

# Additional Registration Data Directory Services (RDDS) Information Policy

As of [INSERT Registration Data Policy Effective Date] this Policy was updated to reflect changes required to implement the Registration Data Policy. This policy was previously known as the Additional Whois Information Policy [insert link to the previous policy].

The key words "MUST", "MUST NOT", "REQUIRED", "SHALL", "SHALL NOT", "SHOULD", "SHOULD NOT", "RECOMMENDED", "NOT RECOMMENDED", "MAY", and "OPTIONAL" in this document are to be interpreted as described in BCP 14 [RFC2119] [RFC8174] when, and only when, they appear in all capitals, as shown here.

Section 1 of this policy details technology-agnostic requirements that apply to all Registration Data Directory Services.

Section 2 of this policy details implementation requirements pertaining to WHOIS (available via port 43) and web-based Whois directory services only.

ICANN-accredited registrars and gTLD registries are obligated pursuant to their respective agreements with ICANN to provide query-based access to certain Registration Data. This Additional RDDS Information Policy additionally requires registrars and registries to include in their RDDS output information to help RDDS users better identify a registration's sponsoring registrar and understand the status codes used by registries and registrars, as follows:

1. Registry Operators and Registrars SHALL implement the following requirements:
  - 1.1. ↓
  - 1.2. include in their RDDS output the following message: "For more information on RDDS status codes, please visit <https://icann.org/epp>" \*  
  
\* Please note that the longer form of the above link that was previously included in section 1(c), i.e., <https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/epp-status-codes-2014-06-16-en> is also compliant under the AWIP.
  - 1.3. ↓

Deleted: Whois

Formatted: Space After: 15 pt, Pattern: Clear (White)

Commented [A1]: The registration data policy, CL&D, Whois Advisory, and RDAP profile use IETF keywords. Using IETF keywords in AWIP should make it easier for implementers to understand the requirements and harmonize this policy with the rest.

Commented [A2]: This follows the same approach as the registration data policy: 1) technology-agnostic requirements, and 2) section with implementation requirements for legacy whois/web-whois. An RDAP implementer would only need to read section 1.

Deleted: r

Deleted: d

Deleted: via web pages and at port 43

Deleted: Whois

Deleted: Whois

Deleted: Whois

Deleted: ,

Deleted: Registrars and registries who include domain name registration statuses in Whois output must

Deleted: 1

Commented [A3]: Moved to section 2.

Deleted: only refer to the

Deleted: Domain

Deleted: status

Deleted: (

Deleted: es

Deleted: )

Deleted: by their respective EPP status codes;

Deleted: ¶

Deleted: provide a link or URL next to each EPP status code that directs to an ICANN web page describing and defining the respective EPP status code. A list of URLs is available at <https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/epp-status-codes-list-2014-06-18-en>; and

Deleted: Whois

Deleted: Whois

Commented [A4]: This requirement was reflected in the RDAP Profile RP section 2.6.3: <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rdap-response-profile-15feb19-en.pdf>

Commented [A5]: Moved to Section2.

Deleted: Registrars shall not remove the links and message described above when providing W( ... [1]

1.4. Registries MUST use the ICANN-issued Globally Unique Registrar Identification number (GURID, commonly known as the IANA ID) in their RDDS output.

**Commented [A6]:** If Registries are required to show a Registrar ID by the reg data policy, it should be the IANA ID.

**Deleted:** must

**Deleted:** include

**Commented [A7]:** This requirement was reflected in the RDAP Profile RP section 2.4.3: <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rdap-response-profile-15feb19-en.pdf>

**Deleted:** in their Whois output in the form of: Sponsoring Registrar IANA ID: 99999

2. Registry Operators and Registrars SHALL implement the following requirements for WHOIS (available via port 43) and web-based WHOIS directory services:

2.1. status(es) MUST be referred by their respective EPP status codes;

**Deleted:** Implementations of WHOIS (available via port 43) and web-based Whois directory services SHALL comply with:

2.2. a link or URL MUST be shown next to each EPP status code that directs to an ICANN web page describing and defining the respective EPP status code. A list of URLs is available at <https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/epp-status-codes-list-2014-06-18-en>;

**Commented [A8]:** In RDAP, RFC8056 provides a mapping between EPP and RDAP, and the RFC8056 is required from the RDAP TIG section 1.

2.3. Registrar, SHALL NOT remove the links and message described above when providing Whois data from its own or another registrar or registry's Whois service.

**Commented [A9]:** RDAP defines the EPP status codes as parameters in a data structure therefore it's clear the status(es) being used. An RDAP client may decide to provide links.

**Deleted:** s

Note: this section applies to contracted parties providing WHOIS (available via port 43) or web-based Whois directory services.

**Formatted:** Indent: Left: 0.25", Space After: 15 pt, No bullets or numbering, Pattern: Clear (White)

**Formatted:** Font color: Black

**Notes:** The Additional RDDS Information Policy (ARIP, originally known as Additional Whois Information Policy) was adopted by ICANN as a consensus policy on 6 May 2012. The effective date of this policy is 31 January 2016. All ICANN-accredited registrars and gTLD registries must comply with the AWIP with respect to registrations they sponsor in all top-level domains, which they are accredited for or administer, beginning on the effective date.

**Deleted:** Whois

**Deleted:** AWIP

The purpose of this policy is to clarify the meaning of EPP status codes in RDDS data and require the consistent identification of registrars by their GURID in RDDS.

**Deleted:** Whois

**Deleted:** Whois

**Background:** On 24 June 2009, the GNSO Council launched a Policy Development Process (PDP) in connection to the Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy (IRTP) (<https://gns0.icann.org/en/council/resolutions#200906> - resolution 20090624-2) and the PDP working group (IRTP Working Group B) submitted its Final Report on 30 May 2011 with a set of recommendations (<https://gns0.icann.org/issues/transfers/irtp-b-final-report-30may11-en.pdf> [PDF, 971 KB]), including Recommendation #8: to standardize and clarify RDDS status messages regarding "Registrar Lock" status. On 22 June 2011, the GNSO Council resolved that prior to the consideration of approval of the

**Deleted:** Whois

recommendation regarding the standardizing and clarifying RDDS status messages regarding Registrar Lock status, the GNSO Council would request ICANN staff to provide a proposal designed to ensure a technically feasible approach can be developed to meet this recommendation. In response to this request, ICANN staff developed a proposal in consultation with the working group which was posted for public comment and subsequently adopted by the GNSO Council on 16 February 2012 (<https://gns0.icann.org/en/council/resolutions#20120216-1>). Following another public comment forum on the recommendation and proposal (<https://www.icann.org/en/news/public-comment/irtp-b-rec8-21feb12-en.htm>) the ICANN Board adopted these on 6 May 2012. (<https://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/documents/resolutions-06may12-en.htm#1.5>)

**Deleted:** Whois

An additional GNSO working group (IRTP Working Group C) was tasked on 22 September 2011 to consider three questions related to the IRTP, including whether the process could be streamlined by a requirement that registries use IANA IDs for registrars rather than proprietary IDs (<https://community.icann.org/display/gnsoirtpdpwg/3.+WG+Charter>). The working group issued an initial report that was the object of a public comment and subsequently a final report that was adopted by the GNSO Council on 17 October 2012. Following another public comment forum, the ICANN Board adopted the recommendations of the final report on 20 December 2012 (<https://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/documents/minutes-20dec12-en.htm#2.a>).

**Commented [A10]:** Registration data policy is the authoritative source defining if the EPP status codes shall be shown in RDDS.

**Deleted: 1** This requirement is not intended to require any registrar or registry to include domain name statuses in its Whois output if it is not already obligated to do so. But for those registrars and registries who do include a domain's status in Whois, the status must be in the form of the respective EPP code and conform to the other requirements of this policy.

1.1.