Service Level on WHOIS

ISSUE: C.2	Service Level on WHOIS	
Priority:	RAA Final Report (High Priority Item)	
Issue / Request	Registrar will meet or exceed the requirements of a service level agreement (SLA) announced by ICANN with regards to access to WHOIS information published through Port 43, that addresses the following features: (i) minimum uptime levels for WHOIS servers, (ii) acceptable query limitations and/or IP blocking restrictions, and (ii) minimum data updates frequency. Registrar will monitor compliance of the ICANN SLA requirements on a monthly basis, and will correct any violations of the WHOIS SLA identified by Registrar or by others within thirty (30) days of notice thereof. Failure to satisfy the WHOIS SLA during two consecutive months during any 12 month period may result in notice of SLA violation posted on ICANN's website, or other appropriate ICANN compliance action under the RAA. Registrar shall cooperate with ICANN, as requested, to develop the parameters to be included in the WHOIS SLA.	**Source:** LEA Code of Conduct
Notes	Additional information regarding requests: **LEA:** ICANN should require Registrars to have a Service Level Agreement for their Port 43 servers. **RAA -DT** 1) SLA on WHOIS Availability 2) It certainly seems reasonable that the RAA contain an SLA provision re WHOIS, just like the registry contracts do.	LEA original submission to the RAA-DT RAA-DT Final Report
Discussion Points		**Date Discussed**
	SLA on WHOIS along the lines set out in the LEA Code would be acceptable to Registrars. Registrars seek removal of "bulk Whois" requirement from RAA, asserting that "no individual or entity is able to exercise market power with respect to registrations or with respect to registration data used for development of value-added products and services by third parties" per RAA 3.3.7. Registrars explained operational burden of operating Whois service via port 43 relative to non-use of the service for domains in thick registries. Overview of proposed SLA for availability, based on the new GTLD Registry Agreements. Discussion of Registrar request to delete Port 43 WHOIS obligations for registrations in Thick registries. Discussion of registrar request to eliminate WHOIS obligation for Port 43 where there is thick registries, as such service is unnecessary since the registry offers this information. Discussion of registrar request to eliminate the bulk access provisions, since the language refers to no registrar having market power.	18 Nov 2011 9 Feb 2012 9 Feb 2012 17 Jan 2012 17 Jan 2012 15 Feb 2012 15 Feb 2012

Proposed Text	Open	
Status / Outcome	Under Discussion	
Explanation	Open	
COMMENTS:	Comments may be submitted using the "Add Comment" feature below.	

To Leave a Comment on This Page: *Any user logged into Confluence will see an "Add Comment" button at the bottom of this page, which can be used to leave a comment. To log in, click the "Log In" button on the gray control bar toward the top of the page, and enter your user name and password. If you do not have a user name and password, please e-mail* seth.greene@icann.org *with "Log In" in the subject line.*