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Introduction and Background

Margie Milam
Background

- ICANN Board directives
  - Implement the WHOIS Review Team recommended improvements
  - Redefine the purpose and provision of gTLD registration data
- Expert Working Group (EWG) formed to assess the need for Next Generation Registration Directory Service (RDS) and identify a replacement for WHOIS
Latest WHOIS Statistics

Steven Pedlow
WHOIS Pilot Accuracy Report
WHOIS Accuracy Reporting System

• Proactively identify inaccurate WHOIS records
• Explore using automated tools
• Forward potentially inaccurate records to registrars for action
• Publicly report on the resulting actions
NORC Pilot Report – WHOIS Accuracy

• Collaboration with: UPU, DigiCert, Strikelion to examine (registrant fields only):
  √ email, telephone numbers and postal addresses
  √ syntactic and operational validation

Findings include comparisons of accuracy rates from different perspectives, including:
  o Registrars under 2009 RAA vs 2013 RAA
  o New gTLDs vs. prior gTLDs
  o Geographic Regions
Sample Design

- 100,000 total domains, oversampling new gTLDs
- New gTLDs (1.4 percent of domains, 25 percent of sample)
  - Minimum of 10 (or all if less than 10) from EVERY gTLD
  - Total of 25,000 domains selected from 318 new gTLDs
- Prior gTLDs (98.6 percent, 75 percent of sample)
  - Minimum of 30 (or all if less than 30) from EVERY gTLD
  - Total of 75,000 domains selected from 20 prior gTLDs
- Each gTLD is a separate systematic sample
  - Every $k^{th}$ record selected starting from the $i^{th}$ record
Sample Design (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Full Sample</th>
<th>10,000</th>
<th>Selection Rate</th>
<th>1,000</th>
<th>Selection Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa (AF)</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin Amer./Carib.</td>
<td>3,380</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(LAC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia/Aust./Pac.</td>
<td>20,176</td>
<td>1,784</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(AP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe (EUR)</td>
<td>23,417</td>
<td>2,071</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North America</td>
<td>50,768</td>
<td>4,490</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(NA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing (.)</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL/OVERALL</td>
<td>98,821</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Two subsamples needed; systematic sorting used

DRAFT RESULTS
### Scope of Pilot

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHOIS Records randomly selected</th>
<th>Address Validation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100,000 records from zone files</td>
<td>Universal Postal Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Syntactical (10,000 records)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operational (1,000 records)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phone Validation</th>
<th>Email Validation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DigiCert</td>
<td>Strikelron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syntactical (10,000 records)</td>
<td>Syntactical &amp; Operational Approximately 100,000 records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational (1,000 records)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ARS Report Requirements

- Accuracy rates: new gTLDs and prior gTLDs
- Accuracy rates: registrars under 2013 RAA versus prior versions
- Compliance rates: validation and verification of certain WHOIS Contact Data requirements, as listed in the WHOIS Accuracy Program Specification to the RAA
- Accuracy rates for registrars, registries and registrants located in the five ICANN Geographic Regions
- Ranking of each ICANN accredited registrar and gTLD registry
- Trend analysis: historical data & improvements/decline in accuracy rates
Preliminary Findings

• Registrars under 2013 RAA have higher Operational accuracy on email addresses, but lower Syntactical accuracy on postal addresses

• New gTLDs and Prior gTLDs perform substantially similar – some differences are statistically significant, but slight

• Geographic Regions:
  § Europe and Latin America/Caribbean have highest accuracy ratings for postal addresses, North America for Syntactical telephone numbers
  § Africa lowest accuracy ratings for Syntactical telephone/postal, Asia/Pacific for Operational email
Accuracy Rating Classifications

**Accurate**
- No Failure
- Minimal Failure
- Limited Failure

**Inaccurate**
- Substantial Failure
- Full Failure
Accuracy Percentages Across RAAs New vs. Prior gTLDs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All gTLDs</th>
<th>2009 RAA</th>
<th>2013 RAA</th>
<th>Prior gTLDs</th>
<th>New gTLDs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Syntactical:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>99.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>88.7</td>
<td>90.1</td>
<td>89.9</td>
<td>88.0</td>
<td>90.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postal</td>
<td>81.2</td>
<td>85.9</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>79.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operational:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>89.2</td>
<td>81.7</td>
<td>89.8</td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td>90.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone*</td>
<td>72.4</td>
<td>79.6</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>74.3</td>
<td>66.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postal*</td>
<td>82.4</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>82.4</td>
<td>82.4</td>
<td>82.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Small Sample Size (1,000)
## Accuracy Percentages - ICANN Geographic Regions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Regions</th>
<th>Africa</th>
<th>Asia Australia Pacific</th>
<th>Europe</th>
<th>Latin America Caribbean</th>
<th>North America</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Syntactical:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>99.5</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>99.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>88.7</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>82.6</td>
<td>85.9</td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td><strong>96.1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postal</td>
<td>81.2</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>74.9</td>
<td><strong>91.2</strong></td>
<td>92.0</td>
<td>79.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operational:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>89.2</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td><strong>83.2</strong></td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>89.8</td>
<td>91.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone*</td>
<td>72.4</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>76.7</td>
<td>85.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postal*</td>
<td>82.4</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>71.9</td>
<td><strong>93.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>92.0</strong></td>
<td>81.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Small Sample Size (1,000)

DRAFT RESULTS
## Sample Sizes for Ten Largest gTLDs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TLD</th>
<th>100,000</th>
<th>10,000</th>
<th>1,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.com</td>
<td>44,399</td>
<td>4,518</td>
<td>451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.net</td>
<td>12,539</td>
<td>1,261</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.org</td>
<td>8,726</td>
<td>883</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.info</td>
<td>4,725</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.xyz (New)</td>
<td>3,282</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.biz</td>
<td>2,215</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.berlin (New)</td>
<td>1,504</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.club (New)</td>
<td>1,162</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.guru (New)</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.mobi</td>
<td>781</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Email Accuracy for Ten Largest gTLDs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TLD</th>
<th>Syntactical</th>
<th>Operational</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>gTLD A</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>91.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gTLD B</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>96.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gTLD C</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>93.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gTLD D</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>92.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gTLD E</td>
<td>99.99</td>
<td>91.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gTLD F</td>
<td>99.95</td>
<td>91.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gTLD G</td>
<td>99.94</td>
<td>90.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gTLD H</td>
<td>99.92</td>
<td>90.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gTLD I</td>
<td>99.89</td>
<td>88.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gTLD J</td>
<td>99.88</td>
<td>88.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sample Sizes for Ten Largest Registrars

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TLD</th>
<th>100,000</th>
<th>10,000</th>
<th>1,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GoDaddy.com, LLC</td>
<td>28,431</td>
<td>2,761</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eNom, Inc.</td>
<td>7,243</td>
<td>1,055</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network Solutions, LLC</td>
<td>6,720</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tucows Domains Inc.</td>
<td>4,511</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1&amp;1 Internet AG</td>
<td>4,362</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMO Internet, Inc.</td>
<td>2,444</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDR Ltd.</td>
<td>2,331</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wild West Domains, LLC</td>
<td>1,887</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSI-USA, Inc.</td>
<td>1,633</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>united-domains AG</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Email Accuracy for Ten Largest Registrars

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Registrar</th>
<th>Syntactical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Registrar A</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registrar B</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registrar C</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registrar D</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registrar E</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registrar F</td>
<td>99.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registrar G</td>
<td>99.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registrar H</td>
<td>99.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registrar I</td>
<td>99.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registrar J</td>
<td>99.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TLD</th>
<th>Operational</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Registrar F</td>
<td>94.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registrar D</td>
<td>94.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registrar I</td>
<td>94.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registrar A</td>
<td>94.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registrar E</td>
<td>93.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registrar G</td>
<td>92.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registrar C</td>
<td>92.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registrar H</td>
<td>92.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registrar B</td>
<td>92.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registrar J</td>
<td>89.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Study Implications & Lessons Learned

• Definitions - careful examination needed
  
  o Example: alternative “syntactical” definitions produce different results

  Should it include a check of the validity of domain name or just conformity to RFC requirements?

• Methodology for producing an overall score across perspectives

• Exploring Identity Validation
  
  o Complexity & Cost Concerns
  
  o What degree of validation is feasible/acceptable?

• Sample Sizes & Confidence Levels
Milestones & Timelines

Preliminary Findings
ICANN LA
Oct 14

Phase I
Syntactical Validation
ICANN 52
Feb 15

Phase II
Operational validation
ICANN 53
June 15

Phase III
Identity?
FY17

Full Pilot Study Report & Public Comment
Oct 14
Additional Information and Next Steps

• Preliminary Findings Paper posted [here](#).
• Full Study Report to be Published after LA.
• Public Comment to be Open until 31 Dec 2014,
seeking feedback on

  Methodology, Approach & Proposed Design of ARS

• Volunteer for Registrar ARS Working Group until 1 Nov by sending email to:

  SI-Volunteer@icann.org
Highlights of WHOIS Activities
PRIVACY & PROXY SERVICES
ACCREDITATION ISSUES (PPSAI)
POLICY DEVELOPMENT PROCESS (PDP)

Don Blumenthal

PDP Working Group Chair
Board-initiated GNSO PDP

• Develop policy recommendations to guide ICANN’s planned Privacy & Proxy Services Accreditation Program
  - WG chartered by GNSO Council in October 2013 following Board approval of 2013 Registrar Accreditation Agreement (RAA)
  - 2013 RAA contains temporary specification on P/P services (expiring January 1, 2017)

• WG on track to publish Initial Report for public comment in early 2015
Issues & Preliminary Conclusions

• Multiple issues categorized as General, Registration, Maintenance, Contact Points, Relay, Reveal, Termination

• Preliminary conclusions agreed on Registration, Maintenance, Contact Points, Relay (partial – on requirements to forward electronic communications)

WG currently focusing on Reveal:

• Recommended definitions: “Publication” distinct from “Disclosure”

• Standards may differ for different types of requestors (e.g. law enforcement, IP owners, anti-abuse queries, consumer requests)
Further Information

• WG face-to-face meeting/community feedback session on **Wednesday 15 October, 0815-0945, Beverly Hills Room**: http://la51.icann.org/en/schedule/wed-ppsai

• WG Workspace: https://community.icann.org/x/9iCfAg

WHOIS Conflicts with National Law

Jamie Hedlund, ICANN
WHOIS Conflicts with National Law

• What is it? How does it differ from Data Retention Waivers?
• Why was it developed?
• What’s going on now?
• Need more information?

GAC WHOIS Concerns

Heather Dryden, GAC Chair
Brief Updates

- Thick WHOIS
- IETF RDAP Protocol
- Compliance Activities
- Internationalized Registration Data
- WHOIS Website
Thick WHOIS Policy Implementation

Francisco Arias, ICANN
Thick WHOIS - Status

• Board adopted the GNSO Policy Recommendations on 7 Feb. 2014

• Two expected outcomes

  1. Transition from thin to thick WHOIS for .COM, .NET, .JOBS

  2. Consistent labeling and display of WHOIS output as per specification 3 of the 2013 RAA for all gTLDs

• ICANN Staff currently working with the IRT

  o Implementation plan being developed

  o Conclusions of the legal review of issues associated with the transition from thin to thick WHOIS expected in November 2014
Thick WHOIS – Next Step

• Implementation work
  o Finalize and deploy a community outreach plan
  o Discuss implementation details with affected parties

• Community Involvement
  o All gTLD registries and registrars should be aware
  o Interested parties may get involved in the IRT
  o Thick WHOIS Implementation Working Session at ICANN51: Thursday 16 Oct. at 8:30 in Constellation
IETF RDAP Protocol
What is RDAP

• A protocol to replace (port-43) WHOIS

• Benefits:
  o Internationalization
  o Standardized query, response, and error messages
  o Extensibility
  o Distributed sources (redirection)
  o Differentiated access
  o Searchability
History on Replacing the WHOIS Protocol

• SAC 051 Advisory (19 Sep 2011)
  o The ICANN community should evaluate and adopt a replacement domain name registration data access protocol
• Board resolution adopting SAC 051 (28 October 2011)
• Roadmap to Implement SAC 051 (4 June 2012)
• RDAP Community development within IETF WG since 2012
• Contractual provisions in 2012 RA & 2013 RAA
• RDAP RFCs expected in the next few months
• Potential synergies w/thick WHOIS Policy implementation?

#ICANN51
Compliance Activities

Owen Smigelski, ICANN
Contractual Compliance Update

• Additional WHOIS requirements with the 2013 RAA related WHOIS Accuracy Verification and Validation, WHOIS Format and SLA

• Implemented WHOIS Closure Codes for community reporting

• Implemented a WHOIS quality process to periodically confirm compliance for suspended domains related to WHOIS Inaccuracy complaints

• Reduced WHOIS processing time by 5 days due to additional system validation

• Publishing the Monthly Compliance Dashboard https://features.icann.org/compliance

#ICANN51
Top 5 Closure Reasons: Jun 2014 – Sep 2014

Whois Inaccuracy: Closure Reasons

- Domain suspended or canceled: 42.0%
- Duplicate complaint (closed): 16.3%
- Domain not registered: 13.6%
- Registrar verified correct: 11.8%
- Complainant's own domain name: 16.3%

Whois Format: Closure Reasons

- Rr corrected format: 53.7%
- Format compliant at submission: 9.8%
- Invalid Rr: 9.8%
- Customer service not in RAA: 12.2%
- Fixed issue: 14.6%
WHOIS Inaccuracy – Quality Review Results

- Reviewed WHOIS Inaccuracy complaints that were closed due to Domain Suspended
- Out of 1,296 complaints sampled found 81% remained suspended

#ICANN51
WHOIS Average Turn Around Time

Average Business Days Turn Around Time
- Complaint Received by ICANN to Submitted to Registrar
- Complaint Received by ICANN to Closed

#ICANN51
WHOIS Inaccuracy Impact of 2013 RAA

Registrar Complaints by Contract Year
May 2013 – Sep 2014

WHOIS INACCURACY
WHOIS FORMAT
WHOIS SLA
WHOIS UNAVAILABLE

#ICANN51
Internationalized Registration Data

Steve Sheng, ICANN
Activities in this Area

• GNSO PDP on Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information

• WHOIS Review Team Internationalized Registration Data Expert Working Group

• Study to Evaluate Solutions for the Submission and Display of Internationalized Contact Data
GNSO PDP on Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information

Charted to answer two questions:

1. Whether it is desirable to translate contact information to a single common language or transliterate contact information to a single common script.

2. Who should decide who should bear the burden translating contact information to a single common language or transliterating contact information to a single common script.

In addition, the Group also considers related questions such as:

- What are the benefits of transformation (translation or transliteration) in light of potential costs?
- Should transformation be mandatory in all gTLDs?
- Should transformation be mandatory for all registrants or only those based in certain countries and/or using specific non-ASCII scripts?
Recent Developments

• Input from SO/ACs and SG/Cs has been received and discussed.

• The Group has discussed a straw man proposal and is currently in the process of drafting its Initial Report, to be published shortly after ICANN51.

• Publication of Final Report for ICANN52 or shortly after.
WHOIS Review Team IRD Expert Working Group

• Chartered to:
  o Develop requirements for internationalized registration data
  o Produce data model that matches the requirement

• Recent Developments
  o WG expected to release final report shortly after ICANN51
IRD Solutions Study

Chartered to document current practices and transformation possibilities for internationalized registration data

1. Look into practices of handling IRD
   - Electronic merchants and online services
   - Registries and registrars in geographies using local languages
   - Protocols on submission, storage, transmission and display

2. Assess accuracy of transforming IRD
Recent Developments

• Final Report will be published in 2014

• Key findings:

  • No responding registrar or registry is currently transforming registrant data;

  • Provisioning and querying protocols are lacking either support or deployment for internationalized registration data; and

  • None of the tools tested is providing a high level of accuracy and consistency in its transformation of internationalized registration data.
WHOIS Website

Margie Milam, ICANN
Other Implementation Activities

WHOIS Website - whois.icann.org

• Single Look-Up Portal for All gTLDs
• WHOIS Primer: http://whois.icann.org/en/primer
• Available in multiple languages
• Knowledge Center contains the latest WHOIS related documents
• Developing - interactive accuracy statistics
ICANN's WHOIS Lookup gives you the ability to lookup any generic domains, such as "icann.org" to find out the registered domain owner. Help us continue to improve WHOIS and share your thoughts!
Future of WHOIS - EWG Report

Susan Kawaguchi, EWG
About the EWG

• Formed to break decade-long impasse
  o Members brought diverse expertise and experiences to bear on this complex problem
  o Discussed issues frankly, participated individually, and sought compromises

• Working together to find an answer to the ICANN Board’s question

Is there an alternative to today’s WHOIS to better serve the global Internet community?
EWG’s Final Report

• Details a proposed next-generation Registration Directory Service (RDS)
• Strikes a balance between
  o Accuracy
  o Access
  o Privacy
  o Accountability
• Collects, validates and discloses gTLD data for permissible purposes only
• Safeguarded through a new paradigm of purpose-driven gated access

#ICANN51
Next Steps

- ICANN Board is now considering how to use EWG’s Final Report as a foundation for Board-requested GNSO Policy Development Process (PDP)

- Next Step: Collaboration Group to explore how to best structure PDP(s) for success

- All interested parties are invited to
  - Contribute ideas about PDP structure: input-to-ewg@icann.org
  - Provide feedback on RDS as part of PDP(s)
## gTLD Registration Services Policy Development Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nov 2012</td>
<td>Board</td>
<td>Direct preparation of an Issue Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 2012</td>
<td>Board</td>
<td>Launch the EWG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 2013</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Preliminary Issue Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar-Apr 2013</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>➔ Public Comment Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun 2013</td>
<td>EWG</td>
<td>EWG Initial Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun-Aug 2013</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>➔ Public Comment Forum &amp; Consultations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 2013</td>
<td>EWG</td>
<td>EWG Update Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec-Feb 2014</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>➔ Public Comment Forum &amp; Consultations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun 2014</td>
<td>EWG</td>
<td>EWG Final Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 2014</td>
<td>GNSO Council + Board</td>
<td>Informal collaboration group to discuss next steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Final Issue Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GNSO Council</td>
<td>Develop Charter for PDP Working Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GNSO Council</td>
<td>Adopt Charter (start of next phase)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>➔ Provide input at early stage of PDP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Orange = Mandatory element of GNSO PDP
To learn more about the proposed RDS…

**Download EWG’s Final Report:** [https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=48343061](https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=48343061)

**Read EWG’s RDS FAQs:** [https://community.icann.org/display/WG/EWG+FAQs](https://community.icann.org/display/WG/EWG+FAQs)

**Watch EWG’s RDS Videos:** [https://community.icann.org/display/WG/EWG+Multimedia+Frequently+Asked+Questions](https://community.icann.org/display/WG/EWG+Multimedia+Frequently+Asked+Questions)
Panel Discussion and Public Consultation
Questions & Answers
Engage with ICANN on Web & Social Media

twitter.com/icann
facebook.com/icannorg
linkedin.com/company/icann
youtube.com/user/ICANNnews

gplus.to/icann
weibo.com/icannorg
flickr.com/photos/icann
icann.org