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Next Generation gTLD RDS to Replace WHOIS PDP Working Group (WG) Charter (Draft)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WG Name:</th>
<th>Next Generation gTLD RDS to Replace WHOIS PDP Working Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Section I: Working Group Identification**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chartering Organization(s)</th>
<th>GNSO Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charter Approval Date:</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of WG Chair:</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name(s) of Appointed Liaison(s):</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WG Workspace URL:</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WG Mailing List:</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GNSO Council Resolution:**

- **Title:** Motion to Approve the Charter for the Next Generation gTLD RDS to Replace WHOIS PDP Working Group
- **Ref # & Link:** TBD

**Important Document Links:**

- [Next Generation gTLD RDS to Replace WHOIS Final Issue Report](#)
- [GNSO Working Group Guidelines](#)
- [GNSO PDP Manual](#)
- [EP-WG Framework for a PDP on Next-Generation RDS](#)
- [EWG Final Report and FAQs, Tutorials, & EWG Member Statements](#)
Section II: Mission, Purpose, and Deliverables

Mission & Scope:

Background
On 8 November, 2012, the ICANN Board passed a resolution launching the Expert Working Group on gTLD Registration Directory Services (EWG) to help redefine the purpose of gTLD registration data and consider how to safeguard the data, and to propose a model for gTLD registration directory services (RDS) to address accuracy, privacy, and access issues.

Upon publication of the EWG’s Final Report in June, 2014, an informal group of GNSO Councilors and ICANN Board Members collaborated to propose a Process Framework for structuring a GNSO PDP to successfully address these challenging issues. On 26 May, 2015, the ICANN Board passed a resolution adopting that Process Framework and reaffirming its 2012 request for a Board-initiated PDP to define the purpose of collecting, maintaining and providing access to gTLD registration data, and to consider safeguards for protecting data, using the recommendations in the EWG’s Final Report as an input to, and, if appropriate, as the foundation for a new gTLD policy.

Accordingly, the GNSO Council is proceeding with the Board-requested PDP, using the Framework’s 3-phase process to (1) establish gTLD registration data requirements to determine if and why a next-generation RDS is needed, (2) design policies that detail functions that must be provided by a next-generation RDS to support those requirements, and (3) provide guidance for how a next-generation RDS should implement those policies, coexisting with and eventually replacing WHOIS.

Mission and Scope
The PDP Working Group is tasked with providing the GNSO Council with policy recommendations regarding the issue identified by the above ICANN Board resolutions and described in the Process Framework. Specifically, the PDP WG is tasked with analyzing the purpose of collecting, maintaining and providing access to gTLD registration data and considering safeguards for protecting that data, determining if and why a next-generation Registration Directory Service (RDS) is needed to replace WHOIS, and creating policies and coexistence and implementation guidance to meet those needs.

During Phase 1, the PDP WG should, at a minimum, attempt to reach consensus recommendations regarding the following questions:

- **What are the fundamental requirements for gTLD registration data?**
  When addressing this question, the PDP WG should consider, at a minimum, users and purposes and associated access, accuracy, data element, and privacy requirements.

- **Is a new policy framework and next-generation RDS needed to address these requirements?**
  - If yes, what further requirements must a next-generation RDS address, including coexistence, compliance, system model, and cost, benefit, and risk analysis requirements?
  - If no, does the current WHOIS policy framework sufficiently address these requirements? If not, what revisions are recommended to the current WHOIS policy framework to do so?
As part of its Phase 1 deliberations, the PDP WG should work to reach consensus recommendations by considering, at a minimum, the following complex and inter-related questions:

- **Users/Purposes**: Who should have access to gTLD registration data and why?
- **Gated Access**: What steps should be taken to control data access for each user/purpose?
- **Data Accuracy**: What steps should be taken to improve data accuracy?
- **Data Elements**: What data should be collected, stored, and disclosed?
- **Privacy**: What steps are needed to protect data and privacy?
- **Coexistence**: What steps should be taken to enable next-generation RDS coexistence with and replacement of the legacy WHOIS system?
- **Compliance**: What steps are needed to enforce these policies?
- **System Model**: What system requirements must be satisfied by any next-generation RDS implementation?
- **Cost**: What costs will be incurred and how must they be covered?
- **Benefits**: What benefits will be achieved and how will they be measured?
- **Risks**: What risks do stakeholders face and how will they be reconciled?

Each of these areas is defined in the Preliminary Issue Report and suggested PDP WG inputs. The Process Framework shown below time-sequences these areas to accommodate inter-dependencies and create opportunities for parallel policy development, subject to resource availability.
Preliminary Issue Report on a Next-Generation gTLD RDS to Replace WHOIS
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3-Phase PDP WG Process: Detailed Description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Users/Purposes</td>
<td>Users/Purposes Design</td>
<td>Users/Purposes Guidance</td>
<td>Users/Purposes Guidance on</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- EWG Principles Sect 4</td>
<td>- Data per Purpose</td>
<td>- Accreditation Policy Per User Community</td>
<td>- Accreditor Criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Use Cases (Annex C)</td>
<td>- Update Process</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Access Protocol Needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- GAC WHOIS Principles</td>
<td>- Accreditation Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Authentication Needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- WHOIS RT Report</td>
<td>Per User Community</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Credential Admin Needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gated Access</td>
<td>Gated Access Design</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Training Needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Differentiated) Access</td>
<td>Gated Access Guidance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- EWG Principles Sect 4b</td>
<td>- Levels of Access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Access Examples (Annex E)</td>
<td>- Access Criteria for each Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- RDS User Accreditation RFI</td>
<td>- LE Access Principles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- WHOIS Misuse Study</td>
<td>- Criteria for each Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Accuracy</td>
<td>Data Accuracy Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- EWG Principles Sect 5</td>
<td>- Accuracy Principles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Validation Service RFI</td>
<td>- Contact Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ccTLD Validation Survey</td>
<td>- Validation Needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- WHOIS Accuracy Studies</td>
<td>- Remediation Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Elements</td>
<td>Data Element Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- EWG Principles Sect 4a</td>
<td>- Data Collection Needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Data Needs (Annex D)</td>
<td>- Data Access Needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 2013 RAA WHOIS record</td>
<td>- Data Validity Needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- WHOIS RegID Study</td>
<td>- EPP/RR/Whois Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privacy</td>
<td>Privacy Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- EWG Principles Sect 6/7</td>
<td>- Overarching DP Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- P/P Provider Survey</td>
<td>- DP Law Compliance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- WHOIS P/P Abuse Study</td>
<td>- Privacy/Proxy Policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Data Protect/Privacy Memo</td>
<td>- Secure Protected Credentials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- GNSO RRSWI WG Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Coexistence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coexistence Reqs</th>
<th>Coexistence Design</th>
<th>Coexistence Guidance on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Coexistence Needs</td>
<td>- Policies to address</td>
<td>- Incremental Test/Adoption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Incl. Time Period, Phased Transition Plan)</td>
<td>- Coexistence Needs</td>
<td>- Transition Plan for each Area (E.g., Access, Accuracy, Privacy)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compliance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compliance Reqs</th>
<th>Compliance Design</th>
<th>Compliance Guidance on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Guiding Principles for Anti-Abuse Deterrents, Auditing, Enforcement</td>
<td>- Compliance Policy Per Ecosystem Player (E.g., RDS Operator, Requestors, Validators)</td>
<td>- Contract Amended Needs (RAA and Registry)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Establish Goals/Metrics</td>
<td></td>
<td>- New Contract Needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Compliance Benchmarks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

System Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System Model Reqs</th>
<th>System Model Design</th>
<th>System Model Guidance on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Collection, Access, and Storage Reqs</td>
<td>- Systems Architecture (Entities &amp; Interfaces)</td>
<td>- RDS Operator Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Internationalization Reqs</td>
<td>- Internationalization Policy Updates</td>
<td>- Protocol Extension Needs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cost Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Model Reqs</th>
<th>Cost Model Design</th>
<th>Cost Model Guidance on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- List of Expenses</td>
<td>- Management &amp; Allocation of Costs</td>
<td>- Ballpark Cost N/A for Ecosystem, based on Model Design, covering full lifecycle (Dev, test, migration, operation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- List of Income Sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Cost Drivers &amp; Principles on Goals/Metrics/Migration</td>
<td>- Recovery Model (E.g., fees)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Cost Tracking Policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Benefit Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit Analysis Reqs</th>
<th>Benefit Analysis Design</th>
<th>Benefit Analysis Guidance on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Guiding Principles on Benefit Goals/Metrics</td>
<td>- Benefit Tracking Policies</td>
<td>- Benefit Modeling, Metrics &amp; Benchmarks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Risk Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Assess Reqs</th>
<th>Risk Assess Design</th>
<th>Risk Assess Guidance on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Guiding Principles to reconcile risks, impacts, and benefits</td>
<td>- Identify Risks</td>
<td>- Possible measures to accept, mitigate, and transfer risks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Assess Impacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Input to PDP WG  
Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group  
Output of PDP WG
During Phase 1, the PDP WG should examine all requirements for gTLD registration data and directory services at a high level. Due to inter-dependencies, all areas should be considered together, by a single team. For example, the PDP WG should consider whether gTLD registration data should continue to be accessible for any purpose, or whether data should be accessible only for specific purposes. If the PDP WG decides the latter, it should recommend permissible users and purposes.

At the conclusion of Phase 1, the PDP WG’s output should be sent to the GNSO Council for approval of its recommendations regarding if and why a next-generation RDS is needed to replace WHOIS. If the WG has concluded a new policy framework is needed, this output should include requirements to be addressed by that new framework and any next-generation RDS. However, if the WG has concluded the existing WHOIS system can adequately address requirements, the WG’s output should confirm this and identify any necessary changes to the WHOIS policy framework.

Before proceeding to Phase 2, the GNSO Council should decide whether or not sufficient progress has been made to move to the next phase, whether questions still need to be more fully addressed before moving to the new phase, or whether the PDP WG has accomplished its charter. The GNSO Council should be guided at each such decision point by a set of questions that assess how well key goals and concerns have been addressed. At minimum, the Council should consider whether all questions posed in the November 2012 Board Resolution initiating this PDP have been addressed:

- Why are gTLD registration data collected?
- What purpose will the data serve?
- Who collects the data?
- What value does the public realize with access to registration data?
- Of all the registration data available, which does the public need access to?
- Is the WHOIS protocol the best choice for providing that access?
- What safeguards are provided to protect the data?

Additionally, the Council should consider whether the WG made suitable progress towards key goals and concerns in this phase of the PDP. For example, has suitable progress been made on:

- Establishing a compelling business case for a next-generation RDS to meet defined needs for registration data?
- Establishing a coexistence plan enabling phased transition over a defined period of time?
- Creating a viable approach to moving from WHOIS anonymous access to RDS gated access?
- Ensuring scalability, stability and security of the Next-Gen RDS?
- Measuring the effectiveness of the Next-Gen RDS in reaching stated goals?
- Seeking buy-in from all impacted parties, including ecosystem players, consumers & standards bodies?

The above list is suggested by the Process Framework as a starting point for the GNSO Council to refine, in advance of reaching the Phase 1 decision point.

This next part of this charter applies only if the GNSO Council confirms after Phase 1 that a new policy framework and next-generation RDS are required and the WG should proceed to Phases 2 and 3.

During Phases 2 and 3, the PDP WG should recommend a new consensus policy framework to satisfy requirements for a next-generation RDS established in Phase 1, along with any necessary coexistence and implementation guidance. Specifically:
In Phase 2, the PDP WG should design detailed policies to satisfy all requirements established in Phase 1. For example, the PDP WG should define the data elements to be accessible for each permissible user and purpose. Opportunities for parallel policy design have been identified, sequenced to reflect inter-dependencies. For example, policies in group B must be drafted before policies in group C can start, but policies in group C could potentially be drafted in parallel by PDP WG subteams, given sufficient resources and coordination.

In Phase 3, the PDP WG should dive more deeply into each policy group to create any necessary implementation and coexistence guidance. For example, in Phase 3a), the PDP WG might explore possible Terms of Service for permissible users and purposes and identify challenges that must be overcome. In Phase 3b), the PDP WG might detail WHOIS and next-generation RDS data access coexistence.

Phases 2 and 3 may be overlapping and iterative. Details explored in Phase 3 may require refinement of certain Phase 2 policies. Any policy refinements should be carefully coordinated to manage inter-dependencies. To accomplish this, the Process Framework recommends that the GNSO Council periodically review Phase 2 work-in-progress to identify gaps or inconsistencies and ensure alignment with Phase 1 requirements.

At the conclusion of Phase 3, the PDP WG’s output should be sent to the GNSO Council for approval of its recommended new policy framework for a next-generation RDS and guidance for how a next-generation RDS should implement those policies, coexisting with and eventually replacing WHOIS.

Upon reaching this final decision point, the GNSO Council should decide whether sufficient progress has been made, whether questions still need to be more fully addressed, or whether the PDP WG has accomplished its charter. As at the end of Phase 1, the GNSO Council should be guided by a set of questions that assess how well key goals and concerns have been addressed.

PDP WG inputs: As directed by the ICANN Board, the EWG Final Report and FAQs, Tutorials, and EWG Member Statements should serve as the foundation for the PDP. In addition to past work on this topic and inputs suggested in the Process Framework, the PDP WG should take into account ongoing ICANN initiatives that may help inform deliberations limited to this specific topic, such as:

- Implementation of the 2013 RAA
- Implementation of Thick WHOIS
- Privacy and Proxy Services Accreditation Issues recommendations, if/when adopted by the GNSO Council and ICANN Board
- Translation and Transliteration recommendations, if/when adopted by the GNSO Council and ICANN Board

The PDP WG is also expected to consider information and advice provided by other ICANN Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees on this topic. The WG is strongly encouraged to reach out to these groups for collaboration at an early stage of its deliberations, to ensure that their concerns and positions are heard and considered in a timely manner. During Phases 2 and 3, the WG may engage outside experts as needed to inform its work, particularly when formulating coexistence and implementation guidance.
Objectives & Goals:

To develop, at a minimum, an Initial Report and a Final Report which addresses the questions enumerated in the Final Issue Report. Both of these Reports are to be published for public comment at the end of Phase 1 and again at the end of iterative Phases 2 +3.

These Reports should be delivered to the GNSO Council, following the processes described in Annex A of the ICANN Bylaws and the GNSO PDP Manual, and further guided by the Process Framework as described above.

Additional Interim Reports may be requested from the PDP WG by the GNSO Council to facilitate oversight, avoid gaps, and ensure continuing alignment across areas.

Deliverables & Timeframes:

To foster sustained progress and timely completion, the PDP WG should work towards a defined timeline for incremental targets (e.g., complete Phase 1 in x weeks). Additionally, the WG shall respect the timelines and deliverables as outlined in Annex A of the ICANN Bylaws and the PDP Manual. As per the GNSO Working Group Guidelines, the WG shall develop a work plan that outlines the necessary steps and expecting timing in order to achieve the milestones of the PDP as set out in Annex A of the ICANN Bylaws, the PDP Manual, and the Process Framework, and submit this to the GNSO Council.

Section III: Formation, Staffing, and Organization

Membership Criteria:

The Working Group will be open to all interested in participating. All members are expected to review previous documents enumerated in the Final Issue Report and produced by the PDP WG, including PDP WG meeting transcripts.

Group Formation, Dependencies, & Dissolution:

The Working Group shall be a standard GNSO PDP Working Group. The GNSO should circulate a ‘Call For Volunteers’ as widely as possible in order to ensure broad representation and participation in the Working Group, including:

- Publication of announcement on relevant ICANN web sites including but not limited to the GNSO, GAC, and other Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committee web pages; and
- Distribution of the announcement to GNSO Stakeholder Groups, Constituencies and other ICANN Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees.

As previously noted, the entire PDP WG should address all policy areas simultaneously during Phase 1 of this PDP. If the GNSO chooses, parallel subteams may be used during Phases 2 and 3 to address policy areas concurrently, in a sequenced manner, given sufficient resources and coordination.

The PDP WG should consider, as part of its work plan, if there are opportunities to facilitate productive dialog, such as periodic face-to-face conferences. The methodology used by the PDP WG must be transparent, consistent with the GNSO Policy Development Process, and take into consideration capacity to ensure adequate resourcing from all stakeholders.
Working Group Roles, Functions, & Duties:
The standard WG roles, functions & duties shall be applicable as specified in Section 2.2 of the Working Group Guidelines. The ICANN Staff assigned to the WG will fully support the work of the Working Group as requested by the Chair, including meeting support, document drafting, editing and distribution and other substantive contributions when deemed appropriate. Staff assignments to the Working Group: <tbd> Especially during Phase 3, external experts may be called upon to help the PDP WG complete research in selected areas (e.g., data protection laws, risk assessment, cost impact analysis).

Statements of Interest (SOI) Guidelines:
Each member of the Working Group is required to submit an SOI in accordance with Section 5 of the GNSO Operating Procedure.

Section IV: Rules of Engagement

Decision—Making Methodologies:
[Note: This material was extracted from the Working Group Guidelines, Section 3.6. If a Chartering Organization wishes to deviate from the standard methodology for making decisions or empower the WG to decide its own decision—making methodology, this section should be amended as appropriate].

The Chair will be responsible for designating each position as having one of the following designations:

- **Full consensus** – when no one in the group speaks against the recommendation in its last readings. This is also sometimes referred to as **Unanimous Consensus**.

- **Consensus** – a position where only a small minority disagrees, but most agree. [Note: For those that are unfamiliar with ICANN usage, you may associate the definition of ‘Consensus’ with other definitions and terms of art such as rough consensus or near consensus. It should be noted, however, that in the case of a GNSO PDP originated Working Group, all reports, especially Final Reports, must restrict themselves to the term ‘Consensus’ as this may have legal implications.]

- **Strong support but significant opposition** - a position where, while most of the group supports a recommendation, there are a significant number of those who do not support it.

- **Divergence (also referred to as No Consensus)** - a position where there isn’t strong support for any particular position, but many different points of view. Sometimes this is due to irreconcilable differences of opinion and sometimes it is due to the fact that no one has a particularly strong or convincing viewpoint, but the members of the group agree that it is worth listing the issue in the report nonetheless.

- **Minority View** – refers to a proposal where a small number of people support the recommendation. This can happen in response to a Consensus, Strong support but significant opposition, and No Consensus; or, it can happen in cases where there is neither support nor opposition to a suggestion made by a small number of individuals.

In cases of Consensus, Strong support but significant opposition, and No Consensus, an effort should be made to document that variance in viewpoint and to present any Minority View recommendations that may have been made. Documentation of Minority View recommendations normally depends on text offered by the proponent(s). In all cases of Divergence, the WG Chair should encourage the submission of minority viewpoint.
The recommended method for discovering the consensus level designation on recommendations should work as follows:

i. After the group has discussed an issue long enough for all issues to have been raised, understood and discussed, the Chair, or Co-Chairs, make an evaluation of the designation and publish it for the group to review.

ii. After the group has discussed the Chair's estimation of designation, the Chair, or Co-Chairs, should reevaluate and publish an updated evaluation.

iii. Steps (i) and (ii) should continue until the Chair/Co-Chairs make an evaluation that is accepted by the group.

iv. In rare case, a Chair may decide that the use of polls is reasonable. Some of the reasons for this might be:
   o A decision needs to be made within a time frame that does not allow for the natural process of iteration and settling on a designation to occur.
   o It becomes obvious after several iterations that it is impossible to arrive at a designation. This will happen most often when trying to discriminate between Consensus and Strong support but Significant Opposition or between Strong support but Significant Opposition and Divergence.

Care should be taken in using polls that they do not become votes. A liability with the use of polls is that, in situations where there is Divergence or Strong Opposition, there are often disagreements about the meanings of the poll questions or of the poll results.

Based upon the WG's needs, the Chair may direct that WG participants do not have to have their name explicitly associated with any Full Consensus or Consensus view/position. However, in all other cases and in those cases where a group member represents the minority viewpoint, their name must be explicitly linked, especially in those cases where polls where taken.

Consensus calls should always involve the entire Working Group and, for this reason, should take place on the designated mailing list to ensure that all Working Group members have the opportunity to fully participate in the consensus process. It is the role of the Chair to designate which level of consensus is reached and announce this designation to the Working Group. Member(s) of the Working Group should be able to challenge the designation of the Chair as part of the Working Group discussion. However, if disagreement persists, members of the WG may use the process set forth below to challenge the designation.

If several participants (see Note 1 below) in a WG disagree with the designation given to a position by the Chair or any other consensus call, they may follow these steps sequentially:

1. Send email to the Chair, copying the WG explaining why the decision is believed to be in error.
2. If the Chair still disagrees with the complainants, the Chair will forward the appeal to the CO liaison(s). The Chair must explain his or her reasoning in the response to the complainants and in the submission to the liaison. If the liaison(s) supports the Chair's position, the liaison(s) will provide their response to the complainants. The liaison(s) must explain their reasoning in the response. If the CO liaison disagrees with the Chair, the liaison will forward the appeal to the CO. Should the complainants disagree with the liaison support of the Chair's determination, the complainants may appeal to the
Chair of the CO or their designated representative. If the CO agrees with the 
complainants’ position, the CO should recommend remedial action to the Chair.

3. In the event of any appeal, the CO will attach a statement of the appeal to the WG 
and/or Board report. This statement should include all of the documentation from all 
steps in the appeals process and should include a statement from the CO (see Note 2 
below).

**Note 1:** Any Working Group member may raise an issue for reconsideration; however, a formal 
appeal will require that that a single member demonstrates a sufficient amount of support 
before a formal appeal process can be invoked. In those cases where a single Working Group 
member is seeking reconsideration, the member will advise the Chair and/or Liaison of their 
issue and the Chair and/or Liaison will work with the dissenting member to investigate the issue 
and to determine if there is sufficient support for the reconsideration to initial a formal appeal 
process.

**Note 2:** It should be noted that ICANN also has other conflict resolution mechanisms available 
that could be considered in case any of the parties are dissatisfied with the outcome of this 
process.

### Status Reporting:

As requested by the GNSO Council, taking into account the recommendation of the Council liaison(s) 
to the WG.

### Problem/Issue Escalation & Resolution Processes:

(Note: the following material was extracted from Sections 3.4, 3.5, and 3.7 of the Working Group 
Guidelines and may be modified by the Chartering Organization at its discretion)

The WG will adhere to ICANN’s Expected Standards of Behavior as documented in Section F of the 

If a WG member feels that these standards are being abused, the affected party should appeal first 
to the Chair and Liaison and, if unsatisfactorily resolved, to the Chair of the Chartering Organization 
or their designated representative. It is important to emphasize that expressed disagreement is not, 
by itself, grounds for abusive behavior. It should also be taken into account that as a result of 
cultural differences and language barriers, statements may appear disrespectful or inappropriate to 
some but are not necessarily intended as such. However, it is expected that WG members make 
every effort to respect the principles outlined in ICANN’s Expected Standards of Behavior as 
referenced above.

The Chair, in consultation with the Chartering Organization liaison(s), is empowered to restrict the 
participation of someone who seriously disrupts the Working Group. Any such restriction will be 
reviewed by the Chartering Organization. Generally, the participant should first be warned 
privately, and then warned publicly before such a restriction is put into place. In extreme 
circumstances, this requirement may be bypassed.

Any WG member that believes that his/her contributions are being systematically ignored or 
discounted or wants to appeal a decision of the WG or CO should first discuss the circumstances
with the WG Chair. In the event that the matter cannot be resolved satisfactorily, the WG member should request an opportunity to discuss the situation with the Chair of the Chartering Organization or their designated representative.

In addition, if any member of the WG is of the opinion that someone is not performing their role according to the criteria outlined in this Charter, the same appeals process may be invoked.

**Closure & Working Group Self-Assessment:**

The WG will close upon the delivery of the Final Report, unless assigned additional tasks or follow-up. A self-assessment as outlined in the GNSO Operating Procedures will be conducted following closure of the Working group.

**Section V: Charter Document History**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Version</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Staff Contact:**

Email: