



The Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers

22 January 2015

Thomas Schneider
Chair, ICANN Governmental Advisory Committee

Re: NGPC responses to GAC advice items from Los Angeles Communiqué

Dear Mr. Schneider:

Following our discussion on 13 January 2014, we wish to provide you with responses to some of the GAC advice items raised in its Los Angeles Communiqué and discussed on the conference call. The attached document addresses GAC advice regarding implementation of WHOIS-related safeguards; security risks safeguard advice; the Public Interest Commitment Dispute Resolution Process; and the WHOIS roadmap.

I hope this information is helpful. Please let us know if you have any questions or concerns.

Sincerely,

Stephen D. Crocker,
Chair, ICANN Board

Follow-up Responses to GAC-NGPC Conference Call on 14 January 2015

1. WHOIS Roadmap

In the Los Angeles Communiqué, the GAC requested a roadmap that identifies linkages and timelines between and among the WHOIS-related issues, in order to enable the GAC to collaborate with other parties to prioritize such work and rationalize timelines and deadlines. Annex 1 of this document provides a roadmap of WHOIS-related activities at ICANN as well as a timeline of the major milestones.

2. GAC Safeguard Advice – WHOIS

In the [Los Angeles Communiqué](#), the GAC strongly advised the ICANN Board to focus its attention on implementation of the WHOIS Related-Safeguards. The NGPC provides the following information and update on ICANN's progress-to-date regarding implementation of the GAC's advice:

WHOIS Pilot Study

On 23 December 2014, ICANN posted the final NORC WHOIS Pilot Study for public comment. The WHOIS Pilot Study Report describes the results of a pilot accuracy study conducted by NORC at the University of Chicago in collaboration with private and public sector validation specialists. The Report illustrates the findings and methodology to be deployed in the WHOIS Accuracy Reporting System (ARS) under development by ICANN. By publishing it for public comment, ICANN is seeking feedback on the approach, methodology, and reporting formats used in the Pilot Study to help shape the final design of the ARS.

The Pilot Accuracy Study is a precursor to the ARS, designed with the intention of isolating and testing key components of the system. The Pilot Study included an in-depth examination of postal addresses, email addresses and telephone numbers. Postal address statistics were developed with guidance from the Universal Postal Union (Switzerland), a specialized agency of the UN that coordinates postal policies worldwide for its member countries. Other validation expertise was provided by leading commercial firms, including StrikeIron (USA), utilizing its proprietary email validation systems, DigiCert (USA), a provider of digital certificates and telephone validation services, and aided by a unique data parsing service by Whibse (USA). Results from the Pilot Study will be used to inform the design of the ARS.

During the [Public Comment](#), ICANN is seeking input on:

1. Sample Design & Methodology
2. Types of Accuracy Reports to be published through the ARS
3. Whether ICANN should conduct Identity Validation in subsequent phases of the ARS Development
4. Whether the methodology should treat registrations under privacy or proxy services differently, and if so, how

The comment period runs until 27 February 2015. In addition, ICANN plans to engage with affected stakeholders at the ICANN 52 Meeting in Singapore in February 2015 to obtain feedback on the proposed design for the ARS as described in the NORC Report. Upon review of these comments and feedback, ICANN will update the design of the ARS and begin development in phases, as described below.

a. Phase 1 – Syntactic Accuracy

Phase 1 will focus on reporting accuracy levels that examine the syntactic aspects of the email, telephone number, and postal addresses. As these examinations can be conducted with the use of largely automated processes, it is expected that this portion of the ARS can be launched in early to mid-2015. A **Final Implementation Plan - Phase 1** will be developed to specify the sample size, process, and classification methodology to be deployed for examining the accuracy of WHOIS from the syntactic perspective.

b. Phase 2 – Operational Accuracy

Next, ICANN plans to further develop the ARS to report accuracy levels that examine WHOIS records from an operational perspective, with regard to the email, telephone number and postal addresses. As this examination involves largely manual processes, smaller sample sizes are likely to be deployed. ICANN will develop a **Final Implementation Plan - Phase 2**, to take into account any lessons learned during Phase 1, for a launch in mid-late 2015.

c. Phase 3 – Exploring Accuracy from an Identity Perspective

The final phase examines whether and how to conduct ongoing accuracy studies from the perspective of confirming the identity of the registrant. The GAC's Los Angeles Communiqué advised ICANN to take steps to scope and examine the risks, feasibility, costs and benefits of conducting ongoing accuracy studies to validate and verify the identity of the registrant. Phase 3 of ARS will assess the feasibility and costs to conduct accuracy studies based on the identity of the registrant.

Process for Correcting Inaccurate Records: ARS Implementation Advisory Group

A key function of the ARS will be to forward records identified as potentially inaccurate to registrars for follow-up to confirm their accuracy. The ARS is being designed to track and report on the progress of these records.

Engagement with registrars and other interested stakeholders is necessary to define an efficient process for transmitting, reviewing, and updating, as appropriate, the identified WHOIS records. ICANN plans to work with registrars and the broader community in the months ahead in order to develop this process. ICANN intends to launch an ARS Advisory Group in January 2015.

Compliance Pilot Initiated

ICANN will kick-off a Compliance Pilot in January 2015, to examine the results of the Pilot Study to determine if a compliance response is appropriate for the WHOIS records that have been categorized as inaccurate from a syntactical perspective. ICANN's Contractual Compliance Department is in the process of auditing the results of the Pilot Study as part of a compliance pilot. Once the audit is complete, ICANN will send inaccurate records to registrars following existing processes.

In addition, ICANN plans to engage with registrars and other interested stakeholders as necessary to define how to integrate transmitting, reviewing, and updating, as appropriate, the volume of identified WHOIS records that have been identified as potentially inaccurate into the existing Compliance processes and systems. ICANN plans to work with registrars and the broader community in the months ahead in order to develop and refine this process.

3. GAC Safeguards Advice – Security Risks

In the Los Angeles Communiqué, the GAC strongly advised the ICANN Board to focus its attention on the GAC's advice in the Beijing Communiqué concerning safeguards related to security risks. The following provides an update on the progress to implement the security risks safeguard advice:

Background

In the [Beijing Communiqué](#) (11 April 2013), the GAC advised that the following safeguard should apply to all new gTLDs and be subject to contractual oversight:
[...]

3. Security checks—

While respecting privacy and confidentiality, Registry operators will periodically conduct a technical analysis to assess whether domains in its gTLD are being used to perpetrate security threats, such as pharming, phishing, malware, and botnets. If

Registry operator identifies security risks that pose an actual risk of harm, Registry operator will notify the relevant registrar and, if the registrar does not take immediate action, suspend the domain name until the matter is resolved.

(Note: the safeguard noted above, is one of the six safeguards proposed by the GAC to apply to all new gTLDs.)

[To address the advice](#), the NGPC adopted a resolution on 25 June 2013 to include a new mandatory Public Interest Commitment (PIC) in Specification 11 of the Registry Agreement (Section 3.b), which requires all registry operators to periodically conduct a technical analysis to assess whether domains in its gTLD are being used to perpetrate security threats, such as pharming, phishing, malware, and botnets, and to maintain statistical reports on the number of threats and actions taken to address them.

In addition, recognizing that “there are multiple ways for a Registry Operator to implement the required security checks”, the NGPC resolution called for community participation in the development of a “framework for Registry Operators to respond to identified security threat[s] that pose an actual risk of harm”.

Status of Consultation

ICANN has initiated the process to consult with the GAC as well as representatives from relevant governmental agencies (law enforcement, consumer protection, etc.) and Registry Operators to develop the framework called for in in [NGPC Resolutions 2013.06.25.NG02 - 2013.06.25.NG03](#). On 20 August 2014, a call for volunteers was issued to the Registry Stakeholder Group (RySG) of the GNSO. A group of interested registries was formed and met for the first time with ICANN Staff during ICANN 51 in Los Angeles to discuss the objective and scope of this consultation.

On 10 December 2041, ICANN released a Preliminary Draft “Framework for Registry Operators to Conduct Periodic Security Checks and Respond to Identified Security Threats” for discussion with and input from both the GAC and interested Registries. It is anticipated that the consultations will lead to the development of a framework constituting a set of minimum requirements that, if strictly adhered to and implemented by new gTLD registries, would carry a presumption of compliance with the obligations of Specification 11 section 3b of the Registry Agreement.

The preliminary draft Framework has been designed to address five key “framework questions” with seed content provided by ICANN’s Security Stability and Resiliency Team (SSR). Answers to these key questions by both registries and the GAC, after an appropriate reconciliation effort, would constitute the final framework called for by the NGPC.

The proposed timeline for initial contributions by Registries and the GAC, as documented in the preliminary draft framework, is the following:

- Friday 30 January 2015: answers to Framework questions 1, 2 and 3 relating to the technical analysis of threats;
- Friday 20 March 2015: answers to Framework questions 4 and 5 relating to the response to identified threats.

Initial feedback was provided by some registries in a teleconference organized by ICANN on 18 December 2014, as well as in several written or spoken communications. More input from registries and input from the GAC are expected before ICANN can report on the substance of the consultation.

Next steps

ICANN is preparing to hold meetings with registries and GAC during ICANN 52 in Singapore on this consultation to discuss input provided in answer to Framework questions 1,2 and 3 by 30 January 2015.

4. Public Interest Commitments (PICs) and the Public Interest Commitments Dispute Resolution Process (PICDRP)

In its [Los Angeles Communiqué](#), the GAC advised the ICANN Board to focus its attention on the Public Interest Commitment Dispute Resolution Process (PICDRP). On 9 December 2014, the GAC issued a [letter](#) to the ICANN Board to assist the NGPC in its work regarding safeguards applicable to new gTLDs by providing further explanation and background about the GAC advice in the Los Angeles Communiqué.

The NGPC provides the following additional information about the public interest commitments and the PICDRP to address the concerns raised about the GAC about the process, timing, and resolution of complaints of non-compliance with PICs:

Public Interest Commitments (PICs) are embodied in Specification 11 of the New gTLD Registry Agreement and are fully binding and enforceable – they are part of the contract between ICANN and the Registry Operator.

Broadly speaking, there are two categories of contractually binding PICs. In February 2013, ICANN provided applicants with the opportunity to make public interest commitments based on statements made in their New gTLD applications and/or additional public interest commitments which were not included in their applications but to which they intend to commit. Most of these commitments were published for review and comment by the community on 5 March 2013. (In a few cases PICs were submitted and published later). Because these PICs were voluntarily made by the applicants, not mandated or negotiated by ICANN, these PICs are sometimes referred to as “voluntary PICs,” but they are incorporated into Specification 11 of the Registry Agreement and are binding and enforceable contractual provisions.

The second form of PICs are those PICs adopted by the NGPC to implement advice issued by the GAC on the New gTLD Program. These PICs are written with standardized language, and are incorporated into Specification 11 of every new gTLD Registry Agreement. Like the PICs voluntarily submitted by applicants, the PICs adopted by the NGPC also are binding and enforceable contractual provisions.

PICs, like other portions of the Registry Agreement, are not subject to unilateral modification or revocation. Any change or amendment to a PIC would be subject to the amendment procedures established in the Registry Agreement, which could include a public comment period and Board approval.

Some applicants submitted voluntary PICs that include an expiration or sunset date. As previously noted, in the interest of openness and transparency, these PICs were posted for public comment. Where included in PICs voluntarily submitted by an applicant, these expiration or sunset conditions apply only to those voluntary PICs submitted by the applicant, not to the mandatory PICs imposed by the NGPC. Because the PICs are incorporated in Specification 11 of the Registry Agreement, they are part of the contract between ICANN and the Registry Operator, and accordingly, these PICs are subject to enforcement by ICANN's contractual compliance department in the ordinary course of its enforcement activities. ICANN's contractual compliance team routinely undertakes a variety of activities to ensure compliance with contractual obligations; some of the activities are a result of complaints submitted to ICANN by third parties, some are the result of monitoring by ICANN, and others are audit-related. Monitoring activities are ICANN-initiated, based largely on industry articles and social media postings, in an effort to proactively address any alleged failure to comply with contract terms.

If ICANN receives a complaint or learns of potential non-compliance with PICs from the media or other sources, it may undertake an investigation and seek to require the Registry Operator to comply with the terms and conditions of the PIC. Anyone can file a contractual compliance complaint with ICANN if they believe a contracted party is breaching its agreement with ICANN.

The Registry Operator is obligated to designate a compliance contact to receive reports forwarded from ICANN alleging non-compliance with its PICs, and promptly to review and address reports of alleged non-compliance with those PICs, and where applicable, correct any non-compliance. If the Registry Operator fails to cure any non-compliance with its PICs, ICANN is entitled to pursue available remedies, up to and including termination of the Registry Agreement. ICANN could do this for failure to comply with a PIC the same as it could with any other provision of the agreement.

Third parties that believe they have been harmed as a result of a Registry Operator's failure to comply with its PICs may report such alleged non-compliance by the Registry Operator to ICANN compliance for review and investigation and may also

choose to avail themselves of the [Public Interest Commitments Dispute Resolution Procedure \("PICDRP"\)](#). The PICDRP provides a potential alternative or parallel mechanism for a harmed party to pursue remedies, but it does not preclude or limit ICANN from enforcing the PICs through its normal contractual compliance process and timetable. In many cases, ICANN's normal compliance processes will result in a speedy resolution.

For example, if a Registry Operator is using a registrar that is not a party to the 2013 RAA (which is required by the PICs), or is failing to include in its agreements with registrars contractual provisions that are mandatory under the PICs, or is failing to maintain required records such as statistical reports on security threats reported, ICANN's contractual compliance team would pursue enforcement of these provisions whether or not a complaining party is simultaneously pursuing other processes under the PICDRP. Often the ICANN contractual compliance process results in rapid resolution of the dispute in a matter of days or weeks.

The requirement that a party pursuing a PICDRP show that it has been harmed is analogous to the legal concept of "standing," which typically requires that a party demonstrate that it has sustained or will sustained direct injury or harm from the conditions for which it seeking relief, and that the harm is actual or imminent, not hypothetical or conjectural. For the matter to be referred to a PICDRP panel for a determination, there must be a concrete dispute between a Registry Operator and a party that believes it is harmed by the Registry Operator's failure to comply with its PICs. However, regulatory authorities, consumer advocates, government agencies, law enforcement and other interested parties would be free to offer advice, assistance and support to someone initiating a PICDRP.

In addition, ICANN's contractual compliance department investigates and pursues complaints regarding non-compliance with contractual provisions, including PICs, regardless of whether the party submitting the complaint alleges that it has been harmed by the contracted party's actions. Thus, regulatory authorities, consumer advocates, government agencies, law enforcement and other interested parties could submit a complaint to ICANN's contractual compliance department regarding a Registry Operator's failure to comply with PICs regardless of whether there is a party alleging that it has been harmed, and ICANN will investigate and pursue such complaints through its normal compliance process.

It should also be noted that nothing in the PICDRP limits harmed parties, regulatory authorities or law enforcement from pursuing other available remedies. These might include, for example, pursuing remedies through administrative, regulatory or judicial bodies to seek fines, damages, injunctive relief or other remedies available at law.

ANNEX 1

WHOIS Activity	Description	Type of Activity	Timeline & Milestones	Related Activities
WHOIS Accuracy/GAC Safeguard Advice on WHOIS Verification and Checks	The new WHOIS Online Accuracy Reporting System is a key project linked to ICANN's strategic initiative to improve the overall effectiveness and accuracy of the WHOIS system. In response to the recommendations of the WHOIS Review Team, the system is designed to produce statistical reports on WHOIS accuracy rates. These reports will be made available on the WHOIS website on a periodic basis, providing visibility and transparency into whether accuracy levels are improving over time. ICANN will also rely on this system to comply with the GAC Beijing Advice regarding WHOIS verification and checks.	Contract implementation; WHOIS Review Team Recommendation implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pilot Program RFP published, May 2014 • Contracts executed, Aug. 2014 • Preliminary Findings published, Oct. 2014 • Community feedback on Pilot Preliminary Findings, Oct. 2014 • Publication of Final Pilot Report, Dec. 2014 • Public Comment Forum, Dec. 2014 – Feb. 2015 • IAG to be formed to recommend process for the follow-up procedure, Jan. 2015 • Launch of Compliance Pilot on the ARS Pilot Study findings, Jan. 2015 • Initiate modifications to Accuracy Reporting System, Mar. 2015 • Launch of Accuracy Reporting System – Phase I (Syntactic validation), mid 2015 • Launch of Accuracy Reporting System – Phase II (Operational validation), late 2015 • Launch of Accuracy Reporting System – Phase III (Identity validation), TBD • IAG Process Recommendations published for public comment, TBD • IAG Process finalized & launched, TBD 	

Key:

- Contract implementation: Implementation of obligations delineated in registry agreements and/or the Registrar Accreditation Agreement
- WHOIS Review Team Recommendation Implementation: Implementation of recommendations made by the WHOIS Review Team and adopted by the Board
- Policy Implementation: implementation of recommendations arising from ICANN policy development process
- Technical: development or implementation of technical specifications
- **Green text:** delineates opportunities for GAC input

WHOIS Activity	Description	Type of Activity	Timeline & Milestones	Related Activities
WHOIS Conflicts with National Privacy Laws	<p>Mandatory review of the effectiveness of the procedure under which registries and registrars may seek modification of their contractual WHOIS requirements in light of a conflict with national law.</p> <p>Currently, the process may only be invoked by the contracted party upon receiving notification of an investigation, litigation, regulatory proceeding or other government or civil action that might affect its compliance with the provisions of the RAA or other contractual agreement with ICANN dealing with the collection, display or distribution of personally identifiable data via WHOIS.</p>	Contract implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff paper posted for public comment, May 2014 • Comment period open, May –Aug. 2014 • Analysis/proposed next steps provided to GNSO; call for volunteers to form Implementation Advisory Group (IAG) and update procedure, ICANN 51/LA, Oct. 2014 • IAG formed to recommend changes to the procedure, not the policy, Dec. 2014 • IAG submits recommendations to GNSO to ensure they are consistent with existing GNSO policy, June 2015 • Board reviews recommended changes to procedure, TBD 	

WHOIS Activity	Description	Type of Activity	Timeline & Milestones	Related Activities
Implementation of Thick WHOIS – Consistent Labeling and Display of WHOIS across all current thick gTLDs	Implement recommendation #1 from the Final Report of the Thick WHOIS Policy Development Process for all current thick gTLDs	Policy implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initial Draft Implementation Plan for Consistent Labeling and Display, Jan. – Feb. 2015 • Final Implementation Plan for Consistent Labeling and Display, May 2015 • Announcement of Policy Effective Date on Consistent Labeling and Display, July 2015 • Implementation of Consistent Labeling and Display by Registries and Registrars, Aug. 2015 – Jan. 2016 • Policy Effective Date for Consistent Labeling and Display, Jan. 2016 	
Implementation of Thick WHOIS – Transition from thin to thick WHOIS for .COM, .NET and .JOBS	Implement recommendation #1 and #3 from the Final Report of the Thick WHOIS Policy Development Process for the thin WHOIS gTLDs (.COM, .NET and .JOBS)	Policy Implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initial Draft Implementation Plan for transition of .COM, .NET, .JOBS, April – May 2015 • Final Implementation Plan for the transition, July – Aug. 2015 • Implementation of the transition of .COM, .NET, .JOBS by Registries and Registrars, Aug. 2015 – Aug. 2016/Jan. 2017 • Policy Effective Date for Transition from Thin to Thick, Aug. 2016 – Jan. 2017 	

WHOIS Activity	Description	Type of Activity	Timeline & Milestones	Related Activities
Cross-Field Address Data Validation Requirements	The WHOIS Accuracy Program Specification of the 2013 RAA requires registrars to validate that all postal address fields are consistent across fields (for example: street exists in city, city exists in state/province, city matches postal code) where such information is technically and commercially feasible for the applicable country or territory.	Contract specification	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Registrar working group was formed to ascertain the availability of technically and commercially feasible tools for cross-field validation. The group was dormant during the rollout of the 2013 RAA but is currently being reinitiated. Proposed validation requirements/specifications to be developed by mid-2015. Registrar Working Group to vote on technical and commercial feasibility in mid-to-late 2015. If approved, requirements become effective 180 days after ICANN announces the approval. 	
Review of RAA WHOIS Accuracy Program Specification	Terms and conditions of the WHOIS Accuracy Program Specification to be reviewed by ICANN in consultation with the Registrar Stakeholder Group on or about the first anniversary of the date that the RAA is first executed by a registrar.	Contract implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ICANN is planning the approach and proposed methodology for the review Initial discussions with the leadership of the Registrar Stakeholder Group began in December 2014 ICANN plans to solicit community feedback beginning in January 2015 and meet with registrars in Singapore in February 2015 Results of the review will determine 'next steps' 	

WHOIS Activity	Description	Type of Activity	Timeline & Milestones	Related Activities
Internationalized Registration Data (IRD)	WHOIS RT made recommendations to charter a new IRD group to look at requirements holistically and to make recommendations in this area.	Recommendations to form basis for further policy work and contract discussions; WHOIS Review Team Recommendation implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Announcement for IRD Team, including call for applicants, July 2013 • IRD Team selected, Sept. 2013 • Preliminary Report published, June 2014 • Interim Report from the Expert Working Group on Internationalized Registration Data published, April 2014 • Interim Report posted for public comment, April – July 2014 • Report of Public Comments on Interim Report published, 2 September 2014 • Final Report publication, 1Q2015 • Board consideration following public comment, 2Q2015 	<p>GNSO PDP Working Group on Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information</p> <p>Expert Working Group on Next Generation gTLD Directory Services</p> <p>IETF WEIRDS work</p>
WEIRDS IETF Protocol development	Development of new replacement of WHOIS protocol, RFC process underway in IETF	Technical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WEIRDS IETF Working Group formed, April 2012 • WEIRDS protocol finalized, 1Q 2015 • WEIRDS final protocol implemented into contracts, TBD 	RDAP/Restful WHOIS
Open Source RDAP/Restful WHOIS	Develop a RESTful WHOIS open-source server for domain name registries that can be used by registries or registrars. The server will use the specifications developed in the IETF WEIRDS WG.	Technical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Server expected, Dec. 2014 • WEIRDS IETF RFC expected to publish, 1Q 2015 	Dependent on development of WEIRDS protocol

WHOIS Activity	Description	Type of Activity	Timeline & Milestones	Related Activities
gTLD Directory Services Expert Working Group Report	Final Report from the Expert Working Group on gTLD Directory Services (EWG) details recommendations for a next-generation Registration Directory Service (RDS) to replace the current WHOIS system.	Policy development; WHOIS Review Team Recommendation implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EWG formed, Dec. 2012 • Publication of Initial Report, Frequently Asked Questions, and online questionnaire, June 2013, kicking off an extensive consultation process within the ICANN community on the initial recommendations. • Final Report published and delivered for consideration by the ICANN Board at ICANN50 in London, June 2014 • Following discussions in London on the interplay between the EWG Final Report and the Board-initiated PDP requested by the Board in Nov. 2012 (which had been put on hold pending the EWG work), the Board and GNSO agreed to form a joint GNSO – Board collaboration group to develop next steps for the PDP, Oct. 2014 • Output of the Joint Board/GNSO Collaboration Group to suggest framework for conducting the Board-initiated PDP, expected Feb. 2015 • Preliminary Issue Report & Public Comment Forum, April-May 2015 • Final Issue Report & Launch of PDP, June 2015 • PDP Initial Report published for public comment, June 2016 • Final Report of PDP, Dec. 2016 • GNSO Approval of PDP Recommendations, Jan. 2017 • Board Approval of PDP Recommendations, Feb. 2017 	Pending GNSO PDP

WHOIS Activity	Description	Type of Activity	Timeline & Milestones	Related Activities
<p>Privacy/Proxy Service Provider Accreditation issues</p>	<p>Board-initiated GNSO PDP to develop policy recommendations to guide ICANN's implementation of an accreditation program for privacy and proxy service providers. This topic was identified during the 2013 RAA negotiations and recommended for community policy development.</p>	<p>Policy development; WHOIS Review Team Recommendation implementation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GNSO launched PDP, Oct. 2013 • WG charter adopted, Oct. 2013 • PDP Final Report, estimated May 2015 • GNSO approval of PDP recommendation, estimated June 2015 • Board Approval of PDP recommendations, estimated July 2015 • Transition Period – Interim Specification on privacy/proxy services in effect until 1/1/17 to allow for privacy/proxy accreditation program to be developed and PDP to be concluded. (See Specification on Privacy & Proxy Registrations in the 2013 RAA) • Staff has begun pre-implementation preparations in consultation with the Working Group 	

WHOIS Activity	Description	Type of Activity	Timeline & Milestones	Related Activities
<p>GNSO PDP Working Group on Translation and Transliteration of Contact Information</p>	<p>The PDP WG is tasked with developing a policy recommendation regarding the translation and transliteration of registration contact information. Among other things, the WG was to consider whether it is desirable to translate contact information to a single common language or transliterate contact information to a single common script. They were also expected to consider the question who should decide who should bear the burden of translating contact information to a single common language or transliterating contact information to a single common script.</p> <p>The PDP includes study on the commercial feasibility of translation and transliteration systems for internationalized contact data</p>	<p>Policy development</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GNSO Council requested an Issue Report, Oct. 2012 • GNSO initiates PDP, June 2013 • PDP Initial Report submitted 15 Dec. 2014 • PDP Final Report, estimated May 2015 • GNSO approval of PDP recommendations, estimated July 2015 • Board Approval of PDP recommendations, estimated Sept. 2015 	<p>Expert Working Group on Internationalized Registration Data (IRD)</p>

WHOIS Activity	Description	Type of Activity	Timeline & Milestones	Related Activities
WHOIS Website Improvements	The WHOIS Website is to be refined & updated	Policy implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Online Search Tool enhancements • WHOIS Annual Report to be published, Dec. 2014 • Updating & Refreshing WHOIS Primer and the Knowledge Center, ongoing 	
WHOIS Review Team 2	The Affirmation of Commitments requires a review of ICANN's WHOIS policy and requirements every three years.	Policy review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commencement of second WHOIS Review, mid-2015. • WHOIS RT2 publishes final report, early 2016 • Board takes formal action on WHOIS RT2 Final Report, mid-2016 	
New gTLD WHOIS Implementation Clarification	Advisory - Clarifications to New gTLD Registry Agreement, Spec. 4 and the 2013 RAA WHOIS Specification	Contract Implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete and publish the updated Advisory by Jan. 31 • New effective date for implementation moved from mid-February to mid-April 	



