

ICANN | GNSO

Generic Names Supporting Organization

Policy Briefing ICANN55 Edition

The GNSO Background Briefings are produced by ICANN's Policy staff supporting the GNSO. These are drafted specifically in preparation for ICANN meetings to provide the Community with concise background information on all relevant GNSO policy efforts.

For more information on the GNSO @ ICANN55:

 gnso.icann.org/icannmeeting  [@ICANN_GNSO](https://twitter.com/ICANN_GNSO)

Contents

A WELCOME TO ICANN55 FROM THE GNSO CHAIR	3
PRIVACY & PROXY SERVICES ACCREDITATION ISSUES 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 – LAUNCH OF POLICY DEVELOPMENT PROCESS WORKING GROUP	14
CROSS COMMUNITY WORKING GROUPS ON THE USE OF COUNTRY AND TERRITORY NAMES AS TLDS	16
CROSS COMMUNITY WORKING GROUP (CWG) ON FRAMEWORK OF PRINCIPLES FOR FUTURE CROSS COMMUNITY WORKING GROUPS	18
NEW GTLD AUCTION PROCEEDS DRAFTING TEAM	20
GAC-GNSO CONSULTATION GROUP ON GAC EARLY ENGAGEMENT IN GNSO POLICY DEVELOPMENT PROCESSES	22
IMPLEMENTATION STATUS: IRTP-D POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS	24
IMPLEMENTATION STATUS: THICK WHOIS POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS	26
IMPLEMENTATION STATUS: TRANSLATION AND TRANSLITERATION OF CONTACT INFORMATION RECOMMENDATIONS	28

A Welcome to ICANN55 from GNSO Council Chair



Dear Colleagues:

Welcome to Marrakech, ICANN55 – the first meeting of 2016! The new year has already been eventful for the GNSO Community. At this meeting the GNSO Council will complete its work on some important topics, while launching several new efforts for the year ahead.

It's been two years since the NTIA announced the IANA transition, but the ICANN community can finally see the finish line. Participants from the GNSO have been active in the work to develop recommendations to enhance ICANN Accountability, and the GNSO Council is expected to complete its final review of the CCWG-Accountability's Proposal in Marrakech.

Several working groups are examining issues relating to WHOIS, including implementation work on “thick” gTLDs, translation/transliteration of contact data, and soon, the Privacy/Proxy accreditation program. All of this work occurs in the shadow of a new policy development process (PDP) examining the feasibility of a “next generation” replacement for the WHOIS system itself.

New gTLDs will also be the subject of GNSO work, as we kick off a PDP to examine issues associated with the next round of applications, review Rights Protection Mechanisms and check in with the cross-community work on country and territory names. And in the weeks following ICANN55, keep an eye out for the launch of a new cross-community group to examine the topic of gTLD Auction funds.

Tackling this workload wouldn't be possible without the work of the many community volunteers from around the globe. Newcomers are always welcome and sorely needed. If these topics, or other GNSO or cross-community projects, are interesting to you, then get involved. Reach out to any of us on the Council, or your stakeholder group or constituency leadership, and contribute your ideas to the work ahead.

James Bladel
GNSO Council Chair

Privacy & Proxy Services Accreditation Issues Policy Development Process

WHAT IS THIS ABOUT?

This Policy Development Process (PDP) was initiated to develop policy recommendations guiding ICANN's implementation of an accreditation program for privacy and proxy service providers.

A privacy service allows domain name registration in the registrant's name, but all other contact details displayed in the publicly-accessible Whois system are those given by the privacy service provider, not by the registrant.

A proxy service allows the registered name holder to license the use of the domain to a customer who actually uses the domain; the contact information displayed in the Whois system is that of the proxy service provider.

WHY IS THIS IMPORTANT?

The 2013 RAA contains a temporary specification that governs registrars' obligations in respect of privacy and proxy services that will expire on 1 January 2017 or when ICANN implements a privacy and proxy accreditation program, whichever first occurs.

WHAT IS THE CURRENT STATUS OF THIS PROJECT?

The PDP Working Group (WG) completed and submitted its Final Report to the GNSO Council in December 2015. In January 2016, the GNSO Council adopted the WG's final recommendations, all of which received full consensus within the WG. Following the close of public comments on the recommendation adopted by the GNSO Council, ([open until 16 March 2016](#)), the ICANN Board will consider their adoption.

WHAT ARE THE EXPECTED NEXT STEPS?

If the ICANN Board adopts the GNSO-recommended policies, an Implementation Review Team will be formed to assist ICANN staff with implementing the recommendations.

HOW CAN I GET INVOLVED?

You can provide comments in the [open public comment forum](#) on the final recommendations through 16 March 2016.

MORE INFORMATION

- The WG’s Final Report containing background and all the final policy recommendations: [gnso.icann.org/en/issues/raa/ppsai-final-07dec15-en.pdf](https://www.gnso.icann.org/en/issues/raa/ppsai-final-07dec15-en.pdf)
- Public comment forum on the final recommendations as adopted by the GNSO Council: [icann.org/public-comments/ppsai-recommendations-2016-02-05-en](https://www.icann.org/public-comments/ppsai-recommendations-2016-02-05-en)
- WG webpage with links to background information: [gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/active/ppsa](https://www.gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/active/ppsa)

BACKGROUND

In October 2011, the ICANN Board initiated negotiations with the Registrars Stakeholder Group to update the Registrar Accreditation Agreement (RAA), and simultaneously requested an Issue Report from the GNSO on issues not covered by the negotiations but suited for a PDP. The Final Issue Report was published in March 2012, and recommended that the GNSO commence its PDP on any issues not covered by the RAA as soon as possible after 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. In October 2013, the GNSO Council formally approved the charter for the PDP WG on Privacy and Proxy Services Accreditation Issues (PPSAI).

STAFF RESPONSIBLE

Mary Wong and Marika Konings

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

WHAT IS THIS ABOUT?

This PDP was initiated in June 2014 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 modified to address the needs of International Governmental Organizations (IGOs) and International Non-Governmental Organizations (INGOs) to protect their names and acronyms at the second level in both existing and new gTLDs.

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. The GNSO had previously recommended certain protective measures to the ICANN Board, but those that pertained to IGO acronyms differed from the advice provided by the Government Advisory Committee's (GAC) to the Board. In early 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, while adopting those GNSO recommendations that are consistent with GAC advice received. In addition, the NGPC and the GNSO Council have discussed the possibility of the GNSO amending its remaining recommendations so as to reconcile them with GAC advice, in accordance with the prescribed procedure in the GNSO's PDP Manual.

However, this new PDP is not dependent on the outcome of those discussions, which focus on the issue of preventive (i.e. before a third party registers a domain name) rather than on curative (i.e. following a third party domain name registration) protections.

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 reached preliminary agreement on a number of points, including on an IGO's standing to file a complaint under the UDRP and URS.

The WG is currently discussing the issue of IGO immunity from the jurisdiction of national courts for purposes of an appeal from a UDRP or URS decision. It is considering advice from an external subject matter expert on the topic.

WHAT ARE THE EXPECTED NEXT STEPS?

The WG hopes to complete its Initial Report shortly after ICANN55 and put its preliminary recommendations out for public comments.

HOW CAN I GET INVOLVED?

The Working Group is open to anyone; please contact the GNSO Secretariat to be added to the mailing list gnso.secretariat@gnso.icann.org.

You can also attend the WG's meeting in Marrakech on Wednesday 9 March 2016 from 09:00-10:15am local time (please see the final Meeting Schedule for confirmation).

MORE INFORMATION



Face-to-face meeting during ICANN55: Wednesday 9 March, 09:00-10:15 local time: meetings.icann.org/en/marrakech55/schedule/wed-igo-ingo-crp

— GNSO project page with relevant dates and background:
gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/active/igo-ingo-crp-access

— IGO-INGO Curative Rights Protection WG collaborative wiki space with meeting records and draft documents:
community.icann.org/x/37rhAg

BACKGROUND

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.

STAFF RESPONSIBLE

Mary Wong and Steve Chan

Next Generation Registration Directory Service (RDS) to replace WHOIS Policy Development Process

WHAT IS THIS ABOUT?

In April 2015, the ICANN Board reaffirmed ‘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 Expert Working Group (EWG) Final Report as an input to, and, if appropriate, as the foundation for a new gTLD policy’. Following the publication of the Final Issue Report, the GNSO Council adopted the charter for the PDP Working Group, which commenced its deliberations at the end of January 2016 with the task to provide the GNSO Council with recommendations on the following two questions as part of phase 1: What are the fundamental requirements for gTLD registration data and is a new policy framework and next-generation RDS needed to address these requirements?

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?

The PDP Working Group commenced its deliberations at the end of January 2016. The PDP Working Group is in the process of developing its work plan for tackling the questions as outlined in its charter.

WHAT ARE THE EXPECTED NEXT STEPS?

Once the PDP Working Group has reviewed all the relevant materials it will send out a request for early input from GNSO Stakeholder Groups and Constituencies, as well as

other ICANN Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees to help inform its discussions.

HOW CAN I GET INVOLVED?

Anyone interested can join this effort. Please complete the registration form at goo.gl/forms/bb65ilznLv or contact the GNSO Secretariat gnso-secs@icann.org.

MORE INFORMATION



Face-to-face meeting during ICANN55: Wednesday 9 March, 16:00-18:00 local time: meetings.icann.org/en/marrakech55/schedule/wed-rds

- PDP Working Group Workspace, including Charter, relevant motions, and background documents and information: community.icann.org/x/rjJ-Ag
- Final Issue Report on Next-Generation gTLD Registration Directory Service (RDS) to replace Whois: whois.icann.org/sites/default/files/files/final-issue-report-next-generation-rds-07oct15-en.pdf
- Board-GNSO Process WG proposed approach: community.icann.org/download/attachments/49359634/EWG-Process%20Group%20Final%20Framework%202-4-15.pdf?version=1&modificationDate=1428939851000&api=v2

BACKGROUND

Pursuant to its [Resolution](#) on 8 November 2012, the ICANN Board directed the ICANN 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, collaborative developed 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?

STAFF RESPONSIBLE

Marika Konings

New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Policy Development Process

WHAT IS THIS ABOUT?

The PDP on New gTLD Subsequent Procedures, initiated in December 2015, is intended to determine what, if any changes need to be made to the existing policy recommendations from the 2007 *Final Report on the Introduction of New Generic Top-Level Domains*, such as:

- Clarifying, amending, or overriding existing policy principles, recommendations, and implementation guidance;
- Developing new policy recommendations; and,
- Supplementing or developing new implementation guidance

It should be noted that the existing policy recommendations adopted by the GNSO Council and ICANN Board have “been designed to produce a systemized and ongoing mechanisms for applicants to propose new top-level domains,” meaning that these recommendations would remain in place unless the PDP WG determines that changes are needed.

WHY IS THIS IMPORTANT?

The new gTLD Program marked a seminal moment in ICANN’s history and in spite of all its success, changes to existing policies and implementation guidance might be needed for subsequent procedures of new gTLD launches. Note, the [Final Issue Report](#) and the PDP Working Group (WG) [charter](#) identify a number of subjects that may require analysis and policy development.

WHAT IS THE CURRENT STATUS OF THIS PROJECT?

The PDP Working Group started its work on 22 February 2016.

WHAT ARE THE EXPECTED NEXT STEPS?

The WG will complete its more administrative tasks of establishing a meeting schedule, electing WG leadership, and preparing a work plan, then shortly thereafter begin its substantive deliberations.

HOW CAN I GET INVOLVED?

As with all GNSO Working Groups, this PDP WG is open to all participants. If you are interested in joining the WG effort, please email gnso-secs@icann.org.

MORE INFORMATION



Face-to-face meeting during ICANN55: 10 March, 09:00-10:30 local time:
community.icann.org/x/M5hlAw

- GNSO Active Project Page, including background information and reports:
gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/active/new-gtld-subsequent-procedures
- WG Wiki: community.icann.org/x/RgV1Aw

BACKGROUND

With the application submission period for the initial new gTLD round closing in June 2012, the GNSO Council continues to have a role to play in evaluating that 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. Upon considering the deliverables of the Discussion Group, the GNSO Council requested a Preliminary Issue Report to be delivered by ICANN staff. After incorporating public comment on its Preliminary Issue Report, staff prepared and delivered the Final Issue Report. Subsequently, the GNSO Council initiated the PDP and adopted the WG charter.

STAFF RESPONSIBLE

Steve Chan, Julie Hedlund

Review of all Rights Protection Mechanisms in All gTLDs Policy Development Process

WHAT IS THIS PDP 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 (PDDRs), and the Trademark Clearinghouse (TMCH), verified data of which supports additional protection 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 and 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 the feasibility of a Consensus Policy that combines the UDRP and all existing new gTLD RPMs and then applies to all gTLDs, legacy and new.

WHAT IS THE CURRENT STATUS OF THIS PROJECT?

Following the submission of the Final Issue Report, the GNSO Council initiated the Policy Development Process on 18 February 2016.

WHAT ARE THE EXPECTED NEXT STEPS?

The GNSO Council is expected to consider the proposed charter for the PDP Working Group during its forthcoming meeting in Marrakech and a call for volunteers to join the PDP WG will be sent out shortly after. The GNSO PDP Working Group will be open to all interested.

HOW CAN I GET INVOLVED?

Watch out for the Call for Volunteers to join the PDP Working Group to Review all RPMs in all gTLDs, which is expected to be circulated shortly after the adoption of the charter by the GNSO Council.

MORE INFORMATION

- Final Issue Report: gnso.icann.org/en/issues/new-gtlds/rpm-final-issue-11jan16-en.pdf

BACKGROUND

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 Policy Development Process (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. The Council followed this recommended course and, following an additional extension of 6 months in February 2015, Staff is publish a new Preliminary Issue Report in September 2015, and, after another public comment forum, the Final Issue Report.

STAFF RESPONSIBLE

Mary Wong, Lars Hoffmann

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 as top-level domains (TLDs) and develop a policy framework.

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 into three sections: 2-character TLDs; 3-character TLDs; and full name country and territory name TLDs. The CWG has tentatively concluded to maintain the status quo of 2-character codes as exclusively reserved for country code TLDs (ccTLDs). A survey on questions surrounding 3-character codes was sent to all of ICANN's Supporting Organization and Advisory Committees solicited valuable feedback and the CWG-UCTN is currently preparing a Straw Man proposal on 3-character codes that will be ready in time for discussion in Marrakech.

WHAT ARE THE 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 ICANN56.

HOW CAN I GET INVOLVED?

If you are interested in joining the CWG-UCTN as a GNSO participant, please email the GNSO Secretariat at gnso.secretariat@icann.org.

MORE INFORMATION



Face-to-face meeting during ICANN55: Monday 7 March, 10:30-12:00 local time: community.icann.org/x/-ZxlAw

- More information on the CWG, including its charter can be found at: ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/ccwg-unct.htm

BACKGROUND

The treatment of country and territory names as TLDs 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). Creating a uniform policy framework on this important issues that can be applied across all TLDs will be a very helpful step forward in the continuous development of the DNS.

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?

There is an increasing reliance on Cross Community Working Groups (CWGs) as the ICANN community has recognized that there are a rising number of issues that cut across and affect more than just one of ICANN's Supporting Organizations (SOs) or Advisory Committees (ACs). Despite the number of past and current CWGs, there are no agreed community-wide guidelines on their functioning. This CWG has been chartered jointly by the ccNSO and GNSO Councils to develop a framework of uniform 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 and advice development, operates under different mandates, and has separate remits. Yet, there are issues that affect or interest more than one SO/AC that may require a cross-community working group. Up to now, CWGs have been formed on an ad-hoc basis, without a consistent framework of underlying operating principles that take into account the different working methods of the various SOs and ACs. The ccNSO and GNSO Councils chartered this group to address these shortcomings.

WHAT IS THE CURRENT STATUS OF THIS PROJECT?

The Cross Community Working Group will publish a draft framework document for public comment in time for ICANN55. The proposed framework identifies key principles and process steps that ought to be considered during each phase of the CWG life cycle (i.e., initiation, formation, operation, decision-making, closure, and post-closure).

WHAT ARE THE EXPECTED NEXT STEPS?


Following the close of the public comment period, the CWG will review all input received and prepare a final proposed framework for adoption by the ccNSO and GNSO Councils in time for ICANN56.

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 **community.icann.org/x/pgfPAQ**.

The CWG is also conducting an open community session at ICANN55 to present its draft Framework and gather feedback.

MORE INFORMATION

- Background information: **gns.icann.org/en/group-activities/active/cross-community**
- CWG Workspace: **community.icann.org/x/rQbPAQ**
-  Face-to-face meeting during ICANN55 Wednesday 9 March, 10:45-12:00: **community.icann.org/x/uphAw**

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 Charter Drafting Team was tasked to develop a charter for a cross-community Working Group to build on the initial work and continue to develop a finalized framework workable across all SO/ACs by governing the formation, chartering, operation, decision-making, and termination of all future CWGs. In March 2015 the ccNSO and GNSO Councils both approved the Charter and launched this CWG.

STAFF RESPONSIBLE

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

New gTLD Auction Proceeds Drafting Team

WHAT IS THIS ABOUT?

The new gTLD Program established auctions as a mechanism of last resort to resolve string contention. Most string contentions (approximately 90% of sets scheduled for auction) have been resolved through other means before reaching an auction conducted by ICANN's authorized auction service provider. However, it was recognized from the outset that significant funds could accrue as a result of several auctions. As such, these auction proceeds have been reserved and earmarked until the Board authorizes a plan for the appropriate use of the funds. In March 2015 that the Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO) started discussing a possible process for facilitating the conversation around new gTLD auction proceeds during the [ICANN meeting in Singapore](#). As part of that discussion, it became clear that there was interest from the GNSO to commence formal conversations on the topic of new gTLD auction proceeds and following which, the GNSO Council reached out to other ICANN Supporting Organizations (SOs) and Advisory Committees (ACs) to determine whether there would be interest to form a cross-community working group (CCWG) on this topic.

WHY IS THIS IMPORTANT?

In relation to new gTLD Program Auction Proceeds, 14 contention sets have been resolved via ICANN Auction since June 2014. The total net proceeds to date are \$105.6 million USD. Details of the proceeds can be found at newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/auctions/proceeds. As of 18 February 2016, 22 contention sets remain to be resolved, although it is important to keep in mind that approximately 90% of contention sets scheduled for auction are resolved prior to the auction. The total amount of funding resulting from auctions, will not be known until all relevant applications have resolved contention.

WHAT IS THE CURRENT STATUS OF THIS PROJECT?

Following a number of sessions on this topic during the ICANN53 in Buenos Aires buenosaires53.icann.org/en/schedule/mon-soac-high-interest and buenosaires53.icann.org/en/schedule/wed-cwg-new-gtld-auction, a [discussion paper](#) was published in September 2015 to solicit further community input on this topic as well as the proposal to proceed with a CCWG on this topic. As the feedback received on the discussion paper confirmed the support for moving forward with a CCWG, James

Bladel, GNSO Chair, reached out to all the ICANN Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees to ask for volunteers to participate in a drafting team to develop a charter for a CCWG on this topic. All ICANN SO/ACs responded to this request and almost all have put forward volunteers to participate in the drafting team. The Drafting Team commenced its deliberations on Tuesday 23 February.

WHAT ARE THE EXPECTED NEXT STEPS?

Once the Drafting Team has finalized its work on the proposed charter for a CCWG, this proposed charter will be submitted to all the ICANN SO/ACs for their consideration.

HOW CAN I GET INVOLVED?

It is the expectation that the CCWG would be open to anyone interested to participate in. Following the adoption of the charter by those ICANN SO/ACs that decide to be chartering organizations, a call for volunteers will be circulated.

MORE INFORMATION

- Updated new gTLD Auction Proceeds Discussion Paper gns0.icann.org/en/drafts/new-gtld-auction-proceeds-07dec15-en.pdf
- DT Mailing List Archives mm.icann.org/pipermail/dt-cwg-auctionproceeds/

STAFF RESPONSIBLE

Marika Konings, David Tait

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). Since the ICANN meeting in Dublin, the CG has worked on the review of the GNSO Liaison to the GAC pilot project, the review of the Quick Look Mechanism which was introduced as a pilot to facilitate GAC input in the early stages of the PDP and explored additional opportunities for early engagement as part of the other stages of the PDP.


WHAT ARE THE EXPECTED NEXT STEPS?

The GNSO Council and GAC will meet in Marrakech to discuss the current status and next steps.

HOW CAN I GET INVOLVED?

You can follow review the conversations on the mailing list mm.icann.org/pipermail/gac-gnso-cg/ or review the materials on the wiki community.icann.org/x/phPRAg.

MORE INFORMATION

-  Face-to-face meeting between the GAC and the GNSO during ICANN55: Sunday 6 March, 16:00-17:00 local time <https://meetings.icann.org/en/marrakech55/schedule/sun-gac-afternoon>
- Consultation Group Wiki: community.icann.org/x/phPRAg
- Mailing List Archives: mm.icann.org/pipermail/gac-gnso-cg/
- Consultation Group Charter: community.icann.org/x/PyLRAg

STAFF RESPONSIBLE

Marika Konings (GNSO), Olof Nordling (GAC)

Implementation Status: 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.

WHAT ARE THE EXPECTED NEXT STEPS?

The draft IRTP and TRDP, which incorporate the Working Group's recommendations, were posted for public comment on 10 November 2015. Following the public comment period, the Implementation Review Team reviewed the comments received.

MORE INFORMATION

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

STAFF RESPONSIBLE

Caitlin Tubergen (GDD)

Implementation Status: 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.

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 in February 2014 and an Implementation Review Team (IRT) has been formed. 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. In June 2015, ICANN’s General Counsel’s Office, released to the IRT a Legal Review Memorandum per the GNSO Council’s recommendation. In December 2015, a Proposed Implementation of GNSO Thick Whois Consensus Policy Requiring Consistent Labeling and Display of RDDS (Whois) Output for All gTLDs was released for Public Comment. This public comment period will close on 18 March 2016. ICANN Staff is currently engaging with experts from affected parties to define an implementation path for the transition from thin to thick of .COM, .NET and .JOBS. The IRT will meet during ICANN55.

MORE INFORMATION

- GNSO PDP Page: gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/active/thick-whois
- Implementation Review Team Workspace: community.icann.org/display/TWCPI/Thick+Whois+Policy+Implementation
- Proposed Implementation of GNSO Thick Whois Consensus Policy Requiring Consistent Labeling and Display of RDDS (Whois) Output for All gTLDs: icann.org/public-comments/rdds-output-2015-12-03-en

STAFF RESPONSIBLE

Fabien Betremieux (GDD)

Implementation Status: Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information Recommendations

CURRENT STATUS AND NEXT STEPS

The ICANN Board adopted the recommendations of the PDP Working Group in September 2015. GDD staff is awaiting a decision from the Board—expected at ICANN55 in Marrakech—regarding the overlap between the Translation and Transliteration project and the recommendations of the Internationalized Registration Data Working Group before proceeding with the implementation. Recruitment of an IRT is expected to commence in mid-March 2016.

FINAL REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS

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 also free to join. Please lookout for the Call for volunteers in March 2016.

MORE INFORMATION

- Final Report: [gnso.icann.org/en/issues/gtlds/translation-transliteration-contact-final-12jun15-en.pdf](https://www.gnso.icann.org/en/issues/gtlds/translation-transliteration-contact-final-12jun15-en.pdf)
- Public comment forum: [icann.org/public-comments/transliteration-contact-recommendations-2015-06-29-en](https://www.icann.org/public-comments/transliteration-contact-recommendations-2015-06-29-en)
- ICANN Board adopting the recommendations contained in the Final Report: [icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2015-09-28-en#1.b](https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2015-09-28-en#1.b)

BACKGROUND

The continued internationalization of the domain name system (DNS) means registrations from registrants unfamiliar with Latin script are increasing. In October 2012 the GNSO Council requested an Issue Report to address whether it is desirable to translate or transliterate contact information into one common language or script. In December 2013 a GNSO PDP Working Group (WG) was formed 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.

STAFF RESPONSIBLE

Brian Aitchison

ICANN | GNSO

Generic Names Supporting Organization