Discussion Document for
Expert Working Group Durban Session on
Next Generation gTLD Registration Directory Services

Background

In December, ICANN announced the creation of an Expert Working Group (EWG) on next-generation gTLD registration directory services, as a first step in fulfilling the ICANN Board's directive to help redefine the purpose and provision of gTLD registration data. The work of the EWG is expected to serve as a foundation to help GNSO create a new global policy for the provision of gTLD registration data, as part of a Board requested Policy Development Process (PDP) to be commenced upon the conclusion of the EWG's activities.

Recent Activities

After conducting a comprehensive review of issues surrounding the requirements for a next-generation gTLD Registration Directory Service (RDS) – including privacy, accuracy, accountability, trust and confidence the EWG worked to answer questions posed by the ICANN Board's directive and SSAC055. The EWG has now posted an initial draft report to share its progress with the community and enable feedback through an online comment forum. The EWG will present a report overview at a webinar on 8 July and a public session in Durban on 15 July, using these events to gather input on its initial recommendations and remaining questions. The EWG will apply community input in its final report to refine its recommendations and address questions not yet fully explored.

Community Input Sought in Durban

Durban not only presents an opportunity for the EWG to share its initial recommendations with the ICANN community and invite feedback, but also to obtain community input on questions still under discussion within the EWG, including:

- Regarding the EWG's suggested Aggregated RDS model, are there additional advantages and disadvantages that should be considered? In such a model, which data repository (ARDS or Registry) should be considered authoritative?

- Could the EWG's recommendations for purpose-driven authenticated Gated Access to validated registration data satisfy identified RDS users and their needs? In such a model, how would requestors be identified, authorized and issued RDS access credentials? In particular, who would accredit law enforcement agents, based on what criteria?

- Could the EWG's recommendations for addressing maximum protected registration satisfy both accountability needs and the privacy needs of at-risk individuals? How might a suitable solution be identified and funded?

- Are the users and purposes identified by the EWG thus far sufficiently representative? Are there any significant gaps in users and purposes that must be addressed?

- Given the desire for an extensible next-generation RDS that might accommodate the needs of a rapidly-evolving global Internet, how could future new users and purposes be accommodated? Who would decide on permitted purposes, using what criteria?

- Are the registration data elements identified by the EWG thus far sufficiently representative of the data required for each identified purpose? Are there any significant gaps in data elements that must be addressed?

- How should public and gated data elements be classified? What criteria should the EWG apply to make initial recommendations in this area?

- What community needs should be considered during the EWG's discussion of registration data storage duration, escrow and access log requirements?

- The EWG acknowledges that deploying and operating the suggested RDS will incur costs. In such a system, how could or should those costs be borne?

For More Information

Information about EWG meetings and activities can be found on the EWG's public wiki:

https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=40175189

The EWG's initial draft report and associated online comment forum can be found at:

https://www.icann.org/en/news/announcements/announcement-3-24jun13-en.htm