

At-Large Whois Policy WG Monthly Reports

2010 Reports

April 2010

Two reports were discussed:

- One pertaining to the studies on the accuracy of the WHOIS data, which later translated into an [ALAC statement](#)
- The Whois Service Requirements Initial Report (deadline 17 May 2010) is the subject of an [ALAC draft statement](#)

Report by Patrick Vande Walle

May 2010

The two reports discussed in April were voted upon by the ALAC and approved.

Report by Patrick Vande Walle

WHOIS Liaison Reports - Monthly Reports

August-September 2007

The WHOIS working group has concluded its work with this report, <http://gnso.icann.org/drafts/icann-whois-wg-report-final-1-9.pdf>, despite concerns from many in the group that the positions listed as "agreed" did not have consensus support even from the self-selected members of the working group. It now goes to the GNSO Council.

June 2007

Although the OPOC (Operational Point of Contact) is still being discussed, the draft burdens it procedural hurdles that would make it impracticably costly -- such as verification of the OPOC or accreditation with ICANN and status as an agent for the registrant. The intent behind many of these proposals seems, as is common, to prevent adoption of more privacy-respecting WHOIS display. If we don't keep the contact lightweight, it will be too costly for registrars to implement and individuals to adopt.

As this is on the agenda for the WG's July 11 call, <http://forum.icann.org/lists/gnso-whois-wg/msg00491.html> it would be helpful if others who have been participating in the WG's work would also express their concerns, either on list or on the call.

The OPOC's responsibility was conceived as one to pass information along to the registrant, without requiring the registrant to list his or her direct contact information in public WHOIS. Somewhere along the way, the WG has given the OPOC an additional role of REVEALing information when a query is made but not responded to. This too seems like an overextension and loss for privacy, at least where there is no legal reason for the registrant's information to be revealed. As an individual participant, I continue to advocate that only due process of law should force disclosure of contact information that individuals choose to protect. I'd be happy to hear support or argument with that view.