

**ICANN Transcription  
RySG Geo tLDS  
Sunday, 6 March 2016 1715 UTC**

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

On page: <http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

(Sebastian Decozza): Lots of faces, very good. I -- we weren't quite sure who was going to show up and how many of us were around. So, that's very, very good. We have a very short session this time. We weren't able to get our usual four hours all Sunday afternoon meeting for different reasons including the fact that ICANN had to shift their whole schedule at the last minute if I understand Will. There were less rooms than expected, more meetings, and different priorities. We got down-sized. I was promised that it was this time and this time only until next time I hope, I assume.

But, so we will try to go back to what we usually have which is four hours on this Sunday. We could and we will discuss that maybe later, looking at maybe a format where we have two hours and two hours during the week, if that's too complicated for ICANN, but I'd like to keep what we used to have. It was just working very well for everybody, particularly with regards to your other agendas during the week.

So, I'm very sorry about that. The consequence or the current consequence is that we're going to have to race through this meeting. If I can have the next slide, I prepared a timeline for everything and I'd like maybe (Sue) to hold -- if

you have a watch, to hold us accountable to that time, if that's possible at all, and start screaming if we go overboard. We have some time to discuss the administrative part of what we're doing. I want to limit that and to go back to also talking about why we're here and talk about the business of running a .guTLD, which we will do. We have a few presentations prepared that we're going to try to keep short and to 10 minutes so everybody can present.

We have a few topics that we'd like to discuss an open discussion on. So, I have tried to weigh down, keep it to a third of the meeting discussing the administrative, not the whole meeting, and the rest we are going to talk about our business. So, without further ado, if we could for the record so everybody knows who we are, to do a quick roundtable. Please just go for names and who you represent. We will have time to discuss your TLD's afterwards.

I have been asked for the record and given how difficult it was to follow everything that we were saying last time to make sure that the speakers speak in the microphone. Having it on and turning your head doesn't work. Try to speak your name and try to state clearly your affiliation so that everybody can understand. And, (Vinnish) if you want to start, maybe?

(Vinnish Daub): Oops, sorry. My name is (Vinnish Daub). I work for Corassusation, working for a number of TLD registries that are geographic and community based. Right now, in particular for instance, for Dot Suisse.

(Stephan Monala): My name is (Stephan Monala). I represent Dot Suisse.

(Olivier Geha): My name is (Olivier Geha). I am also from the Federal Office of Communication, which is the registry organization for Dot Suisse.

(Leann Hopen): (Leann Hopen) from GMR Registry.

(Max Mozzelba): (Max Mozzelba) the (unintelligible), yeah, Registry for Moscow Masqua.

(Cedric Mishafada): (Cedric Mishafada), I represent the Dot Paris on Work for Ethnic.

Woman: (Unintelligible), also working for Ethnic and representing Dot Paris.

Man: (Unintelligible), I represent Dot Quebec.

(Bob Ulnair): (Bob Ulnair) for Dot Amsterdam.

Man: (Unintelligible), from SRDN. We are the beckons from Dot Amsterdam.

(Bart Lebin): (Bart Lebin) for FRL in Amsterdam.

(Henry DeYoung): (Henry DeYoung) from Dot Amsterdam and Dot FRL.

(Dick Koshinovski): (Dick Koshinovski) from Dot Berlin and Dot Hamburg.

(Sebastian Decos): (Sebastian Decos) from Dot Melbourne, Sydney and now New York.

Man: (Unintelligible), from Dot Vienne, Vienna.

Man: Excuse me, (unintelligible), (Dick Koshinovski), we should say that --  
(unintelligible)?

Man: No.

(Martin Bubler): (Martin Bubler) from Dot Kern.

(Edmon Jung): (Edmon Jung), Dot Asia.

Man: (Unintelligible), Dot Jovel, Dot Capetown and Dot Devin.

Woman: (Unintelligible), also from the City Central Registry, Dot Dub and Capetown  
and Jobud.

Man: (Unintelligible), Belgium, representing Dot Flaumin and Dot Brussels.

Man: (Unintelligible), same as (Peter).

Man: My name is (Unintelligible), Istanbul.

Woman: Also, I am (Unintelligible), thank you.

(Sebastian Decozza): Thank you everybody, and thank you, Istanbul, for the (unintelligible) this time noted.

Woman: Yeah, also all of us from Istanbul, yeah, thank you.

(Neil Dundas): (Neil Dundas) from (Unintelligible) Africa for (Unintelligible).

(Sebastian Decozza): So, quick presentation of the new X.gu because this is our first meeting, having (unintelligible), thank you very much. So, I have (Unintelligible) who is not paying attention right here as our treasurer; (Unintelligible) as the Vice Chair and I am (Sebastian Decozza), the Chair. First point of item that we wanted to talk about is the discussion that's taken us through January 1 wherein stated to talk about the fees and the budgets and the membership of this organization.

We've had -- I can't remember exactly when it was, in early February, we sent -- or late January, sorry, we sent a project for a fee structure, received a number of comments organized, following that a -- between quotes, a town meeting to discuss these comments. We agreed to present a budget which I hope and I believe that you've all received. And based on that, on the -- we went back to the proposed fee structure that we had and asked you guys last week to vote for that fee structure. Now, the vote was closed at the end of last week. We tallied these things. Maybe (Sue), you want to explain?

(Sue Schuler): Yeah, I'll just do that, (Sue Schuler), data management for the Registry Stakeholder Group, yeah we closed the vote on Thursday evening. We have 18 voting members currently within the GL, 15 votes came in, 13 to approve and to not approve the member fee.

(Sebastian Decozza): Okay. So, as a resolution, I don't know how to say this officially, but we have voted in a fee structure. You've all seen the fee structure. You know where you live and reside compared to this fee structure. In the coming week or two, give me some time to recover after ICANN, we will contact you individually and try to establish individually exactly what would be required for your organizations in order to be able to pay these fees. We assume that we'll need to send invoices and justification and so on and so forth at this point because this is the first time that we're doing it. There is no established procedure but I will get in contact with all of you individually.

Now, in the agreement that we had last year, we invited people to raise their hands if they wanted to be members or if they wanted to be observers. We also decided that that was not knowing what the fee structure would look like or if there would be one altogether. And we decided to give people the right to change their mind on their status, given that fee structure. So of course, when I will contact you, I will contact you first of all with that question, where do you stand, where do you want to be?

It will be important for us to know pretty quickly where we stand on that and then see how we need collect the funds. We have actually -- maybe if you could get the budget that we had prepared so we can talk about that, we had several questions at that moment about the membership itself. And, one of the biggest questions that we had was with regards to the Registry Stakeholder Group. The interest group that we have constituted within the Registry Stakeholder Group is a body that is intended to be a subset of the Registry Stakeholder Group.

The idea initially when that was drafted was that members of the Registry Stakeholder Group would walk away in a subgroup to go and discuss a specific topic and then come back to the Registry Stakeholder Group to report. This is clearly not the best that we are because a lot of our members are not members of the Registry Stakeholder Group. I calculated that we had about two-thirds of the voting members, not counting the observers, that were members of the Registry Stakeholder Group and not the other way around.

And, the intent to become Registry Stakeholder Group members was clearly not there for a number of them. We had discussions in the past and this is before our tenure with (unintelligible) and the Registry Stakeholder Group. Similar discussions were had by Brand Registry Group, by the BRG, and this is why I was talking with them for five minutes before going here to find a place for our groups within there, because ICANN wants us to find a place, but a place that makes sense.

And one of the things that has popped up or one of the types of memberships that they have created since we first discussed with them is what they call an association membership and this contrary to some of their members going apart, going away and discussing their own subjects. What that status allows us to, is to be a group of our own, with our own membership, that doesn't have to be the Registry Stakeholder Group, and then represent at the Registry Stakeholder Group level with an actual vote where an additional member around their table as a group.

And so this is something that we are not yet. This is something that we will look into. This is something that has a number of implications for us. One of these implications is that we need to establish ourselves as an entity, as an association, so we need to actually have a legal entity representing us, which is one of the items I had put in the budgets, one of the items that we had at the bottom of the list that we probably will have now to raise to the top of the list. It means that some of the fees that we are raising here may need to be devoted to that, to pay our membership into the Registry Stakeholder Group.

It also means for the members that were already Registry Stakeholder Group, that they have actually the capacity to choose if they want to be members of this group and the other or if they want to be members of this group and the other via this group, let's say. You lose your vote at their table and share the vote that we have here. But it is a capacity to be at their table via us.

In my own position, New Star, because the reason of our sitting in the Registry Stakeholder Group goes way beyond the .gu TLDs. We have a lot of other interests. It wouldn't make sense for us to lose that. But, others may decide differently which type of way they want to do it. So, maybe -- do you have the purchase that we had? What I wanted to do is to go quickly, a review of this budget that we presented to you.

There were some explanations but I wanted to go and maybe discuss a bit what is in there, what do you see? What do you see might be missing, items and deliverables that you would be interested in? And more importantly now that we have all these, how should we sort them, rate them, prioritize them for you? Now, this is going to be very hard to read but I've got bionic ears, bionic eyes. Very good.

So the exercise that we will do following this one right now will be to go back and take these items in priority and for each item as we had already discussed during our Town Hall Meeting, to go and actually request quotes for them, understand how much it costs to develop each of them. And once we have some quotes for all these activities, I'll come back to you and say okay, are we ready to do this? That would imply of course that we have in the meantime also collected fees in order to be able to fund these activities. That goes without saying.

So, the first paper on our list actually was originally proposed by (Dick), maybe you want to explain a bit more what you had in mind behind it?

(Dick Klauzhinovski): Yeah, (Dick Klauzhinovski), (unintelligible) Berlin, I proposed that we all are dealing with governments and by contract or was it a part of the government and governments' in my experience have some say, some need, some points they want to bring into the .gu TLD. Some are already using their .gu TLD very actively instead of their established long-time established .cc TLD and this is an interesting field, what happens with your .gu top level domain name and how is the government using it and how could the .gu TLD operate so we here on the table support the government in using their TLD, what is good experience, best practice world-wide?

Because we are a lot of .gu TLD's, more than 60 at the end of the day, and everybody is making some experience with the government and how the government uses the TLD and how this whole thing works together, especially in the field of eGovernment and everybody is talking about eGovernment digitalization of civil services and everything like this, and a paper summarizing this, collecting best practice and experience could help everybody in the room to work better together with the government and at the end of the day make more registrations because the TLD and the domain names are more used. And this is a benefit we all could have from such a paper which an expert would write. That is my take on this point.

(Sebastian Decozza): Maxim?

(Maxim): (Maxim) (unintelligible) for the record, actually we should distinguish between local government most properly, see municipal entity or yeah, and the federal government, because .cc TLD's it's more the federal government side and .gu's in most cases is big cities and they have local government and different people, different ideas. And different scale, because municipal entity doesn't have influence of .cc TLD usually. Thanks, just note.

(Sebastian Decozza): Okay thank you, was there any other question about this particular item?



Man: Just a comment, I think it's a good idea but it should in my experience the different entities inside municipal government have the same kind of issues any domain name usually would have in going from a .cc TLD to .gu TLD, namely what is my position in Google, did I lose any traffic, because they are measured in traffic as well, even though they are government. So, I think a specific part of that paper should be dealing with Google issues as well, even for the government.

(Sebastian Decozza): Yep, thank you for that. Okay so maybe second item in the list, if it's going up, yeah, so the second item that we have is pretty straight forward. It's a website, a web presence that we have of our own. We currently have a page that is hosted and organized by the Registry Stakeholder Group that is meant to be exactly what it is which is a list, a page to show who we are in two brief paragraphs, have a roster, an agenda for our next activities and where we meet and so on and so forth, but definitely not something that is going to be voluminous and rich in information and not something that we can use for what we have in mind.

What we would like to create is a website where members can log-in, can find information on each other, can share information with each other, where we could create one page for everybody to say what they're doing, to create and drop their content that could be used by TLD's about other TLD's, what my neighbor is doing I should be doing, and so on and so forth and obviously the presentations that we're doing and all these things that don't belong on the Registry Stakeholder Group site.

We also don't want to have a presence that is a static presence that is new today, it comes out and no longer lives afterwards. So, we will be -- if this is one of the items selected, we'll be also looking for somebody to maintain this site. It doesn't have to be a daily newspaper but it needs to be something that lives and has information that lives with it. (Unintelligible)?

Man: What would be the URL, what domain name would you choose for the .gu?  
You wanted that Quebec? I'll give it to you.

(Sebastian Decozza): It's a Dot Melbourne, it's already been chosen. I bought it and I can sell it back. No, I don't know, I don't know, to be debated on.

Man: Because I think that (unintelligible) reserved few of .gu TLD's domain. I have reserved few, so maybe we can pull them and --

Man: I reserved the .gu TLD names like .gu TLD.org in the older ones, but for the new ones, from the new .gu TLD's, maybe Dot Global, Dot International, Dot, that's a Dot City.

Man: A domain.

Man: City isn't region so yeah if you have ideas, what we can use, as a domain name --

Man: And the ones that we've reserved already, we can maybe do that.

Man: Yes we would give ours also and I would suggest that every TLD puts a .gu TLD Dot Quebec, Dot Paris, Dot London, so we can promote that in going directly to the main website.

Man: Good point.

(Sebastian Decozza): That's definitely an interesting point. About the group acquiring a name for its own, I would understand if you guys have already registered some of these names that we would get them for a good price.

Man: Yes.

(Sebastian Decozza): Thank you. (Unintelligible):

Man: Just one thing that we should be thoughtful of. If -- I'm saying if, not when or posing it as something that needs to be done, but if you would be choosing to have an established legal entity, then I think it's quite logical that you also register a domain number under the country codes of the country where you are established.

Man: And this is possibly because we are thinking about establishing something in Belgium. ((Laughter))

(Sebastian Decozza): Very good. And this is something that we will get back to you, by the way, absolutely. We will maybe talk about it a bit later when we are talking about that. We were looking at different solutions. But I am going ahead of myself.

So, the third project that we have was to establish a database and a database might be a big word for it. It could be as simple as an intelligent Excel sheet but establish some kind of a tool that would record what is going on within our group, maybe comparing it with the .cc TLD's with comparables to sort of have a (unintelligible) check, be able to know what we're doing, what we're doing to promote our TLD's and possibly by looking at what's done elsewhere, what works and what doesn't work, why comparing that growth with campaigns or with other realities in our world.

You have countries where TLD is already something that is very embedded in the culture and .gu TLD's doing well in these countries may mean something different than a .gu TLD doing well in a country where there is no particular culture in acquiring TLD's, in acquiring, sorry, domain names. Now, again this is a work in progress. We have to put a lot more thinking in what we want to put in this.

One of the discussions that we had before and we had the discussion in regards to the work that the center is doing for example for the European .cc TLD's with the work that some of the consultants are doing for center was

also to go and knock on their door and see what they could do for us and try to figure out with them what would make sense. And, if it makes sense doing it for them, then we would do it for them. If it made sense to pull the information together between us and then have somebody just, you know, putting some brains into it, a work in progress. We need to see where we're going with this.

Woman: I'm sorry, I believe this actually refers to your last, which was your website. We have a comment from (Dan Hill). He says absolutely agree that we need this resource as a group. For instance, we are undertaking a whole new project of research and insight work for Dot London that we want to share with other TLD's and also understand more about what others are doing.

(Sebastian Decozza): So, thank you. On that particular note, research is not something that comes for free. All the work that is being done by the different TLD's is something that comes with a cost and obviously they get the benefit from that cost directly. In sharing these things, they are also giving IP, they are giving intelligence.

It is understood within this group that this is information that we will share within this group between the members and the observers in this group, the people that have raised their hands that are paying fees that are sharing and contributing. One of the reasons of having that site is to be able to have a locked door between what we share between us and what goes out to the market.

So the next project maybe (Sue), if you are able to raise that, was an outreach project and by that I mean outreach to those .gu TLD's or people we have identified as .gu TLD's that are not around this table, or other TLD's that make sense to us or other cities out there that haven't at this time jumped on the bandwagon that haven't applied to TLD's but that we know may be interested because they were already interested in last round and decided at the last moment to pull out. I don't -- yes?

(Dick Klauzhinovski): (Dick Klauzhinovski) of Berlin, and additionally, we have a lot of stakeholders which are not within the ICANN universe I would say like city organizations, regional organizations, politics and other business organizations and we haven't made it into as an infrastructure for the digital city or region. We haven't made it yet into the mind of decision makers which are also stakeholders with us and we should do some outreach to city organizations like city mayors or if they have a metropolis organization for instance or from the European Union, the united cities and local government organizations, they are all powerful organizations and they are talking the whole day about digital things and we should bring in our infrastructure we are now providing for cities as an idea, so bring our things to a higher level of recognition.

(Sebastian Decozza): Clearly, the budget here is only an indication but clearly we are not going to be able to do here what we've been begging ICANN to do for 10 years which is put TLD's, .gu TLD's on their map. It's not our purpose here. Maybe if I can have the next one, I don't remember all of them by heart.

Then, we wanted to work on a paper, on a point of view, on a group point of view, with regards to a second round. You would have heard particularly from the VRG and again this is where their synergies are coming, that they are interested in having an early round for brands. Their big argument is to say brands are not in competition with each other, rising tide raises out boats.

The more brands there are out there, the better every brand will do because the awareness for the brands will exist. It is my personal belief that the .gu TLD's are very much in that same position. This is why we can speak so freely between each other because we are not very much in competition with each other. There is some level where the CC's are not but in general we are not. And, I would be interested, we would be interested to see what's the take here for joining a brand early round and what it would take exactly for this to happen. Any questions? No.

And the last item, so the last item is the one that we discussed first and I'm looking at my clock. I still have five minutes. So the last item was creating this association for the group. This is a bit of an overhead. It's actually -- well, a somehow significant overhead. The idea here is to have a legal entity under which we can live as a group.

It means that the group doesn't live just by the people that show up in this room but lives beyond it over a number of years. It means that we can raise fees in a way that is clean, even for the most painful of us and I might have to raise my hand here being an American listed company. I will probably have the longest list of things that I need to be delivered before I can pay fees. And so on and so forth.

This is something -- when we wrote this, this is something that actually we put down as a priority because it's something that we are looking to do over the year and possibly have by the end of the year. Again, the discussion that we had this morning with (Paul Diaz) from the Registry Stakeholder Group and this possibility of changing our participation in that group from the interest group to an association member may need to mean that we're going to do this a lot earlier than we thought.

This is something that we've actually already discussed both with the BRG and with our friends from (unintelligible) because it happens that in Belgium there is a status for not-for-profit organizations that seems to fit quite well what we would want to do, definitely fit what the BRG was doing and we'll be looking into that to find out in more details what needs to be done here. Any questions on this? Nope? Okay. Question in the back.

(Pete): (Unintelligible) here, not so much of a question, but, sorry, my name is (Pete (Unintelligible)), the general manager of center. It's not so much of a question but since we mentioned on the slides, I just wanted to confirm we'd be very happy to help with advice or practicalities if you would move in that direction.

(Sebastian Decozza): Thank you very much. So, the SSI's for us now coming out of here and I'm not meaning right now, right now, but in the coming week or two is to actually put a priority to this. There are a few things that I know I'm going to have to shuffle now but I'd like to present that -- this is not going to be open to a vote or anything like that but I would put it to the community and ask for comment, see what you have to say about it, about how we want to prioritize that, and once we have that, we will go forth and put actual cost to it by going out there and ask the questions to the consultants or the experts that are going to help us do this.

At this stage, I don't want to commit to how long it's going to take us to do it, but I would want to have this definitely settled by the next time we meet, which means that let's say in the next -- between now and the end of March, we have a clear view as to what we want to have done this year and some of these items may drop. I suspect those to be reshuffled again. We will have a price tag and before we start running with it, we will put all this to evert again.

Any questions on the process? No? This is fantastic. It is 5:54 and I expect this session to finish by 5:55. Very good. No actually, no sorry, I've got five minutes advance on the next phase. Do we need to take a break for five minutes? No? We're good? Let's run.

So, this second bit item on our agenda was to talk about some presentations and the first slide that I had prepared was a quick and if (Sue) can get to it -- yes, this one, is this slide -- it came out a bit wrong in the wash but it is a slide with -- where we all are in terms of our launch, in terms of our development, in terms of where we are. So, in blue you have all the TLD's that are delegated, launched, outer launched and running, basically. You will note that I have some of the TLD's that are in italic.

From here with my bad eyes, I can see that these (unintelligible) and Corsica for example are. The only thing that that means was that these TLD's were

not .gu's at the time of applications. They hadn't ticked the box of .gu. I have rounded them on this chart purposely, 1) because for example, Corsica decided to join us and two because I think that they really belong with us.

If for technical reasons the name that they had chosen for themselves didn't tick the boxes for their .gu's, it's a different problem. We still recognize them as ours. You had also for example the case of (unintelligible) who were communities rather than .gu's because they followed the example of Dot Cat. They are still one of us as far as we are concerned. In green and next time I'll choose different colors because I see that it doesn't come out very well. In green, we had the TLD's that are delegated but not yet through their launches.

Now, launch is a bit of a fuzzy phase. There are very clear launches as listed on the ICANN site. There are a number of people that haven't gone through there so for example without having spoken to them I see that Dot Madrid has got one name that would be Nick Dot Madrid and that usually means that they haven't even started the launch or they haven't published anything.

We have then in -- how did it go, in orange, we have the TLD's that have signed an agreement and are in some kind of a process before delegation. In yellow, no the other way around, I can't remember exactly, but those TLD's that are not yet delegated, basically, either in PDT or in other phases. And then, but I guess we'll hear more from you guys in a moment and then sadly the Dot Africa that is still dried to a halt but I want to -- I'll give you the primer of the news, if there is any news.

Any questions about this? Any comments about this? This is something that is going to be shared. I, from my own -- I'll give you this, so from my own work, my own job at New Star, I keep track of these and all the other TLD's, where they're at, not just those stats but all sorts of different things to know. This is something I'm more than happy to share if people are interested. This



is probably the version 0001 of what the database that I mentioned before should look like, okay?

Man: (Unintelligible) Istanbul, I have to make some comments about that Istanbul, we have just finished sunrise. This is all the statistics. We have now nearly 100 except our own reserve three stations. I just wanted, thank you.

(Sebastian Decozza): So, I had obviously to prepare this, I sent that last week, so I think the stats themselves are about two weeks old. I'm very sorry, so I missed that. Any questions? This is good. We're running so fast that we'll be finished way before, yes?

Man: (Unintelligible) Brussels, (unintelligible), just a quick question, (Sebastian), where did you gather the statistical information? Because we often look at nTLD stats for instance and what we see is that there is quite a discrepancy between the figures of nTLD stats and what we have in the database. So I'm looking for an angle to correct this but still so far I haven't been able to come up with something.

(Sebastian Decozza): Clearly this comes from nTLD stats. I can't remember if they were on the slide or not, but it's been chopped at the bottom. I seem to remember that I had originally but maybe I took it off afterwards, the source and the date. This comes from nTLD stats. I go through the exercise also of checking on zone files and counting and I never have the same numbers as them. I had to have some authority that is somehow, well they are mainly recognized by themselves but the market seems to be looking at them so those are the ones that -- but this is definitely why, again, why we should keep track of our own to make sure that we have that.

For the ones that have been involved in ccTLD's, you'll know that there is a difference between what you see in a zone file, what has been registered in the registry but might not be delegated or in different phases, etc., what a domain name existing means, it means different things if it's registered for

one year or for 10 years. If it has been registered for one year or for 10 years and so on and so forth, that sort of thing we can't just see on nTLD stats.

(Bertrand Nuvo): (Bertrand Nuvo) from Dot Corsica, so sorry my connection was lost when the explanation about the italic was done, can you please repeat that, (Sebastian)?

(Sebastian Decozza): Sure, so in italic, where the TLD's that hadn't ticked the .gu TLD box in the application phase, and so again I just went to the ICANN site and selected by .gu TLD's and those were the ones that didn't appear now. Again, if I made a mistake in the case of Corsica, I don't know exactly. Suddenly I'm having a doubt. Maybe our friends from ethnic can confirm. They are checking. Very good. But yes, I get a yes but I'm not sure what I'm getting a yes for. Oh, you can check, okay. So it will be checked.

So, no, so the answer is (unintelligible) if I've made a mistake I'm very sorry, but essentially the italic meant, hasn't ticked the .gu TLD box but yet we should be a friend of ours.

(Dick Klauzhinovski): A short remark from (Dick Klauzhinovski), Dot Berlin, so in our chatter, we allowed .gu names like Corsica which didn't tick the .gu box in the application but which have support of the government to be members of our association makes it clear that we all, all members have support of the government. It's a very important point and have a .gu name.

Man: Two weeks ago, we contributed letters for Dot Corsica.

(Sebastian Decozza): You mean it will take you two weeks to confirm it, it will take me five minutes.

(Bertrand Nuvo): Two years because -- no, it was the right figures for two weeks ago, you referred to two weeks ago and that's the right figures.

(Sebastian Decozza): You were looking at the figures?

(Bertrand Nuvo): Yes.

(Sebastian Decozza): Okay, yeah, two weeks ago, yeah. So, without further ado, I'll pass the mic to (Lucky) who wanted to do a presentation.

Luck Masiela: Yes. (Unintelligible).

(Sebastian Decozza): Sorry I - I just need to because there was a remote presenter. So we just need to see if he wants to present first...

Luck Masiela: Yes.

(Sebastian Decozza): ...because he was doing that from Holland.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Woman: Do you know what his presentation was called?

(Sebastian Decozza): It was the FRL.

Woman: The FRL?

(Sebastian Decozza): The FRL. So...

Woman: Okay (unintelligible). (Unintelligible) on the phone. (Unintelligible).

(Sebastian Decozza): Sorry, this is taking a few seconds to organize. (Edmon)?

(Edmon Jung): While that's happening, you know, just I need to leave early. But my - you know, for a number of the issues about the operational experience and all that I guess .Asia even though we're not part of the group at this point we're happy to share our experience as well and if you guys are interested. And some of the activities like reaching out to governments and have, you know, positioning geoTLDs we've been doing it for quite some time and we're happy to share experience absolutely. So just offering our support and help. And some of the things that we can probably do together as well especially when you go to Asia. So again just offering a help and...

(Sebastian Decozza): Thank you very much for that. Actually for the record you weren't in the room present before. But we have mentioned that at least in my view and .Asia could be a member the same way .Cap. This is not a new gTLD beast. This is a geoTLD beast. And so yes absolutely if it is something that you wanted to look at you'd be welcome. But I'll need to partake in this meetings now but the rest of our activities absolutely.

(Edmon Jung): Guys we're - so this is not a exclusive like in the RYSG and not the GO but it's a completely separate. So, okay.

(Sebastian Decozza): What we're trying to build is something not separate because we're still a member of the Registry Stakeholder Group but our members don't need to be and don't - our members don't have to be members of the Registry Stakeholder Group. As an interest group this is what we were but what we'll be trying to shift towards is a situation where no, we don't need to and in which case you would be cordially invited as would .Cap.

Woman: (Unintelligible) of there (unintelligible).

(Sebastian Decozza): So wonders of Internet. We don't have a remote presenter. Could we?

Woman: (Unintelligible) he's ready.

(Sebastian Decozza): Oh, okay, good.

Woman: Yes please go ahead.

Woman: I know I (unintelligible) can't hear (unintelligible).

Woman: I could (unintelligible) here and start.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Man: Yes.

(Bart Levin): You control the slides or?

(Sebastian Decozza): Yes.

Woman: I (unintelligible).

(Bart Levin): Okay. Okay so good afternoon everyone, (Bart Levin). I'm representing here in this presentation .apsm and .FRL presentations about potential privacy protection solution that has been put in place or is currently being put in place by both registries. So basically solution that aims to be compliance with pretty formalistic and pretty harsh privacy laws where we see that there's discrepancy on the one hand between the privacy policies and rules regulations especially in Europe and the other hand the requirements of the registry agreement that have been imposed by ICANN.

So on the next slide this is not me. This is (Awalt). So it's as you can see he's much more handsome than I am. So he'll hopefully take over. It's his presentation so I'm basically jumping in for him. Our next slide there's an overview on what the two registries represent. So FRL stands for Friesland,

holds currently about 14,500 domain names, 600,000 inhabitants in that region and it's privately owned so it's basically under the approval of the (Swiss) government local government in the Netherlands. The other one is .Amsterdam. It's aimed at mainly envisaging residents and businesses in Amsterdam itself, currently holds 25,000 plus domain names in the registry, 800,000 inhabitants and it's owned by the city of Amsterdam. And it's operated by FIND and also the involvement of (Awalt) and the team. On the next slide.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

(Bart Levin): Okay so if (Awalt) hears me please take over whenever you want. What we've seen in analyzing the privacy laws and regulations - (Awalt) are you there?

(Awalt): Yes I am.

(Bart Levin): Okay there he is. Okay. So we're basically on your third slide, conflict between law and contract. So it gets hairy now so I'm giving the microphone to you.

(Awalt): I can see it well now. Thank you very much. So thank you (Bart). Both registries starting to understand that ICANN RAA as most as (unintelligible) and of course as we all know there is a conflict between the standard RAA which states that the rules must be completely open to all individuals or all public. And the loss of the Netherlands in this case and the EU which says that the privacy of individuals must be protected.

Furthermore if you look into the contract you even distinguish a conflict between the (contract) and the contract. Because where Paragraph 4, Specification 4 Paragraph 1 specifies that it must be free and open. It is Paragraph 1.10.6 that says the feature and in this case it is the (unintelligible)

must be complete in compliance with privacy laws and policies. So what can we do about this?

Changing the contract takes a long time. It will require formal message from a public body. We have already found that out for the Netherlands. It's requiring such a formal message would us into the feasibility of the government and would also probably incur a very high penalty or fine from the government and we just don't want that. So we have decided to go the other way around for this.

And we have decided to close the public Who is for all private persons. For registrants names, address and cities we will show that is undisclosed. We will format all emails to the - forward the email to the original email address of the registrant party admin contact. But companies names and company addresses will be still visible in the Whois.

To those parties that have a legitimate interest in viewing the whole list they can request access. We have a form for that. They can log in - they can sign a contract with us where they state that while they are going to need it and how they're going to use it. And then they can access the searchable Whois. All searches on the separable Whois will be logged so we will be able to see who is going what and why they are doing it. At least we try to establish that.

So why we're doing this? Well we tried to get close to the spirit of the ICANN contract. We know we will get in trouble with this. But we know that ICANN also wants us to be compliant to local law. And that's the second point. We just want to be compliant to touch on the European law with RAAs. But at the same we will address - we want to address the needs of the ones that really need access to the (list). We don't want to close it all up completely.

So what will we do? We haven't opened or we haven't closed the list yet. We are in the process of doing this. We will - I sent a formal letter to ICANN stating why we did and how we did it and where - to whom we will grant

access and what we will show in the list. And then we will let the lawyers have their way with it.

We hope to be successful with .FRL and if possible if it's successful then Amsterdam will follow. So why this presentation? Basically what we would like to have is your support. We would like to draft up a letter where the other GOs can say they support this way of doing so together we can make a better statement to ICANN. That's basically it. Thank you very much.

(Sebastian Decozza): Thank you (Awalt). Any questions?

(Natian Jajarel): So just to make sure that I understood correctly - sorry (Natian Jajarel) Paris. So to make sure that I understand correctly ICANN has not been informed about it yet?

(Awalt): That is correct. At the moment we are completely under the radar with this. So we are not only (unintelligible)...

Woman: Not anymore.

((Crosstalk))

(Sebastian Decozza): So for the record you are on the record. It's...

(Awalt): Okay, sorry. That's not a problem. Just (unintelligible). But we some prepared the software part of the solution and we're now ready to go public with it.

(Sebastian Decozza): Okay, (moving on)?

(Ronald): So for my clarification you are intentionally breaking as a - sorry, (Ronald) from .Win. You're intentionally breaking the contract with ICANN explaining it with the need to comply to local law. You do not ask ICANN. You just inform ICANN that you will or that you have implemented it that way and you want



the GO, IG to GO interest group to let me say formally support this thing (unintelligible) between are also have the same problem and we fully support this motion or something like this?

(Awalt): Basically it's not really a motion. It is more a request for support. But at the moment we are in - we are breaking the law. We are breaking the local law and we are risking very high fines from the privacy bodies. So we really want to do this to make a statement in the direction of ICANN and to break these things open again.

(Dick): (Dick) from .Berlin. If this is really European, in line with European law we would certainly follow this approach because in Germany with a big .DE ccTLD having its own Whois policy and which has never been approached or confirmed on the other side it's really the question for us what's European law? What's in line with European law? But I think (Bart) might have a say on this and what the way forward could be for us as geoTLDs. And we have a lot of geoTLDs from Europe on the table. And that would certainly effect the ccTLDs as well I think.

(Bart Levin): (Bart Levin). Thank you (Dick). So there are basically quite a few facets to your question. Quite a few ccTLDs currently have a system that looks like this, yes. They have like a tiered access model for Whois. But of course they do not operate under a contracts directly with ICANN, yes. So in that sense I think that most of the European ccTLDs are compliant with their local requirements. Some of them I know have been well approached by the local privacy authority and have the request to explain their modus operandi.

So I think for on the ccTLD side we should be more or less okay. Of course we have a couple of local or national privacy bodies that are a bit more trigger happy than others. So but I guess generally speaking that should be okay. The point is that having a complete open Whois which basically displays information collected by the registry from a registrar and through a registrar.

That is something that is not really in line with European principles and also with national implementation thereof.

What is being proposed here is actually nothing more than the solution that's has already been implemented by a number of ccTLDs being it in a basically more automated way for instance by using that alias that (Awalt) pointed out where you can contact the registrants but you don't see the actual address that is sitting underneath by using that alias.

One of the other things that we're thinking of implementing that is part of the tiered access model is to way well look, we're going to give access to the full Whois data to a number of people who have to show their qualifications that we're also tracking so that they're not basically downloading the complete zone file or on the base of the zone file download the complete Whois data and make that public. So where we're tracking the people who register themselves. And they have to show a certain qualification.

So for instance this is a solution that should allow for people filing a complaint under the UDRP for instance. So they need the actual underlying data for doing that. So if an attorney or a company secretary or a legal counsel of a firm whose trademark is being infringed if they knock on the door -- and we'll have a virtual door for that - that's - and this person says, "Well look I want to file a complaint and I need access to the full Whois data. Then by showing his certificates that he is a practicing attorney that should suffice at that point. And he is then given access to the full Whois data.

So it's not a completely shut door that we're presenting. It's a tiered access model where for certain events in - under certain circumstances that door is being opened in a controlled manner.

(Sebastian Decozza): Okay, thank you. Sorry, I had (Maxim) first and I want to make sure that I have time also for your presentation and there was a third presentation so maybe be quicker.

(Maxim Olber): (Maxim Olber) for the record. Actually (city) these are quite bad example because they - most of them don't - do not have any kind of contracts with ICANN. And they acting effectively on behalf of their governments because they were allowed to do so. So it's not a good reference just to note.

(Sebastian Decozza): (Unintelligible) and...

(Carl): (Carl) from .wing, very short question. The output of the CCDS as you mentioned it will be the same that we saw on the screen, undisclosed content. That is indeed the way how it's currently being set up, yes.

(Awalt): So the CCDS will be - oh yes you're right. Yes sorry. I was confused between CCDS and the data escrow. The data escrow will be fully undisclosed.

(Sebastian Decozza): Then (Rubens) who just joined us can you give your full name and affiliation?

(Rubens Q.): (Rubens Q.) with .Rio, NIC .BR and GNSO Council. As - if I just heard correctly that data escrow will be also omitted I would - no that's other way around. Okay no, because I would caution against that because registry agreement is pretty specific on the data escrow part but it's not in any way specific on the Whois part. Actually we could run Whois with that only answer example.com and be combined with the agreement because the agreement only contains an example of an example.com .may so you could answer all Whois queries with that.

They will - certainly complain about it but they - no they - this is what's in our agreement. So the agreement's pretty weak on the Whois side but pretty strong on the data escrow side. So I would caution against removing that data from data escrow. I'll also caution against supplying tired access for now because that's not foreseen either in the agreement or in any (unintelligible) to service that you have in your Exhibit A. So that might be an issue unless

you file an (rcept). So I would caution against providing tiered access at this point until consensus policy comes out of the RDS PDP Working Group.

(Awalt):

Well thank you (Rubens) for your comments. I think the main trigger for this group for implementing such a system is the new general data protection regulation that comes out - that has come out in Europe which provides under certain circumstances for fines up to 5% of annual turnover and worldwide turnover. So quite a few parties are being implied here yes?

And as I said, you have a number of privacy authorities in Europe that are bit more trigger happy than others. And of course well this could be a very big bullet that could hit a lot of parties that are implied here and involved here. So what we're trying to and well there simply is no perfect solution yes.

So I was on the tiered access group that's operated under the GNSO I think in 2005 or something like that. So that means that we're mulling over this for more than ten years. There is no perfect solution. We are fully aware of that. What we're trying to come up with is a workable solution. And of course anybody can say well look, even the tiered access model could be contrary to privacy regulation because it simply yes, there's simply not perfect answer to this.

So that's what we're trying to do. We're trying to come up with a workable system where we're saying to other parties that are in - that are a member of this group whether they're supportive of such a system. Because of course if this is being implemented for FRL in Amsterdam and Wing does something different and Berlin does something different then it - everybody goes a little bit crazy I would say.

So I think the idea there would be is to come up with a solution that could work and where we're trying to find support. And it's of course open for comment so it's not a give or take type of thing. So if you have any questions

or comments please give them and then or talk to me offline and we'll certainly take those into account.

(Sebastian Decozza): So yes sorry, I'm going to have to shut this down just because we've got other...

Woman: We've got a question remotely.

(Sebastian Decozza): One question remotely but the very last and then afterwards we'll discuss that on the mailing list or directly with (Bart).

Bertrand Louveau: Okay Bertrand Louveau from .(Corsica). How can the other geoTLDs based in Europe help?

(Awalt): Well I think very briefly reach out to us and try to contribute. So we're happy to give a more extensive demo I think offline individually to the group or whatever to show how it works to also note your concern. So it's not a European centric type of thing, let's let that be clear. So we'd like to have of course (Rubens)'s involved as well in order to see where we can put this to a much broader audience so yes, reach out to us.

(Sebastian Decozza): Thank you. Moving on the next presentation.

Luck Masiela: Thanks, (Sebastian). While the presentation is reloaded I know you had the .Africa in red.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Luck Masiela: Oh yes, sorry Luck Masiela Zed ACR representing .Joburg, .Cape Town in Durban. While the presentation is being loaded I would want to quickly ask my colleague Neil to give us a status background on .Africa, why it's still color-coded red and for how long?

Man: It was green.

Neil Dundas: That's what you call a hospital port. Neil Dundas, DNS Africa. So there was a resolution passed by the ICANN board I think it was on the 4th. When is it, 4th or the 3th or the 4th basically confirming the DC application had been rejected, didn't meet the requirements of government support and basically instructing staff to continue with the delegation of our application.

But what has subsequently happened is the other applicant DCA trust has engaged with the US courts in California and has obtained a temporary restraining order against ICANN preventing them from delegating the name until the 4th of April when the matter will be heard by a judge in terms of whether a further injunctive relief would be provided to them pending the outcome of the main case. So things as they currently stand are on hold till the 4th of April and then we'll know more pending the outcome of that court process.

Luck Masiela: Please keep us up to date. I've been following this eagerly for four years.

Woman: (Unintelligible).

(Sebastian Decozza): We disconnect here.

Woman: (Unintelligible) host. Are you online? You're not online.

(Sebastian Decozza): I can go online.

Woman: You're in (unintelligible).

(Sebastian Decozza): (Unintelligible) can we put a laptop here?

Man: Yes (unintelligible).

Woman: (Unintelligible).

(Sebastian Decozza): (Unintelligible) how long is it - sorry everybody. We're having trouble with presentations. Can we try the other presentation? I saw the first page of it.

Woman: Okay.

(Sebastian Decozza): The best.city.

Woman: Best.city?

(Sebastian Decozza): Yes and I'll just go through it.

((Crosstalk))

(Sebastian Decozza): So sorry Luck. I'll take your spot and we'll swap. I'll be short. So this is a presentation. This is a Neustar initiative but this is an initiative for the group in general. It is something that has already been discussed with a few of you guys.

Man: (Unintelligible) from the meeting.

(Sebastian Decozza): .London may have been already - .London was already contacted for that. I know that Dr. (Lynn) was too and obviously Melbourne and Sydney. But originally I came from Neustar in the US for .NYC. Next please.

So what is it? Next slide. So the idea is to run the coordinated campaign knowing that everybody is going to run their own campaign at their own time on their own agenda depending on what's going on in their market. But having one thing that we can have in common between all those campaigns and being able to use and refer to each other using that. And the one thing that they came up with is to use same hashtag for all our campaigns. We all - getting feedback here. We are all going to run our own campaigns using

hashtags that are relevant to us in Twitter and in other media. But by using this best.city tag into our campaign it would allow - it can allow us to all refer to that or track that tag.

And when somebody around the world tweets about their own city that you can have that in your own feed - this is getting really - your own feed and being able to relay it. I've lost the presentation.

Woman: Well it's because you just switched it out to Luck (unintelligible).

(Sebastian Decozza): Oh, sorry. So the use of the hashtag, we have been debating between we wanted to have something that said city. Why city rather than geoTLD, because it calls more attention. People know more about it. We need to maybe in the future add another tag for regions or for languages or for culture or for something else that we're doing. But we're going to try this with a city.

The idea to have the best city was to create some kind of a friendly competition between the different cities and being able to show each other's campaigns even if there's disconnect because there might be language differences and even if there's disconnect because what makes one person laugh in one end of the world may not make the other one interested on the other side, all that but share because we are about differences and we're about different regions of the world and different cultures and different (unintelligible), et cetera.

Why best.city, because we're .something. We're TLDs and we need to make the difference. Also and because we have been looking at it and I understand that London was actually working on the best.city idea using the best.city more than the best.city also because we looked at what is already on Twitter and found that best cities you find a lot about all sorts of things that got nothing to do with it. Best.city is a new tag that has no traffic today and would be much easier to track.



So the idea again is using that tag within your campaign on different media and then have everybody else search for that tag in their own feeds on their own site on their own information in order to be able to relay everybody else's campaign. Next? Why we're doing this? I've said this already. This is my good friend Tony Kirsh's harping on about day and day out. It's because a rising tide lifts all boats because all the efforts that we're putting for our own TLDs in our regions is going to help everybody else.

Our biggest problem is the fact that the world doesn't know yet that there is something beyond the .com. We need to all help each other. And by relaying each other that's exactly what we're doing. Next. So again whenever you do a blog when you do social media whenever you do whatever the subject is use that tag and everybody else will be recognizing the tag and passing on your feed. Of course it means that everybody else also adapts their own feed and their own twitter to be able to pick that and relay that on their site. Next please. I can't say it in better words.

So basically for raising everybody's visibility by using each other's visibility. Now we understand that there's moments where we are allowed in our own cities and our own regions with our own campaigns this is relevant when we are because we're going to be louder by using everybody else. It is also relevant when we're not because when we're not speaking others in the community might be saying things that are interesting and we're passing that on too. Next.

So the rules very, very simple. Be as loud and proud and boasting about your own city as you want but never, ever disparage anybody else. It's a friendly competition. It's not a deadly competition. US the hashtag in amongst other hashtags that you might be using. The fact that that you're using best.city with other hashtags is going to be picked up by other people that are monitoring your other hashtags. And they may add that best.city and then benefiting for everybody else. And use that because now that works with all sorts of different media. I'm not an expert so don't come and ask me but I can

put you in front of experts that know about these things. It works on all those. Use it profusely. Next.

So - here very quickly I have three examples, one from New York because the whole world - there's actually a typo in there. It wasn't mine. Next I have an example from Melbourne. Melbourne is very, very proud of its food and night scene so we're talking about that. Next. And a quick example with Sydney and their iconic Sydney opera. Next.

So the campaign is due to start actually imminently. I understand that London was talking about kicking this in the next two weeks starting with one - you can maybe - if you know where they're at? No. Good. So that was what I heard. New York is also ready to do this in the next two or three weeks. Melvin and Sydney in also the next three weeks will start something using the tag.

You're very welcome to jump in and out of this as you want. You're very welcome to start in your next tweets to start in three months depending on what you're doing. We intend to have this ongoing as long as it works. As long as we see traffic on it we'd love to be able to keep it. As I said we're doing this for cities right now because it's the most of us around the table. But if a best.region makes sense we might do that too.

And I think that was it. Yes, pretty much. Any quick questions before I pass the mic back to Luck who finally has a presentation?

(Runer Sta): Yes just a short question. (Runer Sta) from (Crion Cessation). .City also identifies a top level domain that does exist. So wouldn't that cause confusion if people think it's the best second level registration inside of a .city on the top level domain?

(Sebastian Decozza): Sorry I didn't quite understand what you meant.

(Runer Sta): .City it exists as a top level domain. Okay so and it's run by donuts without any policy. Anybody can get it. You know, maybe some domains are more expensive. Maybe city - .city's just more expensive than, you know, (runer).city. But other than that anybody could get it.

(Sebastian Decozza): I'll definitely pass that back on to the marketing. I don't know that that was looked into. And if it really works then I'll presenting the marketing bill to donuts for the good efforts that we've put for them. But no, very good point. I'll raise that back very quickly.

(Runer Sta): Just sorry just one idea that came to my mind was our place like this would also be other things in cities. And it is a we concept like we, ours, you know, it's - it is kind of people in there together. But it's just one of the ideas. I think the group here might have many ideas if you kind of poll about this.

(Sebastian Decozza): I - one thing that I can't do because I know that a lot of people have put a lot of work into it and I'm only here a voice for them. And particularly given the fact that London is about to trigger this again in the next 15 days let's discuss that. I - what I suggest maybe first is to see what it - what comes out of it, play with it. If it needs to be refined then we can refine.

But yes, sorry I can't at this stage of the development of it open this for discussion too much. It's going to go the way it is in the next two weeks. But yes, maybe wait to see what comes out of it before you join.

So now and finally yes I'm able to pass the mic to (unintelligible).

Woman: We have him coming.

(Sebastian Decozza): Yes.

Woman: Sorry.

(Sebastian Decozza): So I - one last. There's a comment offline.

Man: No? It's okay.

Woman: No.

Man: Okay.

Woman: I'm sorry.

(Detmar Stafis): My name is (Detmar Stafis) from domain in Europe. I'm the organizer of Domain in Europe conference and I hold the conference again on the end of May in the Hague in Netherlands this time. And we have about 150 to 200 attendees. And I invite all of the TLDs to come and join and present your TLD. Just talk to me and we can come to a (unintelligible) arrangement and we can make some really good promotion on this. Thank you.

(Sebastian Decozza): Thank you (Detmar). So Luck it's all yours.

Luck Masilela: Yes Luck Masilela. Finally I'm on the show. Just quickly we're running a campaign and under the name zed a.cities. It was interesting to say that .cities is now being used somewhere. But our marketing team decided that we should use this campaign. Next slide please.

As a form of evaluation if you go to the next slide just to share with you what has happened March for us we thought was an important month in the sense that this is when we signed our registry agreement with ICANN in Singapore. And we are hoping that this March would have the final delegation of .Africa but, you know, it hasn't happened yet as (Neil) stated, yes.

For us, you know, the numbers here are quite exciting for landrush and sunrise which we got the three cities running a competition immediately when we got the delegation of the three city names. This is more going beyond the

cities competing on their beauty around the ocean, one city believing that it has beautiful mountains and the other city believing it as the city of gold. So we said let's look at your digital presence. Next slide please.

You will see that over the three years that we tracking numbers in the next slide which will come up the city of Cape Town has been in the lead with registrations from the point when we started our sunrise and landrush and into general availability they are still in the lead. Now the most interesting thing, you know, if we go into the next slide you will realize that even though Cape Town is in the lead it is a city with the third GDP in the country. Joburg has the highest GDP and with Durban being the second GDP as a province, not as the city but the province where Joburg is based. (Hauting) and Durban which is in (Casadin), Cape Town which is in the Western Cape higher GDP and including the population higher number of registrars, higher number of accredited registrars in Joburg.

But still if you look at the registrations, the numbers in the cities they do not reflect what you are seeing there. Cape Town is still in the lead. And it's one of those things that necessitated us to create this exciting race for numbers over the three cities excluding what we are seeing today. When we talk of the population and over the three cities we're looking at the demarcation pretty much the inner city. If you had to look beyond that you will realize that the cities have an interesting number of residents in them. If we move on to the next slide.

The success factors to date for us in the cities has been those four areas which is pricing. We think we started off on a good price and we - it's something that is still under review. We want as we run our campaigns we will drop our prices down to our ccTLD prices, .zed A or the second level domains in the country. And our policy quite transparent.

More important than anything is the stable technology that is available the reliability on service. Market access is equally important. We feel that access

to the market, growth into the market provides that the beauty in growth. And market access for us we're talking about the registrars that we have.

And you can see the biggest concern is the market access been the registrars for the cities. We do not have sufficient numbers compared to what we have for the second-level domain names in the country. We have at least 400 registrars for (unintelligible) and for this we only have less than 68 and 38 in South Africa, the accredited ones. And that is one of the key areas challenges.

Next one. Now to talk to the campaigns in addressing this, we have what we call domain safe. These are campaigns that will run for one day only and we offer - like for Easter, there will be a domain hunt, pretty much like chasing your Easter egg hunt. Then as we start our winter, we will have a winter freeze and a spring freeze. Now the idea here is to have the prices for the domain - for the city names just for one day at the price of the SLDs that we have in the contract, (unintelligible) the day and the cities as we have it.

Next slide. And then brand my business. This, again, is to clear the brand visibility across the cities with companies which next time you come to South Africa and you go to a popular street called Villa Garza Street, this is a street that has number peace laureates living here -- Mandela, Nelson Mandela and (Luthuli) and Tutu.

So we have the Joburg brand in this popular street in South Africa. And I'd like to do this branding for all the city where there is a lot of feet, a lot of people, so that we can create this visibility. I think they do (unintelligible) well with what you have that campaigns the best.

Next slide, please. Spend time in the cities. We have realized that the cities have not quite picked up as the owners of the names. We only have businesses that have picked you the city names. So we'd like encourage the cities to begin to use these names so that they can even tie these names to

(7th) deliveryhospital.capetown or may@capetown. And we believe that with that and that will generate the competition and begin to increase the uptake throughout.

Next slide, please. Rent a crowd, an exciting one. Here we steal moments of glory. We go to cricket games. We get a crowd that will rent young students to come out there and carry a poster big "I love Joburg." And the hit rate is there. It could be 1 out of 10 that we do get the moment of glory on TV with a huge coverage. So, yes, we have been able to steal that limelight. And this weekend we have our team out there stealing the limelight and get free branding. And we think it's going to be working for us.

Next slide. Yes, this one. These are some of the challenges. Market access. I think this is a heads up for us as members around us whereby we think that it's an issue that for us is very critical in the sense that that market access and the point of accreditation process and associated costs are pretty much tied together in the sense that it is difficult to have local registrars that are selling these names. And we are forced to create an environment, a situation, where it is easy to bring in more registrars to be participating in their own voting process or selling off domain names.

We think it's been a bit difficult, and there have been a little bit of changes within ICANN to make it easy for that access to increase by making it easy for registrars to be able to see the gLDs. And that, for us, is (unintelligible) the numbers. If we compare the million names that we have on the sLDs in South Africa and the 10,000 that we have to date, it is a matter of concern for us. It's a heads up. It's something that we cannot take lightly.

And the other thing that also impends on us is the exchange rate. We currently trade in the Rand, which is a local currency in South Africa. And when we have to ICANN, we have to pay ICANN in dollars. And our current exchange rate of the dollar to the - the Rand to the dollar is 1 is to 15. And there was a point when it was 1 into 16. And this impends extensively on our profitability.

As a matter of fact, it's quite amazing that we've just been barely making it, breaking even in terms of the operations and organization. And if the Rand were to go in any further west direction, then this project for us will be dead in the water. It will be a big albatross on our necks. And we need to find a way of making it easy on us.

Equally, we were quite concerned initially that there would probably be an issue of cannibalization in names whereby people would want to move from (Seodozeti) and take up to Joburg. But equally, we have not seen anything of that nature. We have seen growth in our independent of (Seodozeti) which is beautiful for us.

The next space that we are watching is dot Africa. The same scenario in a way present itself, or we're going to see a huge migration from your dot Joburg to dot Africa. And we're watching that space and would like to make sure that we have a solution to ensure that they ease growth in all areas. As you said, rising tide leaves all ships. So that's the slogan that we should be living by. I thank you, again. That's it.

Any more questions?

(Sebastian Decozza): Thank you, Luck. Any questions for Luck?

I had a very quick one. This is something that worked us for months about Melvin, because it was a very long name. And we aren't sure that it was going to be picked up because it was such a long name. It's funny that out of the three, it's capetown, the longest that is actually getting the better numbers. Good thing to think for next time. So we'll do the New York in full letters next time.



Good. That closes our presentation time. We're running a bit late, but it's okay. We'll pick up on the next phase. So we wanted to - maybe with my glasses, so I can get to see what I (unintelligible).

We had a number of special topics that we wanted to discuss, and this is going to be a bit more of an informal discussion. The three first ones that - the most important ones all went in a different order on this slide, but it doesn't matter. One, the premium names to the changes were the two, character roles, and three, potential next round.

Now what we've done is divide the work between the three of us. I'm going to have (Dick) lead the conversation about the premium names. There was some work prepared by friends that I think that might want to intervene. We have your presentation if we need to use it.

The second is going to be the two character presented by (Rona). And I'm going to do the second round. If we have time afterwards, there was other teams to discuss. But first quickly...

Man: May I have the marker for any other business on registrar amendment? I don't have it.

(Sebastian Decozza): The only problem that we have is that we have until 7:25 at which point we need to close. But I'm happy to add that. So, (Dick), on premium names. So maybe we start with your quick presentation on this.

((Crosstalk))

Woman: No. There is Marrakesh, I think.

(Sebastian Decozza): Maybe you want to start with the two letters because there was no presentation for it, and we'll roll back to the (preme).

Man: Very, very brief update on the two character thing. I think most of you, if not all, have applied to be allowed to release two character names. And there was phase 1 - last November, we could apply for these two character names. On February 25th, this was the date when ICANN informed us a registry - at least I'm speaking of the (unintelligible) -- I suppose it's the same for anyone - - about the fact that some governments had filed their concern -- for example, in our case, it's India and it's Italy.

I think it's the same for most of us that we were not allowed to give away these two character names because of confusion with the country code thing. So we now have eight weeks in time to respond to these comments. And we have to supply some mitigation measured. What do we intend to do that, for example, that win is allowed to give away .in, .it, and whatever. And I just want to inform you that the registry stakeholder group has funded as a working group. And the registry stakeholder group is preparing some, let me say, some generic mitigation measures. So it's just called do not submit your own mitigation proposals too early. Please wait for the registry stakeholder group presenting their, let's say, proposed wordings.

If you go out and say, I'm proposing to this and that and that and that, you could probably lower the letter to some extent that is too high. If you think we'll never allow that to do .in, I will propose to, let's say, ask the Indian Government and then present them in person, do not do this. Wait for the registry stakeholder working group present some proposal.

I know that (Donna Austin) is heading this work group. Let's try to do, let's say, similar answers that we do not have different levels. Because if someone is giving a very high level of what he will do to mitigate these measures, ICANN will put the level to this very high level. So we have eight weeks, if I'm correct in time. So just wait a little bit and see what the working group proposes on that. Nothing more to say at that moment.

I will be watching this very closely because I want to do .in. I want to do .it or what - or in.win or it.win. So be a little bit patient.

(Sebastian Decozza): (Dick) and then (Ruben).

(Dick Koshinovski): (Dick Osnovsky) of Berlin. So (Ronald), is the working group meeting here in Marrakesh and when and where?

(Ronald): I don't know when and where it is, but I know that they will meet here in Marrakesh.

(Sebastian Decozza): We just have (Donna) in the audience, but she had to leave early, which we will ask and follow up on that.

(Rubens)?

(Rubens): Just wish to comment on a particular case which was the Singaporean government that objected only to goTLDs. I think like SG goTLD. So the goTLD work might want specifically at this case as the only case that is specific to goTLDs. All the other ones -- Italy, India -- are generic. They posted the same complaints to every other gLD, whether they made sense or not. So we're probably better by the work group.

But the Singaporean one for (unintelligible) about SG. I don't have that, that makes sense in a lot of languages or what else. But it's the only case that mentions specifically - run for the record. So SG, someone could - what they think is that it could mix up with the Singaporean embassy in Vienna, in Berlin, in London. I would never, ever - we'll be faced with this, let's say, for Indian, (unintelligible). It's a pronoun in German, here. It's not the Indian Embassy.

If we end up arguing that two letter could be the embassy in the very specific region, yes, then they have (wound) up the game. It's nothing about a country code in their respective (unintelligible), especially.

(Sebastian Decozza): Intervening as myself once, the idea here is - I don't know if you guys remember, but a few years back when there was the different questions, there was a number of topics that were raised that we globally called the (pigs) backs. And we were - or ICANN asked the ROs to explain how they would cover a number of issues.

And under the pressure of those clarified questions, a lot of people put stuff in there that ended up on their contract; stuff that they needed to do in order to comply with - they had shot themselves in the foot. ICANN just gave them a gun, and they went and shot themselves in the foot. This is exactly what we're trying to avoid here.

So regardless of the region, of the reason, the country, why they're blocking and who they're blocking, the idea is let's all wait for a minute, not react too quickly, not jump on it, not promise the world. All agree on a strict minimum that needs to be done so that we're not shooting ourselves in the foot.

Any questions on the two letters? Nope. Okay. So let's - (Maxim)?

(Maxim): (Maxim Ozob) for the record. Actually, short notice. Formerly, goTLD x because local government allows that to be - they give you a letter which allows you to grade the registry. And imagine station where some other government tells you what to do inside of your tLD. Usually it's better to avoid even possibility of discussion of these kinds.

Thanks.

(Sebastian Decozza): Okay. Thank you. On to - now my hand to start the discussion about premium names.

(Marianne): So (Marianne) representing the Paris. This is a (new) review about the Paris, so maybe we can move onto the slides dedicate to the premium names

because there are a few slides. So if you can just - thank you. Again and again and again. Yes. Thank you very much.

So we launched in September 2015 a premium program for premium names through an auction program. I think that we discussed that already a little bit here before. After - now we have something back a few months of experience. I will explain a little bit how we did it.

We divided the names in three categories with what we call the floor price for each of them. And then we sold those names through lots - yes, lot related to categories, for instance, of names like some sports or - well, all the kinds of categories. So this is the top ten of the best sales that we had. The football.paris is the first one.

On these amounts, we are quite satisfied because we didn't expect them to be that high and interesting. But on the other side, we realized that we had - we faced some difficulties to sell - not to sell but to recover the price that was invested, yes, in the auction. So basically we were under the expectations we had. And that's what we wrote the number of sales, but the number of payments. And there is a discrepancy between them because it was quite hard to recover the money afterwards.

After how many weeks did we do -- 14 weeks of auction -- we decided to stop the auctions. And we will start in March a new round of sales for those premium names. But we will go through first-come, first-serve basic program. And we will just keep the floor prices. And it is to be that those floor prices are the prices for the creation of the domain name but also for its renewal. So that's interesting because this is where we are expecting to keep the value of the premium name itself.

So that was the overview. If you have questions, of course.

(Sebastian Decozza): Thank you. Now (Mark), can you...

(Mark): So the 250 for the premiums is for 2 years? One-year renewal?

(Marianne): One year.

(Mark): One year plus a renewal?

(Marianne): It's for one year and each year. The first year you pay the price at which you have both...

(Mark): Like 250 (unintelligible) for the first year.

(Marianne): It's 2,500, for example, for the premium names, the first ones. And then you add the auction price at which you had won the auction. But then when you renew the domain name, you only pay value on the (2,050) euros because the renewal...

(Mark): So it's a product pricing for every...

(Marianne): Exactly. And divided in those (unintelligible) depending on the value that we attached to them.

(Dick Koshinovski): (Dick Osnovsky) of Berlin. Your new campaign which is going to start, was a EPP extension for registrars, then?

(Marianne): Yes.

(Dick Koshinovski): So at many registrars you can buy domain names first-come, first serve?

(Marianne): Yes.

(Dick Koshinovski): Was the floor prize...

(Marianne): And it would go through an EPP extension, yes.

(Dick Koshinovski): Okay.

Man: Now is the registrar making a commission on these premium pricing, registrars?

Man: It's registry price. So after the registrar, it is free to have their own commission.

(Sebastian Decozza): So if I open the conversation freely, don't forget to give your names because otherwise we won't be able to track.

(Ronald): (Ronald Dutwin). What was the problem of number of payments being that low? Weren't they aware that they did win an auction or...

(Marianne): Yes, they were, actually because they won the auction. We do not have a clear idea of what is the reason of that. It's something that really didn't expect because when we were considering that, as long as they were participating to the auction they would pay. But then we realized that it was not actually always the case.

(Ronald): The top ten is a paid auction. We've got (unintelligible) up to 10,000 euros. But it's a finale top ten.

(Dick Koshinovski): (Sebastian Ducoff) my name for that. Have you looked a bit at what the big generics are doing? I'm not here to name names particularly of my own clients, but a pattern that I see with the very large generics is that they have very, very low prices, calling prices, for their domain, the official price, but premium lists that are absolutely humongous -- and I'm talking millions of domains -- the equivalent of two or three times of that base price all the way to thousands of euros.

I assume that this is 5,000 euros for your football in a generic, generic that would be put at 50,000, just to give you an example. Even if it's not the price that they're going to sell it at, but this is a price to say, give me a phone call and we'll talk about it type price.

And these generics that we look at suspiciously, we say these numbers of registries are impossible. There is a lot of registries that they must give these things away for free. They do; it's true. There is very, very cheap price but for domains that are worthless.

The actual domains, the ones that have meanings, the ones that are these names, are sold at a much, much higher price that is completely going under the radar that we don't see in the stats that are being reported. And they're making very, very good business on those. So using the very, very low price to call attention and appear on the stats and appear on top of registrar search engines, but at the same time saying your premiums are very high price.

The second thing I wanted to say very quickly is we need to impose on registrar the use of EPP for premium domains. It's a hard job. Again, I've said this before. We found that using multiple ways of passing that information to them, so EPP is one with a price check. The other one is by having lists of premium domains that it can download and feed into the system is very important.

But we need to stand firm, absolutely, on that use of EPP, even if it's -- I mean it's something that they're getting acquainted with. And if they wanted to be part of this game. And premium is not just good for us; it's good for them, too, because, obviously they're going to make a large margin on it.

Woman: We have a question online from (Laurie Schulman): Are brands being offered as premium names or just generics?

(Sebastian Decozza): Are brands being offered as premium names or just generics?



Woman: No. It's generic names. Yes.

(Sebastian Decozza): What happens when a generic term - and I'm not going to name names, but an Apple, for example is a generic term? It happens to be a brand name, too.

Woman: But in French it's (pom), so it doesn't matter.

((Crosstalk))

Man: You had an auction. Let's say the price if 5,000 euros. But that's the registry price or the registrant price, because it needs to go to a registrar. The problem is in how do you communicate to the winner which price he or she will pay? Because you don't know how much (unintelligible) you charge for that registration.

(Sedric): (Sedric) from (Dugbaris). We've got our own web platform, and it's the registrant's price. We were in direct contact with the registrants. And the rest of the registrar was the second year for the renewal price, not for the creation of auction price. We are between AFNIC and registrants on the web platform.

Man: Yes, but the main creation still needs to come from the registrar...

Woman: Yes.

Man: So even if you're charged 0 euros to registrar...

Woman: It was going to registrar through the fact that we were providing a code to the winner of the auction. And then with this code, they were going through a registrar to register the domain name.

(Sedric): And the registrar just built the registry creation price, which was 20 - no more registry price. So, for example, for football, the registrant paid to AFNIC the auction price. And then the registrar (unintelligible) creation price, which was 29 euros.

(Sebastian Decozza): Okay. Any further question on this? This is definitely - thank you. This is definitely a topic of interest. When I said about the Website being able to share information, that's the sort of thing I had in mind that will be used by others.

(Sedric): Just a quick talk on slide B4 of this presentation of premium for that price. We've got the performance of the .paris, and I think it's a good - it's good information, a good basis to talk of how we share like that health or like information. If we can have call of interests of the group of what we measure every day, every week, every week, it's a good basis, I think.

(Sebastian Decozza): I know that AFNIC has been doing a lot of work for this on the past presentation for you guys.

Woman: Yes. We're currently working on...

(Sebastian Decozza): Maybe for the next time come with slides for that. That would be very interesting.

Woman: We'll be happy to share that with you. Yes. Thank you very much.

(Sebastian Decozza): Please do. Okay. So our next topic -- and I'm going to be very, very quick because we have another 5 minutes -- was to talk about the second round and what can be said in 5 minutes is not much.

This is more of a call, if not for action, it's for keeping it in the back of your head. This is going to be a hot topic this year is something that's being discussed at the registry stakeholder level. It's being discussed definitely by the BRG. It's being discussed by a lot of people around.

The defeatists that don't see it until 2025. You have the dreamers, like this guy here who thinks that we're going to be able to start again playing in 2018. There are the people that don't care. The people that clearly here have the tLDs that they wanted; they've done that in round one and don't need to see anybody else.

What I think this time should be for is to reflect on all the things that we've gone through this time and try, at least for ourselves, to create some kind of a base of to do than to not do again. To see if this was to be redone again, how would we do it.

Very quickly, once we have that, we'll call it back and say actually the fastest way to move forward is probably not to change anything and go through the same pains. We're humans. So we'll probably do exactly that. But between the two there is a world. So maybe between here and next time and we'll devote maybe slightly more time next time about it.

Let's have a think in our own experience as GOs and not all just GOs. So possibly also including those that weren't GOs the first time; the AOs; the (GAL) and the others; the experience that we had; what we still could go through; what we don't want to have to go through again; and under what condition we'd be ready to go for a second round hopefully as early as possible but still (unintelligible).

So it was more of a call to attention. It's something that we will raise again and discuss again. But I wanted to make it top of mind for everybody else.

The next subject that we had was universal acceptance. Now I heard from (Maxim) earlier that he had - you have two minutes but we have very little time anyway. So I heard from (Maxim) earlier that he had listened to the conversation that happened in this room earlier today about universal acceptance. Maybe give us a bit of a feedback on what's going on.

(Maxim): Actually, the whole idea is that the end user, someone who use Internet, has in return to his request something he did want to receive. So no change of visual representation of line, of string, happens, so it's (unintelligible) clearly and similarly in your system it's stored accurately. And it's represented after process and accurately.

For example, (unintelligible) just a small thing beyond lots of things going on there. In this effort participated - big companies participate. This time it's Microsoft, some others. Currently the group is working on framework about things surrounding it. And they created a few documents like short introduction, et cetera, et cetera.

So it's in the beginning of the process. They try to participate in different things going on. For example, they will most probably be in (GV Sonnit) in Amsterdam in May. Yes, that's it basically. So they're working on the process over the processer. That's it.

(Sebastian Decozza): Is there anything that we can do for them to help them create a process to process?

(Maxim): You may participate if you want. It's even more technical than policy currently.

(Sebastian Decozza): Okay.

(Maxim): They're trying to go into (RFC) thing because you can smuggle things into a registry and registrar contracts by (unintelligible) and ITF, but I'm not sure they succeed in that. Anyway, efforts is effort.

(Sebastian Decozza): Do you want to tell us the little story you had last week?

Man: Last week when I tried (unintelligible). When I tried to lock in to make the reservation for the GDD Summit in Amsterdam, they said (Krasivnosky)@

.berlin doesn't work; isn't the address. There is a few hours later - I made a screenshot of this. And he got through with his (unintelligible) address. But I figured out it was just recently and interesting effect.

You have a form, a software form, where you put in your name and address and everything you can send it with your new (GTUD) e-mail address. But then you never get the confirmation e-mail. You're waiting and waiting and waiting. And that's the next step. Even if the form works, the people need to send you that confirmation e-mail. When there is a failure, you never hear about it. That's really even worse because they don't want fake addresses.

Man: The reason that it didn't work is due to dot (unintelligible) in four letters. So we have tLD with four letters since 2001. So 15 years later they got it right.

(Sebastian Decozza): So how long do I need to wait with my Melbourne?

Man: 30th century.

(Sebastian Decozza): (Ruben) asked to have also the last word to add something to the agenda. I don't know what it is. I'll let you talk about it.

(Ruben): It's about register amendment. We have been negotiating a new version of the contract with ICANN for some months now. We had initially a provision proposed by the BRG so they could add a specification to negotiate direct with ICANN without all registries approving. During that process, we realized that there is still another category of registry that has specifically contract two provisions which are the public sector ones which are many of the goTLDs, although not all of them. For instance, .berlin is not. (Unintelligible) is a private organization.

The ones that are city owner like .nyc, .rio and some others have specific on their contracts. So we suggest why should it be allowed to negotiate those part of provisions directly with ICANN.

Last news that ICANN denied us all both (unintelligible) negotiations and those contracts. So I suggest we provide strong public comments when the new agreement come out; public comment saying, hey, there is no reason to commercial registries to provide input or acceptance to provisions that only apply to public sector registries.

(Sebastian Decozza): Okay. Thank you. Any comments on this or questions?

(Enrab): Hello. Good evening. My name is (Enrab Acalium), an ICANN staff. It's neither a question or a comment since it's the end of the session. I wanted to flag initiative that we have been asked to participate by a goTLD .gal, which stands for Galicia which is a region in Spain. They want to do an outreach meeting in Galicia, in (Bilbao), around the 24th of May to raise awareness on gTLDs in the country.

I don't see them here. That's why I wanted to just flag it.

(Sebastian Decozza): Neither gal nor (unintelligible) is in Basque country actually.

(Enrab): I'm sorry. Actually, it's not (unintelligible). I was thinking for .gal for other thing at the end of the day. So I just wanted to flag these things. I'm based in Brussels, at the ICANN office in Brussels. Whether you think it's useful for ICANN staff to participate or to support in some form any outreach events, we are ready to do that.

(Sebastian Decozza): To make it clear. They're organizing their own event in Bilbao?

(Enrab): Yes.

(Sebastian Decozza): But they invited you to come and represent ICANN...

(Enrab): And basically to give more information about the new gTLDs, how it works. We do also have some very tiny budget at ICANN to do this sort of outreach

and promotion. So in this particular case we offer them - to help them with media outreach. So we will give some months to do outreach to Spanish media about this event. So if (unintelligible) participating, I'm around. And I if you want to organize something like that -- (Mike) is in Europe -- I'm happy to help.

(Sebastian Decozza): Okay. If it's not in Europe, reach out to me and I'll find for you who to talk to. I know similar things happen in my region with goTLDs specifically, but the ICANN outreach, all the (unintelligible), absolutely. Thank you.

I see that everybody is packed and ready to go. It's been a good full 2-and-a-bit hours. Thank you for everybody's attention. I hope to see you all very soon. Keep updated on the mailing lists for those who have had typos in their names or things that are not getting on the mailing list, please come back to us and tell us. We don't always know when these things disappear.

Keep in touch. Thank you very much.

Woman: For those of you that are not members and wish to become, there is a membership application on the Website, and we also have one here if you want to sign up before you leave. So feel free to take a membership application.

We can stop the recording now. Thank you.

END