ICANN70 | Virtual Community Forum – GNSO - RySG GeoTLD Group Community Session
Wednesday, March 24, 2021 – 10:30 to 12:00 EST

JULIE BISLAND:　　　　　This session is ready to begin. All right. Well, hello everyone. Welcome to the GeoTLD Group Community Session. Please note this session is being recorded and follows the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior. During this session questions or comments submitted in chat will only be read aloud if put in the proper form as noted in the chat. Questions and comments will be read aloud during the time set by the chair or moderator of this session. If you would like to ask a question or make a comment verbally please raise your hand. When called upon, kindly unmute your microphone and take the floor. Please state your name for the record and speak clearly at a reasonable place. Mute your microphone when you are done speaking.

This session includes automated real-time transcription. Please note this transcript is not official or authoritative. To view the real-time transcription click on the live transcript button in the Zoom toolbar. With that, I will hand the floor over to Nacho Amadoz. You can begin, Nacho.

NACHO AMADOZ:　　　　Thank you very much, Julie. Thank you, everyone, for taking the time to come to this session today. We have 90 minutes and we have quite a pretty packed agenda, so please go to the fourth slide directly, Sue, if you will. This is the agenda. We are going to be making the

introductions very, very quickly so that it gives us time for questions and comments on any of the topics that we are going to be looking at.

The first one, and I would say the second and the third one are our usual topics—housekeeping, members, financials—that is going to be conducted by Ronald as the treasurer. Then we are going to be touching upon the management plan for 2021 very briefly. My presentation on that would be very, very brief but we can stay as much as we need if there are comments from anyone in the audience. Then the ICANN policy update by Wim.

Then we have a couple of questions that are connected which is the video that we created early this year out of the proposals that we sent out to the membership list at the end of last year that is video that is intended to be a tool for us to promote not only the group but the notion of the geoTLDs but also your geoTLD in [inaudible] if you provided the information that we requested so we could adapt the video to your language and to your TLD. Then we have the presentation of the website where the video is embedded. This is going to be presented by Luis. There are some tasks that need to be … I don't know what happened to the presentation but it went away, and yeah it's getting back now. Thanks, Sue.

There are some things that we still need from you in order to review the documentation of the information we have uploaded out of the old website but also taking it from your own websites. And this is going to take some work for us but the new website is already published and we want to show it to you.

Then we have one topic that Wim has been conducting some sessions with members who said were interested in developing a common approach, which is registry log. We'll get to that point later.

Then we have the longest piece of the GA which is a presentation by Elina Plexida, the Vice President of ICANN, on the impact of the digital services act and the means to direct on geoTLDs. We requested Elina, we asked Elina to provide us with an overview of what could be the impact because ICANN organized the session that was long and very, very detailed and that was very, very interesting to see how this could affect us all. So we ask Elina to made a summary and review of the main topics for us.

Then we have an initiative that is presented by Dion from Main Domain and .amsterdam that we think might be interesting also for the group. Apart from that, if we have time, but if we don't we can make it, we have any other business. What do I mean with that? We have 90 minutes allocated within the ICANN agenda, but we have reserved some more minutes if members want to discuss any other topic or want to go into more detail into any of the topics that we've presented and we will then jump to another Zoom room outside the ICANN agenda. Okay.

I would say that, if at any point, anybody wants to make any comment about topics, don't hesitate. We can devote time for them. We are going to be pretty quick on the first one so we give more room for the website, for registry log, for the Digital Services Act. But we can come back to them if you want us to, okay.

I'm just turning it to Ronald so that he can start with the housekeeping.

RONALD SCHWAERZLER: Thanks Nacho. Hi all, this is Ronald from Domainworx.com speaking. I'm the treasurer of the geoTLD group and I'm happy to present you some housekeeping topics. Sue, next slide, please. Next slide.

This is just some statistics I want to provide you. Since the last meeting, we have two new members which is .madrid and .barcelona, and in both cases, it's the city council itself. It's not Barcelona under .cat or CORE, so it's the city of Barcelona itself. This has changed in the former years CORE or .cat was taking part for .barcelona, it's now a known member. Unfortunately, we've lost one member to TLD .ist, .istanbul has decided to leave the group last year, so the actual statistics is we represent 37 TLDs. We have 23 members with a TLD and we have two observers with a TLD, so 25 let me say, registry operator. For example, .swiss is not able to join as a member this is why they are listed as an observer. Next slide, please.

We have other observer members without the TLD typically these are the RSPs or other suppliers, .africa one. This is DNS Africa. From Europe, it's DNIC services. We all know DNIC and in our fields of business, DNEC services is providing ESCROW services to registries and registrars. It's a Afilias. And the third one is TLD box it's a registry service provider. From North America, it's CIRA, the Canadian registry authority, not yet having a TLD but joine CIRA d some years before. So we have seen in total to the right 23 members, 2 observers with TLDs, and these 5

observers/service providers, partners without the TLD. Next slide, please.

Then we are coming to the last years financials, 2020. Next slide, please. So, 2020, but you look back, you'll see two columns. The one that we planned for 2020, let me say in the pre-COVID area. And second one is what we did spend in reality. We planned to have outreach meetings. We planned to have as usual a geoTLD meeting [inaudible] would be so grateful to host. Nothing of this was able to do last year.

We had change something, if not all. You'll see if we have a look at thei bottom line we thought we would spend 27 – 800 Euros, the most of it in marketing expenses for proposed activities. We did not spend a single Euro on that. Instead, we planned to do a new website and video which was not all covered in the 2020 year because these projects have not been finished in 2020 so there was a take over of some expenses to the 2021 budget. This leaves us to have an income of .. No, sorry. Spending of 16,320 Euros approximately. Next slide, please.

The income was as expected with the exception that .istanbul left the group so we didn't have 29,500, but 28,000 Euros, as an income which gave us a plus in the last year. We planned to be more or less even, but we ended up with 11,600 Euros in total. We had a balance of 46 [inaudible] by the end of 2019, so we will end up somewhere at about 55,000 – 56,000 Euros. It really depends on the tax declaration, the value-added taxes refunds, but it's about 56,000 Euros that we have both on the bank account and on the balance. Next slide, please.

ICANN|70
VIRTUAL COMMUNITY FORUM

On one slide, the financials overview, income 28,000, costs of 16,300, the result 11,700 and the balance to be expected at about 55,700 Euros.

The official account statement tax declaration is done by our Belgium accountant, [inaudible] .BE. And the bank account per end of the year 2020 was 56,924. So you see that the balance expected one is to be in that area, and if things seems correct, we will have the tax declaration ready by the end of June. The ExCom will then hold a meeting and declare the bank account and the balance at the tax declaration [valid and then it will be sent to the tax authority. And we will then havtober we will then … With the annual general meeting in October, we will then present this 2020 budget to the membership. Any questions to the 2020 financial situation? Nothing of a surprise, I think? Okay, next slide, please.

DIRK KISCHENOWSKI: I have a question.

RONALD SCHWAERZLER: Yes, Dirk, please.

DIRK KISCHENOWSKI: Ronald, hi, by the way. Could you please elaborate a bit on the expenses for the management plan, the 2,800 Euros in the budget?

RONALD SCHWAEZLER:	Yeah. Sue, if you please go two slides back. Yup. Dirk is referring to advocacy and governance, external support for the management plan. This is you'll remember in our last years' May meeting, we said that the ExCom needs some external support. We were seeking for some human resources personal capacity and in the end, it was Wim Degezelle who is now supporting the ExCom with his knowledge, with his time that he dedicates to the geoTLD group and as you see it's 700 Euros a month.
DIRK KISCHENOSKI:	Okay, that is absolutely reasonable and Wim does a great job there, so we should stay with this definitely, in my opinion. But you may rename this external support for… Yeah, it's a little bit difficult for [inaudible].
RONALD SCHWAERZLER:	You have been one of the founders we had in the statue. I think we have something like a general secretary or something like this, but it's somehow like this.
DIRK KISCHENOWSKI:	Yeah. Thank you, Ronald.
RONALD SCHWAEZLER:	We will rename that. Okay. Three slides at once, so we are now coming to the 2021 budget outlook. Next slide, please. We are planning a zero result for 2021 having some takeovers, some costs carried over from website and the video and we also have to

renamed costs for Wim Degezelle's support is planned in the budget. The membership fees we are planning to have them remain the same and I will send out membership fee invoices the week after Easter.

And let me make a wish here. If someone needs a purchase number, an order number, a purchase number, or something like this on the invoice please send this to me in advance at my email address given here or treasurer@geotld.group will also work. Typically it's the registry operators, the members that are closely either sent to a government, to a city for example. I think .london, .amsterdam, the Swiss government, typically needs a purchase order issued on the invoice. I think also [inaudible] always needed one if I remember correctly, Sebastian. [inaudible] is no longer [inaudible] probably it's getting easier. I doubt that. Okay.

If you have any changes, brings me to a good point, any changes in the addresses that should be written on the invoices, so no more [inaudible] but GoDaddy registry services or so, please also give me this information if you have been renamed, sold, or something like this and I don't have this on file. The invoices will go out as last year. Next slide, please.

So this is the budget outlook for 2021. Just one column added with the same naming Dirk, excuse me, external support for management plans—that's Wim. It's for 12 months. We are planning as you proposed. We also proposed to keep Wim in the family. The remaining costs for the website at about 3,200 Euros, the video 4,700 Euros, and 5,000 to be spent on marketing activities. Other domain costs and this external

support and the rest, the accounting tax declaration, etc. sums up to 20,660 Euros. Next slide, please.

The income will be 27,000 Euros instead of 28,000. We had a member changing from being a member to observer so we are, if I'm not mistaken, we will end up with 27,000 Euros as membership fees income which would lead us together with the money spent as a plus/minus 0 – 340 Euros as a yearly balance and the final balance will then more or less remain the same, 56 – 57,000 Euros. Next slide, please.

This is what I had for the budget, just the budget and what we want to do with this money. What are the planned activities we have to flow to [inaudible].

SEBASTIAN DUCOS: A quick question, if I may?

RONALD SCHWAERZLER: Sure, go ahead.

SEBASTIAN DUCOS: I remember from the old status that there was an issue with the status— our statuses are Belgian not-for-profit. We can't accumulate the money forever. Right now we have cash flow for two years' worth of income. Is that an issue? Is it something that we need to look at? Is it money that we need to spend, or are the accountants in Belgium still completely okay with that level of security pillars as Maxim called it a bit earlier?

ICANN|70
VIRTUAL COMMUNITY FORUM

RONALD SCHWAERZLER: Sebastian you're absolutely right. Not-for-profit organizations, on the other hand we have to have money in case something really happens. So two, up to three, at the highest four years cash flow is what the Belgium accountants think we should haore. So two is not a problem. Three is okay. But getting to 100,000 Euros would be too much. Any other questions? Let's proceed with Nacho.

NACHO AMANDOZ: Yeah. Thank you, Ronald. A couple of questions that I would like to address is that we wanted to spend money on 2020. I mean, carefully spend money, not on whatever may come. But there wasn't a chance. The only money we have been able to spend—and I think wisely because it's been very, very helpful—is on Wim.

And that leads me to the second issue which is the name. We presented these option as something that was temporary to be renewed by the membership once we saw in the ExCom whether it was being useful, whether it was helping us get closer to the objectives that we set in the management plan and we think it's been extremely helpful to get us on track on the day-to-day duties, feedback from members, advancements on the issues that we wanted to push.

But we are making the conscious decision to keep it temporary until it comes a point where the membership would see, "Okay, this is some kind of arrangement that we need on a permanent basis or a semi-permanent basis," and we don't think we're there yet because 2020 has

been a disaster for everyone in terms of logistic opportunities to create new things. 2021, we've gone past the first trimester already almost and it's the same thing.

So when we get to a degree of normality where we can assess how should we present this to the membership in order to see whether this is needed, we'll get there. We are extremely happy with how we are working, the three of us and the ExCom and Wim because he's really helping us get the feel of things that we've been able to focus on, on track and maybe comes a point at the end of 2021 or at the beginning of 2022 where we can say, "Okay, guys, we think this is going pretty well. This is one of the [inaudible] it is necessary for us to have a permanent, or not, renewal every six months commitment to someone who's helping us."

So we name it any way we want. We can name it services, but the thing was deliberately not to name it in a way that could indicate this as a permanent thing.

That being said, we would love to get this going and things flowing between the ExCom and the membership so that this would represent that we need this external support in a permanent basis. But we are not there yet. This year has made it difficult for these things to happen but the degree of engagement with members that we have aimed at achieving has not been successful. So, this is part of what we want to insist on this year.

This takes us to the management plan for 2021, and if you see the slide, this may sound familiar because this is the management plan that we presented for 2020 and we need to pick on where we left it one year ago.

We created this management plan before the COVID situation. We wanted to bring it here again because we think that the priorities haven't changed, but we would like to narrow it down to some realistic expectations of where we can go. And if you can go to the next slide, please.

This is where we are, this is what we think that we should be doing, divided into these three different areas. So when we get to development, we still need to take care of organizing the group meetings. This is one example. The other one that Ronald was saying is the GA at the end of the year or the last ICANN meeting of the year, but we're also trying to get informal working groups within the membership to tackle issues and to see how we could get to a common position and the registry log is one of the examples.

The idea of the marketing group still needs us and the membership to show more engagement, so maybe we for the time being focus on specific topics that we get four, five members that are familiar with the topic or really interested in pushing this topic and then try to reach some common position that we can share with the members and see if we want to pursue some kind of agenda there. And you'll see what I mean when we get to the registry log.

ICANN|70
VIRTUAL COMMUNITY FORUM

Attracting new members, that is another thing that is I guess permanent since the beginning. The group has benefitted from adding new members so we'll try to do some outreach to all the registry operators of geo-oriented cultural TLDs to try to get them interested in joining the group.

We also would like at some point in the following weeks to do some evaluation, some survey, so that you can indicate us your degree of satisfaction with what we are proposing. The good thing for us is that we are going to consider no response as full satisfaction, so if we don't get responses from the members, we'll just go ahead the way we've been doing so far and, whenever there is any comment from any member we're really treasuring and try to get that member to work with us to try to get things in the way that that member believes should be done.

We also want to keep focusing on security and best practices. Registry log, we'll get to that. ID4Me, you know we are a member of this consortium and so far I think that 2020 was not the best year for ID4Me activities. Ronald can provide you with more detail into that, but we think that we still need to be part of that because if we help this initiative set some kind of standard, we need to be there and we think it would be beneficial to the members in the group.

And we have another thing that will be represented by .amsterdam at the end of the session which is IDtrust. When it comes down to promotion, well we have the two features that we have presented today. A new website where we are trying to get more integration of

updates from members and something that gets more in line with what we are today. And you will see the result and you will see what still might be needed from any member that wants to use this tool and the promotional video that is also embedded that you can use for your own TLD if you provided the information.

Another thing that we need to think about how we present is that definition of KPIs for geoTLDs that goes beyond the number of domain names resistered because that is a good measure and that's what brings money to the registry operators.

But that is not the only measure that we can use to explain the rationale between the geoTLD and why somebody should choose a geoTLD rather than the .com default. So we'll work on that. Sorry, there was some question or a comment? Sorry.

Then what we have tried to get also is to get the geoTLDs in the WordPress.com platform and the Google registry/registrar operations. In the end, registry log with the marketing group is just different iterations of trying to get the group to share marketing initiatives because that's where we saw last year—or the year before more precisely—were the highest interest from the members of the group was. That focus on governance is not lost, we're still there and we think that we should still be regularly providing comments in those topics that are dealt within ICANN that may affect the group.

That's the next section actually, the ICANN policy update provided by Wim. So, Wim, unless there is any comment, question, suggestion or anything really, we turn it to you.

WIM DEGEZELLE: Thank you. [inaudible] questions. And Sue could you, I think you can go two slides. Next one. Thank you. Hi, al,l from my side. Conscious of time I only picked out two things from everything that's going on at ICANN and tried also to focus only on two points that might be of interest for people that are not following other ICANN sessions or following ICANN on a day-to-day basis, so maybe for some of you, this will just be repeating of what you already heard a hundred times this week.

The first thing I wanted to mention was the SubPro. So, the PDP policy development exercise that looked at the previous round and came up with changes that would be needed for the next round of new gTLDs. When we had the previous meeting—I think the previous gTLD meeting—that group had published its draft final report that was up for public comment.

Now we are, let's say, two stages further. The report was finalized. The report went to the GNSO Council who voted on the report, and now the report was sent to the Board for consideration and final vote. What's next usually or typically—and not even typically there—but to do so, there will be an additional public comment period too before the Board takes a decision where the community can submit comments. I think we don't have the time to go into details into the report, but the most

important is if there are comments/additional issues to raise, there will be that public comment period to send comments to the board later on. For those that ask the question, "What does it need for the next round?" I think it's the same answer we all have been hearing for the last I don't know how many years.

The next round is still coming. Second question: when? Well, the next round is still coming, there is no information on that or no decision on that.

I also added on the slide the link to the final SubPro report that, like I said, is now in the hands of the ICANN Board. Next slide, please.

The next item I wanted to highlight is that DNS abuse is still high on the agenda and discussed within the community and there is no sign that this will change anytime near in the future. Just to give some examples of what is happening in this week we have seen the registry and the registrar stakeholder group—they have their own DNS Working Groups—and they started some outreach activities to discuss and to start up a dialogue with other parts of the community to discuss, and probably in more informal setting, discuss ideas around DNS abuse that's going on.

Another point to look or observation you can make during this week is that also the GAC is very active on DNS abuse and I interpret it, as from what I heard from different GAC sessions, is checking the temperature in the community on the different was forward. One thing is clear: they want to make progress on DNS abuse.But they're planting ideas left and

right probably in a very political way, planting ideas and checking possible ways forward. So going from more what's probably is that most relevant looking into how the contracts with the registries and registrars on DNS, what's that there on DNS abuse, how that could be enforced in a better way or in a more active way. But also thinking whether the community has to come up with some policy or interim solutions while they're working on policy. So there's a lot going on, a lot of ideas related to that.

Related to the DNS abuse discussion is currently also the SSR2—the Security Stability and Resilience review team—has published its final report. It's up for public comment until the 8th of April. The report covers a lot of topics. I think there are 63 recommendations in total relating to SSR implementation that should be overall ICANN stability but also some specific items related to DNS abuse and the contracts with contracted parties and also items related to the global DNS.

I would like to point out here that the Registry Stakeholder Group with also the Registry Stakeholder Group and Registrar Stakeholder Group expressed some serious concerns with some parts in the SSR2 report., that if they would be accepted by the board they would violate some terms of the registry/registrar agreement or undermine the current discussions in the multi-stakeholder or this current talking about the DNS abuse that's going on in the community. I think that's very well, especially I think also the part where SSR2 makes recommendations that directly are in conflict or retain the contracts of the registries is also relevant for the geoTLDs. Also, as I mentioned earlier, one observation I also made this week is that, for example, the GAC is very interested in

listening in different parts of the community what different parts of the community think about the SSR2 recommendations while they're making their own comment.

The links on the slides are to the final report itself. A link to the public comments page you can find on the ICANN website, and I also posted a link to the letter that was sent by the Contracted Party House, the Registry and Registrar Stakeholder Group and the Registry Stakeholder Group comment is attached to that letter if you're interested in that. Then next slide, please.

As last points, I just wanted to mention it probably doesn't come as a surprise that also the next ICANN meeting will be a virtual meeting. The dates remain the same, the 14th until the 17th of June and the time zone will probably be very convenient for the Europeans as the meeting venue was a [inaudible] and ICANN seems to follow the time zones of the official meeting. That's all for this very short overview. If there are immediately reactions or comments, happy to answer.

NACHO AMADOZ: I don't seem to see any, but I guess that the way we should proceed is how we've done in the past. So we compile some position from the members if there are and we integrate them in some document with language that we are all comfortable with, share it with the list, and issue the comments in a certain period if there are no objections or suggestions to change the language that may come at any point that we don't work with tight end dates here when it comes to getting the

members involved or provide comments. So we'll get back to you on that. Thank you very much, Wim.

If we could go to the next slide ,please, we are going to change to funnier topic which is the video. It's a very, very short video, we are very happy with it. I hope that those that commanded their own version of the video are also happy with it and we just wanted to play it for you— it's a very, very short video—and encourage you to share it and use it any way you want to promote the group and your TLD. So, please, Sue if you can play it.

SUE SCHULER: I'm going to try and fix this so that you can hear it as well.

NACHO AMADOZ: Thank you. In the meantime, we created this channel on YouTube so that you can easily share it and that's something that everybody's familiar with, but you can have the file of the video and you can, in any case, refer to its presence on the websites.

[video plays, no speech]

NORMAN FORTIER: Bravo.

NACHO AMADOZ: Thank you.

NORMAN FORTIER: Bravo.

NACHO AMADOZ: You like it? So, that is it. It's something, we think it's catchy and it's funny [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [background audio] I've treated thousands of cats. Once you started working on Mr. Toodles, he improved dramatically and I think you probably gave him probably an extra couple of years.

NACHO AMADOZ: That's not me. That talked about cats but that was not me.

LUIS ANTELO: Mister Toodles.

NACHO AMADOZ: I don't know what that is, Luis. Anyway, we decided as we had the money as we all know. That's not good. Yup, you have to bear that in mind. But that's what we wanted to show you, not the cats, not the bladder, but the video.

                      This is something that we could also do more things about. We are completely open to do anything that the members agree on and that's seen as useful and that can use as a generic tool or as a particularized

tool. So just let us know. We decided to assume the costs of both the video and the customization without charging extra for the customization to the members that decided that they wanted one. This is it. This is it.

I don't know if there are any comments for that apart from the feline fan. I think that next is Luis for the website. It's going to be presented by Luis because [inaudible] offered us their help in conducting these and liaising with the developers and explaining to them the rationale about the Geos and we've come to the end of the process with the [inaudible] round website. We really like it. Let's just hold on to see if you can get back…

LUIS ANTELO: I can start.

NACHO AMADOZ: You can? Go ahead, please.

LUIS ANTELO: Yeah. Frst of all, I'm not going to walk you through the whole website because it's already… Oh, Mr. Toodles again.

SUE SCHULER: Okay, I don't know what's happening. I'm trying to share the PowerPoint presentation and it's still sharing my other screen.

ICANN|70
VIRTUAL COMMUNITY FORUM

LUIS ANTELO: That's right, that's right. [inaudible]

SUE SCHULER: Yeah. Sorry, I'm just [inaudible]. Hhold on.

LUIS ANTELO: I'm worried about Mr. Toodles.

RAFAEL MONTANO-DUPONT: This is Rafael with tech here.

SUE SCHULER: Thank you.

RAFAEL MONTANO-DUPONT: It looks like you might have the YouTube still open in another tab.

SUE SCHULER: I just closed that tab so let me now get back to this.

RAFAEL MONTANO-DUPONT: Great.

EN

SUE SCHULER: Thank you.

RAFAEL MONTANO-DUPONT: All right, sounds good. Perfect.

LUIS ANTELO: Okay. As I was telling you, I'm not going to walk you through the whole website because it's already up and running. You can go and visit it. I just want to tell you a couple of really quick things about the process and about a couple of things that I think are really remarkable about this website. First of all, for the process, we simply decided to help the group with is. We launched a [inaudible] among our useful local providers and you know website development and especially WordPress, and we simply picked not exactly the cheapest but one of the cheaper and the best looking one among them. Afterwards we … I mean, collected the prerequisites and we started with the development. I think I presented a first draft of the design—when was it—like in October, last October Nacho? I don't remember exactly when was that meeting?

NACHO AMADOZ: I think so, yeah.

LUIS ANTELO: Yeah, and afterwards we have really, really interesting feedback from Ronald, Wim, and [Josh] especially, I think. Yeah.

**ICANN|70
VIRTUAL COMMUNITY FORUM**

Obviously, as any process like this, we went full feeling more or less whatever it was asked from us from the developers, and now it's up and running. And there are a couple of things that I think are really interesting. First of all, we managed—I mean the developers managed—to insert all the activity that all the different TLDs have on their websites and social media and that is reflected in each TLD's pages and in the front page too. So when you watch that, you really get the idea of the amount of activity and diversity that's within the group. If you see right now we have news from .cat, [inaudible], from NYC and that's it because it's refreshing constantly. Yeah. And [inaudible] now, yeah. It changed already. So I think that's interesting. Maybe you missed your own information there. I mean, you're still on time to submit your feeds so they can be inserted there. And the other things that have input on the website are because we thought it was useful.

There is a members area where you can share documents, files, or probably the recording of these videos or the transcription and an agenda where you can subscribe and get the updates from the next event. And that's basically it. I mean, it's been live for 24 hours already. You can go check it out and find probably flaws that you're going to find. Yeah. [inaudible]. Yeah.

NACHO AMADOZ: Sorry, I didn't mean to interrupt, Luis, but what I was going to say is that if you miss anything, if you find some information that is not up to date, you can just let us know. We want to integrate as much information from you as we have, so please follow what Luis said. We provided links

answer to the members where they could provide information that we needed about the contact details and the feeds and so on. So this is up to you. This is up to you. I don't know if anybody… Dirk, you have a question? Go ahead, please.

DIRK KISCHENOWSKI: Yes, thank you, Luis. I was always supporting for having a new website and it looks good. I love it from the first impression, and hopefully going deeper into the content, I will still love it. I will do that later this day.

What instantly came to my mind is if you look on the website which has a modern look, bold colors, and looks really nice than our existing logo is that logo is really fine detailed and I would love to see or spend some money from the budget to make the logo more abstract and more fitting to the website design. That could be a task which brings it to a nice whole thing, the website and the logo and everything there. How do you think about this?

LUIS ANTELO: If you're asking me, I think the general group identity needs some sort of standardizing. So, having a logo like vectorize and done properly to fix the colors that we're using. What kind of red, what kind of pink, what tones? I mean, the code of the color, so it's fixated. And the same with typography or whatever elements we decide are part of the identity. That is going to help a lot with new applications of the logo or simply of the corporate identity that we have. I'm all for it. I think one of the sections, one of the links on the website, should be here you can

download the whole chart of how to use the corporate identity of the group.

NACHO AMADOZ: I'm completely fine with that. I think that's a good idea. So I guess that we need to, I don't know, give it some place for the members to say if anybody thinks otherwise, that if that is not the case we should proceed looking for proposals and then subjected it to—I don't know if this needs to be voted by the whole membership—but ExCom. Dirk, as you raised the idea, we would like you also to have a say. We want everybody to have a say, but we understand that sometimes it's not the way this group works. So we could discuss this, see what other proposals and do it all of it together. So I'm totally fine for that. Mr. Treasurer what do you think about that?

RONALD SCHWAERZLER: Yeah, I remember the times when we were—me, Dirk and Sebastien the former ExCom—were discussing the logo in Durban, in Belgium close to Brussels. We were not completely happy with the logo. It was the best we could get at that point of time. So I think it's six years, at about six years old, and you see that it's six years old, so why not change that or rework it together with the whole—how do you call it? Luis you mentioned it—a whole set of color codes and fonts, etc. Yeah. Why not?

NACHO AMADOZ: The way we could proceed is just to summarize and to go on and move along to the next topic. The ExCom, Luis from DotGal is the liaison for the development of the website, and Dirk we are going to be looking for options and developers that could provide this new branding and anybody else that wants to join in just to be an observer, to propose alternatives, to review what we find, just raise your hand in the list or write to us and say, "Hey, count me in," and we'll go ahead with everyone that signs up. Okay. Got it.

Last thing. Wim, do you want to take care of this? Sue can you go to the next slide please? GeoTLDs and COVID. Yeah, go ahead, please.

WIM DEGEZELLE: Well, it's nice moving from the website. I mean, the website allows or can become a great platform to share news about geoTLDs and put them in the picture. One of the—Luis didn't mention but there was also not only the members news but also a new section itself with the idea that everything published there is automatically shown on the homepage, so that if people come again to the website that the see the latest news on there.

In that context, there was on the previous slide the question if you have ideas for content, for news, or news you want to share don't forget … I mean, please use the office of geotld.group website to share those ideas. One of the ideas—and then going back to the next slide—was when we were discussing the movie and then the website we came across some examples of COVID-related geoTLD names and the idea

was it would be nice if we have other names of websites that are really used in the context of the COVID pandemic to put them together on a short blog post and put them on the website just to give the examples, a look geoTLDs are used or relevant because they're close to the people and they're close to the community they want to serve.

For that reason, this request I will follow up with an email to the mailing list as well. If you have examples from your geoTLD, please share them by the end of next week because it will be early April we'll put everything together in one blog post and publish them on the website. That's it.

And then, looking at the time, I think the best is to go to the next topic.

LUIS ANTELO: I really need to ask you to be very quick on that one, Wim. Sorry to rush you, but we are already beyond half past 5:00.

WIM DEGEZELLE: I will be very, very short. So, the next slide is … The next one is about the updates on the registry lock discussion. It was mentioned already in the introduction by Nacho that we had a call and some discussions earlier on in this year. Also, during that call, it was pointed to the fact that it has been two years ago some discussions at GDD Summit related to registry lock. Also, came across a CENTR paper related to the topic.

So, I went through all of them. And the disuccions, also the [inaudible] came up with or put forward two elements. One, registry lock, why

having it as a geoTLD, of course for the security aspect, service aspect, but also for the professional image of the registry. But there were a number of challenges. The registry/registrar/registrant relation. Also the fact that it is a very technical product, clear to us what registry lock needs not necessarily clear for an end user. There are also some issues or also challenges that if you read [inaudible] in a negative way, it either screws up your server for the worse, relation with your registrar, or makes your end clients ask questions about the security of [its normal] domain name you don't want the end user to ask. Next slide, please.

So, the idea is to look also at the previous discussions at the GDD Summit that the focus should not be on developing—technically developing—a solution or automation. Both should more be in how can geos cooperate in coordinating and streamlining some business practices, make sure that if they talk about registry lock they all talk about the same thing, think about posing a more positive message about the registry lock, how to sell it, and also contact with registrars or discuss with the registrars how some of the hindrances might be worked away.

For example, one idea that came up was if your domain name auto renews at the end, a registry lock should also auto renew. That's kind of [inaudible] practices.

So, the next steps would be to have again a call with a number of people of the geoTLD group that are interested in the topic to take this further and dive into discussions.

So, I will send out a draft note that's similar to what's on these two slides to the list and then also an invitation for a follow-up call of the call we had in January. So, I would say look out for that.

And I think there are 30 seconds now for a quick reaction from anyone in the group. I see Dirk, you put your hand up. Dirk, you have wanted to react?

NACHO AMADOZ: I think that was an old hand from before.

WIM DEGEZELLE: Okay.

NACHO AMADOZ: Thanks a lot, Wim. As you said, we started working with some members. We are progressing. Anybody that feels they want to join is very welcome. I'm trying not to be un-polite and rush it, but I don't see any comments or hands, so please go to the next slide.

The next topic is the impact of the Digital Services Act on geoTLDs and we asked Elena and she was so kind to accept. Not only she accepted that, but she said, "You sure you just want the Digital Services Act? You don't want also the directive, Security Network and Information Systems?" So, we're getting the full package. Elena, go ahead, please.

ELENA PLEXIDA: Thank you so much, Nacho. Yes, I also said [inaudible] and you will understand why. Thank you for having me today to discuss this, too. First of all, let me say [inaudible] and congratulations for the website as well.

So, I'll try to give you an overview of Digital Initiatives, focusing of course on the DNS-related part and possible impacts for registries. I sent a rather long slide deck. I had to limit it. There are slides in there that are served for your references, such as the slides that contain in detail the obligations that will be imposed. We'll skip these slides for our chat today.

So, let's get right to the Digital Services Act (DSA). The DSA is about how intermediary services are handling illegal content online. It is an update [inaudible] of the 2000 e-commerce directive, existing European directive. But the scope now is broader. We have more due diligence obilgations. We have increased regulatory oversight on companies that own a great size of the market.

The big change with the DSA is going to be online platforms. It will mostly impact online platforms—Amazon, Facebook, Google, Apple, you name it.

So, if it is mostly about online platforms, where do we come in? Where do we, the DNS, come in?

The DSA also attempts to clarify the rules and the rules under which an intermediary service provider is not responsible for third-party content over their services. In other words, to clarify, the liability regime.

ICANN|70
VIRTUAL COMMUNITY FORUM

Now, under the existing liability regime in Europe, there is ambiguity with respect to DNS. So, the DNS operators. In particular, there have been lengthy discussions over many years on whether registries and registrars are covered by the framework and can therefore benefit from the liability exceptions.

So, what the European Commission tried to do is to clarify this ambiguity by adding [inaudible] in the proposed regulation. I would say that is good intent there. I mean, [inaudible] with respect to not being liable under the law for content is a good thing, in our case.

But the concern I want to share with you is that it's not certain that the current drafting in the proposal really helps [inaudible]. And I will very briefly try to explain why as we go ahead.

But, first, let's put things—all this—in context. I'm going to start with some context on the DSA. What is not [inaudible] from a regulatory perspective?

First of all, similar to the GDPR, there is an [inaudible] effect. And this is the reason why and that's why I said, "Are you sure we don't want to touch on the DSA as well?"

So, the DSA applies to the intermediaries offering their services in the European single market, whether they're established in or outside the EU. As long as you offer services in the EU, you are covered by this.

Then, other things I'd like to point out here is it does not specifiy what is illegal content. So, this [inaudible] does not say what the illegal

content is. You have to go to national legislation for that or EU legislation overall.

What it attempts to do is to put in place [inaudible] mechanisms. It also reserves some of the existing framework. The existing liability framework is not really going away. The principles are there. Even some legislation that complements the framework will be maintained. This, if I may call it, sort of copy/paste adds to the concern [inaudible] we mentioned might not fully clarify the situation for registries and registrars.

Now, the scope. I mentioned at the beginning the DSA applies to providers of intermediary services. Intermediary services are [inaudible]. We have a duty of [inaudible] with cumulative due diligence obligations for intermediary services matching the role and the size and the impact. So you have different tiers of requirements.

The first tier is the lower [inaudible] tier, if we may put it that way. It's only intermediary services in general. This is a copy/paste from the European Commission website where they are talking about the regulation. And I copied and pasted there to point to you that already the first bullet when they talk about intermediary services, they are naming domain name registrars.

Then, those that are offering hosting services has extra obligations. Maybe those are online platforms referred to social media and marketplaces. And very large platforms refer to those social media and marketplaces that have more than 45 million active users.

In this slide, you can see better the different tiers with requirements that are cumulative. So, starting from the right, the first tier—all intermediaries—they have few obligations. Then as you go to the left, the obligations are adding to the other.

So, basedon this duty of care scale, registries, as long as we establish that they are under the DSA scope, they would have the full due diligence obligations. They will have to post public points of contact for the authorities to contact them. If they are not established in the EU, they will have to designate EU legal representatives. They will have to publish the use of their services, and also they will have to publish annual reports concerning any actions they might take proactively with respect to content. And also, they will have to act in response to orders from courts, etc., to address legal content.

If a registry is also offering hosting services, they have additional obligations. Those would be to put in place notice and action regime, so that someone can actually contact them and report harmful or illegal content to be addressed.

Now, as we said, the DSA applies to providers of intermediary services. What is intermediary service under the DSA? In other words, to whom does the DSA apply?

What you see here in the slide is a copy/paste from the definitions that are there on the DSA. There are three categories: mere conduit, caching, hosting. With my very non-technical background, I will say mere conduit, caching, or hosting would basically mean that content is just

EN

passing by or sitting on your services. You're not creating content. Please feel free to correct me here.

Now, the exemption of liability. There is a catch here. To be able to qualify for the exemption for liability, you not only need to be an intermediary service as the DSA describes it, but you also need to qualify for an Information Society service, which is a completely other directive and will still be there.

So, as I said, you don't only need to be an intermediary service, but you also have to be an Information Society service to qualify for the liability exception.

Where do we come in? Why do we care? It's the cycle that I mentioned before. You see the recital on the slide. So, according to this recital, top-level domain name registries, and also DNS services, generally can also benefit from the exception of liability as long as their services qualifervices qualify as mere conduit, caching, or hosting services.

What needs to be noted is that the DSA does noe define what DNS services are. So we don't really know what DNS services are [targeted]. Regsitries are named here, but this general mentioning of DNS services creates some ambiguity.

That would bring us with two open questions. Which DNS services are intermediary services? And if they're intermediary services, are they also Information Society services? In other words, do they qualify for the liability exception?

ICANN|70
VIRTUAL COMMUNITY FORUM

So, for the registries, we have to ask these two questions as well. First, can we be considered as intermediary services? That is, do they qualify as one of the three—mere conduit, caching, or hosting? I've heard different views, I will say.

Then, the second question which is about the liability exception. Do they also qualify for Information Society services? As you see there, the definition of Information Society service. I will just suffice to say that this is, as I said, existing and it will stay there. And it is part of what was creating the ambiguity in the current [thing]. So, this is staying there.

I realize that I'm raising more questions than I am giving answers here, but that already gives you an idea of what needs to be clarified to ensure certainty. I would not even want to imagine what it would mean to have a framework on how to tackle illegal content that calls out DNS services but does not unintentionally effectively steal them from liability from third-party content.

Where is the DSA proposal right now? It has left the hands of the commission. The commission makes the proposals and it has entered the legislative debate, which is now [inaudible] parliament and the council.

This is just an estimation and will take at least two to three years before we see that adopted. And that's, again, just an estimation and I would say it's an optimistic one.

There is one public consultation on the proposed act that is still open until the end of the month. ICANN Org intends to highlight the points

that I just raised with you to policymakers, so we can make sure that it is crystal clear, things are crystal clear. Actually, and the more people who voice these concerns, the better.

And this concludes the presentation on DSA. Nacho, would you like me to continue?

NACHO AMADOZ: I do. I'm sorry because we can give you less time that the one we indicated. But I have a couple of questions and I will keep them in mind. So, if you can give us the same overview about the network information, the security blah-blah-blah. Please go ahead, yeah.

ELENA PLEXIDA: Thank you so much. And [inaudible] as brief as possible. Everyone's tensionon has been concentrated on the [inaudible] by now, I think. Article 23, which is about the WHOIS registration data. But there is much more of DNS in NIS2 and that's mostly what I would like to bring to your attention.

So NIS2 is a proposal to reform an existing directive in Europe, the one that is there from 2016. DNS providers are already included in this existing directive as operators of essential services. The difference with this new proposal is that, before it was up to an EU member state to say—to identify—which operators of essential services are actually essential within the DNS. And in that context, some member states in the EU have identified operators of essential services whereas others

did not. The point is that it was a patchwork and it was confusing, so one of the goals of the reform was actually to harmonize those [inaudible] and how to identify DNS operators.

And how did the European Commission propose to harmonize this criteria? Well, very simply, there are no [criteria] anymore. DNS operators are automatically qualify as essential entities without the need for member states to identify them. They are essential entities. That's it. And they have a set of obligations, of course, that I will tell you about.

When it comes to [inaudible] to DNS, the NIS2 [inaudible] the DSA contains a definition of DNS applies to all providers of DNS services along the DNS resolution chain, including operators of root name servers, TLD name servers, authoritive name servers in regards to the resolvers. So, everything. We even see that we have coverage of the root servers.

We have here as well the [extra] territorial scope of the GDPR. As long as an operator offers services in Europe, they're on the scope and they have to appoint a legal representative if they're not established in Europe.

And just to make the scope on DNS even wider, the small and micro business exceptions do not apply to TLD name registries and DNS service providers.

So, you see the scope is super wide here. I will put it in the words of our CTO when I was asking him about the scope. So, he told me that the

scope is so wide that even a personal resolver that you download on your laptop, the way things are written, that's also under scope right now. It is [inaudible] that that was the intent. It goes without saying registrars are clearly under scope.

All right. What does it mean to be under scope of NIS2 as an essential service provider? You have a set of responsibilities—a big set of responsibilities—is about security management measures. Another big set of responsibilities is reporting obligations. So, any important incident of your services, you have to report it to European authorities.

And finally, you have to provide contact details to ENISA who is making up a registry over essential registries. There's a lot of detail under that but I will not go into it at all.

There are also sanctions. If you fail to meet the security and reporting obligations, there will also be sanctions—fines, that the member states will be fined.

And then, I'm done with the scope [which is super wide] as I said. We come to the domain name registration provisions. We have Article 23 which will also have a recital. This Article 23 proposes requirements for registration data. It aims to make collection, maintenance, and providing access to legitimate access seekers and obligation under law. Also, registries and entities providing domain name registration services will have to collect and maintain accurate and complete registration data. It requires publication of domain name registration data that is not personal data.

Now, the requirements that are there are very high level. Without specifying, for example, what registration data is needed to be considered complete or what registration data is needed to consider them accurate? Or who is a legitimate access seeker? Those things are not specified in there.

A good thing we see with this article and good potential is that it could potentially, if [inaudible] that way, give the registries the possibility to process registration data under a legal obligation, which would mean Article 6.1C under GDPR. Whereas now we have article 6.1F which is registries will have to do the balancing test whenever they need, for example, to disclose data if they need to disclose data. That could be an improvement if applied like that.

Another issue we see—there are many issues like there is international data transfers where you also need the legal basis, and this article does not even touch on that.

Again, this proposal has left the hands of the Commission [inside the] European Parliament and Council side. It will take less time, just an estimation to be adopted by that. But then because it is a directive, it will go to the member states. We'll have to transpose it in national legislation.

And I finish here, Nacho.

NACHO AMADOZ: Thank you very much, Elena. That was an effort to try to compile in so quickly. Thank you. Thank you so much. I guess there are many questions because there are many topics that may be a huge impact on our activities.

I have a hand from Mike. Hi, Mike. But I have also two comments on the chatroom, so let me go first to the comments. Rubens said, "Being a directive means that it requires member states' laws to be binding." Being a directive means that it needs to be transposed by member states, so that they need to create a law. But the directive has a binding effect as well. It's not a regulation that is … Go ahead.

ELENA PLEXIDA: The difference is, when you have a regulation, it applies … The moment it is adopted, it applies directly to everyone that is under scope. When you have a directive, it does not apply automatically. First, it has to go to the member states and they have to put it in national legislation. But it is binding for them to put it in national legislation. We can put it that way.

NACHO AMADOZ: Right. And Maxim said, "No law so far and NIS2 was a draft some time ago." Not sure if it is an actual directive now, but we are going to an 18-month timeframe, you said?

EN

ELENA PLEXIDA: Well, yes. This proposal was tabled in December, so it's just being discussed. We foresee—just an estimation—around two years for the two co-legislators to discuss with European parliament and the council. When they decide, then the 18 months kicks in. So it's a long time. Thank you.

NACHO AMADOZ: Thank you, Elena. Mike, please speak extremely brief because we have only three minutes until the hour and I guess I can allow us some more minutes to run our last presentation.

MIKE: I will keep it quick. Elena, I actually read through all 121 comments that were submitted as part of the NIST comment period that just closed, and one of the things that was interesting is there was a contradiction. There were some groups, such as ICANN, that were talking for a narrowing of a DNS provider definition on technical grounds. But then there were another group of people arguing for an expanse of the DNS provider definition based on functional grounds. They were mentioning privacy-proxy providers, resellers, etc.

So, I was wondering, can you give any insight on where ICANN sees as how to reconcile those two different views on how that important definitional term is going to be defined, particularly in light of it also being referenced in the DNS, the DSA.

ICANN|70
VIRTUAL COMMUNITY FORUM

ELENA PLEXIDA: Thank you, Michael. This is an excellent question, as always. I don't have much insight internally, but I will say the following. To try to reconcile or actually understand the tool, I would say we need to see NIS2 as two parts, as I explained before. The one part that has to do with the scope, so the security and reporting obligations of NIS2 and the other part that has to do with the registration, with the WHOIS obligations.

So, where you saw in the contributions, people asking for narrowing the scope, they were referring to this application of security obligations and reporting obligations on entities that are doubtful, that are critical. If [my laptop crashes], then I only have problem with resolution of anyone else.

Where as well you saw, where we saw, [inaudible] calling for an expansion, they were calling for an expansion with respect to the application of the WHOIS provisions. So these people were saying, "Are you sure that you're covering everything? You're covering registries, you're covering registrars, but we also have privacy-proxy. Maybe you should consider that." That's an interesting point. I don't see one does not go without the other.

MIKE: Thank you. I think I did it in three minutes, too.

ICANN|70
VIRTUAL COMMUNITY FORUM

NACHO AMADOZ: You did indeed. Thank you very much, Elena. We'll get back to these at some point because it's a long way from being approved or a definitive text. So we'll have time for more questions and thank you again for joining us. And next slide, please.

We get to last item. Dion, I'm sorry, you're already on extended time. How much time do we have, ICANN staff?

SUE SHULER: Hey Nacho, we're currently at the top of the hour. We are still standing.

NACHO AMADOZ: But we have three or four more minutes, so that we can at least see the presentation from Dion?

SUE SHULER: I'm going to say yes. They're not stopping us.

NACHO AMADOZ: Thank you very much. They're not stopping us so far. So, Dion, go ahead, please.

DION GOUDKUIL: Thank you very much, Nacho. I'll try to make it as brief as possible. Maybe you can go to the next slide.

IDtrust is a security certificate initiative founded by Mijndomein, .amsterdam, and .frl. We can go to the next slide. I think something happened with the presentation because it's not looking as how I shared it. But no matter.

So, what we did is we did a kind of research on the use of certificates, service certificates, TLS certificates in the market, and what we see is that most of them are founded and created by US companies. And if we can go to the next slide, we also take a look of course at the number of issuers and where they're sourced, and we see of course that the majority of of the markets is done by Let's Encrypt. So there won't be such a big surprise. If we could go to the next slide, I'll try to make it as fast as possible.

We also took a look at the extended validation certificates and that's where we see that there is still a lack, 32% representing the EU market where the top three is U.K., Holland, and Germany. They also are issued by CA, Certificate Authorities, based in the US. If we can go to the next slide.

What we see is there is a big liability there because making use of certificates who are issued from US companies, there's a small issue there because there's a liability because we share customer data, personal data or company data. If we look at the privacy issue, which is no longer active, there's still not a good solution for it. And what we also see, there's not an EU-based certificate authority which provides these kinds of services.

ICANN|70
VIRTUAL COMMUNITY FORUM

So, we see certain problems which are going to solve. So, what our initiative is, we are going to start up and we are already working on it, to set up a European certificate authority following completely the EU rules and legislation, so we can cover that issue.

Next to that, we are also going to support a Let's Encrypt kind of initiative where we supply free certificates, but based on certificate authority in the EU. And we're going to automate the validation process as much as possible. So if we have done a validation of a company and a company needs a certificate, we're going to use the validation which we did before to supply the certificate. In that case, we can lower the costs. And that's kind of a disruptive business model, because at this moment, we see that the certificate authorities charge the amount of money every time again if you need a new certificate.

Next to it, we are not only going to supply domain-validated certificates, but we're also going to offer a range of additional certificates which have a higher quality, ranging from extended validation to personal validative certificates.

And next to that, if we look at Let's Encrypt, a lot of companies use it, a lot of hosters, registrars, but they don't have any form of support. So there's not a service-level agreement and there's also a risk barrier. If they have an issue, then they're kind of left in the open. And of course that's also what we're going to offer. And if we can go to the next slide.

So, that's what our mission and vision is and I think we can move to the next slide, if we look at the limited time we have.

ICANN|70
VIRTUAL COMMUNITY FORUM

So, we see a profit and a non-profit model and a foundation part which will supply the Let's Encrypt certificates. It's, of course, doing that for free. And there's a profit part which is going to supply the high-quality certificates which also of course need more time to create them and to issue them. If we can go to the next slide.

We see there's different roles in the hierarchy where we see that the certificate authority with the foundation, they supply the free domain validated certificate. And what we're looking for is to cooperate with the registries because the registries supply the domain name, and the idea here is, which we're already pitching with several registries—we're really optimistic about it—is that we're going to bundle it with a domain name where we do the validation for the domain-validated certificate and we supply the domain name including the [fee] certificates to the customer. That way we can increase the quality of the validation, so there's less issues with customers or Mickey Mouse kind of registrations and we can increase the level of security because we can encrypt the certificates and the traffic to the website. And I think we go to the next slide.

Based on the registry model, we see that we can work together with different kind of registries and form the foundation. So we've been talking with several registries, as I mentioned before, and the next idea is we could catch up because there are already been done a lot of research and work in the past by several registries to do this themselves, when if we can unite the efforts, knowledge, and everything in place, then we can really make this work. So that's kind of

I C A N N|7 0
VIRTUAL COMMUNITY FORUM

what we're looking for. So, I think if we go to the next slide, we kind of give some context about the setup.

So, we have the foundation, of course, who operates the CA, the Let's Encrypt alternative. We have the business part which supplies the higher value certificates. We have the registries who can bundle the certificates with the domain names. And of course we have the registrars, the resellers, and customers who consume the certificates. So, if we can go to the next slide.

This is kind of a question and a pitch. The idea is are there any participants here who would like to follow-up and explore this more in detail?

NACHO AMADOZ: We have independent reasons to actually look at that, so we can maybe etake this privately because [there's a lot of other things going]. But very much interested in pushing for greater availability of solutions in the style of Let's Encrypt and having more than one solution is already [inaudible] in itself because the excressive reliance on a single party is not a good idea anyway, so it's good to have new initiatives and [inaudible]. So, very much interested in working with that.

DION GOUDKUIL: Okay, great. So, I'll share my contact details in the chat because people are asking for it.

NACHO AMADOZ: I was going to say exactly that. Mike Palage was asking about your contact details. Apart from sharing them on the chat, Sue has already warned me that we need to be out right away.

What we'll do is we will provide the membership with this information and with a proposal as to how we, as a group, could consider joining the initiative and, again, open to any member to join any taskforce to discuss what could be our role. Where do we take it from the point where you are, how can we contribute to what you're doing and we'll get back to you.

DION GOUDKUIL: Great. Thank you very much.

NACHO AMADOZ: Thanks to you for joining us. We really need to be closing now. I don't know if anybody has any question or comment, but you know that I don't give you too much time to say them. I'm really sorry. We really need to close because ICANN is very strict on the time and we are already ten minutes past the time. Thank you, all, for coming. We tried to get many things packed together. We thought that it was good to have them so that you could be where we are in the different things that we are doing.

We can get back together on the list. We can organize another meeting anytime. It doesn't need to be at GA. Just let us know if there's anything that you want us to provide you with more information and we'll get

ICANN|70
VIRTUAL COMMUNITY FORUM

back to you with the minutes and some actionable items that we think have detected throughout the section.

Okay, thank you, again. Thank you and stay safe and see you soon someday, we hope.

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

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]

ICANN|70
VIRTUAL COMMUNITY FORUM