



GNSO Discussion with GDD Staff

GNSO Working Session | 6 March 2015

Agenda

1. RDAP/Whois discussion
2. Policy Implementation projects update
 - Thick Whois
 - IGO/INGO
 - IRTPC and D
 - Translation & Transliteration
3. New gTLD Program / Reviews Update
4. Additional topics



ICANN

RDAP Implementation

6 March 2016

History on Replacing the WHOIS Protocol

- ⦿ SSAC's SAC 051 (19 Sep 2011): *The ICANN community should evaluate and adopt a replacement domain name registration data access protocol*
- ⦿ Board resolution adopting SAC 051 (28 Oct 2011)
- ⦿ Roadmap to implement SAC 051 (4 Jun 2012)
- ⦿ RDAP community development within IETF WG began in 2012
- ⦿ Contractual provisions in: .biz, .com, .info, .name, .org, 2012 Registry Agreement (new gTLDs), 2013 Registrar Accreditation Agreement
- ⦿ RDAP Request for Comments (RFCs) published (Mar 2015)
- ⦿ First draft gTLD RDAP profile mapping current contractual and policy obligations posted for public input (Sep 2015)
- ⦿ Second draft of gTLD RDAP profile posted for comment (3 Dec 2015)

RDAP

The Registration Data Access Protocol (RDAP) is a protocol designed to replace the existing WHOIS protocol and provides the following benefits:

1. Standardized query, response, and error messages
2. Secure access to data (i.e., over HTTPS)
3. Bootstrapping mechanism to easily find the authoritative server for a given query
4. Standardized redirection/reference mechanism (e.g., from a thin registry to a registrar)
5. Builds on top of the well-known web protocol HTTP (e.g., eases implementation of the RDAP services by leveraging existing knowledge to run web services)
6. Flexibility to support various policies
7. Extensibility (e.g., easy to add output elements)
8. Internationalization support for registration data (e.g., contact details in Chinese)
9. Optionally enables differentiated access (e.g., limited access for anonymous users, and full access for authenticated users)

Issue 1: Differentiated Access

- ⦿ Key feedback raised by community members includes:
 - ⦿ The RDAP profile “*must include the feature set that will support differentiated access*” (ALAC)
 - ⦿ Differentiated access should be implemented by all new gTLDs but not be enabled until a contract change or consensus policy is in place (IAB)
 - ⦿ Postponing the implementation of RDAP until a consensus policy has been put in place by the Registration Directory Services (RDS) PDP (Neustar)
 - ⦿ Including a requirement for differentiated access for all gTLDs is premature given ongoing work in the community (IPC)
- ⦿ ICANN notes that current draft gTLD RDAP profile allows for differentiated access for those with contracts that permit such feature

Issue 1: ICANN's current thinking

- ⦿ Parties interested in differentiated access should participate in the RDS PDP
- ⦿ Consider moving forward with planned implementation given that:
 - ⦿ RDS PDP is in initial stage
 - ⦿ Length of time before there is a consensus policy on whether differentiated access will be a required feature of any new Registration Data Directory Service (RDDS) for gTLDs
- ⦿ Absent a policy regarding differentiated access, contracted parties are required to implement RDAP as per their agreements
- ⦿ Registries currently have the option to pursue an amendment to their contract to allow such feature in accordance with existing procedures

Issue #2 – Thick Whois vs Registrar’s RDAP

New RDDS fields for inclusion in registry’s RDDS under discussion per Thick Whois policy implementation (currently in registrar’s RDDS):

1. Registrar Registration Expiration Date
2. Registrar Abuse Contact Email
3. Registrar Abuse Contact Phone
4. Reseller

Implementing EPP extensions would also be needed for a registry to provision some of these fields from the registrar

Issue #2 – Thick Whois vs Registrar’s RDAP

- Draft gTLD RDAP profile requires registrars to offer RDAP service for “thin registrations” (i.e., registrations in which the data of the registrant, administrative, or technical contact is not passed to the registry)
- Some registrars have commented that registrar’s RDAP would be of temporary nature given that there is only three remaining thin-Whois gTLDs (.com, .jobs, and .net)

Issue #2 – Options

In order to allow RDDS users to continue to access these four fields:

- A. Should registrars offer RDAP?
- B. Or, should registries show the four additional fields in their RDDS?

Q&A



Policy Implementation Update

GNSO Working Session | 6 March 2015

Thick Whois Policy Implementation

Background

- ⦿ Policy Recommendations adopted by the ICANN Board on 7 February 2014
<http://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/documents/resolutions-07feb14-en.htm#2.c>
- ⦿ Two expected outcomes (per policy recommendation #1)
 - Transition from thin to thick WHOIS for .COM, .NET and .JOBS
 - Consistent labeling and display for all gTLDs per Spec 3 RAA 2013

Status of Consistent Labeling & Display for all gTLDs (CL&D)

- ⦿ Draft Consensus Policy Language in Public Comments (will close on 18 March 2016)
- ⦿ Phased Implementation, synchronized with RDAP Operational Profile
- ⦿ Policy Effective date (current assumption): 1 August 2017

Status of Transition from thin to thick for .COM, .NET & .JOBS

- ⦿ Staff released the Legal Review Memo on 8 June 2015
- ⦿ The IRT is currently exploring an implementation path composed of two parallel tracks each with their own timeline: new vs. existing registrations
- ⦿ IRT to engage RrSG during ICANN 55 to conduct data analysis on existing registrations and inform implementation discussions

Privacy/Proxy Accreditation Implementation

- ⦿ PPSAI recs at public comment until 16 March 2016
- ⦿ Next: Board consideration (next meeting currently scheduled for May 2016)
- ⦿ Staff planning to discuss implementation plan with IRT around July 2016
- ⦿ 2013 RAA Interim Specification on Privacy and Proxy Registrations expires 1 January 2017
- ⦿ Staff to propose extension (to RrSG) upon finalization of implementation project plan

IGO/INGO Identifiers Protection Policy Implementation

Background

- ⦿ Recommendations adopted in part by the ICANN Board on 30 April 2014
<https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-04-30-en#2.a>
- ⦿ Current effort focusing on implementation of protections at top and 2nd level for:
 - Red Cross Red Crescent Movement Scope 1 identifiers
 - IOC Identifiers
 - IGOs Scope 1 Identifiers (Full Names)
 - INGOs Identifiers (ECOSOC General and Consultative Lists)

Current Status

- ⦿ Staff and IRT have been discussing initial draft Consensus Policy Language addressing reservation at top and 2nd level, including exception procedures
- ⦿ Staff and IRT are now focusing on prerequisite to implementation such as the building of authoritative lists of DNS labels, including some challenges arising in the gathering of data required for implementation
- ⦿ Policy Effective date (current assumption): 1 August 2017

IRTP

IRTP C

- Creation of Change of Registrant policy and updates to FOA rules
- Effective 1 August 2016
- Registrar-led roundtable workshop: Thursday, 10 March 2016 08:00 to 09:15, Roseraie

IRTP D

- Updates to Transfer Dispute Resolution Policy
- Effective 1 August 2016




Update on New gTLD Program Reviews

GNSO Working Session | 6 March 2015

New since ICANN54

- ⦿ 23 Dec 2015: Competition, Consumer Trust, and Consumer Choice (CCT) Review Team convened: <https://www.icann.org/news/announcement-2-2015-12-23-en>
- ⦿ 29 Jan 2016: Updated Program Implementation Review report published: <https://www.icann.org/news/announcement-2016-01-29-en>
- ⦿ 17 Feb 2016: Completed public comment period on draft methodology for Continuous Data-Driven Analysis of Root Server System Stability (CDAR): <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-cdar-study-plan-17feb16-en.pdf>
 - ⦿ Study now in process

Estimated Timeline



At ICANN55

Session	Date	Time	Room
CDAR Update	Tues 8 Mar	08:00	Toubkal
CCT Review Team Working Sessions	Wed/Thu 9/10 Mar	09:00 (All Day)	Emeraude
CCT Review Team Engagement	Wed 9 Mar	17:15	Toubkal
GNSO PDP WG on New gTLD Subsequent Procedures	Thu 10 Mar	9:00	Diamant
Rights Protection: PDP and TMCH Independent Review	Thu 10 Mar	10:45	Atlas

Additional Discussion Questions

- What is upcoming in the PDP pipeline?
- Any efforts to highlight in managing the policy work, increasing stakeholder participation in GNSO?
- How can we (GNSO & GDD) work together better?