Supporting Organization / Advisory Committee / GNSO Stakeholder Group / GNSO Constituency / Input Template

Next-Generation Registration Directory Services (RDS) to replace WHOIS Policy Development Process Working Group

---

PLEASE SUBMIT YOUR RESPONSE AT THE LATEST **BY [To be confirmed – minimum of 35 days]** TO THE GNSO SECRETARIAT (gnso-secs@icann.org) which will forward your statement to the Working Group.

In April 2015, the ICANN Board reaffirmed 'its request for a Board-initiated GNSO policy development process to define the purpose of collecting, maintaining and providing access to gTLD registration data, and consider safeguards for protecting data, using the recommendations in the Expert Working Group (EWG) Final Report as an input to, and, if appropriate, as the foundation for a new gTLD policy'.

Following the publication of the PDP Final Issue Report, the GNSO Council adopted the charter for the PDP Working Group, which commenced its deliberations at the end of January 2016. During the first phase of its work, the Working Group was tasked with providing the GNSO Council with recommendations on the following two questions: What are the fundamental requirements for gTLD registration data and is a new policy framework and next-generation RDS needed to address these requirements?

To enable effective consideration of the many significant and interdependent policy areas that the GNSO must address, the Board approved a Process Framework, collaboratively developed by GNSO Councilors and Board members, to structure this complex and challenging PDP for success. This phased process includes:

- Phase 1: Establishing requirements to determine if and why a next- generation gTLD registration directory service (RDS) is needed to replace today's WHOIS system;
- Phase 2: If so, designing a new policy framework that details functions that must be provided by a next- generation RDS to support those requirements; and
- Phase 3: Providing guidance for how a next-generation RDS should implement those policies, coexisting with and eventually replacing the legacy WHOIS system.

The Working Group is currently in phase 1 of its work. Additional opportunities for input are anticipated throughout this phase as well as the subsequent phases, if it is decided to move forward beyond phase 1.

Part of the Working Group's effort will be to incorporate ideas and suggestions gathered from ICANN Supporting Organizations, Advisory Committees and GNSO Stakeholder Groups and Constituencies through this template Statement. Inserting your response in this form will make it much easier for the Working Group to summarize and consider the responses. This information is helpful to the community in understanding the points of view of various stakeholders. However, you should feel free to add any information you deem important to inform the Working Group's deliberations, even if this does not fit into any of the questions listed below.

For further information, please visit the WG Workspace (see https://community.icann.org/x/rjJ-Ag). For the membership of the WG, please see https://community.icann.org/x/l4xlAw.

Process

- Please identify the member(s) of your SO/AC/GNSO Stakeholder Group / GNSO Constituency who is (are) participating in this working group
- Please identify the members of your SO/AC/GNSO Stakeholder Group / GNSO Constituency who participated in developing the perspective(s) set forth below
- Please describe the process by which SO/AC/GNSO Stakeholder Group / GNSO Constituency arrived at the perspective(s) set forth below

Questions

1. As part of its initial deliberations aimed at developing a work plan [include link to latest draft], the Working Group identified, gathered and reviewed key documents and information available in relation to charter questions that are expected to be addressed by the Working Group (see the check lists developed by the WG at https://community.icann.org/x/p4xlAw and also inputs identified by the Issue Report for each charter question at https://community.icann.org/x/HIxlAw). Furthermore, the Working

Group identified those documents that it determined to be most relevant in relation to the topics of purpose, data elements and privacy (see [include link]). As a reminder, you will find the charter questions that are expected to be addressed by the PDP Working Group in the Annex to this template.

Are there any documents missing from these input inventories and/or any additional documents or information that you consider necessary to inform the PDP WG as they begin to address the charter questions during phase 1? If so, please identify the documents / information and explain their relevance in relation to the WG's phase 1 deliberations.

Your response:

2. In addition, the WG identified key inputs received from third parties (see documents listed at https://community.icann.org/x/R4xlAw, as well as inputs enumerated in http://whois.icann.org/sites/default/files/files/final-issue-report-next-generation-rds-07oct15-en.pdf, and comments posted at https://community.icann.org/x/sYxlAw). If input from your respective SO/AC/GNSO SG/C has been identified here, please confirm whether this input is still relevant and up to date, and if not, what input the Working Group should be considering.

   Your response:

3. Does your SO/AC/GNSO SG/C have any guidance for the Working Group in relation to the completeness of the charter questions to be address by this PDP WG (see Annex A)?

   Your response:

4. If there is any other information you think should be considered by the WG as part of its deliberations, please feel free to include that here.

   Your response:

ANNEX A – Charter Questions

From https://community.icann.org/x/E4xlAw

The following text is **excerpted verbatim from the WG Charter** in order to **provide a list of key inputs for each question**.

During Phase 1, the PDP WG should, at a minimum, attempt to reach consensus recommendations regarding the following questions:

- **What are the fundamental requirements for gTLD registration data?**
  When addressing this question, the PDP WG should consider, at a minimum, users and purposes and associated access, accuracy, data element, and privacy requirements.

- **Is a new policy framework and next-generation RDS needed to address these requirements?**
  If yes, what cross-cutting requirements must a next-generation RDS address, including coexistence, compliance, system model, and cost, benefit, and risk analysis requirements?
  If no, does the current WHOIS policy framework sufficiently address these requirements? If not, what revisions are recommended to the current WHOIS policy framework to do so?

As part of its Phase 1 deliberations, the PDP WG should work to reach consensus recommendations by considering, ***at a minimum***, the following complex and inter-related questions:

- **Users/Purposes:** Who should have access to gTLD registration data and why?
- **Gated Access:** What steps should be taken to control data access for each user/purpose?
- **Data Accuracy:** What steps should be taken to improve data accuracy?
- **Data Elements:** What data should be collected, stored, and disclosed?
- **Privacy:** What steps are needed to protect data and privacy?
- **Coexistence:** What steps should be taken to enable next-generation RDS coexistence with and replacement of the legacy WHOIS system?
- **Compliance:** What steps are needed to enforce these policies?

- **System Model:** What system requirements must be satisfied by any next-generation RDS implementation?
- **Cost:** What costs will be incurred and how must they be covered?
- **Benefits:** What benefits will be achieved and how will they be measured?
- **Risks:** What risks do stakeholders face and how will they be reconciled?

Refer to the Phase 1 Documents page (https://community.icann.org/x/p4xlAw) for initial WG efforts to identify and create summaries of key input documents to inform the WG's work plan, prior to WG deliberation on Phase 1 questions.