**Progress Report – Negotiations on the Registrar Accreditation Agreement**

**Status of RAA Drafting Team Recommendations as of 1 March 2012**

**General Comments**

ICANN and the Registrar Negotiation Team (NT) are undertaking a comprehensive review of the Registrar Accreditation Agreement (RAA).   In advance of the ICANN Costa Rica Meeting, a Summary Document[1] was published to inform the ICANN community of the status of certain law enforcement and community requested RAA amendment topics.

This Additional Report is prepared at the request of the GNOS Council to supplement the Summary Document and provide specific information on the status of each of the High and Medium Priority Amendment Topics that were identified in the Joint GNSO/ALAC RAA Drafting Team's Final Report as of 1 March, 2012.[2]  This report was drafted by ICANN based upon its understanding of the status of negotiations.

This Additional Report identifies how the RAA-DT High and Medium Priority amendment topics were addressed in the original Summary Document published on 1 March 2012.  It does not include any additional information or updates on the progress of the negotiations since the Costa Rica Meeting.

---

[1] The Status Report is posted at: https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/30344497/raa-negotiations-progress-report-01mar12-en%5B1%5D.pdf?version=1&modificationDate=1331140784000

[2] The RAA Drafting Team Final Report on Proposals for Improvements to the RAA is posted at http://gnso.icann.org/issues/raa/raa-improvements-proposal-final-report-18oct10-en.pdf

**Progress Report – Negotiations on the Registrar Accreditation Agreement**

**Status of RAA Drafting Team Recommendations as of 1 March 2012**

| Item No. | Description | Notes from Summary of RAA Negotiations, dated 1 March 2012 |
|----------|-------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|
| High Priority 1 | Prohibition on registrar cybersquatting | See Summary- Page 11, Item 5 |
| High Priority 2 | Malicious conduct – registrar duty to investigate | See LE Request #11,  Summary Page 7 |
| High Priority 3 | Designation and publication of a technically competent point of contact on malicious conduct issues (24 /7 ) | See LE Request #11, Summary Page 7 |
| High Priority 4 | Disclosure of privacy/proxy services made available by registrar;   Responsibility of registrar for compliance by such services | See LE Request No. 1, Summary Page 2 and LE Request No. 8 on Summary Page 5 |
| High Priority 5 | Obligations of privacy/proxy services made available by registrar re:  Data escrow; Relay function; Reveal function | See LE request No. 1; Summary Page 2 |
| High Priority 6 | Registrar responsibility for cancellation of registrations made by other privacy/proxy services for noncompliance with Relay and Reveal | See LE request No. 1; Summary Page 2 |
| High Priority 7 | Define circumstances under which registrar is required to cancel registration for false Whois data and set reasonable time limits for registrar action | See LE request No.1 0, Summary Page 6 |

**Progress Report – Negotiations on the Registrar Accreditation Agreement**

**Status of RAA Drafting Team Recommendations as of 1 March 2012**

| Item No. | Description | Notes/Comments |
|---|---|---|
| High Priority 8 | Require PCI compliance in registration process, or similar pre-existing standard that would assist in verification of registrants | See LE request No.1 0, Summary Page 6 |
| High Priority 9 | Define "reseller" and clarify registrar responsibility for reseller compliance | See LE Request No 8,  Summary Page 5 |
| High Priority 10 | Require greater disclosure of registrar affiliates/multiple accreditations | See LE Request # 5, Summary Page 3 |
| High Priority 11 | Require greater disclosure of registrar contact information, information on form of business organization, officers, etc. | See LE Request # 3, Summary Page 3 |
| High Priority 12 | Clarification of registrar responsibilities in connection with UDRP proceedings | Not Yet Reported |

**Status of RAA Drafting Team Recommendations as of 1 March 2012**

| Item No. | Description | Notes/Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Medium Priority 1 | Spell out registrar "verification" process after receiving report of false Whois data | See LE request No. 10, Summary Page 6 |
| Medium Priority 2 | Require links to Whois Data Problem Reporting System on Whois results pages and on registrar home page | Not Yet Reported |
| Medium Priority 3 | Service Level Agreement on Whois availability | See LE request No 12, Summary Page 7 |
| Medium Priority 4 | Registrar to disclose resellers and vice versa | See LE Request No. 8,  Summary Page 5 |
| Medium Priority 5 | Expand scope of authority to terminate accreditation | See LE Request No. 2 on Summary Page 3, Item 1 on Summary Page 10, and Items 2-5 on Summary Page 11 |
| Medium Priority 6 | Require registrars to report data breaches | Not Yet Reported |
| Medium Priority 7 | Streamline arbitration process in cases of dis-accreditation | See Items 2 and 3 on Summary Page 10 |
| Medium Priority 8 | Streamline process of adding new gTLDs to accreditation | See Item 6 on Summary Page 11 |
| Medium Priority 9 | Registrar responsibilities for acts of affiliates | See LE Request No. 5 on Summary Page 3, and LE Request No. 8 on Summary Page 5 |
| Medium Priority 10 | Staff to draft registrar code of conduct if registrars fail to do so by time certain | Not Yet Reported |