

**Transcription ICANN Dublin
Sunday 18 October 2015
RySG – Geo TLDs**

Dirk Krischenowski: Warm welcome to all of you. We are a big group. I see a lot of people here in the room so the topic has raised after gTLDs and our group has raised, I think, major interest.

And before we start I want to make some housekeeping things. First of all, I have give to those members I could identify, which applied as a member - a membership voting card. You can use this later or need to use this later if you want to vote on a certain topic.

So did I miss anyone who applied as a member and has not received a membership card? Okay. So there's now the chance to become a member. If you - so Cherie will hand out some membership forms to interested parties so you might join during the meeting and have the chance to vote.

Also, okay, that's some housekeeping. The agenda - we have here and I would like to start with a short introduction round so we can see who's on the table and who's interested in the topic. Do we - yes, I would say (unintelligible) could start?

Marianne Georgelina: Yes, (unintelligible), and my colleagues here who are going to introduce themselves.

(Unintelligible), represent the City of Paris (farther) Paris.

(Cedric): (Cedric) (unintelligible) from (unintelligible). (Unintelligible) and I represent (unintelligible).

(Sebastien): (Sebastien) (unintelligible) of now Neustar representing Melvin, Sidney, and possibly a few more cities including New York but I haven't spoken to my peers in the US yet so Melvin and Sidney for now.

Woman: Hi, (unintelligible) with the registry for dot BE so the ccTLD and besides that we also manage .Brussels and dot vlaanderen.

Ronald Schwaerzler: Ronald Schwaerzler, responsible for dot Wien and also running dot (Tyrell), Federal States of Austria.

Gerard Olivier: My name is Gerard Olivier, I'm from the Federal Office of Communications in Switzerland and I'm representing dot Swiss. We are not members, we are observer in this group.

Cherie Stubbs: Good afternoon. My name's Cherie Stubbs and I am the secretariat for the registry stakeholder group.

Sue Schuler: And I'm (Sue Schuler), I'm the data management assistant for the registry stakeholder group and I'm also the management of the Geo TLD Group.

Johannes Lenz-Hawliczek I'm Johannes Lenz-Hawliczek with dot Berlin and dot Hamburg.

Peter Vergote: Peter Vergote from DNS Belgium, dot Brussels, and dot Vlaanderen.

Dirk Krischenowski: Dirk Krischenowski from dot Berlin.

Egbert Wolf: Egbert Wolf, City of Amsterdam with registry for dot Amsterdam.

Paul Molenaar: Paul Molenaar, and I'm a colleague of Egbert also representing the city of Amsterdam.

Oliver Sueme: Oliver Sueme for dot Hamburg.

Man: (Unintelligible) for dot (unintelligible).

Man: (Unintelligible), I'm representing dot (unintelligible), also just an observer.

Daniel Hill: Hi, I'm Daniel Hill. I'm from the dot London registry.

Sam Lay: Hi, I'm Sam Lay, also dot London.

Alex Kinchin-Smith: Alex Kinchin-Smith from dot London.

Dirk: Okay, thank you very much. On this - I need to make another announcement about housekeeping. The meeting is recorded and we have an Adobe Connect connection. Do we have any people at the moment in Adobe Connect? Five people in Adobe Connect.

And the meeting is transcribed and the transcription will be available - I don't know, a few days later after the meeting as well as recording. So it will take some time, we don't have live transcribing in our meeting but last time we didn't have a transcription. This time we have transcription. So things are performing and developing very well.

Okay. The agenda you see on the screen for our meeting, any comments on the agenda? Any topics you want to raise, you want to bring up? Any special topics? Maybe also the people in the audience on the left or right side, anything you want to address? It's a special topic?

Okay. Then we move on.

Dirk: Move on to the charter and fee discussion. So at the last meeting in Buenos Aires we agreed on a - I think we need two - could you - yes, could you please go further to the roadmap, yes.

What's that on the screen? Okay, we decided on a roadmap to go further and with our small team here, which has - which voluntary work the last couple of meetings or partly years making this. We are coming up with a new roadmap and that was (Johannes) from Berlin, (Peter), me, and - myself, and (Neil) from South Africa. There are - okay, fine.

And the roadmap should look like that - at this meeting the goal is to approve an updated charter. It was the idea to include as many new gLTDs into our group as we have some parties, which represent new gTLDs but actually not the operator and want to have - want to be most inclusive in this (unintelligible) so we decided to make a charter amendment.

Approve on this charter that's the target, discuss budget for our group, discussion on membership fee - these are important topics. And then the timeline after the meeting would look like that we nominate the officers for the executive committee in November, elect them in December, and these officers are setting them - the final budget and the final membership fees.

So we don't know who the ex-com people are - officers are at the moment so we decided not to make a determination now where the officers need to live with when they are elected. So that could - at the end of the year in December setting up the budget and the membership fees.

And the start of the operations with the budget and membership fees is the target to start in January 2016. Any other points you want to bring in - into this time and in to this roadmap? Okay, then I would say it's agreed that the roadmap for our group would look like this.

Okay. Then charter and fee discussions. So could I have please the members - yes, this is the actual collection of all our members, which applied with the membership form Cherie handed out during, I think, July or August and September. And we collected 40 members, thank you very much for this.

Very good result especially because these members are representing already a lot of gTLDs and this is really great and was a great number of domain names you see. It's a collected number of domain names of that entity who has become the member of our group. Did I forget someone? No? Okay.

So from the - and this is important, from the 14 members we have ten members here. I handed out ten membership cards for voting. Yes, I think - yes. And we have six observers, that's parties who couldn't decide yet but may become members shortly, hopefully. And yes, should we say anything about our sponsors?

Man: We could but it's not in the charter so...

Dirk: Yes, yes. We had discussion on sponsors. It was a suggestion at the last meetings that we could also have sponsors of the GO TLD group and I think we as a team here thought it shouldn't be in the charter because it's a voluntary thing to sponsor our group and you can approach us and we - I think find a way to deal with the sponsorship of the group, which would be very welcome.

And please be free to contact us if you want to sponsor the group - yes. Okay. So the charter discussion. It's on the next slide. What is different? Different to the charter that was approved by the registry stakeholder group earlier this year. You all remember the discussion we had to include those parties who represent a GO TLD but which are not an operator actually.

And we thought to have just a small sentence more in the requirements to become a member and this says the membership - the member must be an

organization that is contracted party to ICANN in terms of the operation of a geographic top level domain. And then or has authority to represent and act on behalf of such an organization, that's the sentence in bold letters we added to this.

(Sebastien)?

(Sebastien): The next question is obviously how do you demonstrate authority? Do you need to demonstrate authority?

Dirk: We have been discussing this internally and what we do not want is to be so formalistic that we actually will ask the representatives, show us your credentials. Because we know that will force companies like backend registry operators to approach to the local governments?

Local governments will have to go through a different set of procedures in order to produce proxy letters and they certainly will start asking why do you need this and convince us? And we're not able to process that within the next six months or things like that. So we looked at it more from a pragmatic point of view.

We deemed that the members that have filled in the application form or the official representatives of the registry operator granting, however, that registry operator if you would approach us to say we have a particular issue with the organization that has been representing you and the GO interest group.

And then we reach out. We look into the contract to identify who is the registry operator? Does this warning or mailing or whatever come from the official representative? Then we look into who are we going to deal with it?

Because obviously if the person that send us the mail or a letter or whatever and makes us aware of something and we can identify that person as being somebody from the official registry operator then we have to fulfill and look

into that and we can maybe go to a temporary suspension of the member or whatever.

And so that's the proposed approach to say as is because we have - having this regular meetings for the last three years now. I would find it very difficult to believe that there is somebody here that claims to be a representative of a registry operator and for some reason or whatever it would not be the case.

I mean that would be illogical in view of what we have been doing the last three years. So we continue on this with, of course, the possibility for the reform registry operator to alert us if there is an issue to be reported.

Man: Thank you, that seems fair to me, no.

Man: I have a question? I'm not sure if I understand this right. Is it about the membership or is it about people who are having the power to represent a registry?

Because this section from what I understand is about membership so this would mean that a person that is representing a registry would be the member. Is that what you intend or what is - I'm not sure I understand the rationale behind the...

Man: It all comes down with a problem that we have been meeting and we know that certain registry operators want to become linked with this group but they don't attend ICANN meetings themselves. They completely rely not only for the operations but also for the representation and to act on behalf of that registry operator.

True, an official representative including the authority for that representative to say we want to become part of this interest group. So it's both about the application in order to become member as if they have become member to represent that member and take part in the votes, etc.

Man: But the member would be the registry. It's not about saying the representative would be the member.

Man: Exactly. To give a specific example, we have (Afnic) which is the official representative of the City of Paris for .Paris. So the member is actually .Paris but it acts through (Afnic). Does that make any sense?

Man: Yes, I understand. But I would understand this class like - that the representative would be a member. It says the member must meet other conditions below, is an organization, blah, blah, blah, or has the authority to represent and act.

This refers to the person who is representing someone. So my understanding would be that this - according to this the representative would be the member. But maybe I...

Man: No, I would say this - A says is an organization. You can make it dot or a comma after this. That is contracted party or has the authority to represent the contracted party. If you say it in short form, is an organization, I think what's after the A is important. It's not a person we are looking for, it's an organization in any case.

Man: The thing we have, (Olivier), is that actually you could - in the case of .Paris you can have three parties. You have .Paris, the GO gTLD, which is obviously also considered to be member of our GO group.

And .Paris can be represented either by the City of Paris, the City of Paris could have filled in the application form and said we want to become member for .Paris of the GO group. And (Afnic) could do that also on behalf of .Paris.

(Olivier): I get it. It's about (unintelligible) domains that don't have certain corporation for, yes.

Man: Another question, could we make it more precise so that it's excluded that a person has that authority or do you think this is...

(Olivier): I now understood it, okay. It was a matter of understanding, thank you.

Man: Okay.

Man: Yes.

Man: A note?

Man: I think this formulation or this language does not fit all the needs. Let's stay with .Paris. There is the registry backend operator which is core and core has a very, very good knowledge. It has been made really fantastic contributions to these groups.

So our day covered to - it's not the registry backend, it's a - what is core? To .Swiss or something - let's say - yes. Is .core somehow covered by this formulation? It's .Swiss. Sorry, I messed it up.

Man: Yes, maybe we ask...

Man: Forget .Paris, this is my misunderstanding. But for some - we are searching wordings that other contributing organizations can be plugged in. Is this also, for example, a solution for getting core representatives in? Because they are somehow connected, not with .Paris, I'm sorry.

Man: I would respond to that question as yes.

Man: As - if core represents, let's say, .Barcelona or - and they could become member as well.

Cherie Stubbs: Excuse me, I just wanted to make a housekeeping announcement. For those that are participating remotely or for the subsequent recording and transcript if you could announce your name in particular when asking a question that would be wonderful. Thank you all, sorry.

Dirk: Thanks, Cherie. Sebastien, please.

Sebastien: Yes, so Sebastien Ducos, Neustar, I'm in the position indeed of representing Melbourne and Sidney. We're also the backend registry operators of Melbourne and Sidney. I represent other cities, for example, (unintelligible) in Qatar as a backend registry operator only.

There is a (unintelligible) that may or may not want to participate in this group. I represent as a second level backend registry operator. I provide technology for the government of the UE to go and do their own TLD (unintelligible) and Dubai. Do I represent? I don't know.

I think that maybe we could skip one second into the next discussion into what is a member? Is it a TLD? Is it one representative for many TLDs as you demonstrated there? And maybe then back peddling from that we could decide for a TLD represents.

And it might be every TLD has a different configuration because they work differently but they may all decide on one person to represent and one member per TLD. I don't know if that discussion is planned.

Dirk: I like the suggestion but it opens up another can of worms. If we only look at it from the perspective of the specific TLD we will get into discussions that you have one organization, one registry operator for more than one TLD. So you will have another discussion on that level then.

Sebastien: I'm just basing myself - looking at other organization, AP TLD, them looking at - that we participate. Even if we were to have two different membership for

.AU for example, one being the operator (unintelligible) and the other one being asked - at the backend registry operator, we would still have only one person because the membership - the vote is only attached to one TLD, that's what I mean.

Peter: I agree and then on - for that specific topic we are perfectly in line with that. I was more referring to the situation where - for instance, the situation of DNS Belgium. We have one company but we have two Geos. If you look at from a perspective that both .Brussels and dot (unintelligible) would be separate members we would double our votes.

Sebastien: Sorry, Sebastien Ducos again. Yes, but then you have the membership so it's for you to choose if you want to be members for Brussels or for (unintelligible), pay the membership and the dues for one, and then have the matching votes.

If you're ready to pay for two you have two votes. If you want to represent only one on a voting round then you have only one membership or something like that.

Dirk: I would say Dirk, .Berlin. I would say that a single Geo TLD can only represent it by one entity, one member. It can be - that member can be a backend provider. It can be a consulting company or anything else, must be an organization for sure. But yes. So Sydney and Melbourne, they can't have a separate membership from your membership.

Sebastien: Sebastien Ducos again. No, so they can't but I could want two cards, one for Sydney, one for Melbourne provided, obviously, that I had two memberships.

Man: Yes, and two membership (unintelligible). No...

Sebastien: If I'm willing to pay the fees and I have no money myself so I can't promise anything. But if I were to have the fees twice, one for each TLD, then I would have two representations.

Man: That's right. But then you would have - as Neustar two memberships. Three?

Sebastien: Sorry, with New York City.

Dirk: Dirk, dot Berlin, we discussed this about breaking it down to the actual registry operator. So if there are three registry operators and you're representing all three of them it'd be three memberships, that's what we discussed. Irrespective of the number of Geo TLDs.

Man: You're right, yes.

Sebastien: Sorry, Sebastien Ducos again. In your case in South Africa, you represent three cities then .Africa, it's three times the same registry operator. Would you still consider that as three memberships?

Dirk: No, there's only one contract - sorry, there are three contracts but there's one entity that has the three Geo TLDs so it's one membership. The registry operator is what we base it on. So if the registry operator is the same across multiple - it's that membership for that registry operator. It's not - irrespective of the number of Geo TLDs.

Man: What?

Ronald: Ronald Schwaerzler. Neil, I think you could choose. You could say I want three votes, three membership for any TLDs or say you will sum up it because you have the same registry operator. It's what I understood before we took the example of Neustar so if you say Durbin is one, Joberg is one, and Cape Town is one you have to pay three times.

Otherwise make the group assignment and say the member is (unintelligible) registry or however - whatever your company is and then you have one vote paying only one point, two fees, or probably something like this.

Dirk: So if we go back to that slide that shows the members, there's 40 members there representing multiple Geo TLDs. And in essence there's 14 votes. So is that issued as four gTLDs - it's only as one vote. It's based on a - the single lowest common denominator of the registry operator irrespective of the number of Geo TLDs.

I think it's open to the membership if they want to open it to the actual number of gTLDs but that's a different thing altogether. It's not what we discussed. We decided that it would be based on the actual contracted party. The contracted party is the same over multiple applications or multiple Geo TLDs. It's still just one single registry operator as a member.

I don't know if that makes sense. Melbourne and Sydney, for instance, you might have two registries so that would be two members because it's a different registry operator.

Sebastien: But then the - the next question is - so could I sit here at the table representing, let's say, New York, not as a member for Sydney and Melbourne, having only one vote for the one city that I represent but knowing that I have two more behind me.

Dirk: Oliver?

Oliver: Yes, Oliver Sueme from .Hamburg. Once again, does it make sense if each top level domain that has contract with ICANN is one certain member and regardless of the registry behind it because - and maybe a case where you have - like, a GMO registry, one registry representing three top level domains, right.

But - and each of them has a contract to ICANN so if it comes to voting or to the representation of particular interest of a certain top level domain there might be different approaches in Tokyo because they have a very high number of registrations or a top level domain like (unintelligible) who has quite a small number of registries.

So the - and having one registry doesn't mean automatically that the interest in this group are the same to be represented for all the top level domains. So maybe it makes the most sense to say every top level domain that has a certain contract to ICANN is one member. Unless - I mean of course GMO registry could choose to say we are only representing .Tokyo here.

Dirk: Dirk from .Berlin, so that discussion on putting more than one string on one account of a member was about the fee discussion because (Neil) would say (unintelligible)...

Man: It's about the voting rights of course.

Dirk: Yes, four times the fees. So let me count on the members. We have - ICANN says at the moment there are 63 geographic top level domain names that would qualify under our eligibility criteria and not - 63 GO top level domains which ICANN says are geographic names and three of them that's (unintelligible) and another one that doesn't qualify as a Geo - does qualify in ICANN terms of a geographic names but can't become a member, (unintelligible) that Indian industry is - has a geographic name support letter but is not running dot (unintelligible) in a manner as we have it as a purpose of using domain names to indicate or identify a geographic (unintelligible) origin.

So we could potentially have 60 members at the moment. And the members could decide if they want to group - especially for fee purposes because you need to pay three times then the fee, want to group under, let's say, GMO or GMO could have three memberships. Is it right?

Man: Yes.

Man: Three memberships - single memberships but also need to pay for three single memberships.

Dirk: I think late in the discussion when we come to membership fees and you see how the way we've proposed the structuring in terms of the tiered structure we have all the GO TLD names under the registry operator come into play to determine what your membership fees. That's something that's dealt with under the fee structure but I think in terms of membership - for instance, an organization such as ours, we wouldn't want to be four members.

We're getting a value as a single member irrespective of the number of GO TLDs we have. We want to participate in this group - interest group because we get a certain - we believe we get a certain value out of it and we can make a certain contribution. We're not going to do that times four to our advantage.

So we certainly would look for one membership representing all our GO TLDs. When we pay our membership fee we will take all of the domains collectively to determine how much membership we have to pay. But we're just one member if that makes sense. I don't know if I'm speaking around in circles.

Dirk: Peter?

Peter: Peter from dns Belgium. Wouldn't it be in the best interest of this group that we do actually the combination that we allow either a member to choose to combine the Geo TLD strings he is managing and only become one single member?

So with the consequences of only membership fee that needs to be paid and the according number of votes attached with that while - in other cases the

member could say, well, I have three TLDs and I would like each of my individual Geo gTLDs become a separate member of the GEO interest group with that consequence that I will have three membership fees to pay and I will have according voting rights for the three individual memberships.

That looks to me as best of both worlds and I think that we could study this and come up with a memo. We are not going to solve that right now in doing some quick drafting so as a potential way forward I would say - and trust us with the assignment that we create a memo on that and report back for - on the Marrakesh meeting and see what is possible and what is not possible because I want to check this with the registry stakeholder structure as well.

And in the meantime I think that we should aim at adopting the charter as it currently is basically for two reasons. We have had a first version of the charter before we have official members. So from a legal point of view we have a charter but it hasn't been formally adopted by the members.

Now that we have members I think the next step for us to be formal - a GO interest group is to adopt this charter. And there was a second thing I wanted to say but it just slipped my mind. But basically that's the most important thing that we need formally to adopt a charter.

Dirk: So Sue, please switch to the charter slide? Yes. I think that - what we have now as a new charter opens this space for those things we discussed. A single member having - or a single member representing more than one Geo TLD or the same member with multiple memberships could represent multiple TLDs, that's - and we will work on - yes, on this for the next meeting.

But I think at the moment we should adopt this because really includes parties like (Afnic) or Neustar from (Ari) and others as well.

Sue Schuler: This is Sue Schuler, those that are not aware, on the RySG website there is a tab for the Geo TLD interest group and a copy of the charter is available on there if you have not seen it and read through it.

Dirk: (Jonathan)?

(Jonathan): Thanks. I had a question and a request. When we spoke about this in Buenos Aires there was also some kind of a requisite of the members of this group to be members of the registry stakeholder group where is that? And the second, maybe before we have these discussions maybe we should go through the whole thing - the whole thought process also including the member's fee because that's probably also going to change a bit the way things are represented.

If - because I have three TLDs under my belt I am counted as a member for - I can't remember what number you had but, you know, 92,000 domains or do I present the smallest of my TLDs - if the fees are based on the size of your TLD and things like that I would be interested in also seeing how you think of this because it would change a lot of the way we would represent too.

Dirk: I agree with the last observation. It's something we also need to take in while discussing this. But in terms of what - this is a resolution that we present, yes or no, agree with the charter. What we propose concerning membership restructure and budget is not a resolution. It's a discussion.

So what I want to say is when we're discussing this there's not going to be a binding resolution that comes out of it. It's preparing the consensus and it's like they're presented a roadmap. It's going to be the ex-com once it's elected that's going to finally rubberstamp the membership fee structure and the budget. So until that point is reached there will be no formal decision on that.

So my approach would be - because we clearly - we need an adopted - formally adopt a charter is to continue with this and not first have the whole

discussion on membership fee structure, on budget, and which by then make it difficult to reverse to this and still formally adopt this. I don't - I clearly see the link between the two of them and I do take notice of that specific point that how are you going to calculate the membership fee (unintelligible) in terms of the number of registrations.

And we need to reflect on that. But I don't see it so intertwined that we cannot have a decision on this until we have a formal decision on the membership structure.

Sebastien: Sebastien Ducos. I agree in principle. What about the registry stakeholder group membership?

Dirk: Yes, we have been talking with Paul Diaz and they are slightly annoyed with it as well because they are also a bit insecure. Clearly what they want to prevent is that the registry stakeholder group uses its funds to co-finance the work of our group and while in essentially it would be a group with, let's say, half of its members - not even linked with the registry stakeholder group.

So that's their concern. Do they want to press this and do they want to put some hurdles or obstacles and more formalization process? None whatsoever. So currently it has been addressed but it has not been the resolve. The registry stakeholder group doesn't want to make a big issue out of it.

I think that the way how we potentially could resolve it - and that's why it's a good thing that we keep our membership as open as possible so that for each of our members ideally there would be a linkage back to the registry stakeholder group, whether that's the registry operator that has become a member of the registry stakeholder group, whether it's the official representative of - or even another organization that is closely linked with the TLD itself if we could manage that, I think that we are out of the woods.

Man: Okay, maybe a final comment in your case. It could happen to anybody who represents more than one Geo TLD, that Geo TLD drop out - may drop out from this member because it moves to a different backend or different consultant then representing this or - and you all choose the member - the Geo TLDs in your membership form.

You wanted to represent. You were free to say I'm not - I'm only going for Sydney or I'm only going for Tokyo and not for the others. You can still say these shouldn't be represented, then you pay less membership fees.

Ronald: Ronald Schwaerzler from dot wien. That kind of give the memberships that we have, this 14 at least on the screen please? Do we have this problem? Let's say I think we are an interest group within the registry stakeholder group. The members is 14. Let's say for example, (unintelligible) is member of the registry stakeholder group is at least one of the GMO registry TLDs (unintelligible).

Should at least one of them should be registry stakeholder group member? Because otherwise we have entities in here around - have waste of funds of the registry stakeholder groups for them.

Sebastien: Sebastien Ducos, just to make it clear and I think that that's what you are referring to, my link to the registry circle group is three remote. So I'm not Sydney or Melbourne. It is Neustar via (unintelligible), which is a different non-Geo TLD TLD.

Man: But there is a connection.

Sebastien: There is a thing connection, yes.

Ronald: Sorry, I think at least - Ronald from dot wien. At least such a (unintelligible) or loose coupling should be the case.

Dirk: I agree with that. What we didn't do is we didn't scrutinize the incoming applications with the registry stakeholder group because that would entail in a kind of a discussion that also would oblige the registry stakeholder group to look in all the nitty gritty stuff of this.

So our basic concern when setting up the interest GO group was send out the message to potential members, are you interested in applying for membership? And we deal with it along the way. I mean if we have - I think that for the large majority of our members that we currently have, there is a linkage with the registry stakeholder group.

If for some isolated specific cases that would be a problem I think that we can look into that and we can sign up with a solution. But we looked at the pure pragmatic point of view because otherwise we would maybe have ended up with five applications and we need to have a significance in representing the GO TLDs to drive this project forward.

Dirk: So I think then we should come to the voting. Yes?

Egbert: Sorry, Egbert Wolf, Amsterdam. I have one more question. What about the other 40? Did they - did they already actively deny membership? Or did they say we're waiting? Or...

Dirk: I think we three contacted a lot of members on this so some are waiting for others to becoming member and in a second rush become a member, some are waiting on the fee structure, which is important to some of them. And we will do outreach to all to have a maximum inclusiveness in the TLDs.

We can't force anybody like the registry stakeholder group can't force all new gTLDs becoming member of the registry stakeholder group. And I hope that at least some of the observers will switch to a member at the end of the day and to the others we will outreach and show the benefits and - yes, try to get them becoming member in the group.

Peter: Peter Vergote DNS Belgium. I don't want to rush into the discussion or the debate that we are going to have about membership fee structures and budget. But currently nearly all the work for this group has been done on a pure voluntary basis. We like to do it because we believe that there is substantial benefit in having a group like this.

But we also have day jobs besides what we're doing for the GO group. So if we want to do more outreach to the other GOs we have done - we have gone as far as we can on a pure voluntary level. But if you want some specific outreach and somebody who actually is monetary this and does a follow up, like, I'm going to send them an email, I'm going to give them a call, I'm going to try.

If they're around at an ICANN meeting I'm going to try to set up a one-to-one and try to convince them to become member of this group, it's also tied in having resources for this group to do this kind of work. So that's also part of the action (unintelligible).

Dirk: Okay, if there are - (unintelligible). If there are no more voices we're going to the vote. Could you please go to the voting? Yes. We need for normal resolutions - our interest group does, we need seven members to represent 50% of the members to have a forum for normal resolutions.

In the case of a charter we need a two-third of the members to vote for the special resolution. And as I can count we have exactly ten members being present here and I hope we get all ten votes for the charter amendment we want to do.

So everybody has such a card and I'm now asking for your vote for the charter amendment as we presented on the slide before. Yes?

Dirk: Can we perhaps call for the efficiency and to avoid ambiguity, could we do it otherwise? Could we just have a show of cards if all the ten members are present? One, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine, ten. I'm seeing ten cards, okay. So the ten cards are available.

Okay. Are there any members abstaining from adopting the charter? Seeing none, is anyone against the adoption of the current working of the charter? Seeing none so I think we have a resolution passed. Thank you.

Dirk: Thank you, our first resolution. And also to fix that resolution we'll not only have the transcription, we'll do also some minutes, which summarize this and bring the resolution to paper. Yes.

Okay, we - heading to the next point, some basic things of our group we discussed already for many, many times I think but we try to distill a common understanding of the GO top level domain names. And we think that's a strong distinction to other TLD organizations like the registry stakeholder group, (NTAC), ccTLDs or others.

So the reason why is we have different stakeholders that drive our business, different stakeholders than the others have. Let's say, .com has not the same stakeholders we have. We have some common stakeholders but we have different ones. And our ones are the local government administration is public interest. These are our stakeholders.

We have other achievables that means we are more looking for a sustainable operation of our TLD like a ccTLD and our city or region societies or cultural societies are driving our TLDs and we see each other as part of the infrastructure of the city now, the digital infrastructure.

And we have other needs as you all know, policies like right protection mechanisms, the reserve names list, and (unintelligible) like this.

It's something we wanted to bring up - yes. Okay, then, I would head to the next slide, what do we want to achieve? We have three slides, that's the longest one here. We said we want to articulate our interest, make them heard and accomplish within the ICANN ecosystem, that's at ICANN what we want to achieve.

Professional representation of the group and members towards our stakeholders inside ICANN. We have already mentioned on the registry stakeholder group with our charter, the new charter will go to this as well. You can become a member, that's a membership form and everything like this.

And we are acknowledged by being member or an interest group meanwhile within ICANN. Then we have - want to have regular communications in ICANN, outreach to potential new members, which are also at the ICANN meetings.

And we have a lot of current topics to work on and just to name the actual - the current ones like two-letter names, economic study, Whois things. I think we could do a lot of things - there are a lot of common periods running and the GO TLDs could have a voice regarding these things.

And a good example on the next slide, what can be done as a group which has really a professional organization is the brand registry group. Please, the next slide. Yes, that's the brand registry groups. They are not an interest group at the moment but they will likely become an interest group.

And they - what they did with professional work in their groups, they have one employed secretary who - no, the slide before, please, who is working on several topics. And they were aiming for an exemption of the code of conduct and got it. They got special treatment in the release of country and territory names for instance, which is also interesting for us.

They gathered sunrise exemption, that was really hard to do and they worked a lot of years I would say on this but they finally get it and they are likely getting a two-letter exemption for the release of two-letters to - that's something you can have as a professional group.

The next slide, please. This - nice way to change the slide. So - and we have some goals we want to achieve outside of ICANN. So we need to have a professional representation of our group towards other stakeholders in the world and that's not only ICANN who are our stakeholders.

We could perform market research and should do it and benchmark ourselves with ccTLDs, with cTLDs, and have a common understanding of what's going on in our group amongst the members and which finally resides in best practice and quality assurance in our operations. That would really benefit all.

And the last one we want to achieve, next slide, please. No, this is - yes. Peter? It's your turn. No, no, for the second slide a good example of what could be achieved by an organization representing a lot of TLDs is, I think, (unintelligible) and Peter is delighted to say something on what (Center) reached over the years.

Peter: Absolutely, thank you, Dirk. Peter Vergote, DNS Belgium. As many of you probably know, I have been chair of (Center) the last couple of years. And well, I have been involved in (Centers) since its early conception and the way how the organization evolved pretty much looks like the process that we are currently undergoing.

It all started with a small group. By that time it's nearly 20 years ago. By that time ccTLDs were very small registries with the exception for - of .NL, .UK, and dot (unintelligible) but all the rest of the cc's were small. The large majority of them still had very restrictive rules so it was difficult to register domain names under a ccTLD.

And all the issues that are popping up in our discussions have at some point in time occurred within the beginning years of (Center) as well. It's about do we need a budget? Who is going to become member? What's our story? What's the benefit for a ccTLD to become member?

But if you look how influential that (Center) has become as the ccTLD organization right now that might put a good perspective for us where we want to take the level of this group.

And it's a long running effort. I mean we all know that the market is sluggish and the more domain name registrations you can get in the easier it will get to cooperate and to dedicate funds for a professional organization on doing a lot of stuff on your behalf.

But currently (Center) is getting that benefit for its members. And it's currently taking it to the next level. (Center) is not only doing much of lobbying on behalf of the ccTLDs and exploring and best practices and sharing experience and things, that's still the basics for serving as a membership organization.

But what they're doing now within (Center) is look - you can look at it with some basic statistic gathering like how is the name space and the GNSOs growing? How is it with the ccTLDs?

What they're doing now is saying, like, we have a number of stats, let's try to combine all those resources and build on that to give more knowledge to the CC's because also the CC's they found that the markets is not as prosperous any more as it used to be a couple of years ago. Everybody is confronted with declining growth or zero growth.

So the need is high to work on that data and to get insights in your consumer base and with that intelligence try to deliver it and to get your TLD back on

the growth path. So I think there is much that we can learn just by looking at (Center) as an example.

And on top of that what the team has been debating this morning, what we would like to do is to invite somebody from (Center) at our next level in Marrakesh so that they can give us a flavor. How is the organization being built? What is it currently do? And what are the tasks that it's carrying out for the membership?

So I think that this would be worthwhile for all of us just to witness what's going on in that specific membership organization. So if you all agree with that we are going to see to it that we have somebody from (Center) and giving us a presentation. Thank you.

Dirk: Thank you. Next slide, please. Final thing gives us an outlook into the future, what one - what is our aim? What is our vision to become? And I think we are all heading with our GO TLDs to become, let's say, an equal - as important as the ccTLDs are as part of the digital communication infrastructure, of a geographic area or community.

I think this is something we are at the starting point heading towards and this would take a time but I think this is a good value proposal.

Before we come to - yes?

Man: On that specific point and without wanting to go back to the membership again, community - are we going to let our brothers in arms join that are community non-Geo official Geos but community applications? I'm thinking about the dot (unintelligible), the (unintelligible), and all the others.

Man: (Unintelligible), yes, it's - what we have a lot of geographic TLDs which are not really centered on a clear cut geographic area but are rather more geographic in (unintelligible) community or (unintelligible) community.

Sebastien: Yes, Sebastien Ducos because I meant specifically people that didn't tick the Geo box in their application to ICANN are not Geo TLDs as far as ICANN are concerned, are not part of the 63 that you mentioned but yet have for all intents and purposes exactly the same ideas that we do.

Dirk: (Unintelligible)? So one requirement is that you have a support letter of your local government. This is one of the four requirements we have in our charter. And if you don't have - like, I don't know if Irish has? Dot (unintelligible) doesn't have I know.

But I'm not sure who else is in this - in the (unintelligible) group who has a geographic term but no - doesn't tick the box geographic but has support of the government.

Sebastien: Sebastien Ducos, support of the government now at any time after the application? Because as a community they not have been required to produce one, didn't have one because they weren't required to produce one but can produce one today.

Dirk: But what we can do is before making any kind of decision on now we can potentially better reach out - identify those registries, reach out to them, find out, would you be interested in becoming involved in the world of the GEO? And then based on that feedback, come back to the membership and then try to see if we can reach for a resolution.

Man: Yes.

Dirk: Before we come to the budget I just want to bring up a slide about the support of the registry stakeholder group and I can - that's the next slide and have a comparison, what we get free of cost. There are a lot of things like the invitation to meetings, organizing the meeting room.

So if you go in detail there's a lot of work (Sue) and Cherie are doing for us. We get the meeting rooms so they are also (unintelligible) - sometimes we get lunch I think. Didn't miss apply for lunch this time? Okay.

But these are the hard facts but what is not provided? I think that is the interesting part where our group as a group fits into, having minutes was a written resolution, having statistical information, membership or member and observer profiles, benchmarking liaison with the registrar stakeholder group and others. And also following all the mailing lists, which are there.

I have a day job and most of you have a day job as well. You can't follow all the groups that are - and all the processes that are ongoing there. You spend a whole day. Some other registries - the big ones, they have dedicated persons or the whole staff which exactly does only ICANN things, not taking care of operations, premium things or whatsoever, doing all these things.

And I think therefore we really need some helps. And doing presentations, comments, position papers and so on, these things we don't have, we don't get from the registry stakeholder group and - that just wanted to point out which things are there and which things we really need.

Now we're coming to the interesting point, budget discussion.

Woman: (Unintelligible)? I'm sorry.

Man: Sorry.

Dirk: Just one remark, (unintelligible). Short remark under the red ones that are right there, what is not provided? It's the same with the registry stakeholder group. They don't have resources to get four following up current topics and (unintelligible) the group that are registry stakeholder group is (unintelligible) members. They have a biweekly telephone calls meetings, send a formal working group to say who is willing to participate.

So it's a contribution of the members to the group. It is not a financed person in there who is except of you both, (Sue) and Cherie. It's the members that are willing to participate in this groups and to distribute to the group. So it's the same if you would look at the registry stakeholder group, what do we get for our membership? Feasible look, more or less, or exactly the same?

Dirk: I wanted to – Dirk for .Berlin. I wanted to return just briefly to the point that we discussed before because it's in the charter that we have cultural and linguistic communities and also dot (unintelligible) for instance as members in the group so that has already been decided with the charter. Thank you.

Dirk: Okay, Maxim?

Maxim: Small note, please add to the red side annual deliveries. Call it a (unintelligible) and everything I have into PDF and municipal entities could be able to participate because if they have something called annual (unintelligible) or annual deliverables or something - it's the same information, slightly in different form but it will help them to just join without something the need something to have against payment.

Participation, it's for commercial and non-commercial organizations. For governmental, guys, you need something to have in (unintelligible). And since it's just PDF and you might use (unintelligible) for a few members who really need to have it in paper form. This is - it's slightly different name for the same thing but it would allow them to participate properly.

Dirk: (Maxim), would something like a monthly activity reports come close to what you have in mind?

Maxim: I'm thinking about annual or quarterly. Do not do it often. Either way, it's not so much inside and it's like leaflets, you will waste lots of time on not so interesting document. And quarterly or at least three times per year or

something so it's, like, report on what's happened, maybe the after meeting end month after meeting on what goes on, what we go into plan, or maybe some statistics.

It's interesting, we have high (unintelligible) to these and that - to (unintelligible) your TLDs, etc. Something short but looking like just (unintelligible) can have at least once per year, just PDF actually and printed PDF.

Sue Schuler: This is Sue Schuler. Before we leave membership, for those that are here that are not members, if you want to become a member just fill out that registration that I gave you, the application.

We do have more of them here. If you decide after the meeting and you still want to we do have the membership application form on the website and there is information there - who to email that to, thank you.

Dirk: Yes, could you please then go to the next slide on - do we have - yes, okay. Okay. The budget discussion. The task now for our group is to set up a budget according to that understanding that we had throughout the last meetings and especially Buenos Aires and Singapore.

And what we are talking today about is not voting on a budget or finally deciding on a budget but finalizing a provisional budget, which can then be adopted and agreed with a group and ex-com - the officers which are voted later in the year.

So it's not final what we are now discussing but it could give a good indication if the group has a consensus on what we are discussion now for the next steps.

Sue, please. No? Okay. So the budget plan for 2016 would include here a professional secretariat which takes care of the red - the red bullet points we had on the slide on the right side, on the previous slide.

The - we need a - for sure we need a professional website set up with word press or (unintelligible) or whatsoever so that requires some money and professional work. I think we started something a couple of years ago but then the system or the CMS didn't work out.

Market research is something we definitely need putting all the data together and so on and do some other market research we can agree on next year.

Position papers, writing - having professional help in writing papers under Whois, under two-letter, and everything like this. And to do some outreach to new members to do outreach to, let's say, mayor's organization, with mayors or with city organizations to explain who we are and what we want and how can we contribute to digitalization of cities and regions.

This is what we thought as a reasonable budget for the next year. And we want to discuss with you.

Dirk: Maybe we can add it's - in the previous discussions we always had a bit - a chicken and an egg, like, come up with detailed budgets, what you want to do, justify it, and then we are going to decide on that.

Now the chicken and egg situation is that you cannot actually come up with a budget if you don't know what the willingness of the members is to invest in terms of membership fee in this organization. So we split the things. We have high level, we can have discussions on the budget, what according to us needs to be a minimum that we would like this group to achieve and the tasks that are aligned with that.

And then on the other side, we have to make decisions on a future membership restructure. Obviously, it goes hand in hand that if you have or if you would have an agreement on membership restructure that this is not a license to spend. It's not, okay, we have agreed and the payment has been made so now whoever is going to be the ex-com of this interest group in the future now can freely start working with the collected fees.

That's not - that's not the idea. The only reason why we cut it into two different topics is that we need to have a minimum commitment of this group. I mean if we are not really interested in investing even the slightest fee then this interest group is not workable. What we currently lacking the most is activity in between ICANN meetings.

We have a frenzy of activity in the weeks prior in ICANN meeting. Basically, (Neil) (unintelligible), and I that start calling each other, let's start making preparations for the agenda, let's start thinking about topics. Yes, that's true, that was an important topic.

Well, we're still two weeks from ICANN, can we quickly look into this? This is the professionalism that we currently lacking. We're lacking - it doesn't - not need to be much but what we need is some kind of secretarial aid that goes beyond what (Sue) and Cherie are doing because they are actually providing us with the admin support that we are looking for.

We are not looking at doubling admin support. What we are looking is to have that bit of management capacity that actually do - does the necessary prep work so that we as members - we can focus more on what brings us together.

It's exchanging information, exchanging experience, and not having that same situation again that there are four individuals that in the week or in the two weeks before the ICANN meeting start getting together and doing all the work. And you can avoid that with a minimum set of some management capacity that looks on behalf of the topics.

And that also alerts the ex-com or the membership as a whole like beware, this has been debated within ICANN, this is relevant to your group. I suggest that at least a couple of members get their heads together and start thinking about it so that you can have a debate at the next ICANN meeting. This - these are the things that we're really lacking, thank you.

Ronald: Dirk?

Ronald: Ronald from dot wien. Could you please just give some information on this market research? Because 8,000 euros is nothing for market research for something like Neustar group covering the whole world. So what are you up to there?

Dirk: So it's basically we should start with doing some market research within our group on every parameters we have there, assembling the data there, comparing the data there before heading into the real market. Yes, I know, it's a minimum budget but I can't have 50,000 Euros there. Then you would throw me out of this room when I propose that.

Ronald: Well, I don't really know – Ronald, again. I think it would be worthwhile to spend 8,000 Euros or something like that on - let's call it networking or something like that which would be really helpful and to find sponsors for something like data market research.

But for 8,000 Euros you would be able to find a consultant and you take 8,000 Euros with just coming to your place and talking to you. So putting up a think tank and doing some networking I think would be much more effective. And if we want to make a big market research we should look for sponsors and what we have in our stock at home because most of us will have done market research already.

Dirk: I fully agree with that but basically what we also put on the market research - for instance, for (Center), (Patrick Miles) operates from Australia, he is no longer a full time employee for (Center). He works part time for (Center) as a consultant. But he's doing great stuff with stats so in stats and data gathering and getting the two together.

Now what we could potentially do is reach out and ask (Patrick) - look, we are a GEO group, we are starting to explore how we can gather statistics, how we can bring them together in a useful way so that it's beneficial to our members.

And so what we pointed at with market research, it's merely laying fundamental - not doing the research itself because with 8K you're flying nowhere but with that 8K, for instance, I think that if (Patrick) would - we haven't contacted him, just to put this on the record. We haven't contacted him in any way.

But for instance I think he would be more than happy to say, okay, based on my experience that I have been doing stuff for (Center) I could free a couple of hours or a couple of days and look into something that could serve the GEO group, for instance.

Dirk: I have Alex, Oliver, and Sebastien on the queue. Alex?

Alex: thanks, Alex from .London. I realize it's a bit chicken and egg and, you know, how big's the budget and how much will people contribute. It's all sort of quite difficult to comment but for me it's about making sure we're finding real tangible deliverables that will be of a benefit to the group.

So whatever budget size we signoff, you know, I'm really interested in some really good best practices that's coming out of what we do and outside and some really good research that really adds to the growth of the domains, you know, the growth of our work.

I'm personally less interested in the intricacies of some of the ICANN processes and issues that come up. So that may differ across the group but I think whatever budget we set some really clear deliverables in the first six to twelve months that people are going to fill that benefit. And then hopefully want to contribute more potentially because we can research stuff better together then obviously that's sufficient.

Dirk: Thanks. Olivier

Oliver: Yeah, Oliver from dot Hamburg. I think these numbers have to be very rough because as (Peter) mentioned it's an (hand in egg) problem. Because if we don't get at least a very rough idea about what we can do with the money and where would we spend it on and then it's impossible to agree on any kind of fees. So, of course market research is expensive for example and everybody would be happy if we could spend more for this.

But I think we have to withdraw something that comes as close as possible a budget that is depending on the number or the amount of the fees so I think, yeah the numbers have to be rough but I think they are enough to present a rough idea on what a budget could look like and all the details would depend on the actual fees that we would be able to collect.

Dirk: Do you think - the 8000 I'll be with you is not enormous but there is a lot of work already done by individuals like Patrick miles in the community. They can bring a lot even for that much money.

A lot of interesting stuff. I happen to live in the same city as Patrick so we know each other also personally and I know that's something that can be of interest to him. He is not attending this I can, probably be there - we discussed earlier to get centered in the room it might also be interesting to get him in the room next time discussed that.

And then just one for the quick record that I've done the same thing in Buenos Aires. I think that it is very important for the group to recognize the amount of work that you guys have been doing so far. And I just want to have it for the record. Obviously there's going to be at the time of discussed in cash discussions on this and people are going to give me and etc. That's always happens with money but before we get to that I'd like to acknowledge the good work that you guys have been doing so far. Thank you.

Sue Schuler: We have one question from a remote participants John McCormack. Business market research involve web usage analysis in the various GLTD's?

Dirk: It's not decided yet anything we would come up with we what put it around in the group and we have decided what's the most needed at the moment. But we would take this data analysis might be interesting and notice on our list of interesting things.

Man: 32,000 is that the five X's that are on the slide right now. So if you give the numbers you can also some of those numbers. It's a professional secretariat. I think Peter you described it. It is reminding the officers, the members of these groups that they should focus on things that are our daily business.

I think don't think we need someone - it's like hiring a consultant where anyone already knows the answer but doesn't take the seriousness and the time to work on these things. Again, like in the registries they called the groups. There are people dedicating they work to the group being offices there. They are taking part in workgroups etc.

Do we really need a professional secretariat that reminds us that we have agreed on finishing some work in three weeks? Do we need someone that is already working on such things? I could agree. Reminded me that I have promised to do something for the next three weeks I don't want to spend even €1400 a year.

We should agree on do we as the members contribute to this group or do we need someone professional who is working on our behalf and we are willing to pay for him or her. It's not about reminding that the person to do something that they have promised something. That are not aware that there's a meeting in two or three weeks in Dublin are in Buenos Aires or wherever.

So this person, this professional - Secretariat professional expert can also like you propose take care of sponsoring or some fun things some work on behalf of the group and not just remind the officers to do something. I think this is the really understanding we need to have if we are going to spend thousands of dollars or Euros or whatever.

Dirk:

Let me say something. The secretary, but basically how it is calculated. It's one and a half days per month, €600 a day and some travel fees. That's how we calculated this. And if you look into that Intech is to the brand registry, brand registry group is a good example.

They have a high educated employee who earns more than €100,000 a year as a fee just running this. And you know the fees in the brand registry group. And also the registries secretary group that are how they dedicated people just formally pay for preparing everything in the registries Sec. group from various signed, news staff from 1.2619 from all the big players.

And we are mainly very small players and we need to do all the work especially we hear and also you following all the discussion groups in our time besides the operation which is our main task of the security. So I think 40,000 is even minimum we could spend on some professional help and I agree with Ronald not spending this on reminding the office is what to do.

But let us spend the money and let's say writing or preparing some papers. Bringing up important topics which we missed as a group and prepare something on this and sponsorships could go also a point. We have decided

on what the professional secretariat is doing. But the group as Peter said we are lacking of having that she said the biweekly calls and the constant work throughout the year and our group. We are meeting just at the ICANN meeting and doing something around there but we are not as professional as other groups are and they have people doing this job for a time.

Dirk: So there is I guess no decision in my point of view. Why do we say we are as members of this Geo group are doing the work the necessary work or do we hire someone we have to pay for 30,000, 40, 50 or even hundred thousand if we take the brand interest group that is working on our behalf and delivers some papers or whatever. Is paying for someone would be unique on the second time because I think the brand registry is the first example or the one of the service group I'm in which is the register's stakeholder group. The members paid the low to contribute to do the work.

Like you said stake funding group has been quiet all contracted by Google and now she's doing policy work contributing what should be policy work or whatever within the registry stakeholder group.

We are busy want to have someone who is paid by this group and then we need somebody. All we decide let's do it ourselves and have a minimum fee for some house synchronizing.

Oliver: Oliver from dot Hamburg. Again on the budget. I think as I mentioned before the concrete numbers cannot be discussed right now. It's a rough idea and all the rest depends on what we agree on the number of these. Every community (unintelligible) I would agree to list some of the contributions of the members.

That's clear. But that's not our discussion. I think the discussion that we have here now is doing agreed that we need more professional structure and that the structure is not about reminding the with the next ICANN meeting

happens reminded me that we had a call next week is about producing content.

It's about gathering the information from all the registries that are on the table here. Is about representing our interest toward ICANN and a professional matter and to me and to my organization what we're doing here is a core part of our business. We are related to ICANN and contracts.

And I think it's extremely important that we have professional backup that we have professional organization and we will not be able to set this up without money. So I have a very clear position on this. We need a budget.

We need to collect fees and the other option would be to have the meetings and contribute and try to set something up. But I think that this wouldn't match the level of importance that the ICANN meetings and our relation to ICANN has to our business.

Dirk:

I would let the slide stand here after this discussion. I would say most of us agree and we don't need to decide, we need to remember on this point. Most of us agree that there is a budget needed and that could be a rough consensus on a budget where we are heading toward. It's not decided if it's a final budget.

It can be much lower if all 60 GEOTLD's full members. It could be much higher. It depends on I would say the next slide which we are heading to the fee structure of the group. So we calculated this analog to the registry stakeholder group and categories of number of setting domain names for member.

And it comes back into the discussion of who represents how many members and how is this calculated and so on. And we set a minimum fee also for observers would be €500 if you have a really small GLTD'S.

Most of the GLTD's represented here on the table are in the middle group between 10 and 25,000 domain under management and only a few reach the level of from 50 to 100,000. That could be a budget proposal here and we don't have 100,000 at the moment. So what's your take on this proposal?

Man: I just have the rationale for the fee to be based on registrations.

Dirk: The rationale?

Man: Yeah. What's the rationale? It's not a flat fee for an organization with the GLTD'S. Was the rationale which we base on volume of registration?

Dirk: The rationale was that we wanted to have it as possible equal to the registry stakeholder group which is also a GL pricing model.

Man: So is that any rationale to that's what they do?

Dirk: Yeah.

Man: Okay.

Dirk: Yeah, for sure. It comes down what we thought is very small GLTD'S and if you would say, let's have it the average here 1000 or 1250 or something like this might be too much for a very small GLTD'S and we want to be inclusive. So those who have quite more registrations would pay something more and subsidize the participation of the very small ones by this. Is the same in the registry stakeholder group.

Alex: Alex still from London. Is that about means and resources to contribute? I would say this cause I represent a TLD that has more registrations you may say. But if it's about means of resources I think it's different.

So I'll pick on Neal cause - is he still there? He's far enough away. You know, I don't know how many remains that they have but it's clear the resources of the organization that Neil represents on larger than a single TLD.

So if it's about means of resources to pay I struggle a little bit cause actually we all represent different types of organizations. We had different revenues, streams, etc. from different places.

So I'm just putting it out there. Just challenging whether we just take this model or whether it's everyone's getting the benefit than everyone should contribute the same amount.

Dirk:

I think I'm largely to blame in putting this kind of one membership fee structure to the table. Yes, we have looked at what of the membership organizations do. We did the CCNSO. It to my recollection I think it took five years in order to have an agreement with ICANN on membership fee structure and the contribution of the cc's to the overall I can budget.

We have started - I would guess at least a dozen models ranging from one flat fee for all registries because they do have the same kind of discussion can you have smaller registries and you have very large registries like one (unintelligible) for instance.

And we even have models that combine membership fee link to with the gross national product. And NDM, the only model that got enough support from the membership. Not unanimous support of the least resistance was the model based on a tire membership fee.

And the same applies for (unintelligible). The same applies for practically all the organizations or interest groups are supporting organizations that collect membership fees. And all comes down that this is the model that is the least of all evils I would say.

Woman: Sorry, I didn't understand the model you were describing. Which one?

Dirk: Referring to this model and I was comparing it with what is happening in the other ICANN supporting organizations and I was expressly referring to the fee model or the contribution model I should say that is used within the cc NSO.

Woman: So you're saying that this model is more or less the same as the one used TLD in the CCNSO with reference made to the number of one.

Dirk: On principle, yes.

Woman: Okay, thank you.

Dirk: Yes. You as a (unintelligible) for instance the contribution for those are calculated. I can contribution is calculated based on the number of domain names.

Man: I'm jumping and I guess. By one (unintelligible) such small the city of these and CCNSO you have large countries running their own cc TLD's so I don't know if the comparison is completely right. I'm in a bit of the same seat as you are. I have a large number with New York. I could also represent myself as KRD with 50 names. How are we working this out?

Man: So if you have KRD with 50 names you are not then representing Sydney and Melbourne or New York. You can speak on behalf of KRD then.

Dirk: I understand that fully but we all understand that around this table that the advantage of participating here is the information that we shape. We'll go back to the same information that I go with KRD to Sydney, Melbourne and New York. We need to find - it needs to be discussed. And I don't know what the answer is. But we need to discuss as an away that is clear for everybody and works out.

Just one thing back I enjoyed the fees that you put out but if we were calculating 34,000 was about 10 members and then I guess it's a few words that are not in the room that doesn't compute. I'm not quite sure how you came up to that number.

Man: I just have a question regarding the observer fee and we are in observer with NRW and I don't quite understand why it's just €250. That's a full membership fee. If we are not allowed to vote I think it's a crucial thing. Just out of interest.

Dirk: We thought that, even the observers for any reason they couldn't become an observer because it's a national government or operator or city government can't be a member of a group and paying.

But we set the observers should have the option to follow all the musings, accessing all the materials, the market research and all the other stuff that we had. And there was a need for this observer's starter especially for those who can't be a member but we wanted them to have to have them in our group and they wanted to be in our group.

Man: I think it still should be less but, okay.

Dirk: More comments on the fee structure? So there's no big resistance I think on the fee structure. There are some comments then we might rework that said before this is finalized but the tiered model seems to be the less evil model as Peter said.

Man: So that just goes against the - in the agenda part you mentioned the fact that we are going to vote for a board who is then going to decide that. There won't be any time to go back to the membership before we actually need to start being raising the money degrees to membership if this is about. So we will have to decide that before Marrakesh; right? Or how do you intend to do that?

Dirk: No. The timeline is that the XCOM offices are elected in December and they finalized the budget and the membership proposal which is then voted before Marrakesh on those who are members. Both on the proposal the officers to in December.

Man: That's my understanding was in January you are mentioning that we would have to start business as usual with at least some of the money in the kitty to be able to operate and this is two months before Marrakesh. So all these decisions would have to be taken before the next meeting.

Dirk: Yes.

Man: I'm sorry, the question of (unintelligible). We elect the officers. Of the officers set up the rules, set up a budget and either you agree with it or you are not a member of - and pay, or you're not a member of the group. This is what I understand it. So you are finalizing or summing up that there is no resistance probably to the way you want to see it. There is little or at least not absolute consensus on this tiered model.

I heard at least two or 3 things very clearly. We elect the officers, they set up the next year's budget and then you even joined the group with these set up budget or you do not. Because in 2016 you only can fold if you pay the fees for 2016. This is what I've got so far.

Dirk: No, no. You are not right. The office is set up the budget and a fee proposal and the members vote on this. If there are enough members of voting on this and we get this quorum and that would be adopted as I understand.

Man: In 2015 already?

Dirk: In 2015 or early 2016.

Man: But if I don't pay the fees for 2016 I'm not a member? So please quantify, clarify who will vote on this decision and when? We have set up 14 members right now. Let's say this is the member list.

You come up with a yearly fee of let's say €3500 because the sum up divided by 10 or whatever is about the thing then gave 14 decide whether they accepted or not or do you have to pay and because it's already been 2016 and only the ones that are willing to pay can vote on this. This is the decisive that's what comes first. Having to pay and decide on this or decide and then choose whether to pay or not?

Dirk: Maybe I have a suggestion. As I see it I think that the most crucial thing is that we first reach agreement on the membership fee structure. We can leave it said that but to be informally and approve it officially at Marrakesh it could be true and a line voting and have it ready before Marrakesh but in the sequence of things we first need that because this will create the canvas for which within the budget needs to be made.

And I think that the fully detailed budget should be presented to the membership at that I can Marrakesh meeting. That seems to be a logical approach enabling most of the members to say I'm still interested or not.

And even if I agreed with the membership fee that does not necessarily mean that I agree how my membership fee is going to be spent because that needs to be justified by detailed budgets.

Man: I hope that all the members have become members, all the 14 knowing that they would have to pay fees. That's my take on the members. I think no one has become a member to say make several thousand in our group and say I'm becoming a member now.

I have signed the membership and I vote for we don't want to have fees. So I think everybody knows we need some fees at it's the members that are voting on the fees and there are their own fees.

Alex: Alex from London. Please again it's easy. Give me the correct timeline. In November elect the officers, the officers decide on the budget and it's diverting from what was deciding on the fees. They decide on the fees. And then the members vote. Currently we have 14 members.

If the election is in December we have 14 members. If we have the election because out of some time constraints, time going by etc. we have the election and the third week of January. Who is a member then? Still the 14? Or the ones that are willing to pay though whatever fees. This is the - I think it is a crucial thing.

Dirk: Dirk from Berlin. You will be certainly still a member in January 16 if there was no voting or no decision on whatsoever. So you are still a member. There was no need to pay in January if there was no decision before.

At the decision is taken by the group to have this or slightly other membership fee structure then it's the decision on the group and after the decision of the group you can say I don't agree with it. I voted against it. I don't want to be a member anymore.

Man: So whenever this voting on the fees take place it is out of these 14 members of the ones that join the group until the end of December that currently no fee. That is it.

Dirk: It's always going to be the membership that makes the final calls.

Man: Okay.

Dirk: Proposals can be made now because there is no XCOM. Proposals can be prepared by Johannes, Dirk, Neil and I put forward or by everybody but put forward to the membership.

Once we have elected officers I assume that it's a task of the XCOM to prepare meetings and to prepare resolutions that have resolution concerning the future membership fee structure is part of that. And then they propose this resolution to the membership that votes on it period.

Alex: So Alex from London. And I just want to say a couple of things. I think the work that we've all done together and the last couple of years has been hugely valuable to all of us.

So I think is really important that we just practice and I just followed overall a few hundred euros. And I think it's really important that we stay inclusive and that we keep as many people who've been involved in working with each other as possible. And there was a people not here TLDay.

There was some people not on the list that I hope will come back. And I think to set the fees on the activities in a way that doesn't get people to drop out because they can see value of €500 are €1000. So let's try and get right. Let's keep everyone in the ten as we take it.

But we need a way that it feels fair to contribute. So I guess I'm stuck the weather what I should be contributing more to subsidize someone with that domain but we'll get there. I wanted to ask a question about observer spaces as well because I don't quite understand, I'm not sure I quite understood it.

Why someone would be an observer. With the state observer was anyone that actually represents a TLD we would want them to be in. And I think voting is that the most crucial thing in this.

As someone said it's about the information etc. So he's an observer of a transitional status or is it just because your organizational structure doesn't allow you to join or what is it?

Peter: Peter from dot Belgium. I think it's largely it's a transitional status. It's for those organizations that say I'm interested in the work that they G OIG is doing but currently as I don't have a clue what the membership fee is going to look like if any what the budget is going to look like if any so I'm reluctant to commit already as a full member.

So I want to be a board. Currently I do it as an observer. And as a limited category of organizations that are interested in our work like TLD books but by their nature they cannot become members. So for those is not a transitional status it's going to be their final status.

Ronald: Again, Ronald from dot wein. To be clear that London cannot be an observer or that we or can we just to save €250.

Dirk: But from a legal point of view you potentially could. But to finish my sentence what's the point. If that would be the approach of potential members that say no I'm going to stay observers a set of members that it's the end of this group. Let's be serious about that.

Ronald: It's a way of I don't care about the voting. I'm interested in the information and I can save €250. So I get all the information and I have to pay €250. Could it be that is not that perspective but it could be a reason? So you get the same information.

You don't have the possibility and the application to vote officers but you have the same preference, the same information. Is a possible, yes or no? Just to have a very clear sentence. Yes it will be possible. It is not...

Dirk: According to the Charter it would be possible. We relying on.....pressure that this doesn't happen or that it only happens for organizations that use it as a transitional. But if the practice would show that there are number of potential members that prefer observer status because they count and having the same access to the same information, the same level of benefits for the group without paying the membership fee structure to my position is very clear then we should modify the charter in order to avoid this.

Man: I think you are - all the fees you have from (unintelligible). I would like to present the position of the (unintelligible) for the communication. We have chosen to remain observer only by the fact that we are also with the government and we wouldn't interfere in the business of this group that's the only reason is to present it. Thank you.

Dirk: I think we have now again after the budget and rough consensus on the next steps. And I would finish the discussion on the budget discussion on this point except after Sebastien has a...

Man: I just spoke up, sorry. No one else did. How do you come to that highest on (unintelligible) on the (unintelligible). How many members are you accounting on and just a quick one because I haven't done the math but it sounds like it doesn't compute. And I don't want to come back with a discussion in two months when suddenly is twice as much is that was three times.

Dirk: So we calculated it, it's not the full budget we presented but it's roughly going to work and established the work and have some basic tasks to do.

Peter: So in essence to complement you are acknowledging that this would be the middle that gives except to buy the membership and if we don't have a lot of membership fees to come close to the rough budget outline that has been presented in the previous slides we're not going to reverse on that and deciding like we need to waive the membership fees in order to come to the full budget. We stick with that and we see how far this gets us to budget. But

that's a low level budget that's how we are going to do with it in the hope that in cost of 2016 we have more members to join increasing our financial capability. Okay, thanks.

Dirk: I think that was a good last work. Thank you Peter. Then we would make a break and after the break we start with Logic during more interesting part I think and I hope the next meetings we don't have so long discussions on the topics. I want to really go into a large experience and all these kind of things. So 15 minutes or...

Sue Schuler: We are a full hour and a half behind on the schedule. So maybe we should cut it to 10. So please be back in 10 minutes and maybe we can start at 15.

Lutz: Okay, my name is (Lutz) I worked for GNSO. We are the registry for .be and we also manage .Brussels. But I'm just going to give a very short update on numbers and on some marketing initiatives we have taken and will take in the future.

We launched our new geo-TTLDs we started in September 2014 with a different phases which I'm not going to mention anyone now. And GA was January 20 of this year. And these are the numbers we set forward as expectations.

So after two days of GA we had expected - you'll notice that is similar for both. We had expected to have 10,000 registrations and the end of this year we had expected to have about 12,000 registrations per TLD.

On the next slide you will see how we are doing TLD. These are the number so this is reality. At the end of what I call the pre-phase so all those different launch phases that would have been made January we had 2500 registrations. And you can see the numbers that are not below they are quite similar.

After 10 days of GA so that the big brush of GA we were at 4400. And TLD is about 6404 Brussels and 6800 that there was a first slide so we're on the second one now. So it's 6800 for 21715. So as you can see that is way below expectations. When I'm extremely happy with that and that's a bit tough.

But on the slide you can see that we have of course adjusted our budget for these TLD's and we realized that by the end of this year will be we might or just not reach 7000 registrations per TLD. At the end of our confession which was a concession of 10 years so the end will be in 2022 we must really have reached 10,000 registrations per TLD.

On the next slide I have a graph showing the numbers I have mentioned is it .be growth both exit total numbers of .be. The left slide is not very clear but I can tell you that we're at 1.5 million .be TLD and growth is slowing down. We expect 0% growth next year unfortunately on .be. So the green and the red are Brussels. Those are the (unintelligible) but I just mentioned before.

So then on the next slide I just want to give you an idea on how it is in our country to work on these TLD's. Unfortunately we have a very low involvement of the government. They were the ones requesting the TLD's and so we were hoping for a lot more involvement.

It's very low. Brussels have done one radio campaign last spring. They did not, neither did we measure right after the campaign but it resulted in, not numbers, zero almost. But it was more of an awareness campaign so I just anyone would have done research awareness before and after you could have seen some kind of results but we didn't do that. The thing is the city of Brussels is mainly focused on their city marketing.

And having that TLD is part of the city of the total city marketing plan which makes total sense. But unfortunately we would like them to take a bit more attention to it and help us make it a success.

(Leiden) sort of a Flemish government. Their involvement is very low also. They don't even use the TLD's themselves yet. Sorry I have to say this but it's the truth. So yeah were working on that, so are they.

They need some time. The confessions are different between Brussels and (Leiden) and the fact that Brussels does their own marketing and for (Leiden) we do the marketing. That's not very easy either but at least it's the Flemish government was start using the TLD themselves that would be a strong case for us to promote. So as I said we're working on that.

And then on the next two slides I have some more details on the marketing initiatives we took. Well, I didn't bring up all details of the launch phases - the marketing on the launch phases but that would've been too much.

So we had TMCH and business days and a private individual phase etc. so we had specific initiatives per audience that was in 2014 as a result the numbers I have mentioned before in January of this year we do some market research where we were interested to learn on awareness and willingness to buy.

Awareness is extremely low and Belgium so we do our research in Belgium of course. Awareness at that point was still extremely low and then within that small percentage of people being aware of the new G TLD's their willingness to buy was low also.

So our main focus of course for all our marketing efforts is working on that awareness. We have to focus areas. Content marketing which we maybe create ourselves at the registry within the mark home team.

So article, blogs, tweets, speaker slots at events etc., just to spread the word it's as simple as that. We have to talk about it so that people learn about this. And then the awareness campaign is also way to spread the word of course.

We did the campaign this summer which we call domain name of the week and on the next slide there's a few details on that campaign. So the object of the course was to raise awareness pick up to 12 weeks and how do we do that.

We had (unintelligible) external and (unintelligible) if you have Google this name network and we have this is another group of what sites, yeah. Belgium websites. These banners lead people to our campaign website where we displayed, you could call them adoption examples, good examples of usage of the new GTLD's.

And will be mainly done on that campaign page is just explained to people, look these are new TLD is that you can use and the point for you as for now is to really think about the extension you will choose from now. Cause and Belgium just like in many other countries the largest percentage of people to see the CCTLD first.

Secondly they go for .com and then there's a teeny tiny percentage of people who choose something else. So our main goal as a registry being a not-for-profit and having the - as a part of our mission to inform the Belgium audience is that we just want to give them information on all these new extensions that exist and tell them think about what would be the best one for you.

I think I had one more slide there. The results of course. We were very very happy with the results of this campaign. As you can see 38,000 unique visitors on that campaign page. The state on that page for quite, in our case that is a long time.

At the reset forward two targets. We want to 20% significant visits and what we determined to be a significant visits to someone that would stay longer than 30 seconds on the page and as you can see we reach that target. We had 22%.

And the second part of we the forward was to create leads which may be strange news to the work they are. But we determined a lead would be someone who checked availability of the domain name on that campaign page. And we had 20% people doing that. So we were very happy with these results.

And then I can see that I have last slide with our intentions for the future. We will still be focusing on content marketing just like this year and will be doing that for the next years I'm sure.

Then we have a project that we were preparing for this fall where we will do the same thing as in the campaign so we're finding good examples of people using the domain name with the new extension. And will have them as fixed content on a website.

No advertising for it though because we have used it up in summer. But we will try to push it out ourselves. And it will be - contrary to the campaign page it will be fixed content of our website. We might just pick out a few of those if they are really good examples and set up some kind of ambassador program that is to be determined.

And then for future awareness campaign for the coming years we are working on with target audiences. It seems like just targeting everybody and Belgium is too broad so we should set some priorities and were working on that now. So we will be happy to talk about this during the next meeting. Thank you.

Dirk: Thank you (Lutz). Questions for (Lutz)?

Martin: Martin Bulga from Koeln. We have roughly the same situations. I was interested to find out what kind of company use your dot (unintelligible) for dot (unintelligible). If they take it as a new or a main TLD.

Because will be found out and Koln is that mostly startups and small edge partners is start a new business and it's really hard trying to get those who already have that (unintelligible) and to use our local domains. So we're focusing on startups more or less. Do you have any comment about that?

Woman: No full research on that yet but just by the looks of that I think the same situation. Small, very small companies and deed and startups. So that is good to know indeed for our future activities.

Dirk: I'm Derek from Berlin. I've got a question on this campaign you presented to how many new registrations did this that at the end of the day.

Woman: That was not the goal of the campaign.

Dirk: That's always something we have also having an awareness campaign and having a campaign leading to more registrations which are then in the next year renewed.

Woman: Again, I think that's the difference between our types of organizations. Were a not-for-profit very much focusing on quality zone and awareness in the country?

Dirk: More questions? The do we have more presentations and this launch of experience. It's not I would start a short round would you give some and 30 seconds or animated some highlights which happened in your geographic duties. So (unintelligible), Marie could you start on Paris?

Marie: You want to talk about (unintelligible) names.

Dirk: No. Just to start us on what is going on or what are the highlights and what changed between last ICANN meeting and now.

Marie: We have 217 domain names. 600 and new registrations. We have stats of domain names in September. We have a meeting in September. We have now sold 200 domain names. It's a number that we know that we have more than (unintelligible) in the Nancy check.

We expect to have more sales in the centerline because it's going to be going on for the coming weeks. I website of domain names is (unintelligible). So we can see the options. We can project if you want. Our first (unintelligible) I have three categories.

I have three prices. The first is 277 dread euros. €1000 for the second categories and in €250 for the third categories. This price is also the price of renewal. So we have a number of registrations now. We know that next year these are the names we be renewing with the correct price. So is any question about that?

Woman: So we had a very good surprises actually. We realize we sold some names that are very interesting price and we don't expect those mainstream sold at that price. For instance (unintelligible) another name in English. In other people to change in the windows in your house.

So is one of those sales and we were expecting names like sex to be more than (unintelligible) but that was not the case. And also we have an auction TLDay on football .Paris and it's in the tomorrow and is quite encouraging because it surrounding something like €5000 for the moment. So expected to be a good sale as well. So I said we had surprises but we did not expect some names to go that far. But that's a good surprise for us.

Dirk: Okay. Thank you. And unfortunately I don't know how all this question it's because were having such difficulty with the Adobe connect. Another question from John McCormack. Is there a big price difference between the GLTD's and .be?

(Lutz): (Lutz) DMS Belgium. So it was for me so it was quite a big difference yes for .be. I'm also pricing for TLD is for your roles and both of our new G's are at €20. I made a mistake they are. TLD we select three but we just announced, I'm sorry about this, we just announced a price raise for .be as of January 1.

Man: Okay, next.

Man: And I just have a question for Paris. And I just have a question regarding your premium names. I understood that you are auction in the most but you also selling them directly to the registrar general cause it will be three different tiers - pricing tiers; right? So I want to know are you using one registrar. Have you made...

Woman: Our auction price on a website the website are (unintelligible). So the registrars. The auction on the stat form but they have to go through the registrar. The 55 registrar (unintelligible) for Paris.

And they have to pay to create further domain names, interest in addition to the auction price. Two operations. The first payments on the auction platform and the second operation is to create the domain name, (unintelligible) name. We are the registrar.

(Casper): (Casper) from NRW again. But the renew price is always higher than the normal standard price. So that you have problems with the registrars like accepting these price tiers because that's a real expense.

Woman: No. We fortunately checked the name with the different price so the registrar of the price so when you are the created transfer under the remember the full operation.

But they are just up the price when he makes a domain change and check the name. And the registrar to (unintelligible) to have the price of the domain name for the domain names.

Man: Okay.

Man: Can I see this. I don't know the situation in Paris very well. We were back being ALI before Neustar. We were amongst the first day of these out. The very early TLD's came from our platform.

And we adamantly needed to push the premium. Was a big part of our places play. For later TLD's we use the first wants to sort of educate the market and was very very difficult. It was indeed very very difficult. The idea of the premium on the first registration would harm the idea of continuing premium was a very very hard to swallow. Internationally it's something that has now been accepted indeed with price check.

We have I think 3 different ways of checking the price of the TLD. So the price check on the moment of checking those for the price continue to acknowledge when you register the domain and then on top of it there is a daily file dump that they can't upload into their system with all the price checks and everything and then contractually we can change the prices without wanting them for six months or something.

Is quite a cumbersome process but it does more now. I guess you are in focus now more on German registrars that might not all be there. Is a lot of German registrars they don't play so much in - been used to play in the GTLD program. It was hard. Absolutely. Is a lot of education to behind that?

Dirk: Something from Sydney and Melbourne do you want to tell us?

Sebastien: I'm Sydney and Melbourne I asked for a little presentation before and I got the answer that they were under 400 days of activity so they had been qualified somehow. No, just if it's about what is happening. I think that I've talked about it the last time. They have refined and I think it's interesting and this particularly market.

We find a very strong correlation between radio campaigns that you mentioned and sales. It's very - so we happened to Melbourne and Sydney to benchmark on - they have their own radio stations.

They have their own radio networks so they don't listen to the same things. So were able to run campaigns literally in one city or the other and wherever you happen to have very complicated country with bank holidays only in one city and not the other and vice versa.

Whenever you have the situation you see these things correlated. It's as we stop the campaign because there's going to be another event that going to overshadow us we can see it. There is that correlation. We're not yet only getting to the point where a buck invested in the radio ad will come back as a buck and revenue.

We're getting there. It's not quite yet. Obviously we'd like to make at least a two or three for one. But that's where we were looking at. There are other campaigns that we're now starting in particular with our (pioneers). I haven't seen it because I live in Australia last month but apparently there's a (trime) or two that are going around Melbourne with different pioneers in .mail.

The we're also doing a lot of work and this is the advantage of being responsible for the cc TLD and the GTLD. We're doing a lot of work correlating information about people that may own for example there's the domain that has a Melbourne.

It's a very difficult and touchy subject because obviously we do not own these people. These are outside the contact details belong to (Alda) so we can reach out to these people.

By Australia with our law and the way we operate we can reach out to these people directly. It uses contact. So it's very interested to try and start find out

into the statistics who does in what market where it's used in order to be able to then pinpoint and reach out in that market to raise awareness for it.

One of the things that we've done also is to chase the, I don't know how to call them diplomatically. But that they are silly names. The that she was talking about window cleaners but the window cleaners Melvin.Melvin.

The people that have a CC name and then get the GTLD name without thinking that they have already the GL part in their cc name for repeating the GL part a second time. Meaningless. So we've been trying to chase this a bit before they spent too much time advertising this silly names and try to change it to something a bit more reasonable.

Now, so that's the pure GTL the part. But also the backend registry operator for that. And we've done quite a lot of work on that utilization you were mentioning, I forgot the name. You were mentioning that utilization try to figure out how these interviews.

Are they used at all? Are there part of a redirected to something existing? Are they hosting a page study a copy of something existing? Or this work what we're working on I don't have a huge amount to report now. Maybe something for next time.

Man: Maybe something for next time. And then in comparison with third parties might do and that sort of situation singling out how that can be done. The very basic is there's a lot of stuff that doesn't work. There's a lot of people with registered names and don't point to anything.

There's a lot of stuff that point to registrars because the registrars are at least trying to grab that traffic or whatever minimal traffic might be behind it. There is a lot of stuff that day and redirects and the TTLB disappears. It's no longer in the browser visible.

The amount of people that actually use the domain as a primary domain or as a domain that has a lot and is still minute at this is absolutely something that needs to be worked on because without the disability, without wanted to create visibility around that visible tier and wanted to create PR around it without having these names existing and in the wild as we say, on the street on advertising as a call to action and a commercial and so on and so forth.

The critical need is not built at that. And that takes time, it takes a lot of effort. And I don't have the recipe for that. Pioneer is probably at some form of sort of high visibility clients that you need to do it with.

Dirk: Thank you. (unintelligible)?

(unintelligible): After presentation. Afterwards just the short notice on our renewal rates. We have made a net shout of I think 15 days after generally readability and out of these names 92% have been renewed. So this is kind of I think a very good ratio for the first year renewals.

Man: Oliver?

Oliver: Sorry. Sorry about that. Is that 92% of what group?

Man: The started general ability of 15 July. So we did a net shout out that ended all domain name on the I think it was 13 July and then had a local last week which or how many of these domain names are still active on 15 October. So this is including the cool down or the how call it the pending delete and then grace period. So we did not take a look at the - only the deletions that we had but we had the initial want that how many of them are still active. So this is kind of real renewal rates.

Man: Thank you. We don't have a lot to say about this because this is still very young. We started some (unintelligible) on 7 September. As of TLD we have more than 5000 applications in one and a half months so we are very

satisfied. It's beyond our expectations. So it's applications of course because we have a variation process so we have quite (unintelligible) to get the final registration at the end.

Man: There is one thing that maybe being down for the first time indication that .swiss namely not allowing to generic names. Now these generic names sometimes still applied for that we actually found it very nice equilibrium and that target is applied for generic name knowing that it is not allowed but sometimes not being shown but if you would like to be shown it is going to be put on the list of the generic names.

There's a second process starting late whereby they would be able to apply for them on a Monday basis that they were not the pay for the name that they would have to have a scope statement that says what we have to do with the domain name. It would be totally free to us. Please put out the use in the interest of the community.

And lastly it was interesting that we had many applications that grew already from community purpose organizations like the milk producers, the cheese producers and so on. They were ready to be active. They wanted to be sure that they had those specific names in good hands. So I think that's probably a satisfactory and the results at this stage.

Sue Schuler: We have another question from John McCormack online. Many Geo TLD's will have usage content ranging from 30 to 50% in (surveyed). Have any Geo TLD's registers put much thought into promoting a grass roots usage rather than high profile users?

Dirk: Does anyone have an answer on this topic or experience with grassroots registrations? I don't have an answer on this question. I don't have experience in this.

Sam: Sam from .London. So one of the things that would looking at doing in this marketing will take years to go look at the opportunities representative by for instance that's what the question is about.

So I've been doing high-profile commercial and awareness activities actually going down to getting people to very early on in their careers professionally to understand the importance of power offering in the case of the .London and trying to turn them into products and in particular evangelists who want to help us take the brand forward as we move on as well.

We're certainly making it all opportunities in terms of our as more granular approach to marketing that being one of them in combination with a popular line activity and larger promotional activity as well. I think it's very important. The education piece I think it's supercritical for us.

Dirk: (unintelligible) do you have anything on which the stream you want to tell us?

Man: I don't know what the experiences right now. Maybe one thing that is also is of interest to us is that the price of a .swiss is relatively high. This probably something first to look at that said it did not turn out to be anything that deterred on the contrary.

So I guess it enabled us to do to invest more time and actually validating stuff and the validation was actually accepted. People that have a problem with it. Even went to some registrars are ready to respond to their registrations who they know our present owners.

So they didn't want the money from their registrar before but they sent us the money anyway. Because they were really short. They can just as an invoices they would pay for the job was don't.

On the other hand on our side he said look, if you reject it would just get that money back. It's not - you're going to be short you not going to be paying for

little mistakes being made here. And that again is probably experience in terms of price is not so much an important thing that people know that they get what they actually need.

Man: In terms of Catherine Gribbin and Durban as well as CCTLB in South Africa, we very much focus on the broad switch level use. That we found that very little high-profile brand is actually adopted and use the Geo TLB's.. Any use we've seen has been five startups for our people that have just started and created a website themselves.

So what we did is within our organization some time ago to test it. We created a regional competition. We've got about 15 employees. And we credit internal competition to spot domain names in the world. Domain in action is what we call it.

So where anyone sees a domain name being used in industry whether it's on the back of a truck or in a business card on a billboard to take a photo of it and we posted up on an Instagram account and we collect all of these usages.

We are on an internal competition and honestly from the staff there is a prize at the end of that - our intention was to roll that out and make it more public amongst the students market and start some sort of viral competition to try and recognize and identify these domains being used in the world.

We haven't started that yet but I we've had quite a lot of success on the it's the Instagram side. Just as people to be a little bit more aware of other domains being used so that can identify them.

And obviously we create a little bit of campaign around the whole Instagram account so people that are observing or monitoring it can connect with and see these domains being used. So we're exploring on expanding that to the first tier the public competition.

Dirk: I have some figures about .berlin. We had still have renewal rate of over 80% and jelly registrations range between 20 and 30 minute domain names and it's not really growing this daily basis but this is our daily business and that should grow one day.

So it came down from the very first month or very firstly months what you had 50 or 60 or 80 per day came down to 20 or 30 a day and it doesn't look that we get the curve increase.

And again that the challenge we have to have more daily registrations and to grow stronger cause were all have the drops in the renewal we lose a lot of domain names and over the year you need to fill them up again and even have more names the one year than the first year.

So on what we did you may look into our numbers. Was throwing out all domain names and all domain names that are not paid about our marketing campaign.

We had a promotion domain names that are now all gone and we drop down to 57,000 domain names roughly these days. Do not wonder why it's because we are throwing out all promotional activity domain names so these are really fully paid domain names now.

And now we're focusing on really to make domain names visible on make visible gnome domain names and we had me while I have the feeling that we are close to critical mass of domain names and the public. So there's no ride with the bike or by foot or by cars to the city.

Johannes is capturing me or others that is doing not seeing Berlin no name names and we see new domain names. So it has some attention and the city. We're really working on making even more domain names visible in the public that's where we spend our efforts, time and time and less money

because it's not so expensive and the people if we see it we post that that we post on Facebook and we do some promotions sometimes we call them, make a press release on this name so the people feeling knowledge.

They had this new name and they get some additional promotion on that. And that is something good. It's a little bit annoying is the work with some registrars which still haven't integrated to TMCH or didn't offer some premium pricing or premium domain names.

These registrars always said if there's a problem please call the registry. And then the people who call the potential registrar call the registry and we say it's not our problem. It's the registrar's problem and that creates a needed confusion in the market. It's a point but it's annoying. They could stop if a registrars educate them customer service much better. That's what I have to say.

Sue: John has one comment. Is the main reason that the country code Geo's are successful is because their registrations identified with the country code TLD. That's what Geo TLD's have to achieve. Registrar identification with their TLD as their TLD.

Dirk: I think we all agree and the renewal rates we have at the moment show that they are quite equal to many see CPLDs. So I think in a good way we are to having this achieved.

Egbert: Hi this is Egbert from .Amsterdam. We are right now at 22,000 registrations so a little over Paris and Moscow is next on the list to hit. Were actually we did an intense competition.

We set ourselves pretty aggressive targets and to know that .Amsterdam is a punch between city government is SLDN which is CCTLD for (dot tanel) and ourselves .Amsterdam BV which is cooperation between the media company and the registrar.

So will report to the table basically is pretty aggressive marketing of .Amsterdam and I can show you some slides if you like. But we plastered the Netherlands with the fact that .Amsterdam is there. We were quite aggressive.

We had a lot of complaints about the campaign picked a right kind of campaign so we liked it. And if that we had a lot of fun complaints as well because we put next to the highway of Amsterdam we said nobody in New York knows (Amstalfein) which is to the south of Amsterdam.

And I think we can discuss that the mayor of (Amstalfein) personally call the mayor of Amsterdam about this billboard and threatened to retreat from many of business corporations just because of this billboard.

So we can safely say that (Amstalfein) is without serious problems whatsoever if they make a fuss over these kinds of things. But in all seriousness we have a three layer campaign.

The first one was awareness. The second one is about functionality of the domain name. Why you need to have domain and the third one will be starting in January where we can highlight the heroes of . Amsterdam. Not heroes would want to do like the incoming site campaign.

We will offer to domain name owners the fact that they if they produce a commercial will put it on TV or either locally or nationally. Will pay for a large sum of it and being part of a media company we know how to deal with media companies so I think the value we spent on media on advertising is about 3 million euros which is not the money we actually spent but we basically gave up 70% of the first-year revenues for the domain name.

So we ship that was all the media companies. So will sacrifice the first year and will of course take it back over the next years when we exploit the

domain name which was an interesting model so we could get sign-ups from national television commercials, radio commercials, national and all the local stuff that we wanted.

So it was really in terms of the number of registrations we were recently satisfied. We would've liked it to be a little higher. But the big payoff I should say nobody knows that is end up pre-hidden value of the premium domain names. We have about 5 1/2 thousand and our name.

They had their own learning pages and what we found is that doing that aggressive promotion really drives up the value of the domain name. So with records in 50,000 for domain names so they are being paid and so we were quite happy with that.

Dirk: Since we have limited time I would go a little bit as good go a little bit quicker through because we have Amsterdam and registrars and premium names so it would be nice if you could make it shorter.

Man: About the number of registrations is not the fold your past but it's the beginning of January. So we combined in Moscow on and (Moskowaff) something like 50,000 rough something. And 50 year is not yet passed we're not aware of the renewal rates but without premium names we decided not to have those. It's cheaper this way. But it's (unintelligible).

Man: So could I have just a quick question I'm interested about this for the golf also. Registration is Moscow that I copied in (unintelligible) or link between the two do you have any stats on that?

Man: At first we thought that we will have something like 10 persons in IBM and 90 persons in (Liedenstreet). And they are somehow is 50/50. So we say that for example what kind - because Moscow usually accompanied by (unintelligible). So two names. Either (unintelligible) or direct translation usually. Also the I don't know the list of names reserved by the city is usually

translation or either a translation. So usually plus one or both. So it's not a big difference for them suddenly.

Oliver: Oliver from Hamburg. In Hamburg we are currently close to 24,000 registrations. We just had the first anniversary a couple of weeks ago so we're at also very much looking forward to the renewal rates and I cannot present the final figures but everything looks like were also above the 90% line which would be really great and we would be very happy with that.

We also started a radio campaign. So it's very interesting what you said anything that we are making exactly the same experience as they are. Is a strong correlation that we already campaigned in the number of registrations growing it was just the first week.

But it seems to be in a very good way and the whole campaign is running for six more weeks now and we think this will really increase the number of registrations and awareness of the domain and the Metropolitan region. Yeah, so much for Hamburg.

Man: Yeah, we just ended our (unintelligible) and the grace period at the end of the week we face some roundabout 1000 to delete from total of 25,000 domains which is basically all right. We are in encouraging it a little bit because we found out that a lot of generic domains have been common instructions had been used been used by grabbers who tried to sell them.

Nobody bought them so we are addressing them directly and telling them please get back our take on doctor which would actually work with that quite fine. Apart from that we are changing our marketing program at the moment. I think a lot of things to tell when we meet in Marrakesh because we are sifting from local media and from newspapers to large campaigns on Facebook and on Google. And there's no link to that we are going to offer additional furtherance for all companies like Seo services (unintelligible) but I can tell

you at the moment how this will end. So probably in three or four months I will know more.

Dirk: From Berlin at NRW. From Berlin we also just turned one year. Is simultaneously almost of the target of 30,000 registers. And we also concentrating on pioneers and we recently want the foot books that have been set up by Munich which helped a lot actually.

For NRW we have 9500 registrations now so hopefully we had the 10,000 by the end of the year but I am optimistic on that. Which is maybe what telling that we are closely working with the government. We've already got relationship with them. So that actually use that Geo TLD's and NRW for example had the main Internet portal is now land.NRW and the free State of Bavaria will shortly follow with the state of fresh start of (unintelligible).

And so they've helped quite a lot. Also maybe which is worth having that we have a different target group than another target group than many city TLD's. We had an (Bienalon) 2000 different municipalities so we're also working closely with them at this always a credibility once they start their own websites with the new Geo ending.

That's it for Miami. I was not really involved in that which is probably interesting to say that they had on day one I think 5000 registrations and only two weeks later that registration number doubled and I think that's the very steep growth and I haven't seen that with another Geo TLD in the past. So you yeah, thank you.

Alex: Hi Alex from London. And time is quite short so I'm happy to share with people over the outside of the meeting. If you have questions but I wanted to raise one thing around working with registrars and rebates.

So we been trying a rebate program with registrars and across London we tried a couple of different things so we tried working with specific registrars on

kind of a marketing campaign and every that offer that means that they've got a better price put in the market.

And then we all went out to all registrars and offered provided they would do various two or three various things of our positioning and to provide a rebate across the board. And is quite difficult to evaluate that.

So clearly and makes registrars interested in it gets your TLD to be higher up in their store etc. But the actual impact on the difference of that price to the customer I think we're grappling whether it makes any difference. Some quite interested in terms. I know he's tried that or he's interested in throwing it all we can compare notes.

Dirk: Okay, there are no questions. I will get back to you on the point of registry agreement and your privacy regulations. So you're working on for a long time.

Man: In fact, we have not been working on it anymore but I'd like to predict to the floor again. We spoke about this two years ago and London. In fact this goes mainly for European registries unless we're not aware of privacy regulations and other countries.

In fact in the registration agreement it says that you should show all data of a person or a company in the (Rue) east. It is a person and is not compliant with privacy regulations after 28 members states of the EU.

So I was wondering if European registries were aware of this and if they already have thought how to get compliant with it. My idea would be - can you go to slide three. On slide three you will see my private details on this - and this goes for every person who has registered a domain name and the new TLD program.

And while I was wondering how we could get out of the situation. Option one which is in slide four for the next slide. Option one is work with the privacy

protection buddies. There's a pocket call 29 working party which is a combination of all European data protection authorities.

And we can in fact ask them to enforce the privacy laws. There they might come up with an instruction and with this instruction we can go to ICANN can say you see we have an instruction from our and we need to change the registry agreement. That's one possibility.

The other possibility which is on slide five - is to form a working group between us from a number of European Geo TLD's and set up and online of the request of amendment which is also in line with what (Puncut) did a few years ago.

And ask for amendment which I can. We're having a discussion tomorrow with (Merritt Syckoff) from ICANN. And one of the questions is how difficult is it to get a change and the registry agreement. Well, and that's also what I'm wondering how (Puncut) did it.

Why it took so long. I don't think there is anybody from (Puncut) TLDay or from any other Barcelona or Madrid, no?. So we can't ask them. But in fact they had an amendment which is on the last slide - which they agreed with ICANN in 2012. And I'm not sure determined that it took them quite a long time but I never found out why. I'm not sure if anyone here is aware of white it is so difficult but it doesn't look that way. Anyone knows how this has come to why it takes so long.

Maxim: Maxim Alzoba for the record. Actually we have (unintelligible) one of them is Who Is. The other is Data Scroll. And in Data Scroll is the question of who is going to be the hair of the data.

So the registrants' days that doesn't go to the wrong pants. Why it took so long actually with my registry affects the managed to get out of ICANN the

registrar has scrolled doing it. We said that the first year was going to be an example of the local registrar certified to be, allow us to purchase such data.

The second year is any registrar from the country but if I do say personal protection law is Europe is 98 (unintelligible) something roughly divided to. So basically any Europe (unintelligible) in the registrar. And a third tier gap let it be ICANN for example.

And to change those to 12 or 20 lines of text. We spent three and a half months and it was not a big deal is only the registrar. And for registries it's not so simple. Yes, this question is going to be asked a few times by registry consistency. I think as though I'm going to do that first.

And not probably we should think about the legal entity. Who is the registry scroll operator? So it should be most probably in the European Union. And the service where it's located - the data located stored should be in the same zone and the European Union because it's no reason to start on American soil where the local thief has the right to extract anything that they want out of the server.

And all changes to registered agreement they passed through the cycle of the reigning appreciation. It's (Daniel) I think it started a year ago or something it's still in the process. It's in the process.

Where the registry suggested lots of things to be changed in the contract on the, it's my opinion, only minor things to work said okay. Medium things were said no, no, no. We see these that way. Measured things were no no, we don't think it's important or it's necessary. So that's my short comment.

Man:

So that's (unintelligible). First of all let me say I am European, I have a French passport at the same worked for a country in Liven on the other side of the world. Watch what you're asking for in terms of changing ICANN contract. But it's a completely different because it's another program.

He was a part of the gTLD program. These contracts were negotiated over a number of years and all the contracts from that initial round euro slightly different ones for the other. So it took 10 years to negotiate some were quicker. So don't look thereto solution because you won't find it.

As Maxim said I can has been talking about a model to renegotiate the contract yearly. It's taking right now more than a year just to come up with a model that works. The only exception to this rule is the spec 13 that we mentioned very quickly without brand that's the only exception.

Second, I think that would make it things a lot more complicated. Why doesn't for example privacy apply using a proxy registration. Using a Who Is the a proxy the service that we just basically hide the data from the public and they can only available to whatever institution might need it that might rightfully needed.

Man: Can it be done on registrar level (unintelligible)?

Maxim: Maxim Alzoba for the record. Actually the reason for my compliance and the - when we asked him what if we're not happy they responded simply you have a right to cancel your contract in such days. That's it.

Dirk: I think this is an important topic but many of us are interested in this. But it won't become a quick ride to get any amendments there. I think many of us are quite interested in doing something at and comply with European data protection. I'm not sure what should we do with this?

Marianne: Marianne from Afnic. First of all I'm not sure that were not complying TLDay with the Who Is. Because what we would want to be for that French law. What we would do was have the express constant of the users that will be published. And that's what we're doing actually.

So what not that much in conflict with the law but for that as far, because Afnic is operating that is far. We have a very strict policy on the not publishing that personal data so we are quite aware of that and actually went back .cat didn't they kind of work and sparred with what we did at the time because it's been a long time that we been implementing this.

That's the first part and the second is that today there is an open comment on the - you know, public comment on who is -- I don't know the name -- I think it's conflict with privacy laws, the first report that has been done by a working group at ICANN level. And I think it could be interesting as well to provide some public comments on this document. And I think we have until mid-November to provide these comments.

Sebastien Ducos: Sebastien Ducos again. That's a very interesting point. There's been work being done on Whois for the past ten years. I'm not saying that it's very quick. But it's probably going to be a shorter path than changing the contract itself if that's what you're looking for. Yes.

Man: Another possibility could be is to get your national privacy commissioner into the game as well.

Sebastien Ducos: Yes.

Man: We tried it from our angle, and unfortunately, they dropped the case. But you could actually reach out to the privacy commission and say, "We suspect that the current Whois policy for the gTLDs that we are contractually obliged to follow poses problems with the EU legislation. Please advise us on this and come up with a resolution."

Now, if you have a resolution or a statement from your national privacy commissioner that says, "Yes, we as a privacy commission estimate that this is contrary to local law," then according to your ICANN contract, you can actually bypass the parts in your contract that are contrary to your local law.

So that might open a kind of opportunity to alter the way how you publish your Whois results without actually having to do that very difficult and painful contract renegotiation exercise.

Marianne: Yes.

Man: But the thing is -- from our experience -- privacy commissions are reluctant or lazy -- at least in our country to us because they mixed up this case with a complaint they got for .be. And then they dismissed everything, and they said, "Well, it seems like this should be resolved in an international level -- and by the way, we don't have any serious issues with DNS Belgium, so we dismiss both cases."

There we go. Unfortunately, we got nothing. But maybe you can try the same exercise and have more positive results.

Egbert: We were also afraid of getting in that - ending up in this month as well with our privacy data protection body because they're also quite lazy we think. Yes.

Marianne: And another point as well, if that registrar managed to obtain some waiver with regard to specificity of the European law on data and (RVH) is a big French registrar, they managed to change some part of their contract with ICANN. And it was not that complicated.

And the working group on Whois conflict with privacy laws are actually dealing with what could trigger, you know, a waiver in a registry agreement with regard to specific laws on that matter. So it's kind of the same process. And it's possible -- I think -- because registrars manage to obtain it.

Man: Okay. (Unintelligible).

Ronald: In connection with the registrars thing – Ronald Schwaerzler from .dot wein. I think this registrar thing has been brought in by the German registrars as it was very well supported by Thomas Rickert who is in the (diversive) groups -- working groups etc. -- at ICANN.

And once they got one waver for this, the other registrars could just join in and say, "I want the same thing as the one had had." So it really depends whom you address -- whom you are addressing in fact -- and Thomas Rickert did a perfect job on that specific case -- on the Whois case -- for the German registrars being allowed to put away some of this personal informations (sic) on the Whois.

Dirk: Oliver?

Oliver: Just a remark from a lawyer's perspective, many of you know the European data protection framework is under discussion. We will have the completely new framework by probably the - in two years, it will come into force -- in roughly two years.

And as it stands currently, there is room for the so-called legitimate interest of the processes to process data -- which gives some flexibility. And my advice would be before you get in touch with your data protection authorities, let's wait until we have the final data protection regulation on the European level, and then have a look at it and look what it -- well -- what it does allow and where it gives limits to the Whois.

Dirk: I would stop at this point the discussion because we have Ronald discussing with us the registrar's perspective on EPP.

Ronald: Okay. This is part of what has evolved at .wien (unintelligible) what I'm spending my time for. Next slide please. So don't expect a solution. It's a kind of report -- work in progress.

Oh, sorry. Some of the examples -- visibility of .wien -- only three presentations. So you see (unintelligible), .wien -- can you make a little bit adjust to the screen? Just reduce the 195% to 100. Okay.

Part of the visibility increasement (sic) to see if there is a new construction made in Vienna. They use (unintelligible) .wien. Our ruling political party -- we had elections last week -- the social democratic party used it. Hungary (unintelligible) .wien.

So again, the small ones are coming in, not the large brands. That's as we heard today. Next slide, please.

Yes, the same again. BFI -- which is an educational institute -- BFI.Vienna or (unintelligible) .wien in the top - no, bottom right place. Next slide, please.

And one we are very proud of, you know, we have the refugee crisis, and this is the main news in the public broadcast or (unintelligible) as a URL (unintelligible).wien -- (help on the railway station dot Vienna). So it really helped us increasing the visibility. Next slide, please. Next one. So it should be 4. Five, okay.

So premium name, status quo. We are selling domains at fixed price like most of us -- fixed price or you do an auction or you do a tender. We do a single agreement per domain.

For example, if you sell taxi.wien, we say which one-time fee -- which renewal fee? We agree with the customer -- which is a lot of work. And it is at least not prohibited by the registry agreement if you're doing that way.

But it has one obvious problem. Only few people -- too few people -- know about these premium domains. We have low traffic on our auction sites. We have low visibility of our marketplace. We have few participants if we are trying to do a premium domain name sale.

So what could be or what are we working at? Next slide, please. Yes. This is kind of any registrar, and I did a search. It's an (OTNE) environment. Okay. So I did a search for hotel.wien at a registrar who is not capable of doing some premium name sales over EPP, and it says hotel.wien is not available -- or it is unavailable.

And then the registrar gives some extra suggestions -- hotel.dating or hotel.equipment would be available at 102 euros, 87 one-time or renewal fee. So it is the way it works today. So if you're looking for a .wien domain, you get, "It is not available," and then another TLD says in principle it is not available unless you're will to pay more as a one-time or a renewal fee.

So registrars -- some registrars -- are capable of doing this. Our registry is not at the moment. But we want to get there. At least, we want to have the possibility to sell at distinctive create and renewal prices. Next slide, please.

So it's very little -- forgive me, (Richard) -- from our backend registry provider, very little technical effort to implement three commands over EPP. It's the check, the create and the renew command. Right now, you're doing a check command -- is the domain available -- and you get back one or a zero. So it is available or it is not.

If you do this modification, you have to say, "Is it available? What is the create, the renew, the transfer and the restore price?" If you issued a command that way and you see it here. It say available is one, and you will get to see it in the very last line. For example, the registration fee refundable is at 3500 euros.

So if you're not able to speak that extension, you will get back it is not available. If the registrar is capable of speaking that extension, you will get back it is available at special price, at special renewal, at special whatever rate.

So relatively low - yes, it is an effort. But it has to be carried out by the registry backend provider. It's a technical issue. It's relatively easy, and some of the technical - or the TLDs -- I think -- Dot London is already in operation so (unintelligible) Machines and (unintelligible) and all the others. Next slide, please.

What do you have to do if you want to put this into operation? I simply asked ICANN, "Do I have to inform you?" It took them two and a half weeks to tell me, "Yes, you have to. You have to." In the (gTD) portal, there is an - on the onbir -- O-N-B-I-R section -- are you implementing EPP extensions other than the draft EPP launch phase?

And we had, "No," there. Right now, we are forced to say, "Yes, we have." This the one in red, it's the draft EPP fees. It seems absolutely logical to me that my register is not only speaking this one extension. It also has another.

It took them two and a half weeks to answer that simple yes/no question. Let me come back to you. Thanks for that question. Something like this...

Okay, so this is the very easy part. You have to inform ICANN. Next slide, please, and it's the last one.

This is part of your registry agreement. Any of us has this in his registry agreement, and if you're increasing your pricing for the create command, you have to inform your registrars and ICANN at least 30 days in advance.

So I'm doing this EPP pricing for premium names not to inform ICANN, but to make a lot of money out of it -- at least I hope so. So you have to make sure your kind of interpretation - and what I think and I would like to hear your opinion about this.

Let's say I sell hotel.wein for 5000 euros as a one-time fee. In my opinion, it is 4980 as a premium fee and 20 euros as a create fee for the first year. So I want my backend registry provider to include two lines of code -- or in the log file -- telling there is a one-time fee, and it's a standard creation fee because at that time -- at that point of time -- I'm absolutely conformant in my opinion with this obligation. And then I can change this premium fee - yes, Saturday is cheaper than Thursday or whatever.

The registrar knows the exact create price at the moment in that second when he pings the registry. This is the truth.

Next thing, to do renewals you are -- out of your registry agreement -- you are allowed to have different or distinct renewal rates if the registrant agreed at the registrar expressively that he is aware of having another renewal rate than the standard rate. And the registrar must prove to the registree that the registrant has expressively agreed to it. It's the one that is written in red.

So what I will do in the next weeks or so, I will send an amendment to our RRA telling our registrars, "If you are selling - we are using this extension, if you try to do this - use this EPP extension, be aware. Whenever I have a problem with a renewal rate or something like this, you must be able to prove me that your customer -- the registrant -- has expressively agreed to the higher renewal rate."

I know from one of the registrars, they do it that way. If the customer takes the premium domain and puts it in the shopping basket, at that time there is a pop up telling this is a premium domain -- tells the one-time fee, tells the renewal fee -- and then the customer has to click, "Okay, I'm aware of it," and then the domain is put in the shopping basket. If he is say, "No, I don't like it," he is not able to put it in the shopping basket.

But this registrar does not store this screen shot or whatever. It's just that technically the customer is not able to put it into the shopping basket unless

he accepts these prices. I'm not sure whether ICANN compliance will take this technical solution as sufficient proof that the registrant has really agreed to this distinctive renewal fees.

So I think we will go with it. We will interpret the Section 2.10A that way that we have a standard create price and a one-time renewal - a one-time premium fee. And the 2.10C will inform the registrar that -- on request -- he must be able to prove that their customer has been made aware of this distinctive renewal price.

I'm not sure whether it will - whether it will be enough for ICANN compliance if we had some case. I was in the (gTD) summit in Los Angeles, and there was the question put on the floor, "How do you -- ICANN compliance -- think that these two points are okay or not," and their answer was, "We are not aware that there's a problem." This is what ICANN compliance said at at least beginning of September.

So this is the status of the work we are currently in at .wien. And how we will at least formulate our RRA, and I'm interested to hear whether you -- especially the ones to have already in operation a dealing with this.

Alex: A couple of observations because there are two different things that you raised up there. In terms of the price increase, are your names - are those premium names currently reserved? So I don't think that's a price increase. At the moment, they're not available. They're not priced. You're making them available at a price. I wouldn't suggest you're increasing the price.

It might be good practice to tell all the registrars, "Look. In 30 days, we're going to release these, and these might be the prices." But I'm not sure that it's a price increase. So I know you talked about how you were getting around that, but I would have reservations about you being able to split the registration fee and the premium registration fee. I think - I mean it may be difficult, but I'm not sure it's a price increase.

The other observation on the other part is I think it's down to your RRA really. So your RRA needs to put the obligation on the registrars to do it properly. I'm not quite sure where we stand if they don't. But I think that's the same with a bunch of other things.

We've got RRAs that put obligations onto the registrars that are put onto us by ICANN. We don't police all of them to check them, do we? I don't. I don't know if others do. So at the moment, the part of our RRA that deals with premium names puts the obligation on registrars and, you know, if ICANN compliance come after us because they're not doing it, I guess it could get messy.

So I think it's down to what's in your RRA, giving them the obligation.

Sebastien Ducos: I'm Sebastien Ducos Neustar. I wanted to bounce back on the EPP -- put in a new comment.

I used to be a registrar, and I can tell you that EPP is a mess in the sense that everybody has a slightly different version of EPP. And particularly when you deal with ccTLDs, it's an absolute nightmare because every ccTLD has a slightly different way of doing it.

If there is one thing in this program is that we're trying to keep things united and unified to avoid these sorts of problems. I wouldn't go the path of creating something new because then it's you -- an island -- trying to convince all the registrars to connect to that different island. So just watch that.

Why are we not using the price check to give you the price? So you give the name of a domain. You give the number of years that the client wants it for. It returns a price. That price doesn't have to be linear. It doesn't have to be - whatever. It will calculate exactly what the price of the domain should be --

which is the work of a normal registry. I don't quite understand why we're reinventing the wheel on this one.

Ronald: Just to give a short answer, we did not reinvent anything. This is part of RFC or pre-RFC (unintelligible) EPP (brown) proposal. Yes? So this is what has been worked on so far, and we are trying to implement that. And the proposal is on the check command to answer - answer to the check command, you get back the create (unintelligible).

So it is nothing special for wien. It's using the, yes, one of the commercially or currently agreed EPP extensions that work backwards compatible. So if you're not speaking that extension, you're getting a normal functionality.

Maxim Alzoba: Maxim Alzoba for the record. Actually, I had conversations with one of the providers of -- I'd say -- suggestion service is the platform which suggests available domains. And one of the biggest challenges for them is to understand what is the premium name and what is not. Because without being a registrar, you don't have access to EPP check and things like that.

So either you compare them before you implement this or you have lots of complaints from registrants that, "Oh, I seen that on that site. I clicked through, and suddenly next day, registrar come to me and says, 'Oh, it's fine. But you have to pay 2000 euros more, and you have to do it each year.'"

So it's better to contact those providers before you do this.

Ronald: See, my idea -- like Dirk said today -- we have lots of problems. Now most of -- not problems -- most of our work has to do with our reserve names. You get back, "Not available," but it is not Whois - it does not have a Whois record. So you get contacted. I could not register that name, but it doesn't show up Whois.

So it's at least getting better at some registrars because it is not available at the standard price, but it is available at a non-standard or extra price. It doesn't solve your problem with the intermediate platforms. At least at the contracted registrars, it's getting better. So step by step - or getting more clarity.

Maxim Alzoba: Short thing. As I understand color of the output of the output of web, Whois is not regulated so far. So if it's green, it's okay. If it's, like, golden, it's premium price. And (unintelligible) don't (unintelligible).

Dirk: Okay. Any other questions on the topic?

Then we head on to the next topic. We have here on the agenda - I think we have two topics with actual relevance. I think you have something on (unintelligible).

Man: Yes.

Man: You want to share with us?

Man: Yes, but we can keep this very short. Don Hollander has forwarded me a report on the state of play and activities of the Universal Acceptance Steering Group. So instead of reading this out, they clearly have moved ahead and booked some progress -- especially in making available some documentation on the topic of universal acceptance in order to educate.

They also have advanced a bit on one of the most urgent problems -- being email addressing. And they plan to gather some very large email software players in the first quarter of 2016.

So what I would advise, I ask you to put it on our geo interest group web site in the section of the meeting documents. The report is one and a half page. So if universal acceptance is relevant for your geoTLD, then I would advise

you to have a look at the report. If you have any questions whatsoever -- or any observations -- relay them to me, and I will reach out to Don.

And Don is also here. Universal Acceptance Group has a full-day meeting organized today -- which is unfortunate because it overlaps completely with our meeting. But I'm certain that Don will be around for a couple of more days. So we can reach out to him if you have any urgencies you want us to discuss with him.

Thank you.

Man:

Then, I think it's not the actual agenda. We have another point where Peter and me were sending out email this week regarding possible comments of our group for the economic study. You all mentioned that economic study. ICANN performed the economic study on competition choice and diversity of new gTLDs. And it came up end of September was the study. And the study also looked into the prices and what is going on on the market there.

And they didn't mention the geo top level domain names and the special situation of the geo top level domain names. Every other gTLD has no obligations against a government or another organization. So we are all in a situation where our geo top level domain names are relatively expensive on the market compared to other gTLDs which are on the market.

And this is mainly due to money we spend to the government because we all have a contract with the government or are the government or even if you are government, you pay a lot of money to your backend provider. And this causes that we have much higher prices - base fee prices. So base prices, we have an operating cost, since ccTLDs are gTLDs.

And this has not really mentioned in this economic study. And we are a close group of -- let's say -- 60 gTLDs -- which are in such a special situation. And the question was whether we should write a letter to the ICANN board and

address this topic so that in upcoming studies they could mention this situation or if we should not do this.

So it's not new -- the information -- to the evaluators of this economic study, so we mentioned this to them. But they didn't recognize it.

(Rick): Just a question -- this is (Rick) -- do you think that the evaluators say that the new TLDs are more expensive and -- hence -- less good because they're more expensive? Less good because they're more expensive, that the...

Dirk: No.

Alex: Alex from London, no. I don't think so. They should highlight the special situation in which we are because we - many of our geo TLD operators can't offer a gTLD very cheap for 10 euros or something like this as a market price as other gTLDs have. They should just mention the special situation -- the economic stress. Let's say we have as geo TLDs spending the money or sharing the money with the government or the government sharing the money with the registry operator in terms of competition.

I think the geo TLDs -- although they have all these obligations with the government and the contracts with the government -- they are successful relative compared to other gTLDs. And that could be mentioned as well. It's a special situation, and I think economic report would deserve -- if you ask about competition on a domain name market -- why our geo TLDs are much more expensive than ccTLDs? But they are successful with that higher prices.

So I think this is - you need to address both sides.

Ronald: I'm not sure whether we can limit it to the -- Ronald from .wien, sorry -- whether we can limit it to a higher price. For example, I think .cologne is ceiling at 5 euros or something like this. It is more of the burden that are

behind the geo TLDs. Every one of us has a governmental body behind it. We are not allowed to act -- for example -- like, without anything --.xyz or .global or .club. We have obligations that come from government -- and the guy from Dot Swiss is nodding. He knows what I'm talking about.

They made an extra law for these gTLD -- or the law had to be adapted, yes, for the new gTLDs (unintelligible). So this is kind - one of the major point is money, but it's not the only one. And probably if an operator decides to go and offer 5 euros for the first year to get masses, no one would hinder us to do this.

But whether it's commercially - probably it is not even - it doesn't even have to be commercially successful. It could be some kind of willingness of the government that we want to use it, and anyone has to use probably like a duty membership or something like this. Even this could be burden on the TLD like us.

So this is a kind of special situation this report should focus on or at least mention.

Dirk: Sebastien?

Sebastien Ducos: Sebastien Ducos, I'm starting to understand why -- apart from the feel-good factor -- why you would want that to be noted. I'm trying to understand what the advantage to us would be. First of all, because then they're going to start saying, "Yes, but everybody is in a slightly different situation."

The main reason why ccTLDs can be a lot cheaper than a gTLD -- in my personal view -- is that a ccTLD is at a million and a half, two million domains whereas -- at this point -- a city TLD, a gTLD is at 50 and under. That's the major, major price difference.

The fact that a government might be behind them, I'm sure the paper would recognize that the government of Belgium is no less on his back for .be than he is for Brussels and for London. So I don't know. I'm just trying to understand the aim because there might be indeed some backlash afterwards saying, "Well, geo TLDs are after all not that profitable."

We shouldn't - if we were to do a round two -- that is a (unintelligible) round two -- for example -- to say, "We pushed the brands first and maybe not the geo's or something," we might limit ourselves here by trying to prove that we're not as profitable as the others or we're not as competitive as the others or something is wrong with us. That's all I'm saying.

Dirk: I have to make an important announcement. So the other group is waiting here, and I thought we have some more time. But unfortunately, they deserve the room now, and we need to stop our meeting at this point. I'm really sorry, but I hope next meeting we don't have this internal discussion in the front, and we have much more time for our really interesting operations stuff.

So thank you very much and yes.

Sue Schuler: If anyone is interested in a membership application and did not receive one, we do have some here. And if anyone is interested in information about the registry stakeholder group, we also have that information packet.

END