

At-Large's Subsequent Procedures Scorecard: Registrant Protections

CPWG SubPro Small Team

At-Large Consolidated Policy Working Group (CPWG) Call
Wednesday, 11 February 2020, 19:00 UTC



APPLICATION EVALUATION/CRITERIA

Topic/Area:	[29] REGISTRANT PROTECTIONS [2.7.2]			Priority:	MEDIUM	Settled On:	
Related:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EBERO – Emergency Back-end Registry Operator • COI – Continued Operations Instrument • Data Escrow, RO performance specifications in Specification 10 RA 						
Key Issues:	<p>In context of consumer protection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whether EBERO and COI should continue to be used to protect registrants? Exemptions to apply? Any changes required? • Level of applicant screening required. 						
Policy Goals:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Principle D remains applicable: “A set of technical criteria must be used for assessing a new gTLD registry applicant to minimise risk of harming the operational stability, security and global interoperability of the Internet” • The program must continue to incorporate measures into the application process and program implementation that provide protection for registrants 						
Assigned CCT-RT Rec’s:	None						
References:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SubPro WG Application Evaluation/Criteria_Summary Document, 7 January 2020 • 03. SubPro Reserved Names, Closed Generics & Registrant Protection, 20 August 2019 						
What has SubPro PDP WG concluded?	<u>What will/might SubPro PDP WG recommend?</u>	Is this acceptable? If not, why so?	What else needs to be done and by/with whom?				
1. Maintaining registrant protections as is	<p>Recommendation to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain existing registrant protections, including EBERO and associated triggers for an EBERO event and critical registry functions 						

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide exemptions from EBERO requirements to TLDs with applicable Spec 9 RO CoC and Spec 13 .Brand TLDs 		
2. Improving applicant screening process	Recommendation to improve background screening process to be more accommodating, meaningful, and flexible for different regions and in different circumstances	Yes	<p>Monitor at implementation level:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No exemption to background screening for public traded companies Background screening ideally done twice: (1) time of application (to identify unsuitable applicants) and (2) time of contracting (to identify material change)
What has SubPro PDP WG concluded?	<u>What SubPro PDP WG will likely omit?</u>	Is this acceptable? If not, why so?	What else needs to be done and by/with whom?
3.			
<u>PENDING ISSUES:</u>	SubPro PDP WG reaction	Anything missing?	What else needs to be done and by/with whom?
4. Exemptions from COI	Unclear if exemptions from COI also to be provided under certain circumstances		
Position:			