

Index

Privacy & Proxy Services Accreditation Issues Policy Development Process.....	2
Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information Policy Development Process ...	4
IGO-INGO Access to Curative Rights Protection Mechanisms Policy Development Process	6
Next Generation Registration Directory Service (RDS) to replace WHOIS Policy Development Process	9
New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Policy Development Process	12
Review of all Rights Protection Mechanisms in All gTLDs Preliminary Issue Report	14
Policy & Implementation	16
Data & Metrics for Policy Making Working Group.....	19
Cross Community Working Groups on the Use of Country and Territory Names as TLDs	21
Cross Community Working Group (CWG) on Framework of Principles for Future Cross Community Working Groups	23
GAC-GNSO Consultation Group on GAC Early Engagement in GNSO Policy Development Processes	25
Status of Implementation of GNSO Policy Recommendations	27
Status of Implementation of IRTP-D Policy Recommendations.....	29
Status of Implementation of Thick WHOIS Policy Recommendations	30

Privacy & Proxy Services Accreditation Issues Policy Development Process

What is this about?

This PDP was initiated to develop policy recommendations to guide ICANN's implementation of an accreditation program for privacy and proxy service providers. The topic arose within the context of the last round of negotiations between ICANN and the Registrars Stakeholder Group concerning the Registrar Accreditation Agreement (RAA).

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

The 2013 RAA negotiations had dealt with a number of high priority topics previously identified by the ICANN community. 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 system 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).

What is the current status of this project?

- The PDP Working Group was chartered by the GNSO Council in October 2013 and has conducted over 70 weekly meetings to date.
- The WG published its Initial Report for public comment from 5 May 2015 through 7 July 2015.
- The WG will hold a public meeting at ICANN54 to discuss its review of the public comments received and its progress toward a Final Report by December 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 had previously

commissioned several studies on the Whois system, including one on privacy and proxy abuse, the results of which were finalized and published in March 2014.

This PDP provided 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 more generally.

Expected next steps

The WG began reviewing public comments received on its Initial Report in July. It intends to produce a Final Report for submission to the GNSO Council in December 2015, following additional discussions at ICANN54.

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 on 31 October 2013. The WG began its work in December 2013.

How can I get involved?

The WG will hold a public meeting in Dublin on Wednesday morning, scheduled from 0800-0900 local time (please see the final Meeting Schedule for confirmation). All are welcome to attend, to provide input to the WG as it prepares to finalize its consensus recommendations for its Final Report.

Where can I find more information?

- Public comment forum on the WG's Initial Report: <https://www.icann.org/public-comments/ppsai-initial-2015-05-05-en> (includes the full Initial Report, Executive Summaries in all 6 official UN languages and the staff's Report of Public Comments)
- WG webpage with links to background information: <http://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/active/ppsai>
- WG collaborative wiki workspace: <https://community.icann.org/x/9iCfAg>
- 2013 RAA including Privacy & Proxy Specification: <http://www.icann.org/en/resources/registrars/raa/approved-with-specs-27jun13-en.htm-privacy-proxy>
- WG open meeting during ICANN54 in Dublin on Wednesday 21 October from 0800-0900: <https://dublin54.icann.org/en/dublin54/schedule/thu-ppsai>

Staff responsible: Mary Wong and Marika Konings

Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information Policy Development Process

What is this about?

In October 2012 the GNSO Council requested an Issue Report on the translation and transliteration of contact information – posing the question whether it is desirable to translate or transliterate¹ contact information² into one common language or script. In December 2013 this GNSO PDP Working Group was inaugurated to provide an answer to this question as well as to who would carry the financial burden if mandatory translation or transliteration of contact information were recommended and its Final Report was submitted back to the GNSO Council on 12 June 2015.

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 non-Latin script registration data and to assure its global functionality. The ongoing expansion of the gTLD space and the creation of a large number of internationalized domain names, combined with on going reforms of gTLD Directory Services, such as the [Expert Working Group on New gTLD Directory Services](#), makes the need to establish GNSO policy for the potential translation or transliteration of contact information even more pressing.

What is the current status of this project?

The GNSO Council [adopted](#) the Final Report on 24 June 2016 and, following a [public comment period](#), the ICANN Board [adopted](#) the recommendations on the 28 September 2015.

Expected next steps

ICANN Staff will now work on an Implementation Plan and, once completed, send out a call to the Community to form an Implementation Review Team.

Background and Recommendations

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.

¹ '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.

² '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.

2. Who should decide who should bear the burden translating contact information to a single common language or transliterating contact information to a single common script.

In 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.

How can I get involved?

The Implementation Review Team (IRT) is usually composed of members of the Working Group, however, newcomers to this issue are of course free to join. If you have participated in the Translation and Transliteration PDP Working Group, or if you think you have a valuable contribution to make to the implementation of the recommendations, please look out for a call for volunteers to form the IRT in due course.

Where can I find more information?

- Final Report: <http://gns0.icann.org/en/issues/gtlds/translation-transliteration-contact-final-12jun15-en.pdf>
- Public Comment Forum - <https://www.icann.org/public-comments/transliteration-contact-recommendations-2015-06-29-en>
- GNSO Council Resolution adopting the Final Report
<http://gns0.icann.org/en/council/resolutions#20150624-2>
- ICANN Board adopting the recommendations contained in the Final Report
<https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2015-09-28-en#1.b>

Staff responsible: Julie Hedlund and Lars Hoffmann

IGO-INGO Access to Curative Rights Protection Mechanisms Policy Development Process

What is this about?

This PDP was initiated by the GNSO Council to consider whether existing curative rights protection mechanisms (namely, the Uniform Dispute Resolution Policy (UDRP) and Uniform Rapid Suspension (URS) procedure) should be amended, or possibly a new process developed, to address the needs of International Governmental Organizations (IGOs) and International Non-Governmental Organizations (INGOs). This PDP originated in one of the consensus recommendations from the GNSO's prior PDP Working Group on IGO and INGO Protections in All gTLDs (IGO-INGO WG), which was for the GNSO Council to request an Issue Report, as a preceding step to a possible PDP, on the access to and use by IGOs and INGOs to curative rights processes to protect their names and acronyms at the second level in both existing and new gTLDs. In June 2014 the GNSO Council approved the initiation of the PDP and chartered a new PDP Working Group to consider this issue.

Why is this important?

Protecting the names and acronyms of IGOs and INGOs at the top and second levels has been a long-standing issue over the course of the New gTLD Program. There are a number of differences between the GNSO's policy recommendations that were submitted to the Board in Feb 2014 and the Government Advisory Committee's (GAC) advice to the Board on this topic, notably in respect of protections for IGO acronyms. In February 2014, the Board tasked its New gTLD Program Committee (NGPC) to develop a proposal that would take into account both the GNSO's recommendations and GAC advice for the Board's further consideration at a subsequent Board meeting. The NGPC sent a proposal to the GAC in March. In April 2014 the Board resolved to adopt 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. It also resolved to facilitate dialogue between the GAC and the GNSO to resolve the remaining differences. These largely pertain to the scope and duration of protection for certain names associated with the international Red Cross movement (an INGO) and for IGO acronyms, including the use of the Trademark Clearinghouse. The NGPC and the GNSO Council have discussed the possibility of the GNSO's amending its remaining recommendations so as to reconcile them with GAC advice, in accordance with the prescribed procedure in the GNSO's PDP Manual.

This new PDP is not dependent on the outcome of those discussions, as it concerns the issue of curative (i.e. occurring after a third party has registered a domain name) remedies for IGOs and INGOs that were identified as eligible for certain second level protections by the original IGO-INGO WG. However, the WG anticipates receiving a proposal from a small group of IGOs that have been working with NGPC representatives to develop recommendations for possible solutions to the issue.

What is the current status of this project?

- The Charter directs the WG to consider whether the UDRP and URS should be amended to resolve the problems faced by IGOs and/or INGOs and if so in what way, or if a separate, narrowly tailored dispute resolution procedure should be developed to apply only to IGOs and/or INGOs.
- The WG has preliminarily agreed that for various substantive reasons INGOs should not be considered any further in this PDP.
- The WG has also reached preliminary agreement on the issue of standing to file a complaint for IGOs. It is currently discussing issues concerning IGO jurisdictional immunity, and will be consulting an external subject matter expert on the topic.
- The WG is expecting to receive a proposal from the small group of IGOs that have been working with NGPC representatives to develop recommendations to be sent to the GNSO on this topic.

Expected next steps

The WG continues to deliberate the issue of IGO immunity in respect of submission to the jurisdiction of a national court for purposes of an appeal (as is required by the current curative rights processes). Input from the GAC and the IGOs is expected to be an important contribution to the WG's conclusions on this topic. The WG hopes to complete its Initial Report shortly after ICANN54.

Background

In November 2013 the GNSO Council unanimously adopted all the consensus recommendations of its previous IGO-INGO WG, including calling for an Issue Report on IGO and INGO access to and use of the curative rights protections afforded by the UDRP and URS. 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 fully 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 is alleged to jeopardize an IGO's jurisdictional immunity status. 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 also 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.

How can I get involved?

The Working Group is open to anyone interested in participating. If you want to join the WG either as a Member or as an Observer please contact the GNSO Secretariat to be added to the mailing list (gns.secretariat@gns.icann.org). You can also attend the WG's meeting in Dublin on Thursday morning, scheduled from 0900-1000 local time (please see the final Meeting Schedule for confirmation).

Where can I find more information?

- IGO-INGO WG Final Report: <http://gnso.icann.org/en/issues/igo-ingo-final-10nov13-en.pdf>
- GNSO Council Recommendations Report to the ICANN Board:
<http://gnso.icann.org/en/issues/council-board-igo-ingo-23jan14-en.pdf>
- Final Issue Report on IGO & INGO Access to Curative Rights Protection Mechanisms:
<http://gnso.icann.org/en/drafts/igo-ingo-crp-final-25may14-en.pdf>
- IGO-INGO Curative Rights Protection WG collaborative wiki space:
<https://community.icann.org/x/37rhAg>.
- WG open meeting during ICANN54 in Dublin on Thursday 22 October from 0900-1000:
<https://dublin54.icann.org/en/dublin54/schedule/wed-igo-ingo-crp-access>

Staff responsible: Mary Wong and Steve Chan

Next Generation Registration Directory Service (RDS) to replace WHOIS

Policy Development Process

What is this about?

Following the publication of the Expert Working Group's [Final Report](#) on Registration Directory Services (RDS), the ICANN Board and GNSO considered how to use this report as input to a GNSO Policy Development Process (PDP) and agreed to [this framework](#) which sets out the proposed approach for the policy development process. A Preliminary Issue Report was published for public comment shortly following the ICANN meeting in Buenos Aires, following the ICANN Board [reaffirming](#) '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'. Following review of the comments received, the [Final Issue Report](#) has now been published.

Why is this important?

Comprehensive 'Whois' policy reform remains the source of long-running discussions within ICANN. Any discussion of 'Whois' – hereafter called gTLD registration directory services – typically includes topics such as purpose, accuracy, availability, privacy, anonymity, cost, policing, intellectual property protection, security and malicious use and abuse. Although ICANN's requirements for domain name registration data collection have undergone some important changes, after almost 15 years of GNSO task forces, working groups, workshops, surveys, and studies the policy is still in need of comprehensive reforms that address the significant number of contentious issues attached to it.

What is the current status of this project?

During its meeting on 26 April 2015, the ICANN Board confirmed its request for a Board-initiated GNSO PDP on this topic. Staff published the [Preliminary Issue Report](#) in July for public comment and following review of the [comments](#) received, the [Final Issue Report](#) has now been published.

Expected Next Steps

The GNSO Council is expected to review the Final Issue Report during its meetings in Dublin and consider a charter for adoption for the PDP Working Group following which the PDP Working Group is convened.

Background

Pursuant to an [ICANN Board Resolution](#) during a Special Meeting on 8 November 2012, the Board directed the CEO to launch a new effort to redefine the purpose of collecting, maintaining and providing access to gTLD registration data, and consider safeguards for protecting data, as a foundation for new gTLD policy and contractual negotiations. Moreover, the Board directed the preparation of an Issue Report on the purpose of collecting and maintaining gTLD registration data, and on solutions to improve accuracy and access to gTLD registration data, as part of a Board-initiated GNSO policy development process. The Board then went on to pass a resolution

that led to the creation of the [Expert Working Group](#); the Board referred to this as a ‘two-pronged approach’ that is based on ‘broad and responsive action’ in relation to the reform of gTLD Registration Data.

With regard to the PDP, the Board specifically called out two topics in its request: **purpose** and **accuracy**. With regard to purpose, at a minimum the most basic purpose, which is commonly accepted, is that gTLD registration data allows domain name holders to be contacted. However, who would be granted the right to access the data under what circumstances and contact the holder and by which means, is a set of difficult follow-up questions that need to be answered. In relation to accuracy, there are many data elements in the Whois database required under the Registry Agreements and the Registrar Accreditation Agreements; if only one of these data fields is incorrect, does that mean the Whois information is inaccurate? And how can the accuracy of data be verified and/or measured, especially considering that, if data is not accurate, the purpose of gathering the data might be questionable in the first place.

To enable effective consideration of the many significant and interdependent policy areas that the GNSO must address, the Board approved a Process Framework, developed in collaboration by GNSO Councilors and Board members, to structure the PDP for success. This phased process includes:

- Establishing gTLD registration data requirements to determine if and why a next-generation RDS is needed;
- Designing policies that detail functions that must be provided by a next-generation RDS to support those requirements; and
- Providing guidance for how a next-generation RDS should implement those policies, coexisting with and eventually replacing legacy WHOIS.
- The many inter-related policy areas that must be addressed by the PDP include:
 - 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?

How can I get involved?

Following the adoption of a charter for the PDP Working Group a call for volunteers will be published to encourage participation in the PDP Working Group. Anyone interested is invited to join this effort.

Where can I find more information?

- Final Issue Report on Next-Generation gTLD Registration Directory Service (RDS) to replace Whois: <http://whois.icann.org/sites/default/files/files/final-issue-report-next-generation-rds-07oct15-en.pdf>
- Board resolution on Next Steps for the EWG Final Report on Next Generation Registration Directory Services: <https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2015-04-26-en#1.f>
- Board-GNSO Process WG proposed approach: <https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/49359634/EWG-Process%20Group%20Final%20Framework%202-4-15.pdf?version=1&modificationDate=1428939851000&api=v2>
- EWG Final Report: <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/final-report-06jun14-en.pdf>

Staff responsible: Marika Konings

New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Policy Development Process

What is this about?

Following the work of the [Discussion Group on New gTLD Subsequent Procedures](#), which included the development of a list of suggested subjects for a future GNSO issue report that may lead to changes or adjustments for subsequent new gTLD application procedures, the GNSO Council [requested a Preliminary Issue Report on New gTLD Subsequent Procedures](#) at its meeting in Buenos Aires.

Why is this important?

The Discussion Group played an important role in identifying issues that arose from the 2012 round of the new gTLD program, marking the beginning of a process of substantive policy development work on the issue of subsequent new gTLD procedures. As suggested by the Discussion Group, its set of deliverables served as the basis for the GNSO Council requested Preliminary Issue Report to be drafted by ICANN staff. Staff performed research and analysis on the 38 discreet subjects identified by the Discussion Group, seeking to provide the community with an understanding of the scope of topics covered, preliminary suggestions of which subjects may require policy development, and possible mechanisms by which to address the large of number of subjects identified.

What is the current status of the project?

As requested by the GNSO Council, ICANN staff has completed a draft of the Preliminary Issue Report on New gTLD Subsequent Procedures, which is open for [public comment](#) until 30 October 2015 23:59 UTC: <https://www.icann.org/public-comments/new-gtld-subsequent-prelim-2015-08-31-en>.

Expected next steps

Upon closure of the public comment period on 30 October 2015, ICANN staff will perform a summary analysis of public comment received and make any necessary changes to the Preliminary Issue Report. These deliverables will be provided to the GNSO Council for their consideration, with the possible action of initiating a Policy Development Process (PDP) on New gTLD Subsequent Procedures.

Background Information on the Issue

In June 2008, the ICANN Board adopted the GNSO's policy recommendations for the introduction of new gTLDs and directed staff to develop an implementation plan for a new gTLD introduction process. In June 2011 the ICANN Board approved an Application Guidebook ("AGB") for new gTLDs and authorized the launch of the New gTLD Program. The AGB provided that it was intended to govern "the first round of what is to be an ongoing process for the introduction of new gTLDs" and that "ICANN's goal [was] to launch subsequent gTLD application rounds as quickly as possible" and promised to base the timing of the subsequent rounds on "experiences gained and changes required after this round is completed" with a "goal...for the new application round to begin within one year of the close of the application submission period for the initial round."

With the application submission period for the initial round closing in June 2012, the GNSO Council believes that it has a continuing interest and role to play in evaluating the experiences of the first round and proposing policy recommendations, if necessary, for changes to subsequent rounds. A Discussion Group was created to begin that evaluation process and possibly identify areas for future GNSO policy development. The Discussion Group reviewed the first round of the New gTLD Program and discussed and reflected upon experiences gained, identifying a total of 38 discreet subjects for possible further analysis in an issue report. Upon considering the deliverables of the Discussion Group, the GNSO Council, as a required first step in developing new policies, requested a Preliminary Issue Report to be delivered by ICANN staff.

How can I get involved?

The Preliminary Issue Report on New gTLD Subsequent Procedures is open for public comment through 30 October 2015 23:59 UTC.

Further Information:

- Archived project page for the completed Discussion Group effort: <http://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/inactive/2015/non-pdp-new-gtld>
- GNSO Council Resolution requesting a Preliminary Issue Report - <http://gns0.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>
- Open F2F meeting during the ICANN meeting in Dublin, tentatively scheduled for Wednesday 21 October 2015 from 10:45 – 12:15 local time

Staff responsible: Steve Chan, Julie Hedlund

Review of all Rights Protection Mechanisms in All gTLDs Preliminary Issue Report

What is this about?

The review of all Rights Protection Mechanisms (RPMs) in all generic top-level domains would include a review of the long-standing Uniform Dispute Resolution Policy (UDRP), as well as all RPMs applicable to gTLDs launched under the New gTLD Program, namely the Uniform Rapid Suspension Procedure (URS), the Post-Delegation Dispute Resolution Procedures (PDDRPs), and the Trademark Clearinghouse (TMCH), verified data of which supports additional protective mechanisms available during the Sunrise and Trademark Claims service periods.

Why is this important?

The UDRP is a long-standing Consensus Policy that has never undergone any substantial review. However, some community feedback indicates that, although in principal a functioning Policy, the UDRP might have some procedural and substantive shortcomings. In addition, the RPMs applicable to the new gTLD program have provided rights protection to trademark holders but a review of their functioning might improve their applicability and use further. In addition, this review could also examine any overlaps between the new gTLD RPMs and the UDRP and determine whether it might be useful to recommend the creation of a Consensus Policy that combines the UDRP and all existing new gTLD RPMs and would apply to all gTLDs, legacy and new.

What is the current status of this project & Expected Next Steps?

Staff is currently in the final stages of drafting the Preliminary Issue Report. Upon completion the Report will be immediately published for public comment. Once the comment period is closed and staff has reviewed all comments, a Final Issue Report will be published containing also staff recommendation on how to proceed. This Report will then be passed onto the GNSO Council who will decide which course of action to take.

Background

The question of who legally has rights to, or is the legitimate holder of, a domain name can be open to dispute. In relation to domain name disputes concerning the registration and use of legally protected trademarks, the Uniform Dispute Resolution Policy (UDRP) is the longest standing alternative dispute resolution procedure. As a result of the New gTLD Program, several new rights protection mechanisms (RPMs) were developed to mitigate potential risks and costs to trademark rights holders that could arise in the expansion of the gTLD namespace: the Uniform Rapid Suspension Dispute Resolution Procedure (URS); the Trademark Clearinghouse (TMCH) and the associated availability through the TMCH of Sunrise periods and the Trademark Claims notification service; and the Post-Delegation Dispute Resolution Procedures (PDDRPs).

Prior to the launch of the New gTLD Program, on 3 October 2011 ICANN staff had published a Final Issue Report on the current state of the UDRP. The recommended course of action in that UDRP Report was not to initiate a PDP at the time, but to hold off launching any such PDP until after the new URS had been in operation for at least eighteen (18) months.

Subsequently, on 15 December 2011, the GNSO Council requested that ICANN staff prepare and publish a new Issue Report on the current state of all rights protection mechanisms implemented for both existing and new gTLDs, including but not limited to the UDRP and URS. This Preliminary Issue Report is being published for public comment as the result of that GNSO Council request.

Following an additional extension of 6 months in February 2015, Staff is about to publish a new Preliminary Issue Report that will be published for public comment.

How can I get involved?

Once published, please make sure to read the Preliminary Issues Report carefully and submit any feedback you may have to the public comment forum. In addition, if the GNSO decides to launch a PDP, a call for volunteers will be sent out to the Community.

Where can I find more information?

- GNSO Council resolution: <http://gns0.icann.org/en/council/resolutions#20111215-1>
- The Current State of the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy: [Final Issue Report](#), October 2011 Staff Paper on Rights Protection Mechanisms in the New gTLD Program: [Revised Report](#), September 2015
- Metrics compiled on the new RPMs collected for the Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice Review: <https://www.icann.org/resources/reviews/cct/metrics#rights%20protection%20mechanisms>

Staff responsible: Mary Wong, Lars Hoffmann

Policy & Implementation

What is this about?

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

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

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.

What is the current status of this project?

Following its [review of public comments](#) received on the [Initial Recommendations Report](#), the Working Group submitted its [Final Recommendations Report](#) for GNSO Council consideration during the ICANN meeting in Buenos Aires. The recommendations, which were adopted unanimously by the GNSO Council and more recently adopted by the ICANN Board (see <https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2015-09-28-en#2.f>), include the following:

- In response to charter question 1 (recommendations concerning a set of principles that would underpin any GNSO policy and implementation related discussions, taking into account existing GNSO Operating Procedures), it is recommended adhering to the principles outlined in section 4 of the Initial Recommendations Report when policy or implementation related issues arise in the implementation phase (**Recommendation #1**).
- Three new standardized processes for GNSO deliberations (**Recommendation #2**) were adopted regarding such issues as also outlined in the high level overview in Annex B, namely:
 - **GNSO Input Process (GIP)** - to be used for those instances for which the GNSO Council intends to provide non-binding advice, which is expected to typically concern topics that are not gTLD specific and for which no policy recommendations have been developed to date. “Non-binding advice” means advice that has no binding force on the party it is provided to. For example, this process could be used to provide input on the ICANN Strategic Plan or recommendations from an Accountability and Transparency Review Team. It is the expectation that such input would be treated in a similar manner as public comments are currently considered by the entity (e.g. Board, NPOC, or WG) to which the input is provided.

- **GNSO Guidance Process (GGP)** – to be used in those instances for which the GNSO Council intends to provide guidance that is required to be considered by the ICANN Board, but which is not expected to result in new contractual obligations for contracted parties. Guidance developed through a GGP means advice that has a binding force on the ICANN Board to consider the guidance and it can only be rejected by a vote of more than two-thirds (2/3) of the Board, if the Board determines that such guidance is not in the best interests of the ICANN community or ICANN. It is expected that this would typically involve clarification of, or advice on existing gTLD policy recommendations. This could be in response to a specific request from the ICANN Board but could also be at the initiative of the GNSO Council to an issue that has been identified. For example, such a process could have been used in relation to the request from the ICANN Board to provide input on the .brand registry agreement, specification 13.
- **GNSO Expedited Policy Development Process** - to be used in those instances in which the GNSO Council intends to develop recommendations that would result in new contractual obligations for contracted parties that meet the criteria for “consensus policies”³ as well as the qualifying criteria to initiate an expedited PDP. Those qualifying criteria are (1) to address a narrowly defined policy issue that was identified and scoped after either the adoption of a GNSO policy recommendation by the ICANN Board or the implementation of such an adopted recommendation; or (2) to provide new or additional policy recommendations on a specific policy issue that had been substantially scoped previously, such that extensive, pertinent background information already exists, e.g. (a) in an Issue Report for a possible PDP that was not initiated; (b) as part of a previous PDP that was not completed; or (c) through other projects such as a GGP.

The details of each of these processes can be found in Annex C (GNSO Input Process), Annex D and E (GNSO Guidance Process) and Annex F and G (GNSO Expedited Policy Development Process) of the Final Report.

- The GNSO Council also recommends to add a provision to the GNSO Operating Procedures that clarifies that parallel efforts on similar / identical topics should be avoided. As the manager of the process, the GNSO Council is expected to resolve which process would be the most appropriate to use (recommendation #3).
- In its deliberations on three implementation related charter questions, the WG reviewed the Consensus Policy Implementation Framework that has been developed by the ICANN Global Domains Division (GDD) to support predictability, accountability, transparency, and efficiency in the Consensus Policy implementation process (see Annex J of the Initial Recommendations Report). As a result, it is recommended that the Policy Development Process Manual be modified to require the creation of an Implementation Review Team following the adoption of PDP recommendations by the ICANN Board, but allow the GNSO Council the flexibility to not create an IRT in exceptional circumstances (e.g. if another IRT is already in place that could deal with the PDP recommendations). (Recommendation #4) and

³ For further information about ‘consensus policies’, please see <http://gns0.icann.org/en/basics/consensus-policy/about>.

the adoption of the implementation review team principles as outlined in Annex L are followed as part of the creation as well as operation of IRTs (Recommendation #5).

Expected next steps

Following the adoption of the recommendations by the GNSO Council and the ICANN Board, the changes to the ICANN Bylaws and GNSO Operating Procedures to implement these recommendations are expected to be made shortly.

Background

Following several discussions by the GNSO 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. The WG started its deliberations in August 2013 and was 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.

Its work is now completed.

Where can I find more information?

- Policy & Implementation Final Recommendations Report - <http://gns0.icann.org/en/drafts/policy-implementation-recommendations-01jun15-en.pdf>
- Working Group workspace – <https://community.icann.org/x/y1V-Ag>

Staff responsible: Marika Konings, Mary Wong

Data & Metrics for Policy Making Working Group

What is this about?

The Working Group (WG) is exploring opportunities to review standard methodologies of reporting and metrics that could better inform fact-based policy development and decision making; including how the community can collaborate with Contracted Parties and other service providers in the sharing of metrics and data.

Why is this important?

The effort investigated 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 WG explored:

- Evaluated previous PDP and non-PDP efforts and how metrics could have enhanced the WG process (*Complete*)
- Established a baseline of current practices & capabilities to problem reporting (*Complete*)
- Reviewed existing GNSO work product templates, like charters, issue reports, and final reports for possible enhancements to inform the PDP and non-PDP process (*Complete*)
- Evaluated external data sources, such as abuse statistics or DNS industry related data from 3rd parties and/or Contracted Parties, that may benefit the policy process and define a possible framework in how it may be accessed (*Complete*)

What is the current status of the project?

The WG has reviewed the public comments received after its 40 day consultation and updated the Final Report based on those comments and WG deliberations.

Expected next steps

- Complete Final Report and submit to the GNSO Council for their consideration

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 WG has developed preliminary recommendations for a number of the charter questions it was tasked to address, which are described in its [Initial Report](#) [PDF, 395 KB]. Those recommendations that contain suggested edits to the GNSO's Operating Procedures are also included in a [redline version](#) [PDF, 768 KB] should the WG's recommendations be adopted by the GNSO Council.

Further Information:

- Data & Metrics for Policy Making Web Page - <http://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/active/dmpm>
- DMPM Charter - <http://gns0.icann.org/en/issues/dmpm-charter-23jan14-en.pdf>
- Uniformity of Reporting Final Issue Report - <http://gns0.icann.org/en/issues/uofr-final-31mar13-en.pdf>

Staff responsible: Steve Chan

Cross Community Working Groups on the Use of Country and Territory Names as TLDs

What is this about?

Following in the footsteps of the Study Group on the Use of Names for Countries and Territories as TLDs, the purpose of this CWG is to further review the issues pertaining to the use of country and territory names under different policies, such as new gTLD, IDN ccTLD, RFC 1591 and develop a definitional framework that could be used across all these. Note, that second or lower level domain names are beyond the CWG's scope.

Why is this important?

The treatment of country and territory names as Top Level Domains is a topic that has been discussed by the ccNSO, GAC, GNSO, ALAC and the ICANN Board for a number of years. So far, issues regarding the treatment of representations of country and territory names have arisen in a wide range of ICANN policy processes, including the IDN fast track, IDN ccPDP, and the development of the new gTLD Applicant Guidebook (AGB). References to country and territory names and their use are also present in guidelines such as the GAC's 'Principles and Guidelines for the Delegation and Administration of Country Code Top Level Domains' and 'Principles regarding new gTLDs'. Creating a uniform policy framework on this important issues that can be applied across all TLDs would be a very helpful step forward in the continuous development of the DNS.

What is the current status of this project?

The Cross Community Working Group on the Use of Country and Territory Names as top-level domains (CWG-UCTN) has divided its work on representation of country and territory names into three sections: 2-character TLDs; 3-character TLDs; and full name country and territory name TLDs. The CWG has tentatively concluded its discussion on 2-character TLDs with maintaining the *status quo* of 2-character codes exclusively reserved for country code TLDs (ccTLDs) appearing to be the most probable final outcome. A survey on questions surrounding 3-character codes has been sent to all of ICANN's Supporting Organization and Advisory Committees as well as the GNSO's Stakeholder Groups and Constituencies to gather Community feedback prior to tackling this issue. During the CWG-UCTN's face-to-face meeting in Dublin, Group members will review any submitted feedback and start their work on 3-character codes.

Expected next steps

The deliberation on full names will commence following the conclusion of the Group's discussion on 3-character codes and an Initial Report is currently envisaged in time for ICANN55.

Background

The ccNSO Council established a Study Group on the use of Country and Territory Names on 8 December 2010. The Study Group was tasked with developing an overview of:

- How names of countries and territories are currently used within ICANN, be it in the form of policies, guidelines and/or procedures.
-

- The types of strings, relating to the names of countries and territories that currently used, or proposed to be used, as TLDs.
- The issues that arise (or may arise) when current policies, guidelines and procedures are applied to these representations of country and territory names.

The Study Group was comprised of representatives from across the ICANN stakeholder community and conducted its work between May 2011 and June 2013. The Study Group advised the ccNSO Council to set up a cross community working group, with participants from ALAC, ccNSO, GAC and GNSO to further review the current status of representations of country and territory names, and provide detailed advice on the feasibility and content of a consistent and uniform definitional framework that could be applied across the respective SO's and AC's. The ccNSO Council was also advised to request the ICANN Board to extend the current rule in the new gTLD Applicant Guidebook regarding the exclusion of all country and territory names in all languages, for consecutive rounds of new gTLD applications, until such a time that the ccWG developed the framework.

How can I get involved?

If you are interested in joining the CWG-UCTN as a GNSO participant, please email the GNSO Secretariat at gns.secretariat@icann.org to be added to the mailing list.

Where can I find more information?

- More information on the CWG, including its charter can be found at: <http://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/ccwg-unct.htm>
- The Working Group builds on the work of its predecessor, the Study Group on the Use of Names for Countries and Territories as TLDs; its Final Report is available at <http://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/unct-final-08sep12-en.pdf> [PDF, 717 KB]
- CWG Open meeting in Buenos Aires on Monday 19 October 2015 from 11:30-13:00 (see <https://meetings.icann.org/en/dublin54/schedule/mon-ctn>)

Staff responsible: Lars Hoffmann (GNSO), Bart Boswinkel (ccNSO)

Cross Community Working Group (CWG) on Framework of Principles for Future Cross Community Working Groups

What is this about?

With the increasing reliance on Cross Community Working Group, the ICANN community has recognized that there are an increasing number of issues that cut across and affect more than one of ICANN's Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees. CWGs 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), but to date there have been no agreed guidelines on their use or outcomes. Many ICANN community members have highlighted the need for a set of uniform principles to guide the formation and operations of these cross-community working groups. This CWG has been chartered by the ccNSO and GNSO Councils to develop a framework of operating principles that would allow for the effective and efficient functioning of future CWGs.

Why is this important?

Each SO and AC within ICANN is responsible for different aspects of policy development and advice, and operates under different mandates and remits. There has, however, been an increase in the number of issues that affect or interest more than one SO/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/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 other SO/ACs.

What is the current status of this project?

The CWG's charter was approved by the ccNSO and GNSO Councils in March 2014. It has reviewed past cross community efforts to generate "lessons learned" which aided in the development of a proposed framework of principles. The draft framework identifies key principles and process steps that should be considered during each phase of the CWG life cycle (i.e., initiation, formation, operation, decision-making and closure, and post-closure of the CWG).

Expected next steps

The CWG co-chairs expect to circulate an updated draft framework for consideration by its Chartering Organizations, followed by all other SO/ACs, shortly after ICANN54.

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. The charter was approved by the ccNSO and GNSO Councils at their respective Council meetings in Singapore, in March 2014.

How can I get involved?

If you are interested in joining the CWG, please email the GNSO Secretariat at gns.secretariat@icann.org to be added to the mailing list. Membership limits per SO/AC are set out in the CWG charter (see <https://community.icann.org/x/pgfPAQ>).

Where can I find more information?

- Background information: <http://gns.icann.org/en/group-activities/active/cross-community>
- CWG Workspace: <https://community.icann.org/x/rQbPAQ>

Staff responsible: Mary Wong (GNSO), Steve Chan (GNSO) and Bart Boswinkel (ccNSO)

GAC-GNSO Consultation Group on GAC Early Engagement in GNSO Policy Development Processes

What is this about?

The Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC) and the Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO) jointly established a consultation group to explore ways for the GAC to engage early in the GNSO Policy Development Process (PDP) and to improve overall cooperation between the two bodies (for example, by exploring the option of a liaison). The consultation group commenced its work in December 2013.

Why is this important?

The launch of this GAC-GNSO Consultation Group on Early Engagement is the result of discussions between the two entities at the ICANN meeting in Buenos Aires as well as previous ICANN meetings, reflecting a joint desire to explore and enhance ways of early engagement in relation to GNSO policy development activities. The issue was also specifically called-out by both Accountability and Transparency Review Teams (ATRT).

ICANN receives input from governments through the GAC. The GAC's key role is to provide advice to ICANN on issues of public policy, and especially where there may be an interaction between ICANN's activities or policies and national laws or international agreements. The GAC usually meets three times a year in conjunction with ICANN Public Meetings, where it discusses issues with the ICANN Board and other ICANN Supporting Organizations, Advisory Committees and other groups. The GAC may also discuss issues between times with the Board either through face-to-face meetings or by teleconference.

The GNSO is responsible for developing policies for generic Top-Level Domains (e.g., .com, .org, .biz). The GNSO strives to keep gTLDs operating in a fair, orderly fashion across one global Internet, while promoting innovation and competition. The GNSO uses the GNSO Policy Development Process (PDP) to develop policy recommendations which, following approval, are submitted to the ICANN Board for its consideration.

What is the current status of this project?

The Consultation Group comprises approximately equal numbers of representatives from each of the GAC and the GNSO to a total number of approximately 12 active members. The work is divided into two work streams, the first concentrating on Mechanisms for day to day co-operation and the second on the detail options for GAC engagement in the GNSO policy development process (PDP). Due to workload and other priorities, the Consultation Group reduced its meetings after Singapore but restarted its work following the ICANN meeting in Buenos Aires. In the meantime, it has been agreed to continue the GNSO Liaison to the GAC pilot project for FY16. Furthermore, the GNSO Council and GAC, on the recommendation of the CG, adopted a set of recommendations in relation to issue scoping, which includes amongst others, the formation of a GAC Quick Look Committee to provide an early indication of whether or not an issue subject to GNSO policy development is expected to raise public policy concerns, which are currently in the process of being implemented as a pilot.

Expected next steps

The GNSO Council and GAC will meet Dublin to discuss the current status and next steps. The CG is expected to continue its deliberations on early engagement opportunities for the other stages of the PDP as well as day-to-day co-operation following the Dublin meeting.

How can I get involved?

You can follow review the conversations on the mailing list (see <http://mm.icann.org/pipermail/gac-gnso-cg/>) or review the materials on the wiki (see <https://community.icann.org/x/phPRAg>).

Where can I find more information?

- Consultation Group Wiki: <https://community.icann.org/x/phPRAg>
- Mailing List Archives: <http://mm.icann.org/pipermail/gac-gnso-cg/>
- Consultation Group Charter: <https://community.icann.org/x/PyLRAg>
- Joint GNSO - GAC meeting during the ICANN meeting in Dublin on Sunday 18 October from 15.15 – 16.30 local time (see <https://dublin54.icann.org/en/dublin54/schedule/sun-gac-afternoon>)

Staff responsible: Marika Konings (GNSO), Olof Nordling (GAC)

Status of Implementation of GNSO Policy Recommendations

How Does the GDD Implement Policy?

GDD staff actively monitor and participate in all gTLD policy development processes to deliver a smooth transition from policymaking to implementation to the final enactment of a Consensus Policy. GDD staff consult with the community—through implementation review teams and other means—throughout the implementation process to ensure that the intent underlying Consensus Policy recommendations is reflected in the policy’s implementation.

GDD uses a standard process to implement gTLD Consensus Policy recommendations, and to support predictability, accountability, transparency and efficiency in Consensus Policy implementation work.

Read the Consensus Policy Implementation Framework at

[https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/gdd-consensus-policy-imeplementation-framework-31may15-en.pdf](https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/gdd-consensus-policy-implementation-framework-31may15-en.pdf).

Each policy implementation project occurs according to the following stages as detailed in the framework:

- **Prepare:** GDD staff will follow policy development activities to engage on implementation-related matters, as appropriate. Consideration and feedback to policy work products and Consensus Policy recommendations as it relates to implementation will occur through the various phases of the GNSO Policy Development Process. The Board’s approval of Consensus Policy recommendations marks the formal endpoint of this phase.
- **Plan:** Policy and GDD staff arrange for the recruitment of the IRT at the beginning of this stage. Policy formally hands off the project to GDD for implementation. GDD staff will organize the activities required to implement Consensus Policy recommendations. A project plan with complete work breakdown structure is the primary output; including a draft requirements document. GDD’s initial contacts with relevant service providers and the Implementation Review Team (IRT) will occur during this stage. This phase is completed when the implementation project plan is posted.
- **Analyze and Design:** GDD staff will work with the IRT, if convened, during this stage to develop and complete new Consensus Policy language (if required) and any new service that may be needed. Public comments regarding the implementation will also be solicited at this stage. This stage is completed when the final implementation and effective date is announced.
- **Implement:** GDD staff will announce final implementation details to the community and conduct targeted outreach to contracted parties during this phase. The implementation project is formally handed off from GDD to Contractual Compliance staff at the conclusion of this phase, when the Consensus Policy goes into effect.

- **Support and Review:** GDD staff may serve as a resource to Contractual Compliance in its enforcement of new Consensus Policies. GDD staff may also review Consensus Policy implementations.

What is the Policy Change Calendar?

GDD launched a new Policy Change Calendar initiative in May 2015. GDD staff will bundle gTLD Consensus Policy implementation effective dates into six-month cycles based on the estimated timing of GNSO Council approval and Board adoption of Consensus Policy recommendations.

As the implementation projects in each bundle near completion, GDD staff will officially announce the implementation bundle’s effective date. The effective date will be at least six months after the announcement. For example, GDD staff might announce on Feb. 15 that a bundle will go into effect on Aug. 15 of that year.

These procedures are being established on a trial basis, and will be reviewed for possible modifications after they have been in use for at least one year.

A full description of the Policy Change Calendar initiative is available here

<http://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/gdd-policy-change-calendar-13may15-en.pdf>

A list of project statuses can be found here: <https://www.icann.org/policy/implementation>

Which projects are currently in implementation?

The table below shows the projects that are currently in implementation. For more detailed information, please visit the respective Implementation Review Team project workspaces.

Project	Board Approval Date	Estimated Time to Complete	Phase	Projected Effective Date	Links
Thick Whois	February 2014	2+ years	Analyze and Design	Consistent Labeling and Display: July 2016; Transition from Thin to Thick: December 2016/July 2017	IRT Project Workspace GNSO PDP Page
IGO/INGO	Board still working on issues	1 year	Plan	July 2016	GNSO PDP Page
IRTP D	February 2015	1 year	Analyze and Design	January 2017	GNSO PDP Page IRT Workspace

Status of Implementation of IRTP-D Policy Recommendations

What is this about?

The Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy (IRTP) Part D PDP Working Group was 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.

Why is this important?

ICANN's Compliance Department received a total of 6333 transfer-related complaints between August 2013 and August 2014 alone, making it one of the most common issues 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 invoked by registrars.

What is the current status of this project?

The GNSO Council unanimously [adopted](#) the Final Report on 15 October 2014. Following a [public comment](#) period, the ICANN Board [approved](#) all 18 recommendations contained in the Report. The Implementation Review Team currently meets bi-weekly via teleconference, and the draft IRTP and TRDP will be posted for public comment shortly.

Expected next steps

The draft IRTP and TRDP, which incorporate the Working Group's recommendations, will go out for public comment shortly. Following the public comment period, the Implementation Review Team will review the comments received.

Where can I find more information?

- GNSO PDP Page: <http://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/active/irtp-d>
- Implementation Review Team Workspace: <https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=53777540>

Staff Responsible: Caitlin Tubergen (GDD)

Status of Implementation of Thick WHOIS Policy Recommendations

What is this about?

ICANN specifies WHOIS service requirements through Registry Agreements (RAs) and the Registrar Accreditation Agreement (RAA) for the generic top-level domain (gTLD) registries. Registries have historically satisfied their WHOIS obligations under two different models. The two models are often characterized as "thin" and "thick" WHOIS registries. This distinction is based on how two distinct sets of data are maintained.

Why is this important?

WHOIS contains two kinds of data about a domain name; one set of data is associated with the domain name (this information includes data sufficient to identify the sponsoring registrar, status of the registration, creation and expiration dates for each registration, name server data, the last time the record was updated in the Registry database, and the URL for the registrar's WHOIS service), and a second set of data that is associated with the registrant of the domain name.

In a thin registration model the Registry only collects the information associated with the domain name from the Registrar. The Registry in turn publishes that information along with maintaining certain status information at the Registry level. Registrars maintain data associated with the registrant of the domain and provide it via their own WHOIS services, as required by Section 3.3 of the RAA for those domains they sponsor. 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.

What is the current status of this project?

The ICANN Board approved the GNSO recommendations on Thick WHOIS at its meeting on 7 February 2014. (<http://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/documents/resolutions-07feb14-en.htm>). An Implementation Review Team has been formed and various impact assessments and implementation proposals have been discussed with the IRT in the two decoupled work streams: transition from thin to thick for .COM, .NET and .JOBS; and the consistent labeling and display of Whois output for all gTLDs as per Specification 3 of the 2013 RAA. Further discussions of the proposals, issues, and risks are being planned in subsequent IRT sessions. In June 2015, ICANN's General Counsel's Office, released to the IRT a Legal Review Memorandum per the GNSO Council's recommendation. ICANN Staff is currently engaging with experts from affected parties on draft implementation proposals to address data transfer restrictions and potential conflicts with local laws. The IRT will meet during ICANN 54 and will discuss updates to the implementation plan considering conclusions of [the Legal Review](#) of laws applicable to the Transition and recent developments around the roll out of the Registration Data Access Protocol (RDAP).

Where can I find more information?

- GNSO PDP Page: <http://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/active/thick-whois>
- Implementation Review Team Workspace:
<https://community.icann.org/display/TWCPI/Thick+Whois+Policy+Implementation>

Staff Responsible: Fabien Betremieux (GDD)