Recommendation #1 – Accreditation

Based on the leadership's and staff support team review of the feedback provided by the different groups by the deadline on the discussion table, the following topics / issues are being put forward for discussion during Thursday's meeting. The input on these topics / issues, as well as non-controversial changes identified or there responses were aligned in the discussion table, will be used to develop a next iteration of the recommendation text for EPDP Team review. Note, known concerns, which have been considered and discussed previously have not been included and will not be discussed again unless new information has been provided.

Remaining items:

Definition of abuse (revocation and accredited entity requirements)

Accredited User Revocation & Abuse
(…) A Non-exhaustive list of examples where revocation may apply include 1) the accredited user's violation of the code of conduct, 2) the accredited user's abuse of the system, 3) a change in affiliation of the accredited user, or 4) where prerequisites for accreditation no longer exist.

(…)

Accredited entities or individuals:
u) MUST agree to:
* *(…)*
* *prevent abuse of data received;*
* *(…)*
v) Will not be restricted in the number of SSAD requests that can be submitted during a specific period of time, except where the accredited entity poses a demonstrable threat to the SSAD. It is understood that possible limitations in SSAD's response capacity and speed may apply. For further details see the response requirements preliminary recommendation.

---

12. How should abuse of the system be defined and differentiated (if applicable) from violation of the code of conduct?
13. What further guidance can be provided in relation to 'prevent abuse of data received' by the accredited entity or individual (see u)?
14. "Demonstrable threat to the SSAD" (see v) – is that something that can be left to implementation based on SLAs and possible input through the mechanism?

Abuse by Accreditation Authority

15. There is agreement that the Accreditation Authority should also be supervised for potential abuse and the proposed suggestion is that ICANN Org should be identified as the supervisor of accreditation authorities, but ICANN org IS the Accreditation Authority. Was this intended

to indicate that if ICANN org outsources part or all of the Accreditation Authority functionalities, it is responsible for overseeing and addressing potential abuse?

De-authorization of Identity Providers

An appeals mechanism should be available for Identity Providers.
As the use of Identity Providers is optional, the Accreditation Authority is expected to develop an authentication policy for Identity Providers, if it decides to use Identity Providers, factoring in the policy recommendations and implementation guidance provided in the Final Report as well as any further guidance the IRT may provide in the implementation phase.

16. Are there any further elements or aspects that may require clarification?

Implementation guidance

Indicate that further details in relation to 'information asserting trademark ownership' as well as 'recognized, applicable and well established organizations' will be further developed in the implementation phase.