

ANNEX
GNSO Council Report to the ICANN Board
Post-Expiration Domain Name Recovery Policy Development Process

Executive Summary

On 21 July 2011, the GNSO Council unanimously [approved](#) the recommendations and [Final Report](#) of the Post-Expiration Domain Name Recovery (PEDNR) Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group. The recommendations include, amongst others, the following¹:

1. Provide a minimum of 8 days after expiration for renewal by the registrant
2. An expired website must explicitly say that registration has expired and instructions on how to recover the registration
3. The registration agreement must include information on the fees charged for the post-expiration renewal of a domain name
4. Clear indication of methods used to deliver pre- and post-expiration notifications must be provided
5. At least three notices are required, two of which need to be sent prior to expiration at set time intervals and one after expiration,
6. Notifications must not solely be done by methods which require explicit action by the Registrant
7. All gTLDs and registrars must offer the Redemption Grace Period (RGP), with the exception of sponsored gTLDs
8. The transfer of a domain name during the RGP should not be allowed
9. ICANN should develop educational materials on how to properly steward a domain name and prevent unintended loss

In addition, the GNSO Council recommends the promotion by ICANN and the Registrar Stakeholder Group of best practice recommendations such as: post-expiration notifications should be sent to some other contact point than to the email address associated with the

¹ Please note that a detailed description of each of these recommendations can be found in section A of this report as well as the [PEDNR Final Report](#).

expired registration; provide notice of where notification emails will be sent from, and; encourage registrants to provide a secondary email point of contact.

Furthermore, the GNSO Council recommends that ICANN, in consultation with Registrars, ALAC and other interested parties, develops educational materials about how to properly steward a domain name and how to prevent unintended loss.

ICANN's Contractual Compliance Department is requested to provide updates to the GNSO Council on a regular basis in relation to the implementation and effectiveness of the proposed recommendations, either in the form of a report that details amongst others the number of complaints received in relation to renewal and/or post-expiration related matters or in the form of audits that assess if the policy has been implemented as intended.

Under the ICANN Bylaws, the Council's unanimous (supermajority) support for the motion obligates the Board to adopt the recommendation unless by a vote of more than 66%, the Board determines that the policy is not in the best interests of the ICANN community or ICANN.

The policy recommendations, if approved by the Board, will impose new obligations on certain contracted parties. The GNSO Council's unanimous vote in favor of these items exceeds the voting threshold required at Article X, Section 3.9.f of the ICANN Bylaws regarding the formation of consensus policies.

a. A clear statement of any Successful GNSO Vote recommendation of the Council

The GNSO Council unanimously approved at its meeting on 21 July the following recommendations:

1. Define "Registered Name Holder at Expiration" (RNHaE) as the entity or individual that was eligible to renew the domain name registration immediately prior to expiration. If the domain name registration was modified pursuant to a term of the Registration Agreement authorizing the modification of registration data for the purposes of facilitating renewal but not at the explicit request of the registrant, the RNHaE is the entity or individual identified as the registrant immediately prior to that modification.

2. For at least 8 consecutive days, at some point following expiration, the original DNS resolution path specified by the RNHaE, at the time of expiration, must be interrupted² by the registrar, to the extent that the registry permits such interruptions, and the domain must be renewable by the RNHaE until the end of that period. This 8-day period may occur at any time following expiration. At any time during the 8-day period, the Registered Name Holder at Expiration may renew the domain with the Registrar, and the Registrar, within a commercially reasonable delay, will restore the domain name to resolve to its original DNS resolution path prior to expiration. Notwithstanding, the Registrar may delete the domain at any time during the Autorenew grace period.
3. If at any time after expiration when the Registered Name is still renewable by the RNHaE, the Registrar changes the DNS resolution path to effect a different landing website than the one used by the RNHaE prior to expiration, the page shown must explicitly say that the domain has expired and give instructions on how to recover the domain. Wording in the policy must make clear that "instructions" may be as simple as directing the RNHaE to a specific web site.
4. The RNHaE cannot be prevented from renewing a domain name registration as a result of WHOIS changes made by the Registrar that were not at the RNHaE's request.
5. The registration agreement must include or point to any fee(s) charged for the post-expiration renewal of a domain name. If the Registrar operates a website for registration or renewal, it should state, both at the time of registration and in a clear place on its website, any fee(s) charged for the post-expiration renewal of a domain name or the recovery of a domain name during the Redemption Grace Period.
6. The registration agreement and Registrar web site (if one is used) must clearly indicate what methods will be used to deliver pre- and post-expiration notifications, or must point to the location where such information can be found. What destination address/number will be used must also be specified, if applicable.
7. Registrar must notify Registered Name Holder of impending expiration no less than two times. One such notice must be sent one month or 30 days prior to expiration (± 4 days) and one must be sent one week prior to expiration (± 3 days). If more than two alert notifications are sent, the timing of two of them must be comparable to the timings specified.

² DNS interruption is defined as total Internet service interruption except for an informational web page (only one IP on which only port 80 is active).

8. Unless the Registered Name is renewed or deleted by the Registrar, at least one notification to the RNHaE, which includes renewal instructions, must be sent after expiration.
9. Notifications of impending expiration must include method(s) that do not require explicit registrant action other than standard e-mail receipt in order to receive such notifications.
10. With the exception of sponsored³ gTLDs, all gTLD Registries shall offer the Redemption Grace Period (RGP). For currently existing unsponsored gTLDs that do not currently offer the RGP, a transition period shall be allowed. All new gTLDs must offer the RGP. As part of the implementation, ICANN Staff should consider the Technical Steering Group's Implementation Proposal (see <http://www.icann.org/en/meetings/bucharest/redemption-topic.htm>)
11. If a Registrar offers registrations in a gTLD that supports the RGP, the Registrar must allow the Registered Name Holder at Expiration to redeem the Registered Name after it has entered RGP.
12. A transfer of a domain name during the RGP should not be allowed.
13. In the event that ICANN gives reasonable notice to Registrars that ICANN has published web content as described in recommendation #15 below:
 - Registrars, who have a web presence, must provide a link to the ICANN content on any website it may operate for domain name registration or renewal clearly displayed to its Registered Name Holders at least as clearly as its links to policies or notifications required to be displayed under ICANN Consensus Policies.
 - Registrars may also host similar material adapted to their specific practices and processes.
 - Registrar must point to the ICANN material in a communication sent to the registrant immediately following initial registration as well as in the mandated annual WHOIS reminder.
14. The GNSO Council recommends the following best practices for promotion by ICANN and the Registrar Stakeholder Group:
 - If post-expiration notifications are normally sent to a point of contact using the domain in question, and delivery is known to have been interrupted by post-expiration actions,

³ An unsponsored TLD operates under policies established by the global Internet community directly through the ICANN process, while a sponsored TLD is a specialized TLD that has a sponsor representing the narrower community that is most affected by the TLD. It should be noted that this distinction is no longer used in the new gTLD program.

post-expiration notifications should be sent to some other contact point associated with the registrant if one exists.

- The notification method explanation should include the registrar's email address from which notification messages are sent and a suggestion that registrants save this email address as a 'safe sender' to avoid notification emails being blocked by spam filter software.
- Registrars should advise registrants to provide a secondary email point of contact that is not associated with the domain name itself so that in case of expiration, reminders can be delivered to this secondary email point of contact.

15. The GNSO Council recommends that ICANN, in consultation with Registrars, ALAC and other interested parties, develop educational materials about how to properly steward a domain name and how to prevent unintended loss. Such material may include registrant responsibilities, the gTLD domain life-cycle and guidelines for keeping domain name records current.

16. ICANN Contractual Compliance Department is requested to provide updates to the GNSO Council on a regular basis in relation to the implementation and effectiveness of the proposed recommendations, either in the form of a report that details amongst others the number of complaints received in relation to renewal and/or post-expiration related matters or in the form of audits that assess if the policy has been implemented as intended.

17. The GNSO Council shall convene a PEDNR Implementation Review Team to assist ICANN Staff in developing the implementation details for the new policy should it be approved by the ICANN Board. The Implementation Review Team will be tasked with evaluating the proposed implementation of the policy recommendations as approved by the Board and is expected to work with ICANN Staff to ensure that the resultant implementation meets the letter and intent of the approved policy. If the PEDNR Implementation Review Team identifies any potential modifications to the policy or new PEDNR policy recommendations, the PEDNR Implementation Review Team shall refer these to the GNSO Council for its consideration and follow-up, as appropriate. Following adoption by the ICANN Board of the recommendations, the GNSO Secretariat is authorized to issue a call for volunteers for a PEDNR Implementation Review Team to the members of the PEDNR Working Group.

Under the ICANN Bylaws, the Council's unanimous (supermajority) support for the motion obligates the Board to adopt the recommendation unless by a vote of more than 66%, the Board determines that the policy is not in the best interests of the ICANN community or ICANN.

- b. If a Successful GNSO Vote was not reached, a clear statement of all positions held by Council members. Each statement should clearly indicate (i) the reasons underlying each position and (ii) the constituency(ies) or Stakeholder Group(s) that held the position;**

Not applicable. (A successful GNSO vote was reached.)

- c. An analysis of how the issue would affect each constituency or Stakeholder Group, including any financial impact on the constituency or Stakeholder Group;**

The proposed recommendations are expected to require significant changes on the part of registrars and to a lesser extent registries, even though the proposed recommendations are considered to be in line with current registrar and registry practices. Such changes may include:

- Updates to the registration agreement
- Updates to information on the registrar web-site
- Offer Redemption Grace Period
- Ensure that notices are sent at certain times
- Technical adjustments to ensure compliance with the requirements

However, the GNSO Council anticipates that the benefits will outweigh the costs of adjusting existing practices as these proposed recommendations are expected to bring predictability and transparency to expiration and renewal related practices for gTLD registrants. As stated by the PEDNR Working Group 'these recommendations represent the compromise that has been found between the different viewpoints that existed amongst the WG members and the WG is confident that these recommendations will provide additional guarantees to registrants; will improve registrant education and comprehension, and; are in line with current registrar practices and will have minimal impact on most registrars and other affected stakeholders'.

d. An analysis of the period of time that would likely be necessary to implement the policy;

Taking into account the new requirements in the proposed recommendations, but also the obligation to provide a reasonable period of time to contracted parties to comply, it is the estimation that the implementation of these recommendations would take 6-18 months. ICANN Staff expects that the development of the implementation plan would take 2 to 3 months.

e. The advice of any outside advisors relied upon, which should be accompanied by a detailed statement of the advisor's (i) qualifications and relevant experience; and (ii) potential conflicts of interest;

Not applicable. (The GNSO did not rely on the advice of any outside advisors.)

f. The Final Report submitted to the Council

The Final Report of the Post-Expiration Domain Name Recovery Working Group can be found here: <http://gns0.icann.org/issues/pednr-final-report-14jun11-en.pdf>.

g. A copy of the minutes of the Council deliberation on the policy issue, including all opinions expressed during such deliberation, accompanied by a description of who expressed such opinions.

[From the GNSO Council Meeting Minutes \(21 July 2011\):](#)

Tim Ruiz, seconded by **Stéphane van Gelder** proposed a motion on the adoption of the PEDNR Final Report and Recommendations

Whereas on 7 May 2009, the GNSO Council launched a Policy Development Process (PDP) on Post-Expiration Domain Name Recovery (PEDNR) addressing the following five charter questions:

1. Whether adequate opportunity exists for registrants to redeem their expired domain names;

2. Whether expiration-related provisions in typical registration agreements are clear and conspicuous enough;
3. Whether adequate notice exists to alert registrants of upcoming expirations;
4. Whether additional measures need to be implemented to indicate that once a domain name enters the Auto-Renew Grace Period, it has expired (e.g., hold status, a notice on the site with a link to information on how to renew, or other options to be determined);
5. Whether to allow the transfer of a domain name during the RGP. Whereas this PDP has followed the prescribed PDP steps as stated in the ICANN Bylaws, resulting in a Final Report delivered on 14 June 2011;

Whereas the PEDNR WG has reached full consensus on the recommendations in relation to each of the five issues outlined above;

Whereas the PEDNR WG considers all the recommendations listed below as interdependent and has recommended that the GNSO Council should consider these recommendations as such;

Whereas the GNSO Council has reviewed and discussed these recommendations.

RESOLVED, the GNSO Council recommends to the ICANN Board of Directors:

(A):

- Define "Registered Name Holder at Expiration" (RNHaE) as the entity or individual that was eligible to renew the domain name registration immediately prior to expiration. If the domain name registration was modified pursuant to a term of the Registration Agreement authorizing the modification of registration data for the purposes of facilitating renewal but not at the explicit request of the registrant, the RNHaE is the entity or individual identified as the registrant immediately prior to that modification. (PEDNR Recommendation #1)
- For at least 8 consecutive days, at some point following expiration, the original DNS resolution path specified by the RNHaE, at the time of expiration, must be interrupted by the registrar, to the extent that the registry permits such interruptions⁴, and the domain must be renewable by the RNHaE until the end of that period. This 8-day period may occur at any time following expiration. At any time during the 8 day period, the Registered Name Holder at Expiration may renew the domain with the Registrar and the

⁴ DNS interruption is defined as total Internet service interruption except for an informational web page (only one IP on which only port 80 is active).

Registrar, within a commercially reasonable delay, will restore the domain name to resolve to its original DNS resolution path prior to expiration. Notwithstanding, the Registrar may delete the domain at any time during the Autorenew grace period. (PEDNR Recommendation #2)

- If at any time after expiration when the Registered Name is still renewable by the RNHaE, the Registrar changes the DNS resolution path to effect a different landing website than the one used by the RNHaE prior to expiration, the page shown must explicitly say that the domain has expired and give instructions on how to recover the domain. Wording in the policy must make clear that "instructions" may be as simple as directing the RNHaE to a specific web site. (PEDNR Recommendation #3)
- The RNHaE cannot be prevented from renewing a domain name registration as a result of WHOIS changes made by the Registrar that were not at the RNHaE's request. (PEDNR Recommendation #4)
- The registration agreement must include or point to any fee(s) charged for the post-expiration renewal of a domain name. If the Registrar operates a website for registration or renewal, it should state, both at the time of registration and in a clear place on its website, any fee(s) charged for the post-expiration renewal of a domain name or the recovery of a domain name during the Redemption Grace Period. (PEDNR Recommendation #5)
- The registration agreement and Registrar web site (if one is used) must clearly indicate what methods will be used to deliver pre- and post-expiration notifications, or must point to the location where such information can be found. What destination address/number will be used must also be specified, if applicable. (PEDNR Recommendation #6)
- Registrar must notify Registered Name Holder of impending expiration no less than two times. One such notice must be sent one month or 30 days prior to expiration (± 4 days) and one must be sent one week prior to expiration (± 3 days). If more than two alert notifications are sent, the timing of two of them must be comparable to the timings specified. (PEDNR Recommendation #7)
- Unless the Registered Name is renewed or deleted by the Registrar, at least one notification to the RNHaE, which includes renewal instructions, must be sent after expiration. (PEDNR Recommendation #8)

- Notifications of impending expiration must include method(s) that do not require explicit registrant action other than standard e-mail receipt in order to receive such notifications. (Recommendation #9)
- With the exception of sponsored⁵ gTLDs, all gTLD Registries shall offer the Redemption Grace Period (RGP). For currently existing unsponsored gTLDs that do not currently offer the RGP, a transition period shall be allowed. All new gTLDs must offer the RGP. As part of the implementation, ICANN Staff should consider the Technical Steering Group's Implementation Proposal (see <http://www.icann.org/en/meetings/bucharest/redemption-topic.htm>) (PEDNR Recommendation #13)
- If a Registrar offers registrations in a gTLD that supports the RGP, the Registrar must allow the Registered Name Holder at Expiration to redeem the Registered Name after it has entered RGP. (PEDNR Recommendation #14)
- A transfer of a domain name during the RGP should not be allowed. (PEDNR Recommendation #15)
- In the event that ICANN gives reasonable notice to Registrars that ICANN has published web content as described in PEDNR Recommendation #16:
 - Registrars, who have a web presence, must provide a link to the ICANN content on any website it may operate for domain name registration or renewal clearly displayed to its Registered Name Holders at least as clearly as its links to policies or notifications required to be displayed under ICANN Consensus Policies.
 - Registrars may also host similar material adapted to their specific practices and processes.
 - Registrar must point to the ICANN material in a communication sent to the registrant immediately following initial registration as well as in the mandated annual WHOIS reminder. (PEDNR Recommendation #17)

Note: Some of these recommendations may need special consideration in the context of existing provisions in the Uniform Dispute Resolution Policy (UDRP), the proposed Uniform Rapid Suspension System (URS) or exceptions due to fraud, breach of registration agreement or other

⁵ An unsponsored TLD operates under policies established by the global Internet community directly through the ICANN process, while a sponsored TLD is a specialized TLD that has a sponsor representing the narrower community that is most affected by the TLD. It should be noted that this distinction is no longer used in the new gTLD program.

substantive reasons and the GNSO Council, therefore, recommends that such considerations are taken into account as part of the implementation of these recommendations, once adopted.

(B)

The GNSO Council recommends the following best practices for promotion by ICANN and the Registrar Stakeholder Group:

- If post-expiration notifications are normally sent to a point of contact using the domain in question, and delivery is known to have been interrupted by postexpiration actions, post-expiration notifications should be sent to some other contact point associated with the registrant if one exists. (PEDNR Recommendation #10)
- The notification method explanation (see recommendation #9) should include the registrar's email address from which notification messages are sent and a suggestion that registrants save this email address as a 'safe sender' to avoid notification emails being blocked by spam filter software. (PEDNR Recommendation #11)
- Registrars should advise registrants to provide a secondary email point of contact that is not associated with the domain name itself so that in case of expiration reminders can be delivered to this secondary email point of contact. (PEDNR Recommendation #12)

(C)

The GNSO Council recommends that ICANN, in consultation with Registrars, ALAC and other interested parties, will develop educational materials about how to properly steward a domain name and how to prevent unintended loss. Such material may include registrant responsibilities and the gTLD domain life-cycle and guidelines for keeping domain name records current. (PEDNR Recommendation #16).

(D)

ICANN Compliance is requested to provide updates to the GNSO Council on a regular basis in relation to the implementation and effectiveness of the proposed recommendations, either in the form of a report that details amongst others the number of complaints received in relation to renewal and/or post-expiration related matters or in the form of audits that assess if the policy has been implemented as intended. (PEDNR Recommendation #18)

(E)

The GNSO Council shall convene a PEDNR Implementation Review Team to assist ICANN Staff in developing the implementation details for the new policy should it be approved by the ICANN Board. The Implementation Review Team will be tasked with evaluating the proposed implementation of the policy recommendations as approved by the Board and is expected to work with ICANN Staff to ensure that the resultant implementation meets the letter and intent of the approved policy. If the PEDNR Implementation Review Team identifies any potential modifications to the policy or new PEDNR policy recommendations, the PEDNR Implementation Review Team shall refer these to the GNSO Council for its consideration and follow-up, as appropriate. Following adoption by the ICANN Board of the recommendations, the GNSO Secretariat is authorized to issue a call for volunteers for a PEDNR Implementation Review Team to the members of the PEDNR Working Group.

The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

Action Item:

GNSO Secretariat will issue call for volunteers for a PEDNR Implementation Review Team when the new policy is approved by the Board.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

h. Consultations undertaken

External

Public comment forums were held on [the initiation of the policy development process](#), [the Initial Report](#), the [Proposed Final Report](#) and [the recommendations adopted by the GNSO Council](#), in addition to regular updates to the GNSO Council as well as workshops to inform and solicit the input from the ICANN Community at ICANN meetings (see for example, the ICANN Meeting in [Brussels](#) and [San Francisco](#)). Constituency statements were submitted (see <https://community.icann.org/display/gnsopednr/Constituency+Statements>). All the comments received were reviewed and considered by the PEDNR Working Group (see section 7 of the PEDNR Final Report).

Internal

Regular input was received from different ICANN Departments in relation to the recommendations under consideration and potential issues raised with the PEDNR Working Group (see, for example, <http://forum.icann.org/lists/gnso-pednr-dt/msg00691.html> and <http://forum.icann.org/lists/gnso-pednr-dt/msg00802.html>).

i. Summary and Analysis of Public Comment Forum to provide input on the PEDNR Recommendations adopted by the GNSO Council prior to ICANN Board consideration

A public comment forum was held from 15 August to 15 September (see <http://www.icann.org/en/public-comment/pednr-board-recommendations-15aug11-en.htm>). Seven comments were received: four from Organizations and Groups (Registries Stakeholder Group, the Business Constituency, the At-Large Advisory Committee and the Intellectual Property Constituency), and three from individuals (Serj, Vijaya Sree Nidadhavolu and Alan Greenberg).

Summary

Serj's comment relates to a specific practice from Serj's host/registrar, which is called 'extended expiration' during which the expired domain name registration is available for renewal for an additional 2-3 months at an additional cost. In Serj's view, there should be 'a ban of this practice altogether or perhaps a cap on the amount one may charge'.

The Registries Stakeholder Group (RySG) expresses its support for the recommendations and supports their consideration by the ICANN Board. The Business Constituency (BC) also expresses its support for the proposed recommendations and has provided its rationale for supporting the recommendations in its submission. Only with regard to recommendation #2, which recommends that at a minimum 8 consecutive days need to be provided during which the DNS resolution path must be interrupted, the BC notes that it would support a 30 day, instead of 8 day period.

Vijaya agrees that 'reasonable opportunity should be given for the owner of the domain to recover his domain name'. As such, Vijaya suggests that the registrant should be notified on a

different email address than the one that is associated with the registration; a free text message should be sent at least five days before expiration, and; once the registrant has indicated its intention to renew the registration, the domain name should remain in its original state.

The At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) points out some of the challenges the PEDNR Working Group faced such as 'active and continued participation', but notes that despite that it is 'pleased that some progress was made in advancing gTLD registrant rights and that ICANN will be taking positive action to educate, inform and support gTLD registrants' and therefore encourages the ICANN Board to adopt the recommendations.

In its contribution, the Intellectual Property Constituency (IPC) expresses its concern 'with the lack of feedback from the PEDNR Working Group on our comments of April 21, 2011 regarding the Proposed Final Report'. In addition, the IPC comment provides feedback on each of the recommendations proposed, most of which are supported, but reiterating its comments that were made on the proposed Final Report. In response to the submission by the IPC, Alan provides a detailed analysis of how the comments of the IPC have been reviewed and addressed by the PEDNR WG, noting that 'the WG did carefully consider all of the comments and fully debated them'.

Analysis

Serj's comment does not relate to any specific recommendation from the PEDNR Working Group, and although the proposed recommendations do not 'ban' or 'cap the amount one may charge', they are intended to provide additional guarantees to registrants and intended to improve registrant education and comprehension of post-expiration and renewal related practices.

With regard to the BC comment to provide a 30, instead of 8 day consecutive period during which the DNS resolution path must be interrupted following expiration, it should be noted that the recommended 8 days is a minimum not a maximum period. It should also be noted that the PEDNR Working Group discussed the proposed timeframe extensively and the 8 day period is the consensus position that was found between the different viewpoints in the Working Group. In relation to the comments from the IPC, Alan's analysis and response provides an accurate

overview of how the PEDNR Working Group reviewed and addressed the comments made by the IPC. The PEDNR Working Group developed a public comment review tool in which it responded to the different comments received and provided details of how the comments would be addressed, if it was determined that a change to the report was warranted. A link to this public comment review tool was also provided in the Final Report. Following further discussions on the PEDNR mailing list, it is worth pointing out that the majority of active WG members felt that AG's response fairly represents the views of the WG.

j. Impact / Implementation Considerations from ICANN Staff

- As recognized by the PEDNR Working Group, some of the recommendations may need special consideration in the context of existing provisions in the Uniform Dispute Resolution Policy (UDRP), the proposed Uniform Rapid Suspension System (URS) or exceptions due to fraud, breach of registration agreement or other substantive reasons. Such considerations will be taken into account by ICANN Staff as part of the development of the implementation plan for these recommendations, once adopted.
- It should be noted that several of the recommendations propose minimum requirements, such as: for a minimum of 8 days the original DNS path needs to be interrupted and the registrant may renew the registration during that period, and; at a minimum two notices need to be sent prior to expiration to remind the registrant of the upcoming expiration. Currently many registrars offer far beyond 8 days and/or send more than two notices. It is the expectation of the PEDNR Working Group that this will not change as a result of the adoption of these recommendations.
- The PEDNR WG noted that ‘the implementation timeline for some of the recommendations may be different from others. The recommendations should be implemented as quickly as practicable without introducing delays simply to keep the implementations synchronized’.
- In relation to the recommendation that ICANN Contractual Compliance Department is requested to provide regular updates to the GNSO Council and report on the ‘effectiveness’ of the proposed recommendations, Staff would like to receive input from the PEDNR Implementation Review Team concerning what is meant with ‘effectiveness’ and how such ‘effectiveness’ is expected to be measured. The ICANN Compliance Department is more than happy to provide reports and data on complaints received by ICANN and related

compliance/enforcement activities but evaluation of whether this policy is effective should be up to the community and the information and data to be used for the evaluation should not be limited to data available from Compliance.

- Additional implementation considerations might be raised once implementation gets underway, but Staff expects that such issues can be addressed by working together with the recommended PEDNR Implementation Review Team.