

Topic 10 WHOIS RT Recommendations

Work Statement & Work Plan

Work Force Identification	
Members	Volker Greimann, Stephanie Perrin, Cathrin Bauer-Bulst, Susan Kawaguchi
Rapporteur	Volker Greimann and Stephanie Perrin
Scope Objectives	<p>Consistent with ICANN's mission and Bylaws, Section 4.6(e)(iv), the Review Team will (a) evaluate the extent to which ICANN Org has implemented each prior Directory Service Review recommendation (noting differences if any between recommended and implemented steps), (b) assess to the degree practical the extent to which implementation of each recommendation was effective in addressing the issue identified by the prior RT or generated additional information useful to management and evolution of WHOIS (RDS), and (c) determine if any specific measurable steps should be recommended to enhance results achieved through the prior RT's recommendations. This includes developing a framework to measure and assess the effectiveness of recommendations, and applying that approach to all areas of WHOIS originally assessed by the prior RT (as applicable).</p>
Comments on Scope, further details	<p>The 2013 RAA introduced a specification on privacy and proxy registrations requiring registrars to comply with certain requirements regarding such registrations through affiliated p/p service providers as a first step towards implementing this recommendation. The Privacy Proxy IRT WG is currently working on an implementation of this recommendation that will also include unaffiliated providers of such services.</p> <p>This review will encompass the work completed both through the RAA specification and the PDP and if the agreed upon details adhere to the recommendation.</p>

Questions we will need to answer in assessing whether the objective has been reached

⑩ Clearly labeling WHOIS entries to indicate that registrations have been made by a privacy or proxy service;

Included in PPSAI working group report

⑩ Providing full WHOIS contact details for the privacy/proxy service provider, which are contactable and responsive;

How a standard response process will work is still being debated.

⑩ Adopting agreed standardized relay and reveal processes and timeframes; (these should be clearly published, and proactively advised to potential users of these services so they can make informed choices based on their individual circumstances);

Law enforcement relay and reveal processes are still being debated and how this would be implemented in a way that would not be burdensome for each side.

Partially defined under 2.4.5 of the RAA spec.

⑩ Registrars should disclose their relationship with any proxy/privacy service provider;

Included in PPSAI working group report

Partially defined under 2.3 of the RAA spec.

⑩ Maintaining dedicated abuse points of contact for each provider;

Partially defined under 2.4.1 and 2.4.2 of the RAA spec.

⑩ Conducting periodic due diligence checks on customer contact information;

What processes will the compliance need to address this and will they need additional resources to manage the enforcement of the contract? Is this even achievable without violating the reliance of the underlying registrants on the privacy of their data.

⑩ Maintaining the privacy and integrity of registrations in the event that major problems arise with a privacy/proxy provider;

Included in PPSAI working group report

Partially defined under 2.5 of the RAA spec.

⑩ Providing clear and unambiguous guidance on the rights and responsibilities of registered name holders, and how those should be managed in the privacy/proxy environment.

Partially defined under 2.4.4, 2.4.5 and 2.4.6 of the RAA spec.

How effective are these rights and responsibility regarding the effectiveness of proxy registrations and the protection of rights of others.

Estimate of comparative complexity of assessment (1=low, 5=high)	3
Estimate of comparative work load (1=low, 5=high)	3
Estimate of ideal sub-team size (1-5 persons)	4-5
Work Space URL:	https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=71604717
Mailing List:	http://mm.icann.org/pipermail/rds-whois2-privacy-proxy/
Important Background Links:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WHOIS Review Implementation Reports, including <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Executive Summary of Implementation Report ○ Detailed implementation Report • WHOIS Review Team Final Report (2012) • WHOIS Task Force Final Report (2007) [HTML] and [PDF] • WHOIS Task Force Final Report (2003) • WHOIS1 Implementation Briefings on Recommendations 4, 12, 13, 14 • WHOIS1 Implementation Briefings on Recommendations 5, 8, 10, 11 • WHOIS1 Implementation Briefings on Recommendations 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 9, 15, 16

Work Force Timeline

Refer to the RDS-WHOIS2 [work plan](#) for deadlines

Resources

Requests for ICANN briefings	<ul style="list-style-type: none">•
Requests for ICANN materials	<ul style="list-style-type: none">•
Interviews to be conducted	Speak with Caitlin Tubergen and Jen Gore – staff leading the IRT Compliance team to discuss how they will ramp up to manage the compliance.
Need for Independent Expert	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• [Evaluate if independent expert is needed• If independent expert is needed, subject to budget availability, develop and document<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Scope of work○ Skills and experience needed○ Timeline & milestones○ Deliverables]
Other resources (existing outside studies, articles)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">•