**ATRT2 – WHOIS RT (Workstream 3) Requests for additional information**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Rec. No.** | **Request** | **Response** |
| 1 | Answer N makes reference to the involvement of the CEO in Compliance. Please provide additional information regarding the nature of and frequency of such involvement?  Answer E makes reference to the “Halogen” system. As this do not seem to be publicly documented, please provide a brief (i.e. 1-2 sentences) description of what it is. The same for “At-Task” if this is not the system provided by Attask.com. | The CEO is kept informed and is consulted as needed regarding compliance; the nature and frequency of such involvement is in the form of one-on-one bi-weekly meetings and/or focused discussions based on initiatives and needs.  Halogen is ICANN’s employee performance management system where staff business initiatives are logged and evaluated at end of every trimester, and bonus payments are based upon these trimester evaluations. AtTask and At-Task are the same. It is the management portfolio system that launched in Beijing and can be found on MyICANN. While the first is performance management, the later is portfolio management that ties to the performance. The CEO uses At-Task to keep apprised of the milestones reached, pending issues of his direct reports, including from the Vice President of Compliance. |
| 2 | The Recommendation called for a single WHOIS policy document integrating all of the formal policy and de facto policy implemented before ICANN and in ICANN’s early years. The product that is being presented as satisfying this is a web page pointing to the formal bits of policy adopted by ICANN, as well as the requested references to Whois policy and implementation, but seems to lack the integrated “all in one place” WHOIS policy currently in effect. An explanation would be appreciated. | It is important to note that Staff has been implementing the "[Action Plan](http://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/documents/resolutions-08nov12-en.htm) to Address WHOIS Policy Review Team Report Recommendations"approved by the ICANN Board on 8 November 2012. This Plan directed staff to "create and maintain a single public source that compiles current gTLD WHOIS requirements for gTLD registries, registrars and registrants (including consensus policies and contractual conditions)." The posted Board rationale for that direction indicated that "The Board notes that there is not a comprehensive gTLD WHOIS policy that addresses all of the issues raised in the Review Team report and in SAC055. There is a set of existing contractual conditions that have been developed over time by negotiation between ICANN and registries and registrars, and a small set of consensus policies that address some aspects of the management of domain name registration data. These presently available conditions and policies should be publicly available from one source."  Unfortunately, it is difficult to distill all of these contractual conditions and consensus policies into a single, easily understood document, as seems to be suggested by the WHOIS RT Recommendations. One of the goals of the WHOIS online portal is to create more of an educational source for all things related to WHOIS. Staff is in the process of developing more simplified content for the online portal that may make it easier for the public to understand the general principles & policies related to WHOIS. |
| 3 | “In progress” is impossible to interpret as an answer to what percentage or portion has been completed. Please provide a more definitive estimate of what has been done to date and what the prognosis (including time-line) is for further progress. | **Communications Dept. Response**: Planning is complete and the recommendation was implemented by creation of a detailed communications plan to raise awareness about WHOIS policy issues beyond the ICANN community and to raise consumer awareness related to WHOIS. The plan leverages the regional and industry connections of ICANN staff and regional vice presidents to promote WHOIS awareness through speaking engagements, events, newsletters and blogs. Tools including slide decks, talking points and fact sheets have been developed for their use.  A key component of the communications plan is leverage program milestones to generate news media attention and social media chatter. An example of how this works has to do with Communications’ work on the recommendations of the Expert Working Group on 25 June. A news release was distributed to ICANN’s media list and resulted in more than 25 news articles in publications including IT Avisen, ComputerWorld, TechEye, DomainIncite. Articles appeared in Dutch, English, French, Italian, Norwegian and Russian. Roughly 190 tweets appeared related to the ComputerWorld article alone. Similar efforts are planned for upcoming milestones such as the launch of the portal.  The Communications team is following the Communications Plan to generate news media attention whenever other WHOIS related milestones are reached. For example, the launch of the various WHOIS portals (educational and Search) will be accompanied by outreach as detailed in the Communications Plan.  ICANN staff member Dave Piscitello posted information about a recent WHOIS Comment Period to a mailing list comprised of law enforcement professionals all over the world; and will continue to post relevant WHOIS information as needed. Staff also uses Webinars as a means of communicating changes to implementation of the Board’s resolution. For example, Webinars have been held by Staff to keep the Community apprised of the status of implementation of the [WHOIS RT recommendations](http://www.icann.org/en/news/announcements/announcement-16apr13-en.htm), [the RAA negotiations](http://www.icann.org/en/news/announcements/announcement-3-30apr13-en.htm), and of the [Expert Working Group Preliminary Report](http://www.icann.org/en/about/learning/webinars/gtld-directory-services-24jun13-en.htm).  This recommendation was also implemented through the work to create the information portal to become the single source of information and data on WHOIS and the development of a blueprint for a new model of delivery data directory services that will be sent to GNSO Council for further policy development.  Percent complete: 60% complete in total. Communication plan development is 100% done. Deployment of information portal is 20% complete. |
| 4 | Reference is made to “the entire Board is monitoring the progress".  Please describe the mode and time-frame of such monitoring. On the assumption that some or all of this monitoring take the form of regular reports, please provide a copy of a recent report (redacted if necessary to ensure appropriate confidentiality). | **Compliance Dept. Response:** The board is consulted and/or informed based on the compliance activities and initiatives. For example, on 30 January 2012, an ICANN board submission was issued to inform members of the first compliance suspension action; on 7 February 2012 at the ICANN board retreat, compliance presented the 3-year plan; on 3 October 2012, the board’s financial approval of the audit program referenced in the response in column E; on 1 February 2013 a gTLD Whois Update was provided during the board workshop;  The reference to “entire board is monitoring the progress” is made in relation to the less formal approach and feedback received from the board members at the ICANN executive and board dinners. Feedback about the monthly updates, audit program, resources, and feedback as it relates to their satisfaction with compliance fulfilling its commitments on the 3-year plan. Please refer to column F response for more details on deliverables.  4 – F ICANN reported on efforts to improve compliance, enforcement and communication at all ICANN meetings;  1) People - grow staff in skills and expertise and number; Increase staff to 15 FTEs and contractors based on projects; Compliance led by VP reporting to CEO (100% complete)  a. Update: Compliance has 4 additional positions planned and is in the process of reviewing applications; plan is to hire 2 in Istanbul and 2 in Singapore.  3) Systems - consolidate and automate the fragmented tools (100% for WHOIS; 50% for the full consolidation of other systems)  Update: Current complaint consolidation is 100% complete; In addition, compliance launched 2 new community requirements: 1) ability to submit multiple complaints per entry 2) ability to submit registry related complaints; Work is underway to launch the PILOT for Whois Inaccuracy Bulk Submission. Target launch by ICANN47.  6) Audit Program launched (Year one 80% complete)  a. Update: Year-1 Audit program 100% complete; Please refer to the published report at this link: <http://www.icann.org/en/resources/compliance/reports> |
| 5, 11 | Please expand on “In progress” as a percentage/portion and the other  “In Progress” answers to provide an accurate picture of where we are and prognosis including time-line for further progress. | **Communications Dept. Response:** The percentage complete should be marked 80% complete. This percent is based on four aspects, each weighted at 25% of the project.  Creation of the informational portal is 20% done and a beta version is expected by 31 August 2013.  The Registrant Rights & Responsibilities document is 100% complete.  A detailed communications plan has been developed to promote the WHOIS portal upon its launch on 31 August and this aspect is 100% complete. Staff has prepared a prepared a “What is WHOIS?” slide deck to be used by regional vice presidents in their outreach, and a fact sheet. A list of organizations that might be interested in the issue has been assembled and will be used when the portal is up and running. The portal will be “kicked off” with an announcement and news release and supplemented by social media outreach.  The Expert Working Group has developed a blueprint for a new model for delivery data directory services that will be sent to the GNSO Council for further policy development. (100% complete).  **Online Services Response:**  ICANN is creating a WHOIS educational portal to more broadly communicate and disseminate WHOIS content and to be the authoritative single source of WHOIS policies and information. We are in requirements definition phase, along with content gathering, and expect to rapidly progress to development. Our current timeline is a beta launch of the site by August 31st, with community testing and feedback to follow for a 30 day period. Following are a selection of requirements for the portal:  • A historical account of WHOIS and how it got to where it's at today  • What WHOIS provides as a service offering  • How WHOIS works from a technical perspective  • The policies and documentation that governs WHOIS  • Information on organizations working to improve WHOIS and ways for interested parties to become more involved  • Educational Tutorials and FAQs to solve peoples' most critical challenges related to WHOIS  • Integrated support ticketing with ICANN compliance |
| 6, 7 | Comment to Recommendation 5 applies here as well. Given that concerns have been raised about whether this Recommendation can be implemented in an effective and efficient manner.  What alternatives to the NORC methodology is ICANN considering to allow this Recommendation to be addressed and how it will be used to improve, monitor and transparently report on the accuracy of WHOIS data?  Methodology notwithstanding, does ICANN believe that the targets outlined in ecommendation 1 will be met (and if yes, what is the base date which the 12 and 24 months periods refer to). If these targets cannot reasonably be met, | **Online Services Response:**  ICANN has completed (but not fully documented) a preliminary assessment of implementing a statistical analysis program following the methodology used in the NORC study. As previously discussed the study calls for phone validation, which is costly to operationalize and we are looking at competitive analysis to find the best rate for this option. In parallel, we are looking at alternative means of verifying and validating WHOIS sample data. To accomplish this we are discussing the issue with businesses and experts in identity verification, but have yet to identify a methodology that will yield acceptable results.  By September 2nd we will finalize and propose the statistical analysis and record verification and validation methodology along with estimated costs. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 8 | Presuming the current proposed RA and RAA are put into place with  no substantive changes with respect to WHOIS, how does this affect completion of this Recommendation and the answers provided.  Please also address the fact that the vast majority of current domains, and specifically all of the current ones may not be subject to the new RA for an indeterminate amount of time. | **Compliance Response:**  8-F Update: ICANN completed the efforts to assess the impact of the new gTLD Agreement and the 2013 RAA on current activities, templates, enforcement and complaints. Efforts are underway to implement the changes. |
| 9 | Please identify the “Board direction” referred to in “No further action  required here per board direction as it relates to the impact of the annual WHOIS Data Reminder Policy - The WRT recommendation as stated is not feasible.”  There seems to be a discrepancy between 20% completion, the recommendation being “not feasible”, and still “In progress”. Please explain. | The Board Direction relates to the adoption of the "[Action Plan to Address WHOIS Policy Review Team Report Recommendations](http://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/documents/resolutions-08nov12-en.htm)" approved by the ICANN Board on 8 November 2012. The Action Plan for Recommendation 9 specifies no additional commitments as it relates to the annual WHOIS Data Reminder Policy because this recommendation if implemented, could not accomplish what the WHOIS-RT intended. Instead, Staff proposed robust proactive accuracy monitoring and reporting obligations that are referenced in Sections 5, 6 and 7, and the creation of the Expert Working Group (EWG) to identify a better solution for achieving a more accurate and reliable database. The reference to “in progress” relates to these ancillary efforts that, when implemented, should better address the goals of the WHOIS RT. |
| 10 | What is the plan, in some detail, for moving forward once the 2013  RAA is ratified by the Board? We not that to date, no action has been publicly taken to initiate a PDP with respect to Privacy and Proxy provider accreditation (or whatever form it is to take). | The RAA was approved by the Board on 27 June 2013 < <http://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/documents/resolutions-27jun13-en.htm#2.b> >. All new gTLD Registries are required to only use registrars that have signed up to the 2013. In addition, as existing registries agreements come up for renewal, ICANN is requesting that their registrars transition to the 2013 RAA. See for example, the .org Registry Agreement posted for [public comment](http://www.icann.org/en/news/public-comment/org-renewal-21jun13-en.htm) on 21 Jun 2013. The announcement states:  **Use of Registrars Accredited Under the 2013 RAA**: A new provision is included to require the registry operator to amend its Registry-Registry Agreement to require registrars to use the 2013 RAA if registrars representing 67% of the registrations in the TLD sign the 2013 RAA. If the remaining registrars do not sign the amended Registry-Registrar Agreement requiring registrars to become a party to the final 2013 RAA within a certain time period, then the registrars' access to the TLD registry system will be suspended (that is, those registrars will not be permitted to add new registrations). This requirement is dependent upon the registry operators of identified comparable gTLDs also submitting similar requests to amend their Registry-Registrar Agreements.  The [2013 RAA](https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action;jsessionid=383086D68B5CF31C36BB4759F92620FF?pageId=40175189) includes an Interim Specification on Privacy/Proxy Services that provides a baseline of requirements to apply to those services . This specification is Interim until 1/1/2017, to allow for the community input on the policy issues. As part of the [Board resolution](http://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/documents/resolutions-28oct11-en.htm#7) that commenced the RAA negotiations, a Board requested GNSO PDP is to be commenced following the conclusion of the negotiations on the “remaining issues” that were not resolved during the negotiations. One of these issues to be addressed in the PDP is the privacy/proxy issues. Shortly after Durban, Staff will publish a paper outlining these issues to commence the PDP. See: <http://gnso.icann.org/issues/raa/fInal-issue-report-raa-06mar12-en.pdf> for more information. |
| 12 | Please expand on “In progress” as a percentage/portion and the other  “In Progress” answers to provide an accurate picture of where we are and prognosis including time-line for further progress.  A reply of “ICANN **WILL** form a team" (emphasis added) seems to indicate rather low priority given the time since the Board resolution. | An [announcement](http://www.icann.org/en/news/announcements/announcement-08jul13-en.htm) for the team, seeking volunteers was published on 8 July 2013. The announcement seeks volunteers who are community representatives with expertise in linguistics, IDNA, policy and registry/registrar operations to participate in a working group to determine appropriate Internationalized Domain Name registration data requirements and data model for Registration Data Directory Services (aka WHOIS services). Once the call for volunteers has closed (16 Aug 2013) the working group will be selected, and is expected to:  - Determine the requirements for internationalized registration data  - Produce a data model for the IRD that matches the requirement  Staff’s work plan for this effort calls for a preliminary requirements document to be published for public comment by the Buenos Aires Meeting, and a draft model by December 2013.  In addition, a Terms of Reference for a Study to Evaluate Available Solutions for the Submission and Display of Internationalized Contact Data has been issued, and ICANN is in the contract approval stage with contractors, and is seeking a preliminary report by 30 Nov 2013, with a final report by Feb 2013.  IRD Working Group: 15% complete  Survey of Available Solutions: 20% complete |
| 13 | Please provide an update on staff and GNSO activities related to  WHOIS translation and transliteration. | A GNSO PDP has been commenced on 13 June 2013, to develop the policies related to translation and transliteration of registration data. The GNSO resolution 20130613-2 states:  … **RESOLVED:**  The GNSO initiates a PDP on the issues defined in the Final Issue Report (see <http://gnso.icann.org/en/issues/gtlds/transliteration-contact-final-21mar13-en.pdf> ) on the translation and transliteration of contact information;  A Working Group will be created for the purpose of fulfilling the requirements of the PDP. The GNSO requests staff to commission a study on the commercial feasibility of translation or transliteration systems for internationalized contact data, which is expected to help inform the PDP Working Group in its deliberations. |
| 14 | Given the proximity to the possible deployment of the first IDN new  TLDs, the lack of progress is troublesome. Please provide an update. | There has been progress since the last update on IDNs as described above in the answers reflected in 12 and 14 above.  Unfortunately, the timeline is linked to the speed in which the community responds to develop the important policy issues, and the complexities of the GNSO PDP process as described in the ICANN Bylaws. This process calls for publication of a [Preliminary Issue Report](http://www.icann.org/en/news/announcements/announcement-2-08jan13-en.htm), (3 Jan 13), a [Public Comment period](http://www.icann.org/en/news/public-comment/report-comments-transliteration-contact-05mar13-en.pdf) (closed 1 Mar 2013), to be followed by the publication of a [Final Issue Report](http://gnso.icann.org/en/issues/gtlds/transliteration-contact-final-21mar13-en.pdf) (21 Mar 13), which takes into account the public comments received.  Once the Final Issue Report was published, the GNSO deferred action on the Final Report over several meetings, which resulted in approximately three months to approve the PDP on the issue of translation/transliteration of contact data.  This output of this PDP work is required to inform the rest of the IRD related implementation work being supervised by Staff. Conclusion of this aspect of the implementation is dependent upon the speed in which the PDP can be completed once the working group is formed. |
| All | Please provide an update regarding substantive changes in implementation since this table was originally completed (over and above the new information provided in response to the preceding comments). | The most substantive change in the implementation since this table was originally completed are the recommendations of the Expert Working Group to sunset WHOIS and bring about a [new directory platform](http://www.icann.org/en/news/announcements/announcement-3-24jun13-en.htm). These recommendations received a great deal of news coverage and discussion on social media and helped to raise awareness of the issue. It also meant that talking points and other materials developed had to be retooled to include messaging about the future of WHOIS.  In addition, the comprehensive nature of the changes to the contractual framework surrounding WHOIS, as reflected in the new 2013 RAA, the Registry Agreements, and in the renewals of existing Registry Agreements also are considerable, and should not be overlooked. This was possible through the strategic direction of the ICANN CEO, who personally attended many of the negotiation sessions in order to affirm ICANN’s commitment to making real changes to WHOIS. |