WHOIS Review Team – proposed Report Outline

It is assumed that our report will have an executive summary, introduction, main body, conclusions and recommendations. This note breaks out suggested contents for the main body of the report.

# Definitions – what do the terms contained in the AoC and our scope mean?

Law enforcement

Applicable laws

Consumer (including producers, maintainers etc)

Consumer trust

*We are fairly well on with this task, and it is the subject of our ongoing call for public comment.*

*We need to undertake two tasks now to complete this section:*

1. *identify “legitimate needs of law enforcement”*
2. *identify “what factors promote consumer trust in the context of WHOIS”*

***Law Enforcement***

*I believe that Sharon’s law enforcement networks will excellent as a means for identifying the legitimate needs of law enforcement in the context of WHOIS, and also offer information about (1) how often they use WHOIS (2) the extent to which it is stand alone, or used in conjunction with other information (3) their views on data accuracy.*

*Action: Please would the law enforcement subteam draft a questionnaire for review by the RT. Once approved, can we task Sharon to circulate amongst her networks with a deadline of end of April.*

***Consumer trust***

*This is an issue which we began to discuss in San Francisco, but we did not reach a conclusion. In my view, it is a concept which contains a bundle of factors, and the best way to gauge consumer trust is to develop some terms or phrases which describe factors which we think may affect consumer trust to a greater or lesser degree, and seek expert research advice on (1) how to frame questions (2) conduct a sampled survey of relevant stakeholders.*

*We need to do the primary thinking, and I suggest that Sarmad would be an ideal leader for this project, as he has already developed his thinking in this area.*

*Action: Please would Sarmad and the other members of the consumer / consumer trust subteam, develop a working definition, and a simple questionnaire (say 10-20 questions maximum). We can then discuss in the full team, and develop an RFP for a suitable supplier. We also need to contact the board re: budget.*

*Again, I would hope to have this task completed by the time we meet in June.*

# Identification and inventory of existing WHOIS policy

This section is a write-up of the work undertaken by James and Kathy prior to our San Francisco meeting.

It should also develop that work to identify gaps.

# Identification and inventory of ICANN’s implementation of its WHOIS policy

This is a task to be undertaken by Subteam B. We will undertake a presentation in Singapore, and write up after that.

# Gap analysis

To what extent is existing WHOIS policy and its implementation effective, meets the legitimate needs of law enforcement and promotes consumer trust?

*This section will bring together issues highlighted in the preceding sections:*

* *It will discuss gaps between law enforcement and consumer expectations vs reality*
* *It will highlight gaps in the policy and implementation against what the RT expects given its understanding of the expectations, public comment input and the issues*
* *It will look forward a little to consider issues which are not adequately served, eg IDNs, the underlying protocol*

*I would also like us to consider some wider questions, like:*

* *How come this issue has remained so divisive within the ICANN space for so long?*
* *Is there anything we as an RT can do to help the community “stumble in the right direction”? eg are the good practices in policy development or policy/implementation out there in ccTLD?*