

Registrar and User Consultative Committee Meetings

Minutes of the plenary meeting

12/10/2017

afnic

Document index

1. Attendees.....	3
2. Agenda.....	5
3. Minutes.....	6
3.1. Welcome.....	6
3.2. News update.....	6
3.3. Discussion items	7
3.3.1. Study on motivations for the uses of domain names.....	7
3.3.2. GDPR: Changes in Contracts and Practices between Afnic and its Registrars.....	8
3.3.3. Afnic members: position of the consultative committees on employee membership.....	10
3.4. Information update.....	11
3.4.1. Overall assessment of gTLDs	11
3.4.2. Succeeding with the web	11
3.4.3. IoT.....	12
3.4.4. Market trends in domain names.....	13
3.5. Conclusion.....	13

1. Attendees

Registrars: 13 (out of 43 members)

DATAXY	Dulac	Bernard	Remote
DOMAINIUM	Franck	Philippe	
DOMAINOO	Farhat	Saoussen	
GANDI	Atbane	Idir	Remote
GANDI	Lhuillery	Nicolas	
NAMEBAY	Lantonnet	Eric	
NAMESHIELD	Benoist	Maxim	
NETIM	Vincent	Bruno	
NORDNET	Jung	Scott	
ONLINE SAS	Frigault	Laurent	
ONLINE SAS	Michot	Jean Claude	
ORANGE	Jean-Gilles	Sophie	
ORANGE	Kuczera	Jeremy	
ORANGE	Sellier	Sandrine	
ORDIPAT	Destenave	Sylvie	
ORDIPAT	Korn	Jennifer	
SAFEBRANDS	Hirel	Sebastian	
VIADUC	Boutin	Celine	

Users, individuals and corporate entities: 9 (out of 42 members)

ASSOCIATION E-SENIORS	Bachollet	Anne Marie
	Bachollet	Sebastian
ISOC France:	Camus	Matthew
	Chagny	Nicolas
	Frapy	Agnes
	Louis	Benjamin
NEOCAMINO	Measures	Adrian
	Porteneuve	Elisabeth
	Tayer	David-Irving

Afnic

Afnic	Ampeau	Benoit	Labs Manager
Afnic	Benyelles	Loffi	Innovation Marketing Manager
Afnic	Bonis	Pierre	CEO
Afnic	Boulevard	Nathalie	Data Protection Officer (CIL)
Afnic	Canac	Sophie	Member services
Afnic	Damilaville	Loïc	Studies & Intelligence
Afnic	Davoust	Clemency	Event communication
Afnic	Dong	Maëlle	Event communication
Afnic	Georgelin	Marianne	Registry Policy Manager
Afnic	Turbat	Emilie	Marketing and Commercial Director

2. Agenda

09:15 Welcome

09:30 News update

09:45 Presentation of items for discussion in the committees:

- ✓ Study on motivations for the uses of domain names
- ✓ GDPR: Changes in Contracts and Practices between Afnic and its Registrars
- ✓ Afnic members: position of the consultative committees on employee membership

11:15 Coffee break

11:30 Individual Consultative Committee meetings

13:15 Lunch

14:00 Feedback reports from the Consultative Committees

15:00 Presentation of information updates and discussions with members

- ✓ IoT
- ✓ Overall assessment of gTLDs
- ✓ Réussir avec le web (Succeeding with the web)
- ✓ Market trends in domain names

17:00 End of meeting

3. Minutes

3.1. Welcome

Pierre Bonis introduced the session by recalling how the consultation committees operate and by presenting the items on the agenda.

The three trustees present, Sébastien Bachollet and Benjamin Louis (elected by the user members) and Eric Lantonnet (elected by the Registrar members) also welcomed the participants and reminded them that they were at their disposal.

Sébastien Bachollet recalled that the departure of Mathieu Weill had led to a recruitment process and after hearing several candidates, the Board of Trustees had appointed Pierre Bonis as Chief Executive Officer. He explained that members through their elected representatives on the Board of Trustees played an important role in the decisions of the association and in particular the choice of the Chief Executive Officer.

3.2. News update

Pierre Bonis explained that Afnic was sufficiently structured and organized to ensure that the departure of Mathieu Weill did not affect the ability of Afnic to continue its work and deliver its services.

As part of the Council of European National Top Level Domain Registries (CENTR), Nathalie Boulevard (Data Protection Officer (CIL)) and Mickael Vigreux (Sales Manager) had been nominated for the "Contributor of the Year" Award by their European colleagues from the CENTR for their work in the community.

The *.museum*, a legacy TLD which had existed since 2003, had approached Afnic, which should become the technical registry operator for the *.museum* by the end of the year.

Afnic had launched *Réussir avec le web (Succeeding with the web)* at the SME trade fair, the tool's priority target being SOHOs/SMEs. From the promotion of the *.fr* TLD, Afnic has gone on to promote online presence to reach SOHOs and SMEs and encourage their online presence.

At the moment, several important topics were being discussed at Icann, Afnic was actively participating with particular regard to:

- ✓ GDPR
- ✓ ccTLDs with 3 characters (which cannot be opened for registration by others according to Afnic),
- ✓ Icann Reforms and the follow-up to the transfer of the IANA function:
 - The modification of relations with Icann concerning the jurisdiction (Californian law),
 - Diversity at all levels; but the composition of the board and decision groups are increasingly American (US) centered.

Pierre Bonis recalled the importance of showing up at all levels, even online, to back the need for diversity, so that it could be heard by Icann.

Sébastien Bachollet also indicated that the future ICANN board would consist of 5 American citizens. That was far from being representative of the diversity of the international community.

Regarding the governance of the association, part of the Afnic Board of Trustees was to be renewed in June 2018 with the election of a Registrar representative and a User representative. Any person who had been a member for at least 6 months in June 2018 was an elector and could be a candidate. The election campaign would begin in the first quarter of 2018.

3.3. Discussion items

NB The answers to questions from members on discussion items are not included in this report. They will be subject to a separate report after analysis by Afnic teams.

3.3.1. Study on motivations for the uses of domain names

Lotfi Benyelles presented the expectations of this study, which had been the subject of a operational working group (OWG) at Afnic.

The objective was to have qualitative and quantitative indicators on the motivations for the purchase of a domain name, the uses made of it and the profiles of the registrants of *.fr domain names*.

The study should establish:

- ✓ An overview of the decision criteria per target audience and type of online presence throughout the customer life-cycle
- ✓ Strengths and weaknesses of the domain name in the context of online presence
- ✓ The action levers (commercial / marketing, etc.) used by players in the domain name business to develop their activity in online presence
- ✓ Indicators for monitoring the customer experience of prospects / registrants of a domain name under the *.fr*

As wished by the members of the consultation committee:

- ✓ A full version of the results will be restricted to members
- ✓ A summary version of the study will be available to all
- ✓ A summary presentation of the results could be given during an event organized by Afnic

Afnic wanted feedback from its members on the questionnaire in order to improve it before the survey was conducted quickly afterwards, the goal being to have results by the end of the year.

Pierre Bonis supplemented these remarks by asking the Registrars if they needed interaction in relation to the questionnaire that was going to be sent to some of their clients, and if so, in what form.

Registrars' position:

After meeting in a separate session, the registrars indicated:

The study was the result of a considerable amount of work and they thanked Afnic for doing it.

Attention should be paid to the use of the term "Afnic customer", which in the survey referred to users, when the registrars were Afnic's customers.

The registrars wanted a question to be added to the questionnaire about the "customer purchase click-stream" to find out if they bought their domain names through an agency or directly over the internet. It was important to leave the question completely open so as not to influence the answers.

The registrars would also like Afnic to provide a benchmark for what is done elsewhere, through studies in other countries or by others (e.g. Verisign).

Pierre Bonis replied that a benchmark was also planned through the CENTR, which was going to carry out the same type of study for its members.

Users' position:

After meeting in a separate session, the users indicated:

The forecast volume of responses seemed low and it was necessary to broaden the panel.

Attention had to be paid to the risk of bias: the respondents knew Afnic or might have a specific motivation. There was a risk that there would be a small number of people who answered No to the first question. It would be useful to increase the answers for this type of profile.

Users who had opted for an online presence solely on the social networks (Facebook) should be polled. Why did they go to those networks, why did they not have a web site, what were the arguments that would draw them to online presence + domain name + website. The questions also needed to include the world of smartphone apps that were kind of an online presence but were not addressed in the questionnaire.

Comments were made on the length of the study.

Attention should be paid to the use of the term "Afnic customer", which in the survey referred to users, when the registrars were Afnic's customers.

In the questions that included an MCQ on TLD suffixes, attention should be paid on how the choice of suffix was presented, including other ccTLDs (which were not indicated here, otherwise they should be added under "other").

Regarding the tool used for the survey: the respondents had to be able to return to past questions, archive them, and have a summary of their answers at the end.

Pierre Bonis replied regarding the panel of respondents that it could be expanded with the help of members.

Several user members came forward to propose extending the panel through their network, or their members.

3.3.2. GDPR: Changes in Contracts and Practices between Afnic and its Registrars

Marianne Georgelin presented Afnic's study of the impacts of the GDPR (*General Data Protection Regulation*) on the contracts and practices by and between Afnic and the registrars, the identification of the processing carried out by each other, the data flows, the impacts and responsibilities of one and all.

The contract would be submitted to the registrars on December 1 as usual, but the provisions of the GDPR would only apply on May 25, 2018, at the same time as the Regulation.

Article 19 of the contract would be amended and renamed "protection of personal data". It would refer to the provisions of the GDPR and would reiterate the roles and responsibilities of one and all.

It would resemble what already existed but would be fleshed out with the provisions of the GDPR.

Other Afnic documents would be affected (the accreditation policy, and perhaps the naming policy). Changes other than the contract would be made in the first quarter of 2018. In addition Afnic was going to implement a personal data policy as part of the transparency and information initiative.

One member wished to know whether, in the context of additional services such as FR LOCK, Afnic was considered as a data controller or a data processor.

Nathalie Boulevard replied that in this case Afnic was a data processor. It was the responsibility of the data controller, therefore the registrar, to inform its customers of the recipients of data about them to

enable delivery of the service. Afnic complied with the conditions of security and confidentiality dictated by the data controller, i.e. the registrar, who remained the key contact for the customer.

Marianne Georgelin and Nathalie Boulevard also recalled that because Afnic had been anonymizing personal data in the Whois database for 10 years it made things easier and made the changes caused by the arrival of the GDPR less extensive.

Registrars' position:

After meeting in a separate session, the registrars indicated:

In the current state of affairs, the registrars would like to be informed of the changes affecting the contracts and indicated that they would not be able to give an opinion until they were fully cognizant of all the issues.

They wished to be able to study the documents and contracts that Afnic was going to modify all at the same time, in order to take into account the GDPR and thus receive them in grouped fashion.

Pierre Bonis recalled that the usual deadline for the renewal of contracts was January 1, and that the changes would be submitted to them as soon as possible. However, the clauses would only apply in May 2018, so it would always be possible to continue discussions at the beginning of 2018 if this proved necessary.

The registrars and Afnic teams agreed that in any case, they could not wait for the next Consultation Committee meeting and that it would be necessary to have the discussions upstream, by e-mail in particular.

Users' position:

After meeting in a separate session, the users indicated:

There had been a substantive discussion of the interest of the GDPR for users as well as on the origin of the text. The GDPR would not change things much for users. The opinions were divided on its interest and progress.

The users asked the question about Afnic's level of preparedness to respond to requests (whether justified or not) from users, with particular regard to its co-responsibility for the holding of data (processing?). Users might turn to Afnic if the registrar or reseller does not respond to requests.

Beware of the chain of custody effects: resellers of registrars, resellers of resellers of registrars...

Afnic responded on the latter point that it was up to the registrar to ensure that its data processors also comply with the regulations.

3.3.3. Afnic members: position of the consultative committees on employee membership

Pierre Bonis introduced this subject by stating that 2 employees were currently members and had asked for a day off to come and take part in the work of the committees or the general meeting.

He recalled the context and past events in the life of the association during which the question had already been addressed. He summarized the positions of various groups of members concerning employee membership.

What was complicated was not the quality of the employee members, but the way they were perceived and their voices heard. Interventions could also have an impact on the organization and environment of the workplace.

Furthermore, in the event of more massive backing by the employees, the potential weight of the latter in the user college could become too great, and could lead to an employee being elected as a trustee.

It might be possible to involve employees who wished to do so in another form, for example through the operational working groups (OWGs).

Registrars' position:

After meeting in a separate session, the registrars indicated:

A consensus had been found by the registrars, who gave a favorable opinion on the amendment of the Articles of Association to prohibit Afnic employees from becoming members of the association.

But they asked Afnic to study the possibility of increasing the involvement of employees in the life of the association, including without becoming members. While the principle of a willingness to involve employees was in itself beneficial, the terms of that involvement were at issue in this case.

Users' position:

After meeting in a separate session, the users indicated:

The users had identified potential conflicts of interest for member employees, as well as the inconvenience to all in certain cases or discussions. For this reason, the risk of influencing the debates was raised.

One solution would be to conduct a survey at the CENTR to learn about the practices of other ccTLDs, and to study what was being done in France in the associative world (among associations of a similar size). The considerable freedom in the Articles of Association opened up solutions.

The discussion on the reform deserved to be enlarged, because there were other complicated cases (Ministries, gTLDs, etc.) that could generate a massive membership and shift the balance of the Users' college.

In view of the major milestones for Afnic in the next 3 to 4 years, the likely risks to the Users' college and the image of Afnic, the users present had reached a consensus, there had been no votes against, on the case of employee members:

It was proposed to exclude Afnic employees from the association and to no longer allow their membership.

To accompany this change in the Articles of Association:

The relevance of current employees and their willingness to contribute to the advancement of the association was appreciated. Afnic was unanimously asked by the users present to make the operational working group (OWG) permanent and develop them so that interested employees who volunteered could take part in the development of Afnic,

Pierre Bonis summarized the opinions and expectations of the members on this subject:

The Afnic management would ask the Board of Directors to convene an Extraordinary General Meeting to amend the Articles of the association.

In a second step, a broader study would have to be carried out by the October consultation committee meetings on the reform of the colleges.

Sébastien Bachollet, a user-elected member of the Board of Trustees, added that if the colleges were changed, the reasoning process had to be followed through and therefore the impact on the composition of the Board of Trustees also had to be studied.

Pierre Bonis thanked all the members for the quality of the feedback.

3.4. Information update

3.4.1. Overall assessment of gTLDs

Emilie Turbat presented an overall assessment of gTLDs further a request expressed by the members.

Afnic was now accompanying 13 registries divided into 4 geoTLDs and 9 brand / corpTLDs.

In 2016, gTLDs represented 7% of Afnic's turnover.

The volumes of domain names were very disparate, depending on the gTLDs.

Volume was not necessarily a criterion of success for these gTLDs: for geoTLDs, proximity (and exemplarity) were paramount, for corpTLDs it was more a question of use (of strategy), and for some such as the *.ovh*, it was volume.

Muse Doma were to entrust Afnic with a legacy gTLD: the *.museum*, with a technical transition scheduled for October 30. Afnic was to carry out a project to revive the *.museum* :

- ✓ *Recruitment of registrars*
- ✓ *Recruitment of .museum ambassadors*
- ✓ *New website*

3.4.2. Succeeding with the web

Pierre Bonis explained in his introduction that Afnic had positioned itself on the subject of online presence through its involvement in:

- Transition Numérique Plus with whom Afnic worked but whose approach did not focus on online presence.
- The report of the National Council for the Digital Economy (CNUM) in which Afnic had actively participated
- Réussir en .fr and Foliweb partnerships

And hence: Réussir avec le Web

Emilie Turbat presented the project which had been refocused on the SOHO / SME target and on online presence, and whose content has been revised following the feedback made by the members of the consultation committee meetings in March.

The results gathered by this self-assessment tool for online presence would be of benefit to the various stakeholders:

- to respondents who could obtain tips to improve their online presence
- to partners
- to Afnic

Afnic's goal for the end of the year: 1,000 respondents and 3 partners

The registrars asked if it would not be possible, as part of partnerships with a federation customer of a registrar, to extend the process so that the end of the click-stream would include the possibility to file domain name through the registrar.

Emilie Turbat and Pierre Bonis replied that the initial concept, the philosophy behind the tool, did not provide for this type of "exclusivity".

However, for registrars who wanted to relay to their customers and possibly make landing pages allowing members of federations to move on to the purchase of a domain name, there were always possibilities, and for that they should contact Mickael Vigreux.

3.4.3. IoT

Benoit Ampeau presented the work of Afnic as part of a possible diversification towards IoT.

IoT represented the extension of the Internet to real world objects.

Afnic had positioned itself on the subject for several years and was currently contributing as an institutional member to work within the LoRa Alliance™.

Afnic's vision was that the DNS, now a standard for the Internet, could also become a standard for IoT and become the naming service for IoT.

In particular, the DNS would provide interoperability and portability between standards and thus, for example, ultimately enable a gain in the life cycle of products (by avoiding throwing products away with each change of operator or technology).

Afnic's current positioning was to promote the role of a trusted third party and the use of the DNS as a standard component, so that Afnic could become an IoT registry.

One member asked how the DNS was perceived in the IoT sector and what were the positions of other registries on this topic.

Benoit Ampeau answered that the only other registry to position itself on IoT was Nominet.

Concerning the perception of the DNS in the IoT ecosystem, the operators were not waiting for the DNS, they could operate connected objects without the DNS by making agreements direct between operators...

The DNS was not a new solution but a proven solution in the Internet world, one known to all, one that would allow interoperability and simplified portability in an environment where multiple networks and standards coexisted.

3.4.4. Market trends in domain names

Loic Damilaville presented the trends in the domain name market.

3.5. Conclusion

The users' and registrars' consultative committee meetings ended at 17:00.

The schedule for upcoming meetings of the association was provided, as indicated below:

Date	Event	Venue
Thursday, February 8	Board Meeting	SQY (Afnic)
Thursday, March 29	Registrar and User Consultative Committee Meetings	SQY (Afnic)
Thursday, April 12	Board Meeting	SQY (Afnic)
Thursday, May 17	Afnic Forum	Paris
Wednesday, June 6 and Thursday June 7	International College Annual Days	SQY (Afnic)
Friday, June 8	Annual General Meeting Board Meeting Annual dinner	Paris
Wednesday 26 & Thursday, September 27	Board Meeting & Strategic Annual Seminar of the Board	?
Thursday October 11	Registrar and User Consultative Committee Meetings	?
Thursday November 15	Board Meeting	SQY (Afnic)