

Recommendation #1:

Require all new policies implemented to be measured, audited, tracked and enforced by the compliance team. Policy should integrate metrics, measurements, and reporting to ensure that the policy is effective in addressing the issue, and when metrics are defined, compliance would audit, track, report, and enforce as applicable for the policy.

Recommendation #7:

Following a valid WHOIS ARS ticket, or WHOIS inaccuracy complaint, and where there is a pattern of failure to validate as required by the RAA a full audit targeting the relating registrar should be initiated, to check if the registrar follows the contractual obligations, the consensus policies, etc. Sanctions should be applied if deficiencies identified.

Findings:

As detailed in Section 3.2.1, all current compliance activities are separate and conducted individually. WHOIS ARS sampled WHOIS records to do accuracy test, the Audit program sampled registrars to conduct audit, no synergies have been gained through different action tracks.

Rationale:

If a WHOIS record is not accurate due to registrar didn't conduct validation and verification, it shouldn't be a standalone case. A follow up audit will help to mitigate all issues regarding the outstanding registrar.

Impact of Recommendation:

Only related registrars will be impacted by this recommendation <HOW> along with the compliance team. <NEED TO ADD IMPACT OF SUCCESSFUL IMPLEMENTATION AND IMPACT IF NOT IMPLEMENTED>

Feasibility of Recommendation:

This recommendation will make the Audit program more targeted. The compliance team may need further assessment of resources to implement this recommendation.

Implementation:

Level of Consensus: [Document level of RT consensus]

Comment [LPI]: This recommendation is not discussed elsewhere in this report. Need to tie this recommendation to findings and analysis given in Accuracy Report, and to address ICANN62 feedback.

Plenary call Action Item: Susan and Lili to clarify rec 4.7 to indicate the audit would apply only in cases where there is a pattern of failure to validate as required by the RAA

Comment [SK2]: We should discuss clarification of this recommendation at the F2F.

Data Accuracy subgroup asked these questions

What's the proportion of WHOIS inaccuracy complaints falling in Proxy & Privacy Service?

Although ICANN Contractual Compliance receives and processes WHOIS inaccuracy complaints regarding domain names that utilize Privacy and Proxy Services, it does not identify the proportion of complaints this represents. Absent an accreditation system for Privacy and Proxy service providers, it is difficult to automate the accurate identification of domain names subject to Privacy and Proxy services in WHOIS inaccuracy complaints.

9. Have there been any measures for ICANN Org or Registrars or Proxy & Privacy Service Providers to validate and verify the WHOIS data collected from Registrants by Proxy & Privacy Service Providers?

Yes. ICANN Contractual Compliance receives and processes WHOIS inaccuracy complaints regarding domain names using Privacy and Proxy Services, which on occasion are related to the domain name's underlying customer information. This includes inaccurate underlying customer contact information that was revealed to the complaint reporter and invalid underlying email addresses returning delivery failures when communications are sent to the Privacy or Proxy forwarding email address listed in public WHOIS.

10. Besides the PPSAI under implementation, are there any contractual requirements on Proxy & Privacy Service Providers through ICANN or Registrars?

Section 3.14 of the 2013 RAA requires registrars to comply with the Specification on Privacy and Proxy Registrations (P/P Specification). In addition, Section 3.12.4 of the 2013 RAA requires any resellers the registrar utilizes to comply with the P/P Specification.

3.2.1.5 Across Field Validation of WHOIS information

Cross validation of WHOIS information? Where does this stand? What is the compliance issue?

In February 2018, ICANN completed a Request for Information (RFI) on Across Field Validation and nine (9) responses were received. These responses contained updated information regarding current services available to complete across field address validation and verification.

- On 04 May 2018, the Registrar Stakeholder Group requested ICANN org to pause the IRT's work, pending the creation of a permanent policy to be created, possibly via an expedited process, following the Board's adoption of the Temporary Specification to comply with GDPR. The Coalition for Online Accountability opposed this request in an 11 May letter.
- ICANN org distributed a response on 18 June 2018, noting that there are no plans to pause the Across Field Validation work.
- The Registrar Working Group is reviewing the criteria from ICANN org that will be used to determine whether any solution exists in the marketplace that is technically and commercially viable. The working group is expected to respond by 31 July 2018.

Based on this analysis, the subgroup identified the following Problems/Issues: <INSERT HERE, IF ANY, OR STATE NO PROBLEM IDENTIFIED>

To address this issue, the subgroup proposes the following recommendation (further detailed in Section 5): <INSERT HERE, IF ANY, OR STATE NO RECOMMENDATION NEEDED>

Comment [SK3]:

Comment [SK4R3]: Review with subgroup