

I C A N N
POLICY FORUM

65

MARRAKECH

24-27 June 2019



ICANN Reviews Update CCT and RDS Reviews

27 June 2018

ICANN | GAC
Governmental Advisory Committee



ICANN65 - GAC Plenary - Agenda Item 11.1

1. Competition, Consumer Choice and Consumer Trust Review Team
 - Recommendations
 - Previous GAC input
 - Leadership proposal for next steps

1. Registration Directory Services Review Team
 - Update on current status

- Why is it important?

In the GAC Los Angeles Communiqué (16 October 2014) and GAC Helsinki Communiqué (30 June 2016), the **GAC advised that reviews of the 2012 rounds be completed and considered in policy development before the launch of subsequent rounds.**

- Where do we stand?

Mandate of the CCT Review as per the ByLaws:

examine (A) the extent to which the expansion of gTLDs has promoted competition, consumer trust and consumer choice and (B) the effectiveness of the New gTLD Round's application and evaluation process and safeguards put in place to mitigate issues arising from the New gTLD Round.

GAC Representation: Laureen Kapin (US FTC) and Megan Richards (EU COM).

Active GAC involvement: 2 comments

- September 2018: Final Report published with 35 Recommendations
- March 2019: ICANN Board adopts only six of the 35 recommendations of the CCT Review Team
- Kobe Communiqué: GAC expressed concerns and adopted consensus advice inviting the Board to reconsider and liaise with the CCT RT
- CCT Review Recommendations Scorecard
 - The Need for Data
 - Sensitive and Highly Regulated gTLDs
 - Measures to Combat Abuse
 - Privacy
 - Improving Participation of Underserved Region
 - Community-Based Applications
 - Additional CCT Review Recommendations Discussed by the GAC in its Comment on the Draft Report (19 May 2017)
 - Specific CCT Review Recommendation Passed through to the GAC by the ICANN Board (1 March 2019)
 - Other CCT Review Recommendations of Relevance to Public Policy

1. **Continue to consider the actions taken by the ICANN Board on the CCT Review Recommendations** as laid out in its [resolution](#) (1 March 2019), per analysis provided in the GAC Scorecard.
2. **Determine possible next steps for the GAC**, in particular:
 - a. **Contributing** to further work and analysis directed by the ICANN Board, on both accepted and pending recommendations
 - b. **Monitoring** consideration of recommendations passed through to relevant Community Groups and policy development processes
 - c. **Following up** on further consideration by the ICANN Board of recommendations placed in pending status

RDS-WHOIS2 Review Team - Objectives

Assess **implementation** of WHOIS1 recommendations

- **Evaluate** the extent to which ICANN Org has implemented each prior Directory Service Review (WHOIS1) recommendation (16 in total) and **whether implementation of each recommendation was effective**

Review **changes since WHOIS1** to assess impact on **RDS(WHOIS) effectiveness**

Assess the extent to which the implementation of today's WHOIS:

- Meets legitimate **need of law enforcement** for swiftly accessible, accurate and complete data
- Promotes **consumer trust**
- **Safeguards registrant data**

Assess **effectiveness and transparency** of ICANN enforcement of existing policy relating to WHOIS through Contractual Compliance actions, structure and processes

Identify any portions of Bylaws Section 4.6(e), Registration Directory Service Review, which the team believes should be **changed, added or removed**

Review Team Methodology

Objectives	
1	WHOIS1 Rec #1 - Strategic Priority
	WHOIS1 Rec #2: Single WHOIS Policy
	WHOIS1 Rec #3: Outreach
	WHOIS1 Rec #4: Compliance
	WHOIS Rec #5-9: Data Accuracy
	WHOIS Rec #10: Privacy/Proxy Services
	WHOIS Rec #11: Common Interface
	WHOIS Rec #12-14: Internationalized Domain Names
	WHOIS Rec #15-16: Plan & Annual Reports
2	Anything New
3	Law Enforcement Needs
4	Consumer Trust
5	Safeguard Registrant Data
6	Contractual Compliance Actions, Structure, & Policies
7	ICANN Bylaws

- The review team completed most of its work through subgroups.
- Each Subgroup consisted of a rapporteur plus 2-4 team members.
- Subgroups held teleconferences to carry out their work, in addition to e-mail discussions.
- Subgroup's documents and its conclusions were then reviewed in depth by the entire review team.

- **WHOIS1 Recommendations Implementation Assessment**

WHOIS1 Report	Recommendations Implementation Review	
16 recommendations	ICANN org	16 fully implemented
	RDS-WHOIS2 RT	8 fully implemented, 7 partially implemented 1 not implemented

- **Review team Recommendations**

- Analysis of the past WHOIS1 Review Team recommendations
- RDS-WHOIS2 Review Team's new findings and recommendations.

23 New Draft Recommendations
Adopted with Full Consensus

- 9 with High Priority
- 7 with Medium Priority
- 7 with Low Priority

- **Report to be published in the coming weeks**