|  |
| --- |
| EPDP TEam Work Sheet |
|  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Topic** | **Last updated** | **Work Track / Area** |
| Display of information of affiliated vs. accredited privacy / proxy providers | 3 April 2019 | 2 |

|  |
| --- |
| Issue description and/or charter questions |
|  |

As part of phase 1, the EPDP Team made the following recommendation: “In the case of a domain name registration where an "affiliated" privacy/proxy service used (e.g. where data

associated with a natural person is masked), Registrar (and Registry where applicable) MUST include in the public RDDS and return in response to any query full non-personal RDDS data of the privacy/proxy service, which MAY also include the existing privacy/proxy pseudonymized email.

Note, PPSAI is an approved policy that is currently going through implementation. It will be important to understand the interplay between the display of information of affiliated vs. accredited privacy / proxy providers. Based on feedback received on this topic from the PPSAI IRT, the EPDP Team may consider this further in phase 2”.

|  |
| --- |
| EXPECTED DEliverable |
|  |

Confirmation that either the display of information of an affiliated vs. accredited privacy / proxy providers is addressed in the context of the implementation of PPSAI or a recommendation that confirms how accredited privacy / proxy providers could/should be identified in the public RDDS.

|  |
| --- |
| legal questions |
|  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Question** | **Status** | **Owner** |
| None at this stage |  |  |
|  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Required reading |
|  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Description** | **Link** | **Required because** |
| Final Report on the Privacy & Proxy Services Accreditation Issues Policy Development Process | <https://gnso.icann.org/en/issues/raa/ppsai-final-07dec15-en.pdf> | Overview of policy recommendations |
| Draft implementation plan / framework | <https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/62397817/PP_MemoForIRT.pdf?version=1&modificationDate=1476455832000&api=v2> | Overview of proposed implementation that may provide insight into whether this issue is addressed by the proposed implementation |

|  |
| --- |
| Briefings to be provided |
|  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Topic** | **Possible presenters** | **Important because** |
| TBD (dependent on outcome of next entry) |  |  |
|  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| dependencies |
|  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Describe dependency** | **Dependent on** | **Expected or recommended timing** |
| PPSAI IRT to confirm whether the display of information of an affiliated vs. accredited privacy / proxy providers is addressed in the context of the implementation of PPSAI | PPSAI IRT feedback | Outreach to IRT recommended as soon as possible to get clarity on whether this is an issue to be addressed by the EPDP Team or PPSAI IRT |
|  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Proposed timing and approach |
|  |

April 2019

* EPDP Team to formulate question for PPSAI IRT to obtain required information to determine next steps (via google doc)

May 2019

* EPDP Team to review PPSAI IRT feedback and make a determination on the mailing list whether or not this issue needs to be further considered by the EPDP Team or whether it is considered addressed by PPSAI IRT. If not addressed:

TBD

* EPDP Team to further deliberate on this issue with other workstream 2 items, unless it is determined that it can easily be addressed through mailing list discussions.