Possible Requirements drawn from

Thick Whois PDP WG Final Report

http://gnso.icann.org/en/issues/whois/thick-final-21oct13-en.pdf

SM: Information associated with the domain name, and information associated with the domain name registrant, must both be accessible at the registry level.(Rec. #1)

DE: Registration information from all registries should follow consistent rules for labeling and display, as per the model outlined in specification 3 of the 2013 RAA***.*** (Rec. #1)

DE: The RDS should collect and display uniform sets of data regardless of the registry involved. (sec. 5.2)

SM: The RDS should provide multiple fallback locations where data is stored, such that, in case of a failure, there are at least two geographically dispersed sources of data that are available for recovery. (sec. 5.3, 5.11)

SM: Under the RDS, all information associated with the domain name as well as the registrant must be accessible via both the registrar and registry services. (sec. 5.4)

PR: The RDS should provide additional security measures for data in motion, i.e., when data is transferred, downloaded or replicated, especially in large volumes. (sec. 5.5)

CS: Design of the RDS should take into account the costs incurred by registrars, registries and data consumers. (sec. 5.6)

DA: Data in the RDS must be synchronized, i.e., updated in an immediate and accurate manner so that all data sets (e.g., registrar and registry) are exact duplicates. (sec. 5.7)

DA: The RDS must include features to reduce the risk of inconsistencies between data sets held by different parties (i.e., synchronization failures). (sec. 5.7)

UP and/or DA: The RDS must specify the single data set (among multiple data sets) to be relied upon in case of doubt (i.e., the authoritative data). (sec. 5.8)

UP and/or DA: To the extent the RDS involves a hierarchical database structure, it must specify the single database within that structure that holds the data that is assumed to be the final authority regarding the question of which record shall be considered accurate and reliable in case of conflicting records (i.e., the authoritative data). (sec. 5.8)

SM: The RDS should create a competitive level playing field among entities holding data, s and avoid making diversity in RDS data models a matter of competitive advantage. (sec. 5.9)

CX: Adoption of a new RDS should take into account impacts (e.g., on cost of data access and parsing) on existing providers of applications and services related to registration data. (Sec. 5.10)