

---

SAN JUAN – ICANN GDD: Registry Operator Roundtable  
Thursday, March 15, 2018 – 08:30 to 09:45 AST  
ICANN61 | San Juan, Puerto Rico

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: This is ICANN GDD Registry Operator Roundtable in Room 101-A from 8:30 to 9:45.

DENNIS CHANG: Welcome, everyone. Come join us at the table. There's plenty of room here. Let's get this started. This is the Registry Operator Roundtable, and it's for us. Us meaning anybody who is involved in the registry services and support. We have registry operators, the backend operators, those who work with the registry, and of course we have our ICANN Registry Services and Engagement Center and the GDD support staff here too.

So let's start with introducing ourselves. The way we do that is we say our name: My name is Dennis Chang. And what we do: I'm with ICANN. I am the GDD Registry Services and Engagement Program Director. Acronym for an acronym. But generally, I do what they ask me to do to help you, and mostly I'm involved in policy implementation right now. And my ICANN age: I started in 2011, so I'm 7 years old. So that's what I'd like you to do. Share with us your name, what you do, and your ICANN age. So let's see how old you are. Use the mic.

---

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

---

DIETMAR LENDEN: My name is Dietmar Lenden from Valideus in London. We represent 29 TLDs – well, I do anyway – registry TLDs. ICANN age: 2001, so what’s that? 17? Yeah, 17. There you go. Can’t you tell. I mean, I look it. Getting gray and old.

SARA FREIXA: My name is Sara Freixa, and I come from Uniregistry. Uniregistry manages 25 TLDs. And my ICANN age? This started on Saturday, so six days. But I’ve been in the industry for 16 years. I’m just new to the registry side.

CRAIG SCHWARTZ: Good morning. My name is Craig Schwartz. I’m the Managing Director of fTLD Registry Services. We operate the .bank and .insurance top-level domains. My ICANN age is 12.

MARTIN KÜCHENTHAL: Good morning. My name is Martin Küchenthal, CEO and Founder of LEMARIT, a German [inaudible] domain registrar and [we are also serving] a couple of dot brands. This morning my ICANN age is very old, but in general I would say I think it’s 7 years.

---

[ANITA MARJIVA]: Good morning, everyone. My name is [Anita Marjiva]. I'm coming with LEMARIT [either], and I'm representing a couple of brand registries. My ICANN age is I think 3 years.

KATRIN OHLMER: Katrin Ohlmer, Founder and CEO of DOTZON. We are representing quite some brands and also operating .berlin and .hamburg. My ICANN age is 12.

DIRK KRISCHENOWSKI: Dirk Krischenowski, heading .berlin and .hamburg as registries. My ICANN age is 13.

AARON HICKMANN: Good morning, everyone. Aaron Hickmann, GDD Operations and ICANN org. I'm a little over 4.

KARLA HAKANSSON: Good morning, everyone. Karla Hakansson, GDD Registry Services. ICANN age, 9 going on 10.

RUSS WEINSTEIN: I'm Russ Weinstein. I'm the Director of Registry Services and Engagement for ICANN. My ICANN age is 5.

---

LISA CARTER: Hi, I'm Lisa Carter, GDD Registry Services and Engagement Manager. I am 17 months old.

AMANDA FESSENDEN: I am Amanda Fessenden. I work at ICANN also on Registry Services, and I am 6 ½ years old.

MARC ANDERSON: Good morning, everyone. I'm Marc Anderson from Verisign. I've been in the industry about 13 years, but I've only been coming to ICANN meetings since the Dublin meeting.

[MICHEL BOLAND]: Hi. My name is [Michel Boland], and [I am] a registry backend operator for about 30 registries, and I've been with ICANN for 2 years now.

[NINA MILLER]: [Nina Miller] also with [inaudible], and I'm with ICANN for 3 ½ years.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Steinar Grøtterød, .global. My first ICANN meeting was in 2000, Yokohama, so I'm pretty old in this business. Thank you.

---

DENNIS TAN: Good morning, everyone. Dennis Tan, Platform Manager with Verisign. My ICANN age is 6 years old.

RAYMOND ZYLSTRA: Raymond Zylstra, Director of Policy and Compliance at Neustar. I've been in the industry since 2002. ICANN, I think the first one was 2008, so that would be 10 years.

KAREN DAY: Karen Day, Registry Operations Manager at SAS. My first was Dublin.

FRANCISCO ARIAS: Francisco Arias, GDD Technical Services, ICANN. I've been in the industry since '98.

WIM DEGEZELLE: Hi. Wim Degezelle. I'm not specifically for a registry but help the Registries Stakeholder Group with document development.

DENNIS CHANG: What's your ICANN age?

WIM DEGEZELLE: Help me. Since Lisbon.

---

JODY KOLKER: Jody Kolker, GoDaddy. I've been in the industry since 2001.

ZUAN ZHANG: Hello, everyone. I'm Zuan Zhang from CONAC. We are operating two Chinese new gTLDs. I'm based in Beijing. I have been in ICANN for 4 years. Thank you.

[RAHEL ZAFER]: Hi, I'm [Rahel Zafer]. I didn't quite catch what we're supposed to share, but I'm legal counsel for Google Registry, and I've been working with them for a little over a year.

NICK AXELROD-McLEOD: Hi, I'm Nick Axelrod-McLeod with ICANN org Compliance, and my ICANN age is 11 months.

JENNIFER SCOTT: Jennifer Scott, ICANN org, 4 ½ years.

RICHARD SCHREIER: Good morning. Richard Schreier with CIRA. We're the ccTLD operator for .ca. We also operate .sx and .kiwi. My first ICANN meeting was in the tin can in Luxembourg in 2005, so I guess I'm just coming up on 13.

---

MORGAN GOVAARS: Hi, I'm Morgan Govaars with ICANN org, GDD Operations. I've been with ICANN for about 4 ½ years.

EMILY BARABAS: Hi, I'm Emily Barabas, ICANN org supporting policy development, and I've been with ICANN about a year and a half.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: Samantha Demetriou with Verisign. I've been doing ICANN stuff on and off since 2011, so 7 years.

DENNIS CHANG: Your name, who you are, and ICANN age. Right here. Go ahead. Use the mic.

MARTIN SUTTON: You were just going to start again were you? It's Martin Sutton from the Brand Registry Group. Years? I've got no idea now. It must be 10.

DENNIS CHANG: 10 years old?

MARTIN SUTTON: Yeah.

---

DENNIS CHANG: Okay. Thank you, everyone, for coming. Oh, I missed you. Go ahead.

KRISTINA ROSETTE: My plan has been foiled. Kristina Rosette. I lead the legal team that supports Amazon Registry Services. I have been involved in ICANN since 2006 but involved in the industry from a brand protection perspective since about 2003.

DENNIS CHANG: Very good. Anybody else? Well, welcome again. This is the roundtable. The roundtable traditionally at ICANN here, at the Registry Operator Roundtable, is run as an “unconference.” What does that mean? This is the only unconference session we have at ICANN.

What that means is that we have no preset agenda. So the way we select our topics is by you all suggesting topics and we vote on them and that’s what we talk about. So after a whole week of ICANN sessions – and many, many session and were all attending different sessions – I’m sure you had lots of your questions answered.

---

But at the same time, probably new questions [arose], right? And maybe you have ideas of how to solve your own problem that you'd like to share with the other registry operators. And not only to the ICANN staff, but if you have questions, to your fellow registry operators, this is the opportunity to ask those questions to each other.

So this is the home for all of us, all of the ICANN organization, meaning that industry, registry operators, backend operators, and of course the staff all get together in a common mutual goal of how do we do our work better in the future. Before we all leave after the public comment sessions, we want to go ahead and have this last opportunity to share.

Come on up. Sit down. Go ahead and introduce yourself now that you're here.

**BRIAN CIMBOLIC:** Sorry about that. Brian Cimboric. I'm with Public Interest Registry.

**DENNIS CHANG:** Excellent. Let's start by everybody suggesting a topic of discussion. Who has a topic that you'd like to propose for our session today. Go ahead.

---

DIETMAR LENDEN: Hi. I've got three topics.

DENNIS CHANG: That's fine. Go ahead.

DIETMAR LENDEN: First one is, NSP, Naming Services Portal Ts and Cs update would be the first one. Second one, CCDS is going into the Naming Services Portal. What happens if you haven't signed up? Three, if you haven't signed up, CCDS is now going through the NSP. What is Compliance going to do when you are not able to fulfill your obligations as a contracted party of approving CCDS requests? Thank you.

DENNIS CHANG: Anybody else? Go ahead.

KATRIN OHLMER: One topic related to the annual audit. There used to be this prenotification whether you would be selected for the audit or not and apparently this has changed. So I would like to know whether we could get some insights why this process has changed and if so, how we can revert it to the old format.

---

DENNIS CHANG: Okay.

CRAIG SCHWARTZ: Hi. I would say the RRA amendment process.

DENNIS CHANG: Want to talk about that, okay. Any other topics. This side?

DIRK KRISCHENOWSKI: I'm not sure if we should talk about that but how to get closer to the next round.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay.

DIRK KRISCHENOWSKI: It might [inaudible].

DENNIS CHANG: Anybody back there. Do you have any questions to ask, topics of discussion? No? Anybody? Anything you want to know from the registry operators?

---

[NINA MILLER]: I'm not following the Work Track 1 of the next round, the working group, but I think they are talking about the approval process for registry service providers. If we could get an update there, what the current position is maybe or any information.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: I'm just thinking about what will happen if the ICANN Cookbook is not ready by May. Do we have to make another dish?

DENNIS CHANG: Okay, go ahead.

CRAIG SCHWARTZ: It's about the RSTEP process of the RSEP.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay, last call. So we have nine items here. I think that's enough. So we'll have to select maybe four. Let's start with about four because we can't cover all those items, I don't think. So this is where the voting happens. Just raise your hand when the number is called. What we'll do is if we can have Amanda or Lisa count very quickly and I'll take down the number. The ones that have the most votes are what we're going to talk about.

---

Okay, Number 1, who votes for Number 1? Number 1 being NSP terms of use. Raise your hand if you want to talk about this. Seven? Okay.

Next – come on in, guys. Sit down. No? Alan, come sit at the table. Beth, come. Yeah. No, this is your session, Alan. You asked for this, right? We’re doing it for you.

So we already have. If you have an urgent need to throw out another topic, that’s okay. But no? It’s okay? Okay. So we’ll proceed.

Number 2, CCDS and NSP. Who wants to talk about this? Raise your hand. Two, three, four, five, six? Okay, one more? You can raise your hand more than once. So that’s the rule, okay?

Number 3, Compliance and CCDS requests. If you have not signed up to NSP, what will happen? Okay, got it? Alan, is that a hand?

Number 4, annual certification and prenotification. Why has it changed and if it has, why? One, two, three, four, back there five?

Okay, Number 5, RRA amendment process. One, two, three. Three? Three. Okay, one more here. Okay, Number 5, okay five.

---

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I meant specifically with regard to GDPR.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: All of us might want that one. Wink, wink.

DENNIS CHANG: Oh, by the way, we do have a GDPR session for us too this afternoon, so don't forget that.

Number 6, how to get closer to the next round. Okay.

Number 7, approval process for RSPs. One, two, three, four, five, six, seven. Seven.

Well, this is going to be tough.

Number 8, what will happen if Cookbook is not ready by May?  
Oh, no. Okay, that's going to be a high number of hands.

Number 9, RSTEP process for RSEP. One, two, three, four. Okay.

Now can we order it in order of the votes now? Let's see, Number 8 was the first one. That had ten votes, and we have three other ones that have seven votes. So maybe these are the four topics that we'll discuss.

---

RUSS WEINSTEIN:

Yes, I think we can take Number 8 I think as separate. I think we can probably talk 1 through 3 kind of together, so I think that can be one conversation probably five or ten minutes at most. And then you guys can keep ordering the list as we go.

Number 8 I'll try and tackle as best I can. As Dennis mentioned, we have a session today that's focused on talking to you all and your counterparts in registrar land about how we get from where we are today to whatever the next step of GDPR implementation compliance is. It's designed to be a working session where we talk through some of the things we're expecting to have to change or that we think are part of the changes that may not be really clearly articulated in the model itself.

But to the question itself, I think this is the question that we're presenting in front of the DPAs that you've heard John Jeffrey and Göran and Akram all talking about this week.

There's not a lot of good options if the Cookbook or something like it isn't approved or given the go ahead by the DPAs fairly soon. So I think, not to be making it sound like an ultimatum or anything against the Article 29 work party and the DPAs, but I think we're really going to be presenting to them and working hard with them to try and demonstrate that it's better to work with us than to turn a blind eye. When we're all working

---

together, we can solve it as an industry together. I think that's the main message.

I think the consequence of that not happening is fragmentation. I don't think we have a lot of great answers beyond that. It's going to be a really challenging situation. I think every registry and registrar are going to have to figure out what works for them, and that's not great. So we're really trying hard to keep us all together under the same tent and work with the DPAs and the Article 29 work party to get something workable in play.

[We] can talk, but honestly that's probably the best information I can give you right now. And I really encourage you to come to the session later today so we can talk more about what we should be doing differently or what we can be doing together in parallel while those conversations are still going on.

DENNIS CHANG: Go ahead, Alan.

ALAN WOODS: I fully understand that [inaudible] but because public forums sometimes things get a little bit missed or a little bit [inaudible] one of the key worries for me and it directly affects I suppose GDD and getting the amendments through is the fact that as joint data controllers we do need to have it enshrined in a legal

---

agreement under the GDPR or in writing under the Irish example of that [about] the individual [duties] of each data controller.

So we can talk all we want about what's coming up and what we need to do, but the problem is unless that is enshrined in an agreement by May 25, then that fragmentation is just going to happen because we will need to do something. We will need to put our own flags in the sand, so to speak, and say we need to delineate what our responsibilities and our liabilities as a data controller are. And if we do not have something with our contracted party, which is of course ICANN, then that's the problem.

I think the timing here is exceptionally worrisome on this one. I mean, even at this point I'm thinking whatever about the technical implementation but even the legal and policy implementation is just not going to be ready. I think we're talking [at a storm] here.

DENNIS CHANG: Beth, did you have a comment?

[BETH]: Thanks. Along the lines of what Alan said, I understand that you don't have answers and I don't want to put you on the spot, but when you talk to Compliance and maybe even before the

---

session today, it's not even a question of if it's not ready before May 25. It's too late now. We're [leaning] toward fragmentation after this meeting. There were many, many promises and many, many statements of this can't go till San Juan. We can't be waiting this long. So it's getting past the wire.

So if we start to implement things, it will be good to know how Compliance will react to that. It will be good to know if we do things and it's a stopgap and then at some point the DPAs weigh in – which I still think is something of a pipe dream and showing that you're working with them is not necessarily enough – are we going to have to roll things back and do things again?

And is there going to be a process at a minimum, if there's nothing by May 25 or even before, is there going to be maybe a stopgap process where ICANN can say you can do this suite of things or if you do these things, we're not going to ding you because we understand that as a business you need to operate?  
Thanks.

RUSS WEINSTEIN:

Thanks, Beth and Alan. I totally get the feedback, and I think that conversation is best for the 12:30 session if you can make it. I really would urge you to come and have that same comment in that session where it can be told not only to myself and these folks in the room but to some of the executives that are going to

---

be there. I think you're not saying anything we don't know. We get it. Everyone is doing the best they can.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Just a very practical question. If there is nothing ready by May and we decide to [mask the output] of the WHOIS but in the same format as the agreement requires, I assume it will trigger a Compliance ticket.

RUSS WEINSTEIN: Again, I think we're going to get stuck on this topic for an hour and not hit the other ones. If we have another session dedicated to this topic, and I really urge you guys to come to that, you'll get better answers than I can give you in that time. So it's a valid question, but I don't think this is the best use of our time together. If you can come to the 12:30, I really encourage it.

DENNIS CHANG: Is everybody okay with that? Go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I have a follow up because our backend provider told me that they will submit an RSEP for the RDAP system. We will of course do the same [with our TLD]. Will there be some sort of a smooth – if the first one is approved, will the second one be more

---

smoother approved and more faster approved? Because it's kind of critical that then we have some [inaudible] gated access.

**RUSS WEINSTEIN:** In terms of RDAP, we have an RDAP pilot going on right now, and I know Mark can talk about that in more detail if you're provider isn't already in the RDAP pilot. We've been talking to the folks in that forum. And you don't need to submit and RSEP to participate in the RDAP pilot.

**UNIDENTIFIED MALE:** It is more like a question about we need to submit an RSEP and when the [model] for the RDAP is approved, will the rest with the same backend provider be more easily approved or do they start from scratch?

**RUSS WEINSTEIN: :** Yeah, I think our history shows that the first one is the challenging one, and then we're usually able to process them more quickly.

Sorry, you had something?

**KRISTINA ROSETTE:** Yeah, just picking up on what you were saying. And I realize this is not necessarily the session to discuss it. Perhaps the 12:30 one

---

is. But I'm just starting to get my mind around the idea of 1,300 RSEPs and are you guys ready for that and how is that going to work? I think having some understanding of how you all intend to approach that part of it would be a really helpful part of the 12:30 conversation.

RUSS WEINSTEIN: Noted. Thanks.

CRAIG SCHWARTZ: I think kind of wrapped up in what Kristina just said, and I think I saw Brian's head nodding before, is this also will affect the RRA amendment process, which is why I wanted to discuss it today. So if that also is part of a lot of discussion, that's okay. But as we all need to change our RRAs to include some GDPR language, the Registrar Stakeholder Group was pretty clear two days ago that they're not prepared to weigh in on 1,100 RRA requests. And if there's not some standard template language that we can all agree to, that they're just going to held up. And obviously, that can't happen from a business and risk perspective.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay, so again, 12:30 did you say, Russ? What room?

---

RUSS WEINSTEIN: I believe it's Room 104.

DENNIS CHANG: 104 at 12:30. Let's all see you there, and we'll continue the conversation of our favorite topic.

Let's move on to our next topic then. The next topic was NSP terms of use. I think that Russ suggested maybe we can combine the CCDS and NSP and Compliance and CCDS requests if not in NSP. All those three topics, we can talk about it together. Is that okay? Okay, who wants to start this discussion? Go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Just a quick question. Could somebody just say some words about what is the current information out there? Just give a little overview.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [What kind of information?]

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Well, what the [timelines] are and what actually this question is about because I'm not [inaudible].

---

DIETMAR LENDEN: Basically, the CCDS at the moment has a separate portal. That's going to be put into the Naming Services Portal at some stage soon I believe. I'm not sure when "soon" is but sometime soon. Which basically means that if you haven't signed up to the Naming Services Portal – so if you have issues with the terms and conditions of the Naming Services Portal – you're not going to be able to approve the new CCDS requests that are going to be coming through the Naming Services Portal.

So that's a pretty big concern because if you're not able to do that, then ICANN Compliance gets notices from people outside in the world going you're ignoring me. Please hurry up. So my question really is, do we have an update on the terms and conditions? How that's actually faring and also what Compliance might do.

I realize there are, I think the statistic is 30% of registries have signed up to the Naming Services Portal, but 70% is the remainder which is quite a high number. So it would be good to get an understanding where we're at.

RUSS WEINSTEIN: Sure. I think actually I had someone on the team look up the numbers yesterday and it was actually up closer to 50% now are using the portal. So about 50% of the users I think. I didn't get the chance to get the stat for how many TLDs percentage wise

---

that covered, so that might be the discrepancy. I think I've [shared] 30% in the past, but I think that was representative [of] TLDs.

So it's not that nobody is using it. I don't want to portray that. But we have been in discussions with some folks from the RySG who have taken up the issue, and Kristina is in the room today as one of them and Jeff from Valideus, your counterpart Dietmar, and another. So we've been working with them for a number of months now, longer than I think any of us envisioned.

But we're getting really close I feel like. We started with a list of about a dozen things or so, and we're really down to one very legal liability, lawyers talking about different ways to write a liability language. That's sensitive and important and it's important that it's clear for everyone and that it's balanced as it can be.

But in terms of the things we've covered, we've really been able to knock down all those issues other than this last one. So I think we're trying to decide. We've had some people mention that maybe it's time just to implement it into the tool, put it back out so everyone can go read it for themselves and decide yes or no. They want to sign up or if we should try to keep negotiating the last little issue here with – and not to belittle the issue – but the last remaining issue that we think is probably acceptable to

---

some providers or some registries and registry service providers and may not be for some others.

So it's kind of a what do we do. Is it worth trying to keep going in the negotiation or is it worth giving the people the vote? And then we can keep negotiating on the side if we're not getting to the penetration we're looking for.

In terms of CCDS, I think the current timeline is nothing sooner than August. To be honest, I think we were hoping to have it more in the spring, but there was some other work that needed to happen as a result of the implementation of the portal to get it in a state that could prepare to add another platform.

So the idea is that currently, as you mentioned, CCDS is its own system with its own terms of use, by the way. It's not like there's no terms of use that weren't accepted there, terms of use that you all accepted or many of you accepted that used it. So the idea is that those CCDS users would be using the same platform, NSP, the Naming Services Portal. But if you're only a CCDS user, you would only be viewing the CCDS module within the portal. If you are the registry primary contact or an authorized user for other information on the TLD and the CCDS user, you'd have one login and be able to see both those modules.

---

We're actually adding registrar to the portal also later. I think the target is later this month. So again, one login and depending on your access, you'd get different views in the screen.

DIETMAR LENDEN: Thanks. I just have a quick follow up. Thanks for mentioning that. [inaudible] forgot about that. There's a separate terms and conditions for the CCDS portal. How is that going to be implemented into the Naming Services Portal? The terms and conditions that you're currently negotiating with the Registry Stakeholder Group for the Naming Services Portal, does that take into account the potential for CCDS being added into the Naming Services Portal? It does? Okay.

KRISTINA ROSETTE: That was actually one of the very first [set] of the revisions is that language that was originally put in there to cover CCDS was taken out.

RUSS WEINSTEIN: I think we should clarify. There are two agreements related to CCDS when you're using that system. There's the term of use of using the system, the portal, and then there's the term of use that you're agreeing to with the user of the zone file. So the term of use we've negotiated with the portal is meant to cover CCDS

---

users of the system from the registry side. It is not meant to cover the exchange of information of the zone file. You're right, Kristina. We took out all that third-party user stuff because it was confusing. But it is meant to cover the registry user of CCDS for the purpose of the portal part of it.

CRAIG SCHWARTZ: Just a clarification because I'm clearly behind on this topic and someone on my team manages the CCDS requests. You're saying at some point, they will have to be approved through the portal and not via the mechanism that now happens. Is that correct?

RUSS WEINSTEIN: Yeah. So it's just a re-platforming of the same functionality. Moving it from a standalone system into the tent of Naming Services Portal.

CRAIG SCHWARTZ: But you will need to access NSP to get to that sub-platform?

RUSS WEINSTEIN: Correct.

CRAIG SCHWARTZ: Okay, thanks.

---

**RUSS WEINSTEIN:** And again, it can be a user who only has that functionality just like today. So they wouldn't have access to all things in the portal for your TLD.

**UNIDENTIFIED MALE:** I agree with Craig here. Sorry, I haven't followed the discussion, but will a CCDS user be able to manage multiple TLDs with the same [ID]?

**RUSS WEINSTEIN:** Yes, that's my understanding. You can manage multiple, as many accounts that are linked to your one credential.

**DENNIS CHANG:** Okay, any other comments, questions about this topic, CCDS? Go ahead.

**UNIDENTIFIED MALE:** Sorry, Russ. This might be going right into the weeds and I apologize. How is this actually going to look? And for those requestors that have requested access previously, are they just going to be ported across or do they have to reapply? How is that going to work? This might not be the spot for that but if you can answer, that will be great.

---

**RUSS WEINSTEIN:** So how's it going to look? I don't have a great picture in my head that I can articulate to you. But the thing I've seen is a really clean, easy screen, web portal type screen. The requests will port. So it's not going to be back to square one of zero. So if you're giving access to someone today and they don't expire until next week, they'll still have access until next week to your zone file. So it's just a software interface issue.

**DENNIS CHANG:** Are we done with that topic? Everything is clear about the CCDS now and NSP? We know what we're going to do? Go ahead. You have one more question.

**UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:** Sorry. I don't know if I've missed it, but was your question actually answered? What happens if you don't sign up to the portal?

**UNIDENTIFIED MALE:** At the moment, if we don't sign up to the portal, the process we follow for our brand clients is to send an e-mail through to [globalsupport@icann.org](mailto:globalsupport@icann.org). And I'm assuming that's the way we'll

---

continue to do that process. But the Question 4 on the table there is about the Compliance aspect.

Now hopefully by August, this won't actually be a discussion point so we could forget about it. But let's just say August rolls around and we haven't come to any conclusion. There's not going to be a possibility for us or our clients to actually do CCDS requests if they've been moved from the old portal to the new portal, and I'm sure ICANN Compliance will then be knocking on our door saying, hello, why are you not doing something? So I'm not sure how we might be able to resolve that problem. Keep the old portal live? I don't know. Probably not something you want to do, but that might be the only option.

RUSS WEINSTEIN:

I think, like you said, hopefully we're long past that issue. I think if we're approaching software readiness and we still have a lower than desired percentage of uptake on the terms of use, we'd assess is it really time to deploy the new platform or do we need to get closer on terms of use. I think I'd like to say that won't be the issue driving us.

But today, there's a terms of use in the system, and to my knowledge all registrars have accepted that. But we haven't really faced it, but it could have been a situation where people

---

didn't accept it and I guess we'd have to figure out a workaround that we haven't really started planning for.

DENNIS CHANG: Thanks for bringing it up. I'm sure we'll have to watch it and make it part of our transition process.

Okay, let's move on to our next topic then. What was it? It was the approval process for RSPs. Is that it? Go ahead.

[NINA MILLER]: That was my question. My question was what the current information is that is out there because the Work Track 1 of the next round working group are discussing this and I'm not following it. I don't know if anybody else or other people here in the room are following it. But as we had seven votes, maybe there could be somebody that's from that group that could share some information.

DENNIS CHANG: Is there anyone who can share information on this? Go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: The information I might share might not be what you want to hear. I'm not on that working group, but I know that the Registry Stakeholder Group has a separate group outside of Work Track 1

---

that's talking to ICANN I think at the moment or talking [inaudible]. I'm not to sure what process [is that]. But I think there's still a lot of talking going on about how that process is going to work, if it's going to work, whether it's a good idea or a bad idea. That's not much of an update. I apologize. But I don't know if there's anybody else here that could – oh!

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:

Hi. I'm on the Subsequent Procedures Leadership team, not for Work Track 1, but what I can say is that shortly in what, Martin? Three or four weeks? We're going to be issuing our preliminary report, and it's going to lay out the options that we've discussed for a sort of preapproval process for registry service providers for next round applicants. That's the limitation of what we're doing in subsequent procedures.

What the Registry Stakeholder Group working team is doing is a different angle on registry service provider. They're dealing more with moving registry service providers once you've got your TLD and that. Subsequent procedures, we're really limited to making it easy for new applicants to say pick from a list of five preapproved RSPs and know that they've already met ICANN's criteria.

Mid-April, we're going to have our preliminary report coming out. It's going to tell you everything we've discussed, lay out all

---

the options, and essentially ask for your feedback on where you want us to go with that for the next round.

DENNIS CHANG: April preliminary. Okay, Francisco, go ahead.

FRANCISCO ARIAS: If you're interested in these discussions, you may want to approach Stephane Van Gelder from the [Registry Stakeholder Group]. He's chairing that discussion group within the [Registry Stakeholder Group].

DENNIS CHANG: Any other comments, questions on this? No? Go ahead, Marc.

MARC ANDERSON: Thanks, Dennis. I guess I'm wondering if staff has any thoughts or anything they could share from their perspective on this. I know within the Registry Stakeholder Group, there is a group discussing that but my understanding is they're looking more at their effort as an opportunity to provide input into the subsequent procedures work that's going on. Of course, I know it's a topic within subsequent procedures, but I think as was pointed out, one of the initial genesis of this was due to the difficulty of transitioning backend registry providers.

---

So I guess I sort of open ended throw it out to staff. Do you have any visibility into where this is? Any thoughts or developments on what's going on as far as RSP discussions go?

FRANCISCO ARIAS:

My understanding is that a discussion group was formed with the [inaudible] purpose, as you said, to provide input to the subsequent procedures PDP but also to provide some recommendations to work with ICANN org to potentially [improve] some of the processes where policy development [or contact changes] may not be needed. So to [do] the process in a more efficient way. So that's still to be developed.

I believe the deliverable that I'm aware from that discussion group is the input that was submitted to the subsequent procedures PDP. So we are looking forward to have more input from that group on how we can improve the existing process.

MARC ANDERSON:

Thanks. So I guess I take that to mean you're not really actively working on this and you're more waiting for what comes out of the subsequent procedures PDP?

---

**RUSS WEINSTEIN:** I think a little bit different. I think if we look back a couple years ago, staff had started talking about this with the registries in Amsterdam at the GDD Summit there. And then I think the Registry Stakeholder Group had formed a discussion group and, as Francisco mentioned, one of the inputs was going to be back to staff around process improvement. And I think the vibe I got was that's still working and they've asked staff to hang tight until that input comes. So I think we're waiting on the input from the stakeholder group. They've done one of those deliverables which was to a [sub probe], but also we anticipated at least one coming to us to reengage.

**MARC ANDERSON:** Thank you. And just another follow up, if I may. You said process improvement, so can I take that to mean that's specific to process improvement around transitioning backend registry operators? Or are you expecting anything around an RSP accreditation program?

**RUSS WEINSTEIN:** I think the ball is in your court, [Marc], on this one.

**MARC ANDERSON:** All right, fair enough. Thank you.

---

DENNIS CHANG: Very good. Anything else on that? How much time do we have left? We have enough time I think to cover maybe the rest on this, 25 minutes. So if you want to, this is your session, do you want to continue? Okay, so let's pick the next one, Number 6, annual certification prenotification. Why has it changed? Who wants to kick this off and maybe re-ask your question? Jennifer, are you back there? Okay, go ahead and ask your question.

KATRIN OHLMER: So we have the audit of registries and registrars which happened to take place every three years, it's supposed to take place every three years. I think during one GDD meeting, was it in Amsterdam? We agreed that ICANN org issues prenotifications, whatever, in late summer, if a registry or a registrar is selected for the annual audit. And we learned this year actually in the Registry Stakeholder Group that this is not taking place anymore.

Especially in light of better planning and especially for brand clients, it would be helpful to understand why this prenotification is not issued anymore and if you would consider getting back to the this old process of informing registries well in advance if an audit is supposed to happen.

JENNIFER SCOTT:

Hi, this is Jennifer Scott from Contractual Compliance. So you're right. There has been a change, not recently though. A few years back, we had sent preaudit notifications just to those folks who were getting audited. Then we got feedback, I think it was at one of the GDD Summits. It might have been Jeff Neuman or someone, who said, hey, if we're not getting audited, can we know that too?

So we started generating about 300 e-mails to everybody going out to I think it was the registrars trying to say, hey, you're getting audited or, hey, you're not getting audited, and it caused a lot of confusion. It was a logistical and administrative nightmare. We got a whole bunch of complaints. Why am I getting all of these e-mails?

So then we actually reverted back to only sending preaudit notifications to the selected auditees and that's still happening today. So if you haven't gotten an e-mail in advance of an audit round, it's because you're not getting audited.

KATRIN OHLMER:

Can I follow up on that? So can you clarify when, in which timeframe these prenotifications will be sent? This would be helpful to learn whatever it's in August or the first two weeks of

---

September or whenever so we know that if notifications are not sent within this timeframe, neither we nor our clients will be audited. That would be helpful. Thanks.

JENNIFER SCOTT:

There's no set month of the year that we conduct the audits although if you look at the ICANN.org audit program page, you'll see the cadence of when the audits are being initiated, and it's twice a year. We do anticipate, or we did anticipate starting another audit for registries in April of this year. We've gotten some feedback here at ICANN 61 about how registries might be extremely busy with GDPR matters and that might not be a great time to start another audit round. So we're taking that back.

Sorry, let me correct myself. That's the registrar audit. The registry audit new round has actually already started. So if you haven't gotten your audit notification, you haven't been selected for the March audit for registries. The registrar audit was the one that we were anticipating beginning in April, which we'll take the feedback on that we've heard at this meeting.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:

So I'm optimistic that but for the next round of registry operator audits, we'll all be able to use the Naming Services Portal. But for those of us who have very aggressive internal spam filters,

---

would it be possible whether it goes out on the portal or there's some other announcement that basically comes out from Compliance and says, "If you have been selected for audit, you should have received your announcement by now." So that for those of us who haven't if we want to then come back to you and say, did we get lucky or is it the spam filter? That we at least know the time to do that so that we don't inadvertently not respond because we never got the notification.

MARC ANDERSON:

I want to piggyback on that. The absence of anything is not a good notification mechanism. The spam filter issue, I know that happened to some people where they thought they were free and clear because they didn't hear anything but it turned out that it actually went to spam filters and that caused some scrambling.

This was a topic that was debated pretty well within the Registry Stakeholder Group so if you'll indulge me, I'll try and represent the registries on this one.

I think the general feeling among the registries was not that the e-mail notifications that you had not been selected was actually preferred and that the feedback and pushback that you got from that was that maybe the notifications themselves were not clear what they were saying. I'm seeing some nods in the room, so I

---

think I'm getting that reasonably accurate. But I think the pushback you got was not in sending the notifications to everybody. It was looking for more clarity on the notifications themselves.

So again, if you indulge me for trying to represent the registries, I think the preference from registries would still be a notification, yes, you have or, no, you have not been selected. But that they were looking for a little more clarity in what was in those notifications.

STEINAR GRØTTERØD: Can I come with a proposal? Steinar from .global. What about you sending out to those who are being audited and those who have to respond back actually acknowledge that they receive it? And then you can track those who haven't acknowledged that and you can take a follow up. I mean, the rest of us can [go to sleep].

JENNIFER SCOTT: So a few things. Thank you, everybody, for your comments. I'm glad to hear that it has been a topic of discussion in the stakeholder group because we don't want to get caught in trying to address one particular view of one entity. We would like it to be a consensus of the group.

---

I believe because we didn't have a Registry/Compliance session at this meeting that Compliance is going to be conducting some future calls with the stakeholder group after the meeting. So if I may suggest if this is something that could be brought to that call so that we can have that discussion and make sure that you are representing the stakeholder group well. I mean, I'm not saying you're not, but just to make it official and have that.

In terms of the communications themselves being clear, yes, we acknowledge we could do better at that. I think one of the challenges we faced is that when we tried to send the notification that said, no, you're not being audited, we were using registry operator primary contacts or Compliance contacts. And sometimes those contacts manage multiple TLDs, some of which could be in the audit, some of which might not be in the audit. And so they might have gotten two different communications, and that's why it was confusing. Well, am I in it? Am I not? So managing that piece of it I think was a challenge for us. So if we do go back to trying to tell you you're not in the audit, that's something that we have to address better. So that's one thing that we're facing.

In terms of the solution that you've recommended, I'm not sure that will work. There's nothing in the contract that says you have to respond back to us. So again, we're just back into an e-mail situation where we don't know if you got it and that's why you're

---

not responding or if you've just chosen not to respond. So we can definitely talk about solutions on that.

And then the one thing I wanted to address with [Katrin's] comment, I don't think the Compliance portal aspect of the Naming Services Portal is quite there yet. We're still quite down the road, so we still will need to deal with e-mails for a little bit.

Again, we can continue this, hopefully dialogue and see what we can come up with to meet everybody's needs.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

Sorry. Just to slip something in there quickly. We haven't had a Registry/Compliance meeting for a while. Sorry. I find them quite informative, but I don't know about the rest of the registries in the room. But we haven't had one for, I don't know, maybe three ICANN sessions so far. So I just want to get an understanding [as to] how was the decision taken or when was the decision taken? Was it a registry? I mean, I don't know how that decision was taken to just summarily cancel the Registry/Compliance sessions.

JENNIFER SCOTT:

We've been trying to schedule them and, as you might know, the SOs and ACs are really the drivers of the ICANN meeting schedules. Talk to Paul Diaz. We've been trying. We have been

---

offering them, and it just hasn't worked out because of scheduling conflicts. And that's the reason why in lieu of a meeting we've been trying to get on a call with the stakeholder group. But it's not for lack of trying, and if there's any information or liaising that you'd want to do with us, please reach out and we'll get that set up.

MARC ANDERSON: Unless I'm horribly mistaken, there is a Compliance session scheduled for the GDD Summit in May. So there will be that opportunity. I think you have one scheduled for registries and registrars at the Summit.

JENNIFER SCOTT: Yes, that's correct. Thanks.

DENNIS CHANG: That's good information. Yes, I was going to mention that too. Anything else on this? It's a good exchange. Thank you, Jennifer.

Okay, let's go to the next item, how to get closer to the next round. Hmm. Who wants to start this discussion?

DIRK KRISCHENOWSKI: Dirk Krischenowski from .berlin and .hamburg. I brought this in because I was in that pre time before the last round and at every

---

ICANN meeting, people were standing up at the microphone at the various sessions and promoting a new round and asking when does it start and when do the processes and the ICANN board when do they decide and whatsoever.

And we are now heading into the 2012-2018 six years meanwhile before the last round, and I don't hear much noise or much demand from everywhere. Yeah, for sure, there's a procedure going on with all the work tracks and so on, but I was really a bit shocked when I saw the GNSO timeline saying that at the very earliest the application window would be in Q1 2021. And Jeff Neuman summarized that very good that if that timeline stays and we go into 2021 or so, it's a decade since the last round and ICANN hasn't accomplished its mission to go on with expanding the namespace on the web.

And I don't see much noise. Maybe it's behind the curtains or in personal talks but not in the public fora. And my question is, who is really interested in a next round, and how can we push that much harder like in the last round?

DENNIS CHANG:

This is a good question for the registry operators here. What are your thoughts on this? Go ahead.

---

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thanks, Dennis. I think illustrative of that the other day was the session that was taking place of a variety of registry operators saying how success looks differently to others. I think there is this preconceived idea that it has to be a high volume of domain names when in fact a lot of the new registries that have emerged have got very restrictive and controlled environments that they've set up which don't require huge volumes of domain names because they're not selling domains, so for instance a dot brand environment, or they are highly restricted because they are looking after particular highly regulated markets like .bank, like .pharmacy where there's a lot of benefits for the Internet users.

In those spaces, it was very apparent that there was a commonality of zero abuse or confusion in that space. So I think we do have to do a better job of promoting what those different success pictures look like in an industry which tends to be very negative about the new gTLD round. And I think those undertones have gotten through to the ICANN board and it has taken some time to try and encourage them to listen about the different points of view of those that they've introduced into the marketplace in the last round.

---

DENNIS CHANG: Anybody else have thoughts on this? Can I just see your hands on who here would like to see the next round being opened very quickly here? What is the sentiment?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Soon.

DENNIS CHANG: Soon, yeah. And who is okay if it's 2021, you said? Who is okay if it's not so soon? No hands. There's one, two. Yeah, okay. So from the – go ahead. You want to?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Just to kind of caveat that response that I just made, there are a lot of businesses out there that this is really important to, and I respect that. Just because we're not in a rush doesn't mean that the process shouldn't be more responsive to what the community has expressed they need. I'm not particularly close to the subsequent rounds PDP, so I don't know where the work tracks stand. I don't know if the speed is reflective of those tracks are stuck, like legitimately stuck because they're having real dialogue, or if there's some undercurrent that there's not enough demand and there [is an] intentional roadblocking the process moving forward.

---

Again, I don't have enough visibility into that, but it seems like there are enough people in the community that are asking for this and the thought process before the last round was launched was that the new round or the next round would be launched pretty quickly. I think I even heard something like a year after the conclusion. And that it would become more of a rolling process where you wouldn't have this window and this mad rush, but you'd have a process where it's almost first come, first serve kind of like you have with domain names in a registry. You would get to that point with TLDs.

And are we not getting close enough in our maturity that we could actually do that sooner rather than later? I just kind of throw that out as a question.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

I think it's a consequence of a combination of things. There was a distraction with the IANA transition. GDPR has absorbed an incredible amount of time over the last year. So a combination of those along the way has meant that even those working tracks that have been trying to push through a whole series of areas that needed to be checked to see whether there was improvements, because I think there is some consensus if you like across the community that it wasn't perfect and could be

---

improved and should do some improvements to it before it gets let loose again.

But having that concentration of other activities and distractions along the way has meant that the work has been slow, and it's important that we try and get it to the last stages. So for those that did put their hands up, I would ask you to get involved in the work tracks on any particular themes that you're interested in and making those recommendations and changes as quickly as we can.

So there are some challenges, yes. I can't see an easy way of going round that loop. We have to conclude some of that work before implementation can even start [on this]. So the sooner we do it, the better. But it [has] been a hard slog.

DENNIS CHANG:

I was in one of those GNSO Council sessions, I think yesterday, and they were discussing the PDP process as a process and maybe perhaps opportunity for improvement there. And I think they're going to focus on that issue today in one of today's meeting wrap-up sessions. So you might want to go join that session. Go ahead.

---

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Sorry. Just to add as well I think there was also some complacency after the 2012 round opened up in the assumption that there was already something written in the policy which suggested within a year it would all kick off again. So there was already embedded into that policy the assumption that it would quickly move on and it would probably be a more of a continuous improvement cycle rather than a huge PDP process.

DENNIS CHANG: Any more comments on this? No? Let's move on then, RRA amendment process. Did we kind of talk about this already? Is there anything more here? No?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Craig, I know you were the one that suggested this. Were you thinking this was specific to RRA amendments within GDPR or just in general?

CRAIG SCHWARTZ: Well, I think GDPR was driving it. We're actually in the middle of this process now for our TLDs. In fact, the registrars were supposed to have commented by yesterday. I don't know if they did. But whether it's GDPR or otherwise, that the registrars, they have an operational role in getting this done. And they're really busy with GDPR and they're really busy with their tasks.

---

The RRA amendment process was developed a really long time ago, and I think it might even be called “draft” still the way it’s posted. So it might be time when there’s a little bit more bandwidth, because it doesn’t seem like there’s any left right now, to take a look at this and figure out if there’s a way to streamline it just a little bit more.

Because when we want to make some change in our business that is impacted by what’s in the contract with our registrars, we’re basically put on hold and have to wait until these other it could be registrars that aren’t even accredited in our TLDs that might make adverse comments or not or hold it up. I’m just saying it’s probably time to look at this again soon to make it more efficient.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

I agree completely, Craig. And I do agree that there are maybe more pressing issues at the moment, but I don’t think this should be “we’ll get to it when we get to it.” I think it should be something that’s looked at.

We also as a legacy operator have a somewhat unique pain point in that when we amend the RRA, it triggers an amendment of our RA because the RRA is incorporated by reference. And when that happens, there’s two equally fun processes going on with ICANN

---

and then other internal contingencies. So it's just kind of a nightmare.

For instance, we lowered our insurance requirement for registrars from \$1 million to \$500,000, in which basically we got inline with ICANN then ICANN removed theirs. And by the time we actually got it amended because we had to amend the RA and the RRA as a result, ICANN then altogether just dropped their insurance requirements. So it was a little – it wasn't the most streamlined process, let's just say that.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

Yeah, I appreciate the part that your RRA is part of your RA and the materiality check that ICANN applies to a change probably also needs to be revisited. Like lowering your insurance requirement – and again your case is different – but in my view, that's not even a conversation. If it's inline with what ICANN requires of its registrars, it should be check and off. So I agree, we should focus on this sooner and what's reasonable, not when we get to it. I just don't know how. The next couple of months seem pretty full.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

One last little detail on that story to round things out. I think staff has gotten much better on the materiality question as far

---

as at least within the confines of RSEP. I know there's sensitivity to getting inline to is everything material because when we did lower the threshold, all we did was change a number and it was like, why is this material? It was like, well, it mentioned the word insurance so that means it's material. And I was like that's not how that works. But whatever. It got through eventually.

KARLA HAKANSSON:

My team manages the RA process, and I'm so happy to work with you guys on this. The procedure that is posted that's out there has been out there for a while. You're right. So any time you guys, I mean it's up to you guys to think about it and look at it differently if you'd like to. So at any point in time if you want to dig deeper, when you're ready to do so knowing that there are other things that are going on but that it could be a part of what is looming on the horizon, I will make myself available for you guys to try to help figure it out from our side too.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

That's awesome. Thank you, Karla.

DENNIS CHANG:

Very good. That's that topic then. We have one more, RSTEP process in RSEP. No? Go ahead, Craig.

---

CRAIG SCHWARTZ: I think that I'm going to submit a case in the portal to get some guidance on this rather than take up people's time here. I think Brian's hand might have went up for this topic in the beginning, so maybe we could chat offline about what you're thinking is and coordinate some questions.

BRIAN CIMBOLIC: Sounds good.

DENNIS CHANG: Okay then. If everybody agrees, then we're done with our topics. And it's great that we got through all of them. Any parting comments or questions? Let me just quickly ask you about this session then. Is this session fruitful. No, you have...?

AMANDA FESSENDEN: Quick reminder for everyone. We sent out a satisfaction survey a couple weeks ago, so just have that on your radar to respond back to. And don't forget to sign up for the GDD Summit. That was it.

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you for that announcement. Anything else? So one more question for you. This particular session we call Registry

---

Operator Roundtable session. I know it was early in the morning and it was hard to get here. That's probably one complaint. But is it still useful? Do you guys like this? Do you still want to do this? Yeah? Nodding heads, nodding heads. Okay, thumbs up. Okay, there is some feedback for Russ. Of course, Russ, maybe you want to say some final remarks before we conclude?

RUSS WEINSTEIN:

Sure. Thanks, everyone, for coming. I think it's really good to see the positive validation that this session is still of value to you guys. I think as I'm listening here – I can't speak for the other ICANNers – but I'm getting positive value. I have a whole page of notes and things, so I think it's really helpful for us.

Please consider ICANN an open door policy. The GDD really is eager to work together with the registries and the affected parties within the registry ecosystem to make this a quality partnership that we work together, we figure out what the problems are and try and knock down solutions one at a time.

So I'm encouraged that these are of value, and now let's keep doing them. And if there are other ways to go about it between ICANN meetings or between summits and whatnot, let's bring those suggestions to us and use your engagement managers from our team [and use] Global Support whatever it is. But keep the dialogue going because I think that's really helpful.

---

Thanks, everyone.

DENNIS CHANG: Thank you, everyone. We'll see you at the GDD Summit next and then the next ICANN meeting. This meeting is concluded. Bye.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**