

Amy Bivins:Hi Vicky! We will get started in about an hour.  
Vicky Sheckler:oops. thanks. that means I'll only make about  
30-45 min of it. thanks. -V  
Sarah Wyld:Morning!  
Theo Geurts:afternoon!  
Chris Pelling:Good afternoon all  
Eric Rokobauer:hello all  
Vlad Dinculescu:Hi all  
Janelle McAlister:Good Morning!  
Sara Bockey:I don't recall receiving a poll  
Luc Seufer:neither do I  
Darcy  
Southwell:Poll: [https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLSeNagDyesfGQ7DJ0sEXg6pMlPrLZTShtAy6pQxVAYhG8yCv5g\\_viewform&d=DwICaQ&c=FmY1u3PJP6wrcrw1l3mSVzgfkbpSS6sJms7xc14I5cM&r=8\\_WhWIPqsLT6TmF1Zmyci866vcPSF04VShFqESGe\\_5iHWG1BLwwwhehFBfjrsjWv9&m=3PBZ3onH5T72mYTqcKVwtByLDDKtFDzZBLd7ivRX7qE&s=bKfp5G8pWIH7JVIvCoV2QdK3IzliA99E42-zewUyi4U&e=](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLSeNagDyesfGQ7DJ0sEXg6pMlPrLZTShtAy6pQxVAYhG8yCv5g_viewform&d=DwICaQ&c=FmY1u3PJP6wrcrw1l3mSVzgfkbpSS6sJms7xc14I5cM&r=8_WhWIPqsLT6TmF1Zmyci866vcPSF04VShFqESGe_5iHWG1BLwwwhehFBfjrsjWv9&m=3PBZ3onH5T72mYTqcKVwtByLDDKtFDzZBLd7ivRX7qE&s=bKfp5G8pWIH7JVIvCoV2QdK3IzliA99E42-zewUyi4U&e=)  
Darcy Southwell:Response Requested by 8 Feb] PP IRT Operational Questions + New Materials for Review  
Darcy Southwell:Amy's subject line  
Theo  
Geurts:[https://mm.icann.org/mailman/private/pp\\_irt\\_registrars/steve\\_metalitz:Gdd-gnso-ppsai-impl](https://mm.icann.org/mailman/private/pp_irt_registrars/steve_metalitz:Gdd-gnso-ppsai-impl)] [Response Requested by 8 Feb] PP IRT Operational Questions + New Materials for Review ----  
- this was subject line for Amy's e-mail  
Theo Geurts:that's it  
Sara Bockey:Please speak slowly  
Luc Seufer:Found it! Junk folder, must be the wave of the "ICANN" phishing emails which triggered it  
Susan Kawaguchi:I cant find it at all  
Sara Bockey:Agree with Darcy  
Sara Bockey:We need to stop rushing thru this  
Luc Seufer:@Susan for some reason our abuse email address was used for some ICANN WG  
Alex Deacon:I think we can all agree the intent of the PDP was that not only were these words supposed to be in the ToS but also that they must be followed.  
Darcy Southwell:It's implied as part of a contract that a provider makes with a customer.  
Luc Seufer:What are we trying to address here? The fact that providers wouldn't abide by their accreditation which also happene to have provisions included in their own TCs?  
Vicky Sheckler:agree w/ Alex  
Vicky Sheckler:sorry to join late and unfortunately, i'll need

to leave early too

Mary Wong:@Susan, yes - the intent, I believe, was that inclusion in the ToS was meant to provide customers with clear information as to what they can expect including with Disclosure and Publication.

Darcy Southwell:I'm so sorry to have to leave early - I'll catch up on the recording/transcript.

Luc Seufer:that's how the system is construed for ICANN -> Registry -> Registrar -> Registrant for the TM infringement clause for example

Luc Seufer:It would make sense to have the same for ICANN -> PP Provider -> Users

Vicky Sheckler:from my perspective, all items that are required to be in a terms of service should be actioned by the service provider

Vicky Sheckler:agree with susan

steve metalitz:+1 Susan

Graeme Bunton:That's always helpful

Alex Deacon:Draft text is always helpful....

Vicky Sheckler:ICANN compliance should not take a "magic words" approach to contract compliance - if it's required to be in the terms of service, than the service provider should be obligated to action it

steve metalitz:AGree draft text (or revised question) would be good.

Chris Pelling:this should be left to the registrars

Chris Pelling:simply because of the back end services

Alex Deacon:....that sounds like it could take some time and effort.....

Luc Seufer:and this is even before knowing how many providers will get accredited

Chris Pelling:The registrars need to work out a solution to allow transfers between registrars with privacy enabled - it they want to allow that COMMENT

Luc Seufer:I agree with Chris this should be left to registrar and PP providers to voluntarily decide to have such agreement or not

Sara Bockey:Does staff know when the next review of IRTP will take place?

Chris Pelling:affiliated to affiliated would mean the registrars would sort it out themselves. NON affiliated would have to work out a solution to allow transfer of underlying data without removal of PP service

Volker Greimann - GNSO Council Emeritus:@Steve: The problem exists in both cases today., e.g. for affiliated and for non-affiliated providers

Chris Pelling:you cannot allow de-accreditation to to reveal, otherwise no one on planet earth will believe in the service

Sara Bockey:These questions regarding transfer need serious review and consideration - I'm not sure it falls under our remit

Mary Wong:@Steve, yes - much of the WG's discussions focused on transfers of domain from registrar to registrar, and also within the context of de-accreditation of a P/P provider.

Vicky Sheckler:sorry to leave early

steve metalitz:@Volker, on a previous call someone from the registrar group said they would provide a current example of a privacy/proxy service that could seek accreditation but would not be affiliated with a registrar. Is there a real-world example?

steve metalitz:\*could\*

Chris Pelling:@steve surely thats most lawyers

Chris Pelling:?

Sara Bockey:+1 to Theo

Alex Deacon:or the registrant directly.

Chris Pelling:to hosting company - yes

Chris Pelling:Phishing could be as simple as a hacked site

Chris Pelling:thus >> hosting company orr RNH

Chris Pelling:Law Enforcement is my corner

Luc Seufer:if every law firm we have as client and acting as proxy for their clients get accredited, notifying them isn't the fastest avenue, but I am fine with them notified if the hosting and registrar are notified too

steve metalitz:@Chris isn't RNH in this case the proxy service provider?

Chris Pelling:I meant underlying registrant @Steve, for example, you can go to our PP site, fill out the form selecting abuse or RNH and we send that to the underlying data

steve metalitz:@Sara, trademark and copyright complaints have thier own rules (the Illustrative Disclosrue Framework).

Chris Pelling:any TM or UDRP, I simply redirect to the registrant, and, the complaine I revert to ICANN..COM/UDRP

steve metalitz:@Sara, relaying a complaint is also handled separately in the report.

Chris Pelling:COMMENT: at the very most, a PP service provider should forward any complaint to the registrant

Chris Pelling:+1 Volker

Chris Pelling:also we should remove ther duplication element here as well, if the abuse report is sent to the registrar and PP provider, and they are afiliated - only 1 needs to send it on

steve metalitz:@Volker, this is all covered in recommendation 16 re relaying --- provider has option to use commercially reasonable safeguards to deal with abusive communications . This has already been decided, let's not reopen these issues please.

Stephanie perrin:Apologies for being late, somehow did not get the notice until now.

Luc Seufer:if by "handle abuse reports" we mean following the relaying obligation, then fine

Sara Bockey:Not sure what this has to do with P/P services....this is more a registry lock

Chris Pelling:@steve only once it has started

Alejandro Hernandez:sorry phone was disconnected

Susan Kawaguchi:It makes sense to me to include the URS

Sara Bockey:+1 Alejandro

Theo Geurts:6 and 7 sound reasonable to me.

Theo Geurts:even logical

Alejandro Hernandez:+1

steve metalitz:@Volker, you are so agreeable today!

Stephanie perrin:How would I, as an end user, understand where my vulnerabilities are?

Volker Greimann - GNSO Council Emeritus:@Steve: I was just thinking the same about you ^\_^

Mary Wong:@Stephanie, some of the recommendations concerning the Terms of Service and what is to be included were intended to clarify and improve information for end users.

Stephanie perrin:Thanks Mary, would that include explanations of accountability for data breach?

Mary Wong:@Stephanie, not specifically, no.

Stephanie perrin:I guess it should then.

Mary Wong:@Amy, yes, that is exactly right re data provision to ICANN (aggregated).

Mary Wong:The specific language on data aggregation is: "The WG further recommends that providers should be required to maintain statistics on the number of Publication and Disclosure requests received and the number honored, and provide these statistics in aggregate form to ICANN for periodic publication. The data should be aggregated so as not to create a market where nefarious users of the domain name system are able to use the information to find the P/P service that is least likely to make Disclosures."

Stephanie perrin:We have a number of points in the lifecycle where the system, in my view, could be gamed for data disclosure. Current language would, in my view, permit various parties to hide behind "reasonable business practice" which of course does not really take account of privacy legislation in a substantive way.

steve metalitz:@Amy, it might be easier to spell out data collection/retention requirements after the accreditation structure has been fleshed out more.

Susan Kawaguchi:When is the meeting in Copenhagen?

Alex Deacon:FYI my flight lands at 1:30pm-ish so I will be able

to join but will be late (and jetlagged :)  
Chris Pelling:Thanks Amy :)  
Vlad Dinculescu:Thanks all  
Eric Rokobauer:thanks!