

Policy Development Process (PDP) Update

New gTLD Subsequent Procedures

December 2016

ISSUE

Review and recommend possible changes or adjustments to the GNSO principles, recommendations, and implementation guidance from the [2007 Final Report on the Introduction of New Generic Top-Level Domains](#), or possibly develop new policy recommendations.

UPCOMING IMPORTANT DATES

The PDP WG first met in late February 2016, and has been meeting on a regular basis. The PDP WG requested input on a series of overarching questions from Supporting Organizations, Advisory Committees, Stakeholder Groups, and Constituencies prior to ICANN56 in Helsinki. Incorporating comments from the community, the WG is drafting preliminary outcomes for the overarching subjects. The WG is preparing to distribute a second request for community comment, prior to ICANN58, to solicit additional input on specific topics it is considering.

SUMMARY

In June of 2014, the GNSO Council created the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Discussion Group, which was focused on reflecting upon the experiences gained from the 2012 New gTLD round and identifying a recommended set of subjects that should be further analyzed in an Issue Report. It is important to note that there is existing policy from the [2007 Final Report on the Introduction of New Generic Top-Level Domains](#), which states that the original policy recommendations as adopted by the GNSO Council and ICANN Board has “been designed to produce a systemized and ongoing mechanisms for applicants to propose new top-level domains,” meaning that those policy recommendations remain in place for subsequent rounds of the New gTLD Program unless the GNSO Council decides to modify via a policy development process. At the ICANN53 meeting, The GNSO Council approved a motion to request that a Preliminary Issue Report be drafted by ICANN staff, basing the report on the [set of deliverables](#) developed by the Discussion Group, to further analyze issues identified and help determine if changes or adjustments are needed for subsequent new gTLD procedures.

ICANN staff completed the [Preliminary Issue Report on New gTLD Subsequent Procedures](#), which was published for [public comment](#) on 31 August 2015, with the comment period closing on 30 October 2015.

ICANN staff reviewed public comments received and adjusted the Issue Report accordingly. The Final Issue Report, along with the summary and analysis of public comment received, were submitted to the GNSO Council for its consideration on 4 December 2015 and a PDP on New gTLD Subsequent Procedures was initiated on 17 December 2015. The GNSO Council adopted the PDP WG charter during its 21 January 2016 meeting, with a call for volunteers issued on 27 January 2016. The PDP WG held its first meeting on 22 February 2016 and holds meetings on a regular basis. The PDP WG also has established four Work Track Sub Teams to address specific work items. These Sub Teams currently are meeting every two weeks.

While the PDP WG is aware of efforts related to New gTLDs underway within the community, particularly the Competition, Consumer Trust & Consumer Choice Review Team; the PDP WG understands that coordination with other community efforts is needed to promote comprehensive solutions and outcomes.

GAC ENGAGEMENT OPPORTUNITY STATUS



Though the PDP WG has begun its deliberations and there are members from the GAC participating, additional individuals from the GAC are always encouraged to participate in the PDP WG if they so choose. In addition, the GAC will be informed of the opportunities for engagement in the process, which could include providing public comments to WG deliverables, input via communiqués, and periodic requests for input from the PDP WG to the GAC and other community groups. The PDP WG made a formal request for input from the GAC prior to ICANN56 in Helsinki and will make an additional request for input in regards to the remaining subjects identified in the PDP WG's Charter, prior to ICANN58.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION:

- Archived project page for the completed Discussion Group effort <http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/inactive/2015/non-pdp-new-gtld>
- GNSO Council Resolution requesting Preliminary Issue Report <http://gnso.icann.org/en/council/resolutions#201507>
- Preliminary Issue Report on New gTLD Subsequent Procedures <https://www.icann.org/public-comments/new-gtld-subsequent-prelim-2015-08-31-en>
- Final Issue Report on New gTLD Subsequent Procedures - <http://gnso.icann.org/en/issues/new-gtlds/subsequent-procedures-final-issue-04dec15-en.pdf>
- GNSO Council Resolution initiating PDP - <http://gnso.icann.org/en/council/resolutions#201512>
- GNSO Council Resolution adopting PDP - <http://gnso.icann.org/en/council/resolutions#20160121-2>
- PDP WG Charter - <http://gnso.icann.org/en/issues/new-gtlds/subsequent-procedures-charter-21jan16-en.pdf>

- Active Project Page - <http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/active/new-gtld-subsequent-procedures>
- PDP WG Community Wiki - <https://community.icann.org/x/RgV1Aw>

Policy Development Process (PDP) Update

Review of All Rights Protection Mechanisms in All gTLDs (PDP)

December 2016

Upcoming important dates

The Working Group has completed its initial review of the Trademark Post-Delegation Dispute Resolution Procedure (TM-PDDRP), for which sought feedback from the PDDRP providers and all ICANN community groups. Its Sub Team that was formed to perform data collection for its upcoming review of the Trademark Clearinghouse (TMCH) has sent out questions to the TMCH providers, new gTLD registries and registrars. The Working Group expects to begin its substantive review of the TMCH in January 2017. Upon completion of this initial review, the Working Group will move on to review the Sunrise and Trademark Claims processes that are offered through the TMCH.

Summary

The ‘rights protection mechanisms’ (RPMs) in this PDP refer to those policies and processes that are aimed at combatting cyber-squatting and that were developed to provide workable mechanisms for trademark owners to either prevent or remedy certain illegitimate uses of their trademarks at the second level of generic top level domains (gTLDs). The most well-known of these RPMs is the *Uniform Dispute Resolution Policy* (UDRP), which has been an ICANN Consensus Policy since 1999. A number of additional RPMs were developed subsequently to supplement the UDRP as part of the 2012 New gTLD Program: the Trademark Clearinghouse (TMCH) and the associated the Sunrise and Trademark Claims service periods, the Uniform Rapid Suspension procedure (URS), and the Post-Delegation Dispute Resolution Procedures (PDDRPs).

The GNSO Council chartered this Working Group to conduct the PDP in two phases. The first focuses on the review of all RPMs that have been developed for the 2012 New gTLD Program, and the second phase addresses the review of the UDRP. The Working Group began meeting in April 2016 and approved its Work Plan for Phase One, which involves first addressing the TM-PDDRP followed by the TMCH and then the Sunrise and Trademark Claims processes. It will wrap up Phase One of its work by looking at the Uniform Rapid Suspension process (URS). It is hoping to complete all initial reviews for Phase One by late/end-2017.

Engagement Opportunity Status



Anyone may join the Working Group either as a full member or a mailing list observer.

Additional Information

- The Working Group Charter: <http://gnso.icann.org/en/drafts/rpm-charter-26feb16-en.pdf>
- Work Plan: <https://community.icann.org/x/wBeOAaw>

Policy Development Process Update

Next Generation Registration Directory Services (RDS) to Replace WHOIS

December 2016

Upcoming important dates

Most recently, the Working Group has compiled a list of possible requirements for gTLD registration directory services, providing a foundation upon which to recommend answers to these two questions: What are the fundamental requirements for gTLD registration data and directory services, and is a new policy framework and next-generation RDS needed to address these requirements? The WG started its deliberations on the over 1,000 possible requirements during its F2F meeting at ICANN57 but decided that it first wants to focus on a number of key concepts as defined in the charter questions before diving into the detailed requirements. **Further formal and informal input opportunities are expected to occur throughout the WG's deliberations.**

Summary

In 2012, in response to the recommendations of the first WHOIS Review Team, the Board adopted a two-prong approach that simultaneously directed ICANN to (1) implement improvements to the current WHOIS system based on the [Action Plan](#) that was based on the recommendations of the WHOIS Review Team, and (2) launch a new effort, achieved through the creation of the Expert Working Group (EWG), to focus on the purpose and provision of gTLD directory services, to serve as the foundation of a Board-initiated GNSO policy development process (PDP).

The Expert Working Group's [Final Report](#) contains a proposed model and detailed principles to serve as the foundation for a PDP to support the creation of the next generation registration directory services to replace WHOIS. This [Final Report](#) contains over 160 pages of complex principles and recommendations to be considered in the GNSO PDP. In order to effectively manage the PDP on such a large scale, an informal group of Board members and GNSO councilors collaborated to develop the [framework](#) that was approved by the ICANN Board on 26 April 2015. As a result, the Board reconfirmed its request for a Board-initiated GNSO policy development process to define the purpose of collecting, maintaining and providing access to gTLD registration data, and consider safeguards for protecting data, using the recommendations in the EWG [Final Report](#) as an input to, and, if appropriate, as the foundation for a new gTLD policy. The [Preliminary Issue Report](#) was posted for public comment on 13 July 2015. The public comment forum closed on 6 September, with 13 submissions received, including input from the GAC. The [Final Issue Report](#) was submitted to the GNSO Council on 7 October 2015 and the [charter](#) for the PDP WG was adopted during the 17 November 2015 Council meeting, followed by the launch of a call for volunteers for WG participants in early January 2016. The Working Group held its first meeting on 26 January 2016 and is continuing meeting on a weekly basis. The WG's work plan can be found here: <https://community.icann.org/x/olxlAw>. The WG has developed a list of possible requirements which will serve as a basis for further deliberations. This list is in the process of being triaged to facilitate the

review and consideration of these possible requirements in conjunction with [use cases](#) that have been developed.

Engagement Opportunity Status



Following the adoption of the charter for the PDP Working Group, a call for volunteers has been distributed to form the PDP Working Group, which is open to anyone interested to participate. The WG has reached out to GNSO Stakeholder Groups and Constituencies as well as ICANN Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees to request early input to help inform the Working Group deliberations (see <https://community.icann.org/x/pYxlAw>).

Additional Information

- RDS wiki <https://community.icann.org/display/gTLDRDS/Next-Generation+gTLD+Registration+Directory+Services+to+Replace+Whois>
- Charter for PDP WG <http://gnso.icann.org/en/drafts/whois-ng-gtld-rds-charter-07oct15-en.pdf>
- Final Issue Report <http://whois.icann.org/sites/default/files/files/final-issue-report-next-generation-rds-07oct15-en.pdf>
- Preliminary Issue Report <http://whois.icann.org/sites/default/files/files/rds-prelim-issue-13jul15-en.pdf>
- Public Comment Forum <https://www.icann.org/public-comments/rds-prelim-issue-2015-07-13-en>
- Board Resolution <https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2015-04-26-en#1.f>

Policy Development Process (PDP) Update

Privacy and Proxy Services Accreditation Issues in relation to the 2013 Registrar Accreditation Agreement and the Development of a Privacy and Proxy Services Accreditation Program by ICANN

December 2016

Upcoming Important Dates

The Privacy and Proxy Service Provider Accreditation Program Implementation Review Team (IRT) meets biweekly, on Tuesdays, at 15:00 UTC. Additional information about the IRT's work is available on the ICANN community wiki,

<https://community.icann.org/display/IRT/Privacy+and+Proxy+Services+Accreditation+Implementation>.

Members of the GAC are invited to sign up for this IRT as active participants or as observers.

The [ICANN Board has directed](#) the IRT to continue working with the Governmental Advisory Committee's Public Safety Working Group to address GAC concerns related to the accreditation of privacy and proxy service providers). ICANN is initiating a consultation with the PSWG for the purposes of developing a proposal for a framework that will set forth requirements for privacy and proxy service providers' responses to requests from law enforcement authorities. It is expected that an initial proposal will be developed by the PSWG for discussion and refinement within the IRT. Meetings with the PSWG on this topic will commence in January.

The first draft of the PSWG proposal would ideally be ready for distribution to the IRT prior to ICANN58 so that it can be discussed at a face-to-face meeting.

Summary

The Registrar Accreditation Agreement (RAA) is the contract that governs the relationship between ICANN and its accredited registrars (a directory of accredited registrars can be found at

<http://www.internic.net/regist.html>). Its provisions also may have impacts on registrants and other third parties involved in the domain name system. In June 2013, the ICANN Board approved a new 2013 RAA (the provisions of which can be found at <http://www.icann.org/en/resources/registrars/raa/approved-with-specs-27jun13-en.pdf>). In initiating negotiations for the 2013 RAA between ICANN and the Registrars Stakeholder Group in October 2011, the ICANN Board had also requested an Issue Report from the GNSO that, upon the conclusion of the RAA negotiations, would start a GNSO Policy Development Process (PDP) to address remaining issues not dealt with in the RAA negotiations that would be suited to a PDP. The GNSO Council approved the charter for this effort at its meeting on 31 October 2013 and a Working Group was formed.

The WG published its Initial Report for public comment on 5 May: <https://www.icann.org/public-comments/ppsai-initial-2015-05-05-en>. Due to the unusually large volume of comments received (including over 11,000 public comments and almost 150 survey responses), the WG extended its timeline in order to carefully and thoroughly consider all the input received. Having completed its review of all the comments, the WG completed and sent its Final Report to the GNSO Council on 7 December 2015. On 21 January 2016, the GNSO Council voted unanimously to approve all the recommendations contained in the WG's Final Report, all of which attained Full Consensus among the WG. Consonant with the requirements of the

ICANN Bylaws, a public comment forum was opened on the final recommendations from 5 February to 16 March (<https://www.icann.org/public-comments/ppsai-recommendations-2016-02-05-en>), the GNSO Council approved the transmission of a Recommendations Report to the ICANN Board on 18 February, and notification provided to the GAC on 19 February.

In May 2016, the ICANN Board [acknowledged](#) receipt of the GNSO's recommendations, and requested more time to consider them, including time for the provision and consideration of GAC advice, if any. The GAC hosted a session at ICANN56 on the topic and in its [Helsinki Communique](#) advised the ICANN Board to 'direct the Implementation Review Team (IRT) to ensure that the GAC concerns are effectively addressed in the implementation phase to the greatest extent possible'. On 9 August, the Board approved the PDP recommendations and acknowledged the GAC's advice, which it will consider in order to provide further input to the Implementation Review Team (IRT) that is to be formed.

The IRT has been formed and commenced meetings in October. Approximately 40 volunteers have signed up for the IRT, including multiple volunteers from the GAC's PSWG.

[In December, the ICANN Board adopted](#) a scorecard, [GAC Advice—Helsinki Communique: Actions and Updates](#). In this scorecard, the Board:

- Accepted the GAC's advice with respect to this program and said that it will continue to encourage dialogue on constructive ways to address GAC concerns as the policy implementation continues;
- Noted that members of the PSWG have joined the IRT, and encouraged the IRT to continue to work with the PSWG to address the concerns expressed by the GAC regarding accreditation of privacy/proxy service providers; and
- Said that it will use the existing processes in ICANN's Bylaws and the Board-GAC Consultation Process to address any additional advice from the GAC regarding accreditation of privacy/proxy service providers. The Board also noted that ICANN's existing Consensus Policy Implementation Framework allows for new policy issues that emerge during implementation to be referred back to the appropriate policy making body, in this case, the GNSO.

Engagement Opportunity Status



This project is now in the implementation phase. The GAC is encouraged to participate in the Implementation Review Team, particularly as the Public Safety Working Group works to develop a proposed framework for accredited Privacy and Proxy Service Providers' responses to law enforcement requests. Pursuant to the ICANN Bylaws, any GAC advice that is timely provided will be taken duly into account by the Board.

Additional Information

Implementation Review Team wiki page

<https://community.icann.org/display/IRT/Privacy+and+Proxy+Services+Accreditation+Implementation>
WG Charter

<http://gns0.icann.org/en/drafts/raa-pp-charter-22oct13-en.pdf>

WG Workspace

<https://community.icann.org/x/9iCfAg>

WG Initial Report

<http://gnso.icann.org/en/issues/raa/ppsai-initial-05may15-en.pdf>

WG Final Report

<http://gnso.icann.org/en/issues/raa/ppsai-final-07dec15-en.pdf>

GNSO Council resolution approving the Final Report

<http://gnso.icann.org/en/council/resolutions#201601>

GNSO Council Recommendations Report to the ICANN Board

<http://gnso.icann.org/en/drafts/council-board-ppsai-recommendations-09feb16-en.pdf>

ICANN Board notification to the GAC

<https://gacweb.icann.org/download/attachments/27492514/2016-02-19-Steve-Crocker-to-Thomas-Schneider-GNSO-PDP.pdf?version=1&modificationDate=1456046942000&api=v2>

ICANN Board resolution of May 2016: <https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2016-05-15-en#2.a>

GAC Helsinki Communique:

https://gacweb.icann.org/download/attachments/27132037/20160630_GAC%20ICANN%2056%20Communique_FINAL%20%5B1%5D.pdf?version=1&modificationDate=1469016353728&api=v2

ICANN Board resolution of August 2016: <https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2016-08-09-en#2.e>

ICANN Board resolution of December 2016: <https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2016-12-13-en#1.d>

Policy Development Process (PDP) Update

IGO & INGO Access to the Curative Rights Protection Mechanisms of the UDRP & URS

December 2016

Upcoming Important Dates

The WG has completed its initial deliberations over the policy options and practical alternatives for addressing the specific needs of IGOs in relation to curative rights protections (such as the UDRP and URS) at the second level in all gTLDs. The WG has also reviewed the IGO Small Group Proposal that was sent to the GAC and GNSO in October 2016. It is currently finalizing its preliminary recommendations to be published in its Initial Report for public comment in January 2017.

Summary

This Policy Development Process (PDP) originated in a consensus recommendation from the GNSO's prior PDP Working Group on the Protection of International Organization Names in All gTLDs (IGO-INGO WG). This was for the GNSO Council to request an Issue Report, as a preceding step to a possible PDP to explore possible amendments to existing curative rights protection mechanisms, i.e. the Uniform Dispute Resolution Policy (UDRP) and the Uniform Rapid Suspension (URS) procedure, to address the specific needs of International Governmental Organizations (IGOs) and International Non-Governmental Organizations (INGOs).

Engagement Opportunity Status



On 2 June 2014 the GNSO Council [resolved](#) to initiate the PDP following its review of the [Final Issue Report](#), and on 25 June the GNSO Council [adopted](#) the charter for the PDP Working Group to be formed.

The WG has preliminarily determined: (1) to exclude INGOs from consideration in the PDP, thus focusing only on IGOs; (2) that standing to file a complaint may appropriately be based on an IGO's having affirmatively sought protection under Article 6ter of the Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property; and (3) that, based on the expert opinion of the external legal expert engaged for this purpose, the question of IGO jurisdictional immunity is not subject to a single universal rule and as such the applicability and scope of this principle varies across jurisdictions. It has considered how this conclusion might affect the Mutual Jurisdiction requirement currently in the UDRP and URS. It has also reviewed the IGO Small Group Proposal as part of its preparation of its Initial Report.

The WG is currently finalizing the text of its Initial Report, which it hopes to publish for public comment in January 2017.

The GAC, and GAC members and observers, are encouraged to provide input during the public comment period for the Initial Report, especially on topics which may have public international law and policy implications, so that these may be considered as part of the WG's preparation of its final recommendations to be included in its Final Report to the GNSO Council.

Additional Information:

- Charter for the PDP Working Group (as adopted by the GNSO Council on 25 June 2014): <http://gns0.icann.org/en/drafts/igo-ingo-crp-access-charter-24jun14-en.pdf>
- Amended Charter provisions: <http://gns0.icann.org/en/council/resolutions#20150416-3>
- WG wiki space including background documents and latest research: <https://community.icann.org/x/37rhAg>
- Working text of draft Initial Report: <https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/62390631/Draft%20Initial%20Report%20-%202013%20Dec.pdf?version=1&modificationDate=1481814991000&api=v2>

Policy Development Process (PDP) Update

Protection of Certain International Organization Names in all gTLDs

December 2016

Upcoming Important Dates:

The Implementation Review Team that is working with ICANN staff on implementing those Board-adopted PDP recommendations that are not inconsistent with GAC advice is finalizing draft consensus policy language for public comment. Following receipt of the IGO Small Group Proposal in early October 2016 and further discussions with the GAC and the Board at ICANN57, the GNSO Council is considering the Board's new proposal to engage in a facilitated discussion with the GAC, to resolve remaining differences between the GAC and the GNSO on the topic of appropriate preventative protections for certain Red Cross identifiers and IGO acronyms.

Summary:

In November 2013, the GNSO Council unanimously adopted all the consensus recommendations from its PDP Working Group regarding protections at the top and second level in all gTLDs for the names and acronyms of certain International Government Organizations (IGOs) and International Non-Government Organizations (INGOs), including the Red Cross international movement and its national societies (RCRC) and the International Olympic Committee (IOC).

On 30 April 2014 the Board [adopted](#) those of the GNSO's recommendations that are not inconsistent with GAC advice received on the topic and requested additional time to consider the remaining recommendations (which include those relating to IGO acronym protections and Red Cross national society names). It also resolved to facilitate dialogue between the GAC, GNSO and other affected parties to resolve the remaining differences. An Implementation Review Team to implement the Board-adopted recommendations under the direction of the Global Domains Division was formed to implement those recommendations adopted by the Board.

In June 2014 the NGPC [requested](#) that the GNSO Council consider amending its remaining policy recommendations with respect to the nature and duration of protection for IGO acronyms, as well as the names of the entities making up the international Red Cross movement and 189 national Red Cross societies. The GNSO Council [responded](#) to the NGPC's request in October seeking further clarification and in January 2015 received the NGPC's [reply](#) advising that discussions remain ongoing. The names of the international Red Cross and the 189 national societies as well as IGO names and acronyms are currently protected on an interim basis. In 2014, a small group of IGO and GAC representatives began working with ICANN Board representatives on a proposal to reconcile the inconsistent GNSO policy recommendations and GAC advice, facilitated by ICANN staff.

The GNSO Council [wrote](#) to the Board on 31 May 2016 to follow up on certain discussions at ICANN55 in Marrakech. Following additional discussions at ICANN56 in Helsinki, the Board [responded](#) to the GNSO Council in October 2016 and forwarded the final IGO Small Group Proposal at the same time.

Engagement Opportunity Status:



The GAC's [Los Angeles Communiqué](#) reaffirmed its previous advice on the protection of IGO names and acronyms and also acknowledges the NGPC's latest resolution to temporarily protect the Red Cross' national society identifiers until the differences between the GNSO's consensus recommendations and GAC advice are reconciled. In its [Singapore Communiqué](#) the GAC expressed its intention to continue to work with interested parties to reach agreement on appropriate permanent protections for IGO names and acronyms, including working with the GNSO PDP Working Group on IGO-INGO Access to Curative Rights Protection Mechanisms. The [Buenos Aires Communiqué](#) expressed the GAC's hope for a concrete solution by ICANN54 while welcoming the preventative protections that remain in place until the implementation of permanent mechanisms. In its [Dublin Communiqué, the GAC](#) requested the ICANN Board to facilitate the timely completion of the work of the IGO small group in order to resolve the issue of IGO protections. The GAC's [Marrakech Communiqué](#) noted the GAC's hope for resolution of the remaining differences between the GNSO and the GAC as to permanent protections for the Red Cross identifiers at issue. In its [Helsinki Communiqué](#), the GAC requested that the Board continue to pursue discussions with the GAC and the GNSO, and to engage with the IGOs, to reach a resolution on the issues. The GAC's [Hyderabad Communiqué](#) advised the Board: (1) to engage with all parties in order to facilitate, through a transparent and good faith dialogue, the resolution of outstanding inconsistencies between GAC advice and GNSO recommendations with regard to the protection of IGO acronyms using the IGO Small Group Proposal as a starting point; and (2) to urgently request the GNSO to amend its policy recommendation concerning the Red Cross international movement and national society names, and to confirm their protections as permanent.

The Board's proposal at ICANN57 that the GAC and GNSO engage in a good faith facilitated dialogue to resolve these outstanding issues is currently under consideration by the affected parties.

Additional Information:

- PDP [Working Group Final Report](#):
- <http://gnso.icann.org/en/issues/igo-ingo-final-10nov13-en.pdf>
- [GNSO Council Recommendation Report to ICANN Board](#):
<http://gnso.icann.org/en/issues/council-board-igo-ingo-23jan14-en.pdf>
- [ICANN Board Resolution of 30 April 2014](#): <https://features.icann.org/gnsso-policy-recommendations-igo-ingo-protections>
- NGPC Letter of 16 June 2014: <http://gnso.icann.org/en/correspondence/chalaby-to-robinson-16jun14-en.pdf>
- GNSO Council Response of 7 October 2014 to NGPC Letter:
<http://gnso.icann.org/en/correspondence/robinson-to-chalaby-disspain-07oct14-en.pdf>
- NGPC Resolution of 12 October 2014 on interim protections for the international Red Cross and national Red Cross entities: <https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2014-10-12-en#2.d>
- NGPC Letter Response to GNSO Council of 15 January 2015:
<http://gnso.icann.org/en/correspondence/chalaby-to-robinson-15jan15-en.pdf>
- GNSO Council Letter to the Chair of the ICANN Board, 31 May 2016:
<https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/gnsso-council-chairs-to-crocker-31may16-en.pdf>
- Board response to the GNSO Council, enclosing IGO Small Group Proposal, 4 October 2016:
<https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/crocker-to-austin-et-al-04oct16-en.pdf>

Early Engagement Policy Document - Translation and Transliteration

Policy Development Process (PDP) Update Translation and Transliteration Of Contact Information (T/T)

December 2016

UPCOMING IMPORTANT DATES

The Implementation Review Team (IRT) is currently discussing issues surrounding implementation of language and script tags as recommended in the T/T final report. Due to emerging complexities surrounding implementation of language and script tags, the implementation's projected effective date has been extended into 2018. Global Domains Division (GDD) staff continues to iteratively draft policy language to discuss with the IRT.

SUMMARY

The Policy Development Process (PDP) on the translation and transliteration had its inaugural meeting on 19 December 2013. It focused its work the following issues:

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 which party(s) should bear the burden of translating contact information to a single common language or transliterating contact information to a single common script.

The Working Group completed its [Final Report](#), which was [approved](#) by the GNSO Council on 24 June. In its Final Report, the Working Group does not recommend to mandate the translation/transliteration of contact information data. Instead the Group recommends that registrants are able to submit contact data in any language/script supported by their registrar; ideally the registrant's native one. The Group expressed in its Final Report that data submitted in a script native to the registrant is most likely to be accurate and that the costs of translating and/or transliterating all contact information data would be disproportionate to any potential benefits. On 28 September, the ICANN Board [adopted the recommendations](#).

ENGAGEMENT OPPORTUNITY STATUS



Staff has formed an Implementation Review Team and held a kickoff call on 19 July. The GNSO Council has yet to appoint a liaison to the GNSO.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

- Translation and Transliteration Community
Wiki: <https://community.icann.org/display/gnsotcII/Translation+and+Transliteration+of+Contact+Information+IRT+Home>
- Final Report
<http://gnso.icann.org/en/issues/gtlds/translation-transliteration-contact-final-12jun15-en.pdf>
- ICANN Board resolution
<https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2015-09-28-en>
- GNSO Council Resolution
<http://gnso.icann.org/en/council/resolutions#20150624-3>
- Wiki Space
<https://community.icann.org/x/FTR-Ag>

Policy Development Process (PDP) Update

‘Thick’ WHOIS Policy Development Process

December 2016

Upcoming dates

Following the Public Comment period ending in December 2016, ICANN plans to publish the Summary and Analysis Reports for both Thick Whois Consensus Policy Requiring Consistent Labeling and Display of RDDS (Whois) Output for All gTLDs and the Proposed Implementation of GNSO Thick RDDS (Whois) Transition Policy for .COM, .NET and .JOBS in January 2017.

Summary

ICANN specifies WHOIS service requirements through its agreements with gTLD Registries and Registrars. Registries have historically satisfied their WHOIS obligations under two different models, characterized as “thin” and “thick” WHOIS registries. In a thin registration model the Registry only collects and publishes the minimal information associated with the domain name from the Registrar (such as DNS technical information). All of the registrant’s contact information is maintained by the Registrar, which publishes it via their own WHOIS services. In a thick registration model the Registry collects both sets of data (domain name and registrant) from the Registrar and in turn publishes that data via WHOIS. The Council initiated a Policy Development Process (PDP) to consider a possible requirement of “thick” WHOIS for all gTLDs. This issue is one that also affects access to WHOIS data, which is a law-enforcement-related issue. The GAC has indicated its interest in both WHOIS and law enforcement-related issues in previous GAC Communiqués. The Thick WHOIS WG finalized its report and submitted it to the GNSO Council on 21 October 2013. The GNSO Council unanimously adopted the recommendation to require Thick WHOIS for all gTLD registries at its meeting on 31 October 2013. Following the public comment forum and the notification of the GAC, the ICANN Board considered the recommendations and [adopted](#) these at its meeting on 7 February 2014.

ICANN Staff and the Thick Whois IRT have identified two outcomes for the Thick Whois Policy recommendations and agreed that their implementation could be decoupled:

- Consistent Labeling and Display of Whois output for all gTLDs
- Transition from thin to thick for .COM, .NET and .JOBS

GAC Engagement Opportunity Status



Following the adoption of the recommendations by the ICANN Board, an Implementation Review Team has been formed to work with ICANN staff on the development of the implementation plan.

Additional Information

- Registry Registration Data Directory Services Consistent Labeling and Display Policy: <https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/rdds-labeling-policy-2016-07-26-en>
- PDP Documentation: <http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/thick-whois.htm>
- PDP WG Final Report: <http://gnso.icann.org/en/issues/whois/thick-final-21oct13-en.pdf>
- Thick Whois Implementation: <https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/thick-whois-2016-06-27-en>
- Thick Whois IRT Workspace: <https://community.icann.org/display/TWCPI>
- Public Comment period on Consistent Labeling and Display implementation proposal: <https://www.icann.org/public-comments/rdds-output-2015-12-03-en>
- Public Comment period on Transition from thin to thick for .COM, .NET and .JOBS <https://www.icann.org/public-comments/proposed-implementation-gnso-thick-rdds-whois-transition-2016-10-26-en>
-