

---

ICANN71 | Virtual Policy Forum – GNSO - RySG GeoTLD Group Community Session  
Tuesday, June 15, 2021 – 09:00 to 10:00 CEST

NACHO AMADOZ:

Thank you, everyone, for joining us today. Welcome to the community session of the GeoTLD group. We have reserved just one hour today because we are not doing a general assembly as such. We are doing a catch-up meeting with a list of topics that the ExCom came up with. Of course, we have the possibility to add them at the end of the meeting because any members that can raise a hand and say that there was something that we missed and that they didn't have the time to provide it before is welcome to do that. That doesn't apply only to members that applies to everyone. So please just raise your hands and come in freely. This is an open meeting.

We should maybe give it one, two more minutes before we go into the agenda but I think we have a pretty list of attendees already. So yeah. We can go ahead. Sue, how do we pass the slides? You do that for us? Thank you.

So if you go to the next one, you can see that we have this list of topics. We are already on the welcome and introduction and we will start with our regular ICANN policy update by Wim. We would like to hear from you. It's not compulsory but we would really like your feedback about how are you doing? Are you going back to some kind of office normality? You're not? Any updates that are relevant during this

---

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

---

period? Or what would you like us to consider for the next GA during the next ICANN meeting?

We have been having sessions by the working group on the registry lock to see how can we propose the membership to have some kind of common ground to reach out to registrars. And Wim will update us on that.

We have some ideas that we would like to discuss with you about opening up the open list, even more than what we have today. We have been working, also, to onboard registrars, or to help or to facilitate the registrars' onboarding for our members. And that has been carried about by Josu so he will provide the update.

As we were saying before we started the recording, we are all eager to see ourselves in face-to-face. So we are considering a face-to-face meeting of the GeoTLD group in September. But we want to see what's your take and we want to discuss this.

And of course, at the end of the session, any other business that members may want to raise. And we can reserve that for that last bullet.

We have 60 minutes and we think that should be enough. Our last meeting was 90 minutes and we had to rush it a bit because we had a lot of content and we thought it was useful because what took the most time was the presentation Elena Plexida, the vice president of ICANN, regarding the Digital Services Act and the Digital Markets Act. We are still a way from those acts being approved but they are really a big

---

impact on the digital market environment and specifically on registries. So we thought it was very relevant and we need to be prepared for that.

So if anybody wants to make any comment, just go ahead. Do it, interrupting any speaker. Write it on the text, on the chat, or any other way you want. So I see no hands. I don't see any comment about any changes in the agenda so we can go ahead. And Wim, you can take it from there.

WIM DEGEZELLE:

Thank you, Nacho. Good morning, all. Sue, please go to the next slide. One hour and only what is it? Less than 10 minutes for an ICANN update. We will try. What I did is putting two slides together, in the same trend as I did in October—I think it was October last year—trying to focus on not using ICANN titles but just say, “Look. This is what ICANN is working on.” I think half of the participants to this meeting are not regularly following ICANN work. So I've tried to focus on them and I'm sure that the other half of the meeting probably knows way more details on all the different items than I do myself. So don't kill me if I am too abstract.

So ICANN policy work, policy discussions. Let's start with—it was already mentioned—the next round. The ICANN community has been working on the review of the policies that were used in the previous rounds to see if adaptations or changes are needed or should be suggested for the next round. It was work that started in 2016. After five years, that work was finished. And the final report and the recommendations of that group are now sent to the ICANN Board. And

---

now it's in the hands of the Board to decide on the recommendations and then see if they have to be implemented.

A second element of the community is an update of the Registry and Registrar agreements in order to comply with the EU GDPR rules. As you remember, there was a temporary policy that was put in place, just to be in time with the EU deadlines when the new regulation came into force. Then there was a Phase 1 of this policy work, just to check the temporary policy and get it run through a normal ICANN policy procedure so it becomes existing policy.

And then started Phase 2. Phase 2, the first main work was focused on a new System for Standardized Access and Disclosure, the SSAD system. That final report ... There were some other issues, too, in Phase 2 but that final report was also sent to the ICANN Board for consideration so that's finished.

Ready now for Phase 2, which recently published its initial report for public comment. Phase 2 is focusing on the differentiation between the legal and natural persons in the registration data and also on the feasibility of unique contacts to have a uniform anonymized email address. Those are the two major elements. Like I said, there is currently a public comment period open. Partially, the group working on the PDP is asking input from the community on some specific items.

Another chunk of work that's on the community's agenda is a review of the tools and the procedures for trademark rights owners. And apologies for the typos, as some people might start to cheer. The first was a review of the mechanisms that were applicable in the 2012 round,

---

not the 2021 round. Sorry for that. The final report was already finished, sent to the ICANN Board. And a next phase is going to kick off or kicking off soon on a review of the previous UDRP procedures that were in place from 1999. Next slide, please.

Then there is also community work being done on the protection of the names of international governmental organizations and international non-governmental organizations. There was a final report already in 2019 that mainly focused on one question and put forward one recommendation. That is that no specific procedure is needed for this kind of protections but that it can be addressed by some modifications to the existing rights and protection procedures. Like I said, like it's mentioned, that report is also in the hands of the ICANN Board right now. A separate work track will be started as part of the more general review of all rights and protection mechanisms. That work track is being started that's specifically focused on IGO, international governmental organizations.

Then there's also some new PDP policy work starting. First is PDP policy work on reviewing and improving the existing intra-registrar and intra-registrant transfers. That's probably less of interest for registries. But anyhow, we're going to follow and see what's going on. I think the policy process recently started.

Then there's another policy process or policy work that is soon to start, that's on international domain names. It will mainly focus of two elements—the definition and the management of variant TLDs. The second element is the procedure for updating the IDN Implementation

---

Guidelines, that are guidelines that gTLDs need to follow when implementing or using IDNs.

The PDP process is in its startup phase and initial report that's required. The start of the process has already been taken. Now the community and Org is in the process of putting together the PDP Working Group. And if I'm right, there's also a call for expressions of interest for a chair or leadership of that group. So if anyone wants to chair, they can always try. And if someone has some free time, they can also try to do that. That's the general policy work.

Then I would like to point out two other points of discussion in the community. On the one hand, there is work being done on the implementation of RDAP and the retirement of WHOIS. There are negotiations going on, on how to update the Registry and Registrar agreements to include the requirements for RDAP. I think that this is a topic that probably will be more interesting to discuss at the next meeting, as then the current team that's working on it will have come to a conclusion and then it will be more interesting, I think, to discuss. Nevertheless, if there would be questions specific, I think we can still discuss them on the members' list or do it in that way.

The second point is DNS abuse. It has been discussed and it keeps being discussed in the community and also during this meeting. I would like to point out two documents. And I will put the links in the chat in a minute. One is SAC115. It is an SSAC report but that was put together with help from different parts of the community—also representatives

---

from the Registries Stakeholder Group, for example. It is a report that puts down or proposes an approach to addressing DNS abuse handling.

The idea of what's in that report is, for example, a number of definitions of also suggesting a clear contact point so that one knows who to contact to flag a case of DNS abuse, also an escalation path. It is a document that really tries to come back to the ... I think it's a mantra that's being used in the community or that you hear in the community, always linked to DNS abuse. Yes, things can be done in the DNS but it has to be the right question, asked at the right moment, to the right person. I think that's probably the main philosophy behind the SAC115 report.

And then the second document is a document ... I think it was only published yesterday. Let me just put the links to both documents in the chat. It was a framework on domain generating algorithms associated with malware and botnets. Like the title says, it really tries to come up with a clear insight in malware, botnets, and also on what points they are relevant, or actions or activities within the DNS are relevant, in the context of malware and botnets.

It was a document that was developed by a group of members of the Registries Stakeholder Group and the Registries Stakeholder Group's DNS Abuse Working Group together with the GAC's Public Safety Working Group. So I think it is very relevant or very interesting to see that it is a document developed by, on one hand, the governments within ICANN and on the other hand, the Registries.

---

I would like to keep it there for this update. I don't know if there are immediate comments. One thing else, later on on the agenda is also discussing the possibility of a longer face-to-face meeting. It might be interesting to know, also, if there is a real face-to-face meeting, if there are specific policy work topics that are specific interests, as that would allow to better prepare. Also maybe invite some of the protagonists as speakers.

NACHO AMADOZ:

Thank you very much, Wim. I don't know if there was some comment, question. As you said, any member should feel free to specifically address or ask us to address any issue that that member considers relevant. Wim is doing a great job in keeping up and helping us keep up with the ICANN policy which for me, it's harder by the day because I don't see any clear direction. Maybe that's because of what we said before. But it's been very hard to keep up. And what you do when you indicate us where are the discussions is proving extremely useful.

I see some comments but I don't see any specific comment about what you said, asking to clarify, or question. If nobody does have any question, we should move ahead to the next point, please. It is the updates from members. We thought that rather than keeping this at the end of the meeting where we don't have time, we, at the risk of not having any updates, thought about moving it up and putting it at the beginning of the meeting.

What we wanted to know from you is if there is any event in this situation that has any specific significance for you that you want to



---

share, be that because it may have affected your return to the office, your return to normal operations, or because you have been prevented to, or because you think that this may impact you and you would like us to consider doing some session or some preview for that update in our upcoming meetings. I don't see any hands or any comments. So that means everybody's doing fine.

DIRK KRISCHENOWSKI: Hey.

NACHO AMADOZ: Hi, Dirk.

DIRK KRISCHENOWSKI: Hi. Good morning to all, first of all, on such a hot day, I hope, in most areas here. As I'm following the Registries Stakeholder Group meetings, most of them, I'm really annoyed about what's going on at ICANN at the moment. Some of you have probably read a proposal of Ashley Heineman for the next ICANN meeting, what's to discuss, or for this ICANN Meeting, what's to discuss. She and the registrars were also annoyed that nothing is going on at ICANN.

So there are processes like that process for the RDAP service-level agreements—if it's 3,000 milliseconds or 4,000. It's [inaudible], yes. But that is going on forever and that's a very, very, very small detail of all our daily business and that consumes a lot of time at ICANN. This is just

---

one of the processes which I fear there's nothing going on. Like the EPDP, like the new gTLD round, it's also moving very slow.

What can we do to raise our voice and say, "That is annoying. There should something be done at ICANN?" Or we write a letter to ICANN and come up with some ideas how to proceed this, or how to fast-[forward] this or something like this. So I'm really annoyed about what's going on at ICANN since, I think, two years. I have that feeling and that's not good. I don't feel good with ICANN at the moment.

NACHO AMADOZ:

Yeah. I have exactly the same feeling, Dirk. One thing is what Wim is doing so well, which is keeping track with what is being discussed. But then another one—and that is my perception and I think yours as well—is looking at those issues and say, "Do we really need to spend weeks looking at this milliseconds thing?" It doesn't make the time worth it when you have to consider your day work. You cannot get away from something for doing that because it seems so negligible in the scheme of our daily operations. I would be more than happy to have that discussion among the membership to see what can we do.

Martin Sutton reached out. I think you are in the room, Martin, right? I saw you around, I think. Martin reached out saying, "Hey. Should we do something? We are considering doing something to raise our voice, to express concerns about how this evolution to the next round has been stuck and has been prevented from going ahead for very, very minor things."

---

Jeff also said in the chat room the DNS abuse discussion is sometimes being used to stop. I don't know if you said exactly that so please just correct me. And I will give you the word now but I think that we are there. Every extremely tiny little thing serves to waste months rather than making that advancement. Jeff and Martin, I don't know who raised their hand first. I think it was Martin. So please, Martin, go ahead.

MARTIN SUTTON:

Thanks, Nacho. I just wanted to fly that the BRG actually wrote a letter to the ICANN Board to push things along because nothing much had happened in terms of SubPro since the final report was agreed and passed to the GNSO at the start of the year. That coincided with a public comment opening up for the Board. But other than that, we've seen very little happening.

I would recommend if anybody has the opportunity to join our session this afternoon at 14:40 UTC, this is a topic that we are building on and looking at ways that ICANN should help new entrants in the future. So please do come along to that or catch up on the recording afterwards because I know it clashes with the Board and GAC session as well. Thanks, Nacho.

NACHO AMADOZ:

Thanks to you, Martin. I think that most of the group would be very happy to join you in that concern and raising the voice about that concern. So when we find a way to articulate this and we share with the membership to see if there is any opposition, which is what I expect,

---

most of us really endorse pushing forward and pushing with you. We will also see what can we do to help you in that. Jeff, please go ahead.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Yeah. Thanks. And I too am not as happy with the pace since the SubPro report went to Council and then to the Board. The Council pretty much passed it faster than they've done most things, which is great. But it took over a month from when the GNSO Council gave the report to the Board just to get the public comment period started.

And then I think it was Maxim, or Rubens or someone put in the chat that what ICANN may do next is something called an ODP, an operational design phase, which is basically an assessment of the costs and resources needed by ICANN to do another round. That could be another six months or more. I've long been trying to advocate that implementation should have been occurring during the SubPro work, especially as we were getting towards the final report.

One thing we can also do is—but it needs to come from GNSO councilors—should push for setting up the Implementation Review Team earlier and should basically keep on top of ICANN. I'll tell you that's not going to be an easy thing to do because the BC—and potentially others but at least the BC—has filed a statement that they don't want to see any new round until DNS abuse has been “fully addressed.” The GAC joins them. The ALAC joins them on that.

The biggest comment, I think—not the biggest but one of the comments that's shared between all of the positions is that we should be using the

---

new agreements to develop more strict requirements for the new registries so that—essentially, the subtext is so that when the incumbent, existing registries like all of you guys comes up for renewal, then you'll be forced to adopt the things that are in the newer agreement. So it's basically a way to force changes in the old agreements by putting them into the new agreements. They're not even subtle about that point. They say those in the comments.

The good news is that the comments that were submitted are mostly the same comments that have been submitted all throughout SubPro. I think the BRG and the Geo Group should both together point out that these issues that were brought up during the comment period are all issues that the SubPro group has fully addressed and that the comment period from the Board shouldn't be used as another mechanism to argue the same things that were argued previously.

As far as what you can do, I always say that that more you say something, the louder you say something the better. It's great that a letter was written but it needs more letters and more getting up to the mic, and just reiterating that there is, in fact—if there is. I'm not trying to create anything artificial. But if there's truly interest in another round, to express that to the Board because they mostly hear the people that don't want another round. So it's really incumbent upon you all to say it, say it often and loudly. Otherwise, it just won't move.

And I think you should demand to know from ICANN staff who's in charge of ... Karen Lentz is in charge of the implementation but I think

---

it needs people at the top, the executive level to push that along. Otherwise, it won't move on its own inertia. Thanks.

NACHO AMADOZ:

Thanks, Jeff. I think that what you said is what we need to do because I think there is real interest another next round. There is real interest in creating new gTLDs. So be that through a next round or through a permanent window, as sometimes we have also indicated, this doesn't need to be a run like hell thing every 10 years because then it creates problems.

Another thing that you said—and I'm going with you, Maxim, right away—but another thing that you said is that GNSO councilors should be on top of ICANN when it comes to getting these issues on the agenda. We have some GNSO councilors so hopefully we'll hear from them.

Just one very quick comment about the changes in the agreement. I completely agree with that you said. We went, for .cat, through the process of the renewal of the agreement and we were forced to go into the new agreement. When I say "forced," I say in full force. It was a very, very ... Let me find the correct word. It as a very, very concerning process because we had meetings with ICANN staff that were really, really annoying, for not using stronger words. We were forced to accept some things that didn't make any change at all.

So we had to accept the passthrough fees for the Trademark Clearinghouse for a TLD that had been operating for 10 years. And when we saw that, we really had to stop and say, "Hey. Look. What you are

---

asking is not disagreeable to me. We may disagree on what you are asking and if it's reasonable or not but you are asking us to accept things that are simply not applicable to us and that went for many, many other things. And that was a discussion that we had for a lot of months. So yeah. It's something to watch out for.

Maxim and then, Martin, I saw your hand. Maxim, please go ahead.

MAXIM ALZOBA:

First of all, I'd like to share my opinion of ODP. Effectively, it's the assessment of time versus money for the Board. It should be. But in reality, I'm afraid it's going to be used by, I'd say, experts from SSAC and other persons who did not participate in PDP, maybe on purpose, maybe because of other thoughts, and is going to be influenced. When I asked Berry Cobb, who is in charge of project management for GNSO Council, effectively, he confirmed my calculations of additional six, seven months. And I tell you, it's just the projections. It's not the reality because nobody did this ODP before this time. So we might see more.

And also, there is a small thing called safety pillow of ICANN. It's hundreds of millions of dollars. So until they run out of money, we might see no future rounds. Thanks.

NACHO AMADOZ:

Thank you, Maxim. Thank you very much. Martin, go ahead, please.

---

MARTIN SUTTON: Yeah. Apologies for any background noise but just to flag if you are intending to write to ICANN or the Board, I would suggest you include reference to IDNs. I think this is an important area for the Geo group. It certainly is something that Göran has flagged in—

NACHO AMADOZ: We are losing you, Martin.

MARTIN SUTTON: It was, I think, Maarten Botterman, who ... Sorry. Can you hear me?

NACHO AMADOZ: It breaks out.

MARTIN SUTTON: Okay. Not to worry. I'll add it into the chat.

NACHO AMADOZ: Okay. Thank you. Thank you for that. Sorry about that. I see Maxim and Jeff's hands. These are old hands, right? This is really interesting. This is creating a lot of discussion, which is what we aim for and we're happy about it.

JEFF NEUMAN: Nacho?



---

NACHO AMADOZ:                    Yeah?

JEFF NEUMAN:                    Yeah. I'm sorry. Mine was a new one.

NACHO AMADOZ:                    Okay. So go ahead, please.

JEFF NEUMAN:                    Just on the ODP, I think it's ... The operational design phase, which hasn't yet been kicked off, we can try to speed things along a little bit by—and this could be done by Sebastien on the Council—is get the Council to approve or to start taking expressions of interest for the GNSO person that's going to be on the ODP instead of waiting until the Board officially kicks it off.

And whoever is selected for that Council liaison ... Sorry. It's not even a Council liaison. It's a GNSO liaison from the community. Whoever does that should be someone from the community that knows enough about it, that could push ICANN along and try not to have the delay be so long. As former SubPro chair, I'd be happy to do it. But that's got to be decided on by the Council or whatever process they have. I'm sure there's others that could do it as well. But whoever does it needs to push ICANN along and make sure it doesn't just get used for another delay period. Thanks.

---

NACHO AMADOZ: Thank you, Jeff. Seb, do you want to come in or need we ...

SEBASTIEN DUCOS: Thank you for the vote of confidence, Jeff. Sure. That can be something to be looked into for sure. We do need to push this ODP because it's the next stage. We need to push everything to get there. I'm more than happy to have a chat on this, Jeff, at some other time.

NACHO AMADOZ: Thank you. Thank you very much. So that was a nice discussion. Really, we're aiming for getting you both and it's taken a bit of time but I think it was very relevant and useful for the members. We should have some more time at the end of the meeting if we cover the rest of the topics quickly enough. So please let us go ahead and see them quickly so that we can get there with more time if there's any other feedback concerning this and any other topic. So, Wim, please take the next slide.

WIM DEGEZELLE: Thank you. Next one, please. The next one. Okay. Thank you. Let's do it quickly. We discussed this at more length at the previous meeting, the work the small team is doing on the registry lock discussion paper and a draft framework. Let me remind you.

The idea behind it is not as much to put together a clear process or define any technical things. It is really trying to look into practical issues, well aware of the low expectations a registry should have in

---

terms of volume. But really trying to see are there specific hindrances that could be taken from the way that would help registrars and registries to work together on a registry lock?

Like I said, it focuses on having clear definitions, clear understanding, working away practical [entrances]. For example, a practical issue that might come up, or that comes up, or is suggested is make sure that if you have a registry lock that you link it to your registration periods and cycles of your domain name.

So that's roughly in the draft paper. Where are we? With that small team, we are trying to reach out to some registrars to get their input on the draft work—input on both what are their feelings of having such a draft framework when you know that, “Okay. If I have a GeoTLD group member that offers registry lock, they will probably follow this framework so it will be easier for me.” It will also be easier for clients that have GeoTLDs in different registries. We we're trying to get input on the general idea and also inputs and feedback on what's in that draft paper.

We're currently trying to get some feedback there but more eyes are welcome. So if you say, “As a Geo member, I would like to reach out to one of my registrars,” please let us know. More eyes are welcome to work on this. So that was short but happy to answer any questions, here or online.

---

NACHO AMADOZ: Yes. Please do what Wim asked. If you are interested on this, please help us. What we are trying to do is to get to a conversation so that it makes it easy for us and for the registrars to work with us. So if this is something that matters to you, please just join the group. Any questions? I see Patrick's comment about the registry lock model CENTR paper.

WIM DEGEZELLE: Just a quick reaction. Hi, Patrick. Long time. We looked into the CENTR paper. It was really very useful also, as it helps to come up with some definitions of rules. But there was a slightly different angle, as I think the Geo paper, what we want to do is really trying to focus on the business aspect and trying to make it smooth and try to get input from registrars, also. What also keeps you from selling a registry lock? While if I'm right, the CENTR paper was very good in focusing on the process and the different steps. A reference to it is included in the paper. But thank you.

NACHO AMADOZ: Thank you very much. Please join the group ask us about what we are doing to see if that helps you or if that helps the group at the end, which is our objective, to work with the registrars on this. Could you go on to the next slide, please, Sue?

JEFF NEUMAN: Quick question, Nacho.

---

NACHO AMADOZ:                      Sorry, Jeff.

JEFF NEUMAN:                      Have you brought the lock issue up to the TechOps group, which is a group of registries and registrars that work on technical operations?

WIM DEGEZELLE:                      Actually, we started there. When we had one of the first calls within the GEO group, we were pointed at the TechOps meeting. That was—COVID makes it difficult—I think three years ago, during a GDD Summit, or two years ago. But from what we've seen, not much has been done after that meeting. I don't know if you have any idea but I know there was—

JEFF NEUMAN:                      I think the TechOps group is one of those where it's really up to the people that are interested in the subject to push it along. But there's other people on this list that are much more involved with that group and I would defer to them.

NACHO AMADOZ:                      Thanks a lot, Jeff. Tobias, this seems to be something you are involved with, right?

---

TOBIAS SATTLER: Hi. So back then, when the registry lock was raised to TechOps, it got pulled out during the GDD Summit and was not within the TechOps track and therefore we assumed at TechOps that it was no longer of interest if TechOps was going to look at that. So if you want to bring it up again, for sure TechOps can easily look at that. Thanks.

NACHO AMADOZ: Thank you. Thank you very much. So we'll take note of that and we will get it back to you. This one's going to be really quick. We were considering some options for opening up the open list and to reach out with invitations to organizations and individuals that we think might be of benefit for the list. And it might also be good for them to be there if we try to differentiate the members' list as the forum for the internal discussions and the open list where we reach out with whatever decisions, questions, discussions to the rest of the world.

In order to make it really quick, we will come back to you on the list, to the members, to explain to you what are our ideas and our proposal and to see what is the feeling of the members—if we should go ahead with opening up and reaching out and invite more people or if we just leave it as it is. We'll resume this on the mailing list. Please, next slide.

That is for Josu, the registrars' onboarding. Go ahead, Josu.

JOSU WALINO: Thank you, Nacho. Good morning, everyone. I will be quick as well. Please, next slide. Yeah. There you have the actual presentation that we

---

have been doing with the registrars. I will explain the activities that we have been developing with the registrars and with web builders.

It was proposed in our last management plan. As you know, since last year, we have been developing joint marketing actions within the members. This was one priority for us to try to promote the presence of our gTLDs in registrars—with registrars and web builders. But currently, they are not offering our GeoTLDs. So what we tried was to focus, at group level, to give greater value to our proposal, facilitate that involvement of the members within these registrars.

So we talked to some of the registrars that you can see there. We talked to Google Domains, WordPress.com [inaudible], GoDaddy, and then some web builders that we thought that they were representing and they were big enough to be in touch with them, Wix, Jimdo, and Weebly.

I'll do a short summary about each one. We started with Google Domains and we saw that they were selling many domains but not any GeoTLDs. So we contacted them and received a quite great positive answer from that site. They requested additional information. So what we did was to gather. We collected this information from all the members from the group. In fact, we collected the information from 27 members and sent it to Google Domains. They told us that they are interested in this but they do not plan to add any new domains until Q4. So we plan to contact them again in a few months to see if they evaluate information and try to go on with the onboarding.

We also have been in touch with WordPress.com. In fact, we have been talking to them since last year and they are really interested in

---

onboarding GeoTLDs. But in their case, they have other developing priorities right now. So they are looking for work to do it but looking for the proper thing for them. We arranged to speak again next month so I hope that as with Google, in Q4, we can have a positive answer there as well.

GoDaddy was another issue for some of our members because not all the GeoTLDs have listed in GoDaddy. So we contacted them and they also have a positive answer. And now we are looking forward to start talking more consistently with them. They have been receptive and they know. And now we are expecting or waiting for next steps.

Web builders, as I said, we tried to contact the main web builders but we haven't any data contact. In the case of Google Domains, WordPress, GoDaddy, we knew the correct person to contact with data questions. But in this case, we did it through contact forms so it didn't work. If any of you have any contact there or know who could few contact in one of these, would you please let that person know so we can try to do it in a more [private]way.

These are the steps we have been taking so far. If you have any other proposals, any web builders and registrars that you will be willing to contact as a group level, please let us know and we'll try to do it.

NACHO AMADOZ:

Thank you, Josu. Yeah. This is what we are trying to do, get these big registrars interested in the group so that we can save them the hassle of dealing with all the previous procedures to know, so that we can



---

bundle all of us together and show them what are the requirements and how we work so that this does not get lost within their day-to-day operations. We hope to have them soon enough.

Let me see if there's any comments, "As for the list of web builders, Squarespace might be one to add." Thank you, Rubens. John is saying to get registrars on board, it needs to be done on the country—market by country market basis. "The registry markets are highly concentrated in each country. Also, looking at the large ccTLDs' registrars might be helpful." Yes. That's what we usually do. We cannot apply the national market logic to many of us but we try very hard to. But maybe that is something that we can still work. We are talking about the ones that are perhaps not more involved in the usual markets and that's what we are trying to get them, to get interested in us. Good. Next slide.

We are about seven minutes from 10:00. Face-to-face meeting in September. This is open for discussion. We haven't made that decision because this is a decision that needs to be adopted by the group. We have the standing invitation from .bzh, back from 2020, to have the meeting in Quimper, in Brittany. We don't know if it's still the time to have a face-to-face meeting but we think that if we do, it needs to be in a place where we can travel to more easily. So we are looking at hubs that make the travel arrangements easier and that can provide more options in terms of frequency so that it doesn't need to be reserved one month in advance.

We would really like to go to Quimper and I think that the first 2022 meeting, if we get back to normal-normal will be there. But if we do a

---

face-to-face meeting in September, it needs to be in a place where it is easier for all of us to travel, be that because you make the decision just three days before the meeting or because you would like to fly in and get out on the same day. So we are looking at what would be the best options in terms of major European hubs.

But we would like to know—and that is something for the mailing list—if you would be open to having the face-to-face meeting. It will, of course, provide remote connection so that it's not something that you may miss if you don't attend. But if you are interested in and we see good response from the members, we would start making the organizational arrangements needed to have that meeting---if we do have that meeting, to have that meeting by the 9th of September.

It would be, initially, a one-day meeting, open to being one day and a half, depending on the number of topics we need to cover and the feedback from the members. So we will start discussing this in two, three weeks' time, maybe earlier, in the mailing list and see what's your response, okay?

We really thank .bzh for maintaining the invitation but I think that we all understand that it might be more convenient for all of us to go to a place that is easier to get to and that has more fly-in connections to the arrangements needed to get to Brittany.

I don't see any hands, any comments so we can go to the last slide, which is any other business and questions and comments. One of the topics for the face-to-face meeting, or for the meeting in September, is the negotiations for the Registry Agreement. We wanted to cover this

---

topic but perhaps it was not good to do it in an open meeting, open to anyone attending the ICANN meeting.

But we are paying attention to what is being discussed in the Registries Stakeholder Group or constituency. Sorry. I don't remember what's the name now—group so that we can provide you ... Thank you, Rubens. Stakeholder group—so that we can provide you with an update of what is being discussed. But if you also want us to pay attention to anything that is going on or you want to join us in shaping the discussion and feedback that we need to take back to the group, please just let us know. We are more than happy to have anyone else sharing the work that we are doing.

What else? Anybody has any comments, questions? New name? You changed 15 years ago? Sorry about that. It's the pandemic time. I'm completely lost on names. Thank you, Jeff. Maxim, go ahead, please. Take me out of this.

MAXIM ALZOBA:

Short explanation of why it's going to take so long about those milliseconds. The system which is going to be used is built for registries, who have a global infrastructure. And suddenly, they want to apply it to small and medium registrars who build locally, justifying that by measurements of irrelevant data taken from IP address market, I'd say, and demanding that everyone is going to comply. Effectively, it might lead to a situation where small registrars are going to get out of business. And I will ensure it will be one of the items of attention of Antimonopoly Agency this time. Thanks.

---

NACHO AMADOZ: Thank you, Maxim. Thank you very much. Anybody else? Any comments? Any questions? Any proposals? Good. So as usual, thank you, everyone for joining us. Thank you for taking the time to attend the meeting. We will revert to the mailing list to keep discussing some of these questions and we will start circulating soon the proposals for the face-to-face meeting and see what do you think of it. Thank you. Thank you very much. Thank you, Sue, and the ICANN staff.

SUE SCHULER: Thank you, Nacho. We can end the recording.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**