

## **GNSO gTLD Registries Stakeholder Group Statement**

### **Issue: Whois Registrant Identification Study Draft Project Summary Report**

Date: 18 March 2013

Public Comment URL: <http://www.icann.org/en/news/public-comment/whois-regid-15feb13-en.htm>

This statement on the issue noted above is submitted on behalf of the gTLD Registries Stakeholder Group (RySG). The statement that follows represents a consensus position of the RySG as further detailed at the end of the document. The RySG statement was arrived at through a combination of RySG email list discussion and RySG meetings (including teleconference meetings).

The RySG supported the GNSO Council Resolution to perform the 'Whois Registrant Identification Study' with the hope of providing the ICANN community with objective data regarding certain characteristics of domain name registrations that could be used in future Whois policy development work. For many years the GNSO has been largely frustrated in Whois policy development efforts because competing stakeholder views made it difficult to reach a satisfactory level of consensus.

We believed that one of the causes of this was that many of the positions held by policy development participants were based on anecdotal opinions rather than on objective data. We concluded therefore that performing this study provided a way to test the validity of some of those opinions and thereby validate or refute them in a statistically reliable way so that future Whois policy efforts would have solid data to use.

Based on the Whois Registrant Identification Study Draft Project Summary Report (Draft Report), it is our view that the study was successful in producing data that can be used to facilitate future Whois (registrant identification) policy development efforts. In particular, we believe that the results of the study provide answers as indicated to the following four questions asked by the GAC:

1. What is the percentage of registrants that are natural versus legal persons?
  - 33% natural
  - 39% legal
2. What is percentage of domain name uses that are commercial versus non-commercial?
  - 57% commercial
  - 43% non-commercial

3. What is the relative percentage of Privacy/Proxy use among legal persons?
  - 15.1%
4. What is the relative percentage of Privacy/Proxy use among domains with commercial use?
  - 57% if pay-per-click sites are included
  - 45% if pay-per-click sites are not included

The Draft Report also contains numbers for many additional categories that can provide the basis for important discussions about the uses of Whois. The Report provides considerable detail to allow for careful interpretation of the percentages that are reported, including statistical significance levels. It also provides possible conclusions that may be made regarding how domains are used by different types of registrants: legal persons, natural persons, and registrants using privacy/proxy services.

As with any study, the results must be used with certain qualifications. For example, the history of Whois-related debates clearly shows that definitions of “commercial use” and opinions about when pay-per-click may change a site’s character will be brought to the table in any examination of registration identification studies. However, it is our belief that the Draft Report provides sufficient information to support careful analysis of its stated results. Most importantly, we believe that the study results provide objective data that will facilitate policy development work going forward.

## **RySG Level of Support**

1. **Level of Support of Active Members:** [Supermajority]
  - 1.1. # of Members in Favor: 11
  - 1.2. # of Members Opposed: 0
  - 1.3. # of Members that Abstained: 1
  - 1.4. # of Members that did not vote: 2
2. **Minority Position(s):** None

## **General RySG Information**

- Total # of eligible RySG Members<sup>1</sup>: 14
- Total # of RySG Members: 14
- Total # of Active RySG Members<sup>2</sup>: 14

---

<sup>1</sup> All top-level domain sponsors or registry operators that have agreements with ICANN to provide Registry Services in support of one or more gTLDs are eligible for membership upon the “effective date” set forth in the operator’s or sponsor’s agreement (RySG Charter, Article II, RySG Membership, Sec. A). The RySG Charter can be found at [http://www.gtldregistries.org/sites/gtldregistries.org/files/Charter\\_for\\_RySG\\_6\\_July\\_2011\\_FINAL.pdf](http://www.gtldregistries.org/sites/gtldregistries.org/files/Charter_for_RySG_6_July_2011_FINAL.pdf)

- Minimum requirement for supermajority of Active Members: 10
- Minimum requirement for majority of Active Members: 8
- # of Members that participated in this process: 14
- Names of Members that participated in this process:
  1. Afiliat (.info, .mobi & .pro)
  2. DotAsia Organisation (.asia)
  3. DotCooperation (.coop)
  4. Employ Media (.jobs)
  5. Fundació puntCAT (.cat)
  6. ICM Registry LLC (.xxx)
  7. Museum Domain Management Association – MuseDoma (.museum)
  8. NeuStar (.biz)
  9. Public Interest Registry - PIR (.org)
  10. Societe Internationale de Telecommunication Aeronautiques – SITA (.aero)
  11. Telnic (.tel)
  12. Tralliance Registry Management Company (TRMC) (.travel)
  13. Universal Postal Union (UPU) (.post)
  14. VeriSign (.com, .name, & .net)
- Names & email addresses for points of contact
  - Chair: Keith Drazek, [kdrazek@verisign.com](mailto:kdrazek@verisign.com)
  - Alternate Chair: Paul Diaz, [pdiaz@pir.org](mailto:pdiaz@pir.org)
  - Secretariat: Cherie Stubbs, [Cherstubbs@aol.com](mailto:Cherstubbs@aol.com)
  - RySG representative for this statement: Chuck Gomes, [cgomes@verisign.com](mailto:cgomes@verisign.com)

---

<sup>2</sup> Per the RySG Charter, Article II, RySG Membership, Sec.D: Members shall be classified as “Active” or “Inactive”. An active member must meet eligibility requirements, must be current on dues, and must be a regular participant in RySG activities. A member shall be classified as Active unless it is classified as Inactive pursuant to the provisions of this paragraph. Members become Inactive by failing to participate in three consecutively scheduled RySG meetings or voting processes or both. An Inactive member shall continue to have membership rights and duties except being counted as present or absent in the determination of a quorum. An Inactive member immediately resumes Active status at any time by participating in a RySG meeting or by voting.