

	A	B	C	D	E	G
1	Topic Area	Relevant Text From PDP Report	Specific Issue for Implementation	Specific Question for IRT	IRT Feedback	Status
2	Terms of Service/Reveal	(page 10, item 8, first bullet on p. 11) "...the terms of service should at a minimum include the following elements in relation to Disclosure and Publication: 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 is written as a disclosure requirement, but is there also a requirement for action by the PP provider?	Did the PDP WG intend for there to be a requirement that Privacy and Proxy Service providers notify a Requester, 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?		
3	Transfers	(page 16-17, recommendation 21) "The WG reiterates its previous observation that increased risks to a customer's privacy may be involved when a customer is dealing with a P/P service provider who, even if accredited by ICANN, is not Affiliated with an ICANN-accredited registrar. De-accreditation was noted as one topic where additional problems may arise. The WG therefore recommends that the following general principles be adopted and followed when a more detailed P/P service de-accreditation process is developed during implementation. As with transfers of domain names that occur other than as a result of de-accreditation of a P/P service provider, these principles are based on the WG's belief that customer privacy should be a paramount concern. As such, reasonable safeguards to ensure that a customer's privacy is adequately protected in the course of de-accreditation of a customer's P/P service provider – including when transfer of a customer's domain name or names is involved – should be integral to the rules governing the de-accreditation process."	The language surrounding de-accreditation seems to contemplate that there will be a process whereby a Privacy or Proxy Service Customer could transfer from one provider to another.	Did the PDP WG intend for this implementation to create a process for transfers between one PP Service provider and another PP Service provider, independent of existing requirements in the Transfer Policy concerning a change of registrant?		

	A	B	C	D	E	G
1	Topic Area	Relevant Text From PDP Report	Specific Issue for Implementation	Specific Question for IRT	IRT Feedback	Status
4	Abuse Reporting Requirements	(p. 12, item 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." (p. 13, item 15) "15. A uniform set of minimum mandatory criteria that must be followed for the purpose of reporting abuse and submitting requests (including requests for the Disclosure of customer information) should be developed."	Scope of application of abuse reporting requirements	1. Did the PDP WG intend for the abuse report response requirements to apply to any claim of abuse involving the domain name registered using the privacy or proxy service? 2. If not, what was the intended scope (it was suggested on list that this was intended to be limited to claims of abuse involving the PP service only)?		
5	UDRP Proceedings	(p.70, Roman Numeral V) "...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. However, accredited P/P service providers that offer this option <b>should nevertheless expressly prohibit cancellation of a domain name that is the subject of a UDRP proceeding.</b> "	Was this also intended to apply when URS proceedings have been filed?	1. Did the PDP WG intend for there to be a prohibition on the cancellation of names that are subject to URS proceedings?		
6	Best Practices	(p. 55, first bullet point) "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."	The words "facilitate" and "not hinder" are vague.	1. Did the WG intend for this recommended best practice to be more specific in terms of what these words mean?		
7	Best Practices	(p. 55, second bullet point) "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."	The words "commercially reasonable efforts" are not specific.	1. Did the WG intend for this recommended best practice to be more specific in terms of what these words mean?		

	A	B	C	D	E	G
1	Topic Area	Relevant Text From PDP Report	Specific Issue for Implementation	Specific Question for IRT	IRT Feedback	Status
8	Reviews	(p. 15-16) The WG recommends that a review of this Disclosure Framework be conducted at an appropriate time after the launch of the program and periodically thereafter, to determine if the implemented recommendations meet the policy objectives for which they were developed. Such a review might be based on the nonexhaustive list of guiding principles developed by the GNSO's Data and Metrics for Policy Making (DMPM) WG, as adopted by the GNSO Council and ICANN Board. As noted by the DMPM WG, relevant metrics could include industry sources, community input via public comment or surveys or studies. In terms of surveys (whether or providers, customers or requesters), data should be anonymized and aggregated. Please refer to Annex B for the full Disclosure Framework."	Lack of clarity re: proposed review	1. Did the WG intend for this review to be initiated by the GNSO? 2. Should accredited providers be required to retain data that will be relevant for a future review?		