For the results of the survey, please see:

<https://www.surveymonkey.com/results/SM-BJRDWBB97/>

Based on the survey results, EPDP Leadership proposes the following order for upcoming calls:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **EPDP Team Meeting** | **Topics** |
| 1 August 2019 | **Group 2 - First reading continued**:  Investigation of criminal activity where domain names are used. Typical specific example: phishing attack (SSAC 3)  **Group 4** - **First reading**:  Online buyers identifying and validating the source or services/ Internet users validating the legitimacy of an email or a website to protect themselves (ALAC 1) *(Note that SSAC2 scored marginally higher, but due to unavailability of SSAC reps for this meeting, the leadership team decided to commence with this use case)* |
| 2 August 2019 | Members to submit edit/view/proposals for SSAC 3 and ALAC 1 in writing |
| 6 August 2019 | Use case authors, with staff support as needed, to distribute updated SSAC 3 and ALAC 1 use cases, incorporating input received |
| 8 August 2019 | **Group 2 – Second/final reading**:  Investigation of criminal activity where domain names are used. Typical specific example: phishing attack (SSAC 3)  **Group 4 - First reading continued**:  Online buyers identifying and validating the source or services/ Internet users validating the legitimacy of an email or a website to protect themselves (ALAC 1) |
| 9 August 2019 | Members to submit edit/view/proposals for ALAC 1 in writing |
| 13 August 2019 | Use case author, with staff support as needed, to distribute updated ALAC 1 use case, incorporating input received. Final version of SSAC 3 use case to be distributed by use case author, with staff support as needed, and posted on wiki. |
| 15 August 2019 | **Group 5 – First reading:**  Providers requesting access required to facilitate due process in the UDRP and URS (IP 5) *(Note, this use case was tied with BC6 but as this use case was also discussed during phase 1, the leadership team recommends starting with this one)*  **Group 2 – Second/final reading**:  Online buyers identifying and validating the source or services/ Internet users validating the legitimacy of an email or a website to protect themselves (ALAC 1) |
| 16 August 2019 | Members to submit edit/view/proposals for IP 5 in writing |
| 20 August 2019 | Use case author, with staff support as needed, to distribute updated IP 5 use case, incorporating input received. Final version of ALAC 1 use case to be distributed by use case author, with staff support as needed, and posted on wiki. |
| 22 August 2019 | **Group 3 - First reading**:  When a network is undergoing an attack involving a domain name, and the operator(s) of that network need to contact the domain owner to remediate the security issue (DDOS, Botnet, etc.) (SSAC1)  **Group 5 – Second/final reading**:  Providers requesting access required to facilitate due process in the UDRP and URS (IP 5) |
| 23 August 2019 | Members to submit edit/view/proposals for SSAC 1 in writing |
| 23 August 2019 | EPDP Team to identify which use cases, or aspects of use cases, in each category are significantly different from use case already reviewed and need to be considered further. |
| 27 August 2019 | Use case author, with staff support as needed, to distribute updated SSAC 1 use case, incorporating input received. Final version of IP 5 use case to be distributed by use case author, with staff support as needed, and posted on wiki. |
| 29 August 2019 | **Group 3 – Second/final reading**:  When a network is undergoing an attack involving a domain name, and the operator(s) of that network need to contact the domain owner to remediate the security issue (DDOS, Botnet, etc.) (SSAC1)  **Group 1 – first reading, second use case**  (to be determined based on input received by 16 August) |
| 3 September 2019 | Final version of SSAC 1 use case to be distributed by use case author, with staff support as needed, and posted on wiki. |
| 5 September 2019 | **Group 1 – second/final reading, second use case**  **Group 2 – first reading, second use case**  (to be determined based on input received) |
| End August / Early September | **Leadership team to share draft policy principles / recommendations derived from use case review for review and discussion during F2F meeting, incl. proposed schedule to continue review of use cases, if deemed necessary.** |

**Use Case Categorization**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Group 1:Criminal Law enforcement/national or public security | LEA 1, LEA 2, IP 2, IP 3 |
| Group 2: Non-LE investigations and civil claims | BC1/2, BC 3, BC 5, SSAC 3, ALAC 2, IP 1, IP 4 |
| Group 3: Need for redacted data for a third party to contact registrant | BC 7, SSAC 1 |
| Group 4: Consumer protection, abuse prevention, digital service provider (DSP) and network security | SSAC 2, BC 9, ALAC 1 |
| Group 5: Registered Name Holder consent or contract | BC 4, BC 6, BC 8, IP 5 |

**LEGEND**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| LEA 1 | Investigation of criminal activity against a victim in the jurisdiction of the investigating EU LEA requesting data from a non-local data controller. |
| LEA 2 | Investigation of criminal activity against a victim in the jurisdiction of the investigating EU LEA requesting data from a local data controller. |
| SSAC 1 | When a network is undergoing an attack involving a domain name, and the operator(s) of that network need to contact the domain owner to remediate the security issue (DDOS, Botnet, etc.) |
| SSAC 2 | Determine “Reputation” of domain name and/or elements associated with domain name registrations. |
| SSAC 3 | Investigation of criminal activity where domain names are used.  Typical specific example: phishing attack. |
| IP 1 | Trademark owners requesting data in the establishment, exercise or defense of legal claims for trademark infringement |
| IP 2 | Investigation of criminal activity against a victim in the jurisdiction of the investigating LEA requesting data from either a local a non-local data controller. (criminal trademark) |
| IP 3 | Investigation of criminal activity in the jurisdiction of the investigating LEA requesting data from either a local a non-local data controller. (criminal copyright) |
| IP 4 | Copyright owners requesting data in the establishment, exercise or defense of legal claims for copyright infringement |
| IP 5 | Providers requesting access required to facilitate due process in the UDRP and URS |
| BC1/2 | Initial investigation of criminal activity against a victim and/or secondary victim where domain names are used in the commission of the crime |
| BC 3 | Identify owner of abusive domains and other related domains involved in civil legal claims related to phishing, malware, botnets, and other fraudulent activities |
| BC 4 | Maintaining the domain name registration by the Registered Name Holder |
| BC 5 | The establishment, exercise or defense of a legal claim involving a registrant of a domain name |
| BC 6 | M&A name portfolio due diligence or purchase of domain name from bankrupt entity or other seller |
| BC 7 | Contacting the Registrant to resolve a Technical or Operational Issue with a Domain Name |
| BC 8 | Help a certification authority determine and validate the identity of the entity associated with a domain name that will be bound to an SSL/TLS certificate |
| BC 9 | Search Engines, Messaging Services & Social Media Platforms seeking to confirm the authenticity of businesses advertising or Posting News on its Platform |
| ALAC 1 | Online buyers identifying and validating the source of goods or services/ Internet users validating the legitimacy of an email or a website to protect themselves |
| ALAC 2 | Consumer protection organizations |

**Outstanding Action Items**

1. Chris Lewis-Evans to incorporate input received from the EPDP Team and continue fine tuning the use case (GAC LEA1-13719-1), which is expected to be attached in the annex to the Initial Report. Updated version to be posted on the Wiki and the leadership to make a further recommendation for how to finalize the use case.
2. Hadia and ALAC Team to propose edits to the use case based on comments received today as well as outstanding comments received this week and next week on the [Google Doc](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1DBPBL_nIwE8tjaahM1uS3hvIA8FSzPiN/view?ts=5d431132) by **Wednesday, 14 August**. Following the fine-tuning of the document, a final reading will occur at a later meeting.
3. Greg and SSAC Team to propose edits to the use case based on comments received today as well as outstanding comments received this week and next week on the [Google Doc](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1iK9ygUOo8ntLWC_7dx3bS195W2ivkqHH/edit) by **Wednesday, 14 August**. Following the fine-tuning of the document, a final reading will occur at a later meeting.