Recommendation	Summary of ICANN's assessment of implementation including actions taken, implementability and effectiveness	Summary of community input on implementation, including effectiveness	ATRT2 analysis of recommendation implementation (e.g. complete, incomplete or ongoing)
Strategic Priority			
1. WHOIS, in all its aspects, should be a strategic priority, form the basis of staff incentivization (including CEO's) and organizational objectives; Board should create a committee that includes the CEO to be responsible for priority and key actions; issue public updates on progress against targets for all aspects of WHOIS.	WHOIS is deemed to be a strategic focus. Compliance restructured and reports to CEO. ICANN reported that in May, implementation was 25% complete.	Most parts of the community have been silent on this. Advocates for At-Large have not been satisfied that the changes are effective and not merely show, supported by the lack of replies to specific queries.	It is unclear how to assess to what extent the changes are effective. There is clearly a focus on long term WHOIS replacement, but ongoing status is far less clear. Monthly Contractual Compliance reports are not sufficiently clear as to create a clear understanding.
Single WHOIS Policy			
2. Board should oversee creation of a single WHOIS policy document, and reference it in agreements with Contracted Parties; clearly document the current gTLD WHOIS policy as set out in the gTLD Registry & Registrar contracts & Consensus Policies and Procedure.	The Board Briefing Document noted the lack of a single policy (the WHOIS RT's conclusion) and said "These presently available conditions and policies should be publicly available from one source." The result, which is deemed to completely satisfy the recommendation, can be viewed at http://www.icann.org/en/resources/registrars/whois-policies-provisions, entitled "Single Webpage for ICANN Whois-Related Policies and Provisions" but is largely a vast set of pointers to various policy documents and contractual terms. While saying that the implementation is complete, Staff acknowledges that the end result does not meet the desired tartget of having the WHOIS requirements in an understandable form, and says that the forcoming various WHOIS portals will serve the purpose.	There was no community input other than from the WHOIS RT which considered the result to not meet their original intent.	The ATRT concurs with the WHOIS RT assessment. The WHOIS RT and the ATRT2 acknowledges that the task was difficult, but that difficulty for staff is multiplied many times for less knowledgeable users who are attempting to understand Whois policy.

The work planned for the future Whois portals should be accelerated to address this recommendation. |

Recommendation	Summary of ICANN's assessment of implementation including actions taken, implementability and effectiveness	Summary of community input on implementation, including effectiveness	ATRT2 analysis of recommendation implementation (e.g. complete, incomplete or ongoing)
Outreach			
3. ICANN should ensure that WHOIS policy issues are accompanied by cross community outreach, including outreach to the communities outside of ICANN with a specific interest in the issues, and an ongoing program for consumer awareness.	Planning is complete and the recommendation was implemented by creation of a detailed communications plan to raise awareness about WHOIS policy issues beyond the ICANN community and to raise consumer awareness related to WHOIS. The plan leverages the regional and industry connections of ICANN staff and regional vice presidents to promote WHOIS awareness through speaking engagements, events, newsletters and blogs. Tools including slide decks, talking points and fact sheets have been developed for their use. A key component of the communications plan is leverage program milestones to generate news media attention and social media chatter. An example of how this works has to do with Communications' work on the recommendations of the Expert Working Group on 25 June. A news release was distributed to ICANN's media list and resulted in more than 25 news articles in publications including IT Avisen, ComputerWorld, TechEye, DomainIncite. Articles appeared in Dutch, English, French, Italian, Norwegian and Russian. Roughly 190 tweets appeared related to the ComputerWorld article alone. Similar efforts are planned for upcoming milestones such as the launch of the portal.	No input was received other than an overall dissatisfaction with the ICANN efforts by the Whois RT.	It is impossible to gauge the not-published communications plan. That notwithstanding, the recent efforts seems to be in the right direction.

Recommendation	Summary of ICANN's assessment of implementation including actions taken, implementability and effectiveness	Summary of community input on implementation, including effectiveness	ATRT2 analysis of recommendation implementation (e.g. complete, incomplete or ongoing)
	The Communications team is following the Communications Plan to generate news media attention whenever other WHOIS related milestones are reached. For example, the launch of the various WHOIS portals (educational and Search) will be accompanied by outreach as detailed in the Communications Plan. ICANN staff member Dave Piscitello posted information about a recent WHOIS Comment Period to a mailing list comprised of law enforcement professionals all over the world; and will continue to post relevant WHOIS information as needed. Staff also uses Webinars as a means of communicating changes to implementation of the Board's resolution. For example, Webinars have been held by Staff to keep the Community apprised of the status of implementation of the WHOIS RT recommendations, the RAA negotiations, and of the Expert Working Group Preliminary Report. This recommendation was also implemented through the work to create the information portal to become the single source of information and data on WHOIS and the development of a blueprint for a new model of delivery data directory services that will be sent to GNSO Council for further policy development. Percent complete: 60% complete in total.		

Recommendation	Summary of ICANN's assessment of implementation including actions taken, implementability and effectiveness	Summary of community input on implementation, including effectiveness	ATRT2 analysis of recommendation implementation (e.g. complete, incomplete or ongoing)
	Communication plan development is 100% done. Deployment of information portal is 20% complete.		
Compliance			
4. ICANN should ensure that its compliance function is managed in accordance with best practice principles, including full transparency on resourcing and structure; provide annual reports; appoint a senior executive whose sole responsibility would be to oversee and manage ICANN's compliance function (reporting to Board Committee); provide all necessary resources to manage and scale compliance team's activities.	1) People - grow staff in skills and expertise and number; Increase staff to 15 FTEs and contractors based on projects; Compliance led by VP reporting to CEO (100% complete) 2)Processes - build, communicate, implement and publish operational processes (100%) 3) Systems - consolidate and automate the fragmented tools (100% for WHOIS; 50% for the full consolidation of other systems) 4) Communication (100%) -Annual Report redesigned and published in 6 UN languages to provide data on budget and across all areas -Monthly Updates published in 6 UN languages 5) Performance Measurement - Metrics published on MyICANN (100%) 6) Audit Program launched (Year one 80% complete)	Relatively little community input was received. Representatives of At-Large expressed concern over the ability of Compliance to address the Whois issue effectively.	The designation of the head of Compliance as a Vice-President reporting to the CEO, although not as strong as what the RT recommended is a step in the right direction. Staff FTEs were reported as being at 15 in May 2013, but by August were down to XX which is disturbing, and organization charts seem to be out of date. Neither is in keeping with the recommendation's "including full transparency on resourcing and structure". Monthly updates and annual reports, although they provide a lot of data, lack clarity and numbers at times do not tally in any understandable way. Usage of such terms as "Complaint Prevention" to describe the number of complaints received is at best

Recommendation	Summary of ICANN's assessment of implementation including actions taken, implementability and effectiveness	Summary of community input on implementation, including effectiveness	ATRT2 analysis of recommendation implementation (e.g. complete, incomplete or ongoing)
			confusing and at worst deceptive.
Data Accuracy			
5. ICANN should ensure that the requirements for accurate WHOIS data are widely and proactively communicated, including to current and prospective Registrants, and should use all means available to progress WHOIS accuracy, including any internationalized WHOIS data, as an organizational objective.	Communications Dept. Response: The percentage complete should be marked 80% complete. This percent is based on four aspects, each weighted at 25% of the project. Creation of the informational portal is 20% done and a beta version is expected by 31 August 2013. The Registrant Rights & Responsibilities document is 100% complete. A detailed communications plan has been developed to promote the WHOIS portal upon its launch on 31 August and this aspect is 100% complete. Staff has prepared a prepared a "What is WHOIS?" slide deck to be used by regional vice presidents in their outreach, and a fact sheet. A list of organizations that might be interested in the issue has been assembled and will be used when the portal is up and running. The portal will be "kicked off" with an announcement and news release and supplemented by social media outreach. The Expert Working Group has developed a blueprint for a new model for delivery data directory services that will be sent to the GNSO Council for further policy development. (100% complete). Online Services Response: ICANN is creating a WHOIS educational portal to	Little direct input from the community.	Although staff reports much work being done, little has been seen by the community, so it is hard to evaluate just how effective it is.

Classing the EWG work as complete based on a draft report that is in the middles of a comment period and has been subject to much community discussion is perhaps too optimistic.

The Registrant Rights and Responsibilities document referred to as being complete is the one that is now called Registrant XX and Responsibilities, terminology that has caused some user representatives to significantly downgrade its importance. |

Recommendation	Summary of ICANN's assessment of implementation including actions taken, implementability and effectiveness	Summary of community input on implementation, including effectiveness	ATRT2 analysis of recommendation implementation (e.g. complete, incomplete or ongoing)
	more broadly communicate and disseminate WHOIS content and to be the authoritative single source of WHOIS policies and information. We are in requirements definition phase, along with content gathering, and expect to rapidly progress to development. Our current timeline is a beta launch of the site by August 31st, with community testing and feedback to follow for a 30 day period. Following are a selection of requirements for the portal: 　• A historical account of WHOIS and how it got to where it's at today 　• What WHOIS provides as a service offering 　• How WHOIS works from a technical perspective 　• The policies and documentation that governs WHOIS 　• Information on organizations working to improve WHOIS and ways for interested　parties to become more involved 　• Educational Tutorials and FAQs to solve peoples' most critical challenges related to WHOIS 　• Integrated support ticketing with ICANN compliance		
6. ICANN should take appropriate measures to reduce the number of WHOIS registrations that fall into the accuracy groups "Substantial Failure and Full Failure" (as	In progress -ICANN staff has concerns regarding adopting the NORC definition of accuracy, as it will not be possible to produce the desired outcome with automated tools. If the Substantial Failure and Full Failure measure, as defined by NORC, is	No community input other than At-Large expressing doubt that there is any movement in this area.	It would appear that there is progress being made, although extracting that information has been difficult. Based on a comment in a

Recommendation	Summary of ICANN's assessment of implementation including actions taken, implementability and effectiveness	Summary of community input on implementation, including effectiveness	ATRT2 analysis of recommendation implementation (e.g. complete, incomplete or ongoing)
defined by the NORC Data Accuracy Study, 2009/10) by 50% within 12 months and by 50% again over the following 12 months. 7. ICANN shall produce and publish an accuracy report focused on measured reduction in WHOIS registrations that fall into the accuracy groups "Substantial Failure and Full Failure" on an annual basis.	adopted, ICANN will not be able to accomplish this with automation and further discussion is required On further probing, the ATRT2 was told: ICANN has completed (but not fully documented) a preliminary assessment of implementing a statistical analysis program following the methodology used in the NORC study. As previously discussed the study calls for phone validation, which is costly to operationalize and we are looking at competitive analysis to find the best rate for this option. In parallel, we are looking at alternative means of verifying and validating WHOIS sample data. To accomplish this we are discussing the issue with businesses and experts in identity verification, but have yet to identify a methodology that will yield acceptable results. By September 2nd we will finalize and propose the statistical analysis and record verification and validation methodology along with estimated costs.		Board meeting report, it would appear that ICANN is also developing an automated tool to evaluate Whois data, at least in many population centres, and this was verified by ICANN staff when queried. It is unclear when all of this work will culminate in starting to look at and improve Whois accuracy, but it appears that instead of a reduction of 50% in 12 months, we may have the ability to set a baseline some time into the second year after Board action on the Whois RT recommendations. Any discussion about annual reports is premature at this point.
8. ICANN should ensure that there is a clear, unambiguous and enforceable chain of contractual agreements with registries, registrars, and registrants to require the provision and maintenance of accurate WHOIS data; agreements should ensure	Staff went through an extensive internal process to identify areas to improve the registry and registrar agreements. The outcome of this effort led to the additional negotiation topics for the RAA negotiations and the new gTLD Registry Agreements. ICANN received resistance from the contracted		The terms in the new RAA are orders of magnitude better than those in previous RAAs, and the RAA combined with terms in the new gTLD agreements, will hopefully move most or all registrars to the 2013 RAA within a year or

Recommendation	Summary of ICANN's assessment of implementation including actions taken, implementability and effectiveness	Summary of community input on implementation, including effectiveness	ATRT2 analysis of recommendation implementation (e.g. complete, incomplete or ongoing)
that clear, enforceable and graduated sanctions apply to registries, registrars and registrants that do not comply with its WHOIS policies; sanctions should include de-registration and/or deaccreditation in cases of serious or serial noncompliance.	parties during negotiations resulted in language that differed from original proposals.		two. That being said, it is disappointing that ICANN had to lower its goals in such a critical area. How effective this will all be remains to be seen. Under the old RAAs, it is unclear whether any enforcement action was possible due to Whois inaccuracies (a claim which was not confirmed or denied by Compliance) – certainly none was taken during the first 6 months of 2013. Under the 2013 RAA, enforcement is possible. It remains to be seen whether there will be any. It may be that in many cases, Whois inaccuracy is associated with transient domain names and the solution under the current regime is to simply delete the name. [Need additional statement here on penalties for serial infractions.]
9. Board should ensure that the			

Recommendation	Summary of ICANN's assessment of implementation including actions taken, implementability and effectiveness	Summary of community input on implementation, including effectiveness	ATRT2 analysis of recommendation implementation (e.g. complete, incomplete or ongoing)
Compliance Team develop metrics to track the impact of the annual WHOIS Data Reminder Policy (WDRP) notices to registrants; metrics should be used to As per (1) above, the Board will initiate a policy on the purpose of the gTLD WHOIS service, and this will help drive the principles behind privacy/proxy develop and publish performance targets, to improve data accuracy over time; if this is unfeasible, Board should ensure that an alternative, effective policy is developed and implemented that achieves the objective of improving data quality, in a measurable way.			
Data Access – Privacy and Proxy Services			
10. ICANN should initiate processes to regulate and oversee privacy and proxy service providers; processes should be developed in consultation with all interested stakeholders and note relevant GNSO studies; a possible approach to achieving this would be to establish an accreditation system for all proxy/privacy			

Recommendation	Summary of ICANN's assessment of implementation including actions taken, implementability and effectiveness	Summary of community input on implementation, including effectiveness	ATRT2 analysis of recommendation implementation (e.g. complete, incomplete or ongoing)
service providers, and consider the merits (if any) of establishing or maintaining a distinction between privacy and proxy services; goal is to provide clear, consistent and enforceable requirements for the operation of these services consistent with national laws, and to strike an appropriate balance between stakeholders with competing but legitimate interests -- including privacy, data protection, law enforcement, the industry around law enforcement and the human rights community. A list of objectives for regulation is provided for consideration, including: labeling WHOIS entries made by a privacy or proxy service; providing full WHOIS contact details for the privacy/proxy service provider; adopting agreed standardized relay and reveal processes and timeframes; Registrars should disclose their relationship with any proxy/privacy service provider; maintaining dedicated abuse points of contact for each provider; conducting periodic due			

Recommendation	Summary of ICANN's assessment of implementation including actions taken, implementability and effectiveness	Summary of community input on implementation, including effectiveness	ATRT2 analysis of recommendation implementation (e.g. complete, incomplete or ongoing)
diligence checks on customer contact information; maintaining the privacy and integrity of registrations in the event that major problems arise with a privacy/proxy provider; and providing clear and unambiguous guidance on the rights and responsibilities of registered name holders, and how those should be managed in the privacy/proxy environment.			
Data Access – Common Interface			
11. It is recommended that the Internic Service is overhauled to provide enhanced usability for consumers, including the display of full registrant data for all gTLD domain names (whether those gTLDs operate thin or thick WHOIS services); operational improvements should include enhanced promotion of the service to increase user awareness.			
Internationalized Domain Names			
12. ICANN should task a working group within six months of publication of this report, to determine appropriate internationalized domain name			

Recommendation	Summary of ICANN's assessment of implementation including actions taken, implementability and effectiveness	Summary of community input on implementation, including effectiveness	ATRT2 analysis of recommendation implementation (e.g. complete, incomplete or ongoing)
registration data requirements and evaluate available solutions; at a minimum, the data requirements should apply to all new gTLDs, and the working group should consider ways to encourage consistency of approach across the gTLD and (on a voluntary basis) ccTLD space; working group should report within a year.			
13. The final data model, including (any) requirements for the translation or transliteration of the registration data, should be incorporated in relevant Registrar & Registry agreements within 6 months of Board adoption of working group's recommendations, or put explicit placeholders in the new gTLD program agreements, & in existing agreements when they come up for renewal.			
14. Metrics should be developed to maintain and measure the accuracy of the internationalized registration data and corresponding data in ASCII, with clearly defined compliance methods and targets.			

Recommendation	Summary of ICANN's assessment of implementation including actions taken, implementability and effectiveness	Summary of community input on implementation, including effectiveness	ATRT2 analysis of recommendation implementation (e.g. complete, incomplete or ongoing)
Detailed and Comprehensive Plan			
15. ICANN should provide a detailed and comprehensive plan within 3 months after the submission of the Final WHOIS Review Team report that outlines how ICANN will move forward in implementing these recommendations.			
Annual Status Reports			
16. ICANN should provide at least annual written status reports on its progress towards implementing the recommendations of this WHOIS Review Team. The first of these reports should be published one year, at the latest, after ICANN publishes the implementation plan mentioned in recommendation 15, above.			