

EPDP Team Meeting

16 August 2018

Meeting 5

Agenda

1. Roll Call & SOI Updates
2. Welcome and Updates from EPDP Chair
 - a. Response to ICANN email
 - b. Pro-forma Triage Report
3. Summary of responses to EPDP Input Survey Part 3
 - a. Results for Appendix D: Uniform Rapid Suspension
 - b. Results for Appendix E: Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy
 - c. Results for Appendix G: Supplemental Procedures to the Transfer Policy
4. Substantive Discussion of Temporary Specification (beginning with Appendix D, E, G)
 - a. Part 3 of the Survey can be found at <https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/7PWQPP7>
 - b. Appendix D: Uniform Rapid Suspension
 - c. Appendix E: Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy
 - d. Appendix G: Supplemental Procedures to the Transfer Policy
5. Review action items and questions for ICANN Org, if any
6. Wrap and confirm next meeting to be scheduled for Tuesday 21 August at 13.00 UTC. (Part 4 Survey results due Sunday, 19 August by 19.00 UTC)
 - Note: Questions for Part 4 have been updated to include Section 8

High-level Overview of EPDP Input Survey Part 3 Results

Summary of Responses

	RySG	RrSG	BC	NCSG	ALAC	ISPCP	GAC	IPC	SSAC
Appendix D:	Yes	NSO	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Appendix E:	Yes	NSO	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Appendix G:	No	No	No	NSO	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Appendix G:	No	NSO	Yes	NSO	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Sum of Yes	Sum of NSO	Sum of No	% No Agreement
7	1	1	11.11%
7	1	1	11.11%
3	1	5	55.56%
6	2	1	11.11%

Substantive discussion of Temporary Specification

Appendix D: Uniform Rapid Suspension

Issue Summary:

The majority of groups support the text of Appendix D as written or deferred to registrars. Otherwise, the following questions/issues were raised:

1. Should the language "participate in another mechanism" in Section 1.1 be clarified or eliminated?
2. Does the language in section 1.2 create possible incompatibilities with existing URS procedures?
3. There is currently no processing agreement with an Asian URS provider in place. Is this an issue for the EPDP Team?
4. Does the term "contact details" in Section 2 of Appendix D need to be further defined?
5. Should language allowing the Complainant to file an amended URS Complaint after it receives registration data be included in Section 2?
6. Is the review of Appendix D more appropriately addressed by the RPM PDP?
7. Should the review of Appendix D be deferred until after the EPDP Team deliberates on the access model/framework?
8. Does Section 2 of Appendix D need additional safeguards to ensure against abuse, i.e., a complainant filing "doe complaints" in an attempt to get registration data?

Appendix E: Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy

Issue Summary:

The majority of groups support the text of Appendix E as written. Otherwise, the following questions/issues were raised:

1. Should the language "participate in another mechanism" in Section 1.1 be clarified or eliminated?
2. Does the language in section 1.2 create possible incompatibilities with existing UDRP procedures?
3. Does Section 2 of Appendix E require additional safeguards to ensure against abuse, i.e., a complainant filing "doe complaints" in an attempt to get registration data?
4. Should language allowing the Complainant to file an amended UDRP Complaint following receipt of registration data be included in Section 2 of Appendix E?
5. Is the EPDP Team's review of Appendix E more appropriately addressed by the RPM PDP?
6. Should the review of Appendix E be deferred until after the EPDP Team deliberates on the access model/framework?

Appendix G: Supplemental Procedures to the Transfer Policy, Sections 1 & 2

Issue Summary:

The following concerns/issues were flagged by groups not in support of the language as written:

1. Does the revised transfer process create new security risks and vulnerabilities such as domain name theft and hijacking, and if so, should the EPDP Team address this as part of the work of this EPDP?
2. Should this Team's consideration be affected by existing efforts to replace/modify the Transfer Policy?
3. Does Section 1.2 of Appendix G, imposing redundant processes on the registrant, overly denigrate the user experience? Is there an alternative?
4. Should the language "to be offered" be removed from Section 1 to avoid confusion?
5. Is additional language necessary to ensure registry operators are able to process auth-code changes in bulk?
6. Does the language "best practices" in Section 3 require additional clarity?

Wrap Up

Mid-course corrections to today's meeting

Review actions items and questions for ICANN Org, if any

Next meeting to be scheduled for Tuesday 21 August at 13.00 UTC

Note: Part 3 Temp Spec Survey submissions due by **Sunday 19 August by 19.00 UTC**