EPDP: Registration Data

NARALO ICANN75 Read-out

Alan Greenberg

17 November 2022

EPDP

- Expedited Policy Development Process
  - Expedited in that several steps in a traditional PDP are omitted
    - So it may be faster than a traditional PDP on the same topic
    - But not necessarily fast!

- EPDP: Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data
  - i.e. WHOIS

History

- EU GDPR – Privacy protection. AND PENALTIES
- May 2018 – Temporary Specification
- July 2018 – EDPD on Temp Spec
- Feb. 2019 – EPDP Phase 1 Report Issued
- May 2019 – EDPD Phase 1 Recommendations Board approval
- Feb. 2020 – Expected completion of policy formulation AND Contracted Part Implementation
- Phase 2: May 2019-July 2020 – Request & Disclosure System

History

- EU GDPR – Privacy protection. AND PENALTIES
- May 2018 – Temporary Specification
- July 2018 – EDPD on Temp Spec
- Feb. 2019 – EPDP Phase 1 Report Issued
- May 2019 – EDPD Phase 1 Recommendations Board approval
- Feb. 2020 – Expected completion of policy formulation AND Contracted Part Implementation
- Phase 2: May 2019-July 2020 – Request & Disclosure System

Phase 1

- Policy to replace the Temporary Spec

- Report completed February 2019

- Hoped that recommendations would result in a formal policy and be implemented within a year

- Draft policy issued prior to ICANN75
  - Comment period ongoing

- Planned implementation: 4Q 2024

Phase 2

- Temporary Spec and Phase 1 Recommendations resulted in most traditional WHOIS data being redacted

- Phase 2: Decide on policy associated with a system to allow requesting redacted data.

- SSAD: **S**tandardized **S**ystem for **A**ccess and **D**isclosure

SSAD

- Recommendations were only partially agreed to the EPDP

- GNSO Council → ICANN Board
  - All recommendations

- ALAC Advice to Board:
  - Don't implement SSAD
    - Not Standardized (despite name)
    - Will take too long to implement and be very expensive
    - Does not provide sufficient functionality
    - Implement a simple ticketing system to track disclosure requests

ODP – Operational Design Phase

- Staff analysis of recommendations to assist Board in deciding how to address recommendations
  - ODA: Operational Design Analysis
- Result was complex, expensive and would take a long time to implement
  - No basis for understanding to what extent it would be used (due to charges, delay in implementing, and minimal benefits)

How to move forward?

- GNSO Convened small team to review the ODA and made recommendations on how to proceed
  - Some major problems with ODA.
  - Small team recommends a stripped down system
    - Comparable to ALAC advice to Board!
  - Staff to design such a system (probably using existing infrastructure within ICANN as a basis)

WHOIS Disclosure System (WDS)

- Simplifies the process for submitting and receiving requests for nonpublic gTLD registration data for both requestors and contracted parties.
  - Features for requestors to easily create and manage requests.
  - Features for registrars to effectively manage and process in-bound requests.

- Cost-effective
  - Simpler features allow system to be built quickly.
  - Less costly to build and maintain the system.
  - Utilization of existing ICANN systems.

System Features

- System connects requestors and registrars.
  - Registries are not envisioned to be system users.
- System handles data requests for gTLD registration data.
- No identity verification.
- Any communications between requestors and registrars takes place outside of the system.
  - i.e., Clarifying questions, additional documentation request, data disclosure, etc.
- No integration with registrars' systems.
- Logging

Registrar Participation

- Registrars must provide "reasonable access" to registration data.

    - No specific policy or contract requirement for registrars to integrate with a WHOIS Disclosure System.

    - Org is exploring how to encourage participation, and will discuss with Small Team if implementation moves forward.

WDS vs SSAD

	WHOIS Disclosure System		**SSAD**
Dev. Timeline	**+/- 9 months** ● System development (requirements refinement, development, UAT, and launch)		**3 - 4 years** ● IRT ● RFPs ● System development
Dev. Cost	**Approx. $20k** **(external infoSec & penetration testing)** ● + Internal staff costs of approx. $1.7M		**Approx. $20M - $27M** ● System development by vendors
Post-Launch Cost	**Approx. $70k** **(2-year license costs)** ● + Internal staff costs of approx. $1M (2-year maintenance only, no other operational costs included) ● + Contingency costs of $500k	**VS.**	**Approx. $14M - $107M** **(Annual Ongoing Operations)** ● Operations outsourced ● 7 functions vendors
Complexity	● **3** types of actors ● **3** Subsystems ● **2** Processes		● **8** types of actors ● **8** Subsystems ● **60** Processes
Fee Structure	**No Fee**		Accreditations/Identity Verifications: **$86 - $21 (low - high usage)** Requestor Declaration Verification: **$190- $160 (low - high usage)** Disclosure Requests: **$40 - $0.45 (low - high usage)**

Small Team Reaction

- Generally positive!
- A few MUST-HAVE changes
  - None very costly or onerous
- Some things to be decided/changed during final design and implementation but no reason not to proceed
- Some enhancements needed and potentially incremental change later

Next Steps

- Report to GNSO Council

- GNSO Council vote in December

- Presuming Council agreement
  →Board