**‘Thick’ Whois PDP**

**Working Group (WG) Charter**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **WG Name:** | **‘Thick’ Whois PDP Working Group** | | | | |
| **Section I: Working Group Identification** | | | | | |
| **Chartering Organization(s):** | | GNSO Council | | | |
| **Charter Approval Date:** | |  | | | |
| **Name of WG Chair:** | |  | | | |
| **Name(s) of Appointed Liaison(s):** | |  | | | |
| **WG Workspace URL:** | |  | | | |
| **WG Mailing List:** | |  | | | |
| **GNSO Council Resolution:** | | **Title:** |  | | |
| **Ref # & Link:** |  | | |
| **Important Document Links:** | | * ‘Thick’ Whois Final Issue Report (<http://gnso.icann.org/issues/whois/final-report-thick-whois-02feb12-en.pdf>) * GNSO Working Group Guidelines (<http://gnso.icann.org/council/annex-1-gnso-wg-guidelines-08apr11-en.pdf>) * GNSO PDP Manual (<http://gnso.icann.org/council/annex-2-pdp-manual-16dec11-en.pdf>) * Annex A – GNSO Policy Development Process of the ICANN Bylaws (<http://www.icann.org/en/about/governance/bylaws#AnnexA>) | | | |
| **Section II: Mission, Purpose, and Deliverables** | | | | | |
| **Mission & Scope:** | | | | | |
| For the generic top-level domain (gTLD) registries, ICANN specifies Whois service requirements through the registry agreements (ICANN 2009 Registry Agreements) and the Registrar Accreditation Agreement (RAA). Registries have historically satisfied their Whois obligations under two different models. The two common models are often characterized as “thin” and “thick” Whois registries. This distinction is based on how two distinct sets of data are managed. One set of data is associated with the domain name, and a second set of data is associated with the registrant of the domain name. A thin registry only stores and manages the information associated with the domain name. This set includes data sufficient to identify the sponsoring registrar, status of the registration, creation and expiration dates for each registration, name server data, the last time the record was updated in its Whois data store, and the URL for the registrar’s Whois service. With thin registries, Registrars manage the second set of data associated with the registrant of the domain and provide it via their own Whois services, as required by Section 3.3 of the RAA 3.3 for those domains they sponsor. Thick registries maintain and provide both sets of data (domain name and registrant) via Whois.  The PDP Working Group is tasked to provide the GNSO Council with a recommendation(s) regarding the consistent use of ‘thick’ Whois by all, both existing and future, gTLD Registries. As part of its deliberations on this issue, the PDP WG should, at a minimum, consider the following elements as detailed in the Final Issue Report:   * Response consistency: a ‘thick’ Registry can dictate the labeling and display to be sure the information is easy to parse, and all Registrars/clients would have to display accordingly, which could be considered a benefit but also a potential cost. This might also be a benefit in the context of internationalized registration data as even with the use of different scripts, uniform data collection and display standards could be applied. * Stability: in the event of a registrar business or technical failure, it could be beneficial to ICANN and registrants to have the full set of domain registration contact data stored by four organizations (the registry, the registry's escrow agent, the registrar, and the registrar's escrow agent), which would be the case in a ‘thick’ Registry. * Accessibility: is the provision of WHOIS information at the registry level under the Thick WHOIS more cost-effective in protecting consumers and intellectual property owners? * Impact on privacy and data protection, including consideration of possible cross border transfers of registrant data: how would ‘thick’ Whois affect privacy and data protection, also taking into account the involvement of different jurisdictions with different laws and legislation with regard to data privacy? * Cost implications: what are the cost implications of a transition to ‘thick’ Whois for registries, registrars but also registrants as a transition to ‘thick Whois for all gTLDs would affect over 110 million domain name registrations? What are the implications if no changes are made and the status quo is maintained? * Database synchronization between the registry and registrars: what would be the impact on the registry and registrar WHOIS and EPP systems for those registries currently operating a thin registry, both in the migration phase to ‘thick’ WHOIS as well as ongoing operations? * Competition in registry services: what would be the impact on competition in registry services should all registries be required to provide a uniform Whois service – would there be more, less or no difference with regard to competition in registry services? * Existing Whois applications: should ‘thick’ Whois be required, do these applications need to be updated / changed and how would that impact users of those applications. * Data escrow: ‘thick’ Whois might obviate the need for the registrar escrow program and attendant expenses to ICANN and registrars. * Registrar Port 43 Whois requirements: ‘thick’ Whois could make the requirement for Registrars to maintain Port 43 Whois access redundant.   In addition, the PDP WG should take into account other ICANN initiatives that may help inform the deliberations limited to this specific topic such as registry/registrar separation and related developments with regards to access to customer data; results of the RAA negotiations, and the Whois Review Team recommendations. The PDP WG is also expected to consider any information and advice provided by other ICANN Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees on this topic. The WG is strongly encouraged to reach out to these groups for collaboration at an early stage of its deliberations, to ensure that their concerns and positions are considered in a timely manner.  Should the PDP WG reach consensus on a recommendation that ‘thick’ Whois should be required for all gTLDs, the PDP WG is also expected to consider:   * Cost implications for gTLD registries, registrars and registrants of a transition to ‘thick’ Whois * How to conduct such a transition (timeline, requirements, etc.) * Whether special provisions and/or exemptions would need to be foreseen for example for gTLD registries which operate a ‘thick’ Whois but provide tiered access[[1]](#footnote-1)   [NOTE: I WOULD ADD THE OPPOSITE. SHOULD THE PDP WG REACH CONSENSUS ON A RECOMMENDATION THAT THICK WHOIS SHOULD NOT BE REQUIRED FOR ALL GTLDS, THEN THE WG NEEDS TO LOOK AT THE POSSIBILITY OF THOSE THAT OPERATE A THICK REGISTRY CHOOSING TO GO THIN AND GETTING RID OF THEIR EXISTING REQUIREMENTS TO BE THICK] | | | | | |
| **Objectives & Goals:** | | | | | |
| To develop, at a minimum, an Initial Report and a Final Report addressing whether there should be a requirement for ‘thick’ Whois for all gTLD Registries to be delivered to the GNSO Council, following the processes described in Annex A of the ICANN Bylaws and the GNSO PDP Manual. | | | | | |
| **Deliverables & Timeframes:** | | | | | |
| The WG shall respect the timelines and deliverables as outlined in Annex A of the ICANN Bylaws and the PDP Manual. As per the GNSO Working Group Guidelines, the WG shall develop a work plan that outlines the necessary steps and expected timing in order to achieve the milestones of the PDP as set out in Annex A of the ICANN Bylaws and the PDP Manual and submit this to the GNSO Council. | | | | | |
| **Section III: Formation, Staffing, and Organization** | | | | | |
| **Membership Criteria:** | | | | | |
| The Working Group will be open to all interested in participating. New members who join after certain parts of work has been completed are expected to review previous documents and meeting transcripts. | | | | | |
| **Group Formation, Dependencies, & Dissolution:** | | | | | |
| This WG shall be a standard GNSO PDP Working Group. The GNSO Secretariat should circulate a ‘Call For Volunteers’ as widely as possible in order to ensure broad representation and participation in the Working Group, including:   * Publication of announcement on relevant ICANN web sites including but not limited to the GNSO and other Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committee web pages; and * Distribution of the announcement to GNSO Stakeholder Groups, Constituencies and other ICANN Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees | | | | | |
| **Working Group Roles, Functions, & Duties:** | | | | | |
| The ICANN Staff assigned to the WG will fully support the work of the Working Group as requested by the Chair including meeting support, document drafting, editing and distribution and other substantive contributions when deemed appropriate.   Staff assignments to the Working Group:   * GNSO Secretariat * 1 ICANN policy staff member (Marika Konings)   The standard WG roles, functions & duties shall be applicable as specified in Section 2.2 of the Working Group Guidelines. | | | | | |
| **Statements of Interest (SOI) Guidelines:** | | | | | |
| Each member of the Working Group is required to submit an SOI in accordance with Section 5 of the GNSO Operating Procedures. | | | | | |
| **Section IV: Rules of Engagement** | | | | | |
| **Decision-Making Methodologies:** | | | | | |
| *{Note: The following material was extracted from the Working Group Guidelines, Section 3.6. If a Chartering Organization wishes to deviate from the standard methodology for making decisions or empower the WG to decide its own decision-making methodology, this section should be amended as appropriate}.*  The Chair will be responsible for designating each position as having one of the following designations:   * **Full consensus** - when no one in the group speaks against the recommendation in its last readings. This is also sometimes referred to as **Unanimous Consensus.** * **Consensus** - a position where only a small minority disagrees, but most agree. *[Note: For those that are unfamiliar with ICANN usage, you may associate the definition of ‘Consensus’ with other definitions and terms of art such as rough consensus or near consensus. It should be noted, however, that in the case of a GNSO PDP originated Working Group, all reports, especially Final Reports, must restrict themselves to the term ‘Consensus’ as this may have legal implications.]* * **Strong support but significant opposition** - a position where, while most of the group supports a recommendation, there are a significant number of those who do not support it. * **Divergence** (also referred to as **No Consensus**) - a position where there isn't strong support for any particular position, but many different points of view. Sometimes this is due to irreconcilable differences of opinion and sometimes it is due to the fact that no one has a particularly strong or convincing viewpoint, but the members of the group agree that it is worth listing the issue in the report nonetheless. * **Minority View** - refers to a proposal where a small number of people support the recommendation. This can happen in response to a **Consensus**, **Strong support but significant opposition**, and **No Consensus;** or, it can happen in cases where there is neither support nor opposition to a suggestion made by a small number of individuals.   In cases of **Consensus**, **Strong support but significant opposition**, and **No Consensus**, an effort should be made to document that variance in viewpoint and to present any **Minority View** recommendations that may have been made. Documentation of **Minority View** recommendations normally depends on text offered by the proponent(s). In all cases of **Divergence,** the WG Chair should encourage the submission of minority viewpoint(s).  The recommended method for discovering the consensus level designation on recommendations should work as follows:   1. After the group has discussed an issue long enough for all issues to have been raised, understood and discussed, the Chair, or Co-Chairs, make an evaluation of the designation and publish it for the group to review. 2. After the group has discussed the Chair's estimation of designation, the Chair, or Co-Chairs, should reevaluate and publish an updated evaluation. 3. Steps (i) and (ii) should continue until the Chair/Co-Chairs make an evaluation that is accepted by the group. 4. In rare case, a Chair may decide that the use of polls is reasonable. Some of the reasons for this might be:    * A decision needs to be made within a time frame that does not allow for the natural process of iteration and settling on a designation to occur.    * It becomes obvious after several iterations that it is impossible to arrive at a designation. This will happen most often when trying to discriminate between **Consensus** and **Strong support but Significant Opposition** or between **Strong support but Significant Opposition** and **Divergence.**   Care should be taken in using polls that they do not become votes. A liability with the use of polls is that, in situations where there is **Divergence** or **Strong Opposition**, there are often disagreements about the meanings of the poll questions or of the poll results.  Based upon the WG's needs, the Chair may direct that WG participants do not have to have their name explicitly associated with any Full Consensus or Consensus view/position. However, in all other cases and in those cases where a group member represents the minority viewpoint, their name must be explicitly linked, especially in those cases where polls where taken.  Consensus calls should always involve the entire Working Group and, for this reason, should take place on the designated mailing list to ensure that all Working Group members have the opportunity to fully participate in the consensus process. It is the role of the Chair to designate which level of consensus is reached and announce this designation to the Working Group. Member(s) of the Working Group should be able to challenge the designation of the Chair as part of the Working Group discussion. However, if disagreement persists, members of the WG may use the process set forth below to challenge the designation.  If several participants (see Note 1 below) in a WG disagree with the designation given to a position by the Chair or any other consensus call, they may follow these steps sequentially:   1. Send email to the Chair, copying the WG explaining why the decision is believed to be in error. 2. If the Chair still disagrees with the complainants, the Chair will forward the appeal to the CO liaison(s). The Chair must explain his or her reasoning in the response to the complainants and in the submission to the liaison. If the liaison(s) supports the Chair's position, the liaison(s) will provide their response to the complainants. The liaison(s) must explain their reasoning in the response. If the CO liaison disagrees with the Chair, the liaison will forward the appeal to the CO. Should the complainants disagree with the liaison support of the Chair’s determination, the complainants may appeal to the Chair of the CO or their designated representative. If the CO agrees with the complainants’ position, the CO should recommend remedial action to the Chair. 3. In the event of any appeal, the CO will attach a statement of the appeal to the WG and/or Board report. This statement should include all of the documentation from all steps in the appeals process and should include a statement from the CO (see Note 2 below).   Note 1: Any Working Group member may raise an issue for reconsideration; however, a formal appeal will require that that a single member demonstrates a sufficient amount of support before a formal appeal process can be invoked. In those cases where a single Working Group member is seeking reconsideration, the member will advise the Chair and/or Liaison of their issue and the Chair and/or Liaison will work with the dissenting member to investigate the issue and to determine if there is sufficient support for the reconsideration to initial a formal appeal process.  Note 2: It should be noted that ICANN also has other conflict resolution mechanisms available that could be considered in case any of the parties are dissatisfied with the outcome of this process. | | | | | |
| **Status Reporting:** | | | | | |
| As requested by the GNSO Council, taking into account the recommendation of the Council liaison to this group. | | | | | |
| **Problem/Issue Escalation & Resolution Processes:** | | | | | |
| *{Note: the following material was extracted from Sections 3.4, 3.5, and 3.7 of the Working Group Guidelines and may be modified by the Chartering Organization at its discretion}*  The WG will adhere to [ICANN’s Expected Standards of Behavior](http://www.icann.org/transparency/acct-trans-frameworks-principles-10jan08.pdf) as documented in Section F of the ICANN Accountability and Transparency Frameworks and Principles, January 2008.  If a WG member feels that these standards are being abused, the affected party should appeal first to the Chair and Liaison and, if unsatisfactorily resolved, to the Chair of the Chartering Organization or their designated representative. It is important to emphasize that expressed disagreement is not, by itself, grounds for abusive behavior. It should also be taken into account that as a result of cultural differences and language barriers, statements may appear disrespectful or inappropriate to some but are not necessarily intended as such. However, it is expected that WG members make every effort to respect the principles outlined in ICANN’s Expected Standards of Behavior as referenced above.  The Chair, in consultation with the Chartering Organization liaison(s), is empowered to restrict the participation of someone who seriously disrupts the Working Group. Any such restriction will be reviewed by the Chartering Organization. Generally, the participant should first be warned privately, and then warned publicly before such a restriction is put into place. In extreme circumstances, this requirement may be bypassed.  Any WG member that believes that his/her contributions are being systematically ignored or discounted or wants to appeal a decision of the WG or CO should first discuss the circumstances with the WG Chair. In the event that the matter cannot be resolved satisfactorily, the WG member should request an opportunity to discuss the situation with the Chair of the Chartering Organization or their designated representative.  In addition, if any member of the WG is of the opinion that someone is not performing their role according to the criteria outlined in this Charter, the same appeals process may be invoked. | | | | | |
| **Closure & Working Group Self-Assessment:** | | | | | |
| The WG will close upon the delivery of the Final Report, unless assigned additional tasks or follow-up by the GNSO Council. | | | | | |
| **Section V: Charter Document History** | | | | | |
| |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **Version** | **Date** | **Description** | | 1.0 | 10 September 2012 | First draft for DT consideration | | 1.1 | 17 September 2012 | Updated draft | |  |  |  | |  |  |  | |  |  |  | |  |  |  | | | | | | |
| **Staff Contact:** | Marika Konings | | | **Email:** | Policy-staff@icann.org |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Translations: If translations will be provided please indicate the languages below:** | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

1. For some registries, ‘Thick’ Whois information is available at the registry, but public access to the data is organized in tiers. For example, for .name, the full set of data is available to requesters if the requester enters into an agreement with the registry under the Extensive Whois Data tier. See <http://www.icann.org/en/tlds/agreements/name/appendix-05-15aug07.htm> for further details [PLEASE NOTE THAT THIS HAS ONLY BEEN ALLOWED TO MY KNOWLEDGE WHERE THERE IS AN ALLEGATION THAT FOLLOWING ALL OF THE REQUIREMENTS WOULD RUN AFOUL OF PRIVACY LAWS. THIS HAS NOT BEEN ALLOWED IN OTHER REGISTRIES. SO, FOR EXAMPLE, I DOUBT IF ANY NEW REGISTRY JUST DECIDED TO DO THIS ON THEIR OWN, THEY WOULD BE ALLOWED TO DO THAT.] [↑](#footnote-ref-1)