**Global Domain Division Industry Summit**

**9 – 11 May 2017**

**Tuesday 9 May 09:05-10:15**

**GDD Organization Mission and Vision**

* Session began with an intro to GDD and its work, followed by questions/comments from the room.
* Re: New gTLDs, question was raised whether GDD can start work related to future rounds/procedures in some areas before the Subsequent Procedures PDP finishes its work.
* Akram would like to meet with SubPro leadership to see what work might be able to move forward from the PDP’s perspective.
* Jeff asked Akram what GDD sees as the top issues that need to be resolved before ICANN organization can get started with its work.
* Jeff: Important to get support on making progress on controversial issues. One issue that is important to the GAC is geo names. The WG needs support from stakeholders, Board, and ICANN staff to help work with the GAC to move this forward.

**Tuesday 9 May 10:30-12:00**

**Service & Policy Implementation**

* Focus of the session – Data Protection and Privacy (RDAP is listed on the agenda, but this item was postponed to Thursday)
* Sebastien Ducos presented a Geo TLD group survey on implementation of work related to the General Data Protection Regulation: level of awareness, implementation status, measures taken to date ([https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/GeoTLD-GDPR)](https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/GeoTLD-GDPR%29)
	+ 55 responses so far, more in depth discussions with smaller group planned through case studies.
	+ Many of the responses will come from ccTLDs, but lessons may be applicable in the gTLD space. Report expected by ICANN59.
* RySG/RrSG asked ICANN to look into GDPR and help provide advice about how to be compliant.
* Cross- functional group has been developed within ICANN to investigate impact on contracts and ICANN as an organization. ICANN is looking at data elements in contract, looking at ways to engage with DPAs to educate and get information about impacts.
* ICANN is working to get a report out as soon as possible so there is time for contracted parties to implement.
* This work also touches on policy development, so it’s important to work with the community on finding solutions.
* This is a limited exercise related to RDS and contractual terms. The legal analysis won’t provide definitive response on how to comply, but results of the legal analysis as it applies to the community will be shared. Ultimately, registries and registrars will need to decide themselves what they do about compliance.
* Goran: the goal is to find out everything we can, share with the community, and work together to find solutions.
* Concerns raised about the new trigger – DPAs will not put anything in writing until they have already fined the company, so the trigger doesn’t work.
* Comment - If ICANN wants contracted parties to comply local law and contracts, and they are mutually exclusive, contracted parties will choose to follow local law. The GDPR is not open for negotiation.
* Akram: ICANN can’t change the policy without working with the community. We aren’t going to enforce something that will make you do something illegal in your local jurisdiction. In every contract, there is an implicit or explicit requirement to comply with law.
* Akram: There is a mechanism to get a waiver, there is now a new trigger. This is being reviewed to see if there might be additional triggers that can be used. ICANN needs proof that you are at odds with local law in order to provide a waiver.
* Comment - It is important for registries and registrars to start taking inventory of data practices. It would be helpful to have a more definitive timeline on feedback from the ICANN organization.
* Comment – it does not make sense that every single entity needs to provide this evidence for the waiver even though they are all working in the same countries and under the same laws.
* Registries and registrars have started a working group to refresh working document (built on EWG report table?) about data and uses that they can share with ICANN. It is important that ICANN and community work together early and collaborate early rather than in parallel.
* Goran is running a cross-organization team on this issue. If we think of this a contract compliance issue as opposed to a policy development issue, can we identify an advisory group that could work with the organizational team to drill down to details and work on solutions.
* Possible next step -– decide how to structure the GDPR session scheduled for Johannesburg and who to bring into the conversation.
* ACTION ITEMS before ICANN59: Form advisory group that ICANN can work with; Collect data elements and uses to make the conversations more concrete.
* Other suggestions from the audience: have timeframe and plan for work to be done, appoint a Privacy Officer, consider a pressure valve of blanket waiver for registrars and thick registries.
* Examples of GDPR implementation work underway –
	+ SIDN implemented a two-tier system – public WHOIS, gated access provided if someone provides a reason
	+ Michele: Full data audit underway -- what is collected, why it is collect, how long and where it is being retained

**Tuesday 9 May 13:00-14:15**

**Roundtable with ICANN Compliance & Consumer Safeguards Team**

* There is an ad hoc community working group on compliance. The group does not make changes, but creates a forum for discussion.
* Contracted parties have raised some concerns about this group -- conversations on compliance and safeguards that should not be taking place in silos.
* IPC and RySG worked together to come up with recommendations that compliance is looking at how to implement.
* Contracted parties raised contractual and process issues they would like to discuss further, many of which centered around standardization.
* The conversation shifted to a discussion about complaints handling. Staff and community discussed distinctions between the Ombudsman and Complaints office function.

**Tuesday 9 May 14:45-16:00**

**Review of ICANN Process Documentation Initiative**

* 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.
* Three currently process flow charts are underway, on GNSO Policy Process, Specific Reviews (originally AOC), Advanced 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.
* This is a cross departmental effort with Policy & GDD.
* 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.
* The organization will create simple manuals based on the flow charts to provide a consistent point of reference.
* This works serves as a baseline to enable easier documentation of changes going forward.
* Identifying and understanding how to handle impasses is part of the project.
* Question to community - how should the community be involved and what should be the next steps?
* Keith Drazek: 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? Answer: some things, like those involving the Empowered Community are still relatively new, but the majority is already based in existing documentation, such as GNSO processes.
* 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.
* Donna Austin: It will be interesting to see the documentation on how 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.
* Goran: Sometimes even when something is documented, such as in the bylaws, people interpret the text differently. Sometimes different processes run in parallel. 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?
* 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?
* 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.
* Jonathan Robinson: what are the outcomes and benefits of the project?
* 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.
* Chris Disspain: An example of 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.
* Wen Zhai: Regarding changing Specification 12 of the RAA – she has 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?
* Craig Schwartz: 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.
* Jonathan Robinson: Suggestion – hold a high interest session that focusses on impasses and the issues behind them in policy related processes.
* 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. 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.
* Jonathan Robinson: Is this the right place to be having this conversation or should this be moved to the Policy Forum?
* Goran: The initiative is partly about policy, but it is also important to document other things in the organization for issues such as the complaints procedure.
* Constantine Russos: Regarding the CPE review for .music, new accountability committee is being set up, 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?
* 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 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.

**Wednesday 10 May 09:00-10:30**

**Registry & Registrar Issues**

Possible topics for discussion revisited:

Standardization

* Pre-pay model/post-pay model
* Block lists
* Formats for billing

Transfer policy, privacy/proxy, Spec 12, New gTLD rounds, RDAP, Universal Acceptance RRA amendments, Unaccredited registrars, EPP normalization, Cross-field validation, Compliance KPIs, IDN validation standardization

* more time in CANN meetings to address operational concerns
* Improved need for coordination on specific issues between ICANN meetings
* Need for greater organization and coordination throughout the year

**Wednesday 10 May 10:45-12:00**

**Breakout Sessions**

1. Registry onboarding

2. Fees (reduction and excess application fees)

3. TLD Backend Operator Migration

Breakout 1.

* Ended up focusing on relationship between registries and registrars, communication throughout lifecycle (what, when, how)
* Stats.centr.org/registrarportal

Breakout 2.

* Touched on a suggestion to reduce specific fees - registry application fee and annual fee
* Core has proposal for reductions of annual fee
* Objective metrics for assessing qualifications for reduction would be needed
* Discussing led to debate about all the money ICANN collects and the appropriate size of ICANN’s budget
* Current budget process focuses on operating plan, sense that some initiatives are written with a blank check, rarely a question of costs and priority. How do you replenish reserve fund?
* 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.

Breakout 3.

* 50 TLDs have transitioned from one to another this year. Burden on registry, not being compensated, resources are overburdened.

**Wednesday 10 May 13:30-15:00**

**Breakout Sessions (Registries)**

WHOIS Conflicts with National Law – Eleeza

* Paper has been published in response to the February GNSO Council resolution. The Resolution asked ICANN to review the new trigger and other possible triggers. The paper is open for public comment now
* Next review of the procedure will commence no later than October 1 2017 per request by GNSO Council.
* Donna Austin: The new trigger is largely ineffective. We were voting on whether the trigger is consistent with policy, not whether it is a good trigger. This is our opportunity to change it. The community needs to pay attention, comment, and participate now.

Global Amendments to the Registry Agreement – Amanda

* If ICANN Board approves (likely in the next month), ICANN will issue legal notification to Registry Operators, 60 days before changes become effective.

Spec 11 3(b) – Winnie

* Advisory: Guidance document for registries – how to establish compliance regarding measures related to security threats.
* The document will be circulated next week to those on the mailing list.

RSEP - Winnie

* Staff is providing information about the types of requests they see, SLAs,
* There will board action very soon on RSEPs for Country and Territory Names.
* New GDD portal will have information about time elapsed on both ICANN and registry services .
* ICANN is working to have pre-approved tables where you don’t have to go through the RSEP process.
* RSEP group will be restarted to discuss issues and concerns with staff.

Registry Services – Winnie

* Clarification provided on process – documents submitted are reviewed by legal, technical, and other staffers and it is a committee decision.
* Service manager is the owner of sheparding RSEP submissions along with a representative from Christine’s team.

IDN - Francisco

* IDN Guidelines – public comment closed on May 2. Comments are being analyzed. They will part of the requirements in the contract. Guidelines were developed by a group of community members.

EBERO Tests – Francisco

* ICANN has done exercises with two providers –identified opportunities for improvement but considers the exercises successful.

**Wednesday 10 May 15:30-16:30**

**Service & Policy Implementation**

RDAP

* Members of the community are working with ICANN on set of operational profiles.
* Registries and ICANN eager to implement RDAP, although there are some disagreements about the specifics of what needs to happen to do this formally
* RySG Proposal – RDAP pilot that registries could implement building on the RFCs, using different deployments, presumably for a limited time. People involved would share information with ICANN about their work to be used as input into the policy development process. The proposal includes a requirement that those doing the pilot would also run WHOIS in parallel until WHOIS is deprecated.
* RySG submitted a letter to ICANN org with an overview of the proposal and would like to kick of a trial as soon as possible.
* Cyrus: GDPR is coming up, and there is a broader issue of data privacy around world. His vision is to build an RDS on RDAP. There are concerns – there are ties between implementation of RDAP and the RDS-PDP, which is several years away from being complete. It is not clear if the PDP will specify the profile for RDAP. Having an opportunity to experiment with RDAP is a good idea. By the time the PDP and IRT are complete, it could be five years from now. That is a long time for a pilot. Why not experiment for 6 months and then work together to build a profile?
* Stephanie Duchesneau: Policy requirements are needed to make a profile. ICANN profile is replicating some of the flaws in WHOIS that wouldn’t take advantage of the RDAP benefits.
* Cyrus: let’s build a profile from scratch after the 6 month trial, working together.
* Mark: The letter is intended to break the impasse that has existed since 2015. Registries want to dialogue and move forward. This a first step.
* Cyrus: We need to make sure we put in the right checks and balances and have a clear timeline, so we can have a replacement for WHOIS sooner rather than later, getting to a standard, mutually agreed upon profile.
* Keith Drazek: There is a common desire to move forward with a pilot and have the pilot to inform the PDP WG. WHOIS is the result of policy process. The policy mechanism to replace it is the PDP WG. Would like to hear more about interim process for expediting, and any possible circumvention of GNSO procedures.
* Cyrus: we are not suggesting parallel process or shortcutting the PDP process, only trying to help move things forward.
* Rubens Kuhl: The timeline of the pilot should start after GDPR is addressed. Unless RDAP is part of the solution, we won’t have resources to deal with implementation before that. While we are discussing RDAP we are changing WHOIS (Thick WHOIS policy, WHOIS guidelines).
* Jim Galvin: PDP is multi-phased – maybe the pilot could be aligned with the phases of the PDP. Profiles that come from policy will be quite complete. He is hesitant to create complete profile before outputs of the policy process. We don’t want to build on WHOIS profile approach. There is an opportunity to find a timeline we can all work with, which is probably not 6 months.
* Michele Neylon: The profiles stem from policy, but the policy work will not go into designing profiles. EWG looked at issues that kicked off PDP. The PDP WG won’t get into operationalizing. RDAP supports many features, like gating and differentiated access. If we put RDAP in live temporarily, it will likely become the de facto. If we put a profile in place to match the current WHOIS, there will be pushback. It’s fine to experiment, but there are concerns about putting the cart before the horse with design and implementation before policy.
* Akram: As long as we show that there is progress we can extend the pilot, but we should set interim milestones.
* Cyrus: Agrees that a period of experimentation is a good thing. The RySG and ICANN org should revisit proposal leveraging comments from this session and come up with proposed milestones to implement.
* Registries will provide revised proposal.

**Wednesday 10 May 16:30-17:00**

**Wrap-up and Summary**

* Recap from the morning – there was an agreement to create a committee working with staff to coordinate around the issue of standardization.
* Notes will be circulated on morning breakout sessions.

**Thursday 11 May 09:00-10:30**

**Breakout Session Brand TLDs: What is Working in the Market and the Importance of Internal Stakeholder Engagement**

Presentation – Tony from Neustar

* Makeway.world
* .Brands are starting to be used in different ways:
	+ microsite: specific site built for a specific reason, no overlap with .com site
	+ full transition: In the middle of a project, decided to make the move, not necessarily a business case but went for it
	+ Vanity URLS – adds new entry point to the same content

Presentation from .club

* Different reasons for using .Brands
	+ Consistent gateway – redirect as needed
	+ Email
	+ Social media communities
	+ Using words that are important to you on both sides of the dot

Jen Wolfe

* .brand lifecycle
* How and when do you sell inside your company?

Karen Day

* Shared experience with launching .brand at SAS.

**Thursday 11 May 11:30-12:00**

**Wrap-up and Summary**

* Discussion on the possibility of having tracks for future GDD Summit meetings.
	+ Allows participants to follow their interests but might create disconnect between people participating in different discussions
* Participants said that it is important to set the agenda early so people can know whether is helpful to come to the event
* 450 participants in a big room – it was hard to hear and see
* The event is growing in size, may need to rethink format
* Kristina Rosette: Tuesday was too policy focused. This event should be operationally focused and should not cover policy.
* 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.
* Craig Schwartz: it is helpful to have something about policy for smaller companies that don’t attend the bigger meetings.
* Keith Drazek: stakeholder groups could be better about promoting agenda items and being prepared to talk about it.
* 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.