

Recommendation 2 – The Board should oversee creation of a single WHOIS policy.

- | |
|--|
| 1. What is the rationale for creating a single set of links to policies instead of a single policy document? (i.e., one document someone can read and that explains interconnections, targeted to end users) |
| |
| 2. What specifically is provided and planned for registrant, registrar, registry, other non-ICANN-insider audiences? |
| |

Recommendation 3 – ICANN should ensure that WHOIS policy issues are accompanied by cross-community outreach

- | |
|--|
| 3. How is registrant outreach being done? |
| |
| 4. Why are there two different documents with similar titles for registrant rights/benefits and responsibilities and are both required by RAA (3.7.10 and 3.16)? Is Contractual Compliance an auditing requirement for both? |
| |

Recommendation 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

- | |
|---|
| 5. How does ICANN envision the role of the Consumer Safeguards Director, now and in the future? |
| |

Recommendation 5 - ICANN should ensure that requirements for accurate Whois data are widely and pro-actively communicated

- | |
|---|
| 6. Does the portal provide support for all new gTLDs? (e.g., gTLD .film returns an error message) |
| |
| 7. How often do WHOIS queries performed through the portal fail, is this tracked, and is any action taken to remediate failures? What does ICANN do to ensure that each registry or registrar is compliant with allowing lookups? |
| |
| 8. Why do some WHOIS queries performed through the portal return blank fields? (i.e., some registrar-supplied WHOIS fields appear to be blank in some responses) |
| |
| 9. With regard to compliance checks to verify that Registrars are publishing this info, are Resellers also required to publish this info and does compliance spot-check Reseller publication? |

--

Recommendation 5-9

Recommendation 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.

Recommendation 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 defined by the NORC Data Accuracy Study, 2009/10) by 50% within 12 months and by 50% again over the following 12 months.

Recommendation 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.

Recommendation 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. As part of these agreements, ICANN should ensure that clear, enforceable and graduated sanctions apply to registries, registrars and registrants that do not comply with its WHOIS policies. These sanctions should include de-registration and/or de-accreditation as appropriate in cases of serious or serial non-compliance.

Recommendation 9 -- Board should ensure that the 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.

10. Who is the complainant when an inaccurate record results in compliance ticket that is not remedied and eventually generates a breach notice?
11. Is the percentage of inoperable addresses the percentage of all sampled addresses, or the percentage of just the syntactically correct addresses in the sample?
12. Is there a way through registration obligation to check data? Could inaccurate data be compared against other data (e.g., billing data)?
13. Has the process changed to allow registrar feedback that potentially-inaccurate records were in fact

Implementation Briefing Questions raised during RDS-WHOIS2-RT Meetings #7, #8, #9

correct?
14. Are metrics kept on tickets where addresses were correct? (e.g., format differences that appear to be inaccurate but are not)
15. Does ARS take into account different address formats?
16. Is there a process to handle complaints from parties who claim that a WHOIS record is inaccurate because their data is used in that record without authorization?
17. What is the definition of "untouched" for 2013 RAA grandfathered domain names? (e.g., does it include domain names that were renewed with the same WHOIS?)

Recommendation 8 - ICANN should ensure that there is a clear, unambiguous and enforceable chain of contractual agreements with registries / registrars / registrants to require the provision and maintenance of accurate Whois data

18. When will the Registrar option to renew under the 2009 RAA be disallowed?
19. When can it be expected that all Registrars (not just those offering new gTLDs) will move to 2013 RAA?

Recommendation 10 - ICANN should initiate processes to regulate and oversee privacy proxy service providers

20. Are there any privacy services? (e.g., studies identifying P/P services)
21. What are the reasons for delay between GNSO approval/Board adoption of PPSAI policy and IRT launch?

Recommendation 12 - The final data model, including (any) requirements for the translation or transliteration of the registration data, should be incorporated in the relevant Registrar and Registry agreements within 6 months of adoption of the working group's recommendations by the ICANN Board. If these recommendations are not finalized in time for the next revision of such agreements, explicit placeholders for this purpose should be put in place in the agreements for the new gTLD program at this time, and in the existing agreements when they come up for renewal.

Recommendation 13 - The final data model, including (any) requirements for the translation or transliteration of the registration data, should be incorporated in the relevant Registrar and Registry agreements within 6 months of adoption of the working group's recommendations by the ICANN

Implementation Briefing Questions raised during RDS-WHOIS2-RT Meetings #7, #8, #9

Board. If these recommendations are not finalized in time for the next revision of such agreements, explicit placeholders for this purpose should be put in place in the agreements for the new gTLD program at this time, and in the existing agreements when they come up for renewal.

Recommendation 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.

22. Can staff provide a written briefing with links to where additional detail is available on what was done for each recommendation?

23. What support is provided for internationalized email addresses, where transliteration of an email address may render email sent to that address undeliverable?