
ICANN69 | Community Days Sessions – GNSO RySG: GeoTLD Group Annual General Meeting
Wednesday, October 14, 2020 – 09:00 to 11:00 CEST

SUE SCHULER: All right.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everybody. Welcome to the Geo TLD Group Annual General Meeting on the 14th of October, 2020. Please note that this session is being recorded and follow the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior.

During this session, please submit your questions or comments in the chat. If you'd 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. Please also mute your microphone when you're speaking. With that, I'll hand it over to Nacho Amadoz. Please begin.

NACHO AMADOZ: Thank you very much. Welcome, everyone to the first sessions of the Geos of today. Today, we have a couple of sessions—the GA and sharing experiences sessions that we will be running at 12:00 Central European Summer time. It's going to be hard to keep track on who's in the session because I see the list of participants, I see some of the video feeds, and I see the presentation. But I don't see everything at once.

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.

So, if I'm missing anyone ... I see Sebastien. I see Dirk. I've heard [Josue Luis Antella] from .gal. Ronald should be here too, even though I'm not seeing him. Just say something if you are here, Ronald. Marianne is here, Katrin, [Merte], Mike [Blades]. Hello, Mike. So, Sebastien. I already said Sebastien. Benjamin ...

All right. So please, could you pass the next slide? So, you're running that, right? Thank you. And two more so we go to the first one with the agenda. The next one, please. That's the one. Thank you. This is the agenda for today. And I'm sorry for the last-minute announcement and updates but we've run against the clock here.

The session is a two-hour session with a half-hour break in the middle. So, I think that it will not be tight but we will not have spare time either. And it follows the next items. First, housekeeping, internal topics as usual. And that will be conducted by Ronald, in his role of treasurer. Then, we have a review of the plan for 2020 and how we think that stands for 2021. Then, Wim Degezelle will be doing a session on ICANN policy and you will see why when we come to the section number two, the plan for 2021, because we will explain in detail.

Fourth, the SubPro report and comments and presentation prepared by Katrin. Dirk made a relevant comment about the impact of the EU Digital Service Act—I think it was last week—on the members' mailing list. So, we asked him if he wanted to do some presentation on that and he accepted. So, there it is. ID4me membership, conducted by Ronald, who is following on what's going on in the ID4me area. And a last section of questions and comments for everyone to raise a hand

and comment on everything and anything that might have not have time to do during the presentation or to present any new topic or whatever we want.

After that, we will have an hour of spare time. And then, we have the second session. Sue, could you go to the next slide, please? That is a sharing session. Registry lock is something that we've been seeing in many, many comments. So, we thought that it would be good to talk about how this is being implemented, and what are the experiences of the people already doing that, and how could we get from there to something that might be interesting for the group as a whole?

Also proposed by Dirk and also by Cedric, a section to comment on how are we doing in this COVID period that doesn't seem to go away any time soon? So, that affects sales, impacts domain abuse discussions and so on—whatever you want to comment on how the registry is going on this. And if you have faced specific challenges, we can do that there.

Updates on the new website ... That is conducted [Luis Antella] from .gal. .Gal made a proposal because they thought that it might be a good idea to revamp the website and to make it more adjusted to what we think it has to display, regarding the content, to highlight what the members are doing, and how the geos are relevant. And this is still in process. So, [Luis] will be presenting the screenshots and the mockups from the website. And he will provide the details. We have an idea about making a video to this, mainly devised for the website. And [Josue] will present that.

.Gal wants to present some marketing actions. And if [Bear] makes it in time, and if not, I will explain what this is, we want to present a new project by [.cat], which is [inaudible] cat. I wasn't clear on the description of how this is affecting our relationships with registrars. So, maybe the [inaudible] to my interactions with registrars is not precise. And [Bear] will explain it.

And again, any other business—anyone that wants to do an impromptu presentation or wants to ask or comment on anything is ... We have that seventh section for doing that.

I will be taking notes for the minutes. So, if at some point I forget to mute myself and you hear the typing, please let me know and I will mute. And with that, if no one else wants to make any comments or make an addition to the agenda, we should start with the housekeeping.

Remember, around 10:00, we need to stop for a break. I don't know if it's a hard 10:00 or if we can end a section, if we are in the middle of that. But Sue will let us know. Ronald, are you taking over for the housekeeping section?

RONALD SCHWAERZLER:

Welcome, everyone, from rainy Vienna. We are close to winter. Winter is coming. So, I'll give you an update of what we call housekeeping items. So, next slide, please. So, you see that we still don't have any members from South America. But we represent 37 TLDs and we consist of 28 members and observers. Excuse the title here—mainly

coming from Europe. Yeah, mainly coming from Europe, Asia Pacific, North America, and Africa, which is four TLDs but it's one registry operator and one registry service provider. We will see that in a later detail. Next slide, please.

Yeah. With all TLDs—so, these are registry service providers or suppliers—we have an additional five members not having a TLD under management. Next slide, please.

So, if you'll please have a look at your address, whether the TLDs that are connected to your organizations are the right ones. We'll go through this very, very fast. So, if there is something wrong, please contact me so that I can correct it for our membership roster. The next slide, please.

Yeah. This is one that surely needs to be corrected. Neustar, as far as I know, is no longer Neustar. But it is GoDaddy Registry Services or something like this. So, Sebastien, I see you on the call. Please update your company name, address, or whatever it needs to be changed. This is GoDaddy Registry. Yeah, please. And I don't know whether the address is still correct. So, if you can please update me then I can put it in the membership roster. Next slide, please. I think nothing had changed with AFNIC, City of Amsterdam, DNS Belgium. Next slide, please.

Let's go through this very quickly. Everyone should see its company, its registry operator, its address, its affiliation. So, if there is something wrong, please contact me. Next slide, please.

Yeah, Hamburg top-level domain, thank you for the nice gift. If you are not coming to Hamburg, Hamburg is coming to us. So, we got some pencils and so on. So, thank you for that. Next slide, please.

Still the members. I'm unaware if Caspar Veltheim is on the call. Minds + Machines, which is all of Bayern Connect, Minds + Machines, Minds + Machines Group Limited. We will put together its membership as one for the next year. This year, it's still three memberships—two memberships, and one observer. Next slide, please.

Yeah. There is one change with .alsace, Benjamin Louis. The company has changed. It's no longer the [attracté VT de] Alsace or something like this. So, this is new company and Benjamin Louis has taken over the management for the .alsace TLD. This is already active. So, I got this information. Next slide, please. I think [puntoCAT] have the new address or ... Next slide, please.

Yeah. I think that's it, if we come to the next slide. Oh, no. Sorry. The members in North America. Once again—[inaudible] NYC and the remaining ... Yeah. One's Minds + Machines once again. Next slide, please.

So, this is for membership status. There has been no change this year. Let's go to the 2019 account statement and tax declaration, just for your information. Next slide, please.

I got the official tax declaration from our accountant, located in Belgium. I'm not really capable of speaking French. But you see from 2018 to 2019, our assets—our “valeurs disponibles—” so our income,

or our money, or however you want to call it, raised from 24,000 € to 45,000 €. Next slide, please. So, it's the other way around. It's just the same sum. So, this is what is just for the account statement—for the tax declaration. Next slide, please.

Then, we have the yearly—what did we spend the money on and where did we get it in. So, there is ... It's calculated under “services [ABA] diverse—” so various money going on, like the tax declaration, like other things that we spend the money on. It was 11,208 €. Next slide, please.

And what we did receive was 29,000 € in membership fees and other receipts—so other things, money coming in, was a return of value-added taxes and something like this that we had to pay it once. So, in total, we received 32,287.30 €. And we are now on a result ... The result for the 2019 year was plus 20,000 €. So, we did not spend a lot of money on that. Next slide, please.

And like usual ... So, I think ... At least my screen doesn't show the full picture. There are two or three lines missing at the bottom. But it's for information only. So, we, namely Nacho and I, held a General Assembly by the ExCom and we got presented these four sheets of paper that I presented to you. And we accepted this tax declaration. Next slide, please.

And you see that we have a result of 2019, of this 20,000 €. And we have ... Our treasury is 45,737.22 € at the end of 2019. This has been sent to the Belgium tax authority, has been accepted. So, this is it for the year of 2019.

What I told you in our meeting in May, it's not problematic. But we now have had about 1.8 times the membership fees that we collect in a year on the bank account. So, we should not further let the bank account raise to, let's say, 60,000–70,000 € or whatever-thousand euros.

This is what the accountants told me last year. This is what they told me this year. It's not a real problem but we are a not-for profit organization and we should not exceed two or three membership incomes as a [raffle]. So, it's not a problem but be aware, we are not-for-profit organization and we should not have too much money on the bank account. Next slide, please.

So, Nacho, I don't know whether we have to formally accept the account statement of 2019. These are, [in fact], signed by the ExCom, Nacho and me, and sent to the Belgium tax authority. So, I think it's enough if I present it here and we don't need a formal hand raising, whether the members accept or not because otherwise, we would have to check whether we have a quorum or not or something. Nacho, are you aware of this? Do we have to?

NACHO AMADOZ:

I think we don't have to. But if anybody wants to make any comments about what Ronald has just presented and the budget, we can open the floor for any discussion that might be needed.

RONALD SCHWAERZLER: Okay. Then, let me proceed with the budget outlook. We have the whole package together. So, how is the year 2020 evolving, budget-wise? Next slide, please, Sue. So, what we had in mind originally is the left column, the 2020 preview. We adopted that because there were no outreach sessions. There were no [host] of Geo TLD meetings. We decided, in our meeting in May, that we'll do a new website, which I put in 10,000 € here. It will be at about 7,000 €.

So, we had some money going out, the Registries Stakeholder Group membership fee. It was not 2,400 €. It was 1,800 €. The ID4me membership fee, Work Track 5 consultancy, and external support for the management plan and others. So, still some lines missing at the bottom. Next slide, please.

So, we have total costs of 21,700 € estimated for the—until the end of the year. We have membership fees—collected membership fees—of 28,000 €. Two members have not paid already. So, we are still lacking 1,500 €. I did not take into account this. So, we got a positive—we will get a positive balance of this year, of 6,300 €. 1,500 € are added. So, we will end about 8,000 € in plus. So, it will come to a final balance, by the end of the year, of 52,000–53,000 € as a balance for the Geo TLD group. Okay?

NACHO AMADOZ: Thank you, Ronald. I saw a comment from Dirk, indicating that he was in the same situation as you because he couldn't see the full screen.

RONALD SCHWAERZLER: If you look at slide 27 for example, slide 27 is showing its last line, the total costs. If it were a full-screen presentation, you will not see this lower two centimeters. At least I don't see that.

SUE SCHULER: So, are you better off without the full screen. You like it like this presentation better?

RONALD SCHWAERZLER: I think it at least shows all the information.

SUE SCHULER: Okay. I'll leave it this way then.

NACHO AMADOZ: All right. Thank you.

RONALD SCHWAERZLER: Okay. That's it from my side, for the housekeeping items, namely our members and our budget from the past and from the current year. You're very welcome to drop me any questions. If you want to see details on invoices sent or paid, please don't hesitate. If you want to see the bookkeeping, I will give you the address of our accountant in Belgium—how he did the bookings, etc. So, that's no secret. You're members. You're free to look into the books if you want to.

NACHO AMADOZ: Thank you, Ronald. This is Nacho. I see Katrin says “hand up.” So, Katrin, over to you.

KATRIN OHLMER: Can you hear me?

NACHO AMADOZ: Yep.

KATRIN OHLMER: Perfect. Thank you. Ronald, one question. If you could go back one slide please on the budget [inaudible]. I saw that the support from Maria had been cancelled. Can you explain on that a little bit? Thank you?

RONALD SCHWAERZLER: Maria did not drop us any invoices and we were not able to reach her anymore. So, we decided to not follow up with her because it just turned out that we did not get any results re any invoices. So, this is why it has been ... It is no longer in the budget.

NACHO AMADOZ: Yeah. The situation with her was a bit awkward for a time because it was at the beginning of the lockdown. She had some weeks where she was experiencing some personal difficulties. And we tried to follow up with her because at that moment—and we still think it is relevant—but at that moment, the idea to get her to help the group frame what is

the position, how we should communicate, what are our actions to prevent and to confront DNS abuse was very relevant. We still think it is. But as Ronald said, it came to a point where we did not know how to follow up—what to do.

So, life prevailed because we were in lockdown and we had to prepare the GA and we had to try to adapt the budget and many of the things that we wanted to do, that, as you will see, we haven't been able to, to the new situation. And we just dropped it because it was too time-consuming for the feedback we were getting.

I think there are no more questions about the budget. So, Sue, if you could go to the plan for 2021 and to the next slide, please. Thank you. So, when we made our first GA—May, maybe. I think it was May—we proposed the management plan. [Josue] will just refresh that in a moment. But we wanted to target specific key actions as we thought were relevant for the group. And we divided them in three. We will come to that. That was a management plan that we devised at the beginning of January. So, it went to shit when lockdown, and COVID, and everything we are all familiar with started to kick in.

We also tried to establish what would be the KPIs to measure the extent of the advancement and impact of our key actions. And of course, we wanted the members' feedback. This was presented to the membership before our GA in May. We said in May, this is by no means closed. We have money to spend, as we have seen. We think that it might be spent in these three different areas that we have identified. And we still think that ... Please, next slide, Sue.

[Josue], do you want to take over? Do you want me to go? Because the idea would be that we share this. So, if you want to just go briefly over this. Thank you.

JOSU WALINO:

Okay. As you wish. Anyway, as Nacho said, we already presented this plan in May. The idea was to have a management plan defining clear objectives and key actions for the year. And it was divided in three main parts, as you see—advocacy. I forgot. I can't see the previous list. Sue, you don't mind? Yeah. It was mainly ... No. It's in the next one. It was advocacy, marketing, and policy, yeah? So, we defined this. But with the COVID situation and during this year, we saw that it was not really, really ... We weren't really able to develop the plan as [previewed].

Marketing was the main key for the plan because, as you remember, in Santiago, the members decided that marketing was the main issue for the group. We created a marketing taskforce with the idea of facing this challenge. But the actual situation is that with the COVID and with having no real meetings—potential meetings—the marketing taskforce didn't work as expected. So anyway, we tried to develop the plan as much as possible. Next slide, please.

So, you can see that development was the second goal, yeah? And the third one ... Please, next slide. You can see here, promotion, that this—the marketing actions. So, we presented some actions in our meeting in May. And we tried to develop new activities, since we are not having [persons here] meetings. So, later on in the sharing session,

we'll present the new website, the video [idea]. They are the developments we are [going to try] now for this.

We also tried to [lobby] with the sellers. We were talking to WordPress.com, Wix and some others, trying to get involved, then, in the development—or integrating the Geo TLDs in their services. The real situation is that actually, they are not having, really, a good response on that. So, once again, the idea we have is to try to develop this as much as possible. But anyway, we are going to take it over to the next year as well.

And an important point from our point of view is to have a real engagement from the members because we need to engage the members in order to develop, especially in the promotional activities but in all the activities, to improve it for the next year. So, yeah. Next slide, please.

NACHO AMADOZ:

[Josue], if you don't mind, let me step in. Because when we prepared this, our idea was to refresh what we proposed to put in front of the membership again. What were the key points of this strategy, and goals, and how we defined them? And one of the key elements was that we wanted to have a dialog amongst membership. And this year has made it extremely difficult. We understand. We wanted to focus on engagement with the marketing group and we've tried. But again, this has been very difficult.

Another point was whether we should run these actions on a volunteer basis or allocating a budget for specific purposes. And then again, how should we reassess the activities in front of this scenario. If you could go to the next slide, Sue, please.

So, what we want is to carry over this for 2021, still focusing on dialog, still focusing on engagement with the marketing group. And you will see, now, that this is one of the optics that we wanted to give you. The budget allocation, in this case, as was reflected by Ronald in his presentation, has had a difference. And this is the external collaboration with Wim Degezelle. You may have noticed that, in the presentations, the ICANN policy section says Wim. And this is because Wim is going to be taking over these responsibilities.

This was the product of something that we sent to the members in June, I think, where we informed the membership that we wanted to look for external support for the management plan. We published, after no member provided and feedback, the job description, so to speak, in the website. And we reached out to several individuals that we thought might be interested in joining us and that we thought might have an impact on what we want to do.

They were different profiles and Wim prevailed because he is very well-known to anyone in the community. He has following on ICANN policy for quite a while. And he has, also, experience in something that we think is very relevant to for but that might not be yet to tap into, which is organizing the group and providing support, for the group as a whole and for the marketing group specifically, to develop activities.

Now, coming back to what [Josue] was presented, we divided the areas in three—medium interest, high interest. And ICANN policy, out of the meeting Santiago de Compostela, was not the highest. But we understand that it is important. We don't think it should be the main focus of the group but we also think that this has to be incorporated in what we do as a group. And this is the point where Wim will initially focus his efforts.

So, Wim started ... As I said, we announced that to the members in June. We conducted some interviews in July. By the end of August, we made the decision to hire him. And we started at some point in mid-September, I think, or maybe a bit earlier.

So, this is why Wim is joining us to provide the ICANN policy section. And as we said, as we want the allocation of resources to be discussed among the membership, Wim, in a way, is a resource because he will be putting 12 to 14 hours per month in assisting us, the ExCom, in bringing to life the management plan. Not everything will be ICANN policy but we'll start with ICANN policy. But we'll try to see when it is possible to get Wim to help us in other areas.

So, this is not something that is defined to its last detail. So, it is open for any of you to make proposals about how Wim could work with us in this regard. The contract is for six months, initially. Then, it will be reviewed and see whether we need to extend it or not. This is, again, open to the feedback from the memberships, when the time comes. So, we will come back to you for this issue when the time comes.

One of our ideas is to try to have some kind of webinar set up via Zoom every—we don't know—every four, every five, every six weeks to follow up on developments on ICANN policy but also to try to use this—fix a date on the calendar to engage with the marketing group.

We also said, during the GA in May, that part of delegation might be open for the marketing group to make proposals about how could we use that money to be of any use for the membership in this area—in marketing—because this is where we want to focus, to help and to bring [inaudible] to get the geos to sell more, to be more relevant, to be present, to have—to reach a level of awareness that is higher than the one we have today. But the end results of all this is to increase sales—to make life viable for the TLDs with the different models that we have.

So, it is not only focused on any specific model. It tries to encompass everyone. So, everyone is welcome to join this marketing taskforce. This is what we wanted to say about how we wanted to carry over the strategy and goals of 2020 to 2021, with the addition of Wim. So, I think that's the next section. The next section, sorry, is already Wim's.

So, if anybody wants to commence on this or make any proposals about what should we integrate here, you can do that now. You can do it at the end of the session, as we said. But if anybody wants to speak up now, please do that before we go to the next section.

Okay. Sue, could you go to the next slide, please. So, Wim, it's all yours.

WIM DEGEZELLE:

Thank you. And here I am. So, welcome. Well, welcome ... I'm so used to saying "welcome" for webinars. So, I should say thank you for welcoming me. I think ... Not sure you said. You gave a brief overview, both of my background and the idea of how we are, together with the ExCom, looking on how I could help on different parts of the plan and just looking for ways how I could be useful.

So, one of the ideas was the ICANN policy update. I would ... Before going through it—running through it because it's—trying to do it in a short time, not to give too much information—I would also like to invite you to look at the update in a way from ... Is this useful? Is this format useful for us, as Geo TLD members? Is it too much information? Not enough information? Not the right information? Because what I tried to do is come up with something that gives a very high-level helicopter view but that's also, I hope, useful for people that do not follow ICANN on a daily basis.

So, this said, I'm going to my slide. Just check. On the bottom of the slide, there should be the Geo TLD logo on the left and the tagline on the right. If you can't see that, let me know. Then, I also switch and don't show the slides in full-screen.

Okay. The ICANN overview of the current ICANN policy work. I will focus on the four PDPs in the GNSO and then also give a brief overview of what else is going on—being discussed in the ICANN community. First, what is ICANN community working on? An update of the Registry and Registrar Agreements and policy in order to comply to GDPR.

I spent some time on looking for a title for the slides, as it might be ... If you're not used and following the discussions within ICANN, then probably the Expedited Policy, Temporary Specification will not say—or ring a bell that easy. So, that's the topic—how to evolve or how to adapt to GDPR.

There has been quite some work done already. You might remember that there was an issue. GDPR came into force and something had to be done. So, the ICANN Board took some actions with a Temporary Specification, in order to comply in time. Then, there was a Phase 1 that basically had to update or turn—review that temporary policy and review that in order to turn it into ICANN consensus policy. That all has been done. This is now being implemented.

So, the discussions, now, is on Phase 2. Phase 2 is mainly focused on a system to process requests for disclosure of non-public registration data assets and also a number of additional priority topics that partially weren't addressed in Phase 1.

So, this is the main discussion—the main topic. So, assets ... The current proposal is a hybrid model, in which requests are centralized. The requests are centralized and disclosure decisions are made by the Contracted Parties. So, the status of these discussions is the GNSO Council adopted the Phase 2 report in September. And now, the discussion or the point—the issue is at the ICANN Board for consideration and decision.

Interesting to follow up or to know is that the GNSO sent out some—a request—or made it clear that it expects the ICANN Board to consult or

have a discussion on the costs, both the cost to build and the cost to operate SSAD. This is something that might—that you might hear, could hear about in the next months also.

A second point, there is also additional work that still needs to be done. The GNSO Council is, I think, later this month, discussing how they will approach these issues.

The second policy process the community is working is the review of the existing policy on the introduction of new gTLDs. I know the next point on the agenda is focusing on this so I will keep it very brief. What is the topic about is the question? What changes, if any, need to be made to the policy on the introduction of new gTLDs, mainly from 2007? And also, what, if any, changes are needed to the final applicant guidebook from 2012.

The status ... Like I said, it will be discussed in the next agenda point. The draft final report was published for public comment. The working group is now working on reviewing those comments and is expected to publish its final recommendations by the end of this year, after which, also, this part of policy moves to the GNSO Council to vote on the recommendations. If they are accepted, they move to the ICANN Board for consideration and further discussion on this.

Next point that is being discussed is the review of the tools and procedures from trademark right holders. So, in ICANN terms, the Review of All Rights Protection Mechanisms in all gTLD domains. Currently, work is focused on the Phase 1. Phase 1 is the review of the rights protection mechanisms that are applicable to gTLDs that were

launched under the 2012 round. I listed them there. Most, I'm sure, are very familiar to you as gTLDs.

So, the status of Phase 1 is that the working group is now reviewing the public comments it has received on its initial report. And then, the final report will be submitted to the GNSO Council for approval. This is expected late November. And then, the normal procedure is then moved or sent to the ICANN Board. There is also the Phase 2 that still needs to start after this. This is focused on the review of the UDRP procedure that was created in—or introduced in 1999.

The last, or the fourth, or the last GNSO chunk of work I wanted to touch upon is the protection of names of international governmental organizations and international non-governmental organizations. In ICANN terms, the IGO Access to Creative Rights Protections Mechanisms. The key question that is asked is whether the protection of IGO and IGO names can be addressed by modifications to the existing dispute resolution procedures or whether a separate, more tailored procedure is needed.

Status of the work is that the GNSO Council accepts the final report recommendations one to four, which are saying that there is no new procedure—that no new procedure is needed. But they've come up, also, with a number of small modifications or topics that should be addressed in this context. This is now on the table of the ICANN Board to consider and take final decisions. One point from that report was rejected, namely recommendation five. And the GNSO suggested or

referred it back to the All RPMs Phase 2 PDP—so, the PDP or the work that was discussed on the previous slide.

This was a very brief overview of the policy work that is being done in the GNSO, or being led by the GNSO. There are two elements—or two policy processes going on—in the ccNSO. They might be not that relevant, although I think the second one might be interesting for you to know about.

So, the first one—the ccNSO is working on policy for the retirement of ccTLDs. So, what should happen if, for example, a country doesn't exist anymore? It looks simple but there was no RIP policy orders—no RIP policy in place there.

The second element on the slide, the ccNSO is starting to work on policy for the deselection of—or the selection, sorry, and deselection of IDN ccTLD strings. This is a replacement of our [inaudible] replace the IDN ccTLD Fast Track procedure that was created in 2009 to allow countries and territories to request an IDN ccTLD of their country or territory name.

Apart from the policy work, there were two elements on the—or two actions within ICANN that I think are also interesting to know about. First is the review of the ICANN Meeting Strategy. You might have heard about it. At this meeting, or shortly before this ICANN meeting, there was a blog post, I think by Göran, to kick off a discussion on the ICANN Meeting Strategy and the impact of not having face-to-face meetings, and probably also not having face-to-face meetings—new additional face-to-face meetings in the near future.

It's focused ... On one hand, the discussion started or is starting with the SO/ACs based on a survey that is going out. And there is also a Board-community discussion on this topic on the 19th October—so, later on during this ICANN week. That might be something that you would like to follow or also share some ideas.

Then, the second is more practical. ICANN is, I think, proud when, if you heard them, they announced a new department on implementation operations. The idea is that they have one department that coordinates and improves the coordination on the implementation of different recommendations coming out of different reviews and cross-community work. This is not policy but recommendations coming out of all other types of reviews by the community.

I will not go into detail on this slide, so that we finish in time for the break. But this is an overview of different parts of already-decided policy that is currently in—sorry, that is currently being implemented by ICANN Org and the community.

Then, the last slides. I added some points on upcoming work—things you might see coming in the next couple of months. The ICANN Board requested the GNSO to develop policy, relating to defining and managing IDN variants for current gTLDs as well as for future gTLD applications. Secondly, there is an idea to, or a request, or suggestions to start working on policy or reviewing the policy for transfers. I think yesterday or the day before, an issues report on this topic, which is one of the early stages before policy work can start, was published for

public comment. So, if you would go to the public comment page, you can read more about that.

And then, a last point I wanted to address there is the New gTLD Auction Proceeds work—the cross-community working group that was formed to propose a mechanism to allocate the new gTLD auction proceeds—so, the funds that are there—so, how they have to be allocated or how they have to be used.

They came to a conclusion and filed, or sent, their proposal of three possible mechanisms to the ICANN Board. One is a process that's completely internal to ICANN. Second is a mix between ICANN and an external nonprofit. And the last proposal they put together was to form a kind of ICANN foundation. This is now on the table of the ICANN Board, who has to review those proposals and finally decide on a way forward. In the report, the CCWG showed some preference or clear preference for either option a or b.

So, this was ... I think it's still morning here in Brussels. Perfect time for a run. So that's, I think, what I did—really run through the current ICANN policy work at the moment. Like I said, I really would invite feedback on the format and whether this format was useful or not too much or less details. But happy, also, to answer questions or get some remarks. If not, back over to you, Nacho.

NACHO AMADOZ:

Katrin is raising the hand.

KATRIN OHLMER:

Thank you, Nacho. First of all, welcome, Wim. It's great to have you. What I think is ... I do follow quite some policy stuff as well. And I am at the experience. But for people who are not probably familiar with all that stuff, it might be helpful to differentiate between is it true policy or does it have any impact on my daily life?

For instance, does it have an impact on existing contracts—so, for instance, the RDAP adoption amendment of the ICANN contract we have. I think this would be helpful to know that this is the current status and when members can expect to see some emails from ICANN being pushed out to them, that their contract will be amended. And this was probably also something which refers to the EPDP.

And at the same time, we have some policy stuff, which doesn't possibly impact us as much in our daily lives, like all the ccNSO stuff. So, having said this, I think it might make sense that we have one section that really impacts our daily lives and one section which is policy, which doesn't really impact our operations. Thank you.

WIM DEGEZELLE:

Thank you. I can't imagine that the element—the second element you mentioned—is when does it expect ... When can it be expected? The real influence or the impact is really relevant. A long time ago, I also worked some—did some work on European policy. And I remember from there, there was also the same question. When is the discussion on new European regulation? Second point is when it becomes effective and people will have to change their behavior.

And it's often very difficult because there is a long time between the two. But I think that's a very relevant point, to have a section that's really focused on impact of policy or changes.

NACHO AMADOZ:

Let me step in. Thank you, Katrin and Wim. And are already out of time, I think. But what we could do is when we come back, retake this discussion if we need to take this farther because I think that you are very—you are making very, very valid points—and see how can we take your role, not only on ICANN policy but from ICANN policy to other things that can be useful to the members within the scope or what we defined back in June.

Let us stop there because it's 10:00 and we need to be straight with this. And Sue, I think we ... You said half an hour. So, we need to be back at 10:30, right?

SUE SCHULER:

That is correct—a 30-minute break. And you are welcome to just hang onto the line. You don't have to reset.

NACHO AMADOZ:

Thank you very much. So, see you in half an hour.

SUE SCHULER:

Okay. Natalie, please stop the recording.

Perfect. Thank you. Okay, Nacho.

NACHO AMADOZ:

Thank you very much. So, seeing that we have half an hour and three more topics to cover, I would really like to do this quickly. But as we had to close Wim's presentation, any comments that may—anyone may have—I would like just to use two or three minutes for this. Just as Wim said, this is a proposal. It's open to comment and feedback from members. This work is something that is useful for us because not everyone is following ICANN policy.

And it is important, as Katrin said, and very good point, to see what has an impact on our daily life and what is good to know about how things are evolving. So, that distinction could also be our—how we prepare these regular updates from Wim.

Again, this is not the full extent of Wim's work. Hopefully, when we get back to some kind of normal or we finally get used to not getting back and we understand that we have to live like this, we will really put some focus on reactivating the marketing taskforce and engagement with members. And that are two areas ... Those are two areas where Wim also has step in and divide his work into these three.

If there is any other comments about the previous presentation, please raise your hand, either in the chatroom or using the hand option in Zoom. If not, we'll go to the next presentation, which is super-important comment. So, Katrin, all yours.

KATRIN OHLMER:

Thanks, Nacho. Can you hear me? Perfect. Okay. So, next slide, please, Sue. And one slide more, please. Perfect. Thank you. So, just a brief overview, what we've done in the past. So, we started early in 2016 with the analysis about the last round of gTLD applications to determine whether any changes would be necessary with regards to the policy and the implementation. And this work had caused a lot of discussion. And I think I gave enough updates over the past couple of years on the topic.

And we finally made it. So, we published the draft initial report in August and asked for comments from the broader ICANN community—what they think about our report. And next slide, please.

So, the comment period has been a pretty common comment period, with 40 days of public comment. The format, however, was a pretty awkward one, I would say. So, while in the past, we could just write some stuff, and publish it, and send it over to ICANN, this time we had to follow a pretty cumbersome process, with filing an Excel sheet and navigating through huge templates of Excel. So, I think that the common feedback by a lot of people were that ICANN should stope this way of asking for input. And even in reviewing, now, the comment, it's very hard to find and read all those comments.

So, what happened since the comment period opened, we received quite a number of comments. And the Geo TLD group filed a comment. I think you say my proposal on the mailing list and what I got. Maybe, Nacho, you can explore on that a little bit—is that the ExCom, Nacho made some amendments there and published it on the website—on

the comment period website. I put the link and the slides, in case you want to review that. On other comments which have been filed from other Geo TLDs were only from Berlin and Hamburg. So, we filed some comments on our own. Next slide, please. Switch to the next one. Thanks.

So, just to summarize what the comment was all about. So, the main topics still remain the geo top-level domains on the top level—so GeoNames on top level. That’s correct. And there were a couple of concerns that I was representing on behalf of the group and the working groups, namely that most of the rules which applied in 2012 should remain unchanged, to remain a level playing field for any future Geo TLDs.

And I think we managed pretty well on that side. What we weren’t able to achieve was a better or improved situation for protection of city names which are not capital cities. And this is, for instance, one of the topics we filed as a comment, that certain city names could be protected, based on available public lists. So, this is probably one of the most important topics we gave as a comment.

There were some other topics which were not really that relevant for us because there might be some overlap between Geo TLDs and, for instance, community applicants which might also be Geo TLDs. But the main focus, or the focus point, was really the GeoNames on the top level.

So, what we did is after receiving all those comments, we started digesting through all of that and started with the ICANN Board. They

also provided comments—also ICANN Org and a couple of other stakeholder groups within the community.

And I would like, now, to switch to the outlook. Sue, can you please switch one more slide? So, we continue digesting all the comments, which will start today at 2:00. So, anyone interested in reading all those nice comments we received is more than invited to join the session.

After that, we will produce the final report, which is then up for the GNSO Council to determine whether they accept the recommendations or not. And after that, it goes to the ICANN Board. And the once the ICANN Board votes it off, hopefully, fingers crossed, it will then be handed over to ICANN Org for the implementation activities.

One comment on the—not comment but rather question to Wim on the representation. Since I’m not anymore contracted by the Geo TLD group, I would first of all thank you all for your support and help in the past five years. It was been tremendous learning curve for me and really interesting to be able to represent the Geos in that group.

From my point of view, it would be the question to Wim, if you are going to represent the Geo group now, within the SubPro, because I think it would be helpful to have someone being represented—representing the comment able to explain the rationale behind the comments once we get there. So, we haven’t talked about the Geo topics yet. But once we come to that topic, that would be helpful.

So, I think this is just a sweet and short overview from my side. And if you have any questions or, Wim, you want to explain how you plan—if you plan to participate and if so, how. And if I can offer some information or knowledge, I'm here to help.

NACHO AMADOZ: Thank you, Katrin. Wim, up to you. We should follow on this and we should just dedicate the time it needs because this is a relevant issue for many of the members.

WIM DEGEZELLE: Yes. Point taken. Of course, we still have to discuss or still have to follow up, I think, with the ExCom to how to best approach this and who exactly can present—for example, can present on the comments and so forth. I think this is something we still have to take up later. And yeah. I would prefer to have this discussion first and then come up with some ideas or additional suggestions than do it the other way around.

NACHO AMADOZ: Sure. Thank you. As we are past the 10 minutes that we need to put into every presentation, we need to move on to the next one. Thank you, Katrin. And thank you for the work and for the comments provided. I think that that was the basis for what the ExCom posted as a comment because they were well-drafted and very consistent. So, we didn't amend them, as such. We tried to put them into the context so that it could be seen by the group in the context of what was being

discussed in every topic. And we could do that form the work you provided to the group. So, thank you for that.

Next one is the impact of the EU Digital Service Act on Geo TLDs. So, Dirk, you take over.

DIRK KRISCHENOWSKI:

Okay. Can you hear me? Okay. Fine. You all—at least those who participated in the meeting in Santiago de Compostela—can remind that I noticed some regulations which were on the horizon at this time, at this meeting, which named the EU regulations, which named domain name services, and registrars, and registries and parties that might affected by a new regulation that is ... Sue, could you go with the next slide?

Yes—the new regulation that is European Digital Service Act, which updates the old, but still up-to-date in most parts, E-commerce Directive from the year 2000. And you see that slide I presented here in Santiago de Compostela. Sue, could you move to the next slide, please?

Yes. And now, that was the reason I was sending out an email about a statement that CENTR, the organization of European ccTLDs, has made towards the digital service act. The comment period ... We missed this comment period. Personally, I hadn't this on the plan. It was out of the blue for me. But CENTR presented this thing. And we couldn't make a statement on this but the statement CENTR made is a

great 20 pages—22 pages—paper on how this new Digital Service Act might affect us.

And the most important topic is that although registries and registrars are not mentioned in the old E-commerce Directive, they are now mentioned towards one of the categories of this Digital Service Act, which means online intermediaries, which also cloud services, and other services, and social media platforms, search engines, and many more. And we certainly don't want to mix up with Facebook and others on special regulations. I put a lot of links there.

And yeah. The definition of those online intermediaries by the European Union is if you host or transmit content over the wire, then you are online intermediary. And the whole article of the paper CENTR presented really tries to fight that we, as registries, especially the ccTLDs at this point, are not hosting or transmitting content, or multiplying content on the net. Sue, could you go to the next slide, please?

So, the Digital Service Act, I think, is important to us. I'm not a lawyer so I'm seeing this more from a business perspective. But there are quite substantial flaws that the DSA could bring to us. And that would be the LEA, law enforcement agency, function—so the police function as the responsibility for us as registries for deciding what content is legal or not. That would mean that we might have a lawyer or consult a lawyer in all the cases where online content cases—abuse cases—are sent to us.

So, we, at the moment, have only those technical content things and there's not much about legal or illegal on decision making here. But that would mean that we are also responsible for fake shops, for hate speech, for everything which comes with other content. So, that's one thing, is getting into this police function, I would see.

Then, we would need to have policies for abuse handling that are inline with EU laws. Another point which might be not wanted by most of us is the registrant verification, like the Danish ccTLD has and a few other ccTLDs have. That would mean for us a downside in registrations. And that was seen in .dk as well, when they introduced the registrant verification. It would mean that we could be obliged to monitor IP fraud. So, if there is an IP fraud—if there was an IP fraud—we have to monitor this fraud for the rest of our life in our TLD. Then, we might have an EU representative—at least those non-EU-based Geo TLDs.

And there could be measures ... Other measures we take could be supervised by the EU level to mention some. Maybe I missed a few ones but it's worse—absolutely worse—to read that CENTR paper and see how CENTR arguments to what's not being mentioned as online intermediaries. And I will go to the next slide for this.

So, my idea—what I would do here in this case—is there was already a response from ICANN to the Digital Service Act. Oops. Slide has gone. Could you all see the slide, still?

NACHO AMADOZ: I cannot. Yeah. It disappeared for me, too.

DIRK KRISCHENOWSKI: Oh. Anyway, I would evaluate ICANN’s response to the DSA. ICANN did this because this affects registrars and registries. And I would go to my national authority to explain to them that Geo TLDs—so, Berlin and Hamburg—do not host, pass, or transmit content through our infrastructure. I think all of us can agree on that. And mention to our governments that Geo TLDs are obliged by ICANN already to monitor technical abuse on a regular basis and that would be needed.

And then, make clear to our national authorities that Geo TLDs may only act as a last resort in this abuse content fight and only if the law enforcement order is there to act on by deleting or suspending the domain name. And finally, get our local governments to ask the EU authorities that Geo TLD registries do not fall under the DSA category of online intermediaries. Yeah.

That’s the last slide. It’s a bit big but these points, I think are crucial so that we are not falling under this new Digital Service Act. That’s what I have a summary here. And that’s what CENTR is also asking for, not being mentioned as online intermediaries in the sense of this new regulation. And you all know that regulation. There’s no fixed date where it comes at the moment. But we know from GDPR and other privacy laws that can come quicker and more impactive than we are thinking today. Okay.

NACHO AMADOZ:

Thanks, Dirk. I think the proposal is substantial and is something that falls within the remit of what the group needs to do. This is something that could be tracked and coordinated by Wim so that we can work on the approach that we need to make to our national authorities, to ICANN, and to provide them with materials about why this needs to be that way and what could be done so that it stays that way.

So, if you agree, I think that this is something that should be part of what needs to be done, not only because it falls on the ICANN policy side but also because it shows one of the actions that we need to take over as a group so that we provide all this information for the members.

Thank you. We'll get back to this on the mailing list. But I think that this is an action that needs to be followed up on by us—ExCom, but Wim providing the work, so that members can see the progress, and provide the feedback, and have the materials that can be used for that. Any comments or questions for Dirk. I see none.

Sue, it appears that she lost the connection. Thanks, Natalie. But Ronald has taken over the screen, and she's showing the presentation, and he is the one actually doing the last bit of this first session of the morning. So, Ronald, go ahead.

RONALD SCHWAERZLER:

Hello. Can you hear me?

NACHO AMADOZ: Yes.

RONALD SCHWAERZLER: So. Very brief. As you all know, the Geo TLD Group has joined the ID4me initiative this year. We are a member of the ID4me consortium. And this ID4me ... And I'll try to go to the next slide. Yeah.

DIRK KRISCHENOWSKI: The slide is gone. You can see a few letters but not more.

NACHO AMADOZ: I can see it well.

RONALD SCHWAERZLER: I have a second screen and I can see it well, too.

DIRK KRISCHENOWSKI: Sorry.

NACHO AMADOZ: No problem.

RONALD SCHWAERZLER: I don't know. I can go into the other—try to ... Is it better that way?

DIRK KRISCHENOWSKI: No. I can see your menu now. But I see just the top-left part of the whole thing—ID4me member. And then it stops there. Maybe I’m the only one having this problem but ...

RONALD SCHWAERZLER: So, I have a control screen here. And that’s up and it shows perfectly. So ...

DIRK KRISCHENOWSKI: Okay, then. Go ahead.

RONALD SCHWAERZLER: You are also a member of the ID4me so you probably don’t have to see my slides because you fully aware of what’s going on, Dirk. ID4me is more or less a single sign-on—or it’s supposed to be, more or less, a single sign-on environment. It’s my words so please don’t blame me on that. Like you are used it—log into that website, to that shop using Facebook, using Amazon, using Google Accounts or something like this. And really, I have stopped using Facebook login on some websites because I don’t want Facebook giving my data to someone else’s website. It doesn’t—shouldn’t even be allowed to track my behavior—which website I log in, which store I am going to buy something.

So, the idea is that the ID4me, which is a consortium of some registries, registrars, that this environment should be the one—should be a relevant one. And the idea is that it is based on domain names.

It's a text record entry in a domain name that points to a, let's say evaluation—to a repository where you can have usernames, passwords stored, your data stored, and give it to a shop—to a website you want to visit. I have a promotion video I got from VNIC, which is one of the major players. I will try to play it. Let me know if it is working.

NACHO AMADOZ: I see no video, Ronald. You played it? Ronald, you can hear me?

RONALD SCHWAERZLER: Yeah.

NACHO AMADOZ: Because I see no video. Did you play that or did you see it?

RONALD SCHWAERZLER: Okay. Let me check.

NACHO AMADOZ: We've been just warned by Natalie that this needs to close up in time and that means now. So, maybe we could close that and resume the session one hour from now.

RONALD SCHWAERZLER: Okay.

NACHO AMADOZ: So, we can end this topic with the video and then start it with the sharing experiences. I'm sorry to be so strict with that but it seems that we—

RONALD SCHWAERZLER: No. Sure! If you don't see the video, it makes little sense, then. I thought that it should show up.

NACHO AMADOZ: It didn't for me and I think that ... Anyway. Let's close the session so that we—

RONALD SCHWAERZLER: And let me ... Let me just ... I will prepare the video for the afternoon session. And let me just continue with the additional information I wanted to give you on that. The ID4me Consortium has its general assembly on November 5th. I got this message two days before. I was before I could say nothing happened this year. So, sorry. But it's quite different.

The agenda for this meeting will give a review what has been done this year. And I got an email from DNIC services, from Stephan, yesterday, who told me that there has been a lot of activity—a lot of things that he wants to show us. More or less any registry—any Geo TLD registry is enabled by DNIC to have its own registry—ID registry. This is the good side of the story.

So, you can use your .paris, your .wien, your .koeln, your .hamburg names for generating digital identities without having to program something. The downside is if you do not take that opportunity, the names of .paris, of .hamburg, etc. can be used already for generating digital IDs.

So, we have to think how we make sure that a digital ID who is in the namespace of a TLD is a trusted one because if someone can set up an authority, you are not sure whether your ID is a secure one, or a false one, or an unsecure one. So, I think, Nacho, you, me, Dirk, we have to discuss this in relatively great detail to make some proposals.

I will come back to you at the end of—after the agenda, after the membership meeting—the annual general meeting of ID4me because if I think if it's going to be a success, if it can replace or bring this into the market, we must make sure that digital IDs of .barcelona, of .wien are trusted ones. It could or it should coincide with the things that Dirk mentioned before. If we are obliged to confirm the identity of a domain name registrant, like .dk Denmark does, we could use this mechanism that DNIC has implemented for verifying whether a registrant is really the one he says that he is.

So, this could be an idea or an ideal combination of using of domain names, together with some future obligations that might come to registries, not only the Geo ones but to all registries. So, I think it's worth following this process. And I will keep you posted. And I will write in detail and will send you a link to this video after the Annual

General Meeting of the ID4me Consortium. And sorry that it didn't show the video. I will try to have it shared in the following session.

NACHO AMADOZ:

Let's do it in the next session because Natalie is really asking us to stop because the technicians need to be preparing the next session. Sorry, Natalie. Let's the resume the session at this point because I think this is a very relevant point for all of us, too. Okay? Let's see each other in one hour. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]