

Transcription ICANN Copenhagen  
GNSO Registries SG (RySG) Geo TLD Group Planning Session  
Sunday, 12 March 2017 at 13:45 CET

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

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

Sebastien Ducos: Good afternoon, everybody. I've returned that, yes, thank you. Much better.  
Good afternoon. Good afternoon, everybody. We generally go through a round of everybody says who is everybody, though we've doing this for a number of years so...

((Crosstalk))

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Sue Schuler: Could we start the recording please?

Sebastien Ducos: Okay, so recording started. You're now on the record. Good afternoon.  
Welcome to the Geo TLD meeting. We usually start with a quick round of who's who. I'd like to make it very, very quick and particularly for those that come here often because you all know each other. So let's keep it to name and affiliation. (Simlo), if you want to start?

(Simlo Buddo): Hi. I'm (Simlo Buddo) from the (unintelligible) Registry. We are also the registry operator for dotGov in Capetown and dotAfrica.

(Peter): I'm (Peter) (unintelligible) from the TMCH. We'll be discussing a topic later on.

Sebastien Ducos: Yes.

Kurt Pritz: Kurt Pritz, I'm an observer and helping (Peter) out.

Richard Wein: I'm Richard Wein from (unintelligible) backend registry.

Man: (Unintelligible) DNS Belgium.

(Emily Choba): Emily Choba, (unintelligible) for dotParis.

(Marianne): (Marianne) (unintelligible), the same.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Alexander Schubert: Alexander Schubert for Next Round new gTLD applicant dotUSA.

Man: (Unintelligible) from dotQuebec.

Dirk Krischenowski: Dirk Krischenowski from dotBerlin.

Sebastien Ducos: Sebastien Ducos, dotMelbourne, dotSydney and dotNYC.

Katrin Ohlmer: Katrin Ohlmer, dotBerlin, dotHamburg.

Sue Schuler: I'm Sue Schuler, I'm the data management person for the Registry Stakeholder Group.

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba, dotMoscow, (unintelligible) observers.

(Lian Haben): (Lian Haben), dotTokyo.

(Andrea Bloom): (Andrea Bloom) for dot(Win).

Man: (Unintelligible) for dotKRD.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible) Afiliias.

(Marcella Hybert): (Marcella Hybert), dotStockholm.

(Chantelle): (Chantelle) (Unintelligible) Paris (unintelligible).

(Henry Bloom): (Henry Bloom) from dot (unintelligible) and dotAmsterdam.

Ronald Schwarzler: Ronald from dotWien.

(Ivaldo Kleto): (Ivaldo Kleto), CGI.br.

Sebastien Ducos: So thank you very much. Sorry, I don't have a mic but we have (Neil Dondas) for dotCapetown and (Joe Berg) and (Dovan) and dotAfrica. We've got (Jacob Williams) from Interlink, dotOsaka and – yes?

((Crosstalk))

Sebastien Ducos: And (Iyako) also for Interlink. For those that – for whose it's the first time, if you have a business card or something like that to pass on so we can record your name and have the proper spelling and everything for future record. Maxim, no, we don't need yours. Thank you very much. This is going to be a

bit of a broken up session, first of all because some of us have got commitments outside of the room that we'll have to go to and come back to.

Also, because just technically we're going to have to break this session in two different sessions just to give a bit of relief to the technical team. This won't impede us from continuing our conversation and having the room, but we'll have to be cognizant of the fact that there's no longer a – there won't be a recording or Adobe Connect for whatever it is, 15 minutes at some point, midway.

Woman: We'll still have it.

Sebastien Ducos: Oh okay. Okay. Good.

((Crosstalk))

Sebastien Ducos: Very good. Okay. Without any further questions, we're going to go very quickly through the agenda. So we have this time for the first time at ICANN two different sessions. We decided to separate into a first Sunday session that is going to be focused on the inner working in the group, the job that the group does. And a Wednesday sessions that is more of an open session for the rest of the public with presentations on what individual TLDs do, where we're at and etcetera.

On that particular note, I sent an invitation three weeks ago for presentation at received zero input. Thank you very much. We've got a few things to show you and explain and talk about. But if anybody wants there is definitely still space to go and explain what you're doing and rave about your good work. Thank you.

So the agenda for today we're going to talk about membership, I guess, Ronald you're going to be doing that?

Ronald Schwarzler: Yes.

Sebastien Ducos: Yes, and the finance, invoicing and etcetera. We've got exciting new developments in terms of our logo and image for the group, things that we've been working the last few months and we're excited to present to you. With that came a few changes with the Website, some done, some forecast that we'd like to talk to you about.

We have a big discussion to have this week as Geos and as TLD community in general about data privacy in Europe. We'll explain to you why this concerns everybody, Europeans and non-Europeans. I'd like to spend as much time as possible on it. We did have a slot today for the TMCH and I've agreed with (Peter), if I can still have that agreement, that of course if we have time to do it today we'll do it, if we don't make enough time or it's too short for you to present we'll just ask you to come back on Wednesday morning and do your presentation then.

Any other topic that anybody wanted to propose for this session for Wednesday? Any questions about the agenda?

Man: We have a second slide for the – so we have a second slide for the Wednesday...

Sebastien Ducos: Yes.

Man: ...that's what the topics are currently.

Sebastien Ducos: Okay. So again TMCH you're in both seats. You'll have your hour of glory or your 15 minutes of glory but it might be Wednesday.

Ronald Schwarzler: So for Wednesday we have Lockheed telling us about the dotAfrica details so there is one...

Sebastien Ducos: One additional point. Okay, okay. And then maybe that closes the book on it because we already have a number of things on Wednesday. Okay, cool. Can we go back to the previous? So again any question, any suggestion, anything missing for the next – for the two sessions? I don't have a gavel but I'll just close it then, thank you very much.

Oh no, it's all yours.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Ronald Schwarzler: One moment. This one says presentation Geo Copenhagen, yes. So go to first page, you're not supposed to – the first page please. You're not supposed to see this at this at this moment because this is the new – this is the new group's logo how the group's new logo. Had also – you should at least see what we have decided for the – over the past few weeks. So next slide please.

So I will give you some information about financial status of the group. It's like the annual meeting and the shareholders that you are, then giving applause or how do you call it in English, and last tone, we did a fine job and anything is fine after that.

So the membership fees that we collected during that year from the members mentioned to the list, these are the 2016 members as they are – have paid for membership fees, (unintelligible) Paris, Amsterdam, Brussels, (Flandreau), Berlin, London, FRL, Tokyo, Hamburg, Istanbul, Stockholm, Stockholm, the agency and the Stockholm the city has joined for this year so we have two members from Stockholm, Cologne, Quebec, New York, Melbourne under the head of – or under the roof of Neustar, (unintelligible) Africa, Capetown, Joberg and Durbin is members.

So Stockholm should not be under observers because they have been full members to (unintelligible) the agency is for members is now turning to an observer. Swiss, Stockholm, (unintelligible) and RW, Budapest, Miami MMX, so Minds+Machines, dotUSA and TLD Box. So but – yes.

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba, small suggestion, you change fee to fees.

Ronald Schwarzler: But because it's getting more?

Maxim Alzoba: Yes, because if you say fee...

((Crosstalk))

Ronald Schwarzler: So you're not member.

((Crosstalk))

Ronald Schwarzler: Okay so these members paid – in total paid €15,875. Next slide please. So the expenses that we spent your money on was the foundation of the group, you know, we were funded under Belgium law being a non for profit organization, Sebastien, it's called...

Sebastien: (Unintelligible) AISBL under Belgian law.

Ronald Schwarzler: So whenever you see Geotld.group AISBL, which is the French spelling for non for profit organization under Belgium law. So this is a one-time fee that we had to spend this year. The membership to the Registry Stakeholder Group, so that we can (unintelligible) under Registry Stakeholder Group on behalf of all our members is the \$2500 which were at the point of time when we had to pay it, €2409.37.

Man: Not dollars, euros?

Ronald Schwarzler: Euros, so we had to pay dollars, but our account is in euro, this is why it shows that way. And for the Website hosting package including the emails, is €104.88 so it's €10,373.98. What we spent the money for, some point still open, so next slide please. Maxim, again, yes. So our account balance – this is the money that Dirk transferred from the dotBerlin account to the newly founded ING Bank in Belgium, €6212.85 including €600 from German companies.

Thanks again to Dirk and dotBerlin for hosting the Geo TLD group in its first year of existence, which causes some problems, as you see here, we have invoiced the German companies, the German members (unintelligible) now we're a Belgium company. The bookkeeper doesn't know what to do with this €800 so the easiest would be to have it as a – we call it (spend) in German, how...

((Crosstalk))

Ronald Schwarzler: So...

Sebastien Ducos: Maybe we make a big dinner next time or...

Ronald Schwarzler: So this is some money that we have that we should not have. But (Flandin) and Brussels should be invoiced – should have been invoiced. So I as the treasurer don't know how to cope with it. I wanted to show it so we will somehow try to forget about this €800 and spend it anyway on our – on behalf of our group.

So next slide please.

Sebastien Ducos: One quick second, if we could come back to – slide back? Yes. So in next year's budget the foundation budget will no longer be an expense, it will become an expense again in three years time because there's not that much smaller portion of it. We will need to change the status of the association

when we change the Board, the ExComm of it, we'll just have to put new people in, there'll be a few fees in there.

As you remember, as we discussed in Vienna, we've actually also reelected ourselves for the next three years to avoid that expense year on year, so we have that longer term. Obviously the Registry Stakeholder Group will stay an expense, so for all those of you who were already members of the Registry Stakeholder Group, good news, you're still a member.

And you're still member as your separate membership, but now as a group we are also an additional member to that group and so we have a voice should you want to relate so if you're not a member of the Registry Stakeholder Group but feel you want to relay information to the stakeholder group via us, you're very welcome to do, you're now a full member. Good.

Ronald Schwarzler: Okay. Two slides. Yes. So there are some open tasks and also open spending. Spending is coming out of the current year, the 2016. The company needs to be registered for rights purposes. We have to file an annual tax declaration so this will be at about €2000 flat fee or less. I have made some – or got some proposal from a Belgium bookkeeper company. And there is some carryover expenses from the 2016 – the logo has to be – logo design has to be funded €2000.

And the Website needs – let's say technical finalization. It is online, it has been done by my employees who are capable of doing it, but if you look at not only superficially, if you look at – there are some thing that a real technical expert could do better so we propose to have an agency or whoever can do it professionally reconfigure or perfectly configure this Website. And I will show you what is needed in the next thing.

So in principle, if you calculate these €6000 against what is in our budget we are at about a little plus, a little bit minus, yes, depending on how you calculate this additional white that we have in here.

Next slide please. So for the membership fees in 2017, we have new members. We welcome (Zira), the Canadian Internet Registry Association, (Zira)?

((Crosstalk))

Ronald Schwarzler: Okay, but (Zira)...

((Crosstalk))

Ronald Schwarzler: Okay, I don't hear a difference but okay.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Ronald Schwarzler: Okay, which works much better for me, yes? So the Canadian Internet Registry Association, it's dotUSA. We welcome Alexander Schubert. And we have as a full member now Stockholm the second – no, Stockholm the first because it's the Stockholm the city administration, still having Stockholm (unintelligible) as an observer member with us.

Okay, and this is the estimation based on the same membership fees calculated on a registered names per TLD basis. And not having this €250 one time reduction that we had that year, so we will come up with a working budget of €25,000 that we have to availability that we have available for this year's works done by the group.

Next slide please. Working budget, €24,000, €25,000 again, this €800 German red thing. Needed for bookkeeping, annual tax declaration at the end of the year, which would be about €1500 to €2000. We have to agree or we have discussed on editorial work for the Website for filing comments, for filing – having perfect English, native English-speaking consequently all over the Website, all over our material that has to be published.

Right now my employees, Kirk, whoever, has access to the Website, does some editing and if you read it carefully I think you can recognize who wrote that article, there are some errors in there, some typos, some perfect English, some not so perfect English. If we want to be in what we claim to be the number one source for geographic TLDs in the world, it must be perfect. There must not be any typos in there. So we will have to spend some money probably on that.

And I added two other topics that I know that are closely looked work that it's the European Union Privacy Directive that will affect any of at least European TLDs to a great, great extent. I know that ((Oliver)) is going to a meeting that (unintelligible) for 10 minutes with GAC on that. So our friends from FRL and Amsterdam have already stepped in doing some things against it. They have shut down the – or closed the Whois to a certain extent from dotFRL.

It's going to be a great threat money-wise for our TLDs, not only the European ones but especially the European ones. The KPIs, the key performance indicators that we are – that we all want to have etcetera, etcetera. This has to be decided. This is something that we have a budget for. We are, again, an AISBL, a non for profit organization. We should be close to zero by the end of the year, otherwise we get problems from the Belgium government, which does not mean let's spend the money, just that it's been spent, let's spend it on things that we agree on that make sense.

Sebastien Ducos: Just one remark for the record. It's the privacy regulation, not a directive.  
That's a fundamental difference, that is...

Ronald Schwarzler: I got it. Got it wrong. Okay. Regulation.

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba. Is annual audits plan of this bookkeeping or?

Ronald Schwarzler: Yes, this is...

((Crosstalk))

Sebastien Ducos: Can I make a quick comment?

Ronald Schwarzler: Sure.

Sebastien Ducos: So we are trying to be this year – this is our second year running to be as thorough and fair to you, to us, to everybody and make sure that we're actually paying people to do jobs that – professional jobs that are included in there. Bookkeeping, again, last year we have Dirk to thank from your internal team, for Ronald also. We've had a lot of interaction of ourselves putting either our time obviously, and that's normal, but also sometimes our company efforts, and that's a bit less normal for the group.

So I'd like to make sure that now everything is above board, the group is paying for the work that it requires. In this same way, as editorial work, so it's not only are we three incapable foreigners to who English is a foreign language – I see Sue saying yes, absolutely incapable. But there's a lot of – we want to have a Website that is live – a Website that represents our community well, so not only is it a question of editing English and making it something that's there but also somewhere we have the capacity to say, hey, here is a big piece of news, an important piece of news, it should go to the Website quickly without having to wait two or three weeks for us to actually have the time to do it. And thus the extra cost there.

Ronald Schwarzler: Next slide, please. Is it the last one? It is the last one. Okay, this is the last one from telling about financials and membership. Okay.

Sebastien Ducos: Any questions, comments? Could we ask just for everybody's understanding maybe the Stockholm situation, if you could explain who is what and who is who?

(Marcella Hybert): Well, city of Stockholm owns the rights to dotStockholm and previously nobody with domain knowledge able to manage it, so (Cleaub) has been running it for the past few years. And in November last year I started working there. And I previously worked with dotSC and dotNew so trying to manage a launch and try to get dotStockholm running. So I've taken over the membership with this group since I work for the city of Stockholm now.

Sebastien Ducos: Okay well, welcome and thank you for the explanation.

(Marcella Hybert): Thank you.

Sebastien Ducos: So okay so new ongoing rule then, whenever we receive presentation and ourselves presentation, let's put titles in the files that actually make sense for Sue. The presentation from (Zed) doesn't count.

Sue Schuler: Okay, do you know what you named it, Dirk?

Sebastien Ducos: So let's – so we talked basically about the three first points. Just to give a bit of context, we just had a meeting with Akram, (Oliver) will explain that maybe a bit later and right now we've got it at the end of the agenda. I don't know what you're agenda is. But I think that we need to spend some time with it.

Marian, Katrin and I are going to go and see the GAC in a minute and we'll come back with some feedback on that. In the meantime I think that the easiest is to go through the identity, the logo and etcetera on the Website and then we'll come back and talk about working group. Okay?

Dirk Krischenowski: Okay.

Sebastien Ducos: So it's all Dirk.

Dirk Krischenowski: Okay. So where to start with corporate identity? So if you look on our Website at the moment, we don't have any colors, we don't have claim to be

somebody special or something like this, and every organization in the world, including yourself, may want to have a positioning in the market, want to have a claim and want to have a logo and a vision and a mission, that's very normal.

And we were sitting together to find out that are we? What do we want and so on. And the team was that on the next slide, there was during the last couple of months so from the last ICANN meeting to this ICANN meeting so there was Sebastien, there was (Luc) from (unintelligible) Belgium, myself, Katrin, Ronald, (Constanza) and some other helping hands from some agencies, also and friends of ours who looked into this topic.

And, yes, how to start? And on the next slide there are so many different ways to come up with all these things identity and vision and mission, some big things there. That's one idea how this goes. And at the top is the vision and the position is somewhere in the middle and the mission is directly under the vision. Next slide please.

Then you could have something like this, so everybody defines it differently and there are different theories on how to work on finding what we want to achieve, what our plan and how differentiate we, ourselves from the competition. Next slide.

And there are other ways to do it. So it's – everything about branding and all these terms like brand personality, identity, tonality and everything like this. This is something we are new in because we are all not managers of this kind of stuff but everybody, I think, has done something similar with its company like DNS Belgium did or dotBerlin did and others did.

So our team you saw we tried to figure out what the core of activities and so on. Please next slide please. So the way we decided is to answer the following questions ourselves, and we did it by telephone, by meetings, by email exchange and there was a really lengthy process, with a lot of

creativity. And we also have what are we, who are we and how differentiate ourselves from the competition in the market or from other market players like the Brand Registry Group or we don't want to enter – don't want to be in competition with the individual registries. So you all, the group, should not compete with the individual members.

And so we came up with a positioning that's a long version and the claim is a short version of the positioning normally. Then we stepped further down, what's our vision? What do we want to achieve in the next couple of years? You can say three years, five years, 10 years, everybody does it differently, but it should have some perspective and some visionary aspects.

And then the mission, the mission is how we want to – how can we become what we want to be in five years? So that was the plan we had. And we worked on this. So next slide please.

The positioning was the first thing. Next slide. And positioning example, there are not many companies who write their positioning very exactly on their Website but the good example is (AFNIC). (AFNIC) is certainly in competition with other registry providers, maybe not for dotFR but still I think in France you are doing a tender sometimes to run FR I think?

Woman: Every five years there is a tender for running FR.

Dirk Krischenowski: Yes, so you are in competition to others which may come in the way in five years or three years or so. So you need some position and (AFNIC) said a non for profit association and (unintelligible) of dotFR, (unintelligible) Registry Operator, of top level domain names and therefore in competition to other players in this market and some more ideas. That was an example how to do positioning. So and we started with after brainstorming with the idea of a very long text putting everything we had in mind together.

We even had a longer text before with a lot of examples what's the geographic identifier, geographic name, geographic origin so there are many different words in this. And then we started a lengthy process sitting there, shrinking the – this text, changing some words, that's on the next slide, so that was really interesting.

If you are sitting together with a lot of people that text really shrinks a lot and you're changing language and we were all not native English speakers and so that doesn't make it much easier. And at the end of the day, the positioning is the next slide. We came up with a – some shorter sentences. The Geo TLD group is an international non for profit membership association. That's what we are. The group represents the interests of geographic top level domain names identifying cities, regions, cultures and languages. Its members are governments, companies, and associations. That's who are we, how do we consist. That's the positioning here of the group.

Yes, it's a lengthy process and it's also ongoing process, if you find that in the future in the next couple of months or years, something is not anymore correct, you need to adapt this to position yourself. We don't have a direct competitor in the market, but that's how others see us in the market. What are we, what's the members, and what do they do, so that's a clear cut positioning in this case.

Next slide please. Then we came up with a short version of the positioning, that's the claim. And that was – is the next one – we have a short version which should be under the long-coming with the logo. Ronald is presenting in a minute. And a long version that means promoting digital identifies for cities, regions, cultures and languages on the Internet, that's on the Website.

And it really more explains what the logo is because Geo TLD doesn't mean anything to outsiders of our business, we still need to explain to stakeholders and others what are we doing. And we don't want it to have top level domain names for instance, in the claim because top level domain name doesn't

mean anything to any other people like governmental people and, yes, that's fine and easier language was a very big task on this.

So next thing was the vision. It's basically what we want to achieve when we said five years is a reasonable timeframe. And we looked into others, what have others provision? Google has to provide access to the world information on one click. And next slide. Tesla, for instance, says to create the most compelling car companies in the 21st Century by driving the world's transition to electric vehicles. So really great visions there and, yes, we worked on this too. And the result is on the next slide.

So Geo TLDs Group vision is you could – I read it – Geo TLDs are shaping tomorrow's Internet and creating digital identities for places and communities. That's the shortest possible version of a vision. And you may have noticed that we were putting together or changing the Geo TLD, the first letter G, to a small letter because we have the ccTLDs, we have the nTLDs, we have the gTLDs, and we find it more reasonable and gives also the TLD the three letters, more substance if you have a big G at the beginning, that's something, yes, geo you can differentiate now from TLD. That's important. If you have everything small or everything bold then you see it's Geo TLD and it's not a word that means something to people.

And then we said we have the dot and we have the group, so we have a perfect word for which is URL or a domain name and, yes, it should look like. And the second part of the vision is the Geo TLD group strive to represent all geographic top level domain names and stands as the rallying point – as a rallying point. The group stimulates geo TLDs' potential for the benefit of their cities, regions, cultures and languages.

Okay, that's a bit heavy for the moment but maybe we have some time to discuss this. Next slide please. Then the mission, we had some examples of missions too. And Google's mission is to organize the world's information to make it universally accessible and useful. And for instance, next slide,

VeriSign has the mission helping to enable security, safety and reliability on the Internet. And another example of the mission was DNic, responsibility for the Internet community and a lot of smaller things coming with this as explanation.

And, yes, what to do with the mission? So we were, again, sitting there creating words, sentences, deleting them, coming up with new ideas. That was really an interesting process. But finally on the next slide we have our mission and it says the Geo TLD group promotes and connects those engaged in the advocacy, implementation, governance, promotion and development of Geo TLDs within their communities and to their stakeholders.

For its members, the Geo TLD group runs regular meetings, maintains communication, shares information and best practice, guard data and statistics and develops and distributes common positions in relation to stakeholders.

Just reading this, I think there's some room for making this shorter. But that's the process we have to go through. And that's my last slide before Ronald comes on – comes up with the logo development. Any comments on the results, process and everything like this? This was a lot of information, a lot of words.

Ronald Schwarzler: I hope you do not aim for the same ideas and service as Tesla.

Dirk Krischenowski: No, we don't. Not becoming the most worthy stakeholder group in ICANN's history or something like this, we didn't choose that.

(Louie): I really like your presentation. But I must say that this one, as far as I'm concerned, I find it a little heavy.

Norman: One thing to be sure is who is our customers? To who we have to make communication? Is it to registrars? So Geo TLDs good as a name for

registrar because they understand? Or is it directly to customers with end users? So this in our communication we have to define this, who – to who are we addressing communication?

Sue Schuler: Dirk, I have to interrupt for a second. Please announce your names before you speak for the transcript. It makes it very difficult for the transcriptionist.

((Crosstalk))

Sue Schuler: Thank you.

Norman: Yes, this is Norman. This was (Louie) before.

(Oliver): As just a formal remark with regard to the first slide, when you define to other members of the association, sorry for being a lawyer here, but I think governments will not be the members of the association. I think what you mean probably will be public bodies or municipalities. The government itself will not be a member so just as a formal remark. But the rest, thanks a lot of your efforts and I think it's an impressive result in general.

Dirk Krischenowski: Thank you, (Oliver).

(Oliver): (Oliver), sorry.

Dirk Krischenowski: Yes.

(Oliver): (Unintelligible).

Dirk Krischenowski: Yes, as I said, that's a starting point for us to put these messages on the Website as well so that people can see if they want to ask what they are doing. They are to find some more information. And I absolutely agree, it's a bit heavy, and it could be somehow a bit lighter. So less words and maybe less heavy, yes, meanings or so. That's a working basis. And with like every

company, so Google's statement wasn't also all the time the same. So they are adapting and changing this over time too.

And, yes, we had internally also big discussion on the who are our customers, who looks on the Website, who we are talking to or the messages we have, who are the target groups of these messages, and that's something that continues.

And now the logo.

Ronald Schwarzler: And now the logo. I have a presentation that we can share in the Adobe room. But I have had about 200 logo proposals that we got over the month. I have it on the laptop. So can we have it just...

((Crosstalk))

Ronald Schwarzler: No, no I have – it will not be an Adobe room. Do we have (unintelligible) on the Adobe?

Sue Schuler: Can we just put this up to the screen?

Ronald Schwarzler: So...

Sue Schuler: Sorry, he's discussed something and he wants to share on his screen.

Ronald Schwarzler: Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Ronald Schwarzler: Okay. Okay. Yes. I will show you without any comment from my side. The logos we were sent over the past some months, if you want comment you're very much invited to comment. It is a mixture of yes, different looks. So let us just start here.

This was I think about the first proposal. Geo TLD groups - or the logo could look at this one. If you want to have any remarks please do. The next one was this. And let me make a remark, it looks like a bird picking somewhere. Yes but...

((Crosstalk))

Ronald Schwarzler: So the same bird in a different color. So...

((Crosstalk))

Ronald Schwarzler: Yes, okay. If it's not a – it's not a sequence in time, it's just like they are on my computer so you see different colors, so this is the idea of the globe then again some birds.

((Crosstalk))

Ronald Schwarzler: Then this was I think the first time where the idea was the pointer, it points to something because Geo means some point, somewhere so this is where the things are coming from. So this is an element of a pointer – many pointers because we are many TLDs so I have to – this is looking that way. Different origins, different styles, this ones with different colors, having the pointer as an element showing or pointing to the dot.

Still other colors. Larger pointer. Or the pointer going downwards. So being placed differently. Having ears, the pointer. Yes, and then at some point of time, yes, showing sides of our members. You can never do this perfect because...

((Crosstalk))

Ronald Schwarzler: Yes, if there is the Statue of Liberty and it's the Eifel Tower and it's the Toronto Tower or whatever, but what about the Durban side, so Berlin, I recognize Berlin in there, I recognize Rome. But you will forget some and so it's probably nice looking but never perfect thing. Then the globe, not the universe but the globe in various shapes. The world including the (unintelligible). In colors.

((Crosstalk))

Ronald Schwarzler: Yes, so we had hundreds and hundreds of them. So...

((Crosstalk))

Ronald Schwarzler: Yes, and then it reminds you of the AT&T and the other one reminds you of that, and so yes the bird. So and then we finally – so just to give you an idea of what we got from various of our partners, and then we are now switching online the way and if you've already seen it.

((Crosstalk))

Ronald Schwarzler: Yes, but it won't show you a map. So now we are on our Website, the way it looks now. You see, we have just incorporated the logo at that point of time. It says, the Geo TLD group to the left side and the claim promoting local digital entities to the right. We have three colors in that logo, it's the red, it's the...

((Crosstalk))

Ronald Schwarzler: Yes, (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible).

Ronald Schwarzler: So, again, we have somehow agreed on that. You see the pure red, you see the black and you see the light blue. These are the three colors that the logo consists of. And for example, we will – or what we have to do on the Website, is we have to eliminate this green drop down menus. They have to be in the same color, the same coloring scheme that the logo incorporates. So this is what the Website has to be worked at.

It's not only about placing a logo on the top of a Website, but use the coloring scheme throughout the whole Website. Yes, this is what I can tell you about the logo. And now let me give you some other improvements on the Website. And could you please – could we switch?

Sue Schuler: Yes, you just have to – I've got it on the laptop, you've got to put it back in presentation mode.

Ronald Schwarzler: Okay, but I could also show it here? Is it better to go in the – plug it in here?

Sue Schuler: I would say because nobody can see it on Adobe but there is nobody on Adobe really so people in the room. The problem is you're recording Adobe...

Ronald Schwarzler: Okay.

Sue Schuler: So if somebody ever wants...

((Crosstalk))

Sue Schuler: ...they can see it then.

Ronald Schwarzler: There are two and three.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Either or.

Ronald Schwarzler: Okay.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: Okay I have to restart Adobe, it crashed.

((Crosstalk))

Ronald Schwarzler: Oh I could do it here, yes?

((Crosstalk))

Ronald Schwarzler: I bet I can show it here.

Sue Schuler: Yes, but if you pull that out again it's going to crash Adobe again probably.

((Crosstalk))

Sue Schuler: I mean, you're trying to record Adobe so that if you've got people that want...

((Crosstalk))

Ronald Schwarzler: Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Ronald Schwarzler: Yes, it will show. Open task Website, so what we have to do is to finalize the layout and the corporate design of the Website, put in the right – the agreed on colors and – how do I advance here?

((Crosstalk))

Ronald Schwarzler: You are doing it. Okay so please next slide please. And what we – so this is technically working but it's not beautiful at the time. This is what I meant that we have to do some rework on. You know, when you have attended past meetings of the Geo TLD group, Sebastien or Dirk promoted a URL on Dropbox where you could find all the presentations that were done during the meetings. We do no longer need a Dropbox account or a Dropbox access, we will have a login or we already have a login area on the Website.

Being on the membership tab it's the third one on the – from the left telling Home, About and then Membership. And you are clicking on that Membership, you will come to a login area. The primary contact that you have given on your application form is still registered with this Website, and then you can enter the membership area.

Next slide please. If you then go, for example, to the Vienna meeting, located under Events, Meetings and then you go to Vienna 2016, if you are logged in, you will see all the presentations that we have had in this – during this meeting. If you're not logged in you will see there was a meeting in Vienna telling you the agenda, telling you anything that was supposed to be public.

The members that are logged in will be seeing the – all the presentations, etcetera. So not – not needed anymore refers to the Dropbox. We will have one point of communication and can disregard the external storage. Next slide please.

The same for newsletter or mailing lists. We manage them under Google Lists, Google Groups, sorry. We had – as you know, we have two groups there. It's the one – the membership list and it's one for the open Geo TLD open list. We will incorporate these lists also inside the Website's management.

So once you're registered, for example, as a member, you will be in the members list that is managed here. And when we send out the newsletter or mailing you will only have – or at least we from the management side, we'll only have one source where we can send emails to, where you can, for example, change your email if you have a new email address, we do not need to follow two or three or four places where we have up two update.

And again it's not on Google Groups, it's on our Website, this Website is done in Wordpress so it's a single source of information. That is what we want to achieve. Maxim.

Maxim Alzoba: Question, do you have someone looking at the constant security monitoring of the site? Because as a (unintelligible) we have lots of stations where something changed in the version of Wordpress and some bad guys are putting some nasty scripts there and you have to eradicate it and, yes, it's not...

((Crosstalk))

Ronald Schwarzler: So what we have set up – this is a Wordpress, as you recognized, it's a Wordpress thing so we get notification if there is a newer version for sure. We have enabled a feature called Code Guard so once something would change we would be noticed in a minute. I personally do not know how to get rid of it afterwards, but at least it was noted that something has been corrupted. Yes? This is the way that I was talking about, we do it as semiprofessionals or amateurs so we have to get to the next level and probably hire some external that are really able to build or to maintain secure websites.

Now it's a best effort that the group doesn't pay for – it's just a hosting package and it's managed by me, my employees, etcetera, edited by Dirk and some of the articles translated, edited, by dotQuebec. So this is how we are working at the moment. If you want to get more professionalism in it I

think we will have to spend some money on that. There is nothing like a free lunch I think, it's so this is to be done in the next two or three weeks.

So when we will meet for the next time and the next meeting without taking any of the information in advance it is supposed to be in Madrid during or after the GDD Summit, we will have the Website in its, let's say, final state, professionally set up, city corporate design, corporate entity, and this membership area, that is already there, but more – let's say done nicely in a better shape then.

This is the last slide or do we have, yes, Sebastien told about it. I mentioned it at least once if not twice. The editorial revision or the editorial management of our Website. Currently I do some input, (Constanza), my employee, does some inputs, Dirk does some inputs, Norman does some inputs. It's not the same language that we use throughout the whole Website, so I – whenever you have some recommendations, who could do the, let's say, make all the wordings unique or the same all over the Website.

I personally think it must be some native speaking English – must be some English speaking native that we have the professional, the perfect wording. Whenever you know someone who knows the terms that we have inside our ICANN-ish, even if we have to spend money on that, because I noticed it's not done – that someone has to do it for free. But it must be someone who has the time and the knowledge and the language knowledge to at least spend some time and effort on it. Please, contact either me, Dirk or Sebastien, we have to find someone.

Man: Yes, I know someone who knows German, English, profound in this and helped with applications and things like that.

Ronald Schwarzler: You do?

Man: Yes.

Ronald Schwarzler: It's not, I mean, I do not speak German. Sorry...

((Crosstalk))

Man: I will investigate if the person is still in...

((Crosstalk))

Ronald Schwarzler: No, to be serious, recommendations please to the ExComm Board. We are really looking for someone who has the time and the capability knowledge-wise and language wise.

Dirk Krischenowski: So things you can do for the Website and on the Website is for instance putting good use examples if you see an advertising or have a good example how your Geo TLD is used in the public on the Website. So the last one is we have here under Information on the Website it's from November and some advertising from the Flemish government.

((Crosstalk))

Dirk Krischenowski: Yes, yes, you don't see it here at the moment. But that – you can provide some more pictures. And if you have ideas of some texts, you have made or written or something like this, we can publish this on the Website like some – probably most of you got the ITB, the International Tourism fare report on how geo TLDs are used there today – the last days. And something like this we can put on the Website on the Geo TLD Website.

And also I still remind those who haven't sent a link from your geo TLD or Nic Website to that Website, that's really important to have that link coverage that would be an easy doing. But you can – yourself provide also content for the Website and the Website can grow with us all providing here input, that's the message.

Ronald Schwarzler: Any comments, input? Volunteers for whatever?

(Louie): (Louie) (unintelligible) for the transcript. I was wondering did you have in mind to (unintelligible) the members Website or something that – instead of, you know, importing information maybe relating the new information that would be provided by the members on their own Website? It's just a thought.

Ronald Schwarzler: Ronald here for the transcript. What do you mean by RSS?

((Crosstalk))

(Louie): Yes...

Ronald Schwarzler: Okay, okay.

(Louie): A feed, yes, sorry for...

Ronald Schwarzler: Okay...

(Louie): ICANN-ish.

Ronald Schwarzler: Okay. We did not so far, yes? We do not have unique – our partners or our members do not have unique Website. I don't know whether any of our Nic.tld websites have a news section. So technically why not, if we have a section news from our members and we have possibility to input from there. It means technically getting the RRS code from anyone who is interested in inserting, yes?

You have to have an idea on how to put it in the navigation. If you are very active on it we will have only messages from dotQuebec, the first 200 and then some from Berlin and then one from Stockholm, which does not

represent the whole membership area then or the whole membership. But anyone could somehow promote its own TLD.

But again you have – if – my personal opinion, if you are doing a Website for a group you can't let the most active member be the dominating the whole Website. So automatically inputting something, I'm not very much in favor of this. Norman has editing rights, so he can at any time access the Website and put some article in there, so any one of you who says I want to contribute to that, send us to the articles or even demand your own editing rights, someone else that we are looking for will then have the correct wording and somehow modify it.

So that's the way that we at least planned as a first step thing. And disregarding the automatically filled in because you never know how many from the very same TLD we will get. And I'm a technician so I like – I very much like to have automatic things, but not if it comes to editorial things.

(Oliver): But we still can first check if it's possible to have that multi-RSS feed up and running or something like this, might be.

(Louie): Oh my question, (Louie) (unintelligible). My question was only a proposal. I was just wondering if you were talking about, you know, such means to emphasize the information that could be provided by members. But of course you have to take a position and you were talking about your – you were offering your thoughts. And they're as valuable as mine. I know that (unintelligible) disagrees with my proposal. It's not a real proposal.

Ronald Schwarzler: But you're working together, right?

(Louie): Yes.

Ronald Schwarzler: Okay. Any other questions, inputs? Shall we have a break?

Man: (Unintelligible).

Ronald Schwarzler: (Vicky), (Peter), would you be prepared to jump in to do your presentation?

(Vicky Fullens): (Unintelligible) we're supposed to preserve the mandatory break, that's supposed to happen.

Ronald Schwarzler: Okay.

(Vicky Fullens): I don't know what time it's supposed to be at.

Ronald Schwarzler: I think you have the presentation from (Peter)? Yes?

((Crosstalk))

Ronald Schwarzler: Okay, would you come here? Okay, so...okay.

((Crosstalk))

(Peter): Good afternoon, everybody. My name is (Peter) (unintelligible). I'm with the Trademark Clearinghouse together with my colleague (Vicky Fullens). We've been developing a new service for a while now which we think is both relevant for trademark holders and registry operators. And this is what we wanted to present to the Geo TLD group today to see some feedback and answer some questions that you might have.

Next slide please. Yes. So starting off, a bit on the volume of the current volume of the TMCH, so currently as of last week, I believe, we were at 43,106 trademark records in the TMCH which corresponds with about 57,400 exact match labels. So when the TMCH was launched ICANN designed a few matching – identical matching rules so a trademark that has two words and a spacing in between would automatically be converted into two labels, one

with the two words joined together and the other one with a hyphen in between because a space isn't written in the DNS.

Based on some internal statistics, we came to some conclusions and we saw that of all those labels in the Clearinghouse only less than 50% has ever been registered in a single TLD. So that means that 50% of the labels in the Clearinghouse has not been registered in the TLD, not in sunrise but also not in general availability, not even after the 90 days of claims.

If you take one step back and take a look at 50 TLDs, then you see that only 5% or 5.6% has registered or has been registered in 50 TLDs or more. This is what – this is the current state. We had a lot of discussion over the past years ever since the Clearinghouse launched on volume and on performance, we've talked with a lot of our trademark holders and our trademark agents.

The Clearinghouse operates through what we call a reseller channel, the TMCH agents. Most corporate registrars sell TMCH services. We ourselves feel that we are not a single point – we are not a single stop shop, you need additional (unintelligible), consultancy, domain name registrations and that's not within the scope of the TMCH. So that's why we prefer to work with TMCH agents who are expert in their field and who have their links with the trademark community.

Their feedback on low volume in both TMCH but also in low volume in overall registrations is that it's difficult for a brand holder to assess the entire program. So we have over – currently over 500 TLDs that have launched sunrise, for them the different pricing, the different categories, it's difficult for them to pick and choose and to build a strategy.

They need more time and their answer, because the program kept on rolling, their current stance was that they held off on any defensive registrations and registrations in general.

Some additional services like the protected marks list from Donuts are well received, but also there is a feedback that it only still covers a single part of the new gTLD space. So building on top of that, next slide please, we wanted to design a similar service which we call the TMCH (Trex), which is a single service provided by the TMCH. And it would basically allow - it would basically help trademark holders to get some bigger coverage in the new gTLD space.

The TMCH would act as an intermediary between the trademark holder community and between the different TLDs. And basically a trademark holder would be able to activate the service and it will allow him to reserve his name from registration in participating TLDs.

So basically what we have designed is something similar to DPML, but for all different outstanding alone registry operators. Registry operator who only has a single or two TLDs for them it's difficult to build a market, a protective marks list to the trademark community because it only gets results for a single or for two TLDs.

Our goal would be to build a portfolio and where the TMCH would act as service providers to both the trademark community and the TLD community. To be clear, what we are proposing is some kind of a reserving mechanism which allows trademark holders to take their name out of general availability, and add an additional layer of verification on both names that are still available.

This is not a blocking function, this is an additional layer of verification and trademark holders would still be able to override a reservation and still activate the name. We would only target those names that are linked to trademark terms in the Clearinghouse. So there is a coverage which is defined and precise, and it applies only to trademarks that are verified in the TMCH. These trademarks will be annually renewed, so we will be renewing – we will be verifying the SMD files also if the service is being renewed. And

the registry operator can have names exempt such as premium names, two or three letter characters. So there is the possibility to upload an exempt list which these names would not be impacted by the service.

And the TMCH will have an override mechanism to release the names for activation so that the trademark holder can still actively use it when they have time to build their marketing strategy and when they know how to use their different domain names.

The reason that we are here today is we want to discuss this with you, for the registry operators there is some clear benefits. First off, there is some value that will be generated on currently unregistered trademark names. If you have a trademark name that's still out there, chances are slim that they will be registered in the near future, and it will allow you to still get value on those names.

And basically it would be annually recurring revenue on trademarked terms that are currently not registered and not available. It helps building the reputation for rights protection across the new gTLD space. On the same hand, again, we are also, for the TMCH even though we are servicing the trademark holders, we don't want to have a negative communication so everybody wants to see usage and so do we because more usage is more exposure for the new gTLD space.

So we will definitely be designing a marketing platform which allows you to incorporate use cases to target directly to the trademark community and leverage them to create actual usage of the domain names they have reserved.

And finally one of the bigger benefits is that single digit TLD operators, those who house one, two or three TLDs, are able to join an extended rights protection mechanism which until now was very limited to the bigger portfolio players.

And then finally just summarizing the scope, so what we wanted to discuss with you today is the top-level idea of the service. We've been in contact with a few registry operators already. We've had a lot of discussion on the technical flow. I can assure you that I'm a technical side we are looking into investing in ourselves in different flows which fit to the specifications of your backend, so we are committed on making sure that there are - that the implementation impact is as limited as possible.

And basically we want to leverage our neutral position in the domain ecosystem to go into conversations with each and every one of you in conversation with your Registry backend to have services that can be adopted by everybody.

We are working with the ICANN and we are discussing with ICANN to make sure that this service is also accepted and fits within the existing agreements. And yes, like I said we want to promote this service but we definitely want to promote domain name usage. We will do marketing through our trademark - through our channel of trademark agents. We will be doing PR campaigns globally. We will promote domain take up usage, and there is also, yes, we also have a reporting engine which allows you to see statistics on usage and activation of the service.

With that, I think that's a bit the things we wanted to discuss with you today. There is one more slide where basically (unintelligible) for some discussion points on there. We would like to know from your end, do you see the value in this proposition? Is there some kind of buy-in? Is it something that comes from a group decision or more on a per TLD basis? And anybody who is interested but have some concerns on a technical workflow our technical people are also in Denmark so we are more than happy to have any conversations with you to see how we can move forward. Thank you.

Man: (Unintelligible) from Core Association. I'm actually very happy that, you know, we see this proposal now, until the details of course, you know, some of these things are still a work in progress, I understand. But there is really a need for action in this respect because looking at trademarks just at the time of the initial sunrise was very – too limited in scope for, you know, any effectiveness.

The implementation details you probably heard me criticize what has been done, it's not the fault of the Trademark Clearinghouse as such, but just the fault of many mistakes, you know, that have been made globally in the process which made it, up to now, really hard to deal with - with a resource that should actually have been rather helpful.

But essentially what you've put into the diagram, you have many parties on the one side and many parties on the other. And to have a unified point for them to interact is fundamental. Now I would really be happy to work more on the details specifically as we have customers who would like to have solutions (unintelligible), many of us who work in the geos have other customers in other areas because of they're all linked. It would be good to be able to work on that.

And if you have an ability to, you know, take input and discuss with you the technical solutions, you know, that would be really great before they are implemented, because once they are implemented it's been very hard for the version 1.1, then the version 1.2, and after having made all these implementation is really costly.

(Peter): Yes, thank you for that. I'll reach out to you after the meeting and maybe we can set something up later this week. Just one point of clarification as well, the TMCH is doing this because we want to create additional value for the TMCH, we're not – for us this isn't a revenue model; our revenue is for the subscriptions to the TMCH. So the TMCH will be paying the TLDs that participate on a per label, per TLD, per year basis, and that will be - and the

trademark holder will be paying the TMCH, but it's mostly a moving product where I think the bigger portion of the fees go directly to the TLD operators and not to the TMCH.

Any other questions or comments?

Ronald Schwarzler: Okay, (Peter), we had some talks before so are the numbers that you gave me, 4, 3, 1 are they still the one that can be said? So just what I heard from (Peter) and (Vicky), they plan to invoice trademark holder by €4 a year, and three of these, yes – dollars, sorry, which is one by one at the moment, and \$3 should go to the registry and one dollar stays with the TMCH.

Having seen these numbers, there are so many trademark holders that did not register with most of us, if they could convince let's say 5000 trademark holders to buy that service any one of us participate in the program would get about \$15,000 for trademarks that have not registered so far. And we are, at least for Wien, we are three months in operation and 40 – around 50 of these trademark holders have registered with us, so 41,000 have not.

So it's about - I'd like to register - that they register with us, but they did decide not to register in case they have a problem they will find a legal case. So why not at least think of a possibility to make some money and to have them trying to sell it in just to get the names that we can put off the list after words if we really need them for local purposes? This is at least the idea that is behind that. It is another way of – let's say it could be a way of really getting some euros, dollars or whatever to our registries and at least for dotWien, we would like to have some additional money, yes?

Dirk Krischenowski: Yes, I think it all depends on how many trademark holders or trademarks are going into the calculation. So if it's only 200 or so it doesn't make sense. But how do you think - could you really activate those trademark holders to use that kind of service?

(Peter): So when we've discussed this - services with our agents, I think the figure that rolled off about 5000 is our goal that we also discussed to reach in two years, so we're hopeful that by two years we would have about 5000 activated labels for this service.

The feedback that we get from the trademark community is that they want something like this. The advantage of the TMCH offering this is that we would take a lot of that complexity, which (Werner) also touched on earlier, we would take a lot of that complexity on our side both for the TLDs, but also for the trademark holders because for them different timing, different pricing, this would be in a single stop shop with the TMCH where agents for the trademark holder would activate the service and all the management and everything would be done by the TMCH.

So we're confident that we can make those numbers, and we're hopeful that we can build upon that. It's a bit of chicken and an egg situation, the more TLDs we'll have been more activations we'll have and the more trademark holders we will have, and the more trademark holders we'll have the more TLDs we'll have. There is nothing lost with – I mean, it will grow over time that we are confident that we can make these estimations.

Ronald Schwarzler: Ronald for the record. So if I try to formalize it, to speak at the other way, trademark holders are not happy with the different pricing was that all the TLDs offer; some sell for \$100, some sell for \$20. They want to have the domain names or not anyone else have the domain names and they want to secure this for let us say about €4. This is what you think they are willing to pay that no one else can register a domain name that matches any of the trademarks until they are willing to pay but they are not willing to register their trademarks at the Vienna for let's say €30, in Berlin for €50, in London for €80 and on the dotCar for €2800. They want a single price.

And they are also - what do you think that current is €4 and they would say okay, if I have 500 TLDs participating that means \$2000, again, \$2000. And

I'm willing to somehow block lock or whatever these names in the TLDs should get. So the smaller a TLD is the more it would profit from the number of TLDs participating, yes?

Probably some really large (unintelligible) care about dotEUs without making dotEU smaller but they would not register it to use, but there is no cherry picking for the trademark holder if he wants to have his name block in Istanbul, in London, in Berlin, and in Vienna to say some – in Paris to say some of the five important cities in Europe, it is also locked or it has to be locked a rule, this rule is participating in Quebec, in (unintelligible).

So we cannot say I want to have this one, five, six, seven, €4, either it's all or it's nothing for all the participating ones. So the smaller TLDs, the more it probably can, let's say, make benefit of the others.

(Peter): Yes, so it's a bundled package that we will be offering to the trademark holders. So there won't be an interface where they can say I want this TLD or that TLD, the service is, in the TLDs that are in this program, you will get coverage in all of them. They only get some peace of mind and some assurance that these names - that their name is no longer openly available in the DNS space, and that's basically the service that we would be providing to them, not you can pick this TLD or this TLD, it will be a bundled offer.

Man: Just one additional question. I mean, for us it would be interesting in a number of TLDs to say there is a presumption that the following strings are not going to be available, you know, not like that however, there must be a proviso to say if something happens we will be able to take that particular string out of that pool. Is that part of your proposal?

(Peter): So we have designed an override mechanism so you can take that name that has been put on a reserve list, you can take that out of the reserve list in that name can be activated. Currently that has been designed also with the

trademark verification but we are also looking into extending the different verification sets for releasing a name.

Again, our program is designed -- if the trademark holder wants nobody to have that name they need to register it. This is a step in between where if somebody else wants to register it they need to be verified. And we are looking into expanding that verification sets in the beginning of the launch, it's trademark verification but if there is a geo TLD that says okay if a local mark, then we also are looking into how we can - verification sets to be able to enable that.

Ronald Schwarzler: (Peter), Ronald for the record. Another remark, I talked to some of our colleagues and I know that this is not yet decided and it's subject to implementation but one of your proposals was to register the domain without assigning name servers to it. Registering a domain name means having higher volumes in your registration numbers, which then could result in having to pay against ICANN. So this is a negative fact if you would go for that technical solution.

So getting €3 on the one side or \$3 but I'm having to spend something else on ICANN, whatever realize they should your choice here is to make sure that we are not taking any additional costs with it. So probably you can -- it would be your job to go to ICANN and to have resolved that these names would not be subject to the volume to be paid to ICANN or however you would solve it.

(Peter): Yes, so that's one of the reasons that we don't have any technical (unintelligible) on the board at the moment. Everything is still - we have different routes or different tracks in discussion at the moment. Where we clearly are also working with ICANN to see how we can circumvent some of these concerns, it's clear that we need to discuss with everybody else see what are the different concerns.

And again like I mentioned, it's on us to solve that complexity. So I think the existing ecosystem is already very complex, we can design something which goes around that but has other factors into play. So we need to find a balance which works for everybody in the existing DNS ecosystem and also something which doesn't create too much additional implementation workload or additional costs. So that's why we're close to landing the puzzle but there is still a lot of, yes, some top needed and especially on a technical basis, we're listing all concerns in trying to solve all or as many of them as possible.

Dirk Krischenowski: Okay, thank you very much.

(Peter): Okay.

Dirk Krischenowski: And I have that – so I would suggest that we make a break but we have – and we can have after the break the discussion about the privacy thing or should we have that before? How long do you think you would need, (Oliver)?

(Oliver): Well, depends on the level of discussion. I would give you an update about what we discussed earlier today with Akram. I would give you an update about the changes that we are all facing and how we may comply with that, you know...

Dirk Krischenowski: Okay, maybe we have it before the break and then we make a break and wait for Sebastien to come back and tell us what the GAC said on new gTLDs. So...

(Oliver): Okay.

Dirk Krischenowski: ...then I would say...

(Peter): Can I just say, closing, thank you everybody for the opportunity to talk to you. Our email addresses are on the screen so if anybody is interested we will be reaching out to you separately as well, but (Peter)@clearinghouse.org and

vicky@clearinghouse.org is where you can reach us. Some of you know us already, other ones do not. But please feel free to reach out. Thank you.

Dirk Krischenowski: Thank you, (Peter).

Man: (Oliver), the floor is yours.

(Oliver): (Oliver) from dotHamburg for the record. Thank you. Yes, I attended a meeting today, well let me start from the very beginning, the ones of you who attended our meeting in Vienna will remember that we already had a discussion about the challenges that we are facing regarding the upcoming new European framework for data protection and privacy.

We decided back then to establish a working group which consists of Maryann from dotParis, from eVote, dotFRL and myself. And, great, I see that you're back at the very right point. So we had some calls. And well the most important thing that many of us have to solve is that we are facing a situation where the Whois that we are all operating and has contracted parties we are obliged to ICANN to operate it in the way that we have to, will not be compliant once we have the new data protection regulation in Europe enforced.

This affects for most of the European geo TLD registries of course, and we then had to call together with Thomas Rickert from Eco because this is also an issue that is affecting many companies, many member companies from Eco. And we decided to try to set up a first meeting at ICANN Copenhagen. And this meeting together with Akram from the ICANN – from ICANN staff from the Board, happened today at one o'clock.

And well, we took the opportunity to address the issue here and the concern that in particular the geo TLDs have and try to kick off a discussion and a solution process together with ICANN in order to give us a chance to be compliant regarding the Whois problem until May 2018.

So in a nutshell, from what I understood, the big challenge for us and for Eco and for the others, DNic was in that meeting as well. The ICANN legal staff needs proof that what we say is really the case. And so we have to prove that operating Whois will not comply with the future data protection regulation.

And only if there is no other option from a technical perspective, then ICANN would see itself in a situation where they could grant us a waiver and give us an exemption from the contract. As long as there might be other solutions. As an example it was addressed that there is the opportunity at least for a registrar to provide the registrant a proxy service.

So if they should be a solution, which I am convinced it is absolutely not a solution from a legal perspective, but only if there is no other solution they feel themselves or see themselves in a situation to give us a waiver. If this is not the case, then we would have to start a PDP process within the GNSO, which of course would be a process that would take longer and tell me 2018.

So that means our challenge now, together with the colleagues from Eco and from DNic, and maybe other interested parties, who like to be part of this process, is to prove that the Whois is not in line with the future regulation. And we discussed several ways for that. We suggested to incorporate the Article 29 working party of the European commission into this discussion.

For those of you who are not so familiar with data protection law, the Article 29 working group is the umbrella association of the European data protection authorities. So if we would have an official legal opinion of this group that would confirm that what we do will not be in line with the future regulation then that might be the basis also for the ICANN legal team and for the legal staff to believe us and to make the way free for a waiver.

That could be one part. And it might also be useful to incorporate the European Commission itself. There are several of us who know the right

people there who we should speak to. And well, as a result we need something official that supports our view, our perspectives, in order to at least, yes, have the basis for ICANN legal staff to deal with this.

Sebastien Ducos: Sebastien Ducos back from the GAC. I just wanted to say something here as the point of view of this group, and what we want to be able to do and where this is really important. It just so happens that we are the majority of Europeans around here, we are not all Europeans that we are a majority of Europeans, which puts us in a very good position because we are also working with governments for knowing what's going on.

This is a concern for everybody, in this room, outside of this room, within the whole community. Anybody that is a registry or registrar or in fact anybody that holds a database with information that have at least one European resident is concerned. So Istanbul, all the others around the table that are not particularly European, you're equally concerned.

I'd like to use this forum that we have here, the knowledge that we have here, the context that we have here and outside, to go and advocate about this. The biggest problem that we have, and this is a Frenchman working for an American company living in Australia talking, that when you talk to non-Europeans about it, they look at you with big broad smiles saying those weirdo Euros, why did they come up with now?

This is not going away. This is something we need to deal with. And this is something that the whole community needs to deal with. I'm also personally a registry operator. I know what it takes to run big machinery, big software, I know that I don't find solutions, technical implementation of policy changes, overnight. I can't do that. I need time to do it.

I have mentally given myself a deadline until Abu Dhabi, two ICANNs from now, to have a working solution in order to be able to have the time to

develop it and implement it before May. If we don't have as a community and answer to this problem by Abu Dhabi, we are running into the wall.

So I would like for everybody to leave this room this afternoon understanding that we have one week to make everybody aware of this. If we don't know ourselves what we're talking about, (Oliver), (Marianne), myself and others will be able to explain, we have enough people that are aware of the problem, enough lawyers, we need to make sure, and that's your responsibility, that coming out of this meeting this afternoon will have one story to tell, it's not 20 different stories. But people need to be aware. And we all need to use that.

Sorry, I turn to the Canadians, that you have exactly the same problem in Canada and you have the same issues and very similar (unintelligible) above and beyond the fact that it touches everybody. So let's put our heads together now, come up with the story and go and tell it to the rest of the community. This needs to be taken seriously.

In terms of awareness within the community, ICANN is aware, as (Oliver) said, ICANN's position is to say guys, there is already some solutions. Show us that the solutions don't work, unless you show us and prove to us that the solutions don't work, as far as we are concerned there's some solutions.

If you talk to other registry operators, and you and I haven't spoken about this, but foreign registry operators I'm the only one that I know from outside of Europe, there's not that many outside of Europe that actually knows what would talking about and at Neustar we're looking at what needs to be done and looking at examples in Europe that haven't been implemented. I know of others that, no, it's not a concern today. It will soon have to be.

I'd like to have the (unintelligible) and it's not the (unintelligible) in view here. And go and reach out across the aisle, reach out to registrars that we know, reach out to registrars that we know beyond Europe, reach out to registries, reach out to partners that we have, all those people that are concerned to

make them aware of this problem so that we can actually tackle it as a community. Thank you.

Man: One question to (Oliver). You were talking about the waiver from ICANN, does the waiver solve all our problems? I don't think so, or is it a starting point?

(Oliver): I mean, we have problems on several levels here. The waiver from ICANN could fix the problems that we have with Whois, right, so that would be the easiest thing if ICANN would give it to us because then we could provide a model, we could make another suggestion on how we would operate the Whois in the future.

For example, according to the model from (Awod) from dotFRL, who is working with the so-called (TFX)s, which means that you only provide all the data of commercial registrants, in cases where you have private people, consumers that register for a domain, you would not publish the information about the owner. That's roughly how dotFRL and also (FIDN) are operating the system.

That could be a solution. But this would mean that first of all ICANN would accept this and it would also mean that we are also sure that the system complies with the future data protection regulation. But this could be a solution.

But as you said, it's only one part of the solution. Apart from that we are all particular the European registries, it counts also for other ones but I think we are more in the focus here, there are a number of further things that will change. Everybody will have to review this privacy policy is because you have to give new information to the customers according to the new law.

You will, for example, I mean, there are many challenges that we are facing. You will have to have a so-called record of processings in place, it means

documentation about all processes in your company where you are dealing with personal data. You have to document how your IT systems work, where you store the data, why you store for which purposes, what is the risk or the consumers?

And well, there are only some parts of challenges that we are all facing. So ICANN and the Whois thing is one thing that we have to solve. That's the more difficult one. The easier part of that is to be compliant with the things where we have a direct influence, right, to revise our privacy policies and to have all the systems in place that we are required to once we have my 2018.

Sebastien Ducos: Just a short question, I understand that you're a lawyer yourself and help clients without. Would it be possible to share with us a brief on what these things are to change? I'm not saying what to put into policy because you would have to review policy. But in terms of bullet points, what pieces and aspects of policy would need to be added to anybody's policy, as generic as possible.

(Oliver): I'm happy to send a list with the bullet points, but well that we have to comply with. That's not a problem. At the end of the day the bullet points will not be enough. We have to fix it and, I mean, we are all in the exactly the same situation. So I mean, I could also try to help everyone like I can ask my colleagues that are the privacy specialists if from there is a way for framework agreement or something like that because it makes it much easier if we all solve things together, makes it much cheaper because the challenge is the same for everyone.

Sebastien Ducos: So as I understood this issue concerns not only us as registries but also registrars which handle our data as well. It's data or they have the data from their clients and also the escrow service. So we waiver just for us doesn't work if the registrar doesn't play the same game or doesn't have that waiver too.

(Oliver): Yes, that's why we decided to discuss together also with Eco and not only to address the Whois in the registry issue but also the perspective of the registrars and of other - of escrow providers, of backend providers. We are all more or less all in the same boat here, and so the approach of what we discussed this morning was to find a solution where we incorporate all the stakeholders from the community who are facing these challenges. But again that's only a way to solve a conflict that we have because of our contracts within ICANN. The other things where I can circulate the information, that is something that we have to resolve on ourselves.

Ronald Schwarzler: I had some discussion with our lawyer, and to be clear, I will test my lawyer now against you. So he said whenever you are doing a directory service, and the Whois is a directory service and you include that private person, you have to prove that this private person opted in to be displayed in this directory service.

So if you register a dotWien domain name, I would have to ask you, I asked the registry, and I'm not allowed by ICANN to ask you because of (unintelligible), yes, but the registry must be able to prove that you opted in to be displayed in the directory. And you as a private, you have to have the possibility to demand whether your email address, your telephone number and I think your private address are displayed or not.

Not a general solution for lack of an any private person just hide the email address, you say I want my address - you don't want my address displayed so it's a registry going to the registrant, any registrant displayed in the Whois has to opt in, not opt out, opt in, and any registrant can individually decide whether he wants to have his email address or whatever displayed. This is a complete, it's 100%, 180% turn. It's not about what ICANN demands, have an open Whois display any information of any registrant. It's completely other way around.

Sebastien Ducos: That's basically right. But one way to solve this, if we would be able to operate where we don't do that. We do not publish automatically all the data, but only for the ones who said yes, I agree, I'm fine with it, and they have an option. That's exactly the thing, you need an option. Yes.

(Oliver): And this is effective May 2018. Yes? So agreeing within the next 14 months with ICANN and implementing, as Sebastian said, I'm in this business for three or four years now, and I stopped dreaming about any provisions that are beyond 24 months.

Sebastien Ducos: Yes, that's why we have to avoid that this ends up in a policy development process. If that is the case we will never be compliant with anything by May 2018. And I don't – I don't personally see the need for a policy development process. But we are not compliant with the law's effect and we will be able to prove that. And if we prove that, ICANN has to give us a waiver.

Ronald Schwarzler: Ronald here for the record. Proving it, I know that dotCat, you can probably confirm, dotCat made this proof by having someone file a law case against dotCat registry and then this was the proof that dotCat, some years before, was not acting according to law. So getting the proof is relatively easy, register a domain name and have someone to fight against being displayed. I know that nobody wants to carry that burden by getting the proof to get a legal case is relatively easy. Would this help? Would this work? Or what do you think?

(Oliver): Maybe the situation is different now, maybe look at dotCat, the problem was solved by ignoring it – ICANN solved the problem by ignoring the fact that dotCat Whois was not complying with ICANN. So let's, you know, look at it and then at some point you try to resolve it and, you know, an actual lawsuit and possibly what could then be taken down as one element of proof. But they knew that there was a problem, it wasn't high on the list of priorities in those days.

But what we have here is certainly going to be high on the list of priorities. So we should use that, just the very text of directive is probably proof enough. I don't think you have to go and look for something else.

Man: I mean, we didn't have the lawyers this morning in a meeting, it was only - they need much more proof unfortunately than the pure text of what is in the regulation. Yes.

Sebastien Ducos: Yes, their advice, and the lawyer weren't there to substantiate it but Akram said the advice that Akram received was that it wasn't enough. The other advice that you received so far is that we are talking about local law, as far as he is concerned there is no such thing as European, there is many many different countries in Europe. And so he wasn't even sure that a German paper would be receivable for the whole of Europe, he wasn't even sure that Europe itself was a jurisdiction as far as his legal understanding was. So we're far from it.

So that's Akram. But Akram is guided by well paid lawyers who will spend a fair amount of time looking at this in detail. He's not – he's not pulling it out of his hat. This is a planned meeting he prepared. He didn't have the lawyers with him but he did prepare the meeting. And this is what we're dealing with now.

(Oliver): Well, but the way it looks to me is that the lawyers made sure they were not at the meeting.

Ronald Schwarzler: Ronald for the record. Just we had these talks with – who was the compliance – that quit – Allan Grogan last year in Amsterdam, and it – Ronald, what are you talking about? We do not have a single Whois case in the world. So you are talking about for three years of having Whois problems, there is not a single case, we don't have any law case so far. So you're making some (unintelligible) you try to put some work on us. Where is the case? So they are waiting for let's say some law case, I don't know.

(Oliver): Again if we can prove that this is not compliant, that was at least my understanding in the meeting, and the legal team from ICANN would agree on this, then we don't need a case. But what we would need instead is kind of official opinion, a legal analysis from a body that is trustful, that is relevant, that is official for example the ones that I mentioned before. And I think that should be - we will coordinate with the others from the meeting. But I think that will be the next steps to get - entering to the process where we can receive such a legal opinion.

Sebastien Ducos: So who's got – sorry, who's going tomorrow to the meeting with the DPAs? Who is available – you're going? Who's available? I think it was 3:30, 4:00? What time was it exactly for the record?

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Sebastien Ducos: Okay.

Ronald Schwarzler: I think it's 3:15.

Sebastien Ducos: Three fifteen tomorrow, there's a meeting. We should – but at least if we have two hands raised, I can't make it myself. Clearly what Akram said is indeed to have, not a legal advice but a legal document from either law enforcement, and understanding that law enforcement was dangerous as we might be witnessed in trespassing the borders there, or the DPA. So tomorrow going to that meeting would be a very good time to chase the DPAs and see what we can get out of them.

(Peter): Hi, (Peter) (unintelligible) from DNS Belgium. I completely concur that the biggest obstacle is to try to convince ICANN to see that there is a legal problem with the current configuration of Whois. What is a bit of a misperception according to mean is that you don't need a waiver from ICANN whatsoever.

We all have dispositions in our contract that said that you only need to abide with ICANN policy for as long as that policy is not conflicting with your local relevant law. The contract very clearly -- I don't have the exact wording but I can look it up and send it to you by email. But there is a clause in all of our contracts that enables for us to set ICANN policy aside if there is an underlying legislative obligation in our country that would not allow it to apply such a policy.

So basically what we should do is actually try to convince ICANN and the ICANN lawyers. And I know that within the framework of the GDPR, there is going to be a kind of European data protection authority so what we might do is draft a letter explaining the situation to local DPA, sent from each member state as many of those letters to the DPAs and trying to get them so far in to say okay, this is more than only a local situation. We need a coordinated structure answer, so we are going to contact European DPA to have a kind of a memo or resolution on that.

And I think that if you have indeed a confirmation from the European Data Protection Authority, that the current Whois configuration is not compatible with the GDPR framework, that even the ICANN lawyers will have to say okay, we are - we have stumbled across the problem.

Sebastien Ducos: Can I suggest that we are doing that to go just that one step further and also have an understanding of what it should be. So the fact that the one that we have is broken is fine, please tell me as early as possible what it should be. Is the Dutch solution the right solution or the French solution the right solution? Is the solution that (CIRA) developed for Canada one that would work for the rest of the world? I need to know what it is in order to not have to reinvent the second process once we've agreed that it's wrong.

(Marianne): And (Marianne) (unintelligible). I think that before asking them what we need to do we should agree on what we want somehow because they might not

know exactly or precisely, and maybe they might ask for something very, how same, conservative, you see what I mean?

Sebastien Ducos: So I'm not asking the DPA.

(Marianne): Okay, yes.

Sebastien Ducos: I'm asking you guys...

((Crosstalk))

Sebastien Ducos: ... who have developed solutions, tested and against your local DPAs, and can tell me that if it's not 100% final product of what we will do it is actually pretty close to it. And I trust you guys not to have gone any further than you really need to.

(Marianne): Because actually that's what we did for the dotFR, we draft a solution and then we went to see the DPA and we say okay, what do you think about that? And of course they had no opinion. And they say well, great, okay. You understand. So we have somehow to make sure that we know what we want before.

Sebastien Ducos: Any further question on this? We still have an hour to go, not quite an hour. You might have your hour of glory afterward. Katrin, do you want to talk about the - as the chair of the working group for the GAC on what happened?

Katrin Ohlmer: Caught me on the wrong foot. Sorry. So we had the opportunity to give a brief introduction of the Geo TLD group to the GAC saying that we just thought formalized and who we are and what our mission and vision is. And afterwards offered our -- offered to get in a dialogue with the GAC as there might be not only for the next round but for the existing topics like the data protection issue there might be a lot of topics which affect us directly and economic terms and other terms.

And so we offered them to get us on the mailing list, and getting a dialogue with them, and as well share some critical issues we have currently with the – as geo TLDs.

So the next step was then that we briefly talked about the data protection topics where they had some back-and-forth especially from the US. So apparently there is some interest there. As well we pointed out that the discussion within the GAC about the geographic names list for the next round or for the further rounds we might give some feedback based on our experience in the last round how to come up with lists and how to work with governments.

In our small group, (Marianne), Sebastien, me, we assured that it's not us which are the problem, who are the problems it has we really want to interact with governments and we want to operate our TLD with the local or national or regional support.

I think this is certainly one message we have to get over, that it's not us or potential other geos which will apply, but certainly the other ones. And we are asked to find solutions and make proposals which are on one hand quite feasible, on the other hand support the feeling of the GAC in need of protection of other strings. So there will have to be some form of if not compromise but some proposals from our side were welcome.

And then we had a Q&A session where I just started to write that down. And I think, (Marianne), you made some notes as well. We heard from the Swiss GAC about some forum where we are supposed to give feedback. We haven't tried that before so we should take a look at this. Olga Cavalli from Argentina asked us to give feedback to the geographic names list in the discussion. So we will most likely meet with her later this week again.

And let me just think through what did we - we had the guy from Pakistan had a question, the Swiss in the...

Ronald Schwarzler: Maybe I help you out...

((Crosstalk))

Ronald Schwarzler: The GAC member from Iran, Kavouss, asked you - asked us whether we could provide a definition, who are the geo TLDs.

Sebastien Ducos: Yes, so there was a point, the first one that I wanted to talk about is the point of the list. So as you know, the GAC, since Roudn1, since not to name them, the Patagonian and Amazon story, have been very worried about the fact that the AGB, as it stands, doesn't protect geographic name well enough against the brands wanting to take their geographic names.

I have the same vision, I went back to read the beautiful document that I thought I would never ever have to open again to look exactly what it said. As far as I'm concerned, but I'm not a lawyer, and I'm definitely not a lawyer for either of those two brands, as far as I'm concerned in the AGB there was clear, if not final ways of dealing with this issue, at least a clear warning that these issues were going to be issues and that they should be aware of it.

Again, I'm not going to discuss it and all disclosure, one of them is a dear client of mine so I'm certainly not going to put an opinion on this. The GAC's answer to this, the visceral answer to this, was to say let's put a list of names that we consider as being geographic so that anybody in the future applying will know against that list if they have something that will or will not cause a problem. Which in essence is, like as many things that they do, a very good thought but a very, in my view, very bad implementation of that thought.

In a sense that yes, that list would give an open view as to where the problems may be lying. The problem is who creates the list based on what

with what in it. And there's enough people on the GAC that want to stifle anything developed in terms of new gTLD, for somebody to have a good idea throwing the dictionary into that list and stopping any future round for good.

We talked, this morning before we talked to the GAC, we talked privately to the Swiss GAC members who have developed a new processes against this list. Again, very openly, they say basically what we want to do is to give fair warning to make sure that people that want to be geo TLDs know that they have a geographic name, and – sorry - they want to be new gTLDs know that they have a geographic name and are fairly warned about the fact that geo will need to follow the requirements of a geo.

As far as we are concerned, as this group, or first of all I need to acknowledge that I'm part of this group. As part of this group, I'm interested in seeing further geo TLDs. Some of my members, some of our members and some of the people present in the room, don't have that need either because they represent a single city and they're not going to invent the second city just to have the pleasure of having a geo TLD or because they themselves, this is the remit of what they're doing for one reason or another. So for those here concerned, I'm very sorry, but we will continue that conversation even though you may not be that concerned.

I am also very cognizant of the fact that as a geo, we have had various books into the AGB, there are clear barriers and ways to past them, and the clearest of them all was that letter of consent or not objection by local government. A paper that was both very difficult to obtain for a lot of us, but at the same time a sesame to open all doors afterwards once we had that paper we could do whatever we want.

I want to be cognizant that whilst we are here to defend geo TLDs in the interest of geo TLDs, we're not living in a vacuum here. We'd live with other people that have other interests. And if we play on our own here without

looking at the rest of the interest of the community, we're going to close ourselves into a corner. So we can't do that.

The fact that we have that letter and that whatever list they come up with doesn't concern us because in any case we would have to go a letter, and then shutting all the brands behind us, for example, just to give the example, is not a good way to go because otherwise they will shut everything down.

So in our opinion, and this is why we wanted to see the GAC and discuss with them, we are very interested in having all sorts of measures to forewarn future applicants of potential problems and danger areas that they're getting into. We are, at least the three of us, seriously against any idea of a list. It's very late in the date, because they seem to be very very set on their ways and wanting that list and possibly already have one somewhere on somebody's computer.

But it will be our position in the working group, and I'd love in a position to be adopted by the rest of the group in general, to go and say yes, let's create some levels of warning, let's ring fence whatever you want but please do not have another TMCH invention on us that is going to stop the program for another 15 years.

Ronald Schwarzler: Ronald for the record. We already do have a list. So if you want to apply for let's say dotVienna, you have to check against this UN, whatever list, Vienna is on that list so we have to go to Viennese government and to get the letter of support or letter of non objection.

If I want to do dot (unintelligible) or whatever, and someone wants that (unintelligible) to be a geographic domain name, he has to make sure that (unintelligible) is on that list, managed by UN or by whatever. So it's a political process for someone who wants to protect a geo name to get this geo name on that list. So no need for any change here ICANN. We do not have to

replace that UN on managing lists on what could be a protected or ready to be protected name.

If you want it to be protected get that name on that list, and then it's protected. But leave us alone with (unintelligible). Why need another list?

Sebastien Ducos: Adding a name to these lists might not be just owning a Sharpie and writing it in.

Ronald Schwarzler: Yes.

Sebastien Ducos: The process of adding that name might be complicated enough. But yes, absolutely, this is one of the things that we did say is point to lists that already exists, point to list that you're not managing yourself.

((Crosstalk))

Katrin Ohlmer: In the issue really it's not about geographic names, it's about brand names which equate to geographic identifiers, and how to solve that. I mean, this is really a way we won't find any solution.

(Oliver): Go ahead.

Alexander Schubert: Well, Alexander again. This is probably recorded somehow, huh?

Steve DelBianco: Yes.

Alexander Schubert: Okay, Alexander again. Still Kavouss kind of brought it up and asked us for a definition of what is a geo name? And you nodded and said yes, point taken.

Sebastien Ducos: Yes, okay, yes, I did not and I did say point taken. Did we have - you did that whilst we were gone. Did we have the discussion about the mission, vision and the...

Ronald Schwarzler: Yes.

Sebastien Ducos: Okay. And there, and it's on the Website, we have our definition of the geo TLDs. I could have very easily pointed them to it. What I want to make sure, and we need to look at it together, is that it doesn't go in conflict. I did mention the fact that our definition of geos was not the same as theirs. And our definition of geos is geographic locations, cities and regions, cultural and linguistic regions, the same way we have it defined which includes our cities, our regions and it includes dotAsia, it includes dotCat, because it has that cultural and linguistic link, it includes dot(Aos), who are again, weren't geographic, it includes a number of entities like that, that are not purely something to represent on a map.

Ronald Schwarzler: So we had in - I think it's also on the Website, still that we are talking about geographic names, geographic identifiers like dotNYC or dotNRW, something like this and or geographic origin.

Sebastien Ducos: I can't remember what the example of that was.

Ronald Schwarzler: Yes, Africa, for example.

((Crosstalk))

Ronald Schwarzler: Yes, Africa and – yes, I think we need to provide examples of what is what. So that it gets crystal-clear for the GAC.

Alexander Schubert: And this is again Alexander. Maybe we should also, as example, what it is not. So if I understand you right, River would not be a geo-name.

((Crosstalk))

Sebastien Ducos: I don't agree because Amazon could potentially have been a geo-name.  
Should the Amazon region based on...

((Crosstalk))

Alexander Schubert: But that the region. The name of a region.

((Crosstalk))

Sebastien Ducos: Sadly enough, and this is part of the problem that they have is that it's a region of no country, it's a state of no country, it's a whatever. The only thing that I could find or link to, agricultural domain of the UNESCO as such, Amazon forest.

Alexander Schubert: I know that the average river, the average mountain, is that a geo-name in our definition?

((Crosstalk))

Ronald Schwarzler: I wanted to point to (Anna) because she's running something like this.  
You want to say something?

(Anna): So I'm from Dot(Rua) and indeed the (Rua) is the river in the (Rua) area. And we applied for dot(Rua). So it's also – I mean, it's the area, but it's named after a river.

Alexander Schubert: Yes, okay, but still for the area, I mean, no one registers a name for a piece of water.

((Crosstalk))

Alexander Schubert: It's the area that is accidentally named after the river.

(Anna): Of course it's the area but we are not named (Rua) area, we are not dot(Rua)area. We are dot(Rua). So...

Ronald Schwarzler: And, (Anna) did it right because she asked the (unintelligible) government where the river is in, and there is no other government concerns because the river ends, starts and ends (unintelligible). And she asked the government and the government said, we don't have any stakes in the name, so please proceed.

((Crosstalk))

Sebastien Ducos: So, yes, sorry, that's the detail, the second detail I forgot. It's having a geographic (unintelligible) in a letter of the government to sustain it. And even if you don't have the letter, the capacity to get one. I'd like to see the government of (La Seine) to be able to give you – there's no governance over that river. So hills and hamlets and streams, technically, don't have a government to be able to sign that letter.

((Crosstalk))

Sebastien Ducos: A government of authority. What I don't want is the list to suddenly become a proxy for the state government that put the name in it to become the government to own it, so that's indeed a government to say hey, I've got this, you know, (unintelligible) biggest hill in Denmark suddenly belonging to Denmark, and if you want to use the name, suddenly you need to go to the Danish government. And by letting them create that list we are also letting them do that.

Ronald Schwarzler: The Swiss – Ronald for the record – are very clear on that. A mountain name like Mont Blanc, like (Cansenberg), like any name that they can expect

should be in that list, in that new database. Then you have to ask Swiss or whatever government, so this is...

((Crosstalk))

Ronald Schwarzler: He said Matterhorn, which is in Switzerland, yes? But also Mont Blanc, so what is it, French?

((Crosstalk))

Ronald Schwarzler: Yes, so but they think of blocking those names or being able to lock the name in case it's necessary. And Mont Blanc, by the way is a pen also, so we have the discussion again.

((Crosstalk))

Sebastien Ducos: And still in doubt, Mont Blanc I think it's in three countries...

((Crosstalk))

Sebastien Ducos: That you need to ask and that would be something very clear for future applicants in doubt, they should ask the relevant governments. And come up with an objection or no objection or support even.

Ronald Schwarzler: You know, in the specific case of what, you know, the Swiss example we had before, we have a registry managed actually by almost the same group, which is dotSwiss, in this specific case we have (Corner Graut), which was one of those domains, that had actually been handed over to a party which is the railway that goes up to the (Corner Graut).

And so the idea was not that it's blocked, it just there has to be circumspection in the way it's going to be allocated, cannot just be anything. And that doesn't have to mean that the government must decide but special

care must be taken with those names. And the presence of a name on the list shouldn't be something that automatically triggers, you know, a chain reaction. It should be that yes, it's there, it's on the list.

And actually if we say oh we have trouble with lists, you know, if you look at what they're actually asking (unintelligible) the list, it's a registry. And it's really curious that people who run registries, and all of us, oh, what is that supposed to be? You know, we don't know how to run a registry. We know how to run a registry. So we should be proactive. We should be coming up with solutions for that. But then refine it enough to say no, this is not a thing that will automatically trigger, you know, a fact. No, it's just an observation. And there is other registries, by the way, to help for that.

Sebastien Ducos: And this is exactly why I like about pointing to other lists. So it's not about running a registry, you're absolutely right, we all know how to do it in this particular way and probably would fit on an Excel sheet, so it's not the technical problem, it's the fact that it exists and that we are not going to control how things go in and out of it. How it will be used.

I'd much rather have a list of ISO lists and UN lists and things like that that are managed by people outside of this community so that the politics of it, the politics of this community don't enter an account in the generation and the use of the sad list.

Ronald Schwarzler: Who uses geonames.org? It's 8 gigabytes of geographic – it's huge. And it's probably the best response, and have a discussion, but there's a huge list out there and if you have to interface, and it's got the names in all the languages, you know, (unintelligible) that can be picked up, it can be picked up by (unintelligible) application and so on. But I said we should make it our own, not problem, should make it our value added. We shouldn't just see this as a problem.

Man: (Unintelligible) for the record. But we must never forget that if you give that business to the government, any governmental authority, their job is to protect geo names, but that's a name can be used for geo purposes and many other purposes. I've been writing, you know, a couple of things for dotQuebec. And there is a nice little city who is named Hudson in Quebec, right, that there is the Hudson River and there is eight other Hudsons in both Canada and the United States.

But there is also a guy who is not a geo, he's Hudson, and it could be a proper, so, you know, we have to be eyes wide open.

Ronald Schwarzler: Yes, but on the other side, governments are really careful also in claiming what they don't really possess like in the (Rua) area, if they would have claimed (Rua) as our name and no one can use it, that wouldn't be in line with the laws, within European laws. And so at the end of the day, before government says no you can't use the name, because that brings your business out of business and makes them pay money to you because something could happen, so they are careful too.

Sebastien Ducos: Time for a break?

Ronald Schwarzler: Yes.

Man: You didn't have a break.

Sebastien Ducos: I didn't have a break. I need a break.

((Crosstalk))

Ronald Schwarzler: Lets maybe take a break and, yes.

((Crosstalk))

Sebastien Ducos: Come back in 15 minutes?

((Crosstalk))

Sebastien Ducos: So what else do we have on the agenda today?

Ronald Schwarzler: So the only thing that we could do on the agenda...

((Crosstalk))

Ronald Schwarzler: Oh you're already done?

((Crosstalk))

Sebastien Ducos: I missed the whole meeting.

Ronald Schwarzler: Should we talk about the dotAmsterdam supportive letter or wait...

Sebastien Ducos: Oh yes, maybe - so maybe let's take a break, 15 minutes, and then we come back and we will talk about a request from dotAmsterdam about issuing a letter as a group to support dotAmsterdam. Let's have a break, I'll come up with a request and will talk about it.

((Crosstalk))

Sue Schuler: Okay, if we could start the recording again please?

Sebastien Ducos: So this is Sebastien again, for the record. The ExComm received a letter from the city of Amsterdam. It was sent to us and to - it wasn't sent to the mailing list. I will still read it here on the mic, well I'll ask members to send it to the mailing list to make it available to everybody.

Basically the city of Amsterdam had been waiting forever to do the same implementation of the Whois as FRL, have been waiting for a year for advice on it. And obtained from their legal advice, the green light to do it last Friday. They did that on their own. I'm sure that the local DPA is aware of what they're doing, but not fully on board, in any case it's not mentioned.

He said at the end of his email, and I'll read, "Last Monday we had a meeting with (Louis Von Elan), who is the ICANN member," sorry, the ICANN Board member – Dutch ICANN Board member, I can't remember exactly which community she represents. But anyway...

Man: ALAC.

Sebastien Ducos: ALAC? Okay. And happens to be Dutch. And she was present at that meeting. (Eva von) (unintelligible) who was over there for Amsterdam and FRL, and I, from Amsterdam, so I, (Egbert), explained the situation. Her suggestion was to write us a letter, and I asked I assume that she means the Board of ICANN. My idea would be that we write a letter and have it send by registries that are currently in this situation. Mrs. (Von Elan) suggested she can then have it put on the agenda for the ICANN Board meeting 2 May in Geneva. And he's asking us to discuss that, the possibility of writing a letter.

So there's different levels of understanding in Amsterdam. The first, the more simple is do we write a letter asking them to put this thing on the agenda, and then have every single one - individuals here who wants to sign, signing? Do we want to put a letter in the name of the Geo TLD group, which we will find and send to the Board? Will give a bit more impetus on that?

I even discussed this with Becky, who was also a Board member and happens to be a colleague of mine, and she wasn't quite clear that we needed to have a letter. We just need to be aware that whatever the Board receives, and there was a bit of that discussion at the GAC as we walked in this afternoon, as soon as the Board receives a letter that letter becomes

public, and as soon as we write something like that putting their name and putting it on the record, and then suddenly what are the consequences legally behind it and etcetera?

He's asked us to look into it. I'm just putting it here to the floor. And maybe, I don't know if you've got more on it, or comments on it? No? You were present at the meeting. Yes yes, okay. So that's it. Between now and Wednesday, do we want to find time to write that letter, to draft a letter, or do we think that it's not our role? That's all.

Woman: Just sorry, I apologize. Can we have context? We missed...

((Crosstalk))

Sebastien Ducos: Sorry, the letter -- he doesn't give me any wording of the letter or anything like that. He just says that (Lucivus) said if you want us, Board, to look into this quickly, ergo, on 2 May for their next meeting, please send us a letter advising us that this is a problem - in my reflecting, which is it? Advise us that this is a problem that we need to look into because otherwise it might not make it to the agenda.

All I'm saying here is that it might have been the right advice from her point of view that that we are then putting everything on the record and very officially because the ICANN Board doesn't receive any private letters.

Man: The Dutch problem, the fact that the Dutch TLDs are currently in breach of, and the fact that we will soon be, the rest of us, Europeans will soon. No sorry, the rest of us TLDs, who may have business in Europe.

Sebastien Ducos: Thoughts comments or coffee?

Ronald Schwarzler: As I understood, we should write a letter as a group to the ICANN Board and telling them what are the problems with the privacy and Whois thing? Yes? Is it...

Sebastien Ducos: Sorry, you have received the email and you saw that...

Ronald Schwarzler: Yes...

Sebastien Ducos: ...it doesn't really - he wants a letter to the Board that says hey Board, we the geos, see that there is a problem with the FRL and Amsterdam thing and we want you guys to start looking into it please.

Ronald Schwarzler: As far as that is the letter, yes. (Egbert) send a letter and he suggests that she writes a letter that the registries who are of the same opinion would support. So he sent the letter as dotAmsterdam, he drafts the letter and I as Ronald Schwarzler, being CEO of dotWien, I fully support it. I have the same problem. And this is what our lawyer, I asked my lawyer, and he said this is a very good idea to support a letter of dotAmsterdam on our own behalf because then we have raised hands, we will have the same problem, but it is Wolf, it is (Egbert), sorry, it's (Egbert Wolf) who would write that letter on behalf of dotAmsterdam. If I read this e-mail that he sent to us.

Man: And (Wolf Egbert) is city of Amsterdam employee.

Sebastien Ducos: Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Okay.

Sebastien Ducos: Sorry, I'm crying for help here, that you were in the meeting.

Man: Yes, it's a bit of a situation. I was there at a meeting with (unintelligible) in the Netherlands we have always pre-ICANN meetings where we - the Dutch members that go to the ICANN meetings discuss the things that are on hand. And of course this was one of the points of discussion.

And (Louis) (unintelligible) is I think on the ICANN Board, maybe a year now, so we had to explain a lot to her. And that's I think the point that she says well, if you want to have it on the agenda, please provide a letter to the Board. I think there is nothing more to it. But I cannot say if her suggestion is valid or smart or whatever, it's a suggestion from her, that's it.

Ronald Schwarzler: I think that after this ICANN meeting, and in particular after the event or workshop that will happen tomorrow afternoon, the Board and everyone within the ICANN community will be aware of this problem. So and I don't – I don't think a letter is really helpful because, I mean, after the discussion from today with Akram, we know what the response will be. The Board will give it to the legal staff, the legal staff will say give us proof about that that this is really a case and that you have are compliant now. That's something that we already know.

If we approach the Board, I would be in favor with doing this coordinated with the others, because GDPR compliance is not only a matter for us, of course we have to solve our problem with the Whois but it's also a matter for the escrow providers, it's a problem for registrars. And if we address the Board we should do it in a joint and cooperative action, to solve our problems and our challenge, frankly speaking, I don't think that a letter to the Board will help us. We should take the next steps. We need legal proof for our situation. And I think that if nothing where the Board can help us.

Sebastien Ducos: On a related but slightly different topic, Sue earlier raised the fact that at nine o'clock on Tuesday the Registry Stakeholder Group has a meeting with the Compliance people. I should be available at nine o'clock on Tuesday to go there, but should you want to join, as now a member of the Registry

Stakeholder Group, I don't know if you were before, but through this vehicle here we will definitely have some things to say.

Sue Schuler: Related to that as well, this is Sue Schuler. As an association of the Registry Stakeholder Group, you guys have a voice to that Registries. And we have a joint session with the Board on Tuesday with the Registrars. Now we already have all of our topics in mind that if there was any time left over I'm sure that they would love to get this on the agenda for that. You know, I would really recommend that you talk to Paul.

Sebastien Ducos: But on the other side, this letter is then written by the Amsterdam government, and we just have to say I support this. So they may write the letter anyway, and from my opinion we are not writing that letter, we just say yes, we are supporting it. And we can do it on an individual basis.

((Crosstalk))

Sebastien Ducos: Yes.

Man: I just had one experience with writing letters to ICANN, the process have been improved, I think it's actually pretty good. When we write we get the response back from the ICANN Correspondence team. They will say we are going to publish this letter on the slash, correspondence list. You know, if there's anything confidential please tell us and there's not going to be - it's not going to be published. But that is a way of being sure that what we send, the certain way of sending it, and then one after the other it gets, you know, shown on the Website. And just the number of letters coming up like this you have a visual effect, let's say, and that is certainly what we want to have.

Sebastien Ducos: Excellent segue about the email I sent last week with regards to voting on the Registry Agreement. Sorry, jumping from topic to topic here. Who has voted? Who hasn't voted? Who does know what they need to do to vote? Who needs help there? The vote on the changes to the Registry Agreement, I

have no political opinion either way, but the more we vote, the more that we show we are interested, the more we show that we are of a voice, the less, sorry, ICANN staff will have chances of pushing us back next year when we go back to the next round. So I'm really insisting that everybody voting, even if it's an absentee vote, even if it's a whatever.

Does everybody have the information they need to be able to vote? Has everybody voted? And are you ready to vote for April? Yes?

Ronald Schwarzler: Tenth of April.

Sebastien Ducos: April 10, yes.

Ronald Schwarzler: Is the deadline, yes.

Sebastien Ducos: Good. Thank you, I've done my job then.

Man: But we should answer (Egbert) from Amsterdam.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Sorry, my suggestion would be he should write that letter and send it to us as geo TLDs, and then we can individually on a short notice give him an answer, I support. Yes?

Sebastien Ducos: Again, you are suggesting, you were saying it actually it needs to - so you said there needs to be a number of letters that go on the same topic or is that one letter with five signatures on it will be good enough?

Ronald Schwarzler: I think it's probably the best to have one letter with one signature, do the interaction but then the other ones, you know, will then, you know, make reference to that process, because (unintelligible) only be sent at the same time or more or less at the same time. Then they will be published by ICANN.

And for ICANN it's easier to handle if they say, you know, one letter, will get published in the next one comes and, you know, for them they have a team handling this doing a really good job. And they even make references.

So actually that is very good for the visibility on, you know, for people to learn what is an important subject, they very often go to that Correspondence Website and now we see there's actually, you know, a team that handles this professionally we can actually work with that and, you know, actually give the right visibility, you know, the visibility that actually this problem deserves by the fact that we have individual letters coming from a couple of TLDs.

And also the visibility of those actors, namely the cities and so one, you know, in the registries, they should be seen somehow in ICANN. That's actually very good.

Sebastien Ducos: So I'll answer the email so that we talked about it, ask him to write a letter, to send us a letter and then we will disseminate and see who signs it. Cool. Thank you. Any other topic? And I don't know how much time we have left but probably not...

Sue Schuler: None.

Sebastien Ducos: Zero. Okay. No other topic. So we are all meeting again Wednesday morning at 9:00, 9:30, I can't remember, started secretly hoping it's 9:30.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Experience meeting?

Sebastien Ducos: Yes, exactly. It'll be – so at 9:00. Again, we have a few presentations, but if you guys want to present, this is going to be more operational, more what you're doing in your TLDs, what marketing, the newcomers to this group want

to see and hear about - us all and what we're doing, all the briefing. Would love to understand what you're doing in Stockholm too, by the way.

Man: Yes.

Sue Schuler: Thank you, everyone.

Sebastien Ducos: Thank you very much.

Sue Schuler: We can end the recording.

Sebastien Ducos: Yes.

END