

Michelle DeSmyter:Dear All, Welcome to the Privacy and Proxy Services Accreditation IRT Meeting on Tuesday, 11 April 2017 at 14:00 UTC.

Chris Pelling:Afternoon all

Theo Geurts:'lo

Lindsay Hamilton-Reid:Hi all.

Lindsay Hamilton-Reid:Have we started yet? I can't hear anything

Amy Bivins:Good morning! We will get started in just a few minutes, Lindsay

Lindsay Hamilton-Reid:Thanks Amy.

Eric Rokobauer:good day all

Roger Carney:@Amy, can you paste in the specific text of the recommendation

Amy Bivins:Yes, just a second Roger

Amy Bivins:"Registrars are not to knowingly accept registrations from privacy or proxy service providers who are not accredited through the process developed by ICANN."

Amy Bivins:This is from the Final Report, p.7

Roger Carney:Thank you

steve metalitz:@Francisco can't this problem be resolved through labeling in which the provider includes its accreditation number in its Whois data submission?

Chris Pelling:option 2 sounds simplest to implement

steve metalitz:Except that option 2 is contrary to the WG recommendations

Darcy Southwell:@Amy, can you allow us to scroll on the presentation?

Amy Bivins:No problem, you should be able to scroll now

Chris Pelling:@Steve, option 1 means checking at time of registration, which will leave to length of time in registration process

Sara Bockey:If you have the provider include its accreditation number in its Whois data submission, would it be possible to have it hyperlink to an accredited provider maintained by ICANN? may not be possible, but just a thought

Chris Pelling:@steve also bear in mind at no point in the WG was it stated a registrar will be forced to accept a third parties PP service even if it is accredited

Sara Bockey:accredited provider page I meant to say

Chris Pelling:@Steve how do we know it is an accredited service in the first place

steve metalitz:@Chris accredited services are registered with ICANN and will have to use a distinctive label in their registrations.

Chris Pelling:@Steve and you do not think that the naughty

persons out there will simply copy / use that information

steve metalitz:@Chris yes they will that is the third scenario. So the question is how to deal with that. I have suggested 2 solutions. What is yours?

Darcy Southwell:+1 to Roger & Theo

Chris Pelling:@Steve, the only route will lead to innacuracy reports, and from that a larger overhead at the registrar

Francisco Arias:@Roger, would you mind elaborating on what you mean by checking on the back end?

Eric Rokobauer:+1 Theo

Theo Geurts:Alex, a certificate would be a nice to have, but the accredited parties are not the issue to begin with

Chris Pelling:doing this at the backend after registration (so not realtime) might be the simplest, ICANN controls a master list and auth that is provided to the registrar once a week (you tell the pp service they will be able to use their creds after X days on signup) and the code provided will match an entry

Chris Pelling:the problem is if that code is shared

Chris Pelling:ie - an employee gives it to a hacker or whatever
Sara Bockey:Agree with Darcy.

Alicia Kaelin:+1 Darcy

Alex Deacon:@theo unaccredited providers without a credential would be rejected up front. assuming all accredited providers have a credential in the first place.

Theo Geurts:Alex, but we do not know who they are.

Alex Deacon:if the credential was issued by icann for example we would. m

Theo Geurts:I can provide as privacy provider , Theo's awesome P/P service right now and no SRS will stop me.

Chris Pelling:COMMENT: one thing to think of here, above comments are suggesting this is in realtime, we also have another working group that wants this stuff done in realtime before registration, and thus longer and longer times for a registration to complete. Soon it will be quicker to register by post

Theo Geurts:unless we specify fields for privacy providers, wich we can check against a database

Chris Pelling:and that "database" provider will be another fiasco costing millions potentially

Theo Geurts:Chris yes.

Chris Pelling: I wrote above Amy

Amy Bivins:ok Chris, will read in just a sec

Chris Pelling:You cannot keep delaying the registration process

Francisco Arias:@Chris, authentication doesn't have to be live

Darcy Southwell:Completely agree wtih Roger - operational implementation should be left to registrars.

Francisco Arias:it could also be within 24 hours, during the

Add Grace Period, or something like that

Chris Pelling:@ICANN and @Steve, how do you think the "Back end" is created - that's by us, the registrars

Chris Pelling:COMMENT, this sounds a lot like TMCH

Chris Pelling:namely the "fiasco"

Francisco Arias:@chris, there are options for the authentication, put three in this slide, but there are probably more

Chris Pelling:@Francisco, why is ICANN getting involved in this side? Surely it would be easier to allow the registrars to work this out, and more importantly tell ICANN what's needed from them

Mary Wong:@Chris, this is why we're having this discussion - to understand the options and get agreement from the IRT as to whether there are any minimum handling or other requirements that should be designed in order to implement this policy recommendation.

Roger Carney:+1 Theo

Darcy Southwell:+1 Theo

Alicia Kaelin:+1 Theo

Theo Geurts:i am not sure what the voting options are

Francisco Arias:@Theo, the question is whether you agree that scenario 3 is an acceptable risk and those issues will be dealt with existing processes

Chris Pelling:acceptable risk is an inaccuracy report, and domain is shutdown

Chris Pelling:where is the risk?

Theo Geurts:yes scenario 3 is an acceptable risk

Chris Pelling:Thanks Francisco :)

Dennis Chang:page 12

steve metalitz:@Francisco what do you mean by "reusing fields"?

steve metalitz:So "reusing" means "using existing" fields

Dennis Chang:@steve yes

Amy Bivins:@Steve, yes

Alex Deacon:I think the i18n issue is a good one to consider here.

Sara Bockey:Agree. I don't think it really solves anything that couldn't be solved with the current fields

Darcy Southwell:Completely agree with Roger. Adding 4 new fields overcomplicates this.

steve metalitz:Agree with Francisco that the solution (including labeling in existing fields) needs to address internationalized data.

steve metalitz:I speak for some RDS users and have practical questions about adding new fields.

Sara Bockey:still not supportive of adding new fields and think we are going outside the scope of this IRT

Roger Carney:@Amy good topic for the subteam
steve metalitz:In February we asked staff to look at the
complete list (which it alone has) of the names of existing p/p
services affiliated with accredited registrars for ideas for
labeling. Has that been done?
steve metalitz:thanks all!
Roger Carney:Thanks!!
Sara Bockey:thank you all!