

**Index**

**Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy Part D Policy Development Process .....2**

**Privacy & Proxy Services Accreditation Issues Policy Development Process .....4**

**Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information Policy Development Process ...6**

**IGO-INGO Access to Curative Rights Protection Mechanisms Policy Development  
Process.....8**

**Policy & Implementation ..... 10**

**Data & Metrics for Policy Making Working Group..... 12**

**Cross Community Working Groups on Country and Territory Names as TLDs..... 14**

**Cross Community Working Groups on Framework of Principles for Future Cross  
Community Working Groups ..... 16**

**GAC-GNSO Consultation Group on GAC Early Engagement in GNSO Policy  
Development Processes..... 18**

**WHOIS Studies Update ..... 20**

## Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy Part D Policy Development Process

### What is this about?

The Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy (IRTP) Part D PDP Working Group is 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 3816 valid IRTP-related complaints between January 2012 and February 2013 alone, making it the most common issue 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 used by registrars. This appears to be a contradiction in view of the number of complaints relation to the IRTP, and in this context the WG has drawn up a list of use cases of disputed transfers that is currently not covered by the TDRP (see Annex C of the Initial Report).

### What is the current status of this project?

The Working Group started its deliberations on 25 February 2013. Having received and reviewed input from the GNSO Stakeholder Groups and Constituencies, as well as other ICANN Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees, the Group has debated each of the Charter questions. Following this, on 3 March 2014, the Working Group published its Initial Report for Public Comment. The Preliminary recommendations include: 1) Reporting requirements be incorporated into the TDRP policy, 2) A domain name be returned to the original Registrar of Record if it is found through a TDRP procedure that a non-IRTP compliant domain name transfer has occurred, 3) the statute of limitation to launch a TDRP be extended from current 6 months to 12 months from the initial transfer, 4) if a request for enforcement is initiated under the TDRP the relevant domain should be 'locked' against further transfers, 5) no dispute options for registrants be developed and implemented as part of the current TDRP, but the GNSO should ensure that IRTP-C inter-registrant transfer recommendations are implemented and include appropriate dispute-resolution mechanisms, 6) the TDRP be modified to eliminate the First Level (Registry) layer of the TDRP, and 7) the Form of Authorization (FOA) should not be abandoned. Four comments were submitted during the public comment period and the community feedback was largely supportive of the WG's draft recommendations. Only the issue of abandoning the Registry level (see No. 6 above) and the continuation of the FOA (see No. 7 above) received diverging comments. Taking all public comments into account, the Working Group members have continued their discussion and are in the process of completing their Final Report.

**Expected next steps**

The WG continues its weekly meetings and is scheduled to meet face-to-face at ICANN50 in London. The Working Group plans to conclude its discussion and submit its Final Report to the GNSO Council shortly after the London Meeting. If/when the Council adopts the Final Report, a public comment forum will be opened on the recommendations prior to ICANN Board consideration.

**Background**

The IRTP is a 2004 consensus policy developed through the GNSO's policy development process (PDP) and is currently under review by the GNSO through a series of PDPs. The IRTP provides a straightforward procedure for domain name holders to transfer domain names between registrars. On the recommendation of the IRTP Part C WG, the GNSO Council agreed to combine all the remaining IRTP issues into this final PDP, IRTP Part D, in addition to one issue that was raised by the IRTP Part C WG in its Final Report. The GNSO Council unanimously adopted the request for an Issue Report on IRTP Part D at its meeting on 17 October 2012. And so, this PDP is the fourth and final policy development process of different aspects of the Inter Registrar Transfer Policy.

**How can I get involved?**

If you would like to join the WG during its final phase, please contact the GNSO Secretariat ([gnso-secs@icann.org](mailto:gnso-secs@icann.org)).

**Where can I find more information?**

- Initial Report: <http://gnso.icann.org/en/issues/transfers/irtp-d-initial-03mar14-en.pdf>
- Public Forum: <http://www.icann.org/en/news/public-comment/irtp-d-initial-03mar14-en.htm>
- Final Issue Report - <http://gnso.icann.org/en/issues/issue-report-irtp-d-08jan13-en.pdf>
- Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy - <http://www.icann.org/en/resources/registrars/transfers/policy-01jun12.htm>
- Working Group Community Wiki page: <https://community.icann.org/x/B4JwAg>
- Work plan: <https://community.icann.org/x/FIJwAg>
- London F2F Meeting scheduled for Monday 23 June from 13.30 – 14.30 (see <http://london50.icann.org/en/schedule/mon-irtp-d>)

**Staff responsible:** Lars Hoffmann and Steve Chan

## Privacy & Proxy Services Accreditation Issues Policy Development Process

### What is this about?

The Registrar Accreditation Agreement (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). ICANN has already committed to such an Accreditation Program. This PDP was initiated to examine the policy issues related to the provision and accreditation of privacy and proxy services, with a view toward assisting ICANN with its development of such a program.

### What is the current status of this project?

- The PDP Working Group was chartered by the GNSO Council in October 2013 and is meeting on a weekly basis.
- The WG will have a face-to-face meeting in London, and is continuing to discuss substantive questions under its charter that it was tasked to address.

### 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 has also 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. Finally, the issue of accrediting privacy and proxy services is being discussed in the broader context of ICANN's ongoing review of the Whois system, including within an Expert Working Group formed in December 2012 that is looking at the fundamental purpose and possible redesign of gTLD registration data services. This PDP

represents 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 Working Group is addressing the substantive questions posed to it by the GNSO Council in the WG charter. The questions span several categories, ranging from registration and termination to Relay and Reveal procedures. The WG aims to produce an Initial Report for public comment in early 2015.

**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 at its meeting on 31 October 2013.

**How can I get involved?**

The Working Group is open to anyone interested in participating. If you want to join the WG please contact the GNSO Secretariat to be added to the mailing list ([gns.secretariat@gnsso.icann.org](mailto:gns.secretariat@gnsso.icann.org)). You can also attend the WG's meeting in London on Wednesday morning, scheduled from 1000-1130 a.m. London time (please see London Meeting Schedule for confirmation).

**Where can I find more information?**

- Background information: <http://gnsso.icann.org/en/group-activities/active/ppsa>
- WG 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>

**Staff responsible:** Mary Wong and Marika Konings

## Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information Policy Development Process

### What is this about?

Following the recommendations in the Internationalized Registration Data Working Group (IRD-WG)'s [Final Report](#), the GNSO Council requested an Issue Report on the Translation and transliteration of contact information in October 2012. In this context '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. It usually includes the name, organization, and postal address of the registered name holder, technical contact, as well as administrative contact. '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.

### 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 international registration data and to assure its internationalization functionality. The ongoing expansion of the gTLD space and the creation of a large number of internationalized domain names, combined with the reforms attempts of gTLD Directory Services – especially the Expert Working Group on New gTLD Directory Services – makes the need to establish GNSO policy for the translation and transliteration of contact information even more pressing. The PDP WG is in fact expected to tie in with some of the work that is currently under way.

### What is the current status of this project?

The GNSO Council has [initiated a Policy Development Process](#) (PDP) on this topic and the WG was initiated in December 2013. Since then the WG sent a request to the Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees as well as to the GNSO's Stakeholder Groups and Constituencies to provide input on questions relating to the translation and transliteration of contact. The WG is currently reviewing and analyzing the input it received and will provide an update to the community on its work progress at ICANN 50 in London. The Working Group is also closely monitoring the ICANN-commissioned study on the commercial feasibility of translation and transliteration of contact information as well as the outcome of the Expert Working Group on gTLD Directory Services.

### Expected next steps

The PDP WG is reviewing and analyzing the responses to the request for input on the issue questions as well as the results of the commercial feasibility study. The WG aims to publish its Initial Report for public comment in time for ICANN51.

### Background

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.
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.

The PDP WG has asked the Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees to provide input on the following questions relating to the two issues identified in the PDP:

- Whether it is desirable to translate contact information to a single common language or transliterate contact information to a single common script.
- What exactly the benefits to the community are of translating and/or transliterating contact information, especially in light of the costs that may be connected to translation and/or transliteration?
- Should translation and/or transliteration of contact information be mandatory for all gTLDs?
- Should translation and/or transliteration of contact information be mandatory for all registrants or only those based in certain countries and/or using specific non-ASCII scripts?
- What impact will translation/transliteration of contact information have on the WHOIS validation as set out under the 2013 Registrar Accreditation Agreement?
- When should any new policy relating to translation and transliteration of contact information come into effect?
- 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?
- Who does your SG/C believe should bear the cost, bearing in mind, however, the limits in scope set in the Initial Report on this issue?

### **How can I get involved?**

If you would like to join the WG as a member, please contact the GNSO Secretariat ([gnso-secs@icann.org](mailto:gnso-secs@icann.org)).

### **Where can I find more information?**

- Issue Report - [Final Issue Report on Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information](#)
- PDP Workspace - <https://community.icann.org/x/FTR-Ag>

**Staff responsible:** Julie Hedlund and Lars Hoffmann

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

### **What is this about?**

One of the consensus recommendations from the GNSO's PDP Working Group on IGO and INGO Protections in All gTLDs (IGO-INGO WG) was for the GNSO Council to request an Issue Report, as a preceding step to a possible PDP, on permitting IGOs and INGOs access and use of existing curative rights protection mechanisms (namely, the Uniform Dispute Resolution Policy (UDRP) and Uniform Rapid Suspension (URS) procedure), to protect their names and acronyms at the second level in both existing and new gTLDs. The IGO-INGO PDP WG's consensus recommendations were adopted unanimously by the GNSO Council in November 2013. The Preliminary Issue Report was published for public comment in March 2014. Following analysis of the public comment received, the Final Issue Report was submitted to the GNSO Council on 25 May 2014.

### **Why is this important?**

Protecting the names and acronyms of International Governmental Organizations (IGOs) and other International Non-Governmental Organizations (INGOs) from third party domain name registrations at the top and second levels has been a long-standing issue over the course of the New gTLD Program. The GNSO's consensus recommendations on this topic were sent by the GNSO Council to the ICANN Board for its consideration in February 2014. There are a number of differences between the GNSO's policy recommendations and the Government Advisory Committee's (GAC) Advice to the Board, 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.

This new PDP is not dependent on the outcome of those discussions, as it concerns the issue of curative remedies for IGOs and INGOs that have already been identified as eligible for certain second level protections by the IGO-INGO WG. Unlike trademark owners, for whom the UDRP and URS were designed, IGOs and INGOs are not necessarily able to fully utilize these procedures.

### **What is the current status of this project?**

On 5 June 2014, the GNSO Council resolved to initiate a PDP on IGO and INGO access to curative rights protection mechanisms. To allow time for all Stakeholder Groups and Constituencies to provide feedback on a draft WG charter, the Council deferred its vote on the charter – which will determine the scope of the work of the WG – till its meeting in London.



## **Expected next steps**

The GNSO Council is expected to consider a charter for the new PDP WG for approval at its meeting in London, following which a call for volunteers to form the WG will be issued.

## **Background**

In November 2013 the GNSO Council unanimously adopted all the consensus recommendations of the IGO-INGO WG, including calling for an Issue Report on allowing IGOs and INGOs 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 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 may jeopardize an IGO's status as being immune from national jurisdiction. 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?**

A call for volunteers for the new PDP WG will be launched following GNSO Council adoption of the final charter of the WG at the London meeting.

## **Where can I find more information?**

- IGO-INGO WG Final Report: <http://gns0.icann.org/en/issues/igo-ingo-final-10nov13-en.pdf>
- GNSO Council Recommendations Report to the ICANN Board:  
<http://gns0.icann.org/en/issues/council-board-igo-ingo-23jan14-en.pdf>
- Final Issue Report on IGO & INGO Access to Curative Rights Protection Mechanisms:  
<http://gns0.icann.org/en/drafts/igo-ingo-crp-final-25may14-en.pdf>

**Staff responsible:** Mary Wong and Steve Chan

## 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?**

The WG started its deliberations in August 2013 and has 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.

The WG reached out to all ICANN Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees to ask for input. Input has been received from the ALAC, the RySG and ISPCP.

The WG has developed a set of working definitions and posted a set of working principles that will underpin the WG deliberations on the charter questions. The WG has now started its deliberation on the charter questions.

## **Expected next steps**

The WG will continue its deliberations as outlined in its work plan (see [https://community.icann.org/x/rC\\_fAg](https://community.icann.org/x/rC_fAg)) with the aim of delivering an Initial Report for community input by the ICANN51 meeting in Los Angeles.

## **Background**

In order to facilitate these discussions, ICANN Staff developed a draft framework for community discussion that identifies a number of steps and criteria that might facilitate dealing with similar questions in the future. The paper identifies a number of questions that the community may want to consider further in this context, as well as a couple of suggested improvements that could be considered in the short term. In addition, a session on this topic was held at the ICANN Meeting in Beijing, which resulted in the formation of the Working Group by the GNSO Council.

## **How can I Get involved**

The Working Group is open to anyone interested. If you want to join the Working Group please contact the GNSO Secretariat to be added to the mailing list (<mailto:gnsos.secretariat@gnso.icann.org>). Furthermore, public input will be sought on the Initial Report in due time (see <http://www.icann.org/en/news/public-comment>).

## **Where can I find more information?**

- Working Group workspace – <https://community.icann.org/x/y1V-Ag>
- Policy & Implementation Working definitions & principles - <https://community.icann.org/x/9xrRAg>
- Staff discussion paper - <http://gnso.icann.org/en/correspondence/policy-implementation-framework-08jan13-en.pdf>
- London WG F2F meeting session – scheduled for Wednesday 26 March from 15.30 – 17.30 (see <http://london50.icann.org/en/schedule/wed-policy-implementation>)

**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 is expected to investigate 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 will explore:

- Evaluate previous PDP and non-PDP efforts and how metrics could have enhanced the WG process
- Establishing a baseline of current practices and capabilities to problem reporting
- Review existing GNSO work product templates, like charters, issue reports, and final reports for possible enhancements to inform the PDP and non-PDP process
- Evaluate external data sources that may benefit the policy process such as abuse statistics or DNS industry related data and define a possible framework in how it may be accessed

### What is the current status of the project?

- The WG is currently evaluating previous WG efforts as use cases to identify gaps in where data and metrics could have enhanced or promoted opportunities to better understand the extent of the issue being explored and perhaps resulted in more informed policy recommendations.
- GNSO WG efforts reviewed thus far are Fast Flux, PEDNR, AGP, and IRTP-A

### Expected next steps

- Presentation by Contractual Compliance to the GNSO Council
- WG to meet in London – Thursday @ 08:00 local time
- Continue WG sessions post ICANN meeting
- Create Initial Report & Conduct Public Comment

### 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 GNSO resolution states:

Resolved,

The GNSO Council does not initiate a Policy Development Process at this stage but will review at the completion of the ICANN Contractual Compliance three-year plan expected for 31 December 2013 whether additional action is required;

The GNSO Council further approves the creation of a drafting team to develop a charter for a non-PDP Working Group to consider additional methods for collecting necessary metrics and reporting from Contracted Parties and other external resources to aid the investigation.

**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>
- London Session – Scheduled for Thursday 26 June at 08:00 local time (see <http://london50.icann.org/en/schedule/thu-dmpm>)

**Staff responsible:** Berry Cobb, Lars Hoffmann, Steve Chan

## Cross Community Working Groups on Country and Territory Names as TLDs

### What is this about?

The purpose of this CWG is to further review the issues pertaining to the use of country and territory names under the different policies (new gTLD, IDN ccTLD, RFC 1591), and, if feasible, develop a definitional framework that could be used across the different policies. With adoption of the charter, one of the two recommendations of the ccNSO Study Group on use of names of country and territories has been implemented.

### 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. 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. 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", foundation documents such as RFC1591 and administrative procedures such as those followed by IANA, in accordance with ISO3166-1, in the delegation and redelegation of ccTLDs.

The CWG will 1) Further review the current status of representations of country and territory names, as they exist under current ICANN policies, guidelines and procedures; 2) Provide advice regarding the feasibility of developing a consistent and uniform definitional framework that could be applicable across the respective SO's and AC's; and 3) Should such a framework be deemed feasible, provide detailed advice as to the content of the framework.

### What is the current status of this project?

At their meeting in Singapore the ccNSO and GNSO Councils adopted the charter of the cross-community working group on Use of Names of Country and Territories (listed on ISO 3166-1) as TLDs following which a call for volunteers was launched. The CWG held its first meeting on 10 June.

### Expected next steps

The CWG will meet F2F in London to start developing its work plan (see <http://london50.icann.org/en/schedule/thu-unct>).

### 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 WG as a GNSO participant, please email the GNSO Secretariat at [gns.secretariat@icann.org](mailto:gns.secretariat@icann.org) to be added to the mailing list.

#### **Where can I find more information?**

- More information on the ccWG, including its charter can be found at: <http://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/ccwg-unct.htm>
- The Working Group will start its work, basing on the work of its predecessor, the Study Group on the Use of Names for Countries and Territories as TLDs. The Study Group's final report is available at <http://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/unct-final-08sep12-en.pdf> [PDF, 717 KB]

**Staff responsible:** Marika Konings, Bart Boswinkel (ccNSO)

## **Cross Community Working Groups on Framework of Principles for Future Cross Community Working Groups**

### **What is this about?**

The ICANN community has recognized that an increasing number of issues cut across and are of interest to more than one of ICANN's Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees. Cross-community working groups 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). 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 begun meeting to review past cross community efforts to generate "lessons learned" to aid in the development of a final proposed framework of principles. It continues to accept members and observers, and specifically encourages participation from all ICANN SO/ACs.

### **Expected next steps**

The CWG is reviewing the outcomes and "lessons learned" from past cross community efforts, as well as a set of initial draft principles developed by the GNSO in 2012 for which the ccNSO provided extensive feedback in 2013. The CWG aims to create a set of checklists or guidelines as part of a template for the formation, operation and termination of future CWGs.

### **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; however, participants from all across the ICANN community are encouraged to volunteer.

### **How can I get involved?**

If you are interested in joining the CWG, please email the GNSO Secretariat at [gnso.secretariat@icann.org](mailto:gnso.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://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/active/cross-community>
- CWG Workspace: <https://community.icann.org/x/rQbPAQ>

**Staff responsible:** Mary Wong 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). The Consultation Group has been holding weekly conference calls, alternating between team leads calls and calls for the whole consultation group.

### **Expected next steps**

The Consultation Group is expected to provide a status update including a number of proposed recommendations that may be implemented as pilot projects during the joint GNSO – GAC meeting which is scheduled to take place on Sunday 22 June.



# GNSO Background Briefing

---

## **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>

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

## WHOIS Studies Update

### What is this about?

The GNSO had approved several studies on various aspects of the publicly accessible Whois gTLD data directory system between 2010-2011. These concerned: (1) Whois Registrant Identification; (2) Whois Misuse; (3) Whois Privacy & Proxy Services Abuse; and (4) a Pre-Study Feasibility Survey on Whois Privacy & Proxy Relay & Reveal Procedures. The studies were developed based on previous community work, including input from the GAC.

### Why is this important?

The relevance of and needed improvements to the current Whois system of publicly accessible gTLD domain name registration data has been an issue in the ICANN community for some time. The GNSO Council determined that comprehensive, objective and quantifiable study of the Whois system would be helpful to its policy work in this area, and commissioned several studies on different aspects of the Whois system between 2010-2011. Since then, ICANN has also engaged in a review of the Whois system, including through the work of the Whois Review Team in May 2012 and the Expert Working Group that was convened in late 2012. The GNSO has also recently launched a PDP on issues relating to the accreditation of privacy and proxy service providers (PPSAI).

The findings from the studies as well as the various research teams have been used by the EWG and in the PPSAI PDP. It is anticipated that the results of these Whois studies will continue to inform the current and future policy work of the GNSO and ICANN on the Whois system.

### What is the current status of this project?

All the studies have now been completed and their results published. At its meeting on 5 June 2014, the GNSO Council formally closed this study phase of its Whois policy work and encouraged current and future policy groups working on refining and replacing Whois to continue to consult and use the results from the studies.

### Expected next steps

- No specific new initiative from the GNSO; rather, existing groups such as the EWG and PPSAI WG and future community efforts are expected to rely on the studies and their results.

### Where can I find more information?

- Information on all the Whois studies - <http://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/other/whois/studies>
- Executive Summary of all Whois studies - <http://whois.icann.org/sites/default/files/files/executive-summary-studies-05jun14-en.pdf>
- Archived information regarding GNSO work on Whois - <http://gns0.icann.org/en/issues/whois/archive>

**Staff responsible:** Mary Wong