
ICANN78 | AGM – GNSO RySG GeoTLD Group Membership Session
Sunday, October 22, 2023 – 3:00 to 4:00 HAM

SUE SCHULER: Hello, and welcome to the GeoTLD group membership session. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN expected standards of behavior. During this session, questions or comments submitted in chat will only be read aloud if put in the proper form as noted in the chat. Questions and comments will be read aloud during the time set by the chair or moderator of this session. If you would like to ask your question or make your comment verbally, please raise your hand. When called upon, kindly unmute your microphone and take the floor. Please state your name for the record and speak clearly at a reasonable pace. Mute your microphone when you're done speaking. To view the real-time transcription, click on the closed caption button in the Zoom toolbar. To ensure transparency of participation in ICANN's multi-stakeholder model, we ask that you sign into the Zoom sessions using your full name. For example, a first name and last name or surname. You may be removed from the session if you do not sign in using your full name. With that, I will hand the floor over to Nacho Amadoz.

NACHO AMADOZ: Thank you very much, Sue. This is Nacho Amadoz, chairman of the GeoTLD group. Joined here by the fellow ex-com members, Josu Walino vice-chair, and [inaudible], treasurer. We usually do family sessions

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

when we are at ICANN, so we adopted the format to be even more familiar. So at any time, please come join us and be closer to us.

The session today is something that we've been considering for some time. We've had different approaches, and we are very lucky to have the participation of Peter, Rowena, and [inaudible]. We'll present them formally, and the presentation that they are giving is going to be presented formally by Josu. But we were considering how are we represented in the different studies or methodologies that the industry has for GeoTLDs. And we tried to think about why does it matter, because we think it matters. And it matters in terms of representation and in terms of acknowledging of the personality of the different members of the group, how this is determined by what we had to present in our applications. And there is an obvious thing that it is that not every one of us in the GeoTLD group is a Geo by ICANN definitions. So how can we work with that, and how are others working with that, and how are we seeing how this is something that may impact the group when we consider what we need to look for when we are considering whatever, statistics of use, abuse, and so on. So we came up with this round table format to compare the different methodologies to count GeoTLDs.

I'm just going to be doing a very, very quick recap of what the GeoTLD group has been doing this year before giving the floor to Josu to make the formal introduction of the session and of the members. We've had two main activities this year. The UA Day that we had in Cologne back in May, April, April, and the GA that we had in September. That's right, sorry, because I'm not at my best shape at the moment. Also in Cologne, why we did that in Cologne? Because we were collaborating with ECO,

and ECO was very generous to allow us to cooperate with them on the Road to Hamburg program, so that we would be focusing our efforts in building up momentum for the 25th anniversary of ICANN, which is happening now. And we had very good attendance in the GA. The UA didn't have that much of attendance, but we were really killed by circumstances, but it was a very good workshop. UA is a topic that is not so easy to get to the audience at large, but we think we have to keep working with that, and in that light we are still working with the ICANN staff to see how we can create the UA chapter or the regional local chapter, so that we can pursue efforts there and help others technically and from a policy perspective.

The GA was also an experiment this year, because we extended the session to one day and a half, trying to copy what we've learned during central meetings in the past, to get registrars to come and mingle with us, and also to get to the local public in which we were also partly successful, because we had people attending that were not only registrars. And with that, again, thanks to ECO for giving us the support. With that, I'll turn it over to you, Josu, so that you can... And you are now officially the interim boss.

JOSU WALINO:

Okay. Thank you, Nacho. Thank you, everyone. We decided to organize a roundtable, and I didn't expect to take this so literally, but thank you, thank you. I feel a bit like in a wedding, but something to drink and let's dance, but okay, it's a new format for us today. Anyway, as Nacho said, when we were discussing this session for today, we wanted to discuss together how the GeoTLDs are being represented in different

dashboards, different reports, how we understand GeoTLDs as the GeoTLD group, how we define it, and how ICANN does at the same time. So we were discussing that it will be interesting just to share different reports where GeoTLDs are represented, to see how they are being represented and how the definitions fit in these reports. Even because when we talk in our meetings, when we do our own reports, we have problems to share information because sometimes, as Nacho said before, in the GeoTLD group, we have proper geographic TLDs, we have community, as in our case, .us, we are a community TLD, but very geographically represented. We have different kinds of TLDs which are conforming this group, so it's not easy to have different reports in these representations. So today, for that, we are having... Thanks for being here. We are having DOTZON, Katrin, Dirk presenting how they do it in their city studies, Rowena presenting the DNS Abuse Institute, how they look at the GeoTLDs, and Peter from CENTR presenting their study as well.

Before giving you the floor, just a couple of examples. You all received the VeriSign study. For me, it's very curious to see that, for example, Verisign, when they report about geographical TLDs, they are talking about ccTLDs as well as GeoTLDs properly. They combine everything. This is an example of a way to look at the GeoTLDs. Another one. Next slide, please, if you can.

Another one is, I don't know if you already had a look at the ICANN. I don't remember the name. It's something in the ICANN domain named marketplace indicators. If you see, the geographical TLDs are represented there. They show different categories. I represented the geographic TLDs, the legacy TLDs, ccTLDs, and so on. But when you look

closer at the geographical TLDs here, next slide, please, in the definition, they are talking that geographical TLDs, they are the gTLDs qualified, as Nacho said before, as geographic in the ICANN direct classification.

Looking at different definitions, you can see that the ICANN wiki is broader. For example, for the ICANN wiki, GeoTLD is a top-level domain in category created by ICANN, the geographical, geopolitical, ethnic, social, cultural. They are much broader than only the city or the geographic definition there. And if you look at our definition, the GeoTLD group, it's even broader because we talk about a geographic place, language, culture, and there are examples, geographic names like Barcelona, Berlin, Vienna, or South Africa. We could look at .nyc or more related to the regions. We have, all examples are here, [inaudible]. So, we think that this is an issue that we should tackle, we should discuss about it and try to reach an agreement when different reports are talking about geographical TLDs to have the same view on what we intend to say. So, said that, I think that I talked enough.

NACHO AMADOZ:

I just wanted to make an addition, having the benefit of listening to you describe the issue, which is we of course don't want to change what was stated in the guidebook that many years ago, 12 years ago, and it played a role that we understand and we are not doing this as to say that it was wrong or that it created any difficulty because it didn't. But it played a concrete role which is whenever a geographic term as defined by, I can't remember if it was an internal definition or to reference to any other list external to that, needs the support or the non-objection from the

relevant government. And that is understandable and that is convenient. But now the real day-to-day life of what we do is different in the sense that the same group that aims at gathering all the TLDs that are somehow playing a similar role to the communities where they are geographically concentrated even though they are not specifically defined by geographical boundaries because we in most cases don't have requirements of domicile or we are not bound by a concrete geographic area. But we have a certain vocation of representing communities that are in a certain territory beyond that but in a certain territory. So that is what we think we should be discussing. We are also discussing before the session we don't have any concrete outcome that we want to push for what we have is the necessity to have this conversation with the people that in the industry are looking at how the DNS space is organized and then see what we reach as a conclusion if we can reach any conclusion. What is the outcome of this exchange and what should we do moving along?

ROWENA SCHOO:

Hi everyone, I'm Rowena Schoo, I'm from the DNS Abuse Institute. We were created by Public Interest Registry and the aim of creating the institute is really to have us working across the entire ecosystem to help people in registries and registrars deal with this really complex issue. We also operate a bit outside of ICANN as well in recognition that everybody who can participate to solving this problem might not be in the ICANN sphere. If I could go to the next slide please.

So these slides are quite long so I probably won't go into the details of all of them. I'll just give you some signposting where you can find more

information. So I've kind of already talked about this but just briefly when we talk about DNS abuse we tend to use the term defined to technical abuse. So phishing, farming, malware, botnets and spam when used as a delivery mechanism. And next slide.

So in terms of the things that we measure we have a project called Compass and the aim of this is really to measure phishing and malware across the entire ecosystem. Next slide please.

We do that both to inform our own activities in terms of writing best practices and educating people, also understanding whether our efforts are making a difference. But we also do that to empower registries and registrars with their own data. So we have a few principles for the project which were transparency, credibility and independence, accuracy and reliability. Next slide.

So to achieve those we created a partnership with an external academic called Maciej Korczynski. He operates Core Labs which is kind of like a spin-off from Grenoble University and he's responsible for doing all the technical analysis for the project. That information then flows into the data team at Public Interest Registry and we package it all up into Tableau and we use that to publish reports every month. And we also have got to a stage just this week where we're able to give individualized reports to TLDs and registrars, so be really excited if people want to come and see their own dashboards. I've got some examples of that coming up as well. So maybe skip to the next slide.

Yeah, so we do public reporting and we have private stuff. So we also do some bespoke analysis based on whether people are interested in that. And I guess this is kind of where it touches on how we define a GeoTLD

or whether we do or do not. In terms of our public reporting, we don't specifically call out GeoTLDs. We do report on TLDs and we split them into just ccTLDs and gTLDs. In terms of the data that we have underneath that, we have individualized data for every TLD that has been delegated. What we do occasionally is we create a report about abuse in a specific group based on interest. So, for example, we've done presentations to CENTR and I'm doing the presentation here today. And the way that we define that group is by asking the people that are interested what their definition is. So for Geos, as far as I'm concerned, if you want to understand the abuse perspective from GeoTLDs, then I ask you who are GeoTLDs, you tell me and then I create a bespoke report. It's really for us about creating something that's of interest and is useful to the community that is asking for us to support them. So that's what I'm going to show you a little bit of today. Next slide, please.

And this is just to say from a high level, we don't capture all the harm on the Internet. We're specifically focused on measuring unique domain names and we're specifically focused in on phishing and malware for this project. So we don't have botnet spam, we just have phishing and malware. And the reason for that was really around the brief that we gave to Maciej to measure as accurately, as reliably, as consistently as he could. And the place that he said that we needed to start was phishing and malware. So that's why we focus there. And the other thing to note is we can only measure what we can find. So there's going to always be a portion of abuse that we don't see, that no one sees. And specifically with this project, we have optimized for accuracy over coverage. So we're trying to measure a specific portion really reliably

and consistently to allow to make comparisons across the ecosystem and over time. Next slide.

This is a very busy slide, but it's trying to give a high level about methodology to explain how we get to the numbers. I'll just go through it really briefly, but it's mainly to signpost that we have a public methodology, which is linked there. I'm happy for the slides to be shared. So we essentially take the starting point of reputation block lists. We use four of them. We then refine them by deduplicating and cleaning them. And we remove something that we call special domains. So those are domains that it would be inappropriate to act at the DNS level. So URL shorteners, subdomain providers or filing sharing services. Then Core Labs do a number of analysis processes where they take a fingerprint of the domain name. They make an estimate of whether—They do an analysis of whether the domain has been registered maliciously for the purpose of phishing and malware, or whether it looks like it's a domain associated with a website that has become compromised. We also check whether the domain is still active. So we get a sense of whether mitigation has occurred. And then we summarize this into the reports that we produce. Next slide.

So GeoTLDs. Like I said, I basically took the list from this group, and then I pulled off some information for these members to give you a sense of what we see in terms of abuse in this community. Next slide.

A few little caveats. All abuse measurement is not perfect, it's always going to be best efforts. We use publicly available data. So the size of the zone may be a little bit low. It's usually low for most people. It tends to be a bit lower for ccTLDs. One thing we struggle with with small TLDs

is just small numbers. You know, I mentioned that none of these measurement efforts are perfect. False positives are a constant issue that we try to guard against. We do a bunch of things to try to minimize the impact of that. But those things become more difficult when you're looking at quite a small volume. So even if you've only got one false positive in a small TLD, that can have a big impact. So one of the things we do in our public reporting is we redact. Sorry, we do a number of exclusions if you don't meet a minimum requirement of abusive domain names per month. So many of the GeoTLDs would be excluded from that and put in an appendix because their numbers are quite low. And we're trying to guard against false positives. And then finally, probably a bit particularly relevant for this group is we have sort of a suspicion that the source lists might be biased towards particular geographies or particular languages. So it might be that there is abuse in your region or your area that we're not picking up because these lists tend to be English language focused and sort of curated by Americans or Europeans, those kind of geographical areas. So from speaking to registries and registrars, sometimes we hear that actually a lot of their localized abuse in their local language is just not seen in these types of lists. Next slide.

So this is a list. I've redacted all the names, but this is all the GeoTLDs that I had with a number of unique domains identified as phishing or malware by our methodology in August. And so it might be a bit difficult to read, but the top one is 11 and then it goes down to 7542111 and then like lots of zeros. So the short kind of take home message is that in terms of absolute volume, there's not a huge amount of volume that our methodology is picking up in the GeoTLD community. Next slide.

When we have a look at what type of abuse that is, it was basically all phishing with like one malware domain. Next slide. So this is a comparison that I do for these bespoke reports where I'll take the group that we're looking at, in this case the GeoTLDs, and I'll compare them against all other TLDs over a certain volume. In this chart, we're looking at all other TLDs with more than 100,000 domains under management. As you can see, there is maybe not a lot to be gained from this analysis due to the really low numbers. And so I've tried to identify that on the chart. The blue lines are the GeoTLDs, but the numbers are kind of all 10 and below. So it becomes quite difficult to compare. So that's a real challenge that we have when trying to analyze this community because of the small numbers. Next slide, please.

So yeah, what do we make of this? You tend to have quite low numbers of abuse, which is a good thing. You have low raw numbers, and that generally translates to low numbers of abuse per 100,000 domains under management as well. We are constantly trying to improve this project, and we do have dashboards available for all TLDs, so we would love to talk to you. If you come and chat to us, we can show you that and we can give you a login so that you can access that information. It's all free. Everything we do is free. We're very kindly funded by Public Interest Registry, so I'm not here asking for money. We're just trying to help people and provide information that they find useful and helpful to make the Internet a better place. I think that's my last slide. Maybe not. Maybe next slide. This is just an example of what the dashboards look like. So this is the .org one. So when you get a login, you can see your own abuse numbers and abuse per 100,000 domains under management, and you can have a comparison to other TLDs. This will

just be all TLDs in one group, and the ones that we put on the chart will be peers in the sense of just domains under management. So you'll get 20 peers, 10 will be above, and 10 will be below in terms of size. I'm conscious that maybe you want there to be a geo group in the future, and maybe that's something we can look at. That this is basically version one of our dashboards that we're making available, so we're still kind of incrementing our way there and talking to different groups about what's best for them. Okay. Next slide. Just another example of the dashboards. And then final slide. Thank you. I'm very happy to be contacted and have a chat or answer any questions.

Okay, so the question is, is there any actionable info in the reports, or is it just statistics? So we have another project called NetBeacon, and NetBeacon is about reporting abuse and routing that through to registrars. We do push some of the domain names that are found through the Compass Research Project into NetBeacon, and then that sends them to registrars. We tend to see registrars as the pointier end of abuse reports, so they go to the registrar first. But we do also have a functionality now to, I don't know if any of the geos are ccTLDs, there might be. At the moment NetBeacon sends reports to registrars for the gTLD registrars. If you're a ccTLD, we're also now onboarding ccTLDs basically as an intermediary. They take the reports for their ccTLD, and then they distribute them to registrars. So the short answer to the question is, it's not in Compass, but we send it from Compass through NetBeacon to be actioned by a registrar. And we can also provide you with the underlying domains if you'd like to see them for your TLD. Any other questions?

JOSU WALINO: The only comment I had was the one you said already, that if we had these dashboards, for me, for example, looking from our perspective, the interesting part would be to compare to our peers within similar TLDs, which are GeoTLDs or community TLDs, more than similar sized TLDs, because otherwise I'm being compared to, I don't know, .bank or I don't know which one, but because it has a similar size, I'd prefer to be compared to [inaudible] or this kind. So if that's an option, that would be for sure interesting.

ROWENA SCHOO: Yeah. I mean, I don't know. I'd love for us to get to that point, and maybe if it was like you could select compare against other GeoTLDs or compare against ccTLDs or compare about, you know, have like some options where you could choose. I think that would be really cool. We'd love to do that. I'll put it on the long list.

[RONALD:] So if I got your message right, we are small, but we are the good ones.

ROWENA SCHOO: Basically, yeah.

[RONALD:] We could use this for, let's say, marketing purposes. We have very, very little abuse in total number and in percentage. Out of whatever reasons, we are doing the management better or we have cultural or language issues that we are not that much attacked by the English-speaking community or whatever it is. But going to our administration, to our city

owners or whatever, we can say, hey, we have a proof of, let's say, statistics that we are doing better than, let's say, the median of the others, which is very, very positive. If I go to my Viennese government, telling them we have just got the renewal of our registry agreement, so there is a meeting with them, telling them, and then say, hey, we have statistics, and they prove that we are doing very, very well in kind of taking care of abuse and something. We could use the data that you provided for, at least it is an indication that we are doing better than the rest.

ROWENA SCHOO:

Yeah, absolutely. So, of course, all those caveats I gave at the start. But what we can give you in terms of your dashboard, probably for the majority of you, your dashboard will be blank for most months, like it will say, zero abuse. And we designed the dashboards in a way that would allow you to share that with your governments or your regulators or the people that are interested to know that you are doing well. So you can download a PDF and you can say, look, this is our August dashboard report from the Compass project that measures across the whole ecosystem. Here is their methodology. It is public. You can read it. They found no abuse in our GeoTLD for this month. Or low numbers for some. And then you will see that they have been mitigated and you can dig into that and you can see a comparison against peers.

JOSU WALINO:

Speaking as an ex-com member, we can say it as a group. So we can say the Geos in general are the better place to be. Cool marketing. Thanks.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I have more of a comment than a question, actually. There is a known correlation between low pricing and DNS abuse. And one thing that I usually notice in the GeoTLD community is a community of TLDs that seldom uses aggressive promotions to sell domains. That possibly has something to do with finding very low abuse in GeoTLDs, besides other cultural and linguistic factors.

ROWENA SCHOO: So if people are unaware, ICANN is actually running a study called Infernal, where they are looking at some of these factors around pricing and all sorts of other things that might contribute to abuse. So that would be quite interesting as one to look out for as well. Thank you.

PETER VAN ROSTE: I'm the General Manager of CENTR, and CENTR is the awkward acronym for Council of European National Top Level Domain Registries, which means that we are focusing on European ccTLDs, and these are our full members. In addition, we have a category of associate members, of which .cat is one. It's a category of membership that's open to everyone. If interested, talk to me. So for the sales pitch, the reason why Nacho asked me to come and talk to you was that sometimes CENTR in our reports, we do refer to the group of GeoTLDs as opposed to ccTLDs, two-letter codes, gTLDs, three or more, which are not GeoTLDs. But GeoTLDs is indeed, it's not specified. And it never occurred to me that it was a problem. And if we consider the problem, it's probably the easiest one to solve because like Rowena, we would be very happy to take on any

definition that the GeoTLD group provides. How are we currently doing it? It's a curated list. At the moment of the launch, we looked at the new strings. And Patrick keeps a list of GeoTLDs as a specific group because we strongly believe that you are indeed quite different from the rest of the gTLDs that were launched in 2014. Different properties, different audiences, much more aligned to ccTLD values. So hence a good reason for us to indeed look at that group as such. We don't report often nor very specific on GeoTLDs, but sometimes they do appear in our global stats reports.

So one of the things that I had prepared, I don't know, oh yes, my presentation is up. Yeah, please go to the next slide and then the next list, please. Yeah, so this, okay, thank you. So one of the questions that was in Nacho's email was where do you get your, what is your source material? What is the methodology in which you rely on to present those central stats?

There's two different aspects. First of all, the members, the full members, the ccTLDs, they typically do provide us with a JSON file that is retrieved regularly. It's a fully automated process on their end and on our end. And for gTLDs, we get those numbers from ICANN. So ccTLDs, full members, JSON, automated, and then there is the ICANN part.

When it comes to market share, the JSON file from the members also contains data points that will help us with building those data sets. And for ICANN, we work together with [inaudible], who is providing us with estimated ratios for the gTLDs.

We do two additional things as well. The domain name usage, we have a sign of life crawler, which counts all contributing central members, 17

at the moment, who consistently give us a large sample, I think at the moment it's 50,000 names, of their zone. What that crawler does is to check basic stuff. Is the page parked? Is there rich content on it? Does it have MX servers? So the report that follows from it also shows us that ccTLDs and gTLDs are structurally different beasts. And from the little information that I got from Patrick just in preparation for this session, is that gTLDs are much more closer to ccTLDs in that respect than to the rest of the gTLDs.

And then the final thing, the final data sets that we collect, and this is a manual process, this pricing, where we collect pricing for 20 ccTLDs plus .com, if there would be interest from some members of this group, we'd definitely be interested to take that on board and add a few of the members to what we see and observe around the world when it comes to resale pricing, and to see if that makes sense to try that out as an example.

So this is the source of the data that we have, I explained a bit how we are presenting it. If there would be an interest from this group, then we'd definitely be interested to talk about creating dashboards, whether they are public or only for members of this group. I know my data scientists will be really annoyed with me if I promise you secure token-based access, but we can find a way around that. So this is the first proposal. If there would be an interest to have data dashboards on these different data points that I just mentioned for gTLDs, then that's definitely something that we could discuss.

The same for the crawler. If anybody would be interested to get a more in-depth look into their signs of life and data, the essence there is that

we need very stable data for that. So have to agree with Patrick what the sample would look like and how and on what basis to transfer this.

And then maybe a final point is on the market share. I think what we do is market share for European ccTLDs on a national basis. I think it wouldn't make too much sense for GeoTLDs to have those numbers, although we're, again, happy to see if there would be an interest or if anybody of you wants to volunteer to share those numbers and see if we can get anything useful out of this.

As a last point, maybe one of the strategic priorities for next year, they still have to be approved by the CENTR General Assembly, which is that CENTR aims to move from data to insights. So now for the last 15 years we've done a reasonable job of providing our community in particular and a broader world with stats and data about European ccTLDs. But what they basically show is that there was an increase in registrations during COVID and then a year later it went down a bit and now it's flatlining. What we typically don't often do is to dive into the reasons why those things are happening. And so with broader participation for obviously ccTLDs, but maybe also from some European GeoTLDs into identifying what is worth researching and then providing the datasets that could help us do so would be enormously welcome. And that's it for me. Are there any questions? I don't have Zoom room in front of me. Okay, looks we're all good. Unfortunately I'll have to leave in a few minutes, but thank you so much for the opportunity to share this.

JOSU WALINO:

Thank you very much. No questions, no comments. So let's give the floor now to our last speaker, Dirk from DOTZON.

DIRK KRISCHENOWSKI: Yeah, thank you for inviting me to present some data on the studies we are performing for quite a number of years. I've held this presentation in Cologne a couple of weeks ago and we had a lot of discussions and good ideas what to improve in these studies. And yeah, I start with a short promotional thing. So probably everybody heard about Dodson, our consultancy, which has been founded in 2005. And the services are the usual services like other entities also bringing forward. And here's our customer base, which is quite not the hundreds, but we have consulted over 30 applications in the last round. Very successful, this one. Oh, okay. So you might switch to one or three slides to the customer slide then.

And yeah, the most important slide is the next one. We are doing studies and white papers for quite a long time, including brand TLD studies, city TLD studies, because this group is really clearly defined or much more defined as regional, continental, and other GeoTLDs, which have big differences to the cities. And we're doing transparency reports about also data requests and domain abuse. We do sustainability reports for a couple of years now, and that is very good to have that in place for the government you have, for instance. So please feel free to ask us how we do that sustainability report. Yeah, that was a promotional thing, and I'm starting now with the city brand thing on the next slide. Oh, the study is here. I have to say always next slide, please. Yeah, city, brand. Next slide, please.

So we are doing the studies since 2016 with constantly eight key performance indicators we thought that could be of value to have a

comparison of the city top level domain names, the 41 city top level domain names, and we are doing a top 10 ranking in this and bring up some theory about marketing the city and how that fits together with the digital brand of that city. We call it then the city brand study, and we have a lot of use cases in our studies. So I guess pretty much every city TLD, which is here on the table, as we mentioned was a case study and mentioning in that study here. So we do that ranking for all the years since 2017 where the first public study was made. And this year's city top level domain is Amsterdam. After a lot of years, Berlin, Tokyo, and New York were on the first places, and that was a big surprise, but they are doing really well in all the KPIs. Next slide, please.

In all the KPIs and the trends is upwards here in this case. You see quite how, let's say Paris has developed from place 16 in 2017 to place 7, so very good improvement how this works out here. But I wanted to come to the real data, how we collect the data, and what are the flaws in collecting the data as well, because we don't have exact data at the end of the day, and we take all data from publicly available resources so everybody can see where the data come from. Next slide, please.

So Amsterdam's ranking, that was based on a lot of websites at Google Amsterdam has, maybe due to university or hospitals or the government is using them on this, and they had 18 domains per 1,000 inhabitants, which is also not too bad. And despite a low gross national product, they had many domain names registered here, and the revenues were fine. So all over, that was the reasons why Amsterdam made place number one in all our KPIs. Next slide, please. And these are the individual rankings. You can see the KPIs at the x-axis, and at the y-axis you see the position of each of the top 10 TLDs here.

So the case studies with a lot of pictures of publicly visible domain names, and we are always happy if you have a good project, just send us a high resolution picture of whatever poster in the public or newspaper thing or advertising or so on comes on. Probably very good is also public projects by your government, and we bring them in this report. Next slide, please.

These are the pictures we then have in the study and a short description of nice projects, nice domain names we mentioned in the cities. And you probably better know what were good projects in the last year, and then you can send us a picture for that. That would be quite helpful. So next slide, please.

Yeah, key performance indicators. Next slide, please. Yeah, the first key performance indicator is the number of domain names. We get this from NTLD stats, and yeah, it's a nice indicator. Everybody asked for that indicator, how many domain names are registered with you? So that's the most common question here in ICANN, how do you do in terms of registrations? The higher the registrations, the higher the ranking, obviously, but, and these are the flaws or the notes I make here, it doesn't take into account promotions. The people, the operators are doing premium domains, which are registered just for the reason selling them, and they are blowing up the whole zone file. And city-owned domains, so in Hamburg, for instance, we have about 2,000 domain names which are registered for the government, and they will go forever. So there's 100% renewal on these domain names. So every city TLD has its different spectrum of activities, and we can't just follow the number here in this KPI. So next slide, please.

Then the domain price, and we had the discussion about the domain price with Peter here, and we get the domain prices from quite a number of registrars, which have, let's say, the wholesale price plus 10% plus 30%, and it's going through, so you can easily identify what's the wholesale price, and that's a basis for our calculation here. And it's then the revenues, which is a KPI. Next, oh, next slide. Next slide, next slide. Yeah, the revenue, and the flaws are here that price changes during the year are hard to cover because we have a certain date, a certain month where we collect all the data, and if there's a price change in the year, it's not reflected, and revenues from premium domain names are not publicly available, and I guess you don't want to send us all your premium sales revenues. That's a secret with a lot of city TLDs. And individual deals with city-owned domains, which are also not reflected in the domain name prices. But it's a key performance indicator, and we all need to have profits, otherwise we can't operate very well, that's obvious. So next slide, please.

Then we have the usage of a domain name. The best is if you have the website, on the website mentions the domain name, and even better is if you are using email too. We're looking for active domain names, and there's a lot of discussion around how to define active domain names because in all the countries we have different schemes for premium domain names and different provider, and there are hundreds of them, and very different from country to country. So this is a problem too. We would try to get covered with the most important second market, like [inaudible] and others, to find out what is the parking there, or from the registrars, the automatic parking they are doing, but it's not perfect. But

it's an indicator, and it has been relatively stable over the time. So next slide, please. The active domain names. And then the next slide again.

The next slide is number of websites listed in Google. Very easy site thing, and I choose the Rio example because I think the government is using .rio, and you have a lot of websites then mentioned there, even if you have less number of domain names, and that's a nice factor here. So that's Google listed domain names. On the next slide, please. Next slide. Yeah, that's the listing at ... I think that's Alexa, Alexa one million domain names list, and there's another list that's Majestic, one million most visited domain names in the world, and there are even more lists with this million factor, and for instance here in Paris, these are all the names with the rank in the one million, and Tour Eiffel is pretty good with rank 92,892, and this is one factor as well for ranking. So the more domain names you have here in these rankings from Alexa and Majestic, the better you perform with your TLD, or your TLD performs better. Yeah, the Majestic thing.

Then the KPI domains per citizen is one KPI. Next slide, please. Then we have a nice factor which is called GDP per citizen. So if there's a city which is not rich, but has a lot of domain name registration, so they might make something really good with their marketing or the perception by the people, so GDP per citizen is a nice factor which also brings poorer cities into a focus, and this is really nice. It's a little bit complicated to calculate, but it's a nice factor. Next slide, please.

Yeah, then the comparison between the ccTLD and the city TLD, like .US and .Miami is another factor which we calculate, and obviously in the US, Miami and Boston perform very good because in their city they have

a real standing here and often much more domain name registrations than .US, and that's interesting. So yeah, that was our study we are performing every year, and sometimes we are doing in between studies on other key performance indicators, and yeah, it's fun to do this and on a long range to see how city TLDs are really developing if you see the case of Paris in the parameters. Yeah, okay, that's it. Questions?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: On your first KPI, which is number of domain names, when you score a GeoTLD on that, does that factor have the same weighting as any of the other factors, or do you weight them differently?

DIRK KRISCHENOWSKI: No, we tried some weighting, but it's really hard to say what's the most important weighting. It's different from city to city. What is really important, some operators don't need to have high revenues or so, instead they love to see many pages in the language, and so we thought every factor is just one factor, and it's not weighted anyhow.

[ROWENA SCHOO:] As we're finishing up, I just wanted to make a quick offer in terms of the reports that we put out. I put this together for this group to present to you, but if there is interest in doing a geo-specific public report, and you wanted to share your data and put that together as one package, I'd be happy to work with you on that.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah, thank you. With that, that would be really good for also our government to see something like this.

JOSU WALINO: Yeah, I think that the proposal is really great. Thank you very much, Rowena. I think that we don't have more time. Yeah, we're out of time. Thank you very much. It was a thing that we reached what we wanted to have with this session. It was really interesting. Thank you to all the panelists, Rowena, Peter, and Dirk. And just to close, Nacho, you're the president. Please.

NACHO AMADOZ: I know. Yeah, but we are out of time. That was going to be very, very quick. Thank you again. And what we said at the beginning, we didn't have an expected outcome. We wanted to start talking to see where it could take us, and we are seeing that this is maybe some of the efforts that we have to put into our management plan for next year to see how we can work together, to see if that is of use to the members. So we'll be coming back to you to see if you consider this as something that the ex-com needs to pursue, and then we'll come back to you to take up on the offer. Thank you very much, and thank you for coming.

JOSU WALINO: I have a last remark on classification of the GeoTLDs. ICANN is really classifying TLDs in the gTLD group in legacy, new gTLDs, IDN TLDs, brand TLDs, and geographic TLDs. It's in the ICANN TLD health index, which is one project ICANN is running, and in this they are really differentiating the TLDs and not having all gTLDs the same.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]