ICANN Transcription
Privacy and Proxy Services Accreditation Issues PDP WG
Tuesday 16 December 2014 at 1400 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of Privacy and Proxy Services Accreditation Issues PDP WG call on the Tuesday 16 December 2014 at 14:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

The audio is also available at: http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-ppsa-20141216-en.mp3 On page: http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#dec

Attendees:
Steve Metalitz - IPC
Graeme Bunton – RrSG
Frank Michlick – Individual
Justin Macy - BC
Susan Kawaguchi – BC
Kristina Rosette – IPC
Val Sherman – IPC
Theo Geurts - RrSG
Stephanie Perrin - NCSG
James Bladel – RrSG
Griffin Barnett – IPC
Alex Deacon – IPC
Kathy Kleiman – NCSG
Osvaldo Novoa – ISPCP
Phil Corwin – BC
Sarah Wyld – RrSG
Vicky Scheckler – IPC
Holly Raiche – ALAC
Christian Dawson-ISPCP
Carlton Samuels – ALAC
Michele Neylon – RrSG
Don Blumenthal – RySG
Phil Marano - IPC
Todd Williams – IPC
David Cake – NCSG
David Heasley - IPC
 Darcy Southwell – RrSG

David Hughes - IPC

Apologies :
Lindsay Hamilton-Reid- RrSG
Richard Leaning – no SOI
Paul McGrady – IPC
Kiran Malancharuvil – IPC
Marika Konings

ICANN staff:
Mary Wong
Daniela Andela
Nathalie Peregrine

Coordinator: Good morning, good afternoon. Please go ahead. This call is now being

                     recorded.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much, (Francesca). Good morning, good afternoon, and

                     good evening everybody and welcome to the PPSAI Working Group call on

                     the 16th of December, 2014.

                     On the call today we have Tatyana Khramtsova, Val Sherman, Holly Raiche,

                     Michele Neylon, Steve Metalitz, Theo Geurts, Justin Macy, Todd Williams,

                     David Heasley, Alex Deacon, Christian Dawson, Griffin Barnett. Sarah Wyld,

                     Darcy Southwell, Susan Kawaguchi, Phil Corwin, Kathy Kleiman, Oswaldo

                     Novoa, Graeme Bunton, James Bladel, Stephanie Perrin, and Frank Michlick.

                     We have apologies from Don Blumenthal - who will hopefully join soon -

                     Richard Leaning, Lindsay Hamilton-Reid, and Marika Konings. And from staff

                     we have Mary Wong, (Daniella Ondella), and myself Nathalie Peregrine.

                     I'd like to remind you all to please state your names before speaking for

                     transcription purposes. Thank you ever so much and over to you, Graeme.

Graeme Bunton: Hello. Is it me this morning? Good morning everyone. Any updates to SOIs?

                     No, good. Just a reminder maybe to check those out if you haven't looked at

                     yours in a while.

Apologies if I sound a little (canteresque). I'm rocking quite a cold, and I'm being a sucky baby about it.

So today we are going to finalize Category E. We've got some updated draft recommendations here. And then we're going to try and move on to G, skipping F. Sorry, just checking the chat.

So we've got a couple questions there from the - on the right hand side you can see - or on the Category E, the remaining questions. Actually, before we get into that, does anybody have any comments on the agenda? Happy to move forward with that? Good.

I can't seem to scroll in the document. There we go. So if we scroll down to - where is it? We've got all sorts of comments in there. Mary, which bit is it where it's the should versus must? Did we lose Mary, too?

Mary Wong: No, I'm here. Sorry, I apologize that both Don and I actually happen to have imminent outages and power outages, so, like I said, I can't see the Adobe. But if we're looking at the 16th December update, and, Graeme, do you want it to go to the should and must (spec still) in the second bullet point on Page 2?

Graeme Bunton: Oh yeah, there it is. So where we're at is this. Give me one second. I have a large group of people being very loud behind me. Sorry, my apologies. Had to shoosh some people behind me.

So second bullet point on Page 2: "As part of an escalation process and when the above-mentioned requirements concerning a persistent delivery, failure of an electronic communication have been met, providers should or the provider must upon request forward a further form of notice to its customers. Providers should have the discretion to select the most appropriate means of forwarding such a request."

And then we have the anti-charter reasonable (unintelligible) on a cost recovery basis. So let's go to that should versus must and see if anybody has any particular comments on that. There we go. Steve, please.

Steve Metalitz: Thank you, Graeme. This is Steve. I do support must, but I think it might make most sense just to walk through - this is the document that Mary circulated yesterday I believe. And it might just make sense to walk through this because she's tried to simplify things a little bit and reorganize them in a way that I think is helpful to frame the issues.

And then, you know, if we're satisfied with this, then I think the should/must issue becomes simpler to resolve. But basically she's - and again this is back on the second page. I think Graeme is the only one who can scroll at this point. At least I can't.

Graeme Bunton: Oh really? We can...You should...Let's give everybody the ability to scroll. Mary, are you still there? Would you be able to walk us through the changes that you've made here?

Mary Wong: Yes, sure. I'm still here. And essentially what we tried to do is to pick up on all the comments that were made on the call last week. And we haven't incorporated all of them and joined these two bullet points.
You see that for example in a couple of these footnotes that tries to clarify whether it's an electronic communication and to make sure for example that when we talk about delivery and the failure of delivery we're not talking about the failure of a customer to respond. Those seem to us to be not so much recommendations but clarifications, so that's why they went into (slip) notes.

With respect to these particular bullet points on Page 2 -- as Steve mentioned and I think I said on the call last week - the attempt here is to simplify, make it more straightforward. We still use the terminology to assist in failure of

delivery, and I think Kathy may have just an e-mail about I think a possible route to get some more (unintelligible) clarity around that.

So if she's on the call I'll let her explain what she has in mind on that. But essentially the first bullet point from last week, it's pretty much what it used to be except somewhat rearranged. And it said in the affirmative now that there will be promptly forwarded to the customer electronic requests alleging abuse.

And if a provider becomes aware of a persistent delivery failure, then that provider will promptly notify the requestor. So it's two sentences that tries to capture where we were on this point last week.

And then if we go to the second bullet point - and here's where I think some more changes and rearranging has been done -- we have related it back to the persistent delivery failure because there has to be that same error.

And then if a provider becomes aware of that, then the provider promptly notifies the requestor, at which point the second bullet point could kick in as part of escalation, in which case then we're talking about forwarding upon request from a notice with all the other points that are still up for discussion - the cost of recovery basis and the last addition here on the second bullet point is something that we picked up from the call last week again, which is some sort of bracket if you like or some sort of limitation over how often this form of (explanation) can be used.

And that could be seen as an ability to minimize cost as well as possible abuse of the system, etcetera, etcetera.

Then we added a third bullet point that - again, going back to the persistent delivery failure -- that attempts to link us back to recommendations that this group made under Category B, Question 2, which is the obligation of the provider to verify or re-verify, as the case may be, a customer's e-mail

address, the logic here being that if you know as a provider that that e-mail address doesn't work, then that should trigger the obligations that we've already talked about in Category B.

And the final bullet point that was added here - bullet point Number 4 - and this is something that was discussed with the chairs on our pre-call today, and this may actually be a bullet point of broader application than just this particular recommendation.

But since we're on Category E, we thought it would be useful to put it here, which is that given that providers, given that (unintelligible) sometimes do have the ability or do specify that they may take some different or further options, we wanted to make it clear that even with having these recommendations the provider would not be precluded from having those additional abilities under the terms of service.

So I've gone through this as what the staff did with the document after last week's call and here we go.

Graeme Bunton: This is Graeme. Thank you Mary. That is a lot of work and well appreciated. I think that adds a fair amount of clarity there. Kathy, I see your hand is up.

Kathy Kleiman: Sure, although I'm not - can you hear me? Can you hear me, Graeme? And I'm sorry you're not feeling well.

Graeme Bunton: Yes.

Kathy Kleiman: Okay.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you.

Kathy Kleiman: So what Mary has presented is a lot of material, and I certainly don't have my hands around all of it as it is a lot of work, which I appreciate.

So my - as she suggested, I posted something recently that when it came to the first bullet point in Section II regarding further provider actions, when there is a repeated failure of electronic communications, I was reading that, and it got to the point where second sentence of the first bullet, a requestor will be promptly notified of a persistent failure of delivery. And there's a footnote.

I expected that footnote to be a definition of the persistent failure of delivery. And instead it's a note about something very, very important, differentiating the failure of a technical delivery from the failure of a response of, you know, the choice of someone perhaps not to respond. So I think Footnote 3 is very important but I'd still love to see that definition, even a broad, broad definition of what we mean by persistent failure of delivery, because if we don't define it, someone else will. Thanks.

Graeme Bunton: Fair enough. You want to - that wasn't me coughing. Do you have a sense for you, Kathy, what a persistent failure would mean?

Kathy Kleiman: I thought I would leave it to the technical experts of the community. But I think it means - and I know we don't want to quantify it to bounce backs because we've been talking about different types of systems. The answer is I don't know, but it's a good question. Thanks, Graeme.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks Kathy. Are we talking I guess about - just to put this out there - a number of failed within a certain time period would seem the way to approach that. Then I guess we need to figure out the failures and the time period. Steve, you have a clear answer to this question?

Steve Metalitz: I do. I'm very comfortable leaving that question to be resolved in implementation by the technical experts since we've debated that issue I would say excessively in this group. I think Footnote 3 is important because it helps to dispel one misconception that also keeps arising. So I think that

helps to clarify what we're not talking about and I'm certainly comfortable leaving that for implementation.

I wonder what the argument would be against that since we seem not to be capable of mustering the technical expertise to come to an agreed definition or even for someone to put forward a definition that meets technical muster.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you Steve. Someone's mic is on. Getting a lot of echo there. Michele?

Michele Neylon: Thanks Graeme. Michele for the record. Just in relation to Steve's comments, that's assuming that the implementation is handled by a completely different set of people. Based on my own personal experience that is often not the case. It's like usually of combination of ICANN staff with members of the working group. So I'd be wary about just punting something along to implementation.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks Michele. If we don't want to punt it though, then we need to probably come up with something. So do you have something in mind? Do you have a straw man to start us with?

Michele Neylon: This is Michele. I would just say if you want to put some filler text in for now, just say five days or seven days or something like that, there's probably an average number of days that a mail server will retry for sending stuff, after which it will fail. I can't remember off the top of my head what the RFC (unintelligible) say on that.

It's just my main thing is just being, just simply saying okay we can't deal with this. Let's shove it along to implementation is something to be quite careful of because based on my own experience it's often the same people, so it's not actually solving anything. Thanks.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks Michele. Kristina is making a suggestion there that seems like reasonable actually that we could flag this as a point for which we specifically

seek community input when we put out a report for public comment. If we are stuck on this particular topic, then that seems like a reasonable choice to me.

I noticed Don is in. Don are you back on the line? I'm not hearing anything so I'm going to say no. So I'm not hearing, so I'm hearing from Steve that thinks we should leave this to implementation. I'm hearing from Michele that implementation seems to be the same people often and that pushing that along may not be helpful. And then Kristina was suggesting that we seek community input specifically on this.

And I think there seems to be some agreement that Kristina is suggesting is reasonable and we can try and move forward with that. I see Kathy's got her hand up.

Kathy Kleiman: Hi Graeme. In the chat room we're trying to play with some definitions. And perhaps it might be worth creating a footnote where we attempt an explanation and then put that out for public comment. So persistent failure of delivery be a technical failure of delivery over a period of time after which the system stops trying to deliver the message and then adding what James said and the provider becomes aware that the delivery has failed or has been abandoned due to excessive attempts.

So if you combine my chat room and James's chat room we may have at least something we can throw out there for comment.

Graeme Bunton: All right, that's great. Yeah, let's try and capture that, put that in there as a footnote. And we can try and move forward with that and see what the community thinks. A pretty reasonable approach. I think that's an old hand, Kathy? I'm going to assume so.

Okay. All right so that's more or less that first bullet point on that second page I think, which brings us back to the second bullet point, which we were going to start at, and now we've sort of come back to that place, which is good.

And this is where we get into the should and must which we should really make a decision on. And this is where we should - a provider should or a provider must forward a further form of notice to its customer. And a provider has the discretion to select the appropriate means of forwarding such a request.

Steve, I'll come to you in a moment. I guess I want to make sure that first of all in all cases a provider is going to have an alternate method as opposed to the e-mail address that's captured upon registration. And then how we feel about the should or must. So let's go to you first, Steve.

Steve Metalitz: I had two comments on this paragraph, neither of which was directly related to what you were asking. So if you would like me to defer and see if there are comments on your questions, I'm happy to do that.

Graeme Bunton: I see Don's hand, but let's - feel free. Go ahead please.

Steve Metalitz: I should go ahead?

Graeme Bunton: Yes please.

Steve Metalitz: This is Steve. My two comments were - my first comment has to do with the last sentence, which is new, although it was discussed last week. And I think this is fine in principal. I would suggest that we just say the provider can impose reasonable limits on sending communications through alternative means at the request of the same requester in relation to the same domain name.

I don't know this - once a year, twice a year - I don't know what the right number is, but let's - I think we just make it clear that the provider can impose some reasonable limits.

My second point is on the preceding sentence where we obviously have a disagreement and I don't think it's likely that either side will persuade the other - we've debated it at least three or four times - and that's over who bears the cost.

So I'm comfortable providing both alternatives and seeking public comment on that as one option if we cannot persuade the group that in this situation, the system has broken down, the bargain if you will that underlies legitimate privacy proxy services, which is that there is some way to contact the registrant in case of need, that's broken down and therefore not fair to impose that cost on a third party.

If we can - if we don't have agreement on that, then I would be comfortable leaving the two options in there and wait for public comment on that. Thank you.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you Steve. And I think I saw James in the chat agreeing with you that "reasonable limits on repeated duplicate requests" was his language - that we don't necessarily need to specify a time frame. And we can just leave that open. And I think there was some agreement on that.

My sense is I tend to agree. On to your second point, on this fee question we have discussed this back and forth quite a bit, and we haven't as yet come to a clear place. I'll go to James please.

James Bladel: Thanks Graeme. James speaking for the transcript. And I agree with Steve that we have not reached any agreement on this, and so we should probably put both versions out as straw men for public input.

You know, I just feel like this issue as well as some of the things we're seeing in transliteration and transcription as well as some of the concerns around the follow-up work from the EWG is that there's an economic question that's not

being asked relative to all of this (who is) work, which is who is paying for all of this.

And, you know, I think that this is just a symptom of a much larger question that probably should be - a conversation that should be had through our public comment period and just generally throughout the community. So I agree with Steve. Let's put them out there and identify or highlight those in our call for public comments as specific areas that we're targeting for community input. Thanks.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you James. Anyone else have thoughts on this particular issue? Or do we leave that for the fee for public comment, see if we can gather some input from the community? Cool. I wonder how many things we can put out there for specific public comments. I don't think we're at too many just yet, so that's okay.

And then the last bullet point, so we still haven't touched on the should/must there.

Don Blumenthal: Graeme?

Graeme Bunton: Yes hello Don.

Don Blumenthal: Finally.

Graeme Bunton: Hey, bienvenue and welcome. So I'm not sure how long you've been on for, but we had Mary summarize the changes that she's made through this document, which were extensive and I'll thank her again.

We've done a little bit of discussion around what a persistent failure means and whether we should define that ourselves or ask for community input and we've taken a gentle crack at actually defining that. But it is something we'll draw up a community input towards.

And we also looked at reasonable limits, and there is some agreement on that. And we were just coming back around to the should/must is about where we are.

Don Blumenthal: Yeah. I tracked down my portable router. Took a while to, you know, going three floors isn't the easiest thing for me to do. But yeah, by the time I got it rigged up and then I could hear but then I don't know what was going on with the mic so it took longer to talk, but I did hear a bit of the persistent failure discussion and then everything after that.

Graeme Bunton: Great. So I'm going to hand back to you as I'm also desperate to blow my nose now.

Don Blumenthal: Thank you for sharing.

Graeme Bunton: You're welcome. All yours, Don. Thank you.

Don Blumenthal: Okay. Yeah, we have had the should/must, you know, lingering in a couple of places for a few weeks now. So I would like to try to get some thoughts on how we should go to get that resolved and not lay three consecutive items over for explicit requests for public comment.

And I'm getting an echo on myself. Okay, it went away. I guess somebody turned something off. Steve?

Steve Metalitz: Yeah, I think this is simple. If we're trying to set minimum standards then if we're trying a set of standards in this area, it should be must. If people aren't comfortable setting a standard in this area, then we've had several weeks of conversation for no purpose. Thank you.

Graeme Bunton: Did we lose you there, Don?

Don Blumenthal: No. Well, you did for a second but I found the problem. I got Steve's comment there. Kathy?

Kathy Kleiman: I think we should - jot that I want to put everything out for the public comment, but I think we've been around and around on this. I think we should put this one out for public comment because the implications of must - as we've talked about - there could be innumerable unintended consequences of that.

We're setting minimum standards. Let's watch and see what happens. And my sense was should, should be part of those minimum standards. Must - again, tons of unintended consequences there. Thanks. I'm thinking...

Don Blumenthal: Okay, Michele? Thinking what?

Michele Neylon: Thanks. Michele for the record.

Don Blumenthal: Wait, wait...

Michele Neylon: Yes?

Don Blumenthal: Okay. No, it was a brutal echo there, so I just wanted to...Go ahead.

Michele Neylon: Michele, for the record, echoing what Kathy was saying I think this is something maybe we should just look at for several of these outstanding issues where we can't reach agreement within the group and put those out for public input and comment in one of the initial public comment periods. And then based on the feedback we get then maybe we will have a clearer path forward. Thank you.

Don Blumenthal: Okay. Steve, is that new or old?

Steve Metalitz: That's old. I've commented in the chat.

Don Blumenthal: Oh okay.

Steve Metalitz: I think if we're serious about minimum standards this conversation is somewhat surreal. But and I - it just makes me question the commitment to try to reach minimum standards here but I'll need...

Don Blumenthal: Well I'd like to focus on that for a minute. And maybe go and I guess go back to the people who are suggesting we well first ask if there's anybody who agrees with this statement?

And then second ask what the problems are with Steve's comment? You know, are we doing minimum standards and at what point do we just have to say these are the minimum standards and you must do them?

It might be an idea to get an idea of what these unintended -- and I know this is a bit of them oxymoron you don't know it's unintended until you've run into it -- but some thoughts on what theories on what that might even be. Susan.

Susan Kawaguchi: Well obviously I agree with Steve that it should be must. And I think should just give us the status quo's we have today but good proxy providers are going to the responsible ones are going to actually forward something or provide some sort of access and communication and those who aren't going to.

So, you know, I think all of this work that we've done on this is for not if we don't include must. Should isn't going to get us anywhere. We're not going to move the ball forward.

We maybe we've sat and done this for quite a long time and we'll get no result out of this which would be a shame in my opinion.

Don Blumenthal: Appreciate it, Susan. Any other comments on this point? I'll be very honest I'm uncomfortable with punting three issues in a row.

You know, at some point when we start to look a little foolish or that's not the right word but we're going through the section and just saying defer, defer, defer.

You know, it would be helpful to get some specifics on why should is must is problematic on the unintended issue.

David Hughes: Don, its David Hughes. I'm on a cell phone so I cannot raise my hand. I'm sorry.

Don Blumenthal: No, that's okay.

David Hughes: Okay. So I mean the crux of it is if there are going to be bad actors should is meaningless I'm sorry should is meaningless it has to be must.

And if you're a good actor you're going to probably do the right thing whether or not we even agree upon this.

So if we're going to - I think what we have to do is we have to figure out what is the minimum thing that we can agree is a must. I think that is the work that is before this group.

And if we can't agree to something that's one thing but agreeing to something that is only a should seems to me at least from my side not really going to help me because in many cases the actions will be I don't want to say malicious but purposeful.

And unless there is some kind of must it'll be ignored by the bad actors and that's who we're worried about. That's my two cents. Thank you.

David Hughes: Yes. Thanks for cutting in there. Okay. Don't see other hands raised. But let's work this out in the drafting stage a little more.

I think that's all we - Graeme did we cover the cost issue because I...

Graeme Bunton: Steve brought it up briefly. We didn't dig too much into it again. That was one that we talked about putting up for public comment again...

Don Blumenthal: Oh.

Graeme Bunton: ...or drawing attention to it.

Don Blumenthal: Right okay. Okay why do we move on to G. Maybe we can reach solid conclusions on the final one here.

Mary Wong: And Don and everyone this is Mary again. And I apologize that I'm still having an Internet outage that prevents me from being in Adobe.

So I'm going to ask (Natalie) if she hasn't done already to share the documents for G that's from last week or the week before?

Don Blumenthal: And it's nice to know I wasn't the only one having outage issues.

Mary Wong: Yes slightly confident too but I do apologize to everyone in the delay in getting the document up.

Don Blumenthal: Yes. It's flipped over. Well it's - we're in between right now. Okay. No we got the - I got potential recommendations listed here. And I'm getting the echo again. Drat.

Mary Wong: Don if that will help yes I was just going to ask if you wanted me to walk everyone through the document if they haven't seen it for the log because as you said there's some potential recommendations at the bottom of Page 2. And there's also a (unintelligible) a number of outstanding discussion questions as well.

Don Blumenthal: Mary...

Mary Wong: Yes.

Don Blumenthal: I think you kind of dropped out there.

Mary Wong: Oh. I was just offering to walk briefly through the documents if you thought that will be helpful.

Don Blumenthal: I'm sorry my speakers went out. You're back on.

Steve Metalitz: Don this is Steve.

Don Blumenthal: So...

Steve Metalitz: Mary was just offering to walk through this category G document if we thought it would be helpful.

Don Blumenthal: Right.

Steve Metalitz: And I think it would.

Don Blumenthal: Yes I agree. Like I said in my note to the chairs I'm kind of jury rigging here. So audio died but I figured out the problem. Yes if you could Mary that would be helpful.

Mary Wong: Sure. And I'll try and keep it brief. In this document and it's not raised in the same way as of yet with the other preliminary recommendations.

But it has divided into two, you know, general sections. And one is of about termination of the provider itself and the accreditation and that's Page 1 into Page 2.

Page 2 then has a brief section on the termination of the service to the customer which I think we agree at the outset is a different topic.

If we look at the termination of the accreditation of the proxy or privacy provider, you know, the (unintelligible) highlighting some of the things that the working group may need to identify including potentially specific issues that arise in the privacy proxy context but are not currently covered IRTP and how it's not within our scope to recommend changes to the IRTP as a policy. We can identify those issues to be looked at when that policy is reviewed again.

We talked a little bit about transfer issues. There's a couple of questions here that we may not be able to get into today.

But on the potential recommendations the bullet point at the bottom of Page 1 these were based on suggestions discussions from the Category G discussion that this group had several weeks ago.

And we've bolded the ones that look like recommendations. And there's a couple of, you know, smallish or specific points that may still need further clarifications.

For example on bullet point one the potential recommendation would be all right you probably want to notify the privacy proxy customer before its providers be accredited. But at what point should this occur. And a suggestion was made there.

And the other bullet points are pretty self-explanatory. And I don't (unintelligible) them there is potential recommendations.

So it may be helpful for the group to look briefly at these potential recommendations. See if we agree with some or all of them so that we can

resave them into, you know, more affirmative recommendation language like we've done for some of the other sections.

And before you just do that in the second section on determination of the customers service there's points there that we've put down for discussion.

And I think one of the questions at the bottom here is whether or not what we have right now in terms of our current recommendations what providers should put regarding publication and notification in terms of service whether they're sufficient, or whether more needs to be done and whether an escrow model would be helpful.

So Don and Steve my suggestion is to have the group look at the potential recommendations at the bottom of Page 1. See if anything needs to be taken out or added to. And then maybe proceed to the discussion of the last two bullet points at the end of Page 2.

Don Blumenthal: Yes. I agree. I appreciate the background there. It helps bring everybody up to date. The document that does a good job of kind of focusing in - well there's a nice heading there that says potential recommendation. So it draws us write down.

And again I don't think we'll be able to get through everything but why don't we focus in on when I'm going to assume that there's agreement that the privacy proxy customer needs to be notified.

What - at what point should this occur? You know, an obvious answer is after termination. But is there some obligation to alert a customer even when the compliance process is in operation because there isn't at least so far we don't have any kind of automated mechanism for transferring and there is I think Mary suggested they're reasons that the registrar process might not work in a proxy privacy setting.

So let me ask for comments on how we want to not so much if it should happen but when customers need to be notified or when we need to recommend that compliance do some kind of notification?

Trying to follow the chat here.

So do we just go with saying the customer has to be notified when the obviously - after the privacy and proxy provider has been terminated?

Okay well put a placeholder there. Yes I - this is an area - notifying the rest of the privacy proxy community I have to wonder whether that couldn't follow the usual patterns we see with registrar DO accreditation.

Although let me ask and I don't have experience in this. Is this in the registrar situation does compliance whoever does it reach out to the registrar community before termination or after the decision's been made to do it? Michele.

Michele Neylon: Registrar termination the registrar termination doesn't happen overnight to start with. First off to be usually a process involved there.

When as part of the registrar termination process the registrar that is being terminated may elect another registrar to whom the domains may be transferred.

Failing that it then goes out to the broader group of registrars and once a registrar has been selected by ICANN then that is announced. In fact helps clarify things.

Don Blumenthal: Yes, it does. I appreciate that. Is that general process as Michele has explained it going to be sufficient in a proxy privacy situation?

You know, do proxy privacy customers need a little more latitude when it comes to having their - have a little more choice in terms of what - where they're proxy privacy registrations go? Is that a new hand Michele?

Michele Neylon: Yes. Just very briefly I mean I would say if I could - why don't we just use the process for the accreditation of registrars as the strawman. And just see if people raise significant issues with us.

I mean it might be something that we're not seeing. But just as an initial starting point, you know, this is what's done here. Is that enough and just leave it at that?

I don't think there's any point trying to belabor it because we've discussed this several times in the past. A couple of points have been raised but we keep kind of circling back to the same thing. So I think we've pretty much covered this. Thank you.

Mary Wong: Don, are you there?

Don Blumenthal: Sorry the speaker kicked out again. Am I back?

Mary Wong: Yes, you are.

Don Blumenthal: Okay. Not the speaker of the mic kicked out again. I think what Michele just said does makes sense. But I mean we have discussed it.

Since we're wrapping up G I was just want to throw it out again along the lines of what Michele just said I think we could just go with a standard registrar process concerning notification also.

Don't - I would like to suggest that any way. Okay can we go to Page 2 here (Natalie)? Well again all of these things - all of these issues here are things

that we have discussed before. So since we have six minutes - okay Kathy which one specifically?

Kathy Kleiman: I don't. Let me raise one well the main the background. Let me customer to be able to choose its own proxy privacy provider.

I know this is something we've talked about. But it's certainly not something we can do today. I have the option of using the proxy private.

Unless we're going out to regulate attorneys, and Web designers and people like that which maybe we are.

Right now I - when I register a domain name I use the proxy privacy provider provided by my registrar. Are we changing that?

Don Blumenthal: Okay. But what, you know, you wrote in the chat that there are issues new issues in it that we flag here? And to be honest all of them sound familiar to me.

Kathy Kleiman: Yes I just called off the call for something. So that was one of them. No I just think there's material here that needs to be thought about.

So I'm just hoping we can reschedule this also for the next call in case there are issues that come up as we mull over this or people that join us who are currently out on vacation. I wouldn't normally do that but I think this is a big one, accreditation, deaccreditation is a big issue.

Don Blumenthal: Okay. Any other comments on these items? In a general - I don't remember discussing the general recommendation to examine the impact but that's yes that's I don't know if that's controversial.

Mary Wong: Don, this is Mary.

Don Blumenthal: Yes. I'm getting all kinds of beeps and whirs. Hello?

Man: Success.

Don Blumenthal: Yes. Okay Mary unless that was Mary of course.

Mary Wong: Yes it was.

Don Blumenthal: Okay. What were you going to say there?

Mary Wong: I'm sorry. Could nobody hear me?

Don Blumenthal: No. We were getting what we're getting now phone rings.

Mary Wong: Yes I was just asking yes sorry I was just asking if the general recommendation is something the group wanted to make because this just seemed like a logical question to ask the group given it - the discussions on transfer issues?

Don Blumenthal: Okay. Yes it makes sense on the surface. And again I can't see any reason not to do that but particularly folks with more IRTP experience than I would be curious if you had any problems with the idea?

                  Let's see we've got two minutes here real quickly. And I'll get to you Kathy in a second. We're talking about a call next week.

                  We can go ahead and schedule it. I think we may put out a doodle poll just to see who even is going to be on it if folks we're already on vacation at this point. But, you know, as of now I would - I think we would go ahead for people who want to participate. Kathy?

Kathy Kleiman: Yes. So I like this bullet point a general recommendation to examine the impact on proxy privacy customers during the next review of the IRTP.

And I'd go further as specifically to facilitate the transfer of domain names that are covered by proxy privacy services between one proxy privacy service provider and another.

I mean pick your wording. But, you know, it seems like there's a sense of the group that people should be able to transfer their domain names and maintain their proxy privacy coverage.

So I would, you know, specifically add that that that's the goal to expand the transfer to include proxy privacy. Thanks.

Don Blumenthal: Okay. Quick question just to - what is the IRTP cycle for review if anybody knows? Okay...

Graeme Bunton: Sorry, this is Graeme. Let me briefly address that. I think IRTP D is done. But part of the recommendations included in that was that we kick off an overarching look at transfers.

And I think that plays a year after the implementation of IRTP D if I'm correct. So it's on the cards. It's just not immediate. Thanks.

Don Blumenthal: And we'll just see how it fits in with this process finalizing. We slid - gone to 11 o'clock. I see that people are dropping already.

So we'll talk to you all I guess next week who have not already bagged it for the holidays. If you have well we'll talk to in January. Thanks.

Woman: Thank you everybody.

Man: Thanks, Don.

Woman: Thanks a lot.

Woman: Thanks, Don. Bye-bye.

Woman: Thank you very much, (Francesca). You may now stop the recordings. Have a good day.

END