established with them, way back some months earlier, where we wanted to engage them to promote .cat. Everything was good, and all the intentions are there, but I don't think that they are going to push it much further than that. Our aim here is to get .cat to be part of the requirements of public tenders. So, any company that is applying for a public contract should do so running on a .cat domain at least.

We don't know if we'll get there, but I don't think this is not possible. This might be possible. Of course, .cat is not only for Catalan government and Catalonia. This is also for every place where Catalan is spoken, Catalan is official. But it is the first. We also had some engagement with the government of the Balearic Islands, but we are not seeing much progress there. They are using .cat, but they are not going to go as far as the Catalan government has done.

RONALD GEENS: Clarification question … So, if there is a road construction, and I have a company doing road construction, I would have to have a .cat domain, and not allowed to use my .com or whatever, if I wanted to participate in this tender? Wouldn't this be disadvantaging to other European, or even within Spain company?

NACHO AMADOZ: You can have any. As of today, this is not a requirement. We are pushing for this to be a requirement. You can have any, but if you have a .cat, and you're conducting business under your .cat, this might be a premium in the elicitation. This is what we are pushing for. It's a scheme that probably is not so far from what some ccTLDs see happening. In some regulated industries, you have to have your operations under that ccTLD. For example, in gaming in Spain, you have to do that under a .es. So, we are trying to align ourselves in that direction.

DIRK KRISCHENOWSKI: Two comments. So, the Balearic Islands might want to have Mallorca— dot Mallorca, then?

NACHO AMADOZ: They have .cat. They're using .cat. But that might happen. I don't think that's a possibility.

DIRK KRISCHENOWSKI: And then to long-term plans, if the Catalans get their own European state, will .cat become the ccTLD, then?

NACHO AMADOZ: You really want me to go jail when I get back home, right?

DIRK KRISCHENOWSKI: No, certainly not. Could we have the next slide? That is a short summary, now. In Santiago de Compostela, the offsite meeting, we had

a presentation and discussion about domain name threats, which come to our industry. I'd like to share, in a few slides, what we have done and discussed there. Could we have the next slide, please?

First of all, there are quite a number of older and newer studies here, from 2019 and 2018, which are looking into how our ecosystem and domain names are developing here—especially that paper from CENTR from its 20th anniversary. It was interesting, because there were two predictions, and I think this paper wasn't published on first of April, so I take it a bit more serious. The first one was the DNS becomes irrelevant. There was a topic at our GeoTLD meeting as well, in Santiago.

The second one, ICANN becomes irrelevant due to the takeover by DoH. I would say CENTR wouldn't write this is if there isn't a true core in this topic. Some arguments I have put together on the next slide, which go in this direction—why, what could happen.

Yesterday in … Which session was it? Was it abuse? In one of the sessions, I said one of the biggest threats is our homemade mess by registrars, registries, and ICANN. What we are doing, that starts with ICANN rules, which are incredibly complicated, and not understandable by end consumers … End consumers might understand, let's say, food regulations, or car regulations, or whatever normal regulations. But in this case, they don't understand consensus policies, transfer things. And these are all things, coming from the consensus policies, and also operational things.

Then, we have the registrars and the registries, and us included in Berlin and Hamburg, with the different strategies—how to sell premium

EN

domain names with EPP, and then by an own shop. Some are sold by Zedo, or Afternic, or other portals, so they don't understand this concept. Some things like domain creates or transfers seem to be incredibly complicated for some end customers as well.

So, there are a lot of things which make domain names—I wouldn't say unattractive, but hard to get, hard to maintain. And so, we are not the beloved product we should have, and instead, consumers are going to that second, third point—are going to website builders, where they easily get their third-level domain name in the first instance, and setting up a website very quickly. I think the website builder thing was a big opportunity the registrars completely missed in the last decade.

That was made by WordPress. They start to integrate WordPress since the years, but the website builders our industry had were really not good. So, we see that rise of Wix, and Foursquare, and so many others, which have nowadays more websites built by these third-level domain names than domain names. We have 351 million domain names, and we have more pages with all these website builders. So, that's quite interesting.

Social media profile names—long-term story in this. I see also, especially from the speech internet, that domain names are disappearing—disappearing from the view at the consumer, because we see … Google has had some numbers recently, saying that they have 30% of the searches already with speech internet, if it's on the browser, or it's on their Google home box.

We also have the growing mobile usage, where our domain names are rarely seen, meanwhile. The browser providers are looking forward how to give the consumer most trust, or trust anchor, and domain names might be not the solution on that. We don't know what is goes to.

Then, we have the topic of DoH—domains without ICANN, that has gone really prevalent. I'm not an expert in this, but there are a lot things— even lawsuits underway—in this thing. Then, the domain name abuse and government regulations, which might go hand-in-hand here, especially in the European Union.

We have alternative global networks, like the Loon network, or the Facebook.org networks, which are independent balloons or planes, providing internet access by different protocols, which have then an interface to the rest of the DNS.

And we have Google search—maybe the next slide. Google has implemented that mobile first index. That means you build better as a mobile version, or absolutely mobile-compatible, responsive one. Google is also looking into how to replace URLs. Doesn't mean domain names exactly, but how to bring large URLs to maybe a shorter form. There might a chance to have a domain name, the second level and the top level, as anchor for them.

One slide more … Yeah. One new feature at Google was recently brought up. It's not yet in Europe, but the voice chat on the laptop has become with a small microphone. It's there, finally.

The last page here on this short topic is a positive thing, where Google says it wants to have more unique domains in the first search engine result pages. Sometimes, you look for something, and the first page is just domain names from one provider or search results, and they now say, "If you have different kinds of thing to tell, or different parts of the company, use an own domain name that gives you a better ranking." This is, in general, good, and especially good for new top-level domain names, because they have precise, self-speaking explaining domain names.

These were some observations and things from that industry which will affect us in the next coming years. And I will be happy to get some response from you on these topic—what you see in this field.

Okay. I think, then, if we don't have any other topics which you might raise now … Any other things we should discuss, or you want to present or tell the audience? Okay. Then we would be done for today. The ExCom is preparing some sentences for the abuse session, which starts in 15 minutes, and we will see each other there. Thank you very much for the three sessions' attendance here, and all your input on this. Thank you very much, and I'm closing now the GeoTLD session.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]