**DMPM Use Case – Executive Summary**

## Topic

The GNSO Data and Metrics for Policy Making (DMPM) Working Group (WG) has been tasked with exploring opportunities for developing reporting and metrics processes and/or appropriate standardized methodologies that could better inform fact-based policy development and decision making. Improvements to the policy making process should benefit contracted parties, registrants, and end-users alike.

## What Are Some of the Benefits of Fact-Based Policy Development?

By basing discussion and decisions on tangible evidence as opposed to “gut feeling” or anecdotal examples, it is expected that this non-exhaustive list of improvements may be seen in the policy development processes (PDP).

* **Issue Identification/Scoping/Report:** The GNSO is able to consider the scope of impact to affected parties in prioritizing its policy development efforts; the most critical and impactful issues can be prioritized in the queue to be resolved. This is especially important when considering that community volunteers and staff support have limited capacity, as well as the length of PDP efforts.
* **Working Group:** The WG deliberations and development of recommendations should be improved by creating right-sized solutions to the identified issues.
* **Post-Implementation:** The implementation of the policy can be evaluated to determine its level of effectiveness. With that information, the community can make informed decisions about allowing a policy to remain as-is, make modifications, or replace a policy entirely.

## Why is This Important?

The GNSO PDP is the exclusive mechanism in which new Consensus Policies (after Board approval and implementation of recommendations) are established, which all contracted registries and registrars must comply with. Improving the way in which Consensus Policies are developed helps ensure that the most critical registrant, registry, and registrar issues are addressed, and that better recommendations are developed.

## Key Findings to Date From the Working Group

The WG reviewed past PDPs to analyze whether those efforts would have benefitted from having access to data and metrics as topics were deliberated. The group is in agreement that these past efforts would have undoubtedly benefitted from a more fact-based methodology. The group is now deliberating two additional elements from the WG’s Charter:

* Discussing a framework for the request and proper handling of data and metrics. The WG has initially determined that data and metrics are expected to come from any of these sources: freely available, 3rd party paid, internal ICANN, or contracted parties (i.e., registrars and registries).
* Investigating how the PDP process can be injected with data-driven rigor to improve outcomes to the benefit of all affected parties.

## How Can I Help?

The WG has developed a draft data request template for an anticipated IRTP Review team (a recently approved recommendation adopted by the GNSO Council[[1]](#footnote-1)), which may end up being a WG effort in the future. This use case is intended to provide a better understanding of what a real data/metrics request may look like. The goal is to understand the challenges in providing data/metrics, which may involve privacy concerns, costs, or simply level of effort, and establish a framework in which data providers will be comfortable and see tangible benefit to providing information.

**Inter Registrar Transfer Policy**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Group Submitting Request:** | IRTP Review Team |
| **Request Date:** | 01 December 2015 |
| **Policy or Issue being explored:** | Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy – Post Consensus Policy Implementation**Recommendation #17**. The WG recommends that, once all IRTP recommendations are implemented (incl. IRTP-D, and remaining elements from IRTP-C), the GNSO Council, together with ICANN staff, should convene a panel to collect, discuss, and analyze relevant data to determine whether these enhancements have improved the inter-registrar transfer process and dispute mechanisms, and identify possible remaining shortcomings.**Recommendation #18**. The Working Group recommends that contracted parties and ICANN should start to gather data and other relevant information that will help inform a future IRTP review team in its efforts, especially with regard to those issues listed in the Observations (4.2.7.1) above. |
| **Issue to be solved:** | Determine if the IRTP-B thru IRTP-D Consensus Policies enhanced and/or improved the transfer process.Such a review could include, but not be limited to:* The number of uncompleted transfers, both before completed as well as abandoned transfers, collected per Registrar by the registry or ICANN;
* The stages in the transfer process at which transfers are abandoned, where an abandoned transfers mean any number of uncompleted transfers that are not followed by at least one completed transfer, collected per Registrar by the registry or ICANN;
* The number of incidents or communications where registrars are contacted by registrants for transfer support;
* The number of incidents or communications there that registrars worked informally with other registrars to request or to effect a transfer reversal;
* The number of incidents or communications related to disputes between registrars.
* The number of incidents or communications related to complaints or disputes involving a change of registrant
* The number of times that they experience a registrant who's claiming that their domain name has been hijacked that is not related to an account compromise
* The % use of the ClientTransferProhibited status by Registrars, collected per Registrar by the registry or ICANN;
* The number of complaints ICANN Contractual Compliance or Registrars receive about the 60-day transfer lock, the ClientTransferProhibited or the FOA.
* The period of time between the occurrence of an alleged non-compliant transfer and the launch of the TDRP process – including those incidents where no dispute was launched or the dispute was rejected due to the expiration of the statute of limitations.
 |
| **Data Requirements:** | 1. Acquire total amount of transfers before and after policy implementation
2. Acquire transfer complaints submitted to ICANN before and after policy implementation
3. Acquire successful, abandoned, and failed transfer data from Registrars at the various stages of the transfer process (aggregated)
4. Acquire incident information related to transfers from Registrars (aggregated)
 |
| **Responsible Team(s) or Data Source:** | 1. Publicly available data submitted to ICANN via Registry Operator monthly reports
2. ICANN Contractual Compliance complaint intake system
3. Sample(s) of Registrar/Registry data from registrations systems aggregated through third party provider
4. Sample(s) of Registrar/Registry data from complaint intake systems aggregated through third party provider
 |
| **Expected Delivery Date:** | TBD |
| **Resource Estimation:** | TBD |
| **Budget Considerations:** | TBD1. Data supplied by ICANN will not require additional budget allocation
2. Third party provider to aggregate Registrar data will be required; RFP to be announced
 |

1. The GNSO recently adopted the IRTP Part D Final Report and Recommendations (resolution here: <http://gnso.icann.org/en/announcements/announcement-08jul14-en.htm>), which included Recommendations 17 and 18 (report here: <http://gnso.icann.org/en/issues/transfers/irtp-d-final-25sep14-en.pdf>). They recommend that the IRTP process be reviewed after all remaining elements are implemented and that data should begin to be collected to help inform a future IRTP review team in its efforts. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)