

Michelle DeSmyter:Dear All, Welcome to the Privacy and Proxy Services Accreditation IRT Meeting on Tuesday, 18 April 2017 at 14:00 UTC.

Chris Pelling:Good afternoon all, sorry I almost missed this call

Michelle DeSmyter>Welcome Chris, glad to have you on!

Carlton Samuels:Howdy all

steve metalitz:@Amy what is current volume of applicatoins received and what was the volume at initiation of the registrar accreditatoin program? (2001)

Chris Pelling:COMMENT: Surely Accredited registrars who are already in good standing with ICANN will not be subjected to this whole process again ?

Chris Pelling:ah good :)

Chris Pelling:COMment: I would disagree with Theo for already accredited registrars

Chris Pelling:as we are already completing all requirements

Chris Pelling:Yes - New subject to this

Chris Pelling:registrars who are already accredited and provided the service - no

Greg DiBiase:+1 to Theo, I agree with this criteria for providers not affilated with registrars

steve metalitz:@ Greg, Teo, then what would providers affiliated with registrars have to provide for accreditation?

Chris Pelling:COMMENT: Essentially a set of questions should be set, maybe not 60, but, registrant information, Escrow requirements (technical), policy information should all be included

Chris Pelling:Comment: As per the PDP they are treated the same

steve metalitz:@Roger, what is basis for syaing proxy providers are smaller than privacy providers? The most recent data I have seen from ICANN's contractor (NORC?) is that privacy providers are almost nonexistent (3% of total).

steve metalitz:*nonexistent*

Chris Pelling:Comment: I also think as part of the questions, ICANN should make the thje PP service go through a training session, similar to the RAA requires registrars to do so they understand the polices that they will adhere too

Chris Pelling:Selg based

Chris Pelling:Self based - during accreditation

Chris Pelling:it took like 60 minutes for someone who knows the policies

Roger Carney:@Steve, I see many proxy providers as lawyers/law firms. Not sure what the 3% represents (% of providers, % of registrations)?

steve metalitz:@Roger, % of registrations

Scott Austin:Comment: are govt agencies in foreign jurisdictions permitted to PP providers, are political affiliations considered; does data breach security get significant review in the op/tech capability area?

steve metalitz:@Amy, hard to answer that question (about number of Qs to be asked) without seeing what registrar accreditation applicants are being asked today.

Theo Geurts:+1 Steve,

Carlton Samuels:+1 to a training program as the last mile for accreditation

Chris Pelling:Sorry Amy - could you ask it again

Carlton Samuels:@Theo: +1 exactly!

steve metalitz:@Amy, again, hard to answer without seeing the questions. Would have been helpful to have this material in advance of the call.

Chris Pelling:COMMENT: Questions leads to URL for training and exam and once all completed to 100% accreditation given questions being the ones we are talking about now

Darcy Southwell:Without having a sample to look at, my initial response is that if some fill out the application, and others only have to take a "test," then the p/p providers are not being accredited based on the same information.

Roger Carney:@Steve, that 3% number of registrations sort of surprises me, though I do think that the number of privacy providers are quite small compared to proxy providers, but their volumes would be considerable different as well

Eric

Rokobauer:<https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/application-2012-02-25-en> is the link with questions

Jennifer Gore:How to become a Registrar?

https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_www.icann.org_resources_pages_accreditation-2D2012-2D02-2D25-2Den&d=DwICaQ&c=FmY1u3PJP6wrcrwl13mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=8_WhWIPqsLT6TmF1Zmyci866vcPSF04VShFqESGe_5iHWGlBLwwehFBfjrsjWv9&m=d4XK_ysRf-9eFTTsxUUyuZ_lnj2W4WR8nvto2ltdtRE&s=n97cTskQzEmA47cBjG9Z94B7GIKJi_xQvD1SZSMTlYQ&e=

Jennifer Gore:application:

https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_www.icann.org_resources_pages_application-2D2012-2D02-2D25-2Den&d=DwICaQ&c=FmY1u3PJP6wrcrwl13mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=8_WhWIPqsLT6TmF1Zmyci866vcPSF04VShFqESGe_5iHWGlBLwwehFBfjrsjWv9&m=d4XK_ysRf-9eFTTsxUUyuZ_lnj2W4WR8nvto2ltdtRE&s=fHl8zGfYJGDdmhB42hW0iNaay6a57ukZ5fJqg4VlRtg&e=

Chris Pelling:COMMENT: none whatsoever - +1 to Theo

steve metalitz:"Eligibility restrictions" --- other than whether the provider is affiliated with a current registrar (which would not be a permissible distinction for allowing applications, IMHO) -- can Amy or others on staff provide examples?

Carlton Samuels:There should be one and only one accreditation process. These are intended to separate and severable operations. Trust but verify. The only concession is that some one/entity that is already "known" may have a leg up on trust but same process

steve metalitz:I am skeptical there is as much overlap as Theo and others are stating between what current registrars must provide versus what p/p accreditation applicants must demonstrate they understand. The obligations are quite different.

steve metalitz:But again, hard to answer this question in the abstract.

Carlton Samuels:@Steve: The obligations are different +1.

Chris Pelling:@Steve, I am simply saying we as accredited registrars already provide the service, on our audits over the last 6 years, we have had no issues with our service. Therefore I disagree with your comment (if I read it correctly)

steve metalitz:@Chris, but the "service" has not been subject to any requirements from ICANN up to now. With accreditation, this changes.

Carlton Samuels:"Affiliated" has a whole universe of meanings! That could mean a separate legal entity from the registrar. Use the KISS rule here!

Chris Pelling:most of the "service" that we are doing this IRT over Steve is already implemented by us

Chris Pelling:and if it is a simple checklist of "Do you have X, Y and Z" as a cover then we should be able to push through

steve metalitz:@Chris,,but it has not been subject to audit under RAA by ICANN.

Chris Pelling:gone all quiet

Volker Greimann:Statement: The accreditation of affiliated p/p applicants should be baked into their registrar accreditation. There should not be a need for a separate accreditation

Alex Deacon:I've lost audio also.

steve metalitz:Lost audio?

Chris Pelling:I can only hear static

Chris Pelling:no talking

Roger Carney:No audio as well

Volker Greimann:Effectively, a registrar could receive a voucher to accredit one affiliated entity as p/p service provider for free

Chris Pelling:Theo I can hear

Eric Rokobauer:can hear you Theo

Chris Pelling:hear *

Roger Carney:I hear Theo

Amy Bivins:sorry guys, I'm speaking, will dial back in

Amy Bivins:couldn't hear Theo

Carlton Samuels:I can hear Steve

Leana Vitruk:I think it is back

Mary Wong:I think we lost Amy.

Ashley Heineman:Can't hear Amy..

Roger Carney:@Amy?

Michelle DeSmyter:Please stand by

Chris Pelling:Amy ?

Jennifer Gore:Hello All,

Jennifer Gore:Amy and I are going to dial back in

Jennifer Gore:thank you for your patience

Michelle DeSmyter:yes

Eric Rokobauer:yes

Carlton Samuels:Yes Amy

Jennifer Gore:thank you all

Chris Pelling:Comment : Not really, no.

Scott Austin:@Carlton re affiliate and separate entity +1

Chris Pelling:comment: agree with theo

steve metalitz: @Scott/Carlton, "Affiliate" is a defined term in RAA and the PPSAI policy incorporates this definition.

Alex Deacon:ok

Alex Deacon:I will look also :)

steve metalitz:section 1.3 of RAA

Mary Wong:Section 1.3, RAA: "Affiliate" means a person or entity that, directly or indirectly, through one or more intermediaries, Controls, is controlled by, or is under common control with, the person or entity specified.

Amy Bivins:1.3 "Affiliate" means a person or entity that, directly or indirectly, through one or more intermediaries, Controls, is controlled by, or is under common control with, the person or entity specified.

Alex Deacon:old

Chris Pelling:+1 Theo

Carlton Samuels:@Mary @Amy: That description reminds me of the "universe" of possibilities, yes.

Volker Greimann:Limited eligibility: Not practicable unless the requirement for registrars to only knowingly accept registrations from accredited entities is also waived until all providers can become accredited.

steve metalitz:Because you should not be discriminating between affiliated and unaffiliated applicants. Excluding them altogether is clearly discriminatory.

steve metalitz:That does not means that unafiliated applicants

might not be asked to provide more info than affiliated ones to the extent the latter have already provided it through the RAA accreditation or audit process.

Carlton Samuels:@Steve So you want to be a P/P service provider? One policy descriptive, one process, no discrimination.

Scott Austin:@Steve, I don't think the issue is exclusion but exception to the same level of compliance for an affiliated entity to an already accredited registrar.

Roger Carney:@volker, the reason I mentioned compliance enforcement

Chris Pelling:@Steve, I would not be worrying here about discrimination, as an unaffiliated provider will have to find a registrar to use and that registrar accept them

Chris Pelling:^^comment

Volker Greimann:also note that if there is a cost attached to accreditation, no matter how long the period is going to be there will be a rush at the end. No one will pay for accreditation or submit to these rules unless they have to

Volker Greimann:or sooner than they have to

steve metalitz:@Amy, how many affiliated p/p providers have been disclosed to ICANN under the current specification?

steve metalitz:@Amy you have not opened up the files that registrars have submitted? How do you know their submissions comply with the specification?

Chris Pelling:COMMENT: Volker mentioned above that a current ICANN registrar should be given a chitty / voucher for any fees as they are already accredited

steve metalitz:@Amy thanks for clarification. So presumably compliance or whoever has opened the files could provide an exact answer. Can you ask them?

Chris Pelling:@Amy we are already accredited

Chris Pelling:@Amy if we were that dodgy we would not be accredited

steve metalitz:@Amy no. See my previous chat entry.

steve metalitz:Repeating: that does not mean that unaffiliated applicants might not be asked to provide more info than affiliated ones to the extent the latter have already provided it through the RAA accreditation or audit process.

Chris Pelling:COMMENT: Amy, ICANN have already started discussing accreditation fees, what has been discussed further to this ?

Chris Pelling:per use fee ?

Chris Pelling:Thanks all :)

Carlton Samuels:Bye all

Roger Carney:Thanks!!

Theo Geurts:cyas

