

# Report of Public Comments

<b>Title:</b>	Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy Part B Policy Development Process – Recommendation 8 Concerning Standardizing and Clarifying WHOIS Status Messages		
<b>Publication Date:</b>	16 April 2012		
<b>Prepared By:</b>	Marika Konings		
<b>Comment Period:</b>		<b>Important Information Links</b>	
Open Date:	21 February 2012		
Close Date:	15 April 2012		
Time (UTC):	23:59 UTC		
<b>Staff Contact:</b>	Marika Konings	<b>Email:</b>	<a href="mailto:Policy-staff@icann.org">Policy-staff@icann.org</a>
<b>Section I: General Overview and Next Steps</b>			
<p>The Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy Part B Policy Development Process Working Group presented its recommendations to the GNSO Council last year. For one of those recommendation #8, concerning standardizing and clarifying WHOIS status messages regarding Registrar Lock status, the GNSO Council requested ICANN staff to provide a proposal. In consultation with the IRTP Part B Working Group, ICANN Staff prepared a proposal that, together with the IRTP Part B recommendation, has now been approved by the GNSO Council.</p> <p>The objective of the recommendation and the ICANN Staff proposal to clarify why the Registrar Lock has been applied and how it can be changed. If adopted, registrars would be required to associate each EPP status value with a link to an ICANN controlled web page where the relevant status code information as described in the ‘EPP Status Codes, what do they mean and why should I know?’<sup>1</sup> is posted. ICANN will also post translations of the status information. The web page can make use of localization information from the browser the user is using to display the web page in the related language. In addition to the link, registrars would be required to include in the WHOIS output a note that would state "For more information on WHOIS status codes, please visit Internic.net" where the link to the information would be posted.</p> <p>Following the closing of the public comment forum, the Board will now consider the recommendation and the ICANN Staff Proposal, in conjunction with the comments submitted.</p>			
<b>Section II: Contributors</b>			

<sup>1</sup> The IRTP Part B Working Group, with the support of ICANN Staff developed this document, which provides an overview of EPP Status Codes and what they mean (see Annex F of the [IRTP Part B Final Report](#) [PDF, 972 KB] – EPP Status Codes, what do they mean and why should I know?)

*At the time this report was prepared, a total of two (2) community submissions had been posted to the Forum. The contributors, both individuals and organizations/groups, are listed below in chronological order by posting date with initials noted. To the extent that quotations are used in the foregoing narrative (Section III), such citations will reference the contributor's initials.*

#### Organizations and Groups:

Name	Submitted by	Initials
Registry Stakeholder Group	David Maher	RySG

#### Individuals:

Name	Affiliation (if provided)	Initials
Dieter Anders		DA

### **Section III: Summary of Comments**

*General Disclaimer: This section is intended to broadly and comprehensively summarize the comments submitted to this Forum, but not to address every specific position stated by each contributor. Staff recommends that readers interested in specific aspects of any of the summarized comments, or the full context of others, refer directly to the specific contributions at the link referenced above (View Comments Submitted).*

In its submission, the RySG expresses its support for the recommendation.

DA notes six points in his submission:

1. The link to the status descriptions should be included on the Internic.net page
2. gTLD registry operators should use status names that are the same as those used for standard EPP status codes
3. Registries and registrars should also be required to include a link to the internic web-site or the status descriptions web-site on their Whois search page
4. For thin registries, the registrar should also include the Whois data from the relevant registry in their Whois search results
5. The link to [www.uwhois.com](http://www.uwhois.com) should be removed from the Internic web-site
6. A link to the domain name / punycode converter should be added to the Internic web-site

### **Section IV: Analysis of Comments**

*General Disclaimer: This section is intended to provide an analysis and evaluation of the comments received along with explanations regarding the basis for any recommendations provided within the analysis.*

In relation to including the link to the status descriptions on the internic.net page, ICANN Staff agrees that this is a good idea and will consider this as part of the implementation plan if/when the recommendation is adopted by the ICANN Board. In relation to the use of status names by gTLD registries, this was not part of the recommendation or the IRTF Part B WG discussions in this regard, but could be a subject for future policy and/or standardization work should the responsible bodies of ICANN decide so. On the suggestion to require registries and registrars to include a URL on their Whois search page, this should be mostly satisfied by the requirement that the URL is included in web-based Whois output as foreseen in the proposal. With regard to the suggestion on Whois data from thin registries, the link to [www.uwhois](http://www.uwhois.com) and a link to the domain name /

punycode converter, this is considered beyond the scope of the IRTF Part B PDP and the issue under consideration. Nevertheless, ICANN Staff will review the suggestions on [www.uwhois.com](http://www.uwhois.com) and the domain name / punycode converter as a separate issue. ICANN Staff will share this report with the ICANN Board for its review, but as a result of the analysis of the comments received, ICANN Staff is of the opinion that no further changes or consideration is required with regard to the recommendation.