EPDP On the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data - Public Comment Proceeding Input Form

1. Email address *

Important Instructions - PLEASE READ BEFORE PROCEEDING

This Public Comment forum seeks community feedback on the Initial Report published by the Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP) Team on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data.

This is a new format for collecting public comment. It seeks to:
-- Clearly link comments to specific sections of the initial report
-- Encourage commenters to provide reasoning or rationale for their opinions
-- Enable the sorting of comment so that the EPDP team can more easily read all the comments on any one topic

There is no obligation to complete all sections within this form – respond to as many or as few questions as desired. Additionally, there is the opportunity to provide comments on the general content of the Initial Report or on new issues not raised by the Initial Report. To preview all questions in the Google Form, please refer to a Word version of this form here [LINK TBD].

As you review the "Questions for Community Input" in the Initial Report, you will note that there is not a 1:1 correspondence with the questions asked in the Public Comment format. This is because, in some instances, the "Questions for Community Input" have been divided into multi-part questions so that feedback on these questions would be clear. The Initial Report and Comment Forum have been reviewed to ensure that all the "Questions for Community Input" have been addressed in this Comment Forum.

It is important that your comments include rationale (i.e., by answering the "rationale" question in each section). This is not a vote. The EPDP team is interested in your reasoning so that the conclusions reached and the issues discussed by the team can be tested against the reasoning of others. (This is much more helpful than comments that simply "agree" or "disagree").

You can easily navigate from page to page in the form. There is a table of contents below so that you can "fast forward" to the desired section by hitting "next" at the bottom of each page. To preview this entire form in Word format, see, [LINK TBD]

To stop and save your work for later, you MUST (to avoid losing your work):

1. Provide your email address above in order to receive a copy of your submitted responses;

2. Click "Submit" at the end of the Google Form (the last question on every page allows you to quickly jump to the end of the Google Form to submit);

3. After you click "Submit," you will receive an email to the above-provided email address; within the email, click the "Edit Response" button at top of the email;

4. After you click the "Edit Response" button, you will be directed to the Google Form to return and complete;

5. Repeat the above steps 2-4 every time you wish to quit the form and save your progress.

NOTES:
-- Please refer to the specific recommendation and relevant section or page number of the Initial Report for additional details and context about each recommendation. Where applicable, you are encouraged to reference sections in the report for ease of the future review by the EPDP Team.

--Your comments should take into account scope of the EPDP as described by the Charter and General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) compliance.

--For transparency purposes, all comments submitted to the Public Comment forum will be displayed publicly via an automatically-generated Google Spreadsheet. Email addresses provided by commenters will not be displayed.

--To maximize the visibility of your comments to the EPDP Team, please submit your comments via this form only. If you are unable to use this form, alternative arrangements can be made.

--The final date of the public comment proceeding is 23:59 UTC on 21 December 2018. Any comments received after that date will not be reviewed / discussed by the EPDP Team.

Table of Contents

Consent & Authorization

By submitting my personal data, I agree that my personal data will be processed in accordance with the ICANN Privacy Policy (https://www.icann.org/privacy/policy and agree to abide by the website Terms of Service (https://www.icann.org/privacy/tos).

2. Please provide your name: *

_____

3. Please provide your affiliation *

_____

4. Are you providing input on behalf of another group (e.g., organization, company, government)? *

Mark only one oval. (Please note you can highlight your choice.)

◯ Yes

◯ No

5. If yes, please explain:

_____

_____

_____

_____

Save Your Progress

6. Do you want to save your progress and quit for now? You will be able to return to the form to complete at a later time.

Mark only one oval.

◯ Yes   *Stop filling out this form.*

◯ No, I would like to continue to the next section

Section 3, Part 1: Purposes for Processing Registration Data

The EPDP team was tasked with determining whether the ICANN and Contracted Party Purposes for Processing Registration Data listed in the Temporary Specification are appropriate and if additional "Purposes" are required. The Team developed DNS requirements, the data requirements, and mapped data flows in order to identify these purposes.

Recommendation #1: Purposes for Processing Registration Data

The EPDP Team recommends that the following purposes for processing gTLD Registration Data form the basis of the new ICANN policy:

Note that for each of the below purposes, the EPDP Team has also identified: (i) the related processing activities; (ii) the corresponding lawful basis for each processing activity; and (iii) the data controllers and processors involved in each processing activity. For more information regarding the above, please refer to the Data Elements Workbooks which can be found in the Annex D of the Initial Report.

PURPOSE 1 FOR PROCESSING REGISTRATION DATA:

AS SUBJECT TO REGISTRY AND REGISTRAR TERMS, CONDITIONS AND POLICIES, AND ICANN CONSENSUS POLICIES:

(I) TO ESTABLISH THE RIGHTS OF A REGISTERED NAME HOLDER IN A REGISTERED NAME;

(II) TO ENSURE THAT A REGISTERED NAME HOLDER MAY EXERCISE ITS RIGHTS IN THE USE AND DISPOSITION OF THE REGISTERED NAME; AND

(III) TO ACTIVATE A REGISTERED NAME AND ALLOCATE IT TO THE REGISTERED NAME HOLDER

7. Please choose your level of support for Purpose 1:

Mark only one oval.

- ◯ Support Purpose as written
- ◯ Support Purpose intent with wording change
- ◯ Significant change required: changing intent and wording
- ◯ Purpose should be deleted

8. If your response requires an edit or deletion of Purpose #1, please indicate the revised wording here (keep in mind that "Purposes" must be GDPR compliant).

_____

_____

_____

_____

9. Please provide rationale for your recommendation.

_____

_____

_____

_____

PURPOSE 2 FOR PROCESSING REGISTRATION DATA

MAINTAINING THE SECURITY, STABILITY, AND RESILIENCY OF THE DOMAIN NAME SYSTEM IN ACCORDANCE WITH ICANN'S MISSION THROUGH THE ENABLING OF LAWFUL ACCESS FOR LEGITIMATE THIRD-PARTY INTERESTS TO DATA ELEMENTS COLLECTED FOR THE OTHER PURPOSES IDENTIFIED HEREIN

10. Choose your level of support of Purpose #2:

Mark only one oval.

- ◯ Support Purpose as written
- ◯ Support Purpose intent with wording change
- ◯ Significant change required: changing intent and wording
- ◯ Purpose should be deleted

11. If your response requires an edit or deletion of Purpose #2, please indicate the revised wording here (keep in mind that "Purposes" must be GDPR compliant).

_____

_____

_____

_____

12. Please provide rationale for your recommendation.

_____

_____

_____

_____

PURPOSE 3 FOR PROCESSING REGISTRATION DATA

ENABLE COMMUNICATION WITH AND/OR NOTIFICATION TO THE REGISTERED NAME HOLDER AND/OR THEIR DELEGATED AGENTS OF TECHNICAL AND/OR ADMINISTRATIVE ISSUES WITH A REGISTERED NAME

13. Choose your level of support of Purpose #3:

Mark only one oval.

◯ Support Purpose as written

◯ Support Purpose intent with wording change

◯ Significant change required: changing intent and wording

◯ Purpose should be deleted

14. If your response requires an edit or deletion of Purpose #3, please indicate the revised wording here (keep in mind that "Purposes" must be GDPR compliant).

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

15. Please provide rationale for your recommendation.

_____

_____

_____

_____

PURPOSE 4 FOR PROCESSING REGISTRATION DATA

PROVIDE MECHANISMS FOR SAFEGUARDING REGISTERED NAME HOLDERS' REGISTRATION DATA IN THE EVENT OF A BUSINESS OR TECHNICAL FAILURE, OR OTHER UNAVAILABILITY OF A REGISTRAR OR REGISTRY OPERATOR

16. Choose your level of support of Purpose #4:

Mark only one oval.

- ( ) Support Purpose as written
- ( ) Support Purpose intent with wording change
- ( ) Significant change required: changing intent and wording
- ( ) Purpose should be deleted

17. If your response requires an edit or deletion of Purpose #4, please indicate the revised wording here (keep in mind that "Purposes" must be GDPR compliant).

_____

_____

_____

_____

18. Please provide rationale for your recommendation.

_____

_____

_____

_____

PURPOSE 5 FOR PROCESSING REGISTRATION DATA

HANDLE CONTRACTUAL COMPLIANCE MONITORING REQUESTS, AUDITS, AND COMPLAINTS SUBMITTED BY REGISTRY OPERATORS, REGISTRARS, REGISTERED NAME HOLDERS, AND OTHER INTERNET USERS

19. Choose your level of support of Purpose #5:

Mark only one oval.

◯ Support Purpose as written

◯ Support Purpose intent with wording change

◯ Significant change required: changing intent and wording

◯ Purpose should be deleted

20. If your response requires an edit or deletion of Purpose #5, please indicate the revised wording here (keep in mind that "Purposes" must be GDPR compliant).

_____

_____

_____

_____

21. Please provide the rationale for your recommendation.

_____

_____

_____

_____

PURPOSE 6 FOR PROCESSING REGISTRATION DATA

COORDINATE, OPERATIONALIZE, AND FACILITATE POLICIES FOR RESOLUTION OF DISPUTES REGARDING OR RELATING TO THE REGISTRATION OF DOMAIN NAMES (AS OPPOSED TO THE USE OF SUCH DOMAIN NAMES), NAMELY, THE UDRP, URS, PDDRP, RRDRP, AND FUTURE DEVELOPED DOMAIN NAME REGISTRATION-RELATED DISPUTE PROCEDURES FOR WHICH IT IS ESTABLISHED THAT THE PROCESSING OF PERSONAL DATA IS NECESSARY.

22. Choose your level of support of Purpose #6:

Mark only one oval.

◯ Support Purpose as written

◯ Support Purpose intent with wording change

◯ Significant change required: changing intent and wording

◯ Purpose should be deleted

23. If your response requires an edit or deletion of Purpose #6, please indicate the revised wording here (keep in mind that "Purposes" must be GDPR compliant).

_____

_____

_____

_____

24. Please provide rationale for your recommendation.

_____

_____

_____

_____

PURPOSE 7 FOR PROCESSING REGISTRATION DATA

ENABLING VALIDATION TO CONFIRM THAT REGISTERED NAME HOLDER MEETS OPTIONAL GTLD REGISTRATION POLICY ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA VOLUNTARILY ADOPTED BY THE REGISTRY OPERATOR

25. Choose your level of support of Purpose #7:

Mark only one oval.

- ( ) Support Purpose as written
- ( ) Support Purpose intent with wording change
- ( ) Significant change required: changing intent and wording
- ( ) Purpose should be deleted

26. If your response requires an edit or deletion of Purpose #7, please indicate the revised wording here (keep in mind that "Purposes" must be GDPR compliant).

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

27. Please provide rationale for your recommendation.

_____

_____

_____

_____

28. Enter additional comments to Recommendation #1.

_____

_____

_____

_____

Question #1 for Community Input: Purposes for Processing Registration Data

29. If you recommend additional purposes for processing registration data, please enumerate and write them here, keeping in mind compliance with GDPR.

_____

_____

_____

_____

30. For each additional purpose identified above, please enumerate and provide rationale for each of them.

_____

_____

_____

_____

Save Your Progress

31. Do you want to save your progress and quit for now? You will be able to return to the form to complete at a later time.
Mark only one oval.

◯ Yes   _Stop filling out this form._

◯ No, I wish to continue to the next section

Section 3, Part 1: Purposes for Processing Registration Data (Continued)

Recommendation #2: Standardized Access

Per the EPDP Team Charter, the EPDP Team is committed to considering a system for Standardized Access to non-public Registration Data once the gating questions in the charter have been answered. This will include addressing questions such as:

• What are the legitimate purposes for third parties to access registration data?
• What are the eligibility criteria for access to non-public Registration data?
• Do those parties/groups consist of different types of third-party requestors?
• What data elements should each user/party have access to?

In this context, amongst others, disclosure in the course of intellectual property infringement and DNS abuse cases will be considered.

32. Choose your level of support of Recommendation #2:
Mark only one oval.

◯ Support recommendation as written

◯ Support intent of recommendation with edits

◯ Intent and wording of this recommendation requires amendment

◯ Delete recommendation

33. Do you recommend a change to the wording of Recommendation 2? If so, please indicate proposed edits here.

_____

_____

_____

_____

34. Please include the rationale for your answers here.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

35. Enter additional comments for Recommendation #2.

_____

_____

_____

_____

Recommendation #3: Contractual Accuracy Requirements

The EPDP Team recommends that requirements related to the accuracy of registration data under the current ICANN contracts and consensus policies shall not be affected by this policy.

36. Choose your level of support of Recommendation #3:
Mark only one oval.

◯ Support recommendation as written

◯ Support intent of recommendation with edits

◯ Intent and wording of this recommendation requires amendment

◯ Delete recommendation

37. Do you recommend a change to Recommendation 3? If so, please indicate proposed edits here.

_____

_____

_____

_____

38. Please include the rationale for your answers here.

_____

_____

_____

_____

39. Enter any other additional comments or observations you have on Section 3 Part 1 that are not covered by these questions.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Save Your Progress

40. Do you want to save your progress and quit for now? You will be able to return to the form to complete at a later time.

Mark only one oval.

◯ Yes *Stop filling out this form.*

◯ No, I wish to continue to the next section

Section 3, Part 2: Required Data Processing Activities

Recommendation #4: Data Elements

The EPDP Team recommends that the data elements defined in the data elements workbooks in Annex D are required to be collected by registrars. In the aggregate, this means that the following data elements are to be collected (or automatically generated):

Data Elements (Collected and Generated) Note, Data Elements indicated with ** are generated either by the Registrar or the Registry

Domain Name**
Registry Domain ID**
Registrar Whois Server**
Registrar URL**
Updated Date**
Creation Date**
Registry Expiry Date**
Registrar Registration Expiration Date**
Registrar**
Registrar IANA ID**
Registrar Abuse Contact Email**
Registrar Abuse Contact Phone**
Reseller**
Domain Status**
Registry Registrant ID**
Registrant Fields:
· Name
· Organization (optional)
· Street
· City
· State/province
· Postal code
· Country
· Phone
· Phone ext (optional)
· Fax (optional)
· Fax ext (optional)
· Email
Tech ID (optional)
Tech Fields:
• Name (optional)
• Phone (optional)
• Email (optional)
Name Server
DNSSEC (optional)
Name Server IP Address**
Last Update of Whois Database**

Additional optional data elements as identified by Registry Operator in its registration policy, such as (i)

status as Registry Operator Affiliate or Trademark Licensee [.MICROSOFT]; (ii) membership in community [.ECO]; (iii) licensing, registration or appropriate permits (.PHARMACY, .LAW] place of domicile [.NYC]; (iv) business entity or activity [.BANK, .BOT]

Question #2 for Community Input

41. **Do you agree that all these data elements should be collected / generated to achieve the Purposes identified in the Initial Report?**

    Mark only one oval.

    ◯ Yes

    ◯ No

42. **If your answer is 'no', please enumerate which data elements should not be collected / generated.**

    _____

    _____

    _____

    _____

43. **Please provide the rationale for your answer.**

    _____

    _____

    _____

    _____

44. **If you believe additional data elements should be collected / generated, please enumerate which additional elements should be collected / generated.**

    _____

    _____

    _____

    _____

45. **Please provide the rationale for your answer.**

    _____

    _____

    _____

    _____

    _____

Recommendation #4 Continued: Optional Data Elements

The EPDP Team recommends that the following data elements are optional for the Registered Name Holder (RNH) to provide:

• technical contact name
• technical contact email and
• technical contact phone number

The EPDP Team has discussed two definitions of the term "optional" as used in this recommendation:

(1) registrars must offer the data field and registrants can decide whether to fill in the field or leave in blank (in which case the query would return the registered name hold data; OR

(2) registrars can offer this field at their option

46. Should the technical contact fields be optional or mandatory (where mandatory means the registrar must offer the fields AND the RNH must fill in information)?

Mark only one oval.

◯ Optional

◯ Mandatory

47. Please provide the rationale for your answer.

_____

_____

_____

_____

48. If your answer is 'optional', should registrars be required to offer these technical contact fields?

Mark only one oval.

◯ Yes

◯ No

49. Please provide the rationale for your answer.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

50. The EPDP team recommends that contact information for billing and administrative contacts should not be collected. Do you agree that this information should not be collected?

Mark only one oval.

◯ Yes

◯ No

51. Please provide the rationale for your answer.

_____

_____

_____

_____

52. Enter additional comments for Recommendation #4 here.

_____

_____

_____

_____

Recommendation #5: Transmission of Data from Registrar to Registry

The EPDP Team recommends that the specifically-identified data elements under "[t]ransmission of registration data from Registrar to Registry" within the data elements workbooks must be transferred from Registrar to Registry. In the aggregate, these data elements are the same as those in Recommendation #4 for the reasons stated in the Data Workbooks found in Annex D of the Initial Report.

53. Do you agree that all these data elements should be transferred from the registrar to the registry?

Mark only one oval.

◯ Yes

◯ No

54. If your answer is 'no', please enumerate which data elements should not be transferred from the registrar to the registry.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

55. Please provide the rationale for your answer.

_____

_____

_____

_____

56. Enter additional comments for Recommendation #5 here.

_____

_____

_____

_____

Recommendation #6: Transmission of Data to Data Escrow Providers

1. The EPDP Team recommends that ICANN Org enter into legally-compliant data processing agreements with the data escrow providers.

2. The EPDP Team recommends updates to the contractual requirements for registries and registrars to transfer data that they process to the data escrow provider to ensure consistency with the data elements workbooks that analyze the purpose to provide mechanisms for safeguarding Registered Name Holders' Registration Data.

3. The data elements workbook that analyzes the purpose to provide mechanisms for safeguarding Registered Name Holders' Registration Data Registration Data contains the specifically-identified data elements the EPDP Team recommends be transferred by Registries and Registrars to data escrow providers (see Annex D, Workbook 4).

57. Choose your level of support of Recommendation #6:
Mark only one oval.

( ) Support recommendation as written

( ) Support intent of recommendation with edits

( ) Intent and wording of this recommendation requires amendment

( ) Delete recommendation

58. If your response requires an edit or deletion of Recommendation #6, please indicate the revised wording here. Additionally, please enumerate which data elements should not be transferred from the registrar/registry to the data escrow provider.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

59. Please provide the rationale for your answer.

_____

_____

_____

_____

60. Enter additional comments for Recommendation #6 here.

_____

_____

_____

_____

Recommendation #7: Transmission of Data from Registries/Registrars to ICANN Compliance

1. The EPDP Team recommends that updates are made to the contractual requirements for registries and registrars to transfer to ICANN Compliance the domain name registration data that they process when required/requested, consistent with the data elements workbook that analyzes the purpose to handle contractual compliance monitoring requests, audits, and complaints submitted by Registry Operators, Registrars, Registered Name Holders, and other Internet users (see Annex D, Workbook 5).

2. The data elements workbook that analyzes the purpose to handle contractual compliance monitoring requests, audits, and complaints submitted by Registry Operators, Registrars, Registered Name Holders, and other Internet users contains the specifically-identified data elements the EPDP Team recommends be transferred from registries and registrars to ICANN Compliance (see Annex D, Workbook 5).

61. Choose your level of support of Recommendation #7:

Mark only one oval.

( ) Support recommendation as written

( ) Support intent of recommendation with edits

( ) Intent and wording of this recommendation requires amendment

( ) Delete recommendation

62. Do you agree that all of these data elements should be transferred from the registrar to ICANN?

Mark only one oval.

( ) Yes

( ) No

63. If your answer is 'no', please enumerate which data elements should not be transferred from the registrar to ICANN.

_____

_____

_____

_____

64. Please provide the rationale for your answer.

_____

_____

_____

_____

65. Enter additional comments for Recommendation #7 here.

_____

_____

_____

_____

Recommendation #8: Data Redaction

The EPDP Team recommends that redaction must be applied as follows to the data elements that are collected. Data elements neither redacted nor anonymized must appear in a freely accessible directory.

NOT REDACTED
Domain Name
Registrar Whois Server
Registrar URL
Updated Date
Creation Date
Registry Expiry Date
Registrar Registration Expiration Date
Registrar
Registrar IANA ID
Registrar Abuse Contact Email
Registrar Abuse Contact Phone
Reseller
Domain Status

Registrant Fields
• State/province
• Country
• Anonymized email / link to web form

Tech Fields
• Anonymized email / link to web form

NameServer(s)
DNSSEC No
Name Server IP Address
Last Update of Whois Database

REDACTED
Registrant Fields
• Name

• Street
• City
• Postal code
• Phone
• Email

Tech Fields
• Name
• Phone
• Email

UNDECIDED (REDACTED/ NOT REDACTED)
• Organization (opt.)

Please reference page 14-15 of the Initial Report for details of the data elements.

66. Do you agree that all of these data elements should be redacted?
Mark only one oval.

◯ Yes

◯ No

67. If your answer is 'no', please enumerate the data elements that should not be redacted.

_____

_____

_____

_____

68. Please provide the rationale for your answer.

_____

_____

_____

_____

69. The EPDP Team is of divided opinion as to whether "Organization" should be redacted for reasons stated in the Initial Report. Please see the Initial Report, beginning on p. 42. Should the "Organization" field be redacted?
Mark only one oval.

◯ Yes

◯ No

70. Please provide rationale for your answer above.

_____

_____

_____

_____

71. Enter additional comments for Recommendation #8.

_____

_____

_____

_____

Recommendation #9: Organization Field

The EPDP Team recommends that registrars provide further guidance to a Registered Name Holder concerning the information that is to be provided within the Organization field. (For further information, please refer to the Initial Report discussion, beginning on p. 42).

72. Choose your level of support of Recommendation #9:

Mark only one oval.

◯ Support recommendation as written

◯ Support intent of recommendation with edits

◯ Intent and wording of this recommendation requires amendment

◯ Delete recommendation

73. If your response requires an edit or deletion of Recommendation #9, please indicate the revised wording here.

_____

_____

_____

_____

74. Please provide the rationale for your answer.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

75. Additional comments for Recommendation #9.

_____

_____

_____

_____

Recommendation #10: Provision of Email Address/Web Form

In relation to facilitating email communication between third parties and the registrant, the EPDP Team recommends that current requirements in the Temporary Specification that specify that a Registrar MUST provide an email address or a web form to facilitate email communication with the relevant contact, but MUST NOT identify the contact email address or the contact itself, remain in place.

76. Choose your level of support of Recommendation #10:
Mark only one oval.

- ◯ Support recommendation as written
- ◯ Support intent of recommendation with edits
- ◯ Intent and wording of this recommendation requires amendment
- ◯ Delete recommendation

77. If you believe edits are needed for Recommendation #10, please propose edits here.

_____

_____

_____

_____

78. Please provide the rationale for your answer.

_____

_____

_____

_____

79. Additional comments for Recommendation #10.

_____

_____

_____

_____

Recommendation #11: Data Retention

The EPDP Team recommends that Registrars are required to retain the herein-specified data elements for a period of one year following the life of the registration. This retention period conforms to the specific statute of limitations within the Transfer Dispute Resolution Policy ("TDRP").

80. Choose your level of support of Recommendation #11:
Mark only one oval.

- ( ) Support recommendation as written
- ( ) Support intent of recommendation with edits
- ( ) Intent and wording of this recommendation requires amendment
- ( ) Delete recommendation

81. If you do not support Recommendation #11, please provide proposed edits here.

_____

_____

_____

_____

82. Please provide the rationale for your answer.

_____

_____

_____

_____

83. Additional comments for Recommendation #11.

_____

_____

_____

_____

Question 3 for Community Input: Differentiating Registrants: Legal v. Natural Persons; and Effects of Geographic Location

84. **What other factors should the EPDP team consider about whether Contracted Parties should be permitted or required to differentiate between registrants on a geographic basis? (For more information, please refer to the Initial Report, beginning on p.47.**

_____

_____

_____

_____

85. **Please provide the rationale for your above answer.**

_____

_____

_____

_____

86. **Are there any other risks associated with differentiation of registrants on a geographic basis? If so, please identify those factors and/or risks and how they would affect possible recommendations, keeping in mind compliance with the GDPR.**

_____

_____

_____

_____

87. **What other factors should the EPDP team consider about whether Contracted Parties should be permitted or required to differentiate between natural and legal persons?**

_____

_____

_____

_____

88. **Please provide the rationale for your above answer.**

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

89. Should there be further study as to whether whether procedures would be feasible to accurately distinguish on a global scale whether registrants/contracted parties fall within jurisdiction of the GDPR or other data protection laws? Please provide a rationale.

_____

_____

_____

_____

90. Are you aware of existing examples where a legal/natural differentiation is already made and could it apply at a global scale for purposes of registration data? If yes, please provide additional information.

_____

_____

_____

_____

Recommendation #12: Reasonable Access

The EPDP Team recommends that the current requirements in the Temporary Specification in relation to reasonable access remain in place until work on a system for Standardized Access to Non-Public Registration Data has been completed, noting that the term should be modified to refer to "parameters for responding to lawful disclosure requests." Furthermore, the EPDP Team recommends that criteria around the term "reasonable" are further explored as part of the implementation of these policy recommendations addressing:

o   [Practicable]* timelines criteria for responses to be provided by Contracted Parties;
o   Format by which requests should be made and responses are provided;
o   Communication/Instructions around how and where requests should be submitted;
o   Requirements for what information responses should include (for example, auto-acknowledgement of requests and rationale for rejection of request);
o   Logging of requests.

[*Some concern expressed that timeliness that should not be translated into requirements that are impractical for contracted parties].

91. Choose your level of support of Recommendation #12:

Mark only one oval.

◯ Support recommendation as written

◯ Support intent of recommendation with edits

◯ Intent and wording of this recommendation requires amendment

◯ Delete recommendation

92. If you believe edits are needed for Recommendation #12, please propose them here.

_____

_____

_____

_____

93. Please provide the rationale for your answer.

_____

_____

_____

_____

94. Additional comments for Recommendation #12.

_____

_____

_____

_____

Recommendation #13: Joint Controller Agreements

Based on the information and the deliberations the EPDP Team had on this topic and pending further input and legal advice, the EPDP Team recommends that ICANN Org negotiates and enters into a Joint Controller Agreement (JCA) with the Contracted Parties.

In addition to the legally required components of such agreement, the JCA shall specify the responsibilities of the respective parties for the processing activities as described below. Indemnification clauses shall ensure that the risk for certain data processing is borne by either one or multiple parties that have the primary interest in the processing.

95. Choose your level of support of Recommendation #13:
Mark only one oval.

- ◯ Support recommendation as written
- ◯ Support intent of recommendation with edits
- ◯ Intent and wording of this recommendation requires amendment
- ◯ Delete recommendation

96. If you believe changes are needed for Recommendation #13, please provide proposed edits here.

_____

_____

_____

_____

97. Please provide the rationale for your answer.

_____

_____

_____

_____

98. Additional comments for Recommendation #13.

_____

_____

_____

_____

99. Enter any other additional comments or observations you have on Section 3, Part 2 that are not covered by these questions.

_____

_____

_____

_____

Save Your Progress

100. Do you want to save your progress and quit for now? You will be able to return to the form to complete at a later time.

Mark only one oval.

○ Yes   *Stop filling out this form.*

○ No, I wish to continue to the next section

Section 3, Part 3: Data Processing Terms

Recommendation #14: Data Processing Roles & Responsibilities

The EPDP Team recommends that the policy includes the following data processing activities as well as responsible parties. Please reference the Initial Report, beginning on p. 63 for further details.

101. Choose your level of support of Recommendation #14:

Mark only one oval.

- ◯ Support recommendation as written
- ◯ Support intent of recommendation with edits
- ◯ Intent and wording of this recommendation requires amendment
- ◯ Delete recommendation

102. If you do not agree with the enumerated data processing activities and responsible parties, please provide proposed edits, including specific processing activities that need to be added/deleted here. The EPDP team particularly seeks feedback with the assignment of roles such as: "joint-controller," "controller," and "processor.

_____

_____

_____

_____

103. Please provide your rationale for the proposed addition/deletion.

_____

_____

_____

_____

104. Additional comments for Recommendation #14.

_____

_____

_____

_____

Save Your Progress

105. Do you want to save your progress and quit for now? You will be able to return to the form to complete at a later time.

Mark only one oval.

( ) Yes   *Stop filling out this form.*

( ) No, I wish to continue to the next section

Section 3, Part 4: Updates to Other Consensus Policies

106. Enter any general comments or observations you may have on the findings in Section 3, Part 4.

_____

_____

_____

_____

Recommendation #15: Uniform Rapid Suspension/Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy Requirements

The EPDP Team recommends that for the new policy on gTLD registration data, the requirements of the Temporary Specification are maintained in relation to URS and UDRP until such time as these are superseded by recommendations from the RPMs PDP WG (if any).

107. Choose your level of support of Recommendation #15:

Mark only one oval.

( ) Support recommendation as written

( ) Support intent of recommendation with edits

( ) Intent and wording of this recommendation requires amendment

( ) Delete recommendation

108. If you do not agree that the current updated requirements in the UDRP and URS, as provided in the Temporary Specification should remain in place, please provide proposed edits to the current requirements.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

109. Please provide the rationale, keeping in mind compliance with GDPR.

_____

_____

_____

_____

110. ~~**Additional comments for Recommendation #15.**~~

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Recommendation #16: Instruction to GNSO and Rights Protection Mechanisms Policy Development Working Group

The EPDP Team also recommends that the GNSO Council instructs the review of all RPMs PDP WG to consider, as part of its deliberations, whether there is a need to update existing requirements to clarify that a complainant must only be required to insert the publicly-available RDDS data for the domain name(s) at issue in its initial complaint. The EPDP Team also recommends the GNSO Council to instruct the RPMs PDP WG to consider whether upon receiving updated RDDS data (if any), the complainant must be given the opportunity to file an amended complaint containing the updated respondent information.

111. Choose your level of support of Recommendation #16:

Mark only one oval.

◯ Support recommendation as written

◯ Support intent of recommendation with edits

◯ Intent and wording of this recommendation requires amendment

◯ Delete recommendation

112. If you do not support Recommendation #16, please provide proposed text/edits.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

113. Please provide the rationale for your answer.

_____

_____

_____

_____

114. Provide additional comments for Recommendation #16 here.

_____

_____

_____

_____

Recommendation #17: UDRP/URS

The EPDP Team requests that when the EPDP Team commences its deliberations on a standardized access framework, a representative of the RPMs PDP WG shall provide an update on the current status of deliberations so that the EPDP Team may determine if/how the WG's recommendations may affect consideration of the URS and UDRP in the context of the standardized access framework deliberations.

115. Choose your level of support of Recommendation #17:
Mark only one oval.

- ◯ Support recommendation as written
- ◯ Support intent of recommendation with edits
- ◯ Intent and wording of this recommendation requires amendment
- ◯ Delete recommendation

116. If you do not support Recommendation #17, please provide proposed edits or changes.

_____

_____

_____

_____

117. Please provide the rationale for your answer.

_____

_____

_____

_____

118. Provide additional comments for Recommendation #17 here.

_____

_____

_____

_____

Recommendation #18: Data Processing Agreements

The EPDP Team recommends that ICANN Org must enter into data processing agreements with dispute resolution providers in which, amongst other items, the data retention period is specifically addressed, as this will affect the ability to have publicly-available decisions.

119. Choose your level of support of Recommendation #18:
Mark only one oval.

- ( ) Support recommendation as written
- ( ) Support intent of recommendation with edits
- ( ) Intent and wording of this recommendation requires amendment
- ( ) Delete recommendation

120. If you do not agree to Recommendation #18, please provide proposed edits or changes here.

_____

_____

_____

_____

121. Please provide the rationale for your answer here.

_____

_____

_____

_____

122. Provide additional comments for Recommendation #18 here.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Question #4 for Community Input

123. **Are there any changes that the EPDP Team should consider in relation to the URS and UDRP that have not already been identified?**

_____

_____

_____

_____

124. **If so, please provide the relevant rationale, keeping in mind compliance with the GDPR.**

_____

_____

_____

_____

Recommendation #19: Transfer Policy

The EPDP Team recommends that for the new policy on gTLD registration data, the requirements of the Temporary Specification are maintained in relation to the Transfer Policy until such time these are superseded by recommendations that may come out of the Transfer Policy review that is being undertaken by the GNSO Council.

125. **Choose your level of support of Recommendation #19:**
     Mark only one oval.

     ( ) Support recommendation as written

     ( ) Support intent of recommendation with edits

     ( ) Intent and wording of this recommendation requires amendment

     ( ) Delete recommendation

126. **If you do not support Recommendation #19, please provide proposed changes/edits here.**

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

127. Please provide the rationale for your answer, keeping in mind compliance with GDPR.

_____

_____

_____

_____

128. Provide additional comments for Recommendation #19 here.

_____

_____

_____

_____

Recommendation #20: Transfer Policy

The EPDP Team recommends that the GNSO Council, as part of its review of the Transfer Policy, specifically requests the review of the implications, as well as adjustments, that may be needed to the Transfer Policy as a result of GDPR.

129. Choose your level of support of Recommendation #20:

Mark only one oval.

- ( ) Support recommendation as written
- ( ) Support intent of recommendation with edits
- ( ) Intent and wording of this recommendation requires amendment
- ( ) Delete recommendation

130. If you do not support Recommendation #20, please provide proposed edits/changes here.

_____

_____

_____

_____

131. Please provide the rationale for your answer here.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

132. Provide additional comments for Recommendation #20 here.

_____

_____

_____

_____

Question #5 for Community Input

133. Are there any changes that the EPDP Team should consider in relation to the Transfer Policy that have not already been identified? If so, please provide the relevant rationale, keeping in mind compliance with the GDPR.

_____

_____

_____

_____

134. Enter any other additional comments or observations you have on Section 3, Part 3 that are not covered by these questions.

_____

_____

_____

_____

Save Your Progress

135. Do you want to save your progress and quit for now? You will be able to return to the form to complete at a later time.

Mark only one oval.

◯ Yes _Stop filling out this form._

◯ No, I wish to continue to the next section

Section 3: Other Recommendations

136. **Enter any general comments or observations you may have on the findings in Section 3, Other Recommendation.**

_____

_____

_____

_____

Recommendation #21: Joint Controller and Data Processing Agreements

The EPDP Team recommends that ICANN Org enters into required data protection agreements such as a Data Processing Agreement (GDPR Art. 28) or Joint Controller Agreement (Art. 26), as appropriate, with the non-Contracted Party entities involved in registration data processing such as data escrow providers and EBERO providers. These agreements are expected to set out the relationship obligations and instructions for data processing between the different parties.

137. **Choose your level of support of Recommendation #21:**
Mark only one oval.

- ( ) Support recommendation as written
- ( ) Support intent of recommendation with edits
- ( ) Intent and wording of this recommendation requires amendment
- ( ) Delete recommendation

138. **If you do not support Recommendation #21, please provide proposed edits/changes here.**

_____

_____

_____

_____

139. **Please provide the rationale for your answer here, keeping in mind compliance with GDPR.**

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

140. Provide additional comments for Recommendation #21 here.

_____

_____

_____

_____

Recommendation #22: Updates to Existing Consensus Policies

The EPDP Team recommends that as part of the implementation of these policy recommendations, updates are made to the following existing policies / procedures, and any others that may have been omitted, to ensure consistency with these policy recommendations as a number of these refer to administrative and/or technical contact which will no longer be required data elements:

- Registry Registration Data Directory Services Consistent Labeling and Display Policy
- Thick WHOIS Transition Policy for .COM, .NET, .JOBS
- Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy
- WHOIS Data Reminder Policy
- Transfer Policy
- Uniform Rapid Suspension System (URS) Rules

Please reference the Initial Report, beginning on p. 71 for further details.

141. Choose your level of support of Recommendation #22:
Mark only one oval.

- ◯ Support recommendation as written
- ◯ Support intent of recommendation with edits
- ◯ Intent and wording of this recommendation requires amendment
- ◯ Delete recommendation

142. If you do not support Recommendation #22, please provide proposed edits or changes here.

_____

_____

_____

_____

143. Please provide the rationale for your answer here.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

144. Provide additional comments on Recommendation #22 here.

_____

_____

_____

_____

145. Enter any other additional comments or observations you have on Section 3: Other Recommendations that are not covered by these questions.

_____

_____

_____

_____

Save Your Progress

146. Do you want to save your progress and quit for now? You will be able to return to the form to complete at a later time.

Mark only one oval.

◯   Yes   _Stop filling out this form._

◯   No, I wish to continue to the next section

Other Comments & Submission

147. Are there any other comments or issues you would like to raise pertaining to the Initial Report? If yes, please enter your comments here. If applicable, please specify the section or page number in the Initial Report to which your comments refer.

_____

_____

_____

_____

Save Your Progress

A copy of your responses will be emailed to the address you provided