

# At-Large Explore the Draft Next Generation gTLD Directory Services Model Workspace


| Comment Close Date | Statement Name  | Status             | Assignee (s) and RALO(s)              | Call for Comments | Call for Comments Close | Vote Announcement | Vote Open  | Vote Reminder | Vote Close       | Date of Submission | Staff Contact and Email  | Statement Number         |
|--------------------|---|--------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|------------|---------------|------------------|--------------------|--|--------------------------|
| n/a                | <a href="#">Explore the Draft Next Generation gTLD Directory Services Model</a> | Adopted 9Y, 1N, 0A | <a href="#">Holly Raiche</a> (APRALO) | 27.08.2013        | 30.08.2013 20:00        | 30.08.2013        | 30.08.2013 | 05.09.2013    | 06.09.2013 12:00 | 06.09.2013         | <a href="#">Alice Jansen</a><br><a href="#">alice.jansen@icann.org</a> | AL-ALAC-ST-0913-02-01-EN |

## Explore the Draft Next Generation gTLD Directory Services Model

10

24 June 2013

**ICANN has embarked on an effort to reinvent today's WHOIS system. Be part of the solution and join the discussion...online and at ICANN's Durban meeting.**



In our [Initial Report](#) [PDF, 1.7 MB], we identify the design features and principles that we think are essential in this new system, and a proposed Model for the next generation data directory services to replace WHOIS.

Help shape this paradigm shift by sharing your reaction to our [recommendations](#) [PDF, 1.7 MB] and answering the questions **linked below (click on "Share Your Thoughts")**. Did we meet our objective? Do the recommendations address your concerns? How can we make them better?

## Share Your Thoughts

There are different ways to share your perspective with us:

- Provide your input through our [online questionnaire](#)
- A [webinar](#) on **Monday, 8 July at 15:00-16:30 UTC**: we will walk you through our proposal and invite you to share your views and input.
- A [consultation in Durban](#) on **Monday, 15 July**: we will present the outcome of our work and open the floor for any questions or feedback you may have. A recording of the session will be made available shortly after the meeting;
- Submit comments by email: [input-to-ewg@icann.org](mailto:input-to-ewg@icann.org)

All input received by **August 12** will be carefully considered as we finalize our recommendations and bring our work to a conclusion. To help focus your attention, we request your feedback on a set of questions, although you are free to comment on any aspect of the Initial Report.

Sincerely,

Members of the [Expert Working Group on gTLD Directory Services \(EWG\)](#)

**More Information**


Our work stems from the Board's [directive](#) to redefine the purpose and provision of gTLD registration data, while balancing data accuracy and access issues with safeguards for protecting data. We considered the important community work done over the last decade by the GNSO, the SSAC, the WHOIS Review Team, the GAC and others. Our [Initial Report](#) [PDF, 1.7 MB] reflects our **consensus view** of the design principles and features needed for a new system. Our proposed Model highlights how these design principles and features could be fulfilled in the ICANN domain ecosystem.

**What's Next?**

We will consider your input and present a final report containing our recommended design principles, features, and suggested Model to ICANN's CEO and Board when our work is concluded. This output will feed into a Board-initiated GNSO policy development process to serve as a foundation for the GNSO's creation of new consensus policy, and contractual negotiations, as appropriate.

**FINAL VERSION TO BE SUBMITTED IF RATIFIED**

[Please click here to download a copy of the PDF below.](#)



**FINAL DRAFT VERSION TO BE VOTED UPON BY THE ALAC**

The ALAC has previously expressed its concerns with compliance with the RAA, in particular, both the wording of the RAA which made accuracy requirements difficult to enforce and the difficulty with the ICANN Compliance department in acting to ensure such accuracy. These concerns were echoed in the Final Whois Policy Review Team Report, which the ALAC supported.

The ALAC, therefore, supported the important changes to the RAA and related documents as accepted by the Board in June of this year that hold out promise for significant changes including:

- Stronger obligations on registrars for verification
- Stronger accuracy requirements
- Stronger language for enforcement
- At least a skeleton framework for privacy/proxy services

It is against that background that the ALAC is commenting on the proposals by the Expert Working Group for the Aggregated Registration Data Service (ARDS).

Our first issue is that the significant reforms to Whois data - its access, accuracy and enforcability - have been addressed in reforms to the RAA and related documents. Work on development of the ARDS should not be used as any reason to avoid fully implementing those significant reforms.

That said, the ARDS proposal contains many important changes to the issues surrounding registration data which the ALAC supports.

Specifically, we strongly support the following elements of the ARDS proposal:

- The allowance of tiered access to registration data. The public will still have access to some Whois data, but only those with recognised reasons to access specific data will be able to do so - thus addressing some legitimate privacy concerns with all Whois data being publicly available;
- The provision of a centralised responsibility for data accuracy.

There are still significant issues that will need to be worked through, such as determining who has access to what data, for what reason, and how will the compliance function relating to such service be enforced.

In addition to the above, although this proposal is not intended to look at implementation details, the model must be designed with implementation in mind, including ensuring privacy, reliability, resiliency and addressing jurisdictional issues.

We support continuing discussions on the development of the ARDS proposal, and expect to continue to be involved in those discussion.

--- END OF STATEMENT ---

## **FIRST DRAFT SUBMITTED**

ALAC has previously expressed its concerns with compliance with the RAA, in particular, both the wording of the RAA which made accuracy requirements difficult to enforce and the difficulty with the ICANN Compliance in ensuring such accuracy. The concerns were echoed in the Final Whois Policy Review Team Report, which ALAC supported.

ALAC, therefore, supported the important changes to the RAA and related documents as accepted by the Board in June of this year that hold out promise for significant changes including:

- Stronger obligations on registrars for verification
- Stronger accuracy requirements
- Stronger language for enforcement
- At least a skeleton framework for privacy/proxy services

It is against that background that ALAC is responding to the proposals by the Expert Working Group for the Aggregated Registration Data Service (ARDS).

Our first issue is that the significant reforms to Whois data - its access, accuracy and enforcability - have been addressed in reforms to the RAA and related documents. Work on development of the ARDS should not be seen as any reason not to fully implement those significant reforms.

That said, there ARDS proposed many important changes to the issues surrounding registration data which ALAC supports. Specifically, we strongly support the following elements of the ARDS proposal:

- It will allow tiered access to registration data. The public will still have access to some Whois data, but only those with recognised reasons to access specific data will be able to do so - thus addressing some legitimate privacy concerns with all Whois data being publicly available
- it will provide a centralized responsibility for data accuracy

There are still significant issues that will need to be worked through, such as determining who has access to what data, for what reason, and how will compliance be enforced. However, we support continuing discussions on the development of the ARDS proposal, and expect to continue to be involved in those discussion.