GNSO
Background Briefing

Index

Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy 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. Having 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. Following this, on 3 March 2014, the Working Group has published its Initial Report for Public Comment. The Preliminary recommendations include: 1) Reporting requirements be incorporated into the TDRP policy, 2) A domain name be returned to the original Registrar of Record if it is found through a TDRP procedure that a non-IRTP compliant domain name transfer has occurred, 3) the statute of limitation to launch a TDRP be extended from current 6 months to 12 months from the initial transfer, 4) if a request for enforcement is initiated under the TDRP the relevant domain should be 'locked' against further transfers, 5) no dispute options for registrants be developed and implemented as part of the current TDRP, but the GNSO should ensure that IRTP-C inter-registrant transfer recommendations are implemented and include appropriate dispute-resolution mechanisms, and 6) the TDRP be modified to eliminate the First Level (Registry) layer of the TDRP. The WG will meet for a face-to-face workshop during the ICANN Meeting in Singapore to present its preliminary recommendations to the community and gather feedback that, together with any submission to the public comment forum, will help the Group formulate its Final Report.

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), explicitly designed to handle disputed inter-registrar transfers, is hardly ever used by registrars. This appears to be a contradiction in view of the number of complaints relation to the IRTP, and in this context the WG has drawn up a list of use cases of disputed transfers that is currently not covered by the TDRP (see Annex C of the Initial Report). Community feedback is especially sought on how to handle these use cases as well as the question of how to deal with disputed transfers that include multiple hops between different registrars and whether to abolish the registry level as the TDRP's first level dispute provider.

Expected next steps
The WG will review and discuss community feedback received from its face-to-face community workshop in Singapore as well as the public comment forum. The information received will then help the WG to formulate its Final Report expected to be published in time for the ICANN Meeting in London.

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 this 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 fourth and final policy development process of different aspects of the Inter Registrar Transfer Policy.

How can I get involved?
You are encouraged to submit comments to the Initial Report via the Public Forum and/or during its face-to-face workshop during the ICANN Meeting in Singapore. If you would like to join the WG as a member, please contact the GNSO Secretariat (gnso-secs@icann.org).

Where can I find more information?
- Initial Report: http://gnso.icann.org/en/issues/transfers/irtp-d-initial-03mar14-en.pdf
- Public Forum: http://www.icann.org/en/news/public-comment/irtp-d-initial-03mar14-en.htm
- 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
- Work plan: https://community.icann.org/x/FIJwAg
- Singapore F2F Meeting scheduled for Wednesday 26 March from 10.30 – 12.00 (see http://singapore49.icann.org/en/schedule?date=2014-03-26

Staff responsible: Lars Hoffmann

Privacy & Proxy Services Accreditation Issues Policy Development Process

What is this about?

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. The 2013 RAA does, however, contain a temporary specification on the use of privacy and proxy services that will expire either on January 1, 2017 or the implementation by ICANN of a Privacy & Proxy Services Accreditation Program (whichever first occurs). This PDP was initiated to examine the policy 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 PDP Working Group was chartered by the GNSO Council in October 2013 and is meeting on a weekly basis.
- The WG will have a F2F meeting in Singapore, and has begun discussing substantive questions under its charter that it was tasked to address.
- The WG aims to publish an Initial Report for public in early 2015

Why is this important?

The 2013 RAA temporary specification that governs registrars' obligations in respect of privacy and proxy services 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. It has developed a work plan to address the substantive questions posed to it by the GNSO Council through the WG charter. The initial aim is to produce an Initial Report for public comment in January 2015.

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 (gnso.secretariat@gnso.icann.org). You can also attend the WG's meeting in Singapore on Thursday morning, scheduled from 0900-1030 in the Sophia Room (please see Singapore Meeting Schedule for confirmation).

Where can I find more information?
- Background information: http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/active/raa-remaining
- WG workspace: https://community.icann.org/x/9iCfAg
- Work plan: https://community.icann.org/x/wx3RAg
- 2013 RAA including Privacy & Proxy Specification: http://www.icann.org/en/resources/registrars/raa/approved-with-specs-27jun13-en.htm - privacy-proxy
- Singapore F2F WG Meeting scheduled for Thursday 27 March from 9.00 – 10.30 (see http://singapore49.icann.org/en/schedule/thu-ppsa)

Staff responsible: Mary Wong, Marika Konings

Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information Policy Development Process

What is this about?
Translation and transliteration of contact information are issues addressed by the Internationalized Registration Data Working Group (IRD-WG) that recommended in its Final Report that the GNSO Council should request an Issue Report on this subject. 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 whereas '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. The GNSO has approved a PDP WP charter in November 2013 and the WG was initiated in December 2013. On 31 January 2014 the WG sent a request to the Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees to provide input on questions relating to the translation and transliteration of contact information. Concurrently, ICANN has commissioned on the commercial feasibility of the translation and transliteration of contact information. In addition, ICANN has formed an Expert Working Group that is determining the appropriate internationalized domain name registration data requirements, including relevant outcomes from the work of this PDP WG.

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 on New gTLD Directory Services – makes the need to establish GNSO policy for the translation and transliteration of contact information even more pressing. The PDP WG is in fact expected to tie in with some of the work that is currently under way.

Expected next steps
The PDP WG will review the responses to the request for input as well as the results of the commercial feasibility study. Based on this the Group will try provide recommendations to the Charter questions and prepare a Initial Report that will then be open to public comment.

Background
At its meeting on 13 June 2013, the GNSO Council initiated a PDP on the translation and transliteration of contact information. The GNSO Council approved the Charter on 20 November 2013. 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.

The PDP WG has asked the Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees to provide input on the following questions relating to the two issues identified in the PDP:

- Whether it is desirable to translate contact information to a single common language or transliterate contact information to a single common script.
- What exactly the benefits to the community are of translating and/or transliterating contact information, especially in light of the costs that may be connected to translation and/or transliteration?
- Should translation and/or transliteration of contact information be mandatory for all gTLDs?
- Should translation and/or transliteration of contact information be mandatory for all registrants or only those based in certain countries and/or using specific non-ASCII scripts?
- What impact will translation/transliteration of contact information have on the WHOIS validation as set out under the 2013 Registrar Accreditation Agreement?
- When should any new policy relating to translation and transliteration of contact information come into effect?
- 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?
- Who does your SG/C believe should bear the cost, bearing in mind, however, the limits in scope set in the Initial Report on this issue?

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 (gnso.secretariat@gnso.icann.org). You can also attend the F2F WG meeting in Singapore on Monday morning from 7.30 – 8.30 (see http://singapore49.icann.org/en/schedule/mon-transliteration-contact).

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
- Work plan https://community.icann.org/x/xR3RAg
- Singapore F2F meeting session scheduled for Monday from 24 March from 7.30 – 8.30 (see http://singapore49.icann.org/en/schedule/mon-transliteration-contact)

Staff responsible: Julie Hedlund, Lars Hoffmann

IGO-INGO Access to Curative Rights Protection Mechanisms Preliminary Issue Report

What is this about?
One of the consensus recommendations from the PDP Working Group on IGO and INGO Protections in All gTLDs was for the GNSO Council to request an Issue Report, as a preceding step to a possible PDP, on permitting IGOs and INGOs to access and use existing curative rights protection mechanisms (viz. the Uniform Dispute Resolution Policy and Uniform Rapid Suspension procedure), to protect their names and acronyms at the second level in both existing and new gTLDs. The GNSO Council adopted this recommendation at its public meeting in November 2013.

What is the current status of this project?
The Preliminary Issue Report, as requested by the GNSO Council, has been published for public comment, with the comment period open throughout the ICANN meeting in Singapore. The Preliminary Issue Report recommends that the GNSO Council initiate a PDP, and outlines a number of issues that should be explored in the PDP.

Why is this important?
Protecting the names and acronyms of International Governmental Organizations (IGOs), and other International Non-Governmental Organizations (INGOs) from third party domain name registrations at the top and second levels has been a long-standing issue over the course of the New gTLD Program. The GNSO's consensus recommendations on this topic were sent to the ICANN Board for its consideration in February 2014. There are a number of differences between the GNSO's policy recommendations and the Government Advisory Committee's (GAC) Advice to the Board, notably in respect of protections for IGO acronyms. The Board has tasked its New gTLD Program Committee to develop a proposal that will take into account both the GNSO's recommendations and GAC Advice for the Board's further consideration at a subsequent Board meeting. Should the GNSO decide to initiate a PDP on the specific topic of IGO and INGO access to and use of the UDRP and URS, this would be a relevant consideration for the Board as it begins to determine the appropriate forms and scope of protection for IGO names and acronyms.

Expected next steps
- A Final Issue Report will be prepared following the close of the public comment period, taking into account any public comments received on the topic.
- The Final Issue Report will be submitted to the GNSO Council, which will then decide whether or not to initiate a PDP. This is expected to take place around the time of the next ICANN meeting in London.

Background
In November 2013 the GNSO Council unanimously adopted all the consensus recommendations from the PDP WG on IGO and INGO Protections in All gTLDs, including calling for an Issue Report on allowing IGOs and INGOs access to and use of the curative rights protections afforded by the

existing UDRP and URS procedures. An Issue Report is the preceding step toward the possible initiation of a PDP by the GNSO Council.

IGOs and INGOs are currently unable to use either the UDRP or URS for a number of reasons. For IGOs, the requirement that a complainant submit to the jurisdiction of a national court may jeopardize an IGO's status as being immune from national jurisdiction. For both IGOs and INGOs, the fact that the UDRP and URS were designed as protective mechanisms for trademark owners currently means that they cannot utilize these procedures unless they own trademarks in their names and/or acronyms. Both types of organizations are also concerned about the cost involved in using these procedures, which would mean diverting resources and funds from their primary missions.

One of the issues currently pending before the ICANN Board is the appropriate scope and means of protection for IGO acronyms, in which respect the GAC Advice and the GNSO's consensus recommendations differ. Where the GAC had supported protections for IGO acronyms, the GNSO recommended that IGO acronyms be protected only through entry into the Trademark Clearinghouse and use of its 90-days Claims Notification process – a recommendation that IGOs have stated is inadequate given the nature of their public interest missions and the risk that cybersquatting poses to those missions. Should the GNSO Council approve the initiation of a PDP on the possibility of IGOs and INGOs using curative rights protection mechanisms such as the UDRP and URS, the recommendations that may be developed through this PDP may alleviate some of the problems faced by IGOs and INGOs in obtaining adequate protection for their names and acronyms.

How can I get involved?
Public comment is currently being sought on the recommendations in the Preliminary Issue Report: http://www.icann.org/en/news/public-comment/igo-ingo-crp-prelim-10mar14-en.htm. You may provide your comments as an individual or via any group, GNSO constituency, GNSO stakeholder group or other SO/AC with which you may be affiliated.

Where can I find more information?
- Preliminary Issue Report: http://gnso.icann.org/en/issues/igo-ingo-crp-prelim-10mar14-en.pdf
- Public comment forum: http://www.icann.org/en/news/public-comment/igo-ingo-crp-prelim-10mar14-en.htm
- PDP Working Group Final Report: http://gnso.icann.org/en/issues/igo-ingo-final-10nov13-en.pdf
- GNSO Council Report to the ICANN Board: http://gnso.icann.org/en/issues/council-board-igo-ingo-23jan14-en.pdf

Staff responsible: Mary Wong

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 2013 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. To data, only input has been received from the ALAC.

The WG has developed a set of working definitions and is finalizing a set of working principles that are expected to underpin the WG deliberations on the charter questions. The WG aims to deliver an Initial Report by the ICANN meeting in Los Angeles.

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
Once the working principles have been finalized, the WG will form a number of sub-teams to tackle the different charter questions in parallel and gather the recommendations in an Initial Report which will be published for public comment.

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.

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 (mailto:gnso.secretariat@gnso.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
- Policy & Implementation Working definitions & principles - https://community.icann.org/x/9xrRAg
- Staff discussion paper - http://gnso.icann.org/en/correspondence/policy-implementation-framework-08jan13-en.pdf
- Singapore WG F2F meeting session – scheduled for Wednesday 26 March from 15.30 – 17.00 (see http://singapore49.icann.org/en/schedule/wed-policy-implementation)

Staff responsible: Marika Konings, Mary Wong

Data & Metrics for Policy Making Working Group

What is this about?
This effort will with explore opportunities for developing reporting and metrics and/or appropriate standardized methodologies that could better inform fact-based policy development and decision-making. It is expected to review how the community can collaborate with contracted parties and other reporting service providers in the sharing of metrics and data that may compliment the policy development process.

What is the current status of the project?
- The GNSO Council approved the WG charter at its 23 January 2014 meeting.
- Two calls for volunteers were conducted resulting in 25+ members joining the WG with more than two-thirds being outside of the United States.
- The WG's first two meetings were hosted prior to the Singapore ICANN meeting mostly focusing on Working Group Guidelines and newcomer training.

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. Areas the Working Group will explore:
- Establishing a baseline of current practices and capabilities to problem reporting
- Evaluate previous PDP and non-PDP efforts and how metrics could have enhanced the WG process
- Review existing GNSO work product templates, like charters, issue reports, and final reports for possible enhancements to inform the PDP and non-PDP process
- Evaluate external data sources that may benefit the policy process such as abuse statistics or DNS industry related data and define a possible framework in how it may be accessed

Expected next steps
- WG to meet in Singapore – Thursday @ 08:00 local time
- Continue WG session post ICANN meeting
- Create Initial Report
- Conduct Public Comment
- Brief GNSO Council as necessary

Background Information on the Issue
The 2010 Registration Abuse Policies Working Group (RAPWG) identified the Meta Issue: Uniformity of Reporting which it described as "need for more uniformity in the mechanisms to initiate, track, and analyze policy-violation reports." The RAPWG recommended in its Final Report that "the GNSO and the larger ICANN community in general, create and support uniform problem-reporting and report-tracking processes."
The GNSO Council recommended the creation of an Issue Report to further research metrics and reporting needs in hopes to improve the policy development process. The report created by

ICANN Staff outlined accomplishments regarding reporting and metrics by the Contractual Compliance function and it also reviewed other reporting sources that may be of relevance. The GNSO Council subsequently adopted the recommendation to form this non-PDP Working Group tasked with exploring opportunities for developing reporting and metrics processes and/or appropriate standardized methodologies that could better inform fact-based policy development and decision making. The GNSO resolution states:

> Resolved,
> The GNSO Council does not initiate a Policy Development Process at this stage but will review at the completion of the ICANN Contractual Compliance three-year plan expected for 31 December 2013 whether additional action is required;
> The GNSO Council further approves the creation of a drafting team to develop a charter for a non-PDP Working Group to consider additional methods for collecting necessary metrics and reporting from Contracted Parties and other external resources to aid the investigation.

How can I get involved?
Sign up as a volunteer for the Working Group by contacting the GNSO secretariat (mailto:gnso.secretariat@gnso.icann.org).

Further Information:

- Data & Metrics for Policy Making Web Page - http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/active/dmpm
- DMPM Charter - http://gnso.icann.org/en/issues/dmpm-charter-23jan14-en.pdf
- Uniformity of Reporting Final Issue Report - http://gnso.icann.org/en/issues/uofr-final-31mar13-en.pdf
- Singapore Session – Scheduled for Thursday 28 March at 08:00 local time (see http://singapore49.icann.org/en/schedule/thu-dmpm)

Staff responsible: Berry Cobb, Lars Hoffmann

Cross Community Working Groups Principles 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, e.g. 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?
A CWG Drafting Team co-chaired by the GNSO and ccNSO is finalizing a charter for approval by the ccNSO and GNSO Councils, to form a Working Group to take forward the initial work done by the GNSO on this issue.

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 ccNSO and GNSO believe that it would be beneficial to attempt to develop such a framework in collaboration with the other SOs and ACs.

Expected next steps
- The Drafting Team is expected to finalize the proposed WG Charter for approval by the ccNSO and GNSO Councils at or very shortly after the ICANN meeting in Singapore.
- The WG will be formed upon the approval of the charter by both Councils.

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 suggesting additions and clarifications to the initial principles in June 2013. In October 2013, a Drafting Team to be co-chaired by the ccNSO and GNSO was approved by the GNSO Council. The DT was tasked to develop a charter for a WG that will take up the initial work already done, and develop a finalized framework governing the formation, chartering, operation, decision-making and termination of CWGs that would be workable across all SO/ACs.

How can I get involved?
The WG is expected to be formed shortly after the ICANN meeting in Singapore, after its charter is approved by the ccNSO and GNSO Councils. If you are interested in joining the WG, please email the GNSO Secretariat at gnso.secretariat@icann.org to be added to the mailing list.

Where can I find more information?
- Staff Paper summarizing the Initial Principles and ccNSO Feedback: https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/30345130/Staff Paper on CWG Principles.pdf?version=1&modificationDate=1392882429000&api=v2
- CWG DT Workspace: https://community.icann.org/x/rQbPAQ
- Singapore F2F DT meeting scheduled for Thursday 27 March from 8.00 – 9.00 (see http://singapore49.icann.org/en/schedule/thu-gnso-ccnso-alac)

Staff responsible: Mary Wong, Julie Hedlund

WHOIS Studies Update

What is this about?
The GNSO commissioned several studies on various aspects of the publicly accessible Whois gTLD data directory system between 2010-2011. The final two studies, one on Privacy & Proxy Service Abuse and the other on Whois Misuse, have just been completed. The GNSO will begin reviewing the findings of these studies and discuss possible next steps at the ICANN meeting in Singapore.

What is the current status of this project?
The Privacy & Proxy Abuse Study, conducted by the National Physical Laboratory (NPL) in the UK under the leadership of Dr. R Clayton of the University of Cambridge, was published for public comment in September 2013. The Whois Misuse Study, conducted by Cylab at Carnegie Mellon University (CMU) under the leadership of Dr. N. Christin, was published for public comment in November 2013. Reports of the public comments received have been published and Final Reports prepared by both research team taking into account the public comments.

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 several 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, and another relating to the translation and transliteration of gTLD contact data.

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 final status of these two remaining Whois studies at its weekend session in Singapore, and begin discussing how the findings from these and the other studies it had commissioned will feed into ongoing and future policy work.

Where can I find more information?
- Information on all the Whois studies - http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/other/whois/studies
- Archived information regarding GNSO work on Whois - http://gnso.icann.org/en/issues/whois/archive

Staff responsible: Mary Wong