

# Subgroup 4 – Consumer Trust

## Work Statement & Work Plan

### Work Force Identification

<b>Members</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Dmitry Belyavsky</li><li>• Erika Mann</li><li>• Stephanie Perrin</li><li>• Susan Kawaguchi</li></ul>
<b>Rapporteur</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Erika Mann</li></ul>
<b>Scope Objectives</b>	<p>Consistent with ICANN’s mission and <a href="#">Bylaws</a>, Section 4.6(e)(ii), the review team will assess the extent to which the implementation of today’s WHOIS (the current gTLD RDS) promotes consumer trust in gTLD domain names by (a) agreeing upon a working definition of “consumer” and “consumer trust” used in this review, (b) identifying the approach used to determine the extent to which consumer trust needs are met, (c) identifying high-priority gaps (if any) in meeting those needs, and (d) recommending specific measurable steps (if any) the team believes are important to fill gaps.</p>
<b>Comments on Scope, further details</b>	<p>Quick check whether scope needs to be extended since we’re at the end of the current gTLD cycle.</p> <p>Check whether the term ‘trustworthiness’ remains the prime option in determining consumer trust in the gTLD environment.</p>

<p><b>Questions we will need to answer in assessing whether the objective has been reached</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Is the term ‘trustworthiness’ the best and only option in determining consumer trust in the gTLD environment as mentioned in the relevant WHOIS report(s).</li> <li>2) Is the increase in alternative identities (for example FB) an indication that the current use of gTLDs is not sufficiently advocating consumer trust?</li> <li>3) Is the relatively slow uptake of new gTLDs an indication that consumer trust is a less relevant term for users.</li> <li>4) A key high priority gap in understanding the consumer trust environment is apparently the lack of sufficient data, as mentioned in the various WHOIS report(s). Question: Are there new developments that need to be considered.</li> <li>5) Is the decline in awareness for some of the legacy gTLDs (.info, .org) an indication for changing pattern in consumer trust.</li> <li>6) Use factor: URL shorteners and QL codes play a minor role in finding content online, search apparently dominates. Did this situation continue to be relevant in judging consumer trust pattern in the gTLD environment.</li> <li>7) Security and transparency play a major role in defining a trustful Internet environment. Did the current gTLD and WHOIS system achieve this.</li> <li>8) Are regulations like the European GDPR increasing consumer trust if major information is missing in the publicly available WHOIS.</li> </ol>
<p><b>Estimate of comparative complexity of assessment (1=low, 5=high)</b></p>	<p>Level 4</p>
<p><b>Estimate of comparative work load (1=low, 5=high)</b></p>	<p>Level 3</p>
<p><b>Estimate of ideal sub-team size (1-5 persons)</b></p>	<p>4</p>
<p><b>Work Space URL:</b></p>	<p><a href="https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=71604737">https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=71604737</a></p>
<p><b>Mailing List:</b></p>	<p><a href="mailto:rds-whois2-consumertrust@icann.org">rds-whois2-consumertrust@icann.org</a></p>

**Important Background  
Links:**

It may be helpful to start from the list provided on your dedicated Work Space under “Background documents”:

<https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=71604737>

- [WHOIS Review Implementation Reports](#), including
  - [Executive Summary of Implementation Report](#)
  - [Detailed implementation Report](#)
- [WHOIS Review Team Final Report](#) (2012)
- [WHOIS Task Force Final Report \(2007\) \[HTML\]](#) and [\[PDF\]](#)
- [WHOIS Task Force Final Report](#) (2003)
- [WHOIS1 Implementation Briefings on Recommendations 4, 12, 13, 14](#)
- [WHOIS1 Implementation Briefings on Recommendations 5, 8, 10, 11](#)
- [WHOIS1 Implementation Briefings on Recommendations 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 9, 15, 16](#)

## Work Force Timeline

Refer to the RDS-WHOIS2 [work plan](#) for deadlines

## Resources

<b>Requests for ICANN briefings</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Update about the lack of data as reported in the relevant WHOIS reports mentioned above</li></ul>
<b>Requests for ICANN materials</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Short compilation of data to understand current use of new gTLDs in relation to alternative identities (FB etc).</li><li>• Short compilation of data between legacy TLDs and gTLDs to understand the acceptance rate of gTLDs. The acceptance rate might be an important factor in valuing consumer trust</li></ul>
<b>Interviews to be conducted</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• ICANN's Global Domains Division</li></ul>
<b>Need for Independent Expert</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• NOT NEEDED [Evaluate if independent expert is needed</li><li>• If independent expert is needed, subject to budget availability, develop and document<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Scope of work</li><li>○ Skills and experience needed</li><li>○ Timeline &amp; milestones</li><li>○ Deliverables]</li></ul></li></ul>

**Other resources (existing outside studies, articles)**

- Short compilation of data to understand current use of new gTLDs in relation to alternative identities (FB etc). This information might be relevant in determining consumer trust in the gTDL environment.
- Short compilation of data between legacy TLDs and gTLDs to understand the acceptance rate of gTLDs. The acceptance rate might be an important factor in valuing consumer trust.