Thick WHOIS Policy Implementation

Meeting of the IRT | 16 December 2015

Follow-up to Transition Discussions in Dublin

From: Fabien Betremieux <fabien.betremieux@icann.org>
Date: Wednesday, November 25, 2015 at 12:14 AM
To: "gnso-impl-thickwhois-rt@icann.org" <gnso-impl-thickwhois-rt@icann.org>
Subject: Follow-up regarding the transition discussions in Dublin

Dear IRT Members,

Following our meeting in Dublin, there were two items ICANN wanted to follow up on related to the transition from thin to thick Whois.

1) Legal Review Memo: in response to Marc Anderson's question regarding the status of the legal review memo required by policy recommendation 3, we would like to confirm that the memo published on 8 June 2015, discussed during the subsequent IRT meetings on 24 June (ICANN 53) and 4 August 2015, fulfills the portion of recommendation #3 […]

2) Transition from Thin to Thick: Joe Waldron questioned whether the recent data privacy law developments in Russia and the EU would warrant referring the matter back to the GNSO given that their impact may go beyond the scope of the policy recommendations, and considering policy recommendation 3 which states "*Should any privacy issues emerge from these transition discussions that were not anticipated by the WG and which would require additional policy consideration, the Implementation Review Team is expected to notify the GNSO Council of these so that appropriate action can be taken*". This is an interesting question, and it seems the IRT may want to discuss this notion. If that is the case, please let ICANN know and we can schedule a call for that discussion or you can have it on the mailing list.

Best Regards
--

WG Deliberations on the value of Thick Whois

- Improved **response consistency**
- Improved **stability** (increased availability in case of business/technical failure)
- Improved **access** to Whois data (Registry vs. Registrars accessibility)
- No specific **data protection** issues (in addition to already known issues)
- **Privacy** issues are much larger than the policy issue of migrating to thick Whois
- No overly burdensome **cost impacts** on providers of Whois data
- No detrimental effect of transition from thin to thick on **data synchronization**
- No detrimental effect on **authoritativeness** (specific policy not necessary)
- More level playing field for **competition** between registry providers
- No substantive detrimental effect on **existing Whois application**
- More copies of **escrowed data** in the event of a failure
- Irrelevance of **Port 43 Whois** requirement for registrar addressed in RAA 2013

Current Timeline Assumptions (as of ICANN 54)