

2017 Global Domain Division (GDD) Summit Notes – 9 May 2017

<b>Session:</b>	<b>GDD Organization Mission and Vision</b>
<b>Date &amp; Time:</b>	9 May, 0905-1030 UTC+1
<b>Notes Author:</b>	Aysegul Tekce
<b>Presenter(s)</b>	Akram Atallah
<b>Discussion Points Covered</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Atallah explained GDD’s mission: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ serve the public interest</li> <li>○ provide choice and competition to the community</li> <li>○ partner and engage with the community</li> <li>○ implement the policies the community and Board approve</li> <li>○ implement systems, processes to facilitate implementation of policies by registrars and registries</li> </ul> </li> <li>• GDD consists of; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Domain Name System (DNS) &amp; Industry Engagement</li> <li>○ GDD Ops</li> <li>○ Internet Assigned Numbers Authority (IANA) functions</li> <li>○ Product Management</li> <li>○ Strategic Programs</li> </ul> </li> <li>• To achieve trust, Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN) Org and GDD must be responsible and keep others responsible for ensuring global trust in the DNS</li> <li>• Privacy issues are a top priority. Global effects for ICANN Org and contracted parties. Structural impacts on WHOIS, and other data requirements</li> <li>• Operational excellence is another top priority to help contracted parties stay in compliance and focus on their businesses.</li> <li>• Next round – reviews need to finish first and ICANN Org is eager to expedite moving forward with the next round</li> </ul>

**Q&A:**

- Amadeu i Abril (CORE): why are the Registry (Ry) and (Regitrar) Rr sessions closed to ICANN Org (referring to sessions on 10 May morning)?
- Keith Drasek (Verisign): Who are the product managers and what are the products Akram mentioned)? Where does the IDN program fit in the chart? Could you provide more details on the responsibilities for each team?
  - Atallah: GDD Portal, our website, Centralized Zone Data Service (CZDS) , these are our technical online tools, they bridge the gap between requester and developers. IDN falls under DNS & Industry Engagement, Cyrus Namazi's team.
  - Jonathan Robinson (Afilias): Interested in trust as a recurring theme. Do you think the industry is going up or down in terms of trust? What's bothering you or your team?
    - Atallah: Trust has to do with the reach of ICANN now. With the New Generic Top Level Domain (gTLD) Program, awareness is more global. There are more players in the ICANN ecosystem. We are more visible now, and we need to start thinking how we put things in place proactively to ensure our systems are more robust, rules are robust and behavior is more transparent.
    - Lousewies van der Laan (ICANN Board): Edelman Trust Index shows we have high trust in technology but not in business. In the political world, people are waking up to the Internet.
- Jennifer Wolfe (Moderator): What's still remaining from the first round of new gTLDs? What new systems need to be created for a next round of the New gTLD Program?
  - Atallah: Majority of remaining applications are delayed either due to accountability mechanisms or because we need to make a decision on how to sunset them or move them forward. The Applicant Guidebook was missing how to deal with lingering applications. Making progress on that. The systems we used for the current round are no longer supported or available. Leveraging plans for privacy/proxy accreditation for new gTLD applications. It's also important to understand whether the application period will be a window or first-in, first-out. The new systems will need to consider this distinction.
  - Jeff Neuman (Valideus, co-chair of New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group (WG)): There are areas we can start working without

	<p>going through the PDP. On more controversial issues, working toward making proposals. Starting with the geographic names issue, which is a big issue for governments. This will be a discussion item at ICANN 59. Akram, what are your top 10 issues that need to be resolved before we can take the next step? Are there gating items you can list?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Donna Austin (Neustar): If we can have some more communication from ICANN Org on how much lead time you need to prepare, and the order of things you need would be helpful. Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice (CCT) Review team is almost finished. What is the next step in the process? The CDAR report – what happens with that now? Does the Board have to consider it? Does it go to a PDP? Some of these steps are unclear.</li> <li>○ Atallah: On CCT Review, we’re providing an operational view on what they are recommending. Their recommendation will go to Board for approval, then to ICANN Org for implementation.</li> <li>○ Rob Hall (Momentous): I encourage ICANN to work on a continuous application process instead of rounds. Otherwise, we will end up having the same discussions every five years.</li> <li>○ Neuman: PDP WG is looking for input on this topic. The group is considering two windows in a year for example. If we do first-come first-serve, there is still work to do, thus we need windows. The PDP WG is still open to volunteers.</li> <li>○ Atallah: Important for early participation to help shape the policies in a way that is conducive to good business practices in the future.</li> <li>○ Ben McIlwain (Google): Think of registries as platforms.</li> <li>○ Neuman: This is something the PDP WG is thinking about.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Action Items</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● ICANN Org to provide a list of products. The Product Management team is working on for the community. (Chris Gift)</li> <li>● ICANN Org to provide Subpro PDP WG with responses to questions raised by Jeff Neuman and Donna Austin. (Trang Nguyen)</li> <li>● ICANN to Clarify steps (lead time needed to prepare, the order of things, next steps in process, what happens with CDAR report? Does it go to PDP? Does the Board consider it? before Johannesburg (Atallah)</li> </ul>

<b>Session:</b>	<b>Service &amp; Policy Implementation Session (Data Privacy/Protection Issues and RDAP)</b>
<b>Date &amp; Time:</b>	9 May 2017 – 1030-1230 UTC+1
<b>Notes Author:</b>	Winnie Yu
<b>Panelists:</b>	Sebastian Ducos (geoTLD.group), Becky Burr (ICANN Board), Akram Atallah
<b>Discussion Points Covered in Panel:</b>	<p><i>Ducos</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General Data Protection Regulation – European Union legislation. effective starting 25 May 2018.</li> <li>• Applicable to all in Europe and those that do business in Europe; regulates how EU citizens and residents’ data is stored and used.</li> <li>• geoTLD.group surveying its members on how they are complying with the new regulation</li> <li>• What Data Protection Authority (DPA) is interested is for registries to explain how they’re running their business in a way that’s compliant with the framework</li> </ul> <p><i>Atallah</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ICANN’s work - Looked at it in 2 ways: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. ICANN contracts</li> <li>2. ICANN organization itself (example: How it impacts ICANN’s vendors and staff who are all over the globe)</li> </ol> </li> <li>• ICANN contracts: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Examining data elements required in ICANN contract</li> <li>○ How does ICANN engage with authorities in the European Union?</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Reconciling GDPR with consensus policies and working with community to find a way</li> </ul> <p><i>Burr</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policies <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Be mindful of what is within ICANN’s remit <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ What ICANN requires registries and registrars to collect and publish with regards to WHOIS</li> <li>▪ Contractual compliance with regards to data such as escrow</li> <li>▪ This is not about data registries/registrar collect for hosting purposes or billing purposes. That data does not fall within ICANN’s mission and remit.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>• Legal review request <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ In order to provide meaningful legal advice, it’s important to have a matrix of all data elements that may be impacted and how they are used.</li> <li>○ Until the group can come up with this matrix, the response they’ll get from DPAs on what this will effect will be ‘it depends’</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

**Q&A:**

- Reg Levy: Can ICANN provide its full legal analysis to the community?
  - Burr: The analysis internal to ICANN's handling of information related to, for example, employees in the European Union, is likely privileged but more General Information about the Whois stuff is intended to further General community discussion. In the end, every Registry and Registrar is going to have to decide what they are going to do in respect to compliance and then there can be arguments about it.
  - James Bladel (GoDaddy): ICANN ought to share that analysis with contracted parties.
  - Göran Marby: Coordinating this effort because we're in this together. ICANN will share our analysis with you.
- Michele Neylon (Blacknight): Purposes and matrix have been covered in the Expert Working Group (EWG) report. The Contract needs to be changed and not open for negotiation with the community.
  - Atallah: All agreements require you to comply with local laws.
  - Burr: ICANN Organization understands that, the Board understands that we have much more unity of interest than we've had are facing the challenge together.
- Registries/Registrars working on something to be shared with ICANN so that we can continue working on this.
- Thomas Rickert (eco Internet Industry Association): It's important that we work on this together and that registries/registrar engage with ICANN about how best the legal assessment be undertaken:
  - This exercise is not subject to community negotiation or deliberation
  - It's important we get this right and right for everyone
  - It's important we take everyone get us and get community buy-in. We need to get facts right and then legal assessment. We need someone w credibility w ICANN and also with authority
  - Balanced approach of fulfilling legal requirements but not overreaching, as some may use this to push their own interests
- Suggestion to apply waiver across all registries/registrar as opposed to one-off basis
  - Christian Muller: How much proof does ICANN need in order to provide waiver? Do you need proof from every single company that's affected? There's a perception that ICANN is working against them and not on their side.
  - Amadeu Abril: When the Registrar Accreditation Agreement (RAA) was negotiated regarding data etc., it took one year despite ICANN lawyers in agreement with CORE. It cannot

	<p>take one year again. Later, other Spanish registrars had to engage with ICANN again for another waiver for that to be applied to them. It makes no sense for ICANN to force individual organizations to show proof and legal assessment over and over again.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ICANN 59: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ DPAs participating in session on the GDPR. If we can get the matrix filled out, we can have concrete discussions on compliance for each data element.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Suggestion for waiver to not be EU-specific <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Rob Hall: Perhaps we should look at this from the perspective that a good portion of the world is saying this is not ok. We don't want ICANN to do carve-outs that say 'If this is a registrant in EU, here's Set A of rules. If not a registrant in EU, the old rules apply.' That's why we don't want a waiver per registry.</li> <li>○ Keith Drazek: What Rob just called for is discussed in the Next Gen PDP WG. That's not going to conclude in years. What we have now is a problem that is imminent. One thing we need to have on our list of deliverables is a side track. All the things that we listed need to be done, but we need a pressure valve of a blanket waiver.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Contracted party to get ahead of the law. WHOIS Conflicts with National Law Procedure was recently updated with an additional trigger.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Action Items</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Goran committed to ICANN Organization sharing as much information as possible from its legal analysis with the community.</li> <li>• Form advisory committee and the advisory group to form timeline/plan before Joburg. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ ICANN to appoint representatives for its side from staff</li> <li>○ Contracted parties to appoint representatives</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Advisory committee to come up with 1) matrix of uses for each data element and 2) timeframe/plan so that a resolution can be implemented by May 2018</li> <li>• Request for ICANN Organization to provide ICANN expert that contracted parties can direct questions to – such as a privacy officer</li> <li>• Request for ICANN Organization to make legal analysis not just applicable to this specific instance of GDPR in EU but on a global level</li> </ul>

<b>Session:</b>	<b>Roundtable with ICANN Compliance &amp; Consumer Safeguards Team</b>
<b>Date &amp; Time:</b>	9 May 1300-1415 UTC+1
<b>Notes Author:</b>	Emily Barabas
<b>Presenter(s)</b>	Jamie Hedlund, Maguy Serad, Jennifer Scott, Roger Lim
<b>Discussion Points Covered</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is an ad hoc community working group on compliance. The group does not make changes but creates a forum for discussion.</li> <li>• Contracted parties have raised some concerns about this group -- conversations on compliance and safeguards that should not be taking place in silos.</li> <li>• Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice Review Team (CCTRT) has a number of recommendations related to transparency regarding complaints. Compliance team is working to implement those recommendations ahead of the CCTRT's work reaching a conclusion.</li> <li>• Intellectual Property Constituency (IPC) and Registry Stakeholder Group (RySG) worked together to come up with recommendations that compliance is looking at how to implement.</li> </ul>
<b>Q&amp;A:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amadeu Abril: Would like more information about the substance of complaints. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Serad: Compliance complaints are vetted and reviewed by a human, regardless of automated system.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Contracted parties raised contractual and process issues they would like to discuss further, many of which centered around standardization.</li> <li>• The conversation shifted to a discussion about complaints handling. Staff and community discussed distinctions between the ombudsman and complaints office function.</li> </ul>
<b>Session:</b>	<b>Review of ICANN Process Documentation Initiative</b>
<b>Date &amp; Time:</b>	9 May 2017 – 1445-1600 UTC +1
<b>Notes Author:</b>	Emily Barabas
<b>Panelists:</b>	Goran Marby, Theresa Swinehart, Trang Nguyen
<b>Discussion Points Covered in Panel:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Goran and the leadership team provided an overview of the project, noting that it is still in the discovery phase and input from the community is needed.</li> </ul> <p>Three current process flow charts are presented: Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO) Policy Process, Specific Reviews (originally Affirmation of Commitments (AoC)) and Empowered Community Processes (specifically on Approval Powers). Printed versions were posted in the hallway and the community was encouraged to comment using sticky notes on the documents.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is a cross-departmental effort with Policy &amp; GDD.</li> <li>• The goal is to improve clarity around processes, especially for the community, document processes and procedures from inception to implementation, key decisions, and key participation points.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The organization will create simple manuals based on the flow charts to provide a consistent point of reference.</li> <li>• This works serves as a baseline to enable easier documentation of changes going forward.</li> <li>• Identifying and understanding how to handle impasses is part of the project.</li> <li>• Question to the community - how should the community be involved and what should be the next steps?</li> </ul>
<p><b>Q&amp;A:</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Keith Drasek (Verisign): This project is helpful to promote transparency, also understanding how processes fit together. Some processes are rooted in documented processes, others are more based on historical practice. What percent of outputs from this project are coming from existing documentation? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Answer: some things, like those involving the Empowered Community, are still relatively new, but the majority is already based on existing documentation, such as GNSO processes.</li> <li>○ Christine’s team will also be developing process flows and manuals – how the organization supports the Board in process and decision-making. This will further support transparency.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Donna Austin: It will be interesting to see the documentation on how Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC) Advice and integration of GAC advice is handled by the Board. The GNSO provides comments on GAC advice and sometimes feels that the GAC advice is not advice. It would be helpful for the documentation to capture that. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Goran: Sometimes even when something is documented, such as in the bylaws, people interpret the text differently. It is important to see the interlinking between the processes and make sure processes meet in the right places. For example, how can we capture interdependencies between review processes and policy development and make sure we flag them early?</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Michele Neylon: Is there any effort to translate this into plainer or simpler language, and not just what it is but why it matters to people? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Goran: ICANN has a problem with language and acronyms. Trying to change the narrative about ICANN to make it more clear and relatable. There are too many websites and you can’t find anything. Documents are not well organized. We need to change the way both staff and community use language.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Jonathan Robinson: What are the outcomes and benefits of the project?</li> </ul>



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Goran: How many people really understand the process we are involved in? This is the problem the project is trying to solve. At any given point in time, it needs to be clear where we are in the process and what comes next. This is an issue of transparency.</li> <li>○ Chris Disspain: An example of an impasse - where there is a conflict between GAC advice and GNSO policy recommendations – what happens if we reject both? We don't have a process for this. This is a classic example of an impasse. Empowered Community powers – the Board has decided to make a change to a fundamental Bylaws. The Empowered Community must sign off, but we don't have a process for this yet. These are the types of things that impact the way we do business at ICANN.</li> <li>● Wen Zhai: Regarding changing Specification 12 of the RAA – have received several replies from GDD, all saying that they are still checking. What is the process for changing something? What type of input should the community have? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Craig Schwartz: An Informal working group is working on a process, circulated within registry stakeholder group. ICANN doesn't need to do this by itself. It is important to have a process for modifying Spec 12 and people can get involved in the discussion.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Jonathan Robinson: Suggestion – hold a high-interest session that focusses on impasses and the issues behind them in policy related processes. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Goran – It's good for the community and participants to know about the overall processes as well. We should do both. We are not proposing anything. We are just trying to document and share information. The community has to take the initiative to decide how to take it further. Where there are a lot of people involved in the blockages for a very long time – this can be connected to the issue of volunteer fatigue.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Constantine Russos: Regarding the CPE review for .music, new accountability committee that is being set up, the composition of the Board committee is changing. Will there be an opportunity for parties to present to the committee again? On the reconsideration determination, who is the auditor and when will there be a decision? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Chris Disspain: IRP made decisions that they Board decided it was important to investigate. It's taken longer than expected. It would make sense for .music to have an opportunity to present again given the changing structure of the committees. Chris will find out who that auditor is and share that information. They will decide if and when they want to contact the parties involved</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
--	---

<b>Action Items</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Community members interested in providing feedback on process maps should contact Theresa Swinehart or Trang Nguyen.</li> <li>Chris Disspain will find out who that auditor is on the reconsideration determination and share that information (requested by Constatine Russos)</li> </ul>
<b>Session:</b>	<b>Wrap-up and Summary/Review Wednesday's Agendas</b>
<b>Date &amp; Time:</b>	9 May 2017 16:00-17:00 UTC+1
<b>Notes Author:</b>	Lisa Carter
<b>Presenter(s)</b>	Jennifer Wolfe
<b>Discussion Points Covered</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Morning closed sessions will now be open to ICANN organization</li> <li>Wrap-up of topics covered</li> <li>Review of items from to be discussed on 10 May</li> <li>Open items to be discussed during morning and afternoon sessions on 10 May</li> </ul>
<b>Key Takeaways</b>	<p>Topics of Discussion for Wednesday, May 10 to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fees: Reduction in Fees and excess applicant fees</li> <li>Spec 12</li> <li>Abuse Policy</li> <li>Amending RRA</li> <li>Universal acceptance</li> <li>Small Group w/ Registry and Registrar – Data Privacy Best Practices/ICANN legal.</li> <li>Open gTLDs to non-accredited ICANN registrars</li> <li>EPP Normalization</li> <li>Compliance Key Performance Indicators (KPI)</li> <li>Cross-field validation</li> <li>IDN validation standardization</li> <li>ICANN Budget and Operating Plan</li> <li>New gTLD rounds and RDAP to be discussed 10 May</li> </ul>

## 2017 GDD Summit – 10 May 2017

<b>Session:</b>	<b>Breakout Sessions (Registries)</b>
<b>Date &amp; Time:</b>	10 May 2017 13:30 – 15:00 UTC +1
<b>Notes Author:</b>	Yuko Green
<b>Presenter(s)</b>	Karla Hakansson, Amanda Fessenden, Winnie Yu, Eleeza Agopian, Francisco Arias, Cyrus Namazi
<b>Discussion Points Covered</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Registry Services &amp; Engagement team introduction</li> <li>• Overview of Revised WHOIS Conflicts with National Law Procedure: Paper published 3 May for public comment in response to GNSO council’s resolution. New trigger proposed to allow contracted parties to present a letter from local jurisdiction that demonstrates the conflict.</li> <li>• Global Amendment to the RA: General updated provided. Next step is for ICANN Board approval on 17 May, then for ICANN to issue legal notifications to Eligible RO to kick off 60 day change period before the new RA becomes effective.</li> <li>• RA Spec 11(3)(b): ICANN and RySG Working Group is working on the guidance document to establish compliance with spec 11 (3)(b)</li> <li>• Registry Services Evaluation Process (RSEP): Presented some of the new services in RSEP, such as Removal of Searchable Whois, Gateway, pre-registration gTop-Level Domain (TLD) platform, Intergovernmental Organization (IGO)/INGO labels, Verification code for EPP, Change to auto-renew model, and Alternative DRP. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Overall average completion time shared, which included all the back-and-forth between ICANN and RO as well as public comment period for Amendment. The presentation was not the representation of ICANN’s SLT.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• IDN: IDN Guideline was published for Public Comment, which closed on 2 May. Analysis of the public comment underway.</li> <li>• Emergency Back-End Registry Operator (EBERO) test: The Second exercise was conducted last week with the Top-Level Domain (TLD) that was in the process of termination. The exercise was successful.</li> <li>• URS password: Password update was due by the end of April and encouraged ROs to update if not done so yet.</li> <li>• Public domain list: Controlled interruption record can be left as long as you don’t activate names. If you activated names and still have controlled interruption information, you would hear from ICANN.</li> </ul>
<b>Q&amp;A and Discussion:</b>	<p><b>WHOIS conflict with national law</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Donna Austin (GNSO Council) seek community to participate in Public Comment period.</li> </ul>

	<p><b>Global Amendment to RA</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Maxim Alzova (FATID) shared a concern about electronic signatures which are not binding in some local jurisdictions. Cyrus Namazi stated that this will be handled on an exception basis.</li> </ul> <p><b>RA Spec 11(3)(b)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Crystal Ondo (Donuts) stated that RySG will circulate the latest guidance document next week within the mailing list.</li> </ul> <p><b>RSEP</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Maxim Alzova (FATID) and Stephanie Duchesneau (Google) expressed dissatisfaction with the provided data points on the average time it takes for RSEP. The process takes too long. Also suggested to separate the outliers and normal cases to create the average data, and also obtain the data per RSEP category.</li> <li>Christine Willett stated that the timeline presented in the presentation is all inclusive of back-and-forth between ICANN and RO, not the time stated within the policy (15 days each for review). Naming Services Portal will provide better visibility between ICANN and RO's timeline.</li> <li>Crystal Ondo (Donuts) stated that the CTN was discussed during last GDD summit and it is still not addressed. Cyrus Namazi responded that there will be a proposal made to the ICANN Board in two weeks to bring CTN matter to closure.</li> <li>Crystal Ondo (Donuts) asked if we are still doing the IDN through RSEP when the scripts are already approved. Winnie Yu responded that RSEP is made from a consensus policy thus ICANN Org is not in a position to change. Cyrus Namazi explained that the pre-approved IDN tables are in progress and IDN RSEP will go away as long as a pre-approved table is utilized.</li> <li>Rob Hall asked 1) if all RSEP requires amendment, and 2) if it is helpful that RO includes the suggested RA amendment in the request? Suggested creating templated form for each category to cut down on back-and-forth and shorten the timeline. ICANN Organization responded that 1) some legacy agreements do not, and 2) Yes, a suggested amendment is helpful.</li> <li>Crystal Ondo (Donuts) asked who makes the decision whether the proposed change requires RSEP. Jonathan Robinson also asked why RSEP does not have one point person who owns the service. Cyrus Namazi replied that it is a collaborative decision. The service itself is owned by Winnie Yu.</li> <li>Rubens Kuhl (NIC.br) stated that RSEP is a Domain Name Supporting Organization (DNSO) policy, not Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO) policy. Suggested that the policy should be reviewed and the process should be evaluated. Cyrus Namazi proposed that ICANN re-review the policy and engage back with the community in a few weeks.</li> </ul>
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stephanie Duchesneau (Google) stated that her last RSEP took 3 months and only 3 days were due to her pending response.</li> </ul> <p><b>EBERO Test</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rubens Kuhl (NIC.br) asked if there were any lessons learned for future planning of the transition between losing and gaining RSP. Francisco Arias stated that all exercises were uncooperative transition scenario due to failure, not planned transition.</li> </ul> <p><b>General Comments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Elaine Pruis (Donuts) shared that the assignment process has improved vastly between her first and the latest. She also thanked ICANN for asking the community what is not working for improvement.</li> <li>Crystal Ondo (Donuts) asked for an update on the beta of Naming Services Portal. Neeraj Sood stated that a document will be published with the beta tester in the next couple of weeks. Another beta testing will be conducted during the summer.</li> </ul>
<b>Action Items</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ICANN to re-review the RSEP policy then hold a call with interested community members the week of 22 May</li> <li>Cyrus Namazi, Paul Diaz, and Stephanie Duchesneau (Google) to discuss the different requirements of RSEP within new gTLD and legacy RAs</li> </ul>
<b>Session:</b>	<b>Registrar Breakout Session</b>
<b>Date &amp; Time:</b>	10 May 2017 1330-1530 UTC +1
<b>Notes Author:</b>	Caitlin Tubergen
<b>Presenter(s)</b>	Graeme Bunton (Moderator), Jennifer Gore
<b>Discussion Points Covered</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thick Whois Migration Waiver - GDPR</li> <li>Across-Field Address Validation</li> <li>Operations Working Group</li> <li>Inter Registrar Transfer Policy – Part C Outstanding Issue</li> </ul>
<b>Q&amp;A and Discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>General Data Protection Regulation:</b></li> <li>Graeme Bunton: If registrars move from thick and then have the resulting changes because of GDPR, it will create duplicate work. Can there be a waiver/delay to move from thin to thick?</li> <li>Tom Keller: Can we work together to address the Board through a letter? (Similar to ^C)</li> <li><b>Operations Working Group:</b></li> <li>Graeme Bunton: product people, developers, where we can begin to address and tackle technical issues. The goal is not to be policy wonks, but people that care about solving operational problems.</li> <li><b>Across-Field Address Validation (AFAV):</b></li> <li>Chris Pelling: Can the Working Group vote now? If there is any cost to the registrar or registrant, this is not commercially feasible.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tom Keller: Registrars Stakeholder Group (RrSG) should commission a study/white paper so that RrSG can come up with the document itself (rather than ICANN coming up with it).</li> <li>• Tom Barrett: Should it go back to the GNSO?</li> <li>• Michele Neylon: take a vote on it after having facts to rely on; disagrees with Tom Barrett since it's not a policy, but the contract, it should not go to the GNSO</li> <li>• Heath Dixon: At best, if we produce a report of why this is not commercially feasible, it will close the issue for now. In a year or two, the same groups that are demanding the effort now will be coming back asking us to prove it again. The best we can hope for is we can justify our vote this time around. If we establish the precedent that it is incumbent upon us to prove the negative, we'll continue to be in the process and raise the bar of what we have to prove.</li> </ul> <p>Inter Registrar Transfer Policy- Part C (IRTP-C) Issue:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Graeme: It's actually on registrars to pitch where they want to resolve this conflict:</li> <li>• Push that interaction to the Privacy and Proxy Services Accreditation Implementation (PPSAI) Implementation Review Team (IRT)</li> <li>• GNSO to reconstitute the IRTP-C IRT</li> <li>• PPSAI IRT and invite former members of IRTP-C (seemed to be preferred path)</li> <li>• Graeme to write letter to ICANN/GNSO</li> </ul>
--	---

<p><b>Key Takeaways and Action Items</b></p>	<p><b>GDPR:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No consensus on path forward for GDPR, but perhaps it's something that we should consider. Maybe investigate sending a letter to the GNSO.</li> </ul> <p><b>AFAV:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Three approaches have been discussed. 1) we don't produce a report or white paper – we figure out a mechanism to have a vote and push the community to prove it's feasible. 2) work with ICANN in the working group and do the Request for Proposal (RFP) and then have a vote. 3) the registrar stakeholder group does its own RFP and we bring that to the community. There is no consensus in the room on which approach to take.</li> </ul> <p><b>IRTP-C Policy Issue:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Graeme will respond to ICANN with suggested approach</li> </ul> <p><b>Different Contract Interpretations from ICANN Compliance:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Graeme would like to have RrSG members compile a list of actual compliance tickets and instances to discuss with Jamie at the Compliance/Registrar Session in Abu Dhabi</li> <li>• Jennifer Gore: In response to Heath Dixon's question, find out what would happen next if registrars agree to vote on AFAV and not continue with an RFP/report. (no specific commitment date)</li> <li>• Jennifer Gore: What is the crossover between RrSG and Registrar Whois Working Group for AFAV? (no specific commitment date)</li> <li>• Graeme Bunton: Graeme to respond to ICANN/GNSO on how the RrSG would like to proceed with open P/P issue for Change of Registrant</li> </ul>
--	---

<b>Session:</b>	<b>Breakout Session - Engaging with ICANN and GDD for New Registries (Brand Registries)</b>
<b>Date &amp; Time:</b>	10 May 2017, 10.45-12.00 UTC +1
<b>Notes Author:</b>	Aysegul Tekce
<b>Presenter(s)</b>	Linett Nardone, Karla Hakansson, Lisa Carter, Amanda Fessenden, Winnie Yu, Francisco Arias, Jeffrey Bedser
<b>Discussion Points Covered</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Communicating beyond ICANN Stakeholder Groups. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ ICANN Organization sends out mass communications, there are blog and announcements on icann.org.</li> <li>○ Multiple contacts receiving these communications, ICANN has heard different opinions on this.</li> <li>○ Request to build a more flexible system to customize contacts for different topics for different registries.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Global Amendment to base new gTLD RA <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Next steps: Board will consider approving week of 16 May; if approved, legal notification will go to ROs within 2-3 weeks</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Centralized Zone Data Service (CZDS) :</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ How does it relate to brands? Why do the files need to be publicly available?</li> <li>○ Jeff Neuman: is there a way for brands not to publish their zones, RA says yes but is it possible?</li> <li>○ It depends on the TLD.</li> <li>○ Discussion around CZDS users and whether they are trusted parties.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Material Subcontracting Arrangement: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Any subcontracting arrangement change that relates to any critical function for the gTLD (DNS, Domain Name System Security Extensions (DNSSEC), EPP, RDDS). Data escrow changes now have a separate process.</li> <li>○ Jeff Neuman: Diagram does not indicate the timing for the process, brands ask about them and we don't know what to tell them. It would be great to have KPIs internally, SLAs externally.</li> <li>○ Winnie Yu: ICANN Organization is reviewing documents and updating them with timing.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Informational Guides &amp; Training Resources: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Creating a business continuity plan guide</li> <li>○ Registry Services and Engagement team is looking for additional opportunities to provide educational tools, webinars based on discussion topics of interest</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Invoicing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Martin Kuechenthal (Le Marit): We receive invoices very late and it's confusing for clients.</li> <li>○ Linett: Make sure your billing contact /email is up-to-date, there is FAQ for billing</li> <li>○ Jeff Neuman: We don't know when we will receive invoices. A timeline would be helpful.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Cecilia Smith: Confusion in the last month because we've received past due notices.</li> </ul>
<b>Action Items</b> (include due date and owner(s))	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ICANN Organization will begin discussions on how to address requests for a flexible communication platform – allowing different contacts for different topics. (Karla Hakkanson) BRG will provide feedback on this.</li> <li>• Material Subcontracting Agreement (MSA): timelines to be provided in how-to-guides.</li> <li>• Invoices: publish a timeline on when the RO should receive invoices (hard copy and digital)</li> </ul>
<b>Session:</b>	<b>Breakout Session Review</b>
<b>Date &amp; Time:</b>	10 May 2017 – 10.45-12.00 UTC +1
<b>Notes Author:</b>	Emily Barabas
<b>Presenter(s)</b>	Jennifer Wolfe, Paul Dias introduce topics; break into discussion groups
<b>Discussion Points Covered</b>	<p>Breakout 1 - Registry onboarding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Focused on relationship between registries and registrars, communication throughout lifecycle (what, when, how)</li> <li>• Stats.centri.org/registrar portal</li> </ul> <p>Breakout 2 - Fees (reduction and excess application fees)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Touched on a suggestion to reduce specific fees - registry application fee and annual fee</li> <li>• Council of Registrars (CORE) Association has proposal for reductions of annual fee</li> <li>• Objective metrics for assessing qualifications for reduction would be needed</li> <li>• Discussion led to debate about the money ICANN collects and the appropriate size of ICANN's budget</li> <li>• The current budget process focuses on the operating plan, since some initiatives are written with a blank check, there is rarely a question of costs and priority. How do you replenish reserve fund?</li> <li>• Suggestion to direct staff to estimate costs of different recommendations to implement so that WGs understand the costs and can prioritize recommendations (and possibly more than PDPs, also reviews) accordingly.</li> </ul> <p>Breakout 3 - TLD Backend Operator Migration</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 50 TLDs have transitioned from one to another this year. The burden on the registry is not being compensated, resources are overburdened.</li> </ul>

<b>Session:</b>	<b>Service &amp; Policy Implementation (Session 2 of 2)</b>
<b>Date &amp; Time:</b>	10 May, 15:30-16:30
<b>Notes Author:</b>	Linett Nardone
<b>Presenter(s)</b>	Marc Anderson (Verisign) and Stephanie Duchesneau (Google)
<b>Discussion Points:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RSEP <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Concerns by some contracted parties</li> <li>○ Some contracted parties concerned that all RSEPs were not included in data presented</li> <li>○ Felt data was not impressive - ICANN org is hiding SLTs for RSEPs which are in holding pattern due to Board resolutions (i.e. CTN)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• RDAP <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ RySG forwarded letter to ICANN org prior to GDD Summit regarding RDAP pilot</li> <li>○ Letter is to help get passed impasse <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 12 suggested guidelines</li> <li>▪ Voluntary pilot program</li> <li>▪ May implement as soon as reasonable</li> <li>▪ Pilot will inform and help existing PDP</li> <li>▪ During pilot, Whois service must run in parallel</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Start from clean slate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Google currently has two profiles; Verisign currently has one profile</li> <li>▪ Exchange information to come up with universal new profile</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ RDAP foundation to build registration service that can be flexible enough, without undue work</li> <li>○ Take current experiences and build as time goes on</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

<p><b>Action Items</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RSEP <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ RySG to restart group discussions with ICANN org to discuss concerns - call for participants</li> <li>○ Schedule call in two weeks with RySG working group</li> </ul> </li> <li>• RDAP Pilot <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ ICANN org to review recommendation and provide response to RySG</li> <li>○ Akram Atallah – ICANN org <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Michele Nylon to clarify concerns</li> <li>▪ Small issues being debated</li> <li>▪ Show that there is process, can extend period</li> <li>▪ Set milestones and check that we're meeting dates - want to be sure progress is being made</li> <li>▪ If can agree on framework, we can move forward</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Cyrus Namazi – ICANN Org <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Go back and revisit proposal provided, come up with plan with milestones and don't want to make it too difficult - keep simple</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ ICANN should work with TLD operators</li> <li>▪ Deadlocked for 2 yrs</li> <li>▪ Shared issue with contracted parties</li> <li>▪ Next steps - rework proposal and put thought into session</li> <li>▪ Begin informal back/forth</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>
----------------------------	--

## 2017 GDD Summit – 11 May 2017

<b>Session:</b>	<b>Avalanche Botnets and How to Handle Them</b>
<b>Date &amp; Time:</b>	11 May 2017, 9:00-10:30 UTC +1
<b>Notes Author:</b>	Eduardo Alvarez
<b>Presenter(s)</b>	Benedict Addis: Shadowserver Foundation, Registrar of Last Resort Foundation, ICANN SSAC
<b>Discussion Points Covered</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overview of the Avalanche takedown from 2012-2016 for providing hosting and DNS services to criminals.</li> <li>• The impact was spread among legacy and new gTLDs, as well as some ccTLDs, using a domain generation algorithm to register domain names for criminal use.</li> <li>• During the operation, jurisdiction-specific legal sovereignty issues were raised.</li> <li>• Seized malicious domain names are used to identify malware victims, notify and assist in remediation via anti-virus companies who develop special malware removal tools. The Registrar used (Registrar of Last Resort) is an RAA 2013 accredited Registrar with no distinction from other accredited Registrars.</li> <li>• Positive global results are reported, taking down a criminal conglomerate which included arrests of involved administrators, victim remediation, seizing of servers used for criminal activities, raised awareness on malware, phishing, and spam. Statistics show the number of infected machines has dropped considerably compared to 2014.</li> </ul>
<b>Key Takeaways</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Protecting Registry Operators from liability was an important factor. New gTLD Registry Operators were cooperative also because Specification 11 in their Contract.</li> <li>• Encourage a proactive approach for Registries and Registrars to prevent criminal registrations, avoid the costs of negative impact on customers and handling abuse complaints.</li> </ul>
<b>Session:</b>	<b>Breakout Session, Brand TLDs &amp; Universal Acceptance</b>
<b>Date &amp; Time:</b>	11 May 2017, 09:00 – 10:30
<b>Notes Author:</b>	Amanda Fessenden
<b>Presenter(s)</b>	Martin Sutton, Tony Kirsch (Neustar), Jeff Sass (dotClub), Jennifer Wolfe and Karen Day
<b>Discussion Points Covered</b>	<p><i>.Brand TLD Status, Tony Kirsch</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Believes that the dot will become the most powerful symbol in global digital because it will create a new mechanism for connecting</li> <li>• Finding greater success in talking to marketers. As a result, Neustar built .brand Stats Hub (makeway.world) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ According to the data, usage is starting to rise – media, insurance, sports, larger companies</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Brands are being used in 3 main ways:</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Microsites – a specific site built for a specific reason. It does not compete with the standing .com site. Example: next100.bmw, environment.google, chime.aws. Probably close to ~600 of these.</li> <li>○ Full transitions – took their existing website and moved it to the .brand, about 14 companies have done so. Barclays.com redirects to home.barclays; home.saxo; global.canon. These projects happened because it made sense to bring the TLD in for a fresh start. This is a much harder sell.</li> <li>○ Vanity URLs – this provides the customer something unique. Brands are discovering this is a very powerful tool – home.mlb redirects to mlb.com, which creates an additional entry point to the main website. ~60 brands have done this. Examples: home.ford -&gt; ford.com. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ MLB: had 32 various websites representing one of each site. They brought these all under Yankees.com and improved their organic search. Now, Yankees.com redirects to newyork.yakees.mlb.com</li> <li>▪ Users only care how they get to a site. MLB’s identity is Yankees.com, but their content location is at newyork.yankees.mlb.com</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Longtail game is about empowering customers to find what they need – “it’s all about sign posts,” give people the ability to navigate. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Currently, MLB’s digital strategy directs everything to mlb.com; in the future, all of this will be under .mlb. It’s about the customer, not the brand. Yankees.mlb will now redirect like Yankees.com</li> </ul> </li> <li>● .neustar solution: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ started with registry.neustar</li> <li>○ Use .neustar for all short links rather than bitly</li> <li>○ Search.neustar to search the website</li> <li>○ Email addresses</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><i>Why .brand TLD? Tony Kirsch</i></p> <p>Neustar’s message: use .brand to tackle the five giant issues facing digital today.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Websites are no longer capable of navigation – websites are too big. Companies most likely have hundreds of content pages and no longer use navigation, but search to get through the website. Customers aren’t interested in clicking around on a website; they want immediate gratification. Websites in our current models don’t support that.</li> <li>○ Inefficient calls to action – companies have various ways for customers to bring them to content.</li> <li>○ Exponential growth in paid search – in 2016, expenditure in paid search was 47% of the average digital budget. Younger generations click on ads.</li> <li>○ Distractions - You can’t measure what you can’t see.</li> </ul>
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Speed – direct customers in a fast, direct way.</li> </ul> <p><i>Direct lessons when talking to marketers, brands, Tony Kirsch</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Do talk about: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ the customer experience; help customers find what they want</li> <li>○ improved return on advertising</li> <li>○ holistic digital presence</li> <li>○ quick wins, social media, campaigns – baby steps</li> <li>○ identify</li> <li>○ flexibility</li> <li>○ intuitive recall</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Don't talk about: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ talk about domain names. No one cares, they all think they have what they need</li> <li>○ Security/DNSSEC</li> <li>○ Websites</li> <li>○ Transformation</li> <li>○ Hosting</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><i>Marketing Aspects, Jeff Sass (dotClub)</i></p> <p>How can marketers utilize domain names, what is the value of domain names, and how can they leverage the value of domain names in the new landscape?</p> <p>The biggest opportunity is for marketing – marketers need to understand how important a good domain name is for marketing efforts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● It is a call to action – true in ad campaigns whether digital or physical. A domain name is one of a few calls to action that work in all the channels of marketing. People know what to do when they see a domain name. The more memorable the name, the more likely the customer will go to it.</li> <li>● More opportunities for creativity – example: ta.co</li> <li>● Domain names are lasting – if you spend money on the campaign, investing in the domain name and building content, that becomes an asset that lives on.</li> <li>● For brands – get them to think about a strategy for domain names that isn't just a portal to one domain name. Deep links –content buried in a website is difficult to find, especially as more things are happening on mobile devices. The portal model is more difficult. Leverage the new extensions as “deep links” to other aspects of your website. Examples: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Brand.shop</li> <li>○ Brand.news</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Shortcuts – a memorable, short domain name makes it easier to navigate and it sets an expectation about the content you're navigating to. In a mobile world, anything you can do to minimize the number of clicks is better. Can use a domain name to redirect to social presence, specific websites (like an Amazon webpage).</li> </ul>
--	---

	<p>Registrars have been making this easier to do by offering these services.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Premium names - New opportunity for businesses and brands to get short, valuable premium names. These keyword domains perform very well in SEO.             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Domain Name Association (DNA) just published an SEO study (thedna.org) to look at meaningful extensions and how well they perform in SEO. Findings: meaningful domains with a meaningful extensions generally perform equally to an older, more established domain extension. What does this mean? Domain meaning matters.</li> </ol> </li> <li>2. Email – A meaningful and memorable domain name creates a great email address. Some businesses are using new email addresses even if they haven’t changed over their company’s website. More creativity.</li> </ol> <p><i>Jenn Wolfe and Karen Day</i> <i>The Dot Brand Lifecycle</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There’s still no external pressure for brands to use these. Marketers push back because we’re already in a very complicated digital world so the question becomes: why are you adding one more complication to my plate? What is the value-add, how is this different, what about consumer confusion? Many say domain names don’t matter anymore. It’s a huge effort to convince marketers.</li> <li>• A status quo culture keeps the dot-brand on the shelf</li> <li>• Brands need executive level support for their TLDs to survive</li> <li>• Messages must be crafted for each internal stakeholder otherwise it won’t be a supported project</li> <li>• Budgets to obtain and hold the TLD is not significant, but the resource cost and budget for a marketing plan are significant.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Key Takeaways</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The .brand TLD’s company leadership needs to be convinced of the value in domain names. .brands need executive level support for the TLD to survive.</li> <li>• To these companies, it isn’t about the domain name, but the ways in which it can enhance the consumer experience.</li> <li>• Brands are slower to adopt use in their TLDs, but we’re starting to see more use of microsites, marketing campaigns, social media redirects.</li> </ul>

<b>Session:</b>	<b>DNS Primer</b>
<b>Date &amp; Time:</b>	11 May 2017, 10:30-11:30 UTC +1, 11 May
<b>Notes Author:</b>	Gustavo Lozano
<b>Presenter(s)</b>	Matt Larson
<b>Discussion Points Covered</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Short overview of DNS</li> <li>• DNS translates names into numbers</li> <li>• In early days, this was maintained by the Network Information Center (NIC) at the Stanford Research Institute</li> <li>• DNS is a distributed database; explored various components</li> <li>• The database structure is an inverted tree called the namespace, starting with the root, followed by top-level nodes, second-level and third-level nodes.</li> <li>• A domain is a node and everything below it (its descendants).</li> <li>• Description of domain name resolution</li> </ul>
<b>Session:</b>	<b>Wrap-up and Summary</b>
<b>Date &amp; Time:</b>	11 May 2017, 11:30-12:00 UTC +1
<b>Notes Author:</b>	Emily Barabas
<b>Presenter(s)</b>	Cyrus Namazi
<b>Discussion Points Covered</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discussion on the possibility of having tracks for future GDD Summit meetings. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Allows participants to follow their interests but might create disconnect between people participating in different discussions</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Participants said that it is important to set the agenda early so people can know whether is helpful to come to the event</li> <li>• 450 participants in a big room – it was hard to hear and see</li> <li>• The event is growing in size, may need to rethink format</li> <li>• Kristina Rosette: Tuesday was too policy focused. This event should be operationally focused and should not cover policy.</li> <li>• James Bladel: It’s hard to separate policy, operations, and other topics. We have very limited time to talk about policy issues at ICANN meetings. Policy discussions have commercial and operational implications. Technical and operational issues should be the focus here, but it’s hard to avoid touching on policy.</li> <li>• Craig Schwartz: It is helpful to have something about policy for smaller companies that don’t attend the bigger meetings.</li> <li>• Keith Drasek: Stakeholder groups could be better about promoting agenda items and being prepared to talk about it.</li> <li>• Pam Little: Registries and registrars need to be more prepared to dialogue coming into the sessions. They can optimize use of sessions by bringing in items to discuss and having takeaways and action items.</li> </ul>



## Summary of Action Items by Session

### GDD Organization Mission and Vision

- ICANN Organization promised to provide list of products Product Management team is working on to the community (Chris Gift)
- On next round: ICANN Organization promised to provide PDP WG more communication on how much time they have for presenting recommendations to the Board. (PDP WG and Trang)
- ICANN to Clarify steps (lead time needed to prepare, the order of things, next steps in process, what happens with CDAR report? Does it go to PDP? Does the Board consider it? before Johannesburg (Atallah)

### Service & Policy Implementation Session (Data Privacy/Protection Issues and RDAP)

- Goran committed to ICANN Organization sharing as much information as possible from its legal analysis with the community.
- Form advisory committee and the advisory group to form timeline/plan before Joburg.
  - ICANN to appoint representatives for its side from staff
  - Contracted parties to appoint representatives
- Advisory committee to come up with 1) matrix of uses for each data element and 2) timeframe/plan so that a resolution can be implemented by May 2018
- Request for ICANN Organization to provide ICANN expert that contracted parties can direct questions to – such as a privacy officer
- Request for ICANN Organization to make legal analysis not just applicable to this specific instance of GDPR in EU but on a global level

### Review of ICANN Process Documentation Initiative

- Community members interested in providing feedback on process maps should contact Theresa Swinehart or Trang Nguyen.
- Chris Disspain will find out who that auditor is on the reconsideration determination and share that information (requested by Constatine Russos)

### Breakout Session (Registries)

- ICANN to re-review the RSEP policy then hold a call with interested community members on the week of 22 May
- Cyrus Namazi, Paul Diaz, and Stephanie Duchesneau (Google) to discuss the different requirements of RSEP within New g and Legacy RAs

### Breakout Session (Registrars)

- Jennifer Gore: In response to Heath Dixon's question, find out what would happen next if registrars agree to vote on AFAV and not continue with an RFP/report. (no specific commitment date)
- Jennifer Gore: What is the crossover b/w RrSG and Registrar Whois Working Group for AFAV? (no specific commitment date)
- Graeme Bunton: Graeme to respond to ICANN/GNSO on how the RrSG would like to proceed with open P/P issue for Change of Registrant

## Breakout Session - Engaging with ICANN and GDD for New Registries (Brand Registries)

- ICANN Organization will begin discussions on how to address requests for a flexible communication platform – allowing different contacts for different topics. (Karla Hakkanson) BRG will provide feedback on this.
- MSA: timelines to be provided in how-to-guides.
- Invoices: publish a timeline on when the RO should receive invoices (hard copy and digital)

## Service & Policy Implementation (Session 2 of 2)

- RSEP
  - RySG to restart group discussions with ICANN org to discuss concerns - call for participants
  - Schedule call in two weeks with RySG working group
- RDAP Pilot
  - ICANN org to review recommendation and provide response to RySG
  - Akram Atallah – ICANN org
- Michele Nylon to clarify concerns
- Small issues being debated
- Show that there is process, can extend period
- Set milestones and check that we're meeting dates - want to be sure progress is being made
- If can agree on framework, we can move forward
  - Cyrus Namazi – ICANN Org
- Go back and revisit proposal provided, come up with plan with milestones and don't want to make it too difficult - keep simple
  - SSAC
- ICANN should work with TLD operators
- Deadlocked for 2 yrs
- Shared issue with contracted parties
- Next steps - rework proposal and put thought into session
- Begin informal back/forth

## Index of Acronyms

---

### A

Affirmation of Commitments · 8

---

### C

Centralized Zone Data Service · 2, 19  
Communications Coordination Work Team · 3  
Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice · 3  
Coordinated Universal Time · 1, 4, 7, 8, 11, 12, 16, 18, 21, 24, 28  
Council of Registrars · 1, 6, 21

---

### D

Domain · 1, 2, 12, 15, 19, 26, 27  
Domain Name Association · 27  
Domain Name Supporting Organization · 15  
Domain Name System · 1, 2, 19, 24, 28  
Domain Name System Security Extensions · 19, 26

---

### E

Emergency Back-End Registry Operator · 12, 15  
Expert Working Group · 5

---

### G

Generic Names Supporting Organization · 8, 9, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 31  
Generic Top Level Domain · 2, 11, 15, 19, 24  
Global Domains Division · 1, 2, 8, 10, 12, 14, 18, 22, 24, 28, 30, 31  
Governmental Advisory Committee · 9

---

### I

Implementation Recommendation Team (of new gTLDs) · 17  
Inter Registrar Transfer Policy- Part C (IRTP-C) · 14, 15  
Intellectual Property Constituency · 7  
Intergovernmental Organization · 12  
Internet Assigned Numbers Authority · 1  
Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers · 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 28, 30, 31

---

## *K*

Key Performance Indicators · 19

---

## *M*

Material Subcontracting Agreement (MSA) · 17, 26

---

## *N*

Network Information Center · 15, 28

---

## *P*

Panel · 4, 8

Policy Development Process · 2, 3, 4, 6, 22, 30

Privacy and Proxy Services Accreditation Implementation (PPSAI) · 14

---

## *R*

Registrar Accreditation Agreement · 6, 10, 24

Registrars Stakeholder Group · 16, 17, 18, 31

Registry · 1

Registry Services Evaluation Policy · 12, 14, 15, 21, 23, 30, 31

Registry Services Evaluation Process · 12, 14, 15, 21, 23, 30, 31

Registry Stakeholder Group · 7, 12, 14, 22, 23, 31

Request for Proposal · 17, 31

---

## *S*

Security and Stability Advisory Committee · 23, 24, 31

---

## *T*

Top-Level Domain · 12, 19, 21, 23, 24, 25, 27, 28, 31

---

## *W*

Working Group · 2, 3, 4, 6, 30

---