Initial Report on the Privacy & Proxy Services Accreditation Issues Policy Development Process

STATUS OF THIS DOCUMENT

This is the Initial Report on Privacy & Proxy Services Accreditation Issues, prepared by ICANN staff for public comment and submission to the GNSO Council on 5 May 2015. ICANN staff will prepare a Final Report following the Working Group's review of the public comments received on this Initial Report.

SUMMARY

This report is submitted to the GNSO Council and posted for public comment as a required step in this GNSO Policy Development Process on Privacy & Proxy Services Accreditation Issues.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Executive Summary

1.1 Background

On 27 June 2013, the ICANN Board approved the new 2013 Registrar Accreditation Agreement ("2013 RAA"). The 2013 RAA addressed most of the recommended high priority amendments previously proposed by the GNSO-ALAC Drafting Team in its Final Report ("RAA Final Report")[1] and law enforcement agencies ("LEA"), except for the clarification of registrar responsibilities in connection with proceedings under the Uniform Dispute Resolution Policy ("UDRP"), and issues related to privacy and proxy services, including their accreditation and reveal and relay procedures. The GNSO has since addressed the issues pertaining to a registrar's responsibilities in connection with the locking of a domain name subject to proceedings under the UDRP[2], while the UDRP itself, along with all other existing rights protection mechanisms, will be the subject of an Issue Report to the GNSO in October 2015[3]. As such, the issues related to privacy and proxy services were identified[4] as the only remaining issues following the conclusion of the 2013 RAA negotiations that were suited for a PDP, pursuant to the October 2011 request by the ICANN Board for an Issue Report when initiating negotiations for the 2013 RAA with the gTLD Registrars Stakeholder Group[5].

On 31 October 2013, the GNSO Council initiated a Policy Development Process and chartered the Privacy & Proxy Services Accreditation Issues ("PPSAI") Working Group. A Call for Volunteers to the

[1] See http://gnso.icann.org/issues/raa/raa-improvements-proposal-final-report-18oct10-en.pdf.

[2] See http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/active/locking-domain-name.

[3] See http://gnso.icann.org/en/council/resolutions#201112. Note that where the original Council resolution had called for the Issue Report to be published 18 months after the delegation of the first gTLD in the New gTLD Program, an extension of the deadline to October 2015 was approved by the Council in January 2015: http://gnso.icann.org/en/meetings/minutes-council-29jan15-en.htm.

[4] See the Report on the Conclusion of the 2013 RAA Negotiations, prepared by ICANN staff in September 2013: http://gnso.icann.org/en/issues/raa/negotiations-conclusion-16sep13-en.pdf.

[5] See https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2011-10-28-en#7.

Working Group ("WG") was issued on 6 November 2013, and the WG held its first meeting on 3 December 2013[6].

1.2 Deliberations of the Working Group

The PPSAI Working Group started its work on 3 December 2013. The WG decided to conduct its deliberations primarily through weekly conference calls, in addition to discussions on its mailing list and scheduled meetings during ICANN Public Meetings. Section 5 provides an overview of the deliberations of the WG conducted by conference call as well as through e-mail threads and at ICANN Public Meetings.

The WG agreed early on to group the twenty-one questions outlined in its Charter into seven categories of related questions. For each Charter question, the WG used a uniform template that contained relevant background information to that question, community input received, WG member survey responses and other relevant material to inform its discussions and development of the preliminary conclusions presented for public comment in this Initial Report.

The WG's findings and initial recommendations for each of these Charter questions can be found in full in Section 7 of this Initial Report. They are also summarized in Section 1.3 below.

1.3 WG Preliminary Recommendations

The WG was chartered to provide the GNSO Council with "policy recommendations regarding the issues identified during the 2013 RAA negotiations, including recommendations made by law enforcement and GNSO working groups, that were not addressed during the 2013 RAA negotiations and otherwise suited for a PDP; specifically, issues relating to the accreditation of Privacy & Proxy Services". Following its analysis of each of the questions outlined in its Charter related to this task, the WG has arrived at a set of preliminary conclusions, although in several instances the WG has not yet finalized an agreed position on particular issues. These instances are clearly marked as such in this Initial Report. For at least one group of Charter questions, the WG is currently divided with two divergent views; this is also specifically

[6] For background information on the formation and deliberations of the WG, see the WG wiki workspace at https://community.icann.org/x/9iCfAg.

indicated in the text of this Initial Report. A formal consensus call on all the Charter questions will take place once the WG finalizes all its recommendations following its review of public comments received.

The WG believes that its final recommendations, if approved by the GNSO Council and the ICANN Board, will substantially improve the current environment, where there is presently no accreditation scheme for privacy and proxy services and no community-developed or accepted set of baseline or best practices for such services. It hopes that its recommendations will provide a sound basis for the development and implementation of an accreditation framework by ICANN, as part of ICANN's on-going efforts to improve the WHOIS system, including implementing recommendations made by the WHOIS Policy Review Team[7].

The following sub-sections provide a summary of the WG's preliminary conclusions as follows:

- Section 1.3.1 contains all the WG's preliminarily-agreed recommendations;
- Section 1.3.2 contains certain questions relating to specific aspects of "relay" and "reveal" that have yet to be finalized by the WG; and
- Section 1.3.3 contains the WG's majority and minority view on certain aspects in relation to commercial/non-commercial uses of domain names in relation to privacy and/or proxy services.

The full text of all of the WG's preliminary conclusions, including any supplemental notes, are set out in detail in Section 7. Square brackets in this document generally indicate alternative formulations on the same topic that are under consideration by the WG. Commenters are encouraged to specify which formulation they prefer, and why. Any additional statements filed by WG members in respect of particular topics have also been included in this report, in Annex F. Statements in Annex F have not been endorsed by the WG as a whole.

While community input is being sought on all aspects of this report, including the WG's preliminarily agreed recommendations, the WG would particularly welcome specific public comments on those of its deliberations, proposals and options for which there is currently no WG consensus.

[7] See ICANN's Action Plan for the WHOIS Policy Review Team Final Report (November 2012): https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/implementation-action-08nov12-en.pdf.

1.3.1 Summary of the WG's agreed preliminary conclusions

The WG has reached preliminary agreement on the following recommendations:

I. DEFINITIONS:

1. The WG recommends the adoption of the following definitions, to avoid ambiguities surrounding the common use of certain words in the WHOIS context. The WG recommends that these recommendations be used uniformly by ICANN, including generally in relation to WHOIS beyond privacy and proxy service issues:

   - ***"Publication"*** means the reveal[8] of a person's (i.e. the licensee or beneficial owner of a registered domain name) identity/contact details in the WHOIS system.
   - ***"Disclosure"*** means the reveal of a person's (i.e. the licensee or beneficial owner of a registered domain name) identity/contact details to a third party Requester without Publication in the WHOIS system.
   - The term ***"person"*** as used in these definitions is understood to include natural and legal persons, as well as organizations and entities.
   - **"Law enforcement authority"** means law enforcement, consumer protection, quasi-governmental or other similar authorities designated from time to time by the national or territorial government of the jurisdiction in which the privacy or proxy service provider is established or maintains a physical office[9].
   - ***"Relay"***, when used in the context of a request to a privacy or proxy service provider from a Requester, means to forward the request to, or otherwise notify, the privacy or proxy service customer that a Requester is attempting to contact the customer.
   - ***"Requester"***, when used in the context of Relay, Disclosure or Publication, means an

[8] As the single word "reveal" has been used in the WHOIS context to describe the two distinct actions that the WG has defined as "Disclosure" and "Publication", the WG is using "reveal" within its definitions as part of a more exact description, to clarify which of the two meanings would apply in any specific instance. The rest of this Initial Report generally uses the terms "Disclosure" and "Publication" to refer to the relevant specific aspect of a "reveal".

[9] This definition is derived from Section 3.18.2 of the 2013 Registrar Accreditation Agreement, which provision spells out a registrar's obligation to maintain a point of contact for, and review reports received from, law enforcement authorities: see https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/approved-with-specs-2013-09-17-en.

individual, organization or entity (or its authorized representatives) that requests from a privacy or proxy service provider either a Relay, or Disclosure or Publication of the identity or contact details of a customer, as the case may be.

II. NO DISTINCTION IN TREATMENT; WHOIS LABELING REQUIREMENTS; VALIDATION & VERIFICATION OF CUSTOMER DATA:

2. Privacy and proxy services ("P/P services") are to be treated the same way for the purpose of the accreditation process.

3. The status of a registrant as a commercial organization, non-commercial organization, or individual should not be the driving factor in whether P/P services are available to the registrant. Fundamentally, P/P services should remain available to registrants irrespective of their status as commercial or non-commercial organizations or as individuals. Further, P/P registrations should not be limited to private individuals who use their domains for non-commercial purposes[10].

4. Domain name registrations involving P/P service providers should be clearly labelled as such in WHOIS[11].

5. P/P customer data is to be validated and verified in a manner consistent with the requirements outlined in the WHOIS Accuracy Program Specification of the 2013 RAA. In the cases where a P/P service provider is Affiliated with a registrar (as the term is defined in Sections 1.3 and 1.4 of the 2013 RAA) and that Affiliated registrar has carried out validation and verification of the P/P customer data, re-verification by the P/P service provider of the same, identical, information should not be required.

[10] Note that while the WG agreed that there is no reason to distinguish between commercial and non-commercial registrants simply because of their organizational/entity status, it has not reached consensus as to whether the use of P/P services for certain types of commercial activity associated with a domain name should be barred (see Section 1.3.3 and more generally Section 7, below).
[11] While this may be possible with existing fields, the WG has also explored the idea that the label might also be implemented by adding another field to WHOIS, and is aware that this may raise certain questions that should be appropriately considered as part of implementation.

MANDATORY PROVISIONS TO BE INCLUDED IN PROVIDER TERMS OF SERVICE & MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS TO BE COMMUNICATED TO CUSTOMERS:

6. All rights, responsibilities and obligations of registrants and P/P service customers as well as those of accredited P/P service providers need to be clearly communicated in the P/P service registration agreement, including a provider's obligations in managing those rights and responsibilities and any specific requirements applying to transfers and renewals of a domain name. In addition, all accredited P/P service providers must disclose to their customers the conditions under which the service may be terminated in the event of a transfer of the domain name, and how requests for transfers of a domain name are handled.

7. All accredited P/P service providers must include on their websites, and in all Publication and Disclosure-related policies and documents, a link to either a standardized request form or an equivalent list of specific criteria that the provider requires in order to determine whether or not to comply with third party requests, such as for the Disclosure or Publication of customer identity or contact details.

8. All accredited P/P service providers must publish their terms of service (e.g. on their websites), which, in addition to other mandatory provisions recommended by the WG, should at a minimum include the following elements in relation to Disclosure and Publication:
   - Clarification of when those terms refer to Publication requests (and their consequences) and when to Disclosure requests (and their consequences). The WG further recommends that accredited providers expressly include a provision in their terms of service explaining the meaning and consequences of Publication.
   - The specific grounds upon which a customer's details may be Disclosed or Published or service suspended or terminated.
   - Clarification as to whether or not a customer: (1) will be notified when a provider receives a Publication or Disclosure request from a third party; and (2) may opt to cancel its domain registration prior to and in lieu of Publication or Disclosure.
   - Clarification that a Requester will be notified in a timely manner of the provider's decision: (1) to notify its customer of the request; and (2) whether or not the provider agrees to

comply with the request to Disclose or Publish. This should also be clearly indicated in all Disclosure or Publication related materials.

9. In addition, the WG recommends the following as best practices for accredited P/P service providers[12]:
   - P/P service providers should facilitate and not obstruct the transfer, renewal or restoration of a domain name by their customers, including without limitation a renewal during a Redemption Grace Period under the Expired Registration Recovery Policy and transfers to another registrar.
   - P/P service providers should use commercially reasonable efforts to avoid the need to disclose underlying customer data in the process of renewing, transferring or restoring a domain name.
   - P/P service providers should include in their terms of service a link or other direction to the ICANN website (or other ICANN-approved online location) where a person may look up the authoritative definitions and meanings of specific terms such as Disclosure or Publication.

CONTACTABILITY & RESPONSIVENESS OF PRIVACY & PROXY SERVICE PROVIDERS:

10. ICANN should publish and maintain a publicly accessible list of all accredited P/P service providers, with all appropriate contact information. Registrars should provide a web link to P/P services run by them or their Affiliates, and P/P service providers should declare their Affiliation with a registrar (if any) as a requirement of the accreditation program[13].

11. A "designated" rather than a "dedicated" point of contact will be sufficient for abuse reporting purposes, since the primary concern is to have one contact point that third parties can go to and expect a response from.

[12] The WG recognizes that implementation of these recommendations may involve the development of new procedures.
[13] The WG discussed, but did not reach consensus on, the possibility of requiring a registrar to also declare its Affiliation (if any) with a P/P service provider.

12. P/P service providers should be fully contactable, through the publication of contact details on their websites in a manner modelled after Section 2.3 of the 2013 RAA Specification on Privacy and Proxy Registrations.

13. Requirements relating to the forms of alleged malicious conduct to be covered by the designated published point of contact at an ICANN-accredited P/P service provider should include a list of the forms of malicious conduct to be covered. These requirements should allow for enough flexibility to accommodate new types of malicious conduct. By way of example, Section 3 of the Public Interest Commitments (PIC) Specification[14] in the New gTLD Registry Agreement or Safeguard 2, Annex 1 of the GAC's Beijing Communique[15] could serve as starting points for developing such a list.

14. The designated point of contact for a P/P service provider should be capable and authorized to investigate and handle abuse reports and information requests received (a standard similar to that currently required for a Transfer Emergency Action Contact under the Inter Registrar Transfer Policy ("IRTP").

STANDARD FORM & REQUIREMENTS FOR ABUSE REPORTING & INFORMATION REQUESTS:

15. A standardized form for information requests and reports should be developed for the purpose of reporting abuse and submitting requests (including requests for Disclosure of customer

[14] See http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/agb/agreement-approved-20nov13-en.pdf; Section 3 provides that "Registry Operator will include a provision in its Registry-Registrar Agreement that requires Registrars to include in their Registration Agreements a provision prohibiting Registered Name Holders from distributing malware, abusively operating botnets, phishing, piracy, trademark or copyright infringement, fraudulent or deceptive practices, counterfeiting or otherwise engaging in activity contrary to applicable law, and providing (consistent with applicable law and any related procedures) consequences for such activities including suspension of the domain name."

[15] See https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/gac-to-board-11apr13-en.pdf; Safeguard 2, Annex 1 provides that ""Registry operators will ensure that terms of use for registrants include prohibitions against the distribution of malware, operation of botnets, phishing, piracy, trademark or copyright infringement, fraudulent or deceptive practices, counterfeiting or otherwise engaging in activity contrary to applicable law."

information), to also include space for free form text[16]. P/P service providers should also have the ability to "categorize" reports received, in order to facilitate responsiveness.

RELAYING (FORWARDING) OF THIRD PARTY REQUESTS:

16. Regarding Relaying (Forwarding) of Electronic Communications[17]:
    - All communications required by the RAA and ICANN Consensus Policies must be forwarded
    - For all other electronic communications, P/P service providers may elect one of the following two options:
        i. Option #1: Forward all electronic requests received (including those received via emails and via web forms), but the provider may implement commercially reasonable safeguards (including CAPTCHA) to filter out spam and other forms of abusive communications, or
        ii. Option #2: Forward all electronic requests received (including those received via emails and web forms) from law enforcement authorities and third parties containing allegations of domain name abuse (i.e. illegal activity)
    - In all cases, P/P service providers must publish and maintain a mechanism (e.g. designated email point of contact) for Requesters to contact to follow up on or escalate their original requests.

17. Regarding Further Provider Actions When There Is A Persistent Delivery Failure of Electronic Communications[18]

[16] With the specific exception of Disclosure requests from intellectual property rights holders (see Recommendation #19 below), the WG discussed but did not finalize the minimum elements that should be included in such a form in relation to other requests and reports. The WG notes that this recommendation is not intended to prescribe the method by which a provider should make this form available (e.g. through a web-based form) as providers should have the ability to determine the most appropriate method for doing so.
[17] The WG agrees that emails and web forms would be considered "electronic communications" whereas human-operated faxes would not. The WG recommends that implementation of the concept of "electronic communications" be sufficiently flexible to accommodate future technological developments.
[18] Please see also additional discussion of Escalation of Relay Requests under Section 1.3.2 of this Summary.

- All third party electronic requests alleging abuse by a P/P service customer will be promptly forwarded to the customer. A Requester will be promptly notified of a persistent failure of delivery[19] that a P/P service provider becomes aware of.
- The WG considers that a "persistent delivery failure" will have occurred when an electronic communications system abandons or otherwise stops attempting to deliver an electronic communication to a customer after [a certain number of] repeated or duplicate delivery attempts within [a reasonable period of time][20]. The WG emphasizes that such persistent delivery failure, in and of itself, is not sufficient to trigger further provider obligation or action in relation to a relay request unless the provider also becomes aware of the persistent delivery failure.
- When a service provider becomes aware of a persistent delivery failure to a customer as described herein, that will trigger the P/P service provider's obligation to perform a verification/re-verification (as applicable) of the customer's email address(es), in accordance with the WG's recommendation that customer data be validated and verified in a manner consistent with the WHOIS Accuracy Specification of the 2013 RAA (see the WG's recommendation under Category B, Question 2 in Section 7, below).
- However, these recommendations shall not preclude a P/P service provider from taking any additional action in the event of a persistent delivery failure of electronic communications to a customer, in accordance with its published terms of service.

DISCLOSURE OR PUBLICATION OF A CUSTOMER'S IDENTITY OR CONTACT DETAILS:

18. Regarding Disclosure and Publication, the WG agreed that none of its recommendations should be read as being intended to alter (or mandate the alteration of) the prevailing practice among P/P service providers to review requests manually or to facilitate direct resolution of an issue between a Requester and a P/P service customer. It also notes that disclosure of at least some

[19] The WG notes that failure of "delivery" of a communication is not to be equated with the failure of a customer to "respond" to a request, notification or other type of communication.
[20] Although the WG has agreed on this concept in principle, it welcomes community input on the specific timeframes and number of attempts that would qualify as a persistent delivery failure.

contact details of the customer may in some cases be required in order to facilitate such direct resolution.

19. The WG has developed an illustrative draft Disclosure Framework that would apply to Disclosure requests made to P/P service providers by intellectual property (i.e. trademark and copyright) owners. The proposal as drafted includes requirements concerning the nature and type of information to be provided by a Requester, non-exhaustive grounds for refusal of a request, and the possibility of neutral dispute resolution/appeal in the event of a dispute. See Annex E for the full draft Disclosure Framework, including certain alternative formulations for which the WG has yet to reach consensus and welcomes community input on.

DEACCREDITATION & ITS CONSEQUENCES:

20. Regarding de-accreditation of a P/P service provider:
    - P/P service customers should be notified prior to de-accreditation of a P/P service provider, to enable them to make alternative arrangements. One possible time in which to do so might be when Compliance sends breach notices to the provider, as customers would then be put on notice (as is done for registrar de-accreditation).
    - Other P/P service providers should also be notified, to enable interested providers to indicate if they wish to become the gaining P/P provider (as is done for registrar de-accreditation)
    - All notification(s) are to be published on the ICANN website (as is done for registrar de-accreditation)
    - A de-accredited P/P service provider should have the opportunity to find a gaining provider to work with (as sometimes occurs with registrar de-accreditation[21])
    - A "graduated response" approach to de-accreditation should be explored, i.e. a set series of breach notices (e.g. up to three) with escalating sanctions, with the final recourse being de-accreditation

[21] The WG notes that, as with registrar de-accreditation, the gaining provider will need to first be approved by ICANN.

- Where feasible, a customer should be able to choose its new P/P service provider in the event of de-accreditation of its existing provider
- The next review of the IRTP should include an analysis of the impact on P/P service customers, to ensure that adequate safeguards are in place as regards P/P service protection when domain names are transferred pursuant to an IRTP process

In addition to feedback on the specific recommendations outlined above, commenters are also invited to provide suggestions on the need for and scope of a possible compliance framework that can facilitate the effectiveness of the de-accreditation process[22].

1.3.2 Specific topics on which the WG has yet to finalize its preliminary conclusions

The WG has yet to reach agreement on the following topics, regarding certain aspects of "relay" and "reveal". It therefore specifically invites community input on these questions.

On Escalation of Relay Requests:

While the WG reached preliminary agreement on a P/P service provider's obligation to act in the event it becomes aware of a persistent delivery failure, the WG has yet to agree on obligatory next steps regarding escalation by a Requester. The following is the current language under consideration by the WG, with the options included in square brackets:

> *"As part of an escalation process, and when the above-mentioned requirements concerning a persistent delivery failure of an electronic communication have been met, the provider [should] [must] upon request forward a further form of notice to its customer. A provider should have the discretion to select the most appropriate means of forwarding such a request [and to charge a reasonable fee on a cost-recovery basis]. [Any such reasonable fee is to be borne by the customer and not the Requester]. A provider shall have the right to impose reasonable limits on the number of such requests made by the same Requester."*

[22] The WG recognizes that the details of such a framework will need to be further worked out as part of the implementation of its policy recommendations, if adopted.

- What should be the minimum mandatory requirements for escalation of relay requests in the event of a persistent delivery failure of an electronic communication?

On Disclosure and Publication in relation to Requests by LEA and other Third Parties other than Trademark and Copyright Owners:

Although the WG reached preliminary agreement in respect of a proposed Disclosure Framework for handling requests from intellectual property (i.e. trademark and copyright) rights-holders, it has not developed a similar framework or template that would apply to other Requesters, such as LEA or anti-abuse and consumer protection groups. The WG is aware that certain concerns, such as the need for confidentiality in relation to an ongoing LEA investigation, may mean that different considerations would apply to any minimum requirements that might be developed for such a framework. It therefore seeks community input on this general topic, as well as on the following specific questions:

- Should it be mandatory for accredited P/P service providers to comply with express requests from LEA in the provider's jurisdiction not to notify a customer?
- Should there be mandatory Publication for certain types of activity e.g. malware/viruses or violation of terms of service relating to illegal activity?
- What (if any) should the remedies be for unwarranted Publication?
- Should a similar framework and/or considerations apply to requests made by third parties other than LEA and intellectual property rights-holders?

1.3.3 Specific topics on which there is currently no consensus within the WG

Although the WG agreed that the mere fact that a domain name is registered by a commercial entity or by anyone conducting commercial activity should not preclude the use of P/P services[23], there was disagreement over whether domain names that are actively used for commercial transactions (e.g. the sale or exchange of goods or services) should be prohibited from using P/P services. While most WG

[23] The WG notes that the WHOIS RT had specifically acknowledged that P/P services can be and are used to address legitimate interests, both commercial and non-commercial.

members did not believe such a prohibition is necessary or practical, some members believed that registrants of such domain names should not be able to use or continue using P/P services.

For those that argued that it is necessary and practical to limit access to P/P services so as to exclude commercial entities, the following text was proposed to clarify and define their position: *"domains used for online financial transactions for commercial purpose should be ineligible for privacy and proxy registrations."*

Public comment is therefore specifically invited on the following questions[24]:

- Should registrants of domain names associated with commercial activities and which are used for online financial transactions be prohibited from using, or continuing to use, P/P services? If so, why, and if not, why not?
- If you agree with this position, do you think it would be useful to adopt a definition of "commercial" or "transactional" to define those domains for which P/P service registrations should be disallowed? If so, what should the definition(s) be?
- Would it be necessary to make a distinction in the WHOIS data fields to be displayed as a result of distinguishing between domain names used for online financial transactions and domain names that are not?

1.3.4 General

The WG welcomes community input as to whether its recommendations that certain mandatory provisions be included in an accredited P/P service provider's terms of service are sufficient to ensure adequate protection of P/P service customers, particularly in the event of Publication of a customer's details in WHOIS as a result of termination of P/P service due to the customer's breach of the terms. Further, the WG has preliminarily concluded that the registrar accreditation model with its multiple steps, governed by the RAA, may not be entirely appropriate for P/P services; however, it is a useful starting point from which relevant portions may be adapted to apply to P/P service providers. It therefore invites community feedback as to the implications of adopting a particular accreditation model, recognizing, however, that this is a feature that will need to be worked out as part of the implementation of its policy recommendations, if adopted.

[24] Documents considered by the WG and email threads from the WG's mailing list on this topic have been compiled on this page on the WG's wiki space: https://community.icann.org/x/g4M0Aw.

1.4 Community Input

The WG reached out to all ICANN Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees as well as GNSO Stakeholder Groups and Constituencies with a request for input (see Annexes B and C) at the start of its deliberations. All responses received were reviewed by the WG and incorporated into its templates for each of its Charter questions.

The WG also reviewed the responses to a February 2014 privacy and proxy provider questionnaire[25] developed by the Expert Working Group on gTLD Data Directory Services ("EWG") as well as other relevant background material, including the recommendations from the EWG and the WHOIS Policy Review Team[26].

1.5 Conclusions and Next Steps

The Working Group aims to complete this section of the report following its review of public comments received on this Initial Report.

[25] See https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/45744698/EWG%20PP%20PROVIDER%20QUESTIONNAIRE%20SUMMARY%2014%20March%202014.pdf?version=1&modificationDate=1395362247000&api=v2.
[26] These can be accessed on the WG wiki at https://community.icann.org/x/XSWfAg.

2. Objective and Next Steps

This Initial Report on Privacy & Proxy Services Accreditation Issues was prepared as required by the GNSO Policy Development Process as stated in the ICANN Bylaws, Annex A (see http://www.icann.org/general/bylaws.htm#AnnexA). The Initial Report will be posted for public comment for 60 days. The comments received will be analyzed by the WG as part of its development of a Final Report to be considered by the GNSO Council for further action.

3. Background

3.1 Process Background

- At the ICANN Meeting in Dakar in October 2011 the ICANN Board adopted a Resolution regarding amendments to the Registrar Accreditation Agreement (the "Dakar RAA Resolution").
- The Dakar RAA Resolution directed that negotiations on amending the 2009 RAA be commenced immediately, and clarified that the subject matter of the negotiations was to include the recommendations made by LEA, those made in the RAA Final Report, as well as other topics that would advance the twin goals of achieving registrant protection and domain name system ("DNS") stability. This resolution further requested the creation of an Issue Report to undertake a GNSO PDP as quickly as possible, to address any remaining items not covered by the negotiations and otherwise suited for a PDP.
- In response to the Dakar RAA Resolution, ICANN published the Final GNSO Issue Report on 6 March 2012. In this Final Issue Report, ICANN staff recommended that the GNSO Council commence a PDP on the RAA amendments upon either: (i) receipt of a report that the RAA negotiations have concluded, or that any of the 24 Proposed Amendment Topics identified in the Final Issue Report are no longer actively being negotiated, or (ii) a Board instruction to proceed with a PDP on any or all of the Proposed Amendment Topics identified in the Final Issue Report.
- On 27 June 2013, the ICANN Board approved the new 2013 RAA.
- On 16 September 2013, ICANN staff published a paper for the GNSO Council on the conclusion of the 2013 RAA negotiations, recommending that the GNSO Council proceed to commence the Board-requested PDP, on remaining issues not addressed by the 2013 RAA and otherwise suited to a PDP, i.e. issues pertaining to privacy and proxy services.
- On 31 October 2013 the GNSO Council approved the initiation of the PDP and the Charter for the Privacy & Proxy Services Accreditation Issues Working Group ("PPSAI WG").

3.2 Issue Background

3.2.1 The Outcome of the 2013 RAA Negotiations

The RAA Final Report includes a number of High Priority and Medium Priority topics. The 2013 RAA negotiations addressed most of the High and Medium Priority topics as well as recommendations received from LEA. As noted in the Staff Report on the Conclusion of the 2013 RAA Negotiations, out of these topics and recommendations, only two remained after the completed negotiations that could be considered as not having been addressed adequately: (1) clarification of registrar responsibilities in connection with proceedings under the existing UDRP; and 2) privacy and proxy services – including accreditation and reveal/relay procedures.

The UDRP-related issue has since been addressed in the recommendations that were adopted in August 2013 by the GNSO Council for the locking of a domain name subject to UDRP proceedings; these were in turn approved by the ICANN Board in September 2013.

With regard to P/P services, the 2013 RAA contains an interim specification[27] that will be in place until the earlier either of 1 January 2017, or until any PDP recommendations are developed by the GNSO and adopted by the ICANN Board. The specification includes a limited set of minimum requirements that ICANN-accredited Registrars, their Affiliates and Resellers have to comply with. These minimum requirements include: (1) disclosure of key service terms; (2) publication of infringement/abuse point of contact; (3) publication of business contact information; and (4) escrow of customer data.

During the 2013 RAA negotiations, ICANN and the Registrars' negotiating team had agreed that a number of interim protections would be in place for P/P services offered through Registrars or their Affiliates. These interim protections require that information be made available on matters such as abuse reporting processes and the circumstances under which a provider will relay third party communications to a P/P customer, terminate a customer's service, and publish a customer's details in WHOIS. While these are not necessarily comprehensive in terms of the terms and protections that can

[27] See https://www.icann.org/en/resources/registrars/raa/approved-with-specs-27jun13-en.htm#privacy-proxy.

be put in place for accredited P/P service providers, these interim protections were intended to provide a more responsible marketplace until a formal accreditation program is developed by ICANN.

Other relevant information, materials and prior work that were taken into account by the GNSO Council in chartering the PPSAI WG, and that were reviewed or noted by the WG during its deliberations, are highlighted below[28].

3.2.2 Related Work by the GNSO and ICANN Community

The ICANN community, including the GAC and the GNSO, had previously raised a number of issues and concerns regarding P/P services. Besides the work of the GNSO and At Large communities on the RAA Final Report, the WHOIS-related studies approved by the GNSO Council between 2009 and 2011 also formed part of the background material for the PPSAI WG. These studies included one on Privacy & Proxy Service Abuse that was conducted by the National Physical Laboratory ("NPL") in the United Kingdom. NPL's final results were published in March 2014. The GNSO Council had also approved a Pre-Feasibility Survey on Relay and Reveal Procedures, conducted by the Interisle Consulting Group, who published their findings in August 2012.

The GAC had previously issued a set of Principles regarding gTLD WHOIS Services in 2007[29], and had also proposed a number of topic and study areas to the GNSO in 2008. In addition, several GNSO study groups had worked on study proposals relating to WHOIS services, and developed key definitions (including for the terms "privacy service" and "proxy service") that were used to frame the GNSO's WHOIS studies.

3.2.3 Recommendations from the WHOIS Policy Review Team

[28] These were summarized in the form of an Issue Chart in the Staff Report on the Conclusion of the 2013 RAA Negotiations, and formed the basis for the PPSAI WG Charter that was approved by the GNSO Council in October 2013.
[29] See https://gacweb.icann.org/download/.../WHOIS_principles.pdf.

The WHOIS Policy Review Team ("WHOIS RT"), constituted as part of ICANN's Affirmation of Commitments with the United States Government, published its Final Report[30] in May 2012. The Final Report had highlighted the lack of clear and consistent rules regarding P/P services, resulting in unpredictable outcomes for stakeholders. The WHOIS RT noted that appropriate regulation and oversight over such services would address stakeholder needs and concerns, and recommended that ICANN consider an accreditation system, with the goal of providing "clear, consistent and enforceable requirements for the operation of these services consistent with national laws, and to strike an appropriate balance between stakeholders with competing but legitimate interests. At a minimum, this would include privacy, data protection, law enforcement, the industry around law enforcement and the human rights community."

The WHOIS RT also recommended that ICANN consider "a mix of incentives and graduated sanctions to encourage privacy/proxy service providers to become accredited, and to ensure that registrars do not knowingly accept registrations from unaccredited providers". For example, "ICANN could develop a graduated and enforceable series of penalties for proxy/privacy service providers who violate the requirements, with a clear path to de-accreditation for repeat, serial or otherwise serious breaches."

The WHOIS RT went on to list several specific possible objectives and recommendations for consideration, as follows:

- Clearly labeling WHOIS entries to indicate that registrations have been made by a privacy or proxy service;
- Providing full WHOIS contact details for the privacy/proxy service provider, which are contactable and responsive;
- Adopting agreed standardized relay and reveal processes and timeframes; (these should be clearly published, and pro-actively advised to potential users of these services so they can make informed choices based on their individual circumstances);
- Registrars should disclose their relationship with any proxy/privacy service provider;
- Maintaining dedicated abuse points of contact for each provider;
- Conducting periodic due diligence checks on customer contact information;

[30] See https://www.icann.org/en/about/aoc-review/whois/final-report-11may12-en.

- Maintaining the privacy and integrity of registrations in the event that major problems arise with a privacy/proxy provider; and
- Providing clear and unambiguous guidance on the rights and responsibilities of registered name holders, and how those should be managed in the privacy/proxy environment.

3.2.4 Recommendations of the EWG on gTLD Data Directory Services

The EWG had been formed in December 2012 as a first step toward fulfilling the ICANN Board's directive to assist in redefining the purpose and provision of gTLD registration data, and to provide a possible foundation for the GNSO to develop a new policy for gTLD directory services. In requesting that ICANN staff address the topic, the Board had also requested an Issue Report, kicking off a Board-mandated PDP, to address the purpose of collecting, maintaining and making available gTLD registration data as well as related issues pertaining to data accuracy and access.

The EWG published its Final Report in June 2014, which included certain recommendations relating to P/P services[31]. It noted the current lack of standard processes and the prior work that had been done by the GNSO and ICANN community, and highlighted certain common needs to be addressed:

- Relaying communications to a privacy or proxy service customer – provided by many but not all providers, this is often done by auto-forwarding email sent to the customer's admin/tech contact email address
- Revealing the identity and direct contact details for a proxy customer in response to a third party complaint – here, processes, documentation, responsiveness, and actions taken vary and often depend on established relationships between Requesters and providers
- Unmasking the identity of the underlying customer and publishing his/her name and contact details in WHOIS
- Requesters often look to the Registrar (which may or may not be affiliated with the provider) for escalation or assistance when they fail to contact the underlying customer or when there is no resolution from the provider

[31] See Section VII of the EWG Final Report: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/final-report-06jun14-en.pdf.

The EWG recommended accrediting P/P service providers in general, and offered the following additional specific recommendations[32]:

- Entities and natural persons may register domain names using accredited privacy services that do not disclose the Registrant's contact details except in defined circumstances (e.g., terms of service violation or in response to a subpoena) as well as accredited proxy services that register domain names on behalf of the customer
- ICANN must require specific terms to be included in the terms of service, which must include requiring the service provider to endeavor to provide notice in cases of expedited take-downs
- Accredited service providers must provide the Registrar with accurate and reliable contact details for all mandatory Purpose-Based Contacts[33], in order to reach the provider and entities authorized to resolve technical, administrative, and other issues on behalf of the Registrant
- Accredited service providers must be obligated to relay emails received by the Registrant's forwarding email address
- Accredited proxy service providers must provide the Registrar with their own Registrant name and contact details, including a unique forwarding email address to contact the entity authorized to register the domain name on behalf of the customer
- As the registered name holder, accredited proxy service providers must assume all the usual Registrant responsibilities for that domain name, including provision of accurate and reliable mandatory Purpose-Based Contacts and other registration data
- Accredited proxy services must be obligated to respond to reveal requests in a timely manner

[32] See Recommended Principles 138-149 from Section VII and Annex H of the EWG Final Report.
[33] This concept was developed by the EWG as part of its proposed Registration Directory Service ("RDS") and is further described in their report.

4. Approach taken by the Working Group

4.1 Working Methodology

The PPSAI WG began its deliberations on 3 December 2013. It decided to continue its work primarily through weekly conference calls, in addition to e-mail exchanges on its mailing list, with further discussions taking place at ICANN Public Meetings when scheduled. All the WG's meetings are documented on its wiki workspace, including its mailing list, draft documents, background materials and input received from ICANN's SO/ACs and the GNSO's Stakeholder Groups and Constituencies.

The WG also prepared a Work Plan, which was reviewed on a regular basis. In order to facilitate its work, the WG decided to use a template to tabulate all input received in response to its request for Constituency and Stakeholder Group statements (see Annex B). This template was also used to record input from other ICANN SOs and ACs, as well as individual WG members' responses (either on their own behalf or as representatives of their respective groups) to a survey that was conducted among the WG concerning each of the WG's Charter questions.

The WG scheduled community sessions at each ICANN Public Meeting that took place after its formation, at which it presented its preliminary findings and/or conclusions to the broader ICANN community for discussion and feedback. The WG was also selected by the GNSO Council to be the first WG to participate in the GNSO Council's pilot project to facilitate effective WG consensus-building in FY2015. This took the form of a full-day face-to-face (in-person as well as with remote participants) meeting at the ICANN Public Meeting in Los Angeles in October 2014, facilitated by a community facilitator with expertise on the topic.

4.2 Members of the Working Group

The members of the PPSAI WG are:

NCSG	Affiliation*	Attended**
Amr Elsadr	NCUC	19
David Cake	NCSG	26
Maria Farrell++	NCUC	13
Marie-Laure Lemineur++	NPOC	11
Roy Balleste	NCUC	17
Stephanie Perrin	NCUC	38
Wendy Seltzer	NCUC	1
Howard Fellman	NCUC	0
Kathy Kleiman	NCSG	54
James Gannon	NCSG	2
CSG		
Adamou Nacer	ISPCP	1
Alex Deacon	IPC	43
Hector Ariel Manoff	IPC	1
Brian Winterfeldt	IPC	3
Keith Kupferschmid	IPC	16
Kiran Malancharuvil	IPC	30
Kristina Rosette++	IPC	32
Steve Metalitz	IPC	56
Osvaldo Novoa	ISPCP	37
Philip Marano	IPC	36
Todd Williams	IPC	43
Victoria Scheckler	IPC	22
Griffin Barnett	IPC	54
Valeriya Sherman	IPC	54
David Hughes	IPC	16
Paul McGrady	IPC	35
Jim Bikoff	IPC	46
David Heasley	IPC	48

Don Moody	IPC	10
Emily Emanual	BC	4
Michael Adeyeye	BC	0
Justin Macy	BC	52
John Horton	BC	9
Libby Baney	BC	25
Michael Shoukry	BC	1
Christain Dawson	ISPCP	24
Laura Jedeed	BC	9
Katherine McGowan++	BC	0
Susan Kawaguchi	BC	29
Chris Chaplow	BC	1
Phil Corwin	BC	24
Terri Stumme	BC	7
Sean McInerney	IPC	6
Seth Arnold	IPC	0

RrSG

Ben Anderson	4
Jeffrey Eckhaus	0
Gordon Dick	5
Graeme Bunton	54
Tatiana Khramtsova	43
James Bladel	47
Luc Seufer	44
Matt Serlin	2
Michele Neylon	46
Nicolas Steinbach	6
Rob Villeneuve	0
Tobias Sattler	16
Susan Prosser	25

Tim Ruiz++	22
Volker Greimann	48
Theo Geurts	16
Sarah Wyld	43
Darcy Southwell	47
Billy Watnpaugh	3
Jennifer Standiford	11
Chris Pelling	41
Bob Wiegand	0
Lindsay Hamilton-Reid	8
Ivens Oliveira Porto	0
Roger Carney	4

RySG

Michael Palage	6
Statton Hammock	4
Bret Fausett	1

At Large/ALAC

Carlton Samuels	37
Holly Raiche	36

Individuals

Don Blumenthal	45
Eric Brunner-Williams	1
Dan Burke++	3
Frank Michlick	38
William Lin	0
Thomas Rickert	2

Other

Gema Maria Campillos++	GAC	8
Richard Leaning		8

The Statements of Interest of the WG members can be found at https://community.icann.org/x/c4Lg.

The attendance records can be found at https://community.icann.org/x/xrbhAg. The email archives can be found at http://mm.icann.org/pipermail/gnso-ppsai-pdp-wg/.

* The following are the ICANN SO/ACs and GNSO Stakeholder Groups and Constituencies for which WG members provided affiliations:

RrSG – Registrar Stakeholder Group
RySG – Registry Stakeholder Group
CBUC – Commercial and Business Users Constituency
NCUC – Non-Commercial Users Constituency
IPC – Intellectual Property Constituency
ISPCP – Internet Service and Connection Providers Constituency
NPOC – Not-for-Profit Organizations Constituency
GAC – Governmental Advisory Committee

** This list was accurate as of 22 April 2015. Note that some members joined the WG only after it began meeting in December 2013, and several WG members have also since left (these are indicated with ++ against their names).

5. Deliberations of the Working Group

This Section provides an overview of the deliberations of the WG. The points outlined below are meant to provide the reader with relevant background information on the WG's deliberations and processes, and should not be read as either final recommendations or as representing the entirety of the deliberations of the WG. The WG will not finalize its recommendations to the GNSO Council until it has conducted a thorough review of the comments received during the public comment period on this Initial Report.

5.1 Initial Fact-Finding and Research

Per its Charter, the WG was tasked to review a list of topics and questions, as part of its work to develop policy recommendations relating to the accreditation of privacy and proxy services. These topics and questions were derived in large part from the prior work done by the ICANN community, as noted in Section 3 above.

The WG grouped all its Charter questions into seven specific categories, as follows: *Main Issues; Maintenance of Privacy/Proxy Services; Registration of Privacy/Proxy Services; Contact Point to be Provided by Privacy/Proxy Services; Relay of Complaints to a Privacy/Proxy Customer; Reveal of the Identity or Contact Details of a Privacy/Proxy Customer;* and *Termination of Privacy/Proxy Services and De-Accreditation of Privacy/Proxy Service Providers*[34]. Each category and the Charter questions grouped within it are listed in further detail below.

In order to obtain as much information as possible at the outset of the process, a survey was conducted amongst the WG membership. In addition, the WG requested input from GNSO Stakeholder Groups and Constituencies, as well as other ICANN Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees (see Annexes B & C and section 6 for further details).

[34] See the WG's Final Grouping of Charter Questions (as of 23 February 2014): https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/47256202/Clean%20PPSAI-Charter-QuestionsGrouping-13%20Feb%202014.doc?version=1&modificationDate=1397484425000&api=v2.

5.2 Main Issues (Charter Questions Grouping Category A)

The following Charter questions were grouped into this Category A, as the WG believed these to be of a more general nature. Other, more specific questions were consequently grouped into more focused categories (B through G).

1. What, if any, are the types of Standard Service Practices that should be adopted and published by ICANN-accredited privacy/proxy service providers?

2. Should ICANN distinguish between privacy and proxy services for the purpose of the accreditation process?

3. What are the effects of the privacy and proxy service specification contained in the 2013 RAA? Have these new requirements improved WHOIS quality, registrant contactability and service usability?

4. What should be the contractual obligations of ICANN accredited registrars with regard to accredited privacy/proxy service providers? Should registrars be permitted to knowingly accept registrations where the registrant is using unaccredited service providers that are bound to the same standards as accredited service providers?

In reviewing the Category A questions, the WG agreed that the following sub-question could also be relevant to its deliberations:

- What are obligations of a registrar when it finds out that a registrant is operating as an unaccredited service provider after registration has already been processed?

The WG also agreed that discussion of Question A-3 should take place later on in its deliberative processes, given that the 2013 RAA only went into effect on 1 January 2014. It is expected that the WG will return to this question following the close of the public comment period on this Initial Report. The

WG also did not develop preliminary recommendations for Questions A-1 or A-4, as these appear to be general questions that would be better addressed following the WG's finalization of all its specific recommendations in the other Charter question categories.

The WG's preliminary conclusions on Category A can be found in Section 7.

5.3 Maintenance of Privacy/Proxy Services (Charter Questions Grouping Category B)

The following Charter questions were grouped into this Category B, with additional sub-questions agreed on and added to Question B-2 as indicated below:

1. Should ICANN-accredited privacy/proxy service providers be required to label WHOIS entries to clearly show when a registration is made through a privacy/proxy service?
2. Should ICANN-accredited privacy/proxy service providers be required to conduct periodic checks to ensure accuracy of customer contact information; and if so, how?
   a) *How would such checks be conducted and to what level (e.g., following the levels of validation and verification set out in the 2013 Registrar Accreditation Agreement or some other level)?*
3. What rights and responsibilities should domain name registrants that use privacy/proxy services have? What obligations should ICANN-accredited privacy/proxy service providers have in managing these rights and responsibilities? Clarify how transfers, renewals, and PEDNR policies should apply.

In relation to Question B-3, the WG requested a briefing from ICANN staff on the current policies and processes regarding transfers, renewals and post-expiration domain name recovery ("PEDNR"). The WG also created a Sub-Team to consider issues that might arise during domain name transfers, including transfers from a failed registrar and inter-registrar transfers where either the gaining or losing registrar uses a privacy or proxy service. The Sub-Team recommended[35] that the WG consider generally mandating the relay of ICANN-critical communications (such as required notices and reminders – for

[35] See the Sub-Team report on transfer issues: https://community.icann.org/x/BI-hAg.

example, annual reminders under the WHOIS Data Reminder Policy and notices under the Expired Registration Recovery Policy). For transfers from a failed or de-accredited registrar, the Sub-Team considered that the situation would be almost fully covered by the IRTP.

In analysing the interplay between privacy protections (via use of a P/P service) and the process of a transfer under the IRTP, the Sub-Team noted several types of use cases that could take place, as follows:

A. Non-Private to Non-Private (Current IRTP)	B. Private to Non-Private
C. Non-Private to Private	D. Private to Private

0 No P/P service involvement, (status quo under current IRTP)
1 Losing registrar has affiliated P/P, Gaining does not.
2 Gaining registrar has affiliated P/P, Losing does not.
3 Both Gaining and Losing registrars have affiliated P/P which the customer has opted to use.

The Sub-Team noted that cases arising under B and D would likely require some method for registrars and their affiliated P/P services to exchange protected contact data, such as a hash function, in order to provide additional protection for the transfer of the domain name.

The WG's preliminary conclusions on Category B can be found in Section 7.

5.4 Registration of Privacy/Proxy Services (Charter Questions Category C)

The following Charter questions were grouped into this Category C, with the WG agreeing early on that an additional "threshold" question was needed to more fully contextualize the question of "commercial" and "non-commercial" use. As with other Charter categories, the WG also agreed on a number of sub-questions for discussion within this category.

Threshold Question:

Currently, proxy/privacy services are available to companies, non-commercial organizations and individuals. Should there be any change to this aspect of the current system in the new accreditation standards?[36]

1. Should ICANN-accredited privacy/proxy service providers distinguish between domain names used for commercial vs. personal purposes? Specifically, is the use of privacy/proxy services appropriate when a domain name is registered for commercial purposes?
   a) *Define "commercial purpose" – must there be actual "trading", or does it include any online business purpose (e.g. including for information or education)?*
   b) *Should there be a definition of what constitutes trading? Purpose? Level?*
   c) *Any difference between "personal" vs "noncommercial" e.g. what about noncommercial organizations or noncommercial purposes such as political, hobby, religious or parental?*
   d) *Include whether registration is for commercial purpose (not just the use of the domain name)*
   e) *Must P/P services disclose affiliated interests?*
2. Should the use of privacy/proxy services be restricted only to registrants who are private individuals using the domain name for non-commercial purposes?
   a) *What about non-profits and other noncommercial organizations that use a domain name for noncommercial purposes?*
3. Should there be a difference in the data fields to be displayed if the domain name is registered or used[37] for a commercial purpose, or by a commercial entity instead of a natural person?
   a) *Registration AND (not OR) use?*

   b) How to deal with non-commercial organizations that may be incorporated as corporations for insurance or liability purposes?

This Charter category generated a significant amount of discussion within the WG, primarily due to the lack of a clear definition or distinction as to what might constitute "commercial" and "non-commercial"

[36] Several WG members noted that some questions in this Category C are somewhat conditional, in that a Yes/No answer to one may obviate the need to answer others.
[37] It was suggested during the WG deliberations over Category C that a further threshold question could be whether enquiring into "use" of a domain name is within ICANN's scope and mission.

purposes, uses and organizations. Concern was also expressed over whether enquiring into the "use" of a domain name might implicate content issues. As of this writing, the WG's preliminary conclusions on Category C are divided into two views, for which the WG solicits public comment to assist it in preparing for a consensus call as it develops a Final Report following its review of any public comments received.

The two positions of the WG on the questions in this Category C can be found in Section 7.

5.5 Provision of Contact Point by a Privacy/Proxy Service (Charter Questions Category D)

The following Charter questions were grouped into this Category D, with the WG agreeing on additional sub-questions as shown below.

1. What measures should be taken to ensure contactability and responsiveness of the providers?
2. Should ICANN-accredited privacy/proxy service providers be required to maintain dedicated points of contact for reporting abuse? If so, should the terms be consistent with the requirements applicable to registrars under Section 3.18 of the RAA?
3. Should full WHOIS contact details for ICANN-accredited privacy/proxy service providers be required?
4. What are the forms of alleged malicious conduct, if any, that would be covered by a designated published point of contact at an ICANN-accredited privacy/proxy service provider[38]?

   a) Difference between "illegal" and "malicious"?

   b) Any difference if Requester is law enforcement vs. private party; if Requester is from different jurisdiction than P/P provider; or if laws are different in P/P provider and registrant's respective jurisdictions?

In its deliberations on Category D, the WG noted that the current interim Privacy/Proxy Specification in the 2013 RAA requires providers to "publish a point of contact for third parties wishing to report abuse or infringement of trademarks (or other rights)". The WG also reviewed the current requirements applicable to accredited registrars under Section 3.18 of the 2013 RAA, noting the difference between a

[38] Several WG members pointed out that having a published point of contact may mean that it will be used for both legitimate as well as spurious purposes.

contact point that is "designated" as opposed to one that is "dedicated" to receive reports and complaints. The WG also discussed the relevance of the definition of "illegal activity" in the 2013 RAA, and agreed that it may be helpful to analyse the possible difference (and consequent impact) between the phrase "illegal activity" and "malicious conduct".

The WG's preliminary conclusions on Category D can be found in Section 7.

5.6 Relay of Communications to a Privacy/Proxy Service Customer (Charter Questions Category E)

The following Charter questions were grouped into this Category E, with several additional sub-questions agreed on by the WG.

1. What, if any, are the baseline minimum standardized relay processes that should be adopted by ICANN-accredited privacy/proxy service providers?
2. Should ICANN-accredited privacy/proxy service providers be required to forward to the customer all allegations of illegal activities they receive relating to specific domain names of the customer?
   a) *If so, should this apply to all formats, or just email communications?*
   b) *Plus publication of email address of the complainant?*
   c) *Any difference if enquiry is from law enforcement, private attorney or other parties?*
   d) *Should the P&P Service refrain from forwarding the allegations to the customer if the enquire asks not to do it and reasons its request?*
   e) *Any difference; if Requester is from different jurisdiction than P/P provider; or if laws are different in P/P provider and registrant's respective jurisdictions?*
   f) *If allegations are received from supposed victim, how to protect her safety/privacy? Require redacted (i.e. identifying information is removed) requests or have this as an option?*
   g) *Should P/P service have discretion to forward rather than be mandated (outside a court order or law enforcement request)?*

Concerns surrounding the lack of rules and standard practices for the relaying of third party communications to a privacy or proxy service customer – as well as the revealing of customer identities and contact information – have been well documented previously, including most recently by the WHOIS RT and the EWG (see Section 3, above). A specific example relevant to relay and reveal procedures would be the GNSO's 2010 deliberations over a proposal to study the extent to which legitimate uses of WHOIS data were curtailed by P/P services. These discussions revealed significant concerns over the feasibility of such a study, largely because of a likely inability to obtain a sufficient data sample from volunteer respondents for reasons ranging from business sensitivities to privacy implications[39].

The GNSO Council therefore commissioned a feasibility survey, to be conducted by the Interisle Consulting Group. The survey findings, published in August 2012, suggested that "a full study would have to be designed and carried out in a way that did not require participants to disclose specific details of domain names or identify registrants using privacy/proxy services. A full study that depended on the ability to track and correlate individually identifiable requests and responses would therefore be impractical. A study designed to work with anonymized or aggregated request data would be acceptable to at least some potential participants if strong assurances were provided that their data would be protected and their participation would not require substantial time and effort. Anonymized or aggregated data, however, might not support the type of detailed analysis expected by the GNSO Council. Careful consideration of this tradeoff should precede any decision to invest in a full study."

The GNSO Council did not proceed with a full study on relay procedures and the use of P/P services. As a result, the PPSAI WG's discussions of its chartered tasks with respect to relay procedures as well as reveal issues (see, further, Section 5.7 below) consumed a significant amount of the WG's time. The issues surrounding relay and reveal also formed a substantial part of the agenda for the WG's facilitated face-to-face full-day meeting that took place in in Los Angeles in October 2014, immediately before ICANN's 51st Public Meeting.

Nevertheless, the WG was able to come to agreement preliminarily regarding the relaying (or

[39] See http://gnso.icann.org/en/issues/whois/whois-pp-relay-reveal-feasibility-survey-28mar11-en.pdf.

forwarding) by a P/P service provider of electronic communications. In dealing with the possibility that a third party Requester might not receive a response, the WG distinguished between a situation where a customer does not respond to a request received (i.e. no response) and one where a customer does not receive the request (i.e. non-delivery). In this regard, the WG noted that different systems may be configured differently, and a provider may not know in many cases that delivery to a customer has failed or been delayed. The WG therefore agreed to craft its recommendations in technologically neutral language, to allow for multiple types of situations of delivery failure, and to condition P/P service provider action on knowledge of persistent delivery failure. The WG also noted that the current interim Privacy/Proxy Specification in the 2013 RAA obligates ICANN-accredited registrars and their Affiliates and Resellers who offer P/P services to disclose in their terms of service the circumstances under which it will relay third party communications to a customer.

In addition, the WG discussed the question of escalation, and the extent of a P/P service provider's obligation to act in the event that a Requester does not receive a response to its request from a customer. It was noted that escalation requests could be in either electronic or hard copy form, and there may be a cost associated with dealing with various different formats. The WG also acknowledged its recommendation under Category B – to the effect that a provider has an obligation to verify the accuracy of a customer's contact information upon becoming aware that attempted delivery of a communication has failed[40]. The WG therefore attempted to craft preliminary recommendations that would balance the various different interests involved in dealing with a relay request and consequent escalation procedures.

The WG's preliminary conclusions on this Category E, including open questions for which it particularly seeks community input, can be found in Section 7.

5.7 Reveal of a Privacy/Proxy Customer's Identity or Contact Details in WHOIS (Charter Questions Category F)

The following Charter questions were grouped into this Category F, with some additional sub-questions

[40] See the WG's preliminary conclusion on this point, under Charter Category Questions B-2 and B-3 (Section 7, below).

agreed on by the WG.

1. What, if any, are the baseline minimum standardized reveal processes that should be adopted by ICANN-accredited privacy/proxy service providers?
   a) Any difference if Requester is law enforcement or a private party?
   b) Should details of the complainant be revealed to the registrant/owner?
   c) Consider a voluntary cancellation of the domain name registration as an option, notwithstanding access to data by legitimate Requesters. If so, should law enforcement and injured parties still have access to the information? How (if at all) to prevent registrant from changing her information upon receiving notification?
   d) *Consider customer option for different methods and notification issues where applicable laws so permit.*
   e) What processes or levels of revealing the underlying registrant exist?
   f) What are the minimum standards of proof that should be required for the identity of the Requester?
   g) What are the minimum standards of proof that should be required for the allegations being raised by the Requester?
   h) Does the P&P service have to assess the lawfulness of the request? What if the allegation refers to conduct legal in one jurisdiction but not the other?
   i) What limitations should the Requester be required to agree to regarding use of the revealed data (e.g., only for the purpose stated in the request and not for publication to the general public)?
2. Should ICANN-accredited privacy/proxy service providers be required to reveal customer identities for the specific purpose of ensuring timely service of cease and desist letters?
   a) When should P/P providers be required to do this?
   b) Clarify that this relates to service of letters by private attorneys (and other parties?)
   c) *Should notification of the customer also/ be required?*
   d) When should customer be notified? Under what circumstances can customer contest the reveal before it takes place?
   e) Any difference if Requester is law enforcement vs. private party; if Requester is from different jurisdiction than P/P provider; or if laws are different in P/P provider and registrant's respective jurisdictions?

3. What forms of alleged malicious conduct, if any, and what evidentiary standard would be sufficient to trigger a reveal?
   a) *Any difference if Requester is law enforcement vs. private party; if Requester is from different jurisdiction than P/P provider; or if laws are different in P/P provider and registrant's respective jurisdictions?*
4. What safeguards must be put in place to ensure adequate protections for privacy and freedom of expression?
   a) *Protections to cover both individuals and organizations*
   b) *Safeguards needed also for small businesses/entrepreneurs against anti-competitive activity, as well as for cases of physical/psychological danger (e.g. stalking/harassment) perhaps unrelated to the purpose of the domain name?*
   c) *Consider protections also for cases where publication of physical address could endanger someone's safety, or the safety of an organization (e.g. a religious or political group)*
5. What circumstances, if any, would warrant access to registrant data by law enforcement agencies?
6. What clear, workable, enforceable and standardized processes should be adopted by ICANN-accredited privacy/proxy services in order to regulate such access (if such access is warranted)?
7. What specific alleged violations of the provider's terms of service, if any, would be sufficient to trigger publication of the registrant/owner's contact information?
8. What safeguards or remedies should be available in cases where publication is found to have been unwarranted?
   a) *Should registrant be notified prior to publication?*
9. What are the contractual obligations, if any, that if unfulfilled would justify termination of customer access by ICANN-accredited privacy/proxy service providers?

As noted under Section 5.6 above, previous community work had revealed substantial concerns and a lack of rules and standard practices for whether and when a P/P service provider discloses – either to a specific third party Requester or more broadly to the public by publishing in WHOIS – a customer's identity or contact details. The WG therefore also spent a significant amount of time discussing this topic, including many of the specific issues highlighted in the various Charter questions in this category.

The WG was able to come to agreement on definitions that more clearly explain the two possible forms of a "reveal", i.e. Disclosure to a single Requester as opposed to Publication to the world at large. It reviewed a sampling of responses from various P/P service providers, which confirmed the lack of standard practice among providers in relation to how they handle disclosure and publication requests. The sampling also showed that in the current environment, many providers include provisions in their terms of service that inform customers either of circumstances under which a provider will disclose or publish their identity and/or contact information, or that note a provider's discretion to do so in appropriate situations (e.g. in response to a court order). As with relay, this comports with the current requirement in the interim Privacy/Proxy Specification of the 2013 RAA, in that ICANN-accredited registrars, their Affiliates and Resellers who offer P/P services are obligated presently to disclose to their customers the circumstances under which a customer's identity or contact details will be disclosed or published. The sampling of P/P service providers did, however, indicate that publication of a customer's details in WHOIS generally were more likely to be a consequence of a provider's terminating[41] its service to a customer as a result of that customer's breach of the terms of service.

One general issue for which the WG seeks public comment in this regard is therefore the community's view as to whether the current provisions in the 2013 RAA interim Privacy/Proxy Specification are sufficient, or if additional and/or more specific provisions need to be developed,

The WG also acknowledged that there are various different grounds upon which third parties may request disclosure. These can include the initiation of proceedings under the UDRP, allegations of copyright, trademark or other intellectual property infringement, problems with the content of a website(s), and the distribution of malware. In addition, there are also different types of Requesters – such as LEA, intellectual property rights owners or their attorneys, and anti-spam and anti-phishing groups (among others). The WG noted that different standards and recommendations may have to be developed for either each type of request, or each type of Requester, or both. At the moment, the WG has developed an illustrative Disclosure framework for requests made by trademark and copyright owners or their authorized representatives (see Annex E), and welcomes community input on the need for, and possible elements of, a similar framework for LEA and other types of third party Requesters.

[41] See further Section 5.8 below.

The WG also acknowledged that a request for disclosure or publication need not always be conditioned on there first having been a relay request from that particular Requester. The WG also discussed the likelihood that clear, consistent and well-understood procedures for relay may reduce the need and dependency by Requesters on disclosure or publication in order to resolve issues with a domain name.

The WG's preliminary conclusions on this Category F, including open questions for which it particularly seeks community input, can be found in Section 7.

5.8 Termination [and De-Accreditation] of Privacy/Proxy Services

The following Charter questions were grouped into this Category G, with additional sub-questions agreed on by the WG:

1. What types of services should be covered, and what would be the forms of non-compliance that would trigger cancellation or suspension?

a) How will disputes about accreditation of a P/P service provider be resolved?

b) What will be the process for complaints that a particular accredited provider no longer satisfies accreditation standards?

c) Would there be an appeal mechanism if a provider is denied accreditation?

The WG agreed early on that the scope of its Charter included deliberation both of the situation where a P/P service provider terminates service to a customer, as well as where the provider's accreditation is itself terminated by ICANN, i.e. de-accreditation.

The WG also sought and obtained briefings from ICANN's Registrar Services department, in order to understand, first, the process of registrar accreditation and de-accreditation under the 2013 RAA, and secondly, whether or not the registrar accreditation and de-accreditation process might serve as the model for a privacy/proxy services accreditation and de-accreditation program. The WG acknowledged that many of the actual details and procedures regarding such a process will be developed as part of implementation of the WG's policy recommendations; however, the WG also felt that understanding the

various alternative models for accreditation and de-accreditation could help inform its deliberations and development of workable, implementable policy.

The WG's preliminary conclusions for this Category G can be found in Section 7.

6. Community Input

6.1 Request for Input

According to the GNSO's PDP Manual[42], a PDP WG should formally solicit statements from each GNSO Stakeholder Group and Constituency at an early stage of its deliberations. A PDP WG is also encouraged to seek the opinion of other ICANN Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees who may have expertise, experience or an interest in the issue. As a result, the WG reached out to all ICANN SOs and ACs as well as GNSO Stakeholder Groups and Constituencies with a request for input (see Annexes B and C) at the start of its deliberations. In response, statements were received from:

- The GNSO Business Constituency (BC)
- The GNSO Intellectual Property Constituency (IPC)
- The GNSO Internet Service Provider & Connectivity Provider Constituency (ISPCP)
- The GNSO Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group (NCSG)
- The At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)

The full statements can be found here: https://community.icann.org/x/SRzRAg.

6.2 Review of Input Received

All of the statements received were added to the template for each Charter question (where applicable) and reviewed by the WG as part of its deliberations on that particular topic.

[42] See Annex 2 of the GNSO Operating Procedures: http://gnso.icann.org/council/annex-2-pdp-manual-13nov14-en.pdf.

7. Working Group Preliminary Recommendations and Observations

7.1 Preliminary Recommendations

The WG was tasked to provide the GNSO Council with "policy recommendations regarding the issues identified during the 2013 RAA negotiations, including recommendations made by law enforcement and GNSO working groups, that were not addressed during the 2013 RAA negotiations and otherwise suited for a PDP; specifically, issues relating to the accreditation of Privacy & Proxy Services". The following are the preliminary recommendations from the WG, listed in order of each of the Charter questions, as grouped by category (A-G). Where these have yet to be finalized or do not represent a consensus position within the WG, square brackets around specific options under consideration have been used to indicate the current thinking of the WG; where there are two or more views within the WG on a particular issue, all viewpoints have been included.

CATEGORY A QUESTION 2[43]: Should ICANN distinguish between privacy and proxy services for the purpose of the accreditation process?

WG Preliminary Conclusion: ***Privacy and proxy services are to be treated the same way for the purpose of the accreditation process.***

CATEGORY B QUESTION 1 - Should ICANN-accredited privacy/proxy service providers be required to label WHOIS entries to clearly show when a registration is made through a privacy/proxy service?

WG Preliminary Conclusion: ***Domain name registrations involving P/P service providers should be clearly labeled as such in WHOIS[44].***

[43] The WG has deferred consideration of Questions A-1, A-3 and A-4 pending the results of public comment and further analysis on the specific Charter questions in Categories B through G.
[44] The WG acknowledged that implementing this recommendation may require analysis of the possible implications of adding another field to WHOIS.

WG Notes on B-1:

There may be various ways to implement this recommendation in order to achieve this objective; the feasibility and effectiveness of these options should be further explored as part of the implementation process. As an example, it was suggested that P/P service providers could be required to provide the registration data in a uniform / standard format that would make it clear that the domain name registration involves a P/P service - e.g. entering in the field for registrant information 'Service Name, on behalf of customer' (in the case of a proxy service this could then include a number, such as customer #512, while in the case of a privacy service it would include the actual customer name). Following submission of this information to the registrar, this information would then be displayed in WHOIS making it clearly identifiable as a domain name registration involving a P/P service.

CATEGORY B QUESTION 2 - Should ICANN-accredited privacy/proxy service providers be required to conduct periodic checks to ensure accuracy of customer contact information; and if so, how?

WG Preliminary Conclusion: ***The WG recommends[45] that P/P service customer data be validated and verified in a manner consistent with the requirements outlined in the WHOIS Accuracy Program Specification of the 2013 RAA. Moreover, in the cases where a P/P service provider is Affiliated with a registrar (as defined by the 2013 RAA) and that Affiliated registrar has carried out validation and verification of the P/P customer data, re-verification by the P/P service provider of the same, identical, information should not be required.***

WG Notes on B-2:

Similar to ICANN's Whois Data Reminder Policy, P/P service providers should be required to inform the P/P service customer annually of his/her requirement to provide accurate and up to date contact information to the P/P service provider. If the P/P service provider has any information suggesting that the P/P service customer information is incorrect (such as the provider receiving a bounced email notification or non-delivery notification message in connection with compliance with data reminder

[45] Some WG members are of the view that the minimum verification or validation standards for accredited services would need to exceed those applicable to non-proxy registrations, but this view could be affected by the final outcome of discussions regarding relay and reveal requirements (e.g., re the speed of reveal). As such, this recommendation will be revisited upon the completion of the WG deliberations on the other Charter questions.

notices or otherwise) for any P/P service customer, the provider must verify or re-verify, as applicable, the email address(es). If, within fifteen (15) calendar days after receiving any such information, the P/P service provider does not receive an affirmative response from the P/P service customer providing the required verification, the P/P service provider shall verify the applicable contact information manually.

CATEGORY B QUESTION 3 - What rights and responsibilities should domain name registrants that use privacy/proxy services have? What obligations should ICANN-accredited privacy/proxy service providers have in managing these rights and responsibilities? Clarify how transfers, renewals, and PEDNR policies should apply?

WG Preliminary Conclusion: ***All rights, responsibilities and obligations for registrants as well as those of accredited P/P service providers would need to be clearly communicated in the P/P registration agreement, including a provider's obligations in managing those rights and responsibilities and any specific requirements applying to transfers and renewals of a domain name. In addition, all accredited P/P service providers must disclose to their customers the conditions under which the service may be terminated in the event of a transfer of the domain name, and how requests for transfers of a domain name are handled. Further details as to minimum requirements for rights, responsibilities and obligations may need to be developed.***

The WG also recommends that it be mandatory for all accredited P/P service providers to relay to their customers any notices required under the RAA or an ICANN Consensus Policy (see the main text under Category E in this Section 7 for additional recommendations regarding relay).

In addition, the WG recommends the following as best practices for accredited P/P service providers:

- ***P/P service providers should facilitate and not hinder the transfer, renewal or restoration of a domain name by their customers, including without limitation a renewal during a Redemption Grace Period under the Expired Registration Recovery Policy and transfers to another registrar.***
- ***P/P service providers should use commercially reasonable efforts to avoid the need to disclose underlying customer data in the process of renewing, transferring or restoring a domain name.***

- ***P/P service providers should include in their terms of service a link or other direction to the ICANN website (or other ICANN-approved online location) where a person may look up the authoritative definitions and meanings of specific terms such as Disclosure or Publication.***

WG Notes on B-3:

In relation to transfers and renewals, the WG noted the common practice among providers of terminating P/P service protection as part of the transfer process and recommends that this be clearly disclosed to customers (NOTE: a sub group was formed to explore practical ways to facilitate transfers without the need for termination – see Section 5.3, above).

The WG has not explored in detail the possibility of recommending that P/P service providers report updates to WHOIS information within a certain time frame (e.g. modelled on Section 3.2.2 of the 2013 RAA).

CATEGORY C[46]:

"Threshold" Question: Currently, proxy/privacy services are available to companies, non-commercial organizations and individuals. Should there be any change to this aspect of the current system in the new accreditation standards[47]?

The WG discussed the practical difficulties created by the lack of clear definition as to what is "commercial" and what is "non-commercial". For instance, a distinction could be made on the basis of the individual or organization having a certain corporate form, or on the basis of the activities/transactions the individual or organization engages in regardless of corporate form. In addition, some commercial entities register and use domain names for non-commercial (e.g. charitable or experimental) purposes.

[46] The WG agreed to first discuss a Threshold (i.e. baseline) Question for this Category. In the course of deliberations it became clear that likely responses to Questions C-1 & C-2 were closely linked to this Threshold Question.

[47] In agreeing to first discuss this threshold question for Category C, WG members noted also that answers to some questions in this category might be somewhat conditional, in that a Yes/No answer to one may obviate the need to answer others. The WG also noted that references to the "use" of a domain for specific purposes may also implicate content questions.

The WG agrees that the status of a registrant as a commercial organization, non-commercial organization, or individual should not be the driving factor in whether P/P services are available to the registrant. Fundamentally, P/P services should remain available to registrants irrespective of their status as commercial or non-commercial organizations or as individuals[48].

However, some WG members are of the view that domain names being actively used for commercial transactions (e.g., the sale or exchange of goods or services) should not be able to use or continue using proxy/privacy services. Accordingly, Charter Question C-1 presented some distinctions that created a division within the WG, and for which public comments are sought by the WG.

CATEGORY C QUESTION 1 - Should ICANN-accredited privacy/proxy service providers distinguish between domain names used for commercial vs. personal purposes? Specifically, is the use of privacy/proxy services appropriate when a domain name is registered for commercial purposes?

As noted above, the WG agrees that the mere fact of a domain being registered by a commercial entity, or by anyone conducting commercial activity in other spheres, should not prevent the use of P/P services. In addition, a majority of WG members did not think it either necessary or practical to prohibit domain names being actively used for commercial activity from using P/P services.

However, other WG members disagreed, noting that in the "offline world" businesses often are required to register with relevant authorities as well as disclose details about their identities and locations. These members expressed the view that it is both necessary and practical to distinguish between domains used for a commercial purpose (irrespective of whether the registrant is actually registered as a commercial entity anywhere) and those domains (which may be operated by commercial entity) that are used for a non-commercial purpose. Moreover, domains that conduct financial transactions online must have openly available domain registration information for purposes of, for example, consumer self-protection and law enforcement purposes. Accordingly, these members suggested that domains used for online financial transactions with a commercial purpose should be ineligible for privacy and proxy registrations.

[48] [48] The WG notes that the WHOIS RT had specifically acknowledged that P/P services can be and are used to address legitimate interests, both commercial and non-commercial.

Among the arguments in response, some WG members assert that in jurisdictions where similar legal requirements (e.g. business registration, disclosure of location) already exist for the "online world", such disclosures are generally made via a prominent link on the web site rather than in the WHOIS data. This is due apparently to the fact that, in the translation from the "offline world" to the "online world", legislators usually focus on the content available under the domain name, not the domain name registration itself. This view also holds that there may be valid reasons why domain name registrants using their domain names for commercial purposes may legitimately need the availability of such services (for example, for the exercise of political speech).

Question C-1 subparts (a) and (b), which the WG added to focus its discussions, suggest defining "commercial" within the context of specific activities, and uses "trading" as an example. However, the WG discussion has focused on a broad term "commercial" and whether certain types of commercial activity mean that a domain is not eligible for P/P registration. The WG therefore began to use the word "commercial" in a broad sense and the word "transactional" to address issues raised by the position held by the group that supports disallowing domains used for online financial transactions with a commercial purpose from using P/P services.

Accordingly, a possible definition of "transactional" was developed for further discussion of this group's approach, as follows: ***"[D]omains used for online financial transactions for commercial purpose should be ineligible for privacy and proxy registrations."***.

CATEGORY C QUESTION 2 - Should the use of privacy/proxy services be restricted only to registrants who are private individuals using the domain name for non-commercial purposes?

Given the foregoing discussion, ***the WG does not believe that P/P registrations should be limited to private individuals who use their domains for non-commercial purposes.***

WG Notes on C-1 & C-2:

The WG notes that per its preliminary agreement on question B-1, "domain name registrations involving P/P service providers should be clearly labeled as such in WHOIS. The WG observes that there may be

various ways to implement this recommendation in order to achieve this objective and suggests that the feasibility and effectiveness of these options is further explored as part of the implementation process …"

CATEGORY C QUESTION 3 - Should there be a difference in the data fields to be displayed if the domain name is registered or used for a commercial purpose, or by a commercial entity instead of a natural person?

WG Preliminary Conclusion: ***A majority of WG members are of the view that it is neither desirable nor feasible to make a distinction in the data fields to be displayed.***

Additional Questions for the Community on Category C:

- Should registrants of domain names associated with commercial activities and which are used for online financial transactions be prohibited from using, or continuing to use, privacy and proxy services? If so, why, and if not, why not?
- If you agree with this position, do you think it would be useful to adopt a definition of "commercial" or "transactional" to define those domains for which P/P service registrations should be disallowed? If so, what should the definition(s) be?
- Would it be necessary to make a distinction in the WHOIS data fields to be displayed as a result of distinguishing between domain names used for online financial transactions and domain names that are not?

CATEGORY D QUESTION 1- What measures should be taken to ensure contactability and responsiveness of the providers?

WG Preliminary Conclusion: ***ICANN should publish and maintain a publicly accessible list of all accredited P/P service providers, with all appropriate contact information. Registrars should provide a web link to P/P services run by them or their Affiliates, and P/P service providers should declare their Affiliation with a registrar (if any) as a requirement of the accreditation program.***

WG Notes on D-1:

The WG noted that provider responsiveness is a separate but necessary part of the accreditation program. While not necessarily fully dispositive of the issue of responsiveness for all the types of reports and requests that a P/P service provider may receive, the WG has developed a set of preliminary recommendations concerning the relaying of electronic communications, as well as a draft Framework to govern provider intake, processing and response to information disclosure requests from intellectual property rights-holders (see the main text in this Section 7 under Categories E and F below for details on the WG's recommendations concerning relay and disclosure procedures).

CATEGORY D – QUESTION 2: Should ICANN-accredited privacy/proxy service providers be required to maintain dedicated points of contact for reporting abuse? If so, should the terms be consistent with the requirements applicable to registrars under Section 3.18 of the RAA?

WG Preliminary Conclusion: ***The WG agreed that a "designated" rather than a "dedicated" point of contact will be sufficient for abuse reporting purposes, noting that the primary concern is to have one contact point that third parties can go to and expect a response from. The WG also recommends that the designated point of contact be "capable and authorized" to investigate and handle abuse reports and information requests received (a standard similar to that required of a Transfer Emergency Action Contact under the IRTP).***

WG Notes on D-2:

The WG noted with approval the following recommendations from ICANN's Compliance Department (whose input the WG had sought) in relation to the practical workings of Section 3.18 of the RAA, and agreed that these recommendations may be helpful in developing guidelines and processes relevant to implementing the WG proposals for this Charter question: (i) provide guidance to an abuse report requirement as to the types of abuse complaints allowed and types of actions P/P service providers should take about these reports; and (ii) consider alternative abuse report options other than publishing an email address on a website and in WHOIS output (to address increasing volumes of spam).

CATEGORY D QUESTION 3 - Should full WHOIS contact details for ICANN-accredited privacy/proxy service providers be required?

WG Preliminary Conclusion: ***The WG agreed that P/P service providers should be fully contactable through the publication of contact details on their websites in a manner modelled after Section 2.3 of the 2013 RAA Specification on Privacy and Proxy Registrations.***

WG Notes on D-3:

The WG notes that adoption and implementation of its recommendations in response to other Charter questions may affect the outcome of this issue (e.g. the WG recommendation for ICANN to publish a publicly-accessible list of accredited providers (see WG Preliminary Conclusion for D-1), and for WHOIS entries to be clearly labeled if they are those of a P/P service provider (see WG Preliminary Conclusion for B-1).)

CATEGORY D QUESTION 4 - What are the forms of alleged malicious conduct, if any, that would be covered by a designated published point of contact at an ICANN-accredited privacy/proxy service provider?

WG Preliminary Conclusion: ***The WG recommends that the requirements in relation to which forms of alleged malicious conduct would be covered by the designated published point of contact at an ICANN-accredited P/P service provider include a list of forms of malicious conduct to be covered. These requirements should allow for enough flexibility to accommodate new types of malicious conduct. Section 3 of the Public Interest Commitments (PIC) Specification in the New gTLD Registry Agreement[49] or Safeguard 2, Annex 1 of the GAC's Beijing Communique[50] could serve as starting points for developing such a list.***

[49] "Registry Operator will include a provision in its Registry-Registrar Agreement that requires Registrars to include in their Registration Agreements a provision prohibiting Registered Name Holders from distributing malware, abusively operating botnets, phishing, piracy, trademark or copyright infringement, fraudulent or deceptive practices, counterfeiting or otherwise engaging in activity contrary to applicable law, and providing (consistent with applicable law and any related procedures) consequences for such activities including suspension of the domain name."

[50] "Registry operators will ensure that terms of use for registrants include prohibitions against the distribution of malware, operation of botnets, phishing, piracy, trademark or copyright infringement, fraudulent or deceptive practices, counterfeiting or otherwise engaging in activity contrary to applicable law."

The WG also recommends that a standardized form be developed for the purpose of submitting abuse reports and information requests, to also include space for free form text[51]. P/P service providers should also have the ability to "categorize" reports received, in order to facilitate responsiveness.

CATEGORY E QUESTIONS 1 & 2 - What, if any, are the baseline minimum standardized relay processes that should be adopted by ICANN-accredited privacy/proxy service providers? Should ICANN-accredited privacy/proxy service providers be required to forward to the customer all allegations of illegal activities they receive relating to specific domain names of the customer?

WG Preliminary Conclusions: The WG divided its discussions on Category E into two further topics, as further detailed below. Readers should note that the WG has yet to reach consensus on the final language and recommendation for topic II below, as shown by the options indicated in square brackets.

I. Regarding Electronic Communications[52]:

(1) All communications required by the RAA and ICANN Consensus Policies must be forwarded.

(2) For all other electronic communications, accredited P/P service providers may elect one of the following options:

- ***Option #1: Forward all electronic requests received (including those received via emails and web forms), but the provider may implement commercially reasonable safeguards (including CAPTCHA) to filter out spam and other forms of abusive communications; or***
- ***Option #2: Forward all electronic requests (including those received via emails and web forms) received from LEA and third parties containing allegations of domain name abuse (i.e. illegal activity).***

(3) In all cases, accredited P/P service providers must publish and maintain a mechanism (e.g. designated email point of contact) for Requesters to contact to follow up on or escalate their original requests.

[51] The WG discussed but did not finalize the minimum elements that should be included in such a form.
[52] The WG agrees that emails, web forms and automated telephone calls would be considered "electronic communications" whereas human-operated faxes and non-automated telephone calls would not. The WG recommends that implementation of the concept of "electronic communications" be sufficiently flexible to accommodate future technological developments.

The WG also recommends that standard forms and other mechanisms that would facilitate the prompt and accurate identification of a relay request be developed for the use of accredited P/P service providers (e.g. drop-down menus in a provider's web-based forms or fields that would require the filling in of a Requester's contact details, specifying the type of request or other basic information).

II. Regarding Further Provider Actions When There Is A Repeated Failure of Electronic Communications

- ***All third party electronic requests alleging abuse by a P/P service customer will be promptly forwarded to the customer. A Requester will be promptly notified of a persistent failure of delivery[53] that a P/P service provider becomes aware of.***
- ***The WG considers that a "persistent delivery failure" will have occurred when an electronic communications system abandons or otherwise stops attempting to deliver an electronic communication to a customer after [a certain number of] repeated or duplicate delivery attempts within [a reasonable period of time]. The WG emphasizes that such persistent delivery failure, in and of itself, is not sufficient to trigger further provider obligation or action under this Category E unless the provider also becomes aware of the persistent delivery failure.***
- ***[As part of an escalation process, and when the above-mentioned requirements concerning a persistent delivery failure of an electronic communication have been met, the provider [should] [must] upon request forward a further form of notice to its customer. A provider should have the discretion to select the most appropriate means of forwarding such a request [and to charge a reasonable fee on a cost-recovery basis]. [Any such reasonable fee is to be borne by the customer and not the Requester]. A provider shall have the right to impose reasonable limits on the number of such requests made by the same Requester.]***
- ***When a P/P service provider becomes aware of a persistent delivery failure to a customer as described herein, that will trigger the provider's obligation to perform a verification/re-verification (as applicable) of the customer's email address(es), in accordance with the recommendation of this WG under Category B, Question 2.***

[53] The WG notes that failure of "delivery" of a communication is not to be equated with the failure of a customer to "respond" to a request, notification or other type of communication.

- ***These recommendations shall not preclude a P/P service provider from taking any additional action in the event of a persistent delivery failure of electronic communications to a customer, in accordance with its published terms of service.***

CATEGORY F:

1. **What, if any, are the baseline minimum standardized reveal processes that should be adopted by ICANN-accredited privacy/proxy service providers?**
2. **Should ICANN-accredited privacy/proxy service providers be required to reveal customer identities for the specific purpose of ensuring timely service of cease and desist letters?**
3. **What forms of alleged malicious conduct, if any, and what evidentiary standard would be sufficient to trigger a reveal?**
4. **What safeguards must be put in place to ensure adequate protections for privacy and freedom of expression?**
5. **What circumstances, if any, would warrant access to registrant data by law enforcement agencies?**
6. **What clear, workable, enforceable and standardized processes should be adopted by ICANN-accredited privacy/proxy services in order to regulate such access (if such access is warranted)?**
7. **What specific alleged violations of the provider's terms of service, if any, would be sufficient to trigger publication of the registrant/owner's contact information?**
8. **What safeguards or remedies should be available in cases where publication is found to have been unwarranted?**
9. **What are the contractual obligations, if any, that if unfulfilled would justify termination of customer access by ICANN-accredited privacy/proxy service providers?**

The WG's preliminary conclusions on the Category F Charter questions are set out below. The nature of its deliberations has meant that the WG believes it is more helpful to present its recommendations in a different form rather than as chronological answers to each Charter question. Where the WG has yet to reach consensus on certain specific points, or has not offered a concrete recommendation in direct answer to a Charter F question, this has been highlighted so as to enable commenters to provide

tailored and constructive feedback to the WG on issues relating to the disclosure of a P/P customer's identity and/or contact details.

I. WG Recommended Definitions

The WG's review of a sample of P/P service provider policies as well as of prior ICANN work on this issue indicates that there is currently no consistent, universally-accepted or well-understood single definition of "Reveal" as the word is used by the ICANN community. The WG has developed the following definitions to cover the two aspects of what a "Reveal" request is commonly understood to mean, and recommends that ICANN adopt these definitions in its P/P Service Provider Accreditation Program, and more generally in all relevant contracts and related policies:

- ***"Publication" means the reveal of a person's (i.e. the licensee or beneficial owner of a registered domain name) identity/contact details in the WHOIS system.***
- ***"Disclosure" means the reveal of a person's (i.e. the licensee or beneficial owner of a registered domain name) identity/contact details to a third party Requester without Publication in the WHOIS system.***
- ***The term "person" as used in these definitions is understood to include natural and legal persons, as well as organizations and entities.***

The WG also agreed that there may be a need in certain circumstances to differentiate between a request made by law enforcement authorities ("LEA") and one made by other third parties such as intellectual property rights holders or private anti abuse organizations. The WG notes that a definition of LEA appears in the 2013 RAA (see https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/approved-with-specs-2013-09-17-en) and recommends adopting a similar definition in the ICANN Accreditation Program, and in related contracts and policies:

"Law enforcement authority" means law enforcement, consumer protection, quasi-governmental or other similar authorities designated from time to time by the national or

territorial government of the jurisdiction in which the P/P service provider is established or maintains a physical office[54].

II. General Recommendations on Publication and Disclosure

The WG reviewed the Publication and Disclosure practices of several P/P service providers, some of who are represented in the WG. Most providers reported using a manual rather than an automated system to deal with Disclosure requests, in the sense that an employee initially reviews a request prior to a decision being made on whether to comply. For at least one provider, its policies and practices were intended to encourage the Requester and the customer to deal directly with each other as far as possible.

The WG agreed that none of its recommendations should be read as being intended to alter (or mandate the alteration of) the prevailing practice among P/P service providers to review requests manually or to facilitate direct resolution of an issue between a Requester and a customer. It also notes that disclosure of at least some contact details of the customer may in some cases be required in order to facilitate such direct resolution.

The WG agrees that there can be significant differences between the consequences of Publication of a customer's details in the public WHOIS system compared to Disclosure of the same details to a single third party Requester. Specifically, the WG agrees that there may be a greater need for safeguards to ensure customer protection with respect to Publication than with respect to Disclosure. ***The WG therefore recommends that accredited P/P service providers should indicate clearly in their terms of service when they are referring to Publication requests (and their consequences) and when to Disclosure requests (and their consequences). The WG further recommends that accredited P/P service providers expressly include a provision in their terms of service explaining the meaning and consequences of Publication.***

[54] This is based on the wording of Section 3.18.2 of the 2013 RAA.

The WG notes that several providers currently include in their terms of service or other published policies provisions pursuant to which the provider may Disclose or Publish a customer's details, or suspend or terminate service to a customer. Possible circumstances include where action is required by legal process such as court orders, subpoenas, or warrants, by ICANN Consensus Policy or by Registry requirements. Occasions also may arise in the course of resolving third party claims involving the domain name or its uses, including where necessary to protect property or rights, the safety of the public or any person, or to prevent or stop activity that may be illegal or unethical. ***Without mandating that such specific provisions be included in an accredited provider's terms of service, the WG nonetheless recommends that accredited providers should indicate clearly in their terms of service the specific grounds upon which a customer's details may be Disclosed or Published or service suspended or terminated[55]. Accredited P/P service providers should also include in their terms of service a link or other direction to the ICANN website (or other ICANN-approved online location) where a person may look up the authoritative definitions and meanings of specific terms such as Disclosure or Publication.***

The WG further recommends that, in deciding whether or not to comply with a Disclosure or Publication request, providers not mandate that the Requester must have first made a Relay request.

III. WG Recommendations Specific to LEA Requests

Although the WG has preliminarily agreed on a Disclosure Framework for the intake and processing of, and response to, Disclosure requests made by a copyright or trademark owner (see Annex E), it has not done the same for LEA Requesters, or requests made by other types of third parties. This was due in part to likely differences with how these Requesters would handle certain issues such as those related to authorization and confidentiality, and what the WG perceived as a relative lack of expertise on the matter within the WG. ***The WG therefore invites public comments on the feasibility of this type of framework for non-IP Requesters.*** In providing input on this topic, commenters may wish to also address the following specific questions:

[55] The current interim P/P Specification in the 2013 RAA requires that P/P providers who are, or who are Affiliated with, Registrars post their terms of service either on their, or on their Affiliated providers' websites, including the circumstances under which they terminate service and when they reveal or disclose the customer's identity and details: see Section 2.4 of the Specification: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/approved-with-specs-2013-09-17-en#privacy-proxy.

- Should it be mandatory for accredited P/P providers to comply with express LEA requests not to notify a customer?
- Should there be mandatory Publication for certain types of activity e.g. malware/viruses or violation of terms of service relating to illegal activity?
- What (if any) should the remedies be for unwarranted Publication?
- Should a similar framework and/or considerations apply to requests made by third parties other than LEA and intellectual property rights-holders (e.g. consumer protection and anti-abuse groups)?

IV. WG Recommendations Specific to Requests made by Intellectual Property Rights-Holders

The WG has developed a proposed Disclosure Framework that would apply to Disclosure requests made to P/P providers by intellectual property (i.e. trademark and copyright) owners. The proposal as drafted includes requirements concerning the nature and type of information to be provided by a Requester, non-exhaustive grounds for refusal of a request, and the possibility of neutral dispute resolution/appeal in the event of a dispute. ***Please refer to Annex E for the full draft of this proposed Disclosure Framework, including certain alternative options (indicated in square brackets) currently under consideration by the WG.***

V. WG Recommendations on Customer Notification and the Availability of Alternative Options

The WG recommends that accredited P/P service providers should indicate clearly, in their terms of service and on their websites, whether or not a customer: (1) will be notified when a provider receives a Publication or Disclosure request from a third party; and (2) may opt to cancel its domain registration prior to and in lieu of Publication.

VI. WG Recommendations on Requester Notification

The WG recommends that accredited P/P service providers should indicate clearly, on their websites and in all Publication or Disclosure-related materials, that a Requester will be notified in a

timely manner of the provider's decision: (1) to notify its customer of the request; and (2) whether or not the provider agrees to comply with the request to Disclose or Publish. This should also be clearly indicated in all Disclosure or Publication related materials.

VII. WG Recommendations on Categorizing Third Party Requests and the Use of Standard Request Forms

The WG's review of various P/P service provider policies shows that least one provider has in place distinct policies dealing specifically with different types of claims for which a Disclosure request is made, e.g. UDRP Filings, Trademark & Copyright Infringement Complaints, and Subpoenas (Civil and Criminal). The WG believes that such categorization can be a voluntary best practice to be recommended to providers, but does not presently recommend mandating this as a requirement for the Accreditation Program.

Nonetheless, ***the WG recommends that ICANN's Accreditation Program include a requirement for all accredited P/P service providers to include on their websites, and in all Publication or Disclosure-related policies and documents, a link to a [standardized] Request Form or an equivalent list of specific criteria that the provider requires in order to comply with such requests (including with reference to the proposed Disclosure Framework for intellectual property-related requests).***

CATEGORY G - What types of services should be covered, and what would be the forms of non-compliance that would trigger cancellation or suspension?

The WG discussed the differences between the termination of a P/P service provider's accreditation, and the termination by a P/P service provider of its service to a customer (e.g. for breach of the provider's terms of service by a customer). The following preliminary conclusions are concerned with the consequences of de-accreditation of a P/P provider.

- ***P/P service customers should be notified prior to de-accreditation of a provider, to enable them to make alternative arrangements.*** One possible time in which to do so might be when Compliance sends breach notices to the provider, as customers would then be put on notice (as is done for registrar de-accreditation).

- ***Other P/P service providers should also be notified, to enable interested providers to indicate if they wish to become the gaining P/P service provider*** (as is done for registrar de-accreditation)
- ***All notification(s) are to be published on the ICANN website*** (as is done for registrar de-accreditation)
- ***A de-accredited P/P provider should have the opportunity to find a gaining provider to work with*** (as sometimes occurs with registrar de-accreditation[56])
- ***A "graduated response" approach to de-accreditation should be explored***, i.e. a set series of breach notices (e.g. up to three) with escalating sanctions, with the final recourse being de-accreditation
- ***Where feasible, a customer should be able to choose its new P/P service provider***
- ***The next review of the IRTP should include an analysis of the impact on P/P service customers, to ensure that adequate safeguards are in place as regards P/P service protection when domain names are transferred pursuant to an IRTP process***

WG Notes on Category G:

In relation to termination of P/P service by a provider to its customer, the WG noted its recommendations under Category F that accredited P/P service providers are to publish certain minimum terms regarding Disclosure and Publication in their terms of service. The WG has yet to finalize a position on whether these minimum recommendations are sufficient to ensure adequate protection of P/P service customers in the event of Publication of a customer's details in WHOIS as a result of termination of P/P service (including where this was due to the customer's breach of a provider's terms of service). The relevant Category F recommendations for minimum mandatory requirements in this regard are:

- The specific grounds upon which a provider will Publish a customer's details, suspend service, or terminate service

- The meaning (per the WG's definition) of Publication and its consequences

[56] As with registrar de-accreditation, the gaining provider would first have to be approved by ICANN.

- Whether a customer will be notified when the provider receives a request either for Disclosure or Publication

- whether a customer will have the option to cancel its domain name registration prior to and in lieu of Publication

The WG also discussed whether the current registrar accreditation and de-accreditation model might be applicable as a framework for P/P service providers. The WG agreed that there are some significant distinctions between the registrar model and P/P services, e.g. cancellation/transfer of a domain name is not the same as cancellation/transfer of a P/P service, and domain name transfers are governed by the IRTP (an ICANN Consensus Policy). However, there are also many similarities.

The WG has preliminarily concluded that the registrar model with its multiple steps, governed by the RAA, may not be entirely appropriate for P/P services; however, it is a useful starting point from which relevant portions may be adapted to apply to P/P service providers.

8. Conclusions & Next Steps

The WG will complete the next phase of its work and develop its recommendations in a Final Report to be sent to the GNSO Council for review following its analysis of public comments received on this Initial Report.

Annex A - PDP WG Charter

Working Group Charter for a Policy Development Process to Address Privacy & Proxy Services Accreditation Issues arising under the 2013 Registrar Accreditation Agreement

WG Name:	RAA Privacy & Proxy Services Accreditation Issues PDP Working Group	
Section I: Working Group Identification		
Chartering Organization(s):	Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO) Council	
Charter Approval Date:	TBD	
Name of WG Chair:	TBD	
Name(s) of Appointed Liaison(s):	TBD	
WG Workspace URL:	TBD	
WG Mailing List:	TBD	
GNSO Council Resolution:	**Title:**	Motion to Approve the Charter for the 2013 Registrar Accreditation Agreement (RAA) Privacy & Proxy Services Accreditation Issues Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group (WG)
	Ref # & Link:	TBD
Important Document Links:	•	

Section II: Mission, Purpose, and Deliverables

Mission & Scope:

Background

At the ICANN Meeting in Dakar in October 2011 the ICANN Board adopted Resolution 2011.10.18.32 regarding amendments to the Registrar Accreditation Agreement (Dakar RAA Resolution). The Dakar RAA Resolution directed negotiations on amending the 2009 Registrar Accreditation Agreement (RAA) to be commenced immediately, and requested the creation of an Issue Report to undertake a GNSO Policy Development Process (PDP) as quickly as possible to address any remaining items not covered by the negotiations and otherwise suited for a PDP. With the Preliminary Issue Report on RAA Amendments having been published in December 2011, the Final GNSO Issue Report on RAA Amendments was published, following from the Dakar RAA Resolution, on 6 March 2012. On 27 June 2013, the ICANN Board approved the new 2013 Registrar Accreditation Agreement (2013 RAA). Accordingly, the GNSO Council is now proceeding with the Board-requested PDP on the remaining issues identified in the RAA negotiations that were not addressed in the 2013 RAA; specifically, issues relating to the accreditation of Privacy & Proxy Services.

Mission and Scope

This RAA PDP Working Group (WG) is tasked to provide the GNSO Council with policy recommendations regarding the issues identified during the 2013 RAA negotiations, including recommendations made by law enforcement and GNSO working groups, that were not addressed during the 2013 RAA negotiations and otherwise suited for a PDP; specifically, issues relating to the accreditation of Privacy & Proxy Services.

As part of its deliberations on the matter, the RAA PDP WG should, at a minimum, consider those issues detailed in the Staff Briefing Paper published on 16 September 2013. These are:

- *What, if any, are the types of Standard Service Practices that should be adopted and published by ICANN-accredited privacy/proxy service providers?*
- *What, if any, are the baseline minimum standardized relay and reveal processes that should be adopted by ICANN-accredited privacy/proxy service providers?*
- *Should ICANN-accredited privacy/proxy service providers be required to reveal customer identities for this specific*

purpose?

- *Should ICANN-accredited privacy/proxy service providers be required to forward on to the customer all allegations they receive of illegal activities relating to specific domain names of the customer?*
- *What forms of malicious conduct (if any) and what evidentiary standard would be sufficient to trigger such disclosure? What safeguards must be put in place to ensure adequate protections for privacy and freedom of expression?*
- *What specific violations, if any, would be sufficient to trigger such publication? What safeguards or remedies should there be for cases where publication is found to have been unwarranted?*
- *Should ICANN-accredited privacy/proxy service providers be required to conduct periodic checks to ensure accuracy of customer contact information; and if so, how?*
- *What are the contractual obligations (if any) that, if unfulfilled, would justify termination of customer access by ICANN-accredited privacy/proxy service providers?*
- *What rights and responsibilities should customers of privacy/proxy services have? What obligations should ICANN-accredited privacy/proxy service providers have in managing these rights and responsibilities? Clarify how transfers, renewals, and PEDNR policies should apply.*
- *Should ICANN-accredited privacy/proxy service providers be required to label WHOIS entries to clearly show when a registration is made through a privacy/proxy service?*
- *Should full WHOIS contact details for ICANN-accredited privacy/proxy service providers be required? What measures should be taken to ensure contactability and responsiveness of the providers?*
- *Should ICANN-accredited privacy/proxy service providers be required to maintain dedicated points of contact for reporting abuse? If so, should the terms be consistent with the requirements applicable to registrars under Section 3.18 of the RAA?*
- *What are the forms of malicious conduct (if any) that would be covered by a designated published point of contact at an ICANN-accredited privacy/proxy service provider?*
- *What circumstances, if any, would warrant access to registrant data by law enforcement agencies?*
- *What clear, workable, enforceable and standardized processes should be adopted by ICANN-accredited privacy/proxy services in order to regulate such access (if such access is warranted)?*
- *Should ICANN-accredited privacy/proxy service providers distinguish between domain names used for commercial vs. personal purposes? Specifically, is the use of privacy/proxy services appropriate when a domain name is registered for commercial purposes? Should there be a difference in the data fields to be displayed if the domain name is registered/ used for a commercial purpose or by a commercial entity instead of to a natural person?*

- *Should the use of privacy/proxy services be restricted only to registrants who are private individuals using the domain name for non-commercial purposes?*
- *What types of services should be covered, and what would be the forms of non-compliance that would trigger cancellation or suspension of registrations?*
- *Should ICANN distinguish between privacy and proxy services for the purpose of the accreditation process?*

The following additional issues should also be considered by the WG:

- *What are the effects of the privacy & proxy service specification contained in the 2013 RAA? Have these new requirements improved WHOIS quality, registrant contactability and service usability?*
- *What should be the contractual obligations of ICANN accredited registrars with regard to accredited privacy/proxy service providers? Should registrars be permitted to knowingly accept registrations where the registrant is using unaccredited service providers that are however bound to the same standards as accredited service providers?*

The WG's final recommendations do not need to be limited to formal Consensus Policy recommendations; it may, for example, make recommendations more appropriately covered by a code of conduct or best practices, or through other mechanisms (e.g. as indicated in the GNSO PDP Manual.)

The WG should also bear in mind that this PDP is expected to inform ICANN's proposed Action Plan to launch an accredited privacy/proxy program and further ICANN's ongoing efforts to implement recommendations made by the WHOIS Review Team. In addition, the WG should take into account recommendations made by the WHOIS Review Team at as early a stage as possible, and the results of the WHOIS Privacy & Proxy Abuse Study commissioned by the GNSO Council and published for public comment on 24 September 2013: http://www.icann.org/en/news/public-comment/whois-pp-abuse-study-24sep13-en.htm

The WG may also wish to consider forming sub-groups to work on particular issues or sub-topics in order to streamline its work and discussions.

Objectives & Goals:

To develop, at a minimum, an Initial Report and a Final Report regarding the WG's recommendations on issues relating to the accreditation of privacy & proxy services arising in relation to the 2013 RAA, to be delivered to the GNSO Council, following the processes described in Annex A of the ICANN Bylaws and the GNSO PDP Manual.

Deliverables & Timeframes:

The WG shall respect the timelines and deliverables as outlined in Annex A of the ICANN Bylaws and the

PDP Manual. As per the GNSO Working Group Guidelines, the WG shall develop a work plan that outlines the necessary steps and expected timing in order to achieve the milestones of the PDP as set out in Annex A of the ICANN Bylaws and the PDP Manual, and shall submit this to the GNSO Council.

Section III: Formation, Staffing, and Organization

Membership Criteria:

The WG will be open to all interested in participating. New members who join after certain parts of work has been completed are expected to review previous documents and meeting transcripts.

Group Formation, Dependencies, & Dissolution:

This WG shall be a standard GNSO PDP Working Group. The GNSO Secretariat should circulate a 'Call For Volunteers' as widely as possible in order to ensure broad representation and participation in the WG, including:

- Publication of announcement on relevant ICANN web sites including but not limited to the GNSO and other Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committee web pages; and
- Distribution of the announcement to GNSO Stakeholder Groups, Constituencies and other ICANN Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees

Working Group Roles, Functions, & Duties:

The ICANN Staff assigned to the WG will fully support the work of the Working Group as requested by the Chair including meeting support, document drafting, editing and distribution and other substantive contributions when deemed appropriate.
Staff assignments to the Working Group:

- GNSO Secretariat
- ICANN policy staff members (Mary Wong)

The standard WG roles, functions & duties shall be those specified in Section 2.2 of the GNSO Working Group Guidelines.

Statements of Interest (SOI) Guidelines:

Each member of the WG is required to submit an SOI in accordance with Section 5 of the GNSO Operating Procedures.

Section IV: Rules of Engagement

Decision-Making Methodologies:

The Chair will be responsible for designating each position as having one of the following designations:

- **Full consensus** - when no one in the group speaks against the recommendation in its last readings. This is also sometimes referred to as **Unanimous Consensus.**
- **Consensus** - a position where only a small minority disagrees, but most agree. *[Note: For those that are unfamiliar with ICANN usage, you may associate the definition of 'Consensus' with other definitions and terms of art such as rough consensus or near consensus. It should be noted, however, that in the case of a GNSO PDP WG, all reports, especially Final Reports, must restrict themselves to the term 'Consensus' as this may have legal implications.]*
- **Strong support but significant opposition** - a position where, while most of the group supports

a recommendation, there is a significant number of those who do not support it.

- **Divergence** (also referred to as **No Consensus**) - a position where there is no strong support for any particular position, but many different points of view. Sometimes this is due to irreconcilable differences of opinion and sometimes it is due to the fact that no one has a particularly strong or convincing viewpoint, but the members of the group agree that it is worth listing the issue in the report nonetheless.
- **Minority View** - refers to a proposal where a small number of people support the recommendation. This can happen in response to **Consensus**, **Strong support but significant opposition**, or **No Consensus;** or it can happen in cases where there is neither support nor opposition to a suggestion made by a small number of individuals.

In cases of **Consensus**, **Strong support but significant opposition**, and **No Consensus**, an effort should be made to document variances in viewpoint and to present any **Minority View** recommendations that may have been made. Documentation of **Minority View** recommendations normally depends on text offered by the proponent(s). In all cases of **Divergence,** the WG Chair should encourage the submission of minority viewpoint(s).

The recommended method for discovering the consensus level designation on recommendations should work as follows:

i. After the group has discussed an issue long enough for all issues to have been raised, understood and discussed, the Chair, or Co-Chairs, make an evaluation of the designation and publish it for the group to review.
ii. After the group has discussed the Chair's estimation of designation, the Chair, or Co-Chairs, should reevaluate and publish an updated evaluation.
iii. Steps (i) and (ii) should continue until the Chair/Co-Chairs make an evaluation that is accepted by the group.
iv. In rare cases, a Chair may decide that the use of polls is reasonable. Some of the reasons for this might be:
    - A decision needs to be made within a time frame that does not allow for the natural process of iteration and settling on a designation to occur.
    - It becomes obvious after several iterations that it is impossible to arrive at a designation. This will happen most often when trying to discriminate between **Consensus** and **Strong support but Significant Opposition** or between **Strong support but Significant Opposition** and **Divergence.**

Care should be taken in using polls that they do not become votes. A liability with the use of polls is that, in situations where there is **Divergence** or **Strong Opposition**, there are often disagreements about the meanings of the poll questions or of the poll results.

Based upon the WG's needs, the Chair may direct that WG participants do not have to have their name explicitly associated with any Full Consensus or Consensus views/positions. However, in all other cases and in those cases where a group member represents the minority viewpoint, their name must be explicitly linked, especially in those cases where polls where taken.

Consensus calls should always involve the entire WG and, for this reason, should take place on the designated mailing list to ensure that all WG members have the opportunity to fully participate in the

consensus process. It is the role of the Chair to designate which level of consensus has been reached and to announce this designation to the WG. WG member(s) should be able to challenge the designation of the Chair as part of the WG discussion. However, if disagreement persists, WG members may use the process set forth below to challenge the designation.

If several participants (see Note 1 below) in a WG disagree with the designation given to a position by the Chair or any other consensus call, they may follow these steps sequentially:

1. Send email to the Chair, copying the WG explaining why the decision is believed to be in error.
2. If the Chair still disagrees with the complainants, the Chair will forward the appeal to the liaison(s) from the Chartering Organization (CO). The Chair must explain his or her reasoning in the response to the complainants and in the submission to the liaison(s). If the liaison(s) supports the Chair's position, the liaison(s) will provide their response to the complainants. The liaison(s) must explain their reasoning in the response. If the liaison(s) disagrees with the Chair, the liaison(s) will forward the appeal to the CO. Should the complainants disagree with the liaison(s)'s support of the Chair's determination, the complainants may appeal to the Chair of the CO or their designated representative. If the CO agrees with the complainants' position, the CO should recommend remedial action to the Chair.
3. In the event of any appeal, the CO will attach a statement of the appeal to the WG and/or Board report. This statement should include all of the documentation from all steps in the appeals process and should include a statement from the CO (see Note 2 below).

Note 1: Any Working Group member may raise an issue for reconsideration; however, a formal appeal will require that that a single member demonstrates a sufficient amount of support before a formal appeal process can be invoked. In those cases where a single Working Group member is seeking reconsideration, the member will advise the Chair and/or Liaison(s) of their issue and the Chair and/or Liaison(s) will work with the dissenting member to investigate the issue and to determine if there is sufficient support for the reconsideration to initiate a formal appeal process.

Note 2: It should be noted that ICANN also has other conflict resolution mechanisms available that could be considered in case any of the parties are dissatisfied with the outcome of this process.

Status Reporting:

As requested by the GNSO Council, taking into account the recommendation of the Council liaison(s) to the WG.

Problem/Issue Escalation & Resolution Processes:

The WG will adhere to ICANN's Expected Standards of Behavior as documented in Section F of the ICANN Accountability and Transparency Frameworks and Principles, January 2008.

If a WG member feels that these standards are being abused, the affected party should appeal first to the Chair and Liaison(s) and, if unsatisfactorily resolved, to the Chair of the CO or their designated representative. It is important to emphasize that expressed disagreement is not, by itself, grounds for abusive behavior. It should also be taken into account that as a result of cultural differences and language barriers, statements may appear disrespectful or inappropriate to some but are not necessarily intended as

such. However, it is expected that WG members make every effort to respect the principles outlined in ICANN's Expected Standards of Behavior as referenced above.

The Chair, in consultation with the CO liaison(s), is empowered to restrict the participation of someone who seriously disrupts the Working Group. Any such restriction will be reviewed by the CO. Generally, the participant should first be warned privately, and then warned publicly before such a restriction is put into place. In extreme circumstances, this requirement may be bypassed.

Any WG member that believes that his/her contributions are being systematically ignored or discounted or wants to appeal a decision of the WG or CO should first discuss the circumstances with the WG Chair. In the event that the matter cannot be resolved satisfactorily, the WG member should request an opportunity to discuss the situation with the Chair of the CO or their designated representative.

In addition, if any member of the WG is of the opinion that someone is not performing their role according to the criteria outlined in this Charter, the same appeals process may be invoked.

Closure & Working Group Self-Assessment:

The WG will close upon the delivery of the Final Report, unless assigned additional tasks or follow-up by the GNSO Council.

Section V: Charter Document History

Version	Date	Description

Staff Contact:	Mary Wong	Email:	Policy-staff@icann.org

Translations: If translations will be provided please indicate the languages below:											

Annex B – Request for Constituency / Stakeholder Group Statements

Stakeholder Group / Constituency / Input Template

Privacy & Proxy Services Accreditation Issues PDP Working Group

---

PLEASE SUBMIT YOUR RESPONSE AT THE LATEST BY **FRIDAY 28 FEBRUARY 2014** TO THE GNSO SECRETARIAT (gnso.secretariat@gnso.icann.org), which will forward your statement to the Working Group.

The GNSO Council has formed a Working Group of interested stakeholders and Stakeholder Group / Constituency representatives, to collaborate broadly with knowledgeable individuals and organizations, in order to consider recommendations in relation to Privacy & Proxy Services Accreditation Issues.

Part of the Working Group's effort will be to incorporate ideas and suggestions gathered from Stakeholder Groups and Constituencies through this template statement that contains questions that the GNSO asked the WG to address. Inserting your responses in this form will make it much easier for the WG to summarize the responses. We have categorized the items in the hope that it adds clarity.

This information will be helpful to the community in understanding the points of view of various stakeholders. Please answer as many questions as you can. In addition, please feel free to add any information you deem important to inform the Working Group's deliberations, even if this does not fit into any of the questions listed below.

A short list of definitions that the Working Group hopes your Stakeholder Group/Constituency will find helpful follows after the list of questions. For further information, please visit the Working Group's Workspace (see https://community.icann.org/x/9iCfAg).

Questions from the Working Group Charter:

I. MAIN ISSUES

1. What, if any, are the types of Standard Service Practices that should be adopted and published by ICANN-accredited privacy/proxy service providers?
2. Should ICANN distinguish between privacy and proxy services for the purpose of the accreditation process?
3. What are the contractual obligations, if any, that if unfulfilled would justify termination of customer access by ICANN-accredited privacy/proxy service providers?
4. What types of services should be covered, and would be the forms of non-compliance that would trigger cancellation or suspension of registrations?
5. What are the effects of the privacy and proxy service specification contained in the 2013 RAA? Have these new requirements improved WHOIS quality, registrant contactability and service usability?
6. What should be the contractual obligations of ICANN accredited registrars with regard to accredited privacy/proxy service providers? Should registrars be permitted to knowingly accept registrations where the registrant is using unaccredited service providers that are however bound to the same standards as accredited service providers?

II. MAINTENANCE

1. Should ICANN-accredited privacy/proxy service providers be required to label WHOIS entries to clearly show when a registration is made through a privacy/proxy service?
2. Should ICANN-accredited privacy/proxy service providers be required to conduct periodic checks to ensure accuracy of customer contact information; and if so, how?
3. What rights and responsibilities should customers of privacy/proxy services have? What obligations should ICANN-accredited privacy/proxy service providers have in managing these rights and responsibilities? Clarify how transfers, renewals, and PEDNR policies should apply.
4. Should ICANN-accredited privacy/proxy service providers distinguish between domain names used for commercial vs. personal purposes? Specifically, is the use of privacy/proxy services appropriate when a domain name is registered for commercial purposes?
5. Should there be a difference in the data fields to be displayed if the domain name is registered or used for a commercial purpose, or by a commercial entity instead of a natural person?
6. Should the use of privacy/proxy services be restricted only to registrants who are private individuals using the domain name for non-commercial purposes?

III. CONTACT

1. What measures should be taken to ensure contactability and responsiveness of the providers?
2. Should ICANN-accredited privacy/proxy service providers be required to maintain dedicated points of contact for reporting abuse? If so, should the terms be consistent with the requirements

applicable to registrars under Section 3.18 of the RAA?
3. Should full WHOIS contact details for ICANN-accredited privacy/proxy service providers be required?
4. What are the forms of alleged malicious conduct, if any, that would be covered by a designated published point of contact at an ICANN-accredited privacy/proxy service provider?

IV. RELAY

1. What, if any, are the baseline minimum standardized relay processes that should be adopted by ICANN-accredited privacy/proxy service providers?
2. Should ICANN-accredited privacy/proxy service providers be required to forward to the customer all allegations of illegal activities they receive relating to specific domain names of the customer?

V. REVEAL

1. What, if any, are the baseline minimum standardized reveal processes that should be adopted by ICANN-accredited privacy/proxy service providers?
2. Should ICANN-accredited privacy/proxy service providers be required to reveal customer identities for the specific purpose of ensuring timely service of cease and desist letters?
3. What forms of alleged malicious conduct, if any, and what evidentiary standard would be sufficient to trigger such disclosure? What specific alleged violations, if any, would be sufficient to trigger such publication?
4. What safeguards must be put in place to ensure adequate protections for privacy and freedom of expression?
5. What safeguards or remedies should be available in cases where publication is found to have been unwarranted?
6. What circumstances, if any, would warrant access to registrant data by law enforcement agencies?
7. What clear, workable, enforceable and standardized processes should be adopted by ICANN-accredited privacy/proxy services in order to regulate such access (if such access is warranted)?

Other information/Suggestions:

****

LIST OF RELEVANT DEFINITIONS

(1) Privacy & Proxy Services

The following definitions are those used by the GNSO in the various WHOIS studies that it commissioned between 2010-2012 (http://gnso.icann.org/issues/whois/whois-working-definitions-study-terms-18feb09.pdf):

- ***Privacy services*** hide customer details from going into WHOIS. Privacy service providers, which may include registrars and resellers, may offer alternate contact information and mail forwarding services while not actually shielding the domain name registrant's identity. By shielding the user in these ways, these services are promoted as a means of protecting personal privacy, free speech and human rights and avoiding personal data misuse.

- ***Proxy services*** protect users' privacy by having a third-party register the name. The third-party is most often the proxy service itself. The third-party allows the user to access and use the domain name through a separate agreement or some other arrangement directly with the user. Proxy service providers may include web design, law, and marketing firms; web hosts, registrar subsidiaries, resellers and individuals.

NOTE: The 2013 Registrar Accreditation Agreement contains a temporary specification relating to Privacy & Proxy Services (http://www.icann.org/en/resources/registrars/raa/approved-with-specs-27jun13-en.pdf), which refers to these services as follows:

> 1.1 "P/P Customer" means, regardless of the terminology used by the P/P Provider, the licensee, customer, beneficial user, beneficiary, or other recipient of Privacy Services and Proxy Services.
>
> 1.2 "Privacy Service" is a service by which a Registered Name is registered to its beneficial user as the Registered Name Holder, but for which alternative, reliable contact information is provided by the P/P Provider for display of the Registered Name Holder's contact information in the Registration Data Service (WHOIS) or equivalent services.
>
> 1.3 "Proxy Service" is a service through which a Registered Name Holder licenses use of a Registered Name to the P/P Customer in order to provide the P/P Customer use of the domain name, and the Registered Name Holder's contact information is displayed in the Registration

Data Service (WHOIS) or equivalent services rather than the P/P Customer's contact information.

1.4 "P/P Provider" or "Service Provider" is the provider of Privacy/Proxy Services, including Registrar and its Affiliates, as applicable.

(2) Relay & Reveal Requests

The following descriptions are taken from the GNSO's Terms of Reference for a proposed Proxy & Privacy Relay & Reveal Study in 2010 (http://gnso.icann.org/issues/whois/whois-proxy-privacy-relay-reveal-studies-tor-29sep10-en.pdf):

- For many domains, Registered Name Holders can be reached directly at addresses obtained from WHOIS. However, for Privacy/Proxy-registered domains, Registered Name Holders or third party licensees cannot be reached directly via WHOIS- published addresses. Instead, ***communication relay requests*** may be sent to the Privacy/Proxy service provider published in WHOIS, or attempted using addresses obtained from other sources, websites or communications associated with the domain.

- For many domains (including those registered via Privacy services), the Registered Name Holder's identity is published directly in WHOIS. However, for domains registered via Proxy services, the name of the licensee is not published in WHOIS; third party licensees can typically only be identified by ***asking the Proxy to reveal the licensee's identity***, given reasonable evidence of actionable harm.

Annex C – Request for Input from other ICANN SO / ACs

Dear SO/AC Chair,

As you may be aware, the GNSO Council recently initiated a Policy Development Process (PDP) on Privacy & Proxy Services Accreditation Issues. As part of its efforts to obtain input from the broader ICANN Community at an early stage of its deliberations, the Working Group that has begun to explore questions related to these issues is looking for any input or information that may help inform our deliberations.

Below you will find an overview of the issues that the WG has been assigned to address in its charter. We would appreciate it very much if you would examine the items and provide any input that your group may have to the GNSO Secretariat (gnso.secretariat@gnso.icann.org) by **Friday 28 February 2014**. If you cannot submit your input by that date, but your group would like to contribute, please let us know when we can expect to receive your contribution so that we can plan accordingly. While we would like your thoughts on all items, responses to a subset still will be helpful. Please feel free also to suggest modifications to or additional questions that your group believes useful for the WG to address.

Your input will be valuable for informing the WG as we begin our work. We have included a list of relevant definitions at the end of this document in the hope that they will be of assistance to your group in providing input. For further background information on our WG's activities to date and to follow our work as we move forward, see https://community.icann.org/x/9iCfAg.

With best regards,

Don Blumenthal, Chair of the Privacy & Proxy Services Accreditation Issues PDP Working Group

QUESTIONS FOR WHICH THE WG WAS CHARTERED AND IS SEEKING INPUT

This RAA PDP Working Group (WG) was created to provide the GNSO Council with policy recommendations regarding the issues identified during the 2013 RAA negotiations, including recommendations made by law enforcement and GNSO working groups, that were not addressed during the 2013 RAA negotiations but are otherwise suited for a PDP. These issues focus on the accreditation of Privacy & Proxy Services.

As part of its deliberations on the matter, the RAA PDP WG was asked to, at a minimum, consider those issues detailed in the Staff Briefing Paper published on 16 September 2013 and included in the WG Charter (see https://community.icann.org/display/gnsopnpsrvaccrdtwg/WG+Charter). The WG has organized the questions in the hope that it adds clarity.

I. MAIN ISSUES

7. What, if any, are the types of Standard Service Practices that should be adopted and published by ICANN-accredited privacy/proxy service providers?
8. Should ICANN distinguish between privacy and proxy services for the purpose of the accreditation process?
9. What are the contractual obligations, if any, that if unfulfilled would justify termination of customer access by ICANN-accredited privacy/proxy service providers?
10. What types of services should be covered, and would be the forms of non-compliance that would trigger cancellation or suspension of registrations?
11. What are the effects of the privacy and proxy service specification contained in the 2013 RAA? Have these new requirements improved WHOIS quality, registrant contactability and service usability?
12. What should be the contractual obligations of ICANN accredited registrars with regard to accredited privacy/proxy service providers? Should registrars be permitted to knowingly accept registrations where the registrant is using unaccredited service providers that are however bound to the same standards as accredited service providers?

II. MAINTENANCE

7. Should ICANN-accredited privacy/proxy service providers be required to label WHOIS entries to clearly show when a registration is made through a privacy/proxy service?
8. Should ICANN-accredited privacy/proxy service providers be required to conduct periodic checks to ensure accuracy of customer contact information; and if so, how?
9. What rights and responsibilities should customers of privacy/proxy services have? What obligations should ICANN-accredited privacy/proxy service providers have in managing these rights and responsibilities? Clarify how transfers, renewals, and PEDNR policies should apply.

10. Should ICANN-accredited privacy/proxy service providers distinguish between domain names used for commercial vs. personal purposes? Specifically, is the use of privacy/proxy services appropriate when a domain name is registered for commercial purposes?
11. Should there be a difference in the data fields to be displayed if the domain name is registered or used for a commercial purpose, or by a commercial entity instead of a natural person?
12. Should the use of privacy/proxy services be restricted only to registrants who are private individuals using the domain name for non-commercial purposes?

III. CONTACT

1. What measures should be taken to ensure contactability and responsiveness of the providers?
2. Should ICANN-accredited privacy/proxy service providers be required to maintain dedicated points of contact for reporting abuse? If so, should the terms be consistent with the requirements applicable to registrars under Section 3.18 of the RAA?
3. Should full WHOIS contact details for ICANN-accredited privacy/proxy service providers be required?
4. What are the forms of alleged malicious conduct, if any, that would be covered by a designated published point of contact at an ICANN-accredited privacy/proxy service provider?

IV. RELAY

3. What, if any, are the baseline minimum standardized relay processes that should be adopted by ICANN-accredited privacy/proxy service providers?
4. Should ICANN-accredited privacy/proxy service providers be required to forward to the customer all allegations of illegal activities they receive relating to specific domain names of the customer?

V. REVEAL

8. What, if any, are the baseline minimum standardized reveal processes that should be adopted by ICANN-accredited privacy/proxy service providers?
9. Should ICANN-accredited privacy/proxy service providers be required to reveal customer identities for the specific purpose of ensuring timely service of cease and desist letters?
10. What forms of alleged malicious conduct, if any, and what evidentiary standard would be sufficient to trigger such disclosure? What specific alleged violations, if any, would be sufficient to trigger such publication?
11. What safeguards must be put in place to ensure adequate protections for privacy and freedom of expression?
12. What safeguards or remedies should be available in cases where publication is found to have been unwarranted?
13. What circumstances, if any, would warrant access to registrant data by law enforcement agencies?
14. What clear, workable, enforceable and standardized processes should be adopted by ICANN-

accredited privacy/proxy services in order to regulate such access (if such access is warranted)?

LIST OF RELEVANT DEFINITIONS

(3) Privacy & Proxy Services

The following definitions are those used by the GNSO in the various WHOIS studies it commissioned between 2010-2012 (http://gnso.icann.org/issues/whois/whois-working-definitions-study-terms-18feb09.pdf):

- ***Privacy services*** hide customer details from going into WHOIS. Privacy service providers, which may include registrars and resellers, may offer alternate contact information and mail forwarding services while not actually shielding the domain name registrant's identity. By shielding the user in these ways, these services are promoted as a means of protecting personal privacy, free speech and human rights and avoiding personal data misuse.

- ***Proxy services*** protect users' privacy by having a third-party register the name. The third-party is most often the proxy service itself. The third-party allows the user to access and use the domain name through a separate agreement or some other arrangement directly with the user. Proxy service providers may include web design, law, and marketing firms; web hosts, registrar subsidiaries, resellers and individuals.

NOTE: The 2013 Registrar Accreditation Agreement contains a temporary specification relating to Privacy & Proxy Services, which refers to these services as follows (http://www.icann.org/en/resources/registrars/raa/approved-with-specs-27jun13-en.pdf):

> 1.1 "P/P Customer" means, regardless of the terminology used by the P/P Provider, the licensee, customer, beneficial user, beneficiary, or other recipient of Privacy Services and Proxy Services.
>
> 1.2 "Privacy Service" is a service by which a Registered Name is registered to its beneficial user as the Registered Name Holder, but for which alternative, reliable contact information is provided by the P/P Provider for display of the Registered Name Holder's contact information in the Registration Data Service (WHOIS) or equivalent services.
>
> 1.3 "Proxy Service" is a service through which a Registered Name Holder licenses use of a Registered Name to the P/P Customer in order to provide the P/P Customer use of the domain name, and the Registered Name Holder's contact information is displayed in the Registration Data Service (WHOIS) or equivalent services rather than the P/P Customer's contact information.

1.4 "P/P Provider" or "Service Provider" is the provider of Privacy/Proxy Services, including Registrar and its Affiliates, as applicable.

(4) Relay & Reveal Requests

The following descriptions are taken from the GNSO's Terms of Reference for a proposed Proxy & Privacy Relay & Reveal Study in 2010 (http://gnso.icann.org/issues/whois/whois-proxy-privacy-relay-reveal-studies-tor-29sep10-en.pdf):

- For many domains, Registered Name Holders can be reached directly at addresses obtained from WHOIS. However, for Privacy/Proxy-registered domains, Registered Name Holders or third party licensees cannot be reached directly via WHOIS- published addresses. Instead, ***communication relay requests*** may be sent to the Privacy/Proxy service provider published in WHOIS, or attempted using addresses obtained from other sources, websites or communications associated with the domain.

- For many domains (including those registered via Privacy services), the Registered Name Holder's identity is published directly in WHOIS. However, for domains registered via Proxy services, the name of the licensee is not published in WHOIS; third party licensees can typically only be identified by ***asking the Proxy to reveal the licensee's identity***, given reasonable evidence of actionable harm.

Annex D – 2013 RAA Interim Privacy / Proxy Specification

Until the earlier to occur of (i) January 1, 2017, and (ii) the date ICANN establishes and implements a Privacy and Proxy Accreditation Program as referenced in Section 3.14 of the Registrar Accreditation Agreement, Registrar agrees to comply, and to require its Affiliates and Resellers to comply, with the terms of this Specification, provided that ICANN and the Working Group may mutually agree to extend the term of this Specification. This Specification may not be modified by ICANN or Registrar.

1. Definitions. For the purposes of this Specification, the following definitions shall apply.

   1.1 "P/P Customer" means, regardless of the terminology used by the P/P Provider, the licensee, customer, beneficial user, beneficiary, or other recipient of Privacy Services and Proxy Services.

   1.2 "Privacy Service" is a service by which a Registered Name is registered to its beneficial user as the Registered Name Holder, but for which alternative, reliable contact information is provided by the P/P Provider for display of the Registered Name Holder's contact information in the Registration Data Service (Whois) or equivalent services.

   1.3 "Proxy Service" is a service through which a Registered Name Holder licenses use of a Registered Name to the P/P Customer in order to provide the P/P Customer use of the domain name, and the Registered Name Holder's contact information is displayed in the Registration Data Service (Whois) or equivalent services rather than the P/P Customer's contact information.

   1.4 "P/P Provider" or "Service Provider" is the provider of Privacy/Proxy Services, including Registrar and its Affiliates, as applicable.

2. Obligations of Registrar. For any Proxy Service or Privacy Service offered by the Registrar or its Affiliates, including any of Registrar's or its Affiliates' P/P services distributed through Resellers, and used in connection with Registered Names Sponsored by the Registrar, the Registrar and its Affiliates must require all P/P Providers to follow the requirements described in this Specification and to abide by the terms and procedures published pursuant to this Specification.

   2.1 Disclosure of Service Terms. P/P Provider shall publish the terms and conditions of its service (including pricing), on its website and/or Registrar's website.

   2.2 Abuse/Infringement Point of Contact. P/P Provider shall publish a point of contact for third parties wishing to report abuse or infringement of trademarks (or other rights).

   2.3 Disclosure of Identity of P/P Provider. P/P Provider shall publish its business contact information on its website and/or Registrar's website.

2.4 Terms of service and description of procedures. The P/P Provider shall publish on its website and/or Registrar's website a copy of the P/P Provider service agreement and description of P/P Provider's procedures for handling the following:

2.4.1 The process or facilities to report abuse of a domain name registration managed by the P/P Provider;

2.4.2 The process or facilities to report infringement of trademarks or other rights of third parties;

2.4.3 The circumstances under which the P/P Provider will relay communications from third parties to the P/P Customer;

2.4.4 The circumstances under which the P/P Provider will terminate service to the P/P Customer;

2.4.5 The circumstances under which the P/P Provider will reveal and/or publish in the Registration Data Service (Whois) or equivalent service the P/P Customer's identity and/or contact data; and

2.4.6 A description of the support services offered by P/P Providers to P/P Customers, and how to access these services.

2.5 Escrow of P/P Customer Information. Registrar shall include P/P Customer contact information in its Registration Data Escrow deposits required by Section 3.6 of the Agreement. P/P Customer Information escrowed pursuant to this Section 2.5 of this Specification may only be accessed by ICANN in the event of the termination of the Agreement or in the event Registrar ceases business operations.

3. Exemptions. Registrar is under no obligation to comply with the requirements of this specification if it can be shown that:

3.1 Registered Name Holder employed the services of a P/P Provider that is not provided by Registrar, or any of its Affiliates;

3.2 Registered Name Holder licensed a Registered Name to another party (i.e., is acting as a Proxy Service) without Registrar's knowledge; or

3.3 Registered Name Holder has used P/P Provider contact data without subscribing to the service or accepting the P/P Provider terms and conditions.

Annex E – Illustrative Draft Disclosure Framework for Intellectual Property Rights-holders

Policy Purpose:

By facilitating direct communication among Requesters, Service Providers, and Customers, this policy serves the public interest and seeks to strike an appropriate balance among the interests of all parties concerned. It aims to provide Requesters a higher degree of certainty and predictability as to if, when and how they could obtain what level of disclosure; to preserve for service providers a sufficient degree of flexibility and discretion in acting upon requests for disclosure; and to include reasonable safeguards and procedures to protect the legitimate interests and legal rights of customers of accredited proxy/privacy service providers.

Policy Scope:

The following procedures were developed by the Working Group to apply to requests made by intellectual property rights-holders or their authorized representatives. The WG has not developed a similarly detailed process for other types of Requesters, e.g. law enforcement authorities or consumer protection agencies.

Given the balance that this Policy attempts to strike~~s~~, evidence of the use of high volume, automated electronic processes for sending Requests or responses thereto (without first being subjected to human review) to the systems of any of the parties involved (Requesters, Service Providers, or Customers) by any of the parties in performing any of the steps in the processes outlined herein shall create a rebuttable presumption of non-compliance with this Policy.

I. Service Provider Process for Intake of Requests

A. Service Provider will establish and publish a point of contact for submitting complaints that registration or use of a domain name for which the Service Provider provides privacy/proxy service infringes copyright or trademark rights of the Requester. The point of contact shall

enable all the following information (in II below) to be submitted electronically, whether via e-mail, through a web submission form, or similar means. Telephonic point of contact may also be provided.

B. [Nothing in this document prevents a Service Provider from] [Service Provider is encouraged, but not required, to] implement measures to optimize or manage access to the Request submission process. This could include:
   i. Requiring Requesters to register themselves and/or their organizations with Service Provider.
   ii. Authenticating complaint submissions as originating from a registered Requester (e.g., log-in, use of pre-identified e-mail address).
   iii. Assessing a standardized nominal cost-recovery fee for processing complaint submissions, or to maintain Requester account so long as this does not serve as an unreasonable barrier to access to the process.
   iv. Qualifying Requesters meeting certain reliable criteria as "trusted Requesters" whose requests would be subject to a streamlined process.
   v. Revoking or blocking Requester access to the submission tool for egregious abuse of the tool or system, including submission of frivolous or harassing requests, or numerous requests that are identical, i.e., that concern the same domain name, the same intellectual property, and the same Requester.

C. Nothing in this document prevents Service Providers from sharing information with one another regarding Requesters who have been revoked or blocked from their systems or who have engaged in misconduct under this Policy, including frivolous or harassing requests.

D. Nothing in this document prevents a Service Provider from adopting and implementing policies to publish the contact details of Customers in Whois, or to terminate privacy and proxy service to a Customer, for breach of Service Provider's published Terms of Service, or on other grounds stated in the published Terms of Service, even if the criteria outlined in this document for a Request have not been met.

II. Request templates for Disclosure

A. Where a domain name allegedly infringes a trademark

Requester provides to Service Provider:

1) The domain name that allegedly infringes the trademark;
2) Evidence of previous use of a relay function (compliant with the relevant section of accreditation standards regarding Relay) to attempt to contact the Customer regarding the subject matter of the request, and of any responses thereto;
3) Full name, physical address, email address, and telephone number of the trademark owner, and for legal entities, the country where incorporated or organized;
4) Authorized legal contact for trademark owner and his/her name, title, law firm, if outside counsel, physical address, email address and telephone number for contact purposes;
5) The trademark, the trademark registration number, links to the national trademark register where the mark is registered (or a representative sample of such registers in the case of an internationally registered mark), showing that the registration is currently in force; and
6) A good faith statement, either under penalty of perjury or notarized or accompanied by sworn statement[57] ("Versicherung an Eides statt"), from either the trademark holder or an authorized representative of the trademark holder, that —:
    a) provides a basis for reasonably believing that the use of the trademark in the domain name -
        i. allegedly infringes the trademark holder's rights and
        ii. is not defensible; and
    b) states that Requester will use Customer's contact details only -
        i. to determine whether further action is warranted to resolve the issue;
        ii. to attempt to contact Customer regarding the issue; and/or
        iii. in a legal proceeding concerning the issue.

[57] TO BE DETERMINED: Mechanism for resolving provider claims of false statements/misrepresentations. See Annex 1 for two options discussed by the Working Group.

7) Where the signatory is not the rights holder, he/she must attest that he/she is an authorized representative of the rights holder, capable and qualified to evaluate and address the matters involved in this request, and having the authority to make the representations and claims on behalf of the rights holder in the request, including the authority to bind the rights holder to the limitations on the use of Customer data once disclosed[58].

8) Where the signatory is not the rights holder, an officer of the rights holder (if a corporate entity) or an attorney of the rights holder, and the Provider has a reasonable basis to believe that the Requester is unauthorized to act on behalf of the rights holder or seeks to verify a new or unknown Requester, the Provider may request, and the Requester shall provide, sufficient proof of authorization.

B. Domain name resolves to website where copyright is allegedly infringed

Requester provides to Service Provider:

1) The exact URL where the allegedly infringing content is located;
2) Evidence of previous use of a relay function (compliant with the relevant section of accreditation standards regarding Relay) to attempt to contact the Customer with regard to the subject matter of the request, and of any responses thereto. Requesters are also encouraged (but not required under this Policy) to provide evidence of previous attempts to contact the web host or the domain name registrar with regard to the subject matter of the request, and of any responses thereto;
3) Full name, physical address, email address, and telephone number of the copyright owner; and for legal entities, the country where incorporated or organized;
4) Authorized legal contact for copyright owner and his/her name, law firm, if outside counsel, physical address, email address and telephone number for contact purposes;

[58] An example of such an attestation: "I attest that I am the rights holder / authorized representative of the rights holder, capable and qualified to evaluate and address the matters involved in this request, and have the authority to make the representations and claims in this request." The same attestation statement can also be used in situations arising under Section II.B(8) and Section II.C(7), below.

5) Information reasonably sufficient to identify the copyrighted work, which may include, where applicable, the copyright registration number, and the country where the copyright is registered;
6) The exact URL where the original content is located (if online content) or where the claim can be verified; and
7) A good faith statement, either under penalty of perjury or notarized or accompanied by sworn statement ("Versicherung an Eides statt"),[59] from either the copyright holder or an authorized representative of the copyright holder —:
    a) Providing a basis for reasonably believing that the use of the copyright content on the website
        i. infringes the copyright holder's rights and
        ii. is not defensible;
    b) Providing a basis for reasonably believing that the copyright protection extends to the locale the website targets; and
    c) Stating that Requester will use Customer's contact details only
        i. to determine whether further action is warranted to resolve the issue;
        ii. to attempt to contact Customer regarding the issue; and/or
        iii. in a legal proceeding concerning the issue.
8) Where the signatory is not the rights holder, he/she must attest that he/she is an authorized representative of the rights holder, capable and qualified to evaluate and address the matters involved in this request, and having the authority to make the representations and claims on behalf of the rights holder in the request, including the authority to bind the rights holder to the limitations on the use of Customer data once disclosed.
9) Where the signatory is not the rights holder, an officer of the rights holder (if a corporate entity) or an attorney of the rights holder, and the Provider has a reasonable basis to believe that the Requester is unauthorized to act on behalf of the rights holder or seeks to verify a new or unknown Requester, the Provider may request, and the Requester shall provide, sufficient proof of authorization.

[59] TO BE DETERMINED: Mechanism for resolving provider claims of false statements/misrepresentations. See Annex 1 for two options discussed by the Working Group.

C. Domain name resolves to website where trademark is allegedly infringed

Requester provides to Service Provider:

1) The exact URL where the allegedly infringing content is located;
2) Evidence of previous use of a relay function (compliant with the relevant section of accreditation standards regarding Relay) to attempt to contact the Customer with regard to the subject matter of the request, and of any responses thereto. Requesters are also encouraged (but not required under this Policy) to provide evidence of previous attempts to contact the web host or the domain name registrar with regard to the subject matter of the request, and of any responses thereto;
3) Full name, physical address, email address, and telephone number of the trademark owner; and for legal entities, the country where incorporated or organized;
4) Authorized legal contact for trademark owner and his/her name, law firm, if outside counsel, physical address, email address and telephone number for contact purposes;
5) The trademark, the trademark registration number, links to the national trademark register where the mark is registered (or a representative sample of such registers in the case of an internationally registered mark), showing that the registration is currently in force; and
6) A good faith statement, either under penalty of perjury or notarized or accompanied by sworn statement ("Versicherung an Eides statt"),[60] from either the trademark holder or an authorized representative of the trademark holder —:
    a) Providing a reasonable basis for believing that the use of the trademark on the website
        i. infringes the trademark holder's rights and
        ii. is not defensible; and
    b) Stating that Requester will use Customer's contact details only
        i. to determine whether further action is warranted to resolve the issue;
        ii. to attempt to contact Customer regarding the issue; and/or
        iii. in a legal proceeding concerning the issue.
7) Where the signatory is not the rights holder, he/she must attest that he/she is an authorized representative of the rights holder, capable and qualified to evaluate and address the matters

[60] TO BE DETERMINED: Mechanism for resolving provider claims of false statements/misrepresentations. See Annex 1 for two options discussed by the Working Group.

involved in this request, and having the authority to make the representations and claims on behalf of the rights holder in the request, including the authority to bind the rights holder to the limitations on the use of Customer data once disclosed.

8) Where the signatory is not the rights holder, an officer of the rights holder (if a corporate entity) or an attorney of the rights holder, and the Provider has a reasonable basis to believe that the Requester is unauthorized to act on behalf of the rights holder or seeks to verify a new or unknown Requester, the Provider may request, and the Requester shall provide, sufficient proof of authorization.

III. Service Provider Action on Request

Upon receipt of the information set forth above in writing, Service Provider will take reasonable and prompt steps to investigate and respond appropriately to the request for disclosure, as follows:

A. Promptly notify the Customer about the complaint and disclosure request and request that the Customer respond to Service Provider within 15 calendar days. Provider shall advise the Customer that if the Customer believes there are legitimate reason(s) to object to disclosure, the Customer must disclose these reasons to the Provider and authorize the Provider to communicate such reason(s) to the Requester; and
B. Within x calendar days after receiving the Customer's response, or after the time for Customer's response has passed, Service Provider shall take one of the following actions:
    i. disclose to Requester the contact information it has for Customer that would ordinarily appear in the publicly accessible Whois for non-proxy/privacy registration; or
    ii. state to Requester in writing or by electronic communication its specific reasons for refusing to disclose.

In exceptional circumstances, if Provider requires additional time to respond to the Requester, Provider shall inform the Requester of the cause of the delay, and state a new date by which it will provide its response under this Section.

C. Disclosure can be reasonably refused, for reasons consistent with the general policy stated herein, including [without limitation] any of the following:

i. the Service Provider has already published Customer contact details in Whois as the result of termination of privacy and proxy service;
ii. the Customer has objected to the disclosure and has provided [[adequate] [sufficient] [compelling] reasons against disclosure, including without limitation a reasonable defense for its use of the trademark or copyrighted content in question] [a reasonable basis for believing (i) that it is not infringing the Requester's claimed intellectual property rights, and/or (ii) that its use of the claimed intellectual property is defensible];
iii. [the Provider has found [adequate] [sufficient] [compelling] reasons against disclosure] [the Provider has a reasonable basis for believing (i) that the Customer is not infringing the Requester's claimed intellectual property rights, and/or (ii) that the Customer's use of the claimed intellectual property is defensible];
iv. the Customer has surrendered its domain name registration in lieu of disclosure, if the Service Provider offers its Customers this option; or
v. that the Customer has provided, or the Provider has found, specific information, facts and/or circumstances showing that the Requester's trademark or copyright complaint is a pretext for obtaining the Customer's contact details by effecting removal of the privacy/proxy service for some other purpose unrelated to addressing the alleged infringement described in the Request.

D. Disclosure cannot be refused solely for lack of any of the following: (i) a court order; (ii) a subpoena; (iii) a pending civil action; or (iv) a UDRP or URS proceeding; nor can refusal to disclose be solely based on the fact that the request is founded on alleged intellectual property infringement in content on a website associated with the domain name.

E. For all refusals made in accordance with the policy and requirements herein, Service Provider must accept and give due consideration to Requester's requests for reconsideration of the refusal to disclose.

F. In the event of a final refusal to disclose by the Provider, Provider must participate in an ICANN-approved review process for determining whether the reason for refusal to disclose complies with the general policy stated above,[61] as appropriately limited to exceptional cases, and not to be used for every refusal; and which should be similarly accessible to the Customer for purposes of an appeal.

G. In the event that a Provider is alleged to have made a wrongful disclosure based on a Requester having provided false information, the Provider and Requester shall participate in an ICANN-approved dispute resolution process. A framework for such a review and dispute resolution process is outlined in Annex 1, below.

ANNEX I TO DISCLOSURE FRAMEWORK: TWO OPTIONS FOR RESOLVING DISPUTES ARISING FROM DISCLOSURES MADE AS A RESULT OF ALLEGEDLY IMPROPER REQUESTS

PRELIMINARY NOTE:

The following set of options were initially drafted to apply to instances where there may be a dispute as between a Provider and a Requester concerning wrongful disclosure of Customer contact details as a result of alleged false statements made by a Requester. However, following its deliberations, the Working Group has included language to cover situations where a disclosure was made properly but the Requester nonetheless misused the data disclosed to it, i.e. used the information beyond the scope of the specific purposes stated in the Policy.

Neither option below is intended to preclude any party from seeking other available remedies at law.

[61] The ICANN-approved dispute resolution provider will provide a neutral and impartial panelist who, after providing due notice to and opportunity to be heard by the Requester, the Service Provider, and the Customer, will determine promptly and confidentially, at minimal expense, whether disclosure should be made. In accordance with the general policy stated above, the dispute resolution provider shall order that disclosure be made if there is a reasonable basis for believing that the Customer has, as alleged, infringed upon the Requester's claimed rights in a manner that is not defensible. This Provider shall, as far as practicable, have extensive expertise in human rights law, including freedom of expression principles, as well as intellectual property, including principles concerning fair use and fair dealing.

OPTION #1

Arbitration:

Any controversy, claim or dispute arising between the Service Provider and the Requester as a result either of: (i) alleged wrongful disclosure by Provider of Customer's contact information; or (ii) alleged misuse by Requester of Customer's contact information shall be referred to and finally determined by a dispute-resolution service provider approved by ICANN, in accordance with standards established by ICANN.

Under these standards, disclosure is wrongful only when it is effected by the Requester having made knowingly false representations to the Provider. Disclosure is not wrongful if the Requester had a good faith basis for seeking disclosure at the time the Request was submitted to the Provider.

Under these standards, misuse occurs only when a Requester knowingly uses Customer contact information disclosed to it by a Service Provider for a purpose other than one of the specific purposes for which it had agreed to use such information (as listed in Section II.A(6), II.B(7), and II.C(6) of the Policy).

Judgment on an award rendered by the arbitrator(s) may be entered in any court having competent jurisdiction over the Requester.

OPTION #2:

Jurisdiction:

In making a submission to request disclosure of a Customer's contact information, Requester agrees to be bound by jurisdiction at the seat of the Service Provider for disputes arising from alleged improper disclosures caused by knowingly false statements made by the Requester, or from Requester's knowing misuse of information disclosed to it in response to its request.]

Annex F – Additional Statements

ADDITIONAL STATEMENT SUBMITTED BY KIRAN MALACHANRUVIL, ON BEHALF OF DOMAIN TOOLS, FACEBOOK INC., LEGITSCRIPT, MARKMONITOR and SMITH, GAMBRELL & RUSSELL LLP:

A number of PPSAI Working Group (WG) members assert that **Internet consumers should be able to determine with whom they are doing business via information in the domain name registration (Whois) record**, consistent with global law and policy**.** Throughout the WG process, these WG members raised concerns about the ability of domain name registrants who use domain names to sell products or services to conceal their identity and location in the domain name registration by use of privacy/proxy services. They argue the following in support of their position:

- **Requiring transparent WHOIS data for persons or entities engaged in commercial activity online is generally consistent with global law and policy.** A white paper authored by FWD Strategies International and LegitScript supports this claim. The paper analyzed six different jurisdiction's' laws, finding that in every each entities engaged in the sale of a product or service to the public must openly register or otherwise disclose their name, identity and location. ***This white paper was distributed to the PPSAI WG and is available here.***

- **Transparent information helps prevent malicious activity.** In the physical world, market participants gain information through storefronts, physical presence, and publicly available business information. For Internet-based activities, that information comes from the WHOIS registration data. Unlike the "contact us" section of a website, the WHOIS data must be accurate, otherwise the domain name may be subject to suspension, giving consumers a better, more accurate way of evaluating the online business.

- **Policy on use of privacy/proxy services should balance personal privacy and consumer rights**. On the one hand, domain names used for non-transactional purposes (e.g. blogs, information pages, etc.) should be permitted to utilize privacy/proxy registrations, whether the registrant is

a private or legal person. This reflects a fundamental right to privacy of registrants not engaged in commerce. However, the same right does not exist for registrants of websites engaged in active commerce.

The members of the WG that submitted this Additional Statement therefore desire public comment on the issue of encouraging transparent, non-anonymous WHOIS data for persons and entities engaged in active transactional commercial activity and provides the above-referenced white paper as background for consideration.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENT SUBMITTED BY KATHY KLEIMAN, ON BEHALF OF HERSELF, STEPHANIE PERRIN, DAVID CAKE AND JAMES GANNON (MEMBERS OF THE NON-COMMERCIAL STAKEHOLDERS GROUP):

We respectfully submit that Section 1.3.3, 1.3.3, **Specific Topics on which there is currently no consensus within the WG**, of this PPSAI Executive Summary and Interim Report is incomplete. There are a number of topics on which there is currently no consensus within the WG and which need considerable work. These are issues well known and deeply discussed.

For the purposes of clarity and to lend depth to the comments and discussion to come, we submit this statement of how we would like to see Section 1.3.3 written.

1.3.3, **Specific Topics on which there is currently no consensus within the WG**

1.3.3.1 REVEAL

The WG's has not yet reached final preliminary conclusions on key details of its "Reveal" recommendations (See Annex E of the Interim Report). There are many details still under discussion and for which the WG has not reached consensus. These include:

- What remedies should a Customer be allowed in the event that a Reveal Request was falsely made or the data was improperly used (current recommendations provide mechanism only for Provider action)?
- Should Requestors be allowed to escalate each and every rejection of a Reveal Request to a 3rd party forum, or should the WG seek to adopt reasonable standards and thresholds for such appeals to avoid unnecessary and time-consuming appeals? (Note: a Request for Reconsideration is already a part of the recommended process the WG has agreed to by consensus.)
- What rights and protections should a Customer be allowed and encouraged to forth in her/his/its own defense to provide a reasonable defense for maintaining her/his/its privacy, even in the face of a copyright or trademark infringement allegation?

- How can Customers be protected from extraterritorial requests from Law Enforcement from outside their country, when the use of their domain name is for legal purposes in their own country, but perhaps purposes deemed illegal in other countries [Note: even Interpol refuses to act across national lines in matters of political, military, religious and racial issues because of the enormous differences of law. Article 3, Interpol Constitution]

Input and comments would be helpful on these issues.

1.3.3.2 THE COMPLEXITIES OF INTRUDING INTO NATIONAL LAW

Although the WG agreed that the mere fact that a domain name is registered by a commercial entity or by anyone conducting commercial activity should not preclude the use of P/P services[62][1], there was disagreement over whether domain names that are actively used for commercial transactions (e.g. the sale or exchange of goods or services) should be prohibited from using P/P services.

While **most WG members** did not believe such a prohibition is necessary or practical, some members believed that registrants of such domain names should not be able to use or continue using proxy or privacy services. [1]

Other members of the WG noted that fundraising and membership drives are often performed by the very groups and organizations seeking privacy/proxy registration for protection, including minority political groups, minority religious organizations, ethnic groups, organizations committed to change of racial policies, gender orientation groups, and publications engaged in freedom of expression. These groups and their representatives note that, in the laws of their countries, the mere collection of a donation or membership fee does not change their status from "non-commercial" to commercial. Others noted that "non-profit" status is limited to only a few countries.

Further, many of organizations, small businesses, home-based businesses (including those run by mothers and seniors) conduct their financial transactions through 3rd party e-commerce companies, such as PayPal, and thus *are not processing the financial transactions directly*. Accordingly, many

[1] The WG notes that the WHOIS RT had specifically acknowledged that P/P services can be and are used to address legitimate interests, both commercial and non-commercial.

members in the WG submit there is no reason to breach the proxy/privacy of organizations and businesses purely and solely for this reason.

Many members many in the WG submit that content regulation is far beyond the scope of ICANN and properly the scope of national laws – some of which has taken initiatives in this area which are clearly defined and properly limited in scope and application (e.g., Germany).

For those that argued that it is necessary and practical to limit access to P/P services to exclude commercial entities, the following text was proposed to clarify and define their position: "domains used for online financial transactions for commercial purpose should be ineligible for privacy and proxy registrations."

This suggestion has been debated strongly by the members of the WG and has not reached consensus as others submitted that:

> "Attempting to distinguish the end purposes of a domain registration is not practicable for the purposes of determining eligibility for privacy/proxy services, and will unfairly discriminate against vulnerable groups, entrepreneurs, small businesses and organizations who wish to exercise their rights of freedom of expression rights on the Internet.

Input requested on the full issues, including questions below:

- Should registrants of domain names associated with commercial activities and which are used for online financial transactions be prohibited from using, or continuing to use, privacy and proxy services?

Is this type of content regulation outside of ICANN's scope and mandate and the proper province of national law?