

steve metalitz: (3/11/2017 13:38) Is audio on?

Caitlin Tubergen: (13:42) Hello, my name is Caitlin Tubergen, and I will be monitoring this chat room. In this role, I am the voice for the remote participants, ensuring that they are heard equally with those who are "in-room" participants. When submitting a question that you would like me to read aloud to the room, please provide your name and affiliation if you have one, start your sentence with <QUESTION> and end it with <QUESTION>. When submitting a comment that you want me to read aloud to the room, once again provide your name and affiliation if you have one then start your sentence with a <COMMENT> and end it with <COMMENT>. Text outside these quotes will be considered as part of "chat" and will not be read out loud on the mic. Any questions or comments provided outside of the session time will not be read aloud.

steve metalitz: (13:44) Caitlin I am seeing video but no audio. Is audio on?

Caitlin Tubergen: (13:45) Thanks, Steve. I will test again.

steve metalitz: (13:45) audio on, thanks

Caitlin Tubergen: (13:46) Thank you, Steve!

Caitlin Tubergen: (13:49) The session will begin shortly.

Alexander Heirwegh: (13:56) Will there be a transcript or recording of the session consultable afterwards ?

Caitlin Tubergen: (13:59) @Alexander - yes. Links to the recording and transcript of this session will be posted to the website.

Alexander Heirwegh: (14:00) Allright, thanks

steve metalitz: (14:00) Good timeline.

Sara Bockey: (14:04) Just joined. August 2017 seems very aggressive. Only acceptable if we reach that goal without rushing thru. It's important to get this done corre ctly, not fasst

steve metalitz: (14:04) Again, good timeline, thanks to staff.

Jennifer Gore: (14:06) @Steve Metalitz, please submit your questoin via chat? Thank you

steve metalitz: (14:06) Again, for the third time, good timeline and let;s all work together to make it happen.

Jennifer Gore: (14:06) thank you

steve metalitz: (14:08) Will try to phone in on the bridge

steve metalitz: (14:10) COMMENT: Ratoinala was expiration of the inteirm xspec on 1/1/18

Luc Seufer: (14:18) Regarding step 3, I briefly met with AFNIC (French registry) who has such system in place since years and thus data reg it and they would be ready to provide and present such data if asked.

steve metalitz: (14:21) COMMENT: Suggest that Luc's comment above be read to group.

Caitlin Tubergen: (14:21) Thank you, Steve -- will do.

Theo Geurts: (14:23) +Luc

Alexander Heirwegh: (14:28) audio down?

Kiera-Video Tech: (14:28) Phone participants, is there still an echo?

Sara Bockey: (14:34) Agree with Greg

Michael Flemming: (14:37) Yes, one or more is fine, but just please make it easy to find.

Michael Flemming: (14:38) Will we be talking about what is "abuse" next?

Jennifer Gore: (14:39) @Micheal Flemming - we are discussing abuse now. We invite you to participate. Thank you.

Griffin Barnett: (14:42) Agree that use of a form or email POC for reporting abuse is OK; for a form, would want to see ability to upload/attach documents as evidence supporting a report

Michael Flemming: (14:42) This isn't abuse, this is about how to report abuse.

steve metalitz: (14:42) commentt: agree that "easy for reporter to find" is critical -- whichever mechanism is used

Griffin Barnett: (14:43) +1 steve
Michael Flemming: (14:43) I am just wondering if we will discuss what defines "abuse".
steve metalitz: (14:43) @Michael I think that may be on of next topics.
Michael Flemming: (14:43) Perfect
Jennifer Gore: (14:43) @Michael Flemming - you are welcome to participate to define abuse now
Michael Flemming: (14:43) Thanks, it was just a question for clarity.
Michael Flemming: (14:43) Thank you, Jennifer. I may.
Griffin Barnett: (14:47) Support using the PIC definition
Michael Flemming: (14:48) +1 Steve
Claudia Martinuzzi: (14:49) + 1 Steve
Michael Flemming: (14:51) Perhaps add "Including but not limited to"
Griffin Barnett: (14:53) @Pam Litlte - it is helpful to be able to investigate the underlying registrant before reaching the point of filing a UDRP complaint
Griffin Barnett: (14:53) hence why using the abuse reporting mechanism is a helpful preliminary step
Alexander Heirwegh: (14:54) Indeed, proving bad fiath registration and use is often difficult without knowing the identity of the respondent
Michael Flemming: (14:54) UDRP doesn't include malware distribution though.
Michael Flemming: (14:54) Or was that assumed?
steve metalitz: (14:55) Comment: +1 Griffin. Also this process should be a faster and less expensive way of obtaining this information (compared to initiating UDRP).
Michael Flemming: (14:55) There are mechanisms that allow for the domain take down that this definition is tied to. But that does not include things like malware or phishing.
Griffin Barnett: (15:02) I think I put it in the chat earlier, but I support using the PIC language as our definition, although would be open to trying to refine some terms if necessary (e.g. "deceptive practices") - we may be able to look at case law and agency guidance (e.g. from the US FTC) to try and see if we can refine legal terms of art like that
steve metalitz: (15:09) Now Adobe channel not working and my phone link was dropped so i will dial back in
steve metalitz: (15:12) "Capable and authorized to investigate and handle" is pretty close to "investigate and respond appropriately".
steve metalitz: (15:13) Yes, RAA language is consisent.
steve metalitz: (15:14) *consistent*
steve metalitz: (15:14) The above are COMMENTS
steve metalitz: (15:16) +1 Darcy. The RAA afe general requirements but as she noted there are specific standards for IP complaints.
steve metalitz: (15:16) *are*
steve metalitz: (15:16) ...and might be more specific requirements for law enforcement, etc.
Griffin Barnett: (15:17) Agree
steve metalitz: (15:21) Agree with Darcy on this. Not specifically discussed. These look like best practices for providers to follow.
Griffin Barnett: (15:21) +1
steve metalitz 2: (15:55) +1 to Graeme -- earlier sharing is better, even on a provisional basis. Could it be shared as an "individual" contribution, without PSWG /GAC imprimatur ? Just a suggestion for consideration.
Darcy Southwell: (16:02) Totally agree with Graeme, too. Earlier ths better to keep this IRT moving forward in a timely manner.
steve metalitz 2: (16:07) Yes, abuse should be defined consistently
Griffin Barnett: (16:07) +1

Graeme Bunton: (16:08) Screenshot of general abuse reporting guidelines:
https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_i.gyazo.com_094a48ae15df29c8a0391e33936871b6.png&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PjP6wrcrwlI3mSVz_gfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=8K75qGdDIOta4kh6k2F0jrT195M3tF3J_Fxcz6EvuG2kYKDeA67ZTEnthHXAPVXH&m=SNUNd7AY0enJ3lgoQijQmvQc58FxfhLgQf2lw0Q3zR0&s=BjACDI_fkzec-U1i3mBFvxzS1uWJgXph6ljyHYQ9Qmc&e=

Luc Seufer: (16:09) SFW?

Graeme Bunton: (16:10) Yes.

steve metalitz 2: (16:14) @Darcy, can you provide an example of something that would be considered under the abuse definition but not "illegal activity"?

Darcy Southwell: (16:15) The RAA defines "Illegal Activity" to mean conduct involving use of a Registered Name sponsored by Registrar that is prohibited by applicable law and/or exploitation of Registrar's domain name resolution or registration services in furtherance of conduct involving the use of a Registered Name sponsored by Registrar that is prohibited by applicable law.

Darcy Southwell: (16:23) Agree with Theo & Roger that there's isn't a gap.

Roger Carney: (16:30) Agree with Darcy

Greg DiBiase: (16:30) Agree with Darcy

Luc Seufer: (16:30) Same here

steve metalitz 2: (17:01) @Amy are you talking about unaffiliated providers who ARE accredited or not accredited?

Caitlin Tubergen: (17:02) @Steve -- Amy is referring to accredited providers who are unaffiliated with registrars

steve metalitz 2: (17:08) Re "labelling," are you referring to Rec. 4: registrations from accredited providers "should be clearly labeled as such in WHOIS."?

steve metalitz 2: (17:17) Registrars would need to know because they are not to accept registrations from unaccredited providers.

steve metalitz 2: (17:17) That was a COMMENT in response to Roger.

Sara Bockey: (17:18) Knowing accept

Sara Bockey: (17:18) oops. knowingly accept

steve metalitz 2: (17:19) @Sara, correct.

Roger Carney: (17:21) Agree with Darcy/Greg

steve metalitz 2: (17:24) If the Whois data is that of an unaccredited provider, then it is inaccurate because the registrant is the customer.

steve metalitz 2: (17:27) @Howard, privacy and proxy services treated the same under the policy.

steve metalitz 2: (17:29) @Francisco, unaffiliated providers are to be publicly listed if they are accredited.

steve metalitz 2: (17:31) COMMENT: This has been a recurring issue. May be best to wait until an unaffiliated provider seeking accreditation steps forward and encounters those problems .

Theo Geurts: (17:32) Not a bad idea Steve

steve metalitz 2: (17:32) If my computer mic is working I will raise my hand.

steve metalitz 2: (17:33) audio not working so I will defer

Darcy Southwell: (17:33) Agree with Steve.

steve metalitz 2: (17:36) Since all p/p registrations must be labeled as such one could require that the registrant name include the accreditation number of the provider.

steve metalitz 2: (17:36) In previous meetings we have decided that creating a new field is not necessary to satisfy the labeling requirement.

steve metalitz 2: (17:39) @Jenifer, what kind of "change" are you referring to?

steve metalitz 2: (17:41) thanks for clarification, I think Jothan has answered

Theo Geurts: (17:41) agreed

Jothan Frakes: (17:41) good steve. I reckon it could be dns but the focus is contact info

steve metalitz 2: (17:42) thanks all

Griffin Barnett: (17:42) thanks!