



Index

Protection of IGO and INGO Identifiers in All gTLDs Policy Development Process 2
RAA Privacy & Proxy Services Accreditation Issues Policy Development Process..... 4
Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information Policy Development Process... 6
Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy (IRTP) Part D Policy Development Process..... 8
Policy & Implementation10
Cross Community Working Groups Drafting Team 12
Metrics and Reporting Drafting Team.....14
Whois Studies Update..... 16

Protection of IGO and INGO Identifiers in All gTLDs Policy Development Process

What is this about?

Providing special protections for the names and acronyms, known as identifiers, of the Red Cross Red Crescent (RCRC), International Olympic Committee (IOC), International Governmental Organizations (IGO), and other International Non-Governmental Organizations (INGO) from third party domain name registrations at the top and second levels of new gTLDs has been a long-standing issue over the course of the New gTLD Program.

The Board has requested the GNSO Council to provide policy advice on whether to protect RCRC, IOC, IGO, and other INGO names at the top and second levels in new gTLDs; the GNSO Council initiated a PDP on this topic in October 2012. As a result of the Board's New gTLD Program Committee response to GAC advice, protections of certain RCRC, IOC and IGO names are indefinitely in place until any GNSO policy recommendations require further and/or different actions.

What is the current status of this project?

On 20 September 2013 the WG published its Draft Final Report which includes policy recommendations for the protection of IGO and INGO (including the RCRC and IOC) identifiers in all gTLDs. Each recommendation or proposal also contains the WG's Chair assessment of consensus. The objective of the Draft Final Report was to solicit feedback from the community on the proposed consensus policy recommendations. The comment period closed 1 November 2013. The WG has reviewed the public comments submitted, modified the Final Report, and sent it to the GNSO Council for their consideration at the Buenos Aires meeting.

Why is this important?

This is a high-profile issue for both the ICANN Board and the GAC, and continues to be followed closely by senior officials at the Red Cross, IOC, and IGOs including the UN and OECD. Any policy outcomes as a result of this PDP will impact not only the New gTLDs being delegated now, but it will also require protection implementation within existing gTLD delegated prior to 2012 if the recommendations are eventually adopted by the NGPC.

Expected next steps

- The GNSO will receive a detailed briefing on the proposed recommendations at the Saturday GNSO Session in Buenos Aires. The WG has a session scheduled for Monday 18 Nov, but the session may be cancelled if it is not necessary for the WG to meet.
- The GNSO Council will deliberate and consider the PDP WG's recommendations presented in its Final Report and determine next steps.

Background on Developments since the Durban Meeting

- The GAC in its Durban Communiqué advised that the IGO names and acronyms and RCRC acronyms be included in the second-level protections in preparation for delegation of new

gTLDs at least until the GAC advice and any GNSO PDP outcome has been determined. The NGPC accepted the GAC advice and current protections have been added to Specification 5 of the approved Registry Agreement.

- The PDP Working Group published its Draft Final Report on 20 September 2013 for public comment which closed 1 November 2013.
- The PDP Working Group has completed its Final Report and submitted to the GNSO Council on 10 November 2013. The following is a summary of the recommendations, but do not represent the supported recommendation in whole or in detail:
 - Top-level reservation protection of full name + exception procedure
 - Second-level reservation protection of full name + exception procedure
 - No acronym reservation protections
 - Identifiers not reserved (acronyms) to be bulk added to the Trademark Clearinghouse
 - 90 days TMCH claims notification service
 - Initiate PDP to determine how IGOs-INGOs may access UDRP and URS curative rights protection mechanisms

Where can I find more information?

- Draft Final Report
<http://gns0.icann.org/en/issues/igo-ingo-final-20sep13-en.pdf>
- Additional Information
<http://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/active/igo-ingo>

Staff responsible: Berry Cobb, Mary Wong

RAA Privacy & Proxy Services Accreditation Issues Policy Development Process

What is this about?

The Registrar Accreditation Agreement (RAA) is the contract that governs ICANN's relationship with its accredited registrars. Revised periodically, the newest form of RAA was approved by the ICANN Board in June 2013. Registrars wishing to sell domain names in the new gTLD program will have to sign up for the new 2013 RAA, as will registrars operating under the older 2009 RAA who wish to renew their contracts with ICANN.

A number of high priority topics were identified by the ICANN community for the RAA negotiations. One of these was the accreditation of providers of privacy and proxy services for domain name registrations. A *privacy service* is one in which a domain name is registered in the registrant's name, but other contact details displayed in the publicly-accessible Whois gTLD registration data directory are those given by the privacy service provider and not those of the registrant. A *proxy service* is one in which the registered name holder licenses use of the domain to the customer who actually uses the domain, and the contact information displayed in the Whois system is that of the registered name holder. The *Whois system* is a form of Internet data directory service, utilizing a protocol that permits public lookup of a domain name, including certain contact and technical information about the registrant and the domain.

The topic of privacy and proxy services accreditation was not addressed in the 2013 RAA negotiations. This PDP will examine the issues related to the provision and accreditation of privacy and proxy services, with a view toward assisting ICANN with developing an accreditation program for such services.

What is the current status of this project?

The GNSO Council approved the charter that will guide the work of the Working Group for this PDP in October 2013. A [call for volunteers](#) has been issued, and the WG is expected to hold its first meeting during the ICANN meeting in Buenos Aires.

Why is this important?

The 2013 RAA contains a temporary specification that governs registrars' obligations in respect of privacy and proxy services. The specification will expire either on 1 January 2017 or ICANN's implementation of a privacy and proxy accreditation program, whichever first occurs. The GNSO has also commissioned several studies on the Whois system, including one on privacy and proxy abuse, the results of which were released for public comment in September 2013. Finally, the issue of accrediting privacy and proxy services is being discussed in the broader context of ICANN's ongoing review of the Whois system, including within an Expert Working Group formed in December 2012 that is looking at the fundamental purpose and possible redesign of gTLD registration data services. This PDP represents an opportunity for the GNSO and other interested community members to assist ICANN with developing its privacy and proxy accreditation program and informing its broader work on Whois.

Expected next steps

The Working Group is still accepting participation from all interested community members. At its first meeting during the ICANN meeting in Buenos Aires, the WG will elect a Chair and determine its next steps, including frequency of meetings and a proposed work plan.

Background

In October 2011, the ICANN Board initiated negotiations with the Registrars Stakeholder Group for a new form of RAA, and simultaneously requested an Issue Report from the GNSO on issues not covered by the negotiations and otherwise suited for a PDP. The Final Issue Report was published in March 2012, and recommended that the GNSO commence its PDP as soon as possible after receiving a report that the negotiations were concluded.

In June 2013, the ICANN Board formally approved the new 2013 RAA. In September 2013, ICANN staff published a paper for the GNSO reporting on the conclusion of the RAA negotiations and highlighting issues relating to privacy and proxy services, including their accreditation and Relay/Reveal procedures. Following a number of discussions on the topic, the GNSO Council formally approved the charter for the PDP WG at its meeting on 31 October 2013.

How can I get involved?

The Working Group is open to anyone interested in participating. If you want to join the WG please contact the GNSO Secretariat to be added to the mailing list (gnsso.secretariat@gnsso.icann.org). You can also attend the WG's meeting in Buenos Aires on Thursday morning: <http://buenosaires48.icann.org/en/schedule/thu-raa-remaining>.

Where can I find more information?

[Background Documents on RAA Privacy & Proxy Services Accreditation issues PDP](#)

[GNSO Whois Studies](#)

[RAA Specification on Privacy & Proxy Services](#)

Buenos Aires Session: <http://buenosaires48.icann.org/en/schedule/thu-raa-remaining>.

Staff responsible: Mary Wong

Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information Policy Development Process

What is this about?

The translation and transliteration of contact information were addressed by the IRD-WG in its [Final Report](#), in which it was recommended that the GNSO Council should request an Issue Report on the translation and transliteration of contact information. In this context "contact information" is a subset of Domain Name Registration Data and thus the information that enables someone using a Domain Name Registration Data Directory Service (such as WHOIS) to contact the domain name registration holder. It usually includes the name, organization, and postal address of the registered name holder, technical contact, as well as administrative contact. Translation is defined as the translation of a text into another language and transliteration is the writing of a word using the closest corresponding letters of a different alphabet.

What is the current status of this project?

The GNSO Council has [initiated a Policy Development Process](#) (PDP) on this topic. A Drafting Team was formed and has submitted Charter to the GNSO Council for its consideration. The motion to pass the Charter was deferred and then returned back to the Drafting Team to address some additional concerns that were raised by some Counselors. It has since been re-submitted to the Council and will be voted on during the public meeting in Buenos Aires. If adopted, a call for volunteers to form a Working Group will be published.

Why is this important?

The continued internationalization of the domain name system in general and specifically of registration data means that there is an urgent need to allow for standardized query of international registration data and to assure its internationalization functionality. The ongoing expansion of the gTLD space and the creation of a large number of internationalized domain names, combined with the reforms attempts of gTLD Directory Services – especially the Expert Working Group – makes the need to establish GNSO policy for the translation and transliteration of contact information even more pressing. The Working Group is in fact expected to tie in with some of the work that is currently under way.

Expected next steps

If the Charter is approved by the GNSO Council, a call for Volunteers will go out and the Working Group is expected to start its work by December 2013.

Background

At its meeting on 13 June 2013, the GNSO Council initiated a PDP on the translation and transliteration of contact information. The Drafting Team has completed the Charter, which is awaiting approval by the GNSO Council.

The two main questions, covered, by the Charter are:

1. Whether it is desirable to translate contact information to a single common language or transliterate contact information to a single common script.
2. Who should decide who should bear the burden translating contact information to a single common language or transliterating contact information to a single common script.

In answering these questions, the Working Group is encouraged to also discuss the following issues:

- What are the benefits to the community are of translating and/or transliterating contact data, especially in light of the costs that may be connected to translation/transliteration
- Should translation/transliteration of contact data be mandatory for all gTLDs?
- Should translation/transliteration of contact data be mandatory for all registrants or only those based in certain countries?
- What impact will translation/transliteration of contact data have on the Whois validation as set out under the 2013 RAA?
- When should the WG's recommendations come into effect
- Who do they [the WG] believe should bear the cost?
- Check relevant recommendations that may arise from the Expert Working Group on gTLD Directory Service if/when those become available and determine possible linkage to the issues at hand.

Where can I find more information?

Issue Report - [Final Issue Report on Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information](#)

PDP Workspace - <https://community.icann.org/x/FTR-Ag>

Staff responsible: Julie Hedlund, Lars Hoffmann

Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy (IRTP) Part D Policy Development Process

What is this about?

The Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy (IRTP) Part D PDP Working Group is chartered by the GNSO Council to answer six questions in relation to the IRTP: 1) whether reporting requirements for registries and dispute providers should be developed; 2) whether to amend the Transfer Dispute Resolution Policy on how to handle disputes when multiple transfers have occurred; 3) whether dispute options for registrants should be developed; 4) whether registrars should be required to make information on transfer dispute resolution options available to registrants; 5) whether additional penalties for IRTP breaches should be introduced, and; 6) whether the universal adoption and implementation of EPP AuthInfo codes has eliminated the need for FOAs.

What is the current status of this project?

The Working Group started its deliberations on 25 February 2013. The WG has received and reviewed input from the GNSO Stakeholder Groups and Constituencies, as well as other ICANN Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees. The Group has debated each of the Charter questions and agreed in principle on recommendation on four of them. The discussion on the last remaining two questions, concerning the TDRP and the matter of multiple hops has not yet reached its conclusion. Still, the Group expects to publish its Initial Report by the end of the year.

Why is this important?

ICANN's Compliance Department received a total of 3816 valid IRTP-related complaints between January 2012 and February 2013 alone, making it the most common issue of community complaint. However, at the same time, the Transfer Dispute Resolution Policy (TDRP) is hardly ever used by registrars, which appears to be a contradiction in view of the number of complaints relation to the IRTP. The WG's recommendations is contemplating how best to address this dichotomy, which may result in a reform of the TDRP or other measures that would address the issues encountered in relation to the IRTP.

Expected next steps

The WG is expected to publish its Initial Report for public comment in December 2013.

Background

The IRTP is a 2004 consensus policy developed through the GNSO's policy development process (PDP) and is currently under review by the GNSO through a series of PDPs. The IRTP provides a straightforward procedure for domain name holders to transfer domain names between registrars.

On the recommendation of the IRTP Part C WG, the GNSO Council agreed to combine all the remaining IRTP issues into one final PDP, IRTP Part D, in addition to one issue that was raised by the IRTP Part C WG in its Final Report. The GNSO Council unanimously [adopted](#) the request for

an Issue Report on IRTP Part D at its meeting on 17 October 2012. And so, this PDP is the forth and final policy development process of different aspects of the Inter Registrar Transfer Policy.

How can I Get involved

The Working Group is open to anyone interested. If you want to join the Working Group please contact the GNSO Secretariat to be added to the mailing list (gnso-secs@icann.org).

Furthermore, public input will be sought on the Initial Report in due time (see <http://www.icann.org/en/news/public-comment>).

Where can I find more information?

Final Issue Report - <http://gnso.icann.org/en/issues/issue-report-irtp-d-08jan13-en.pdf>

Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy - <http://www.icann.org/en/resources/registrars/transfers/policy-01jun12.htm>

Working Group Community Wiki page: <https://community.icann.org/x/B4JwAg>

Buenos Aires Session: <http://buenosaires48.icann.org/en/schedule/wed-irtp-d>

Staff responsible: Lars Hoffmann

Policy & Implementation

What is this about?

Mainly as a result of discussions stemming from implementation related issues of the new gTLD program, there is increased focus on which topics call for policy and which call for implementation work, including which processes should be used, at what time and how diverging opinions should be acted upon.

Following several discussions by the GNSO Council on this topic, the GNSO Council formed a Working Group which has been tasked to provide concrete recommendations on how to address some of these issues from a GNSO perspective.

What is the current status of this project?

The WG started its deliberations in August and has been tasked to provide the GNSO Council with recommendations on:

1. A set of principles that would underpin any GNSO policy and implementation related discussions, taking into account existing GNSO Operating Procedures.
2. A process for developing gTLD policy, perhaps in the form of "Policy Guidance", including criteria for when it would be appropriate to use such a process (for developing policy other than "Consensus Policy") instead of a GNSO Policy Development Process;
3. A framework for implementation related discussions associated with GNSO Policy Recommendations;
4. Criteria to be used to determine when an action should be addressed by a policy process and when it should be considered implementation, and;
5. Further guidance on how GNSO Implementation Review Teams, as defined in the PDP Manual, are expected to function and operate.

The WG reached out to all ICANN Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees to ask for input. The WG is expected to finalize its work plan in Buenos Aires and has already formed a number of sub-teams to start working on issues such as working definitions and principles that are intended to underpin the upcoming deliberations on the charter questions.

Why is this important?

While developing a bright-line rule as to what is policy or implementation may not be possible, the hope is that by developing clear processes and identifying clear roles and responsibilities for the different stakeholders, it will become easier to deal with these issues going forward and allow for broad participation and involvement.

Expected next steps

The WG is planning to form a number of sub-teams to tackle the different charter questions and aims to publish its Initial Report for public comment in due time.

Background

In order to facilitate these discussions, ICANN Staff developed a draft framework for community discussion that identifies a number of steps and criteria that might facilitate dealing with similar questions in the future. The paper identifies a number of questions that the community may want to consider further in this context, as well as a couple of suggested improvements that could be considered in the short term. In addition, a session on this topic was held at the ICANN Meeting in Beijing, which resulted in the formation of the Working Group by the GNSO Council. The Working Group is tasked to provide recommendations on:

How can I Get involved

The Working Group will be open to anyone interested. If you want to join the Working Group please contact the GNSO Secretariat to be added to the mailing list (<mailto:gnsso.secretariat@gnsso.icann.org>). Furthermore, public input will be sought on the Initial Report in due time (see <http://www.icann.org/en/news/public-comment>).

Where can I find more information?

Working Group workspace – <https://community.icann.org/x/y1V-Ag>

Staff discussion paper - <http://gnsso.icann.org/en/correspondence/policy-implementation-framework-08jan13-en.pdf>

Buenos Aires session - <http://buenosaires48.icann.org/en/schedule/wed-policy-implementation>

Staff responsible: Marika Konings

Cross Community Working Groups Drafting Team

What is this about?

The ICANN community has recognized that there may periodically be issues that cut across and are of interest to more than one of ICANN's Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees. Cross-community working groups have been created previously, including the Joint DNS Security & Stability Analysis Working Group (DSSA) involving At Large, ccNSO, GNSO, NRO, and SSAC, and the Joint IDN Working Group (JIG) involving the ccNSO and GNSO. Many ICANN community members have highlighted the need for a set of principles that would guide the formation and working processes of these cross-community working groups. This CWG Drafting Team is a renewed effort, originally initiated by the GNSO, to develop a framework of operating principles that would allow for the effective and efficient functioning of future CWGs.

What is the current status of this project?

The GNSO Council approved the formation of a new CWG Drafting Team at a meeting in October. The new DT is to be comprised of members from all interested SOs and ACs, and co-chaired by the GNSO and ccNSO. Invitations to participate have been sent to all SO and AC Chairs, and a call for volunteers initiated.

Why is this important?

Each SO and AC within ICANN is responsible for different aspects of policy development and advice, and operate under different mandates and remits. From time to time, however, there may be cross cutting issues that affect or interest more than one SO or AC. Up to now, cross community working groups have been formed on a relatively ad-hoc basis, without a framework of consistent operating principles that take into account the differences between each SO and AC. In order to facilitate the successful functioning of CWGs, the GNSO believes that it would be beneficial to attempt to develop such a framework in collaboration with the other SOs and ACs.

Expected next steps

Invitations and a call for volunteers will be sent by the GNSO to all other SOs, ACs and the community. The Drafting Team is expected to be formed immediately after the ICANN meeting in Buenos Aires, and will hold its first meeting shortly thereafter.

Background

In March 2012 the GNSO Council approved an initial set of operating principles for CWGs that it sent to other SOs and ACs for feedback. Detailed comments and suggestions were received from the ccNSO, most recently in June 2013. In October 2013, the GNSO Council resolved to convene a new cross community Drafting Team, to be co-chaired by the GNSO and the ccNSO, to take up the work and further develop the principles in light of the ccNSO feedback.



GNSO Background Briefing

How can I get involved?

The Drafting Team is open to anyone interested in participating. If you are interested, please email the GNSO Secretariat at gns.secretariat@icann.org to be added to the mailing list.

Where can I find more information?

[Draft Principles for CWGs](#)

[ccNSO Comments on Draft CWG Principles](#)

Staff responsible: Julie Hedlund and Mary Wong

Metrics and Reporting Drafting Team

What is this about?

This effort allows for a review in how the community can collaborate with contracted parties and other reporting service providers in the sharing of complaint and abuse data that may also further educate Registrants and Internet users in submission of complaints to the appropriate party. It will also investigate how metrics can benefit the policy development process and improve fact-based decision-making.

What is the current status of the project?

- ICANN Staff completed the Final Issue Report for delivery to the GNSO Council for their deliberation at the Beijing meeting.
- The GNSO Council approved to form a non-PDP Working Group at its meeting on 16 May 2013 and a call for volunteers to form a drafting team to develop the Charter for the WG was launched.
- Following a second call for volunteers, the Drafting Team has been convened and its work is under way; it is expected to submit a Charter to the GNSO Council in the weeks following the ICANN Meeting in Buenos Aires.

Why is this important?

The effort is expected to investigate more formal processes for requests of data, metrics and other reporting needs from the GNSO that may aid in GNSO policy development efforts.

Possible areas the Working Group may explore:

- A set of principles that may compliment any GNSO policy efforts related to metric/data requirements to better inform the policy development process;
- A process for requesting metrics and reports both internal to ICANN or external, including GNSO contracted parties;
- A framework for distributing metrics and reports to Working Groups, the GNSO Council and the GNSO as a whole;
- Changes, if any, to existing Working Group guidelines and work product template s

Expected next steps

- Complete Metrics & Reporting WG Charter and submit to GNSO Council
- Approval of Charter by the GNSO Council
- Issue call for volunteers and form the Working Group

How can I get involved?

Sign up as a volunteer for the Drafting Team or the Working Group once the Charter is adopted. Contact: gns0-secs@icann.org.

Background Information on the Issue

- This issue was originally identified in the Registration Abuse Policies WG and forwarded to the GNSO Council in 2011.

- The GNSO Council collaborated with ICANN Contractual Compliance and members of the GNSO community to gather additional information related to this issue and the GNSO Council eventually adopted a resolution to have an Issue Report created by staff.
- On 9 May 2013, the GNSO Council approved the Final Issue report's recommendations to await any further action regarding Contractual Compliance metrics and reporting until the conclusion of their three-year plan towards the end of 2013.
- The GNSO Council also adopted the recommendation to form a non-PDP Working Group tasked with exploring opportunities of reporting and metrics recommendations that might better inform policy development via fact-based decision making, where applicable.

Further Information

GNSO Metrics and Reporting Web Page - <http://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/active/metrep>

Uniformity of Reporting Final Issue Report - <http://gns0.icann.org/en/issues/uofr-final-31mar13-en.pdf>

Drafting Team Community Wiki page: <https://community.icann.org/x/myt-Ag>

Buenos Aires Session: <http://buenosaires48.icann.org/en/schedule/thu-metrep>

Staff responsible: Berry Cobb, Lars Hoffmann

Whois Studies Update

What is this about?

The GNSO commissioned four studies on various aspects of the publicly accessible Whois gTLD data directory system in 2010. At the ICANN Buenos Aires meeting, ICANN staff will provide an update to the GNSO regarding the two remaining studies to be completed: one on Privacy & Proxy Service Abuse, and the other on Whois Misuse.

What is the current status of this project?

The Privacy & Proxy Abuse Study, conducted by the National Physical Laboratory (NPL) in the United Kingdom under the leadership of Dr. Richard Clayton of the University of Cambridge, was published for public comment in September 2013. The public comment period closes on 13 November 2013. The Whois Misuse Study is being conducted by Carnegie Mellon University (CMU) under the leadership of Dr. Nicolas Christin. The team has completed its initial findings and the draft results will be published for public comment after the ICANN meeting in Buenos Aires.

Why is this important?

The relevance of and needed improvements to the current Whois system of publicly accessible gTLD domain name registration data has been an issue in the ICANN community for some time. The GNSO Council determined that comprehensive, objective and quantifiable study of the Whois system would be helpful to its policy work in this area, and commissioned four studies on different aspects of the Whois system between 2010-2011. Since then, ICANN has also engaged in a review of the Whois system, including the report of the Whois Review Team in May 2012 and the ongoing work of the Expert Working Group that was convened in late 2012. The GNSO has also recently launched a Policy Development Process on issues relating to the accreditation of privacy and proxy service providers.

It is anticipated that the results and findings of these Whois studies will inform the current and future policy work of the GNSO and ICANN on the Whois system.

Expected next steps

- The GNSO will receive an update on the status of these two remaining Whois studies at its weekend session in Buenos Aires.
- Following the ICANN Buenos Aires meeting, ICANN staff will summarize and analyze the public comments submitted in relation to the Privacy and Proxy Abuse Study, and publish the initial results from the Whois Misuse Study for public comment.

Where can I find more information?

- Information on all the Whois studies
<http://ghttp://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/other/whois/studies>

- The public comment forum for the Privacy and Proxy Abuse Study
<http://www.icann.org/en/news/public-comment/whois-pp-abuse-study-24sep13-en.htm>
- Archived information regarding GNSO work on Whois
<http://gns0.icann.org/en/issues/whois/archive>

Staff responsible: Mary Wong