

## RECOMMENDATION 22

#	Comment	Contributor	EPDP Response / Action Taken
	<p>The EPDP Team recommends that as part of the implementation of these policy recommendations, updates are made to the following existing policies / procedures, and any others that may have been omitted, to ensure consistency with these policy recommendations as a number of these refer to administrative and/or technical contact which will no longer be required data elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Registry Registration Data Directory Services Consistent Labeling and Display Policy</li> <li>• Thick WHOIS Transition Policy for .COM, .NET, .JOBS</li> <li>• Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy</li> <li>• WHOIS Data Reminder Policy</li> <li>• Transfer Policy</li> <li>• Uniform Rapid Suspension System (URS) Rules</li> </ul>		

  

Response Category	Count	Percentage
Support recommendation as written	17	41%
Support intent of recommendation with edits	10	24%
Intent and wording of this recommendation requires amendment	1	2%
Delete recommendation	0	0%
Not designated	14	33%

**Support recommendation as written**

#	Comment	Contributor	EPDP Response / Action Taken
1.	No comments provided in support of this recommendation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evin Erdoğan; ALAC</li> <li>• Sivasubramanian Muthusamy; Internet Society India Chennai</li> <li>• DR. JAIDEEP KUMAR MISHRA ; DIRECTOR MINISTRY OF ELECTRONICS AND INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY, GOVERNMENT OF INDIA</li> <li>• Farzaneh Badii; Internet Governance Project</li> <li>• Michele Neylon; Blacknight Internet Solutions Ltd</li> <li>• Sara Bockey; GoDaddy</li> <li>• Volker Greimann; Key-Systems GmbH</li> <li>• Zoe Bonython; RrSG</li> <li>• Domain.com, LLC &amp; affiliates</li> <li>• Ayden Férdeline; NCSG</li> <li>• Lars Steffen; eco – Association of the Internet Industry</li> <li>• Wolf-Ulrich Knoben; ISPCP Constituency</li> <li>• Monica Sanders; i2Coalition</li> <li>• David Martel</li> <li>• Etienne Laurin</li> <li>• Ben Butler; SSAC</li> <li>• Ivett Paulovics; MFSD Srl URS Provider</li> </ul>	<p><b>Support</b></p> <p>EPDP Response: The EPDP Team appreciates the support.</p> <p>Action Taken: None <b>COMPLETED</b></p>
<b>Support intent of recommendation with edits</b>			

<p>2.</p>	<p>The EPDP Team recommends that as part of the implementation of these policy recommendations, updates are made to the following existing policies / procedures, and any others that may have been omitted, to ensure consistency with these policy recommendations as a number of these refer to administrative and/or technical contact which will no longer be required data elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Registry Registration Data Directory Services Consistent Labeling and Display Policy</li> <li>• Thick WHOIS Transition Policy for .COM, .NET, .JOBS</li> <li>• Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy</li> <li>• WHOIS Data Reminder Policy</li> <li>• Transfer Policy</li> <li>• Uniform Rapid Suspension System (URS) Rules</li> <li>• Privacy &amp; Proxy Services Accreditation Issues Policy</li> <li>• Additional WHOIS information Policy (governing insertion of EPP status codes)</li> <li>• Expired Registration Recovery Policy</li> </ul> <p>We agree overall with reviewing all existing ICANN Consensus Policies and implementation documents for consistency with final Consensus Policy on RDDS, although the specific contours may evolve by the time the final EPDP recommendations are adopted. For instance, the specific note about admin/technical contacts going away may not be the case, and we might suggest that part of this text be deleted because it presupposes a final conclusion. We also propose adding the PPSAI policy to this list, even though it is still in IRT phase – technically it has still been adopted as a relevant ICANN Consensus Policy. The work of the PPIRT should be resumed immediately.</p> <p>A recommendation that describes how Privacy/Proxy data should be displayed in WHOIS is needed. IPC suggests using the wording from the Temp Spec, as revised below e.g.</p> <p>Recommendation XX</p> <p>In the case of a domain name registration where a privacy/proxy service used (e.g. where data associated with a natural person is masked), Registrar MUST include in the public WHOIS and return in</p>	<p>Brian King; IPC</p>	<p><b>Concerns</b></p> <p><b>EPDP Response:</b></p> <p><b>Action Taken:</b></p> <p><b>[COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED]</b> – [Instruction of what was done.]</p>
-----------	---	------------------------	---

#	Comment	Contributor	EPDP Response / Action Taken
	<p>response to any query full WHOIS data, including the existing privacy/proxy pseudonymized email.</p> <p>Except as set forth above, the privacy/proxy service policy should not be addressed in the EPDP, and instead, ICANN should immediately proceed with finalizing implementation of the PPSAI.</p>		
3.	<p>Modify opening paragraph to read: The EPDP Team recommends that as part of the implementation of these policy recommendations, updates are made to the following existing policies / procedures, and any others that may have been omitted, to ensure consistency with these policy recommendations as a number of these refer to administrative and/or technical contact which may no longer be required data elements</p> <p>COA believes the word “may” should be substituted for the word “will” in the last line of the opening paragraph because the word “will” presupposes a final conclusion.</p> <p>Furthermore, while COA agrees with the IPC that in general ICANN consensus policies should be updated to ensure consistency with whichever of these GDPR related policy recommendations are ultimately adopted, and that the Privacy/Proxy Service Accreditation policy is one of those consensus policies (although ICANN has decided to delay indefinitely its implementation), we note that the Privacy/Proxy consensus policy was developed in full awareness of the EU Data Protection Framework Directive (the predecessor to the GDPR), so we anticipate that few, if any, changes to its implementation would be necessary. We also note that there is nothing in the Charter of the EPDP addressing privacy/proxy services, and thus join the IPC request that implementation work on this privacy/proxy consensus policy be resumed immediately.</p>	Dean S. Marks; Coalition for Online Accountability	<p><b>Concerns</b></p> <p><b>EPDP Response:</b></p> <p><b>Action Taken:</b></p> <p><b>[COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED]</b> – [Instruction of what was done.]</p>

#	Comment	Contributor	EPDP Response / Action Taken
4.	<p>The EPDP Team recommends that as part of the implementation of these policy recommendations, updates are made to the following existing policies / procedures, and any others that may have been omitted, to ensure consistency with these policy recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Registry Registration Data Directory Services Consistent Labeling and Display Policy</li> <li>• Thick WHOIS Transition Policy for .COM, .NET, .JOBS</li> <li>• Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy</li> <li>• WHOIS Data Reminder Policy</li> <li>• Transfer Policy</li> <li>• Uniform Rapid Suspension System (URS) Rules</li> <li>• Privacy &amp; Proxy Services Accreditation Issues (PPSAI) Policy [ added ]</li> <li>• Additional WHOIS Information Policy, governing insertion of EPP status codes [added]</li> <li>• Expired Registration Recovery policy [added]</li> </ul> <p>The BC supports an edited version of this recommendation, provided the data is replaced with that of an appropriate contact. Note that the BC also recommends adding the PPSAI policy to this list. PPSAI is in implementation phase, since it has been adopted as ICANN Consensus Policy, and Implementation should be resumed immediately.</p> <p>In the case of a domain name registration where a privacy/proxy service used (e.g. where data associated with a natural person is masked), Registrar MUST return in response to any query full WHOIS data, including the existing proxy/proxy pseudonymized email.</p>	Steve DelBianco; BC	<p><b>Concerns</b></p> <p><b>EPDP Response:</b></p> <p><b>Action Taken:</b></p> <p>[ <b>COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED</b> ] –  [Instruction of what was done.]</p>

#	Comment	Contributor	EPDP Response / Action Taken
5.	<p>The EPDP Team recommends that as part of the implementation of these policy recommendations, updates are made to the following existing policies / procedures, and any others that may have been omitted, to ensure consistency with these policy recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Registry Registration Data Directory Services Consistent Labeling and Display Policy</li> <li>• Thick WHOIS Transition Policy for .COM, .NET, .JOBS</li> <li>• Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy</li> <li>• WHOIS Data Reminder Policy</li> <li>• Transfer Policy</li> <li>• Uniform Rapid Suspension System (URS) Rules</li> <li>• Privacy &amp; Proxy Services Accreditation Issues Policy</li> </ul> <p>Privacy / Proxy Policy (PPSAI) should be added to the list. Even though it is still in implementation phase, it has still been adopted as ICANN Consensus Policy.</p>	<p>Jeremy Dallman, David Ladd – Microsoft Threat Intelligence Center; Amy Hogan-Burney, Richard Boscovich – Digital Crimes Unit; Makalika Naholowaa, Teresa Rodewald, Cam Gatta – Trademark; Mark Svancarek, Ben Wallace, Paul Mitchell – Internet Technology &amp; Governance Policy; Cole Quinn – Domains and Registry; Joanne Charles – Privacy &amp; Regulatory Affairs; Microsoft Corporation</p>	<p><b>Concerns</b></p> <p><b>EPDP Response:</b></p> <p><b>Action Taken:</b></p> <p>[ <b>COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED</b> ] – [Instruction of what was done.]</p>
6.	<p>".... as a number of these refer to administrative and/or technical contact [insert: "or other registration data elements"] which will no longer be required data elements [insert: "or there may be other changes"]: ...."</p> <p>There could be other changes which might affect the above referenced policies and procedures.</p>	<p>John Poole; Domain Name Registrant</p>	<p><b>Concerns</b></p> <p><b>EPDP Response:</b></p> <p><b>Action Taken:</b></p> <p>[ <b>COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED</b> ] – [Instruction of what was done.]</p>
7.	<p>No additional comments added.</p>	<p>A. Mark Massey; Domain Name Rights Coalition</p>	<p><b>Concerns</b></p> <p><b>EPDP Response:</b></p> <p><b>Action Taken:</b></p> <p>[ <b>COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED</b> ] – [Instruction of what was done.]</p>

#	Comment	Contributor	EPDP Response / Action Taken
8.	<p>The EPDP Team recommends that as part of the implementation of these policy recommendations, updates are made to the following existing policies / procedures, to ensure consistency with these policy recommendations, specifically by modifying the references to administrative and/or technical contacts, which will no longer be required data elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Registry Registration Data Directory Services Consistent Labeling and Display Policy</li> <li>• Thick WHOIS Transition Policy for .COM, .NET, .JOBS</li> <li>• Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy</li> <li>• WHOIS Data Reminder Policy</li> <li>• Transfer Policy</li> <li>• Uniform Rapid Suspension System (URS) Rules</li> </ul> <p>Specificity is important so that there is no confusion around what policies are recommended for review and modification or what the proposed changes are.</p>	Tucows Domains Inc.	<p><b>Concerns</b></p> <p><b>EPDP Response:</b></p> <p><b>Action Taken:</b></p> <p><b>[COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED]</b> –  [Instruction of what was done.]</p>

#	Comment	Contributor	EPDP Response / Action Taken
9.	<p>The RySG recommends the following edits to Recommendation #22:</p> <p>“The EPDP Team recommends that as part of the implementation of policy recommendations, conforming updates are identified to existing policies / procedures to ensure consistency with policy recommendations.”</p> <p>The RySG recognizes that a general Recommendation to identify any necessary conforming edits to impacted consensus policies to ensure conformity with the resultant policy will be important for continuity across policies. However, the RySG does not feel that the EPDP reached consensus on this issue and that further discussion within the group is required.</p> <p>The RySG could not identify any explicit instances where the EPDP Team has discussed which individual policies need to be updated, with the exception of the URS. While we agree with the importance of maintaining consistency across the wide variety of policies the EPDP touches on, we cannot express support for or advise changes to this recommendation at this time. In particular, we cannot express support or advise changes until further deliberations have been made to ensure the comprehensiveness and accuracy of such a list, which should be included as part of the implementation phase of this policy development process.</p>	Wim Degezelle ; RySG	<p><b>Concerns</b></p> <p><b>EPDP Response:</b></p> <p><b>Action Taken:</b></p> <p><b>[ COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED ]</b> –  [Instruction of what was done.]</p>



#	Comment	Contributor	EPDP Response / Action Taken
10.	<p>The EPDP Team recommends that as part of the implementation of these policy recommendations, updates are made to the following existing policies / procedures, and any others that may have been omitted, to ensure consistency with these policy recommendations as a number of these refer to administrative and/or technical contact which will no longer be required data elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Registry Registration Data Directory Services Consistent Labeling and Display Policy</li> <li>• Thick WHOIS Transition Policy for .COM, .NET, .JOBS</li> <li>• Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy</li> <li>• WHOIS Data Reminder Policy</li> <li>• Transfer Policy</li> <li>• Uniform Rapid Suspension System (URS) Rules</li> <li>• Privacy &amp; Proxy Services Accreditation Issues Policy</li> </ul> <p>MarkMonitor agrees overall with reviewing all existing ICANN Consensus Policies and implementation documents for consistency with final Consensus Policy on RDDS, although the specific contours may evolve by the time the final EPDP recommendations are adopted. For instance, the specific note about admin/technical contacts may not be the case, and we suggest that this text be deleted because it presupposes a final conclusion.</p> <p>MarkMonitor also proposes adding the PPSAI policy to this list. Even though it is still in implementation phase, it has still been adopted as ICANN Consensus Policy.</p>	Brian King; MarkMonitor, Inc., a Clarivate Analytics company	<p><b>Concerns</b></p> <p><b>EPDP Response:</b></p> <p><b>Action Taken:</b></p> <p>[ <b>COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED</b> ] – [Instruction of what was done.]</p>
11.	<p>The remaining thin gTLD registries should be required to move to thick status, per the Thick WHOIS Consensus Policy and Board Resolution 2014.02.07.08.</p> <p>See SSAC's SAC101 for rationale.</p>	Greg Aaron; iThreat Cyber Group	<p><b>Concerns</b></p> <p><b>EPDP Response:</b></p> <p><b>Action Taken:</b></p> <p>[ <b>COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED</b> ] – [Instruction of what was done.]</p>
<b>Intent and wording of this recommendation requires amendment</b>			
<b>Delete recommendation</b>			
<b>Not designated</b>			

#	Comment	Contributor	EPDP Response / Action Taken
10.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sivasubramanian Muthusamy; Internet Society India Chennai</li> <li>• Lori Schulman Senior Director, Internet Policy; International Trademark Association (INTA)</li> <li>• George Kirikos; Leap of Faith Financial Services Inc.</li> <li>• Tim Chen; DomainTools</li> <li>• Mark Massey; Domain Name Rights Coalition</li> <li>• Steve Gobin; Corporate domain name management</li> <li>• Ashley Heineman; NTIA</li> <li>• Neil Fried; The Motion Picture Association of America</li> <li>• Sajda Ouachtouki; The Walt Disney Company</li> <li>• Greg Mounier on behalf of Europol AGIS; Europol Advisory Group on Internet Security</li> <li>• Monique A. Goeschl; Verein für Anti-Piraterie der Film- und Videobranche (VAP)</li> <li>• Fabien Betremieux; GAC</li> <li>• Brian Beckham; Head, Internet Dispute Resolution Section at WIPO</li> <li>• Theo Geurts</li> <li>• Ivett Paulovics; MFSD Srl URS Provider</li> <li>• Ashley Roberts; Valideus</li> <li>• Renee Fossen; Forum - URS and UDRP Provider</li> <li>• Stephanie Perrin</li> </ul>	<p><b>EPDP Response:</b> none</p> <p><b>Action Taken:</b> none</p> <p><b>[COMPLETED]</b></p>

Enter any other additional comments or observations you have on Section 3: Other Recommendations that are not covered by these questions.

#	Comment	Contributor	EPDP Response / Action Taken
11.	<p>The ALAC would like to note that migration from thin to thick registries should be respected and that the registrars and registry operator of .COM, .NET and .JOBS should comply with the announcement made by ICANN on 25 October 2018 which states that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- By 31 May 2019: The registry operator must begin accepting Thick WHOIS data from registrars for existing registrations in .COM, .NET and .JOBS.</li> <li>- By 30 November 2019: All registrars must send Thick WHOIS data to the registry operator for all new registrations in .COM, .NET and .JOBS.</li> <li>- By 31 May 2020: All registrars are required to complete the transition to Thick WHOIS data for all registrations in .COM, .NET and .JOBS.</li> </ul> <p>The vast majority of gTLDs are thick, and unless ICANN will take action to change all of these to thin, the results of the Thick WHOIS PDP must be honoured.</p>	Evin Erdoğan; ALAC	<p><b>Concerns</b></p> <p><b>EPDP Response:</b></p> <p><b>Action Taken:</b></p> <p><b>[ COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED ]</b> –  [Instruction of what was done.]</p>

<p>12.</p>	<p>Thick WHOIS Transition Policy for .COM, .NET, .JOBS</p> <p>The ongoing existence of thin Whois databases is demonstrable proof that ICANN’s mandate to protect the security, stability, and resilience of the Internet does NOT require the collection of personal data by registries. It may also point to the fact that it does not require the collection of personal data by registrars. ICANN should scrap any thick Whois transition for currently-thin registries and instead look to transition currently-thick registries to thin registries. Thick Whois is unnecessary for any TLD, including these. In this matter, the principle of data minimization is instructive: if the data are not necessary for provision of the service (as they are clearly not), it ought not be collected by the registry.</p> <p>Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy</p> <p>Tucows notes that the URS procedures require communication by the vendor via secure means and note that this should be the standard for UDRP as well. Arbitration vendors are custodians of personal data and, as such, should only be communicating with contracted parties in a secure manner. Public PGP keys as are used by the URS vendors also help confirm the identity of a vendor. The URS rules are fine as is but this section should be extended to UDRP.</p> <p>WHOIS Data Reminder Policy</p> <p>The Whois Data Reminder Policy can be understood to require that personal data be sent via email, which is an insecure and thus problematic medium for such data transmission. This policy should be amended to allow for more secure methods of reminding the RNH of their domain data, and to clearly not require the inclusion of data that is no longer required (as the Admin and Tech contacts may be, pending the outcome of this EPDP)</p> <p>Transfer Policy</p> <p>The TechOps Group has provided helpful instruction and we recommend that the EPDP and ICANN defer to their expert opinion.</p> <p>Uniform Rapid Suspension System (URS) Rules</p>	<p>Tucows Domains Inc.</p>	
------------	--	----------------------------	--

#	Comment	Contributor	EPDP Response / Action Taken
	Because URS Rules for accommodate better privacy protections, Tucows notes recommends that certain of them (namely those that relate to public PGP keys) be extended to UDRP.		
13.	The transition of com, net and .jobs to "thick" should be stopped. They should remain as thin registries.	Michele Neylon; Blacknight Internet Solutions Ltd	