

	A	C	D	E
1	Relevant Text From PDP Report	Specific Question for IRT	IRT Feedback	Proposed Resolution/Response
2	<p>"Finally, the WG has 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. The implications of adopting a particular accreditation model will need to be worked out as part of the implementation of its policy recommendations, if adopted." (p.19)</p>	<p>Do you think that ICANN should be examining the same types of information as registrars (financial information, background criteria, understanding of policy and contractual requirements, operational and technical capabilities) when evaluating privacy and proxy service providers?</p>	<p>Chris Pelling: COMMENT: Surely Accredited registrars who are already in good standing with ICANN will not be subjected to this whole process again ?</p>	
3			<p>Theo Geurts: when we are looking at these questions, it is pretty important that we have these checks and balances in play here. We need to make sure that these providers have a financial capability, are operational and have technical capabilities. I would say "yes" to answering all these questions.</p>	

	A	C	D	E
1	Relevant Text From PDP Report	Specific Question for IRT	IRT Feedback	Proposed Resolution/Response
4			Chris Pelling: COmment: I would disagree with Theo for already accredited registrars as we are already completing all requirements	
5			Theo Geurts--we are discussing issues for accredited registrars later. When it comes to PPs who are new to the game, not affiliated with registrars, they should be subject to this. For Rrs who are already providing PP services, that's a different discussion.	
6			Greg DiBiase: +1 to Theo, I agree with this criteria for providers not affilated with registrars	
7		Should the screening process be as extensive for Privacy/Proxy as it is for registrars? For registrars, we ask about 60 questions, require detailed technical information, and require long-form paragraph-type answers to questions about policy and contractual requirements.		

	A	C	D	E
1	Relevant Text From PDP Report	Specific Question for IRT	IRT Feedback	Proposed Resolution/Response
8			<p>Theo Geurts--the short answer is yes. What we learned from the registry fly incident--it shows how important it is that this is being pared out in a correct fashion. These third party providers who are maybe new to ICANN ecosystem, they need to understand this is not just something that you take lightly. We take this seriously as registrars, and those who are new to the game need to understand this is pretty serious stuff. This needs to be very strict.</p>	
9			<p>Chris Pelling: COMMENT: Essentially a set of questions should be set, maybe not 60, but, registrant information, Escrow requirements (technical), policy information should all be included</p>	
10			<p>Alex Deacon: I think it does make sense to leverage the existing Rr accreditation process. It's easier for all involved. I don't think we should duplicate effort here. We should streamline process for those affiliated PP providers but I think we do, for affiliated PPs, to have some sort of PP addendum that specifies that in addition to Rr capabilities they are also seeking similar services for their PP services. I know these are separate orgs but it does make sense that we should be able to streamline so long as we capture the proper legal entities.</p>	

	A	C	D	E
1	Relevant Text From PDP Report	Specific Question for IRT	IRT Feedback	Proposed Resolution/Response
11			Chris Pelling: Comment: I also think as part of the questions, ICANN should make the thje PP service go through a training session, similar to the RAA requires registrars to do so they understand the polices that they will adhere too	
12			Theo Geurts--when it comes to questions, it wouldn't make much sense to ask a bunch of questions where a PP would have no operational business or ties (there's definitely stuff in the RAA that is not related to PP). So you wouldn't ask those questions. Focus on the most important questions of operating a PP so you get a clear picture. This co is in the business to get accredited for PP, ask questions to ensure they understand the business they are in, and skip all the unrelated questions.	
13		Could ICANN require providers to take a training course and successfully complete it as a condition of obtaining accreditation?	Chris Pelling: Self based - during accreditation	
14			Theo Geurts--several cctlds require technical tests to get accredited and as soon as you past tests they throw an exam your way and you have to answer operational and legal questions; after you finish that, then you become accredited. This is all before accreditation.	Application process=essay plus training and multiple-choice "exam."
15			Carlton Samuels: +1 to a training program as the last mile for accreditation	

	A	C	D	E
1	Relevant Text From PDP Report	Specific Question for IRT	IRT Feedback	Proposed Resolution/Response
16		Could such training course serve as a substitute for some of the long-form questions that are intended to gauge an applicant's understanding of relevant requirements?	Chris Pelling: COMMENT: Questions leads to URL for training and exam and once all completed to 100% accreditation given questions being the ones we are talking about now	
17		Should/could ICANN limit eligibility for an initial application window?	Theo Geurts: When we are looking at streamlining the process, we should already know which Rrs have PPs. If you take those results and incorporate those into the onboarding process you can already take the results and onboard these registrars right away. This leaves enough time to deal with the third party providers. That would be my suggestion.	
18		Would limiting eligibility to Rr-Affiliates raise fairness issues?	Theo Geurts: I don't see any issues here. To be clear, Rrs who offer PP already went through the accreditation process and already have been audited on certain aspects of PP. Onboard all registrars, you have their records, and then focus on new people.	
19			Chris Pelling: COMMENT: none whatsoever - +1 to Theo	
20			steve metalitz: "Eligibility restrictions" --- other than whether the proider is affilited with a current registrar (which woudl not be a permissible distinctoin for allowing applications, IMHO) -- can Amy or others on staff provide examples?	AB response on call-- one possible option would be to move incomplete/inadequate applications to the ongoing application window.

	A	C	D	E
1	Relevant Text From PDP Report	Specific Question for IRT	IRT Feedback	Proposed Resolution/Response
21			Carlton Samuels: There should be one and only one accreditation process. These are intended to separate and severable operations. Trust but verify. The only concession is that some one/entity that is already "known" imay have a leg up on trust but same process	
22			steve metalitz: I am skeptical there is as much overlap as Theo and others are stating between what current registrars must provide versus what p/p accreditation applicants must demonstrate they understand. The obligatoins are quite different.	
23			Carlton Samuels: @Steve: The obligations are different +1.	
24			Roger Carney: I agree with what everyone is saying here. It would be good to get the affiliated ones through. Maybe the guinea pigs of going through the process--these providers have done most of this already so we can vet our process well enough and get any clarifying issues done before introducing it to anyone who is not used to the process. I don't see a fairness issue so long as we are not saying when first group of providers go through, then Compliance gets to hold everyone accountable. That's where fairness becomes an issue. If only affiliated people are through the first group, obviously compliance can't start until a certain period of time after that.	

	A	C	D	E
1	Relevant Text From PDP Report	Specific Question for IRT	IRT Feedback	Proposed Resolution/Response
25			Chris Pelling: @Steve, I am simply saying we as accredited registrars already provide the service, on our audits over the last 6 years, we have had no issues with our service. Therefoie I disagree with your comment (if I read it correctly)	
26			steve metalitz: @Chris, but the "service" has not been subject to any requirements from ICANN up to now. With accreditation, this changes.	
27			Carlton Samuels: "Affiliated" has a whole universe of meanings! That could mean a separate legal entity from the registrar. Use the KISS rule here!	
28			Chris Pelling: most of the "service" that we are doing this IRT over Steve is already implemented by us Chris Pelling: and if it is a simple checksheet of "Do you have X, Y and Z" as a cover then we should be able to push through	
29			Volker Greimann: Statement: The accreditation of affiliated p/p applicants should bed baked into their registrar accreditation. There should not be a need for a seperate accreditation	

	A	C	D	E
1	Relevant Text From PDP Report	Specific Question for IRT	IRT Feedback	Proposed Resolution/Response
30			<p>Theo Geurts: We have the requirements that we are forming now and we have the current accreditation requirements (two different topics). So when discussing onboarding requirements, if we apply the same Rr rules and regs then we can already streamline that bc we don't have to go through that process again, we've already gone through it. For new regulations for PP, that is a different process--in the end we will all have to comply with it.</p>	
31			<p>Theo Geurts: I can't think of any restriction why you should do that.</p>	<p>AB answered on call. This possibility was asked about because of the practical reality that accrediting all existing providers who apply is going to take a significant amount of time. We are thinking about possible options for expediting the</p>
32			<p>Volker Greimann: Limited eligibility: Not practicable unless the requirement for registrars to only knowingly accept registrations from accredited entities is also waived until all providers can become accredited.</p>	
33			<p>steve metalitz: Because you should not be discriminating between affiliated and unaffiliated applicants. Excluding them altogether is clearly discriminatory.</p>	

	A	C	D	E
1	Relevant Text From PDP Report	Specific Question for IRT	IRT Feedback	Proposed Resolution/Response
34			Volker Greimann: also note that if there is a cost attached to accreditation, no matter how long the period is going to be there will be a rush at the end. No one will pay for accreditation or submit to these rules unless they have to	AB-There doesn't seem to be significant support for limiting eligibility. Asked IRT to comment if they disagree. No further comments.
35			steve metalitz: @Amy, how many affiliated p/p providers have been disclosed to ICANN under the current specification?	We estimate approximately 200
36			steve metalitz: @Amy you have not opened up the files that registrars have submitted? How do you know their submissions comply with the specification?	
37			Chris Pelling: COMMENT: Volker mentioned above that a current ICANN registrar should be given a chitty / voucher for any fees as they are already accredited	We will take this back and discuss/
38			steve metalitz: @Amy thanks for clarification. So presumably compliance or whoever has opened the files could provide an exact answer. Can you ask them?	

	A	C	D	E
1	Relevant Text From PDP Report	Specific Question for IRT	IRT Feedback	Proposed Resolution/Response
39		So, could ICANN ask Affiliated services a more limited set of questions just focused on the new requirements, and ask unaffiliated services the longer set of questions?	Theo Geurts: I would say "No." Compliance already asked us if any employees have criminal records--we already went through accreditation and were audited (even if questions not related they are still being asked on a constant basis). So for those Rrs who already offer those services and are being audited I would say do not ask any additional questions or a subset of limited questions, just onboard those and just vet those who are new to the game. If there are issues with existing registrars, they would already have surfaced and addressed.	
40			Alex Deacon: What is an Affiliated Service?	Definition provided in the AC chat.
41			Theo Geurts: We as a Rr have affiliated companies that carry out certain registrar functions; regardless of what they are doing, we as a Rr remain responsible for what they are doing	Section 1.3, RAA: "Affiliate" means a person or entity that, directly or indirectly, through one or more intermediaries, Controls, is controlled by, or is under common control with, the person
42		Should applicants that are Affiliated with an ICANN-accredited registrar have a different accreditation process than others?	steve metalitz: Repeating: hat does not means that unafiliated applicants might not be asked to provide more info than affiliated ones to the extent the latter have already provided it through the RAA accreditatoin or audi t process.	

	A	C	D	E
1	Relevant Text From PDP Report	Specific Question for IRT	IRT Feedback	Proposed Resolution/Response
43			<p>Chris Pelling: COMMENT: Amy, ICANN have already started discussing accreditation fees, what has been discussed further to this ?</p> <p>Chris Pelling: per use fee ?</p>	<p>We have not started discussing in detail other than acknowledging that there will be significant costs associated with screening; in the registrar context, the applicant fee is meant to recoup part of that cost. We will be discussing fees</p>
44		Draft v1 Applicant Guide Discussed on 16 May 2017 IRT call	Theo Geurts: Will there be a portal for submitting an application like registries had?	<p>We are still discussing this issue internally and hope to have more information to discuss in the short term.</p>

	A	C	D	E
1	Relevant Text From PDP Report	Specific Question for IRT	IRT Feedback	Proposed Resolution/Response
45			Greg DiBiase: If provider misses the initial window, what happens to their registrations?	That is something we need to discuss within the IRT. There could be some sort of delayed enforcement period to provide time to get providers onboarded. Question for IRT: what do you think a reasonable time period is for giving providers time to obtain accreditation before their existing services would be impacted?
46			Steve Metalitz--based on the current document--it looks like month 6 would be the deadline and a provider who has not applied by that time--when compliance kicks in registrars should not be accepting applications from the provider	Correct--this proposal was an initial attempt to draw a line, but there are additional issues because it's not just the acceptance of new registrations but also the status of existing registrations and what happens to those?

	A	C	D	E
1	Relevant Text From PDP Report	Specific Question for IRT	IRT Feedback	Proposed Resolution/Response
47			Theo Geurts: if that would be the case we would need some sort of solution there--there will be some people that are very unhappy if providers cannot apply and cannot accept registrations--that's not going to go over well with some folks in the community	We want to hear from you and the community whether you think this proposed 3-month application period is reasonable. If you don't think this is reasonable and have other ideas, please share them--we are very open to discussion on this.
48		What do you think of timeline?	Theo Geurts: Looks good for now	
49			Steve Metalitz: It's really six months, right? That seems ample or maybe even more than needed.	Correct, but because educational program will be required, applicants would have a difficult time meeting the deadline if they waited until the last minute to apply, but in general, yes, that would be six months from announcement to close

	A	C	D	E
1	Relevant Text From PDP Report	Specific Question for IRT	IRT Feedback	Proposed Resolution/Response
50			Roger Carney: Why wouldn't we allow providers to start as early as they can? Why the 3 months?	There are a couple of reasons why we proposed this initial lag. (1) generally ICANN provides some sort of notice/ramp up period (6 months) so this would be less than that but still provide some time for preparation/education; (2) ICANN will also need time to have the systems and processes ready to begin processing applications
51			Greg DiBiase: When you make the announcement, why not just allow Rrs to begin submitting applications? You could start reviewing at month 3 if you want, but better to provide more time to submit applications.	We will take this back and discuss.
52			Alex Deacon: Given most PP providers are affiliated with a registrar it seems that applications could come in the month 1-3 window	
53		Presentation of proposed accreditation criteria in draft guide v1	Theo Geurts: the tier III datacenter requirement may be a bit steep; other criteria look fine	
54			Eric Rokobauer: Maybe we should consider removing/modifying background screening for Rr Affiliates to expedite the process	

	A	C	D	E
1	Relevant Text From PDP Report	Specific Question for IRT	IRT Feedback	Proposed Resolution/Response
55			Greg DiBiase: Can we have a comparison to the Rr App?	Yes--AB to distribute to IP
56			Alex Deacon: Can we map to the Final Report?	Yes--AB to distribute to IP
57			Steve Metalitz (on list): the draft P/P accreditation application omits questions regarding proof of the applicant's standing to do business in the jurisdiction in which it claims to be domiciled. By comparison, question 3 and 5 of the registrar application ask for this information. I note that the P/P application asks for a "business registration certificate" as a "required appendix" --so maybe #3 is covered (though perhaps it should be clarified just what the applicant is required to submit, i.e., a current certificate issued by the jurisdiction in which domicile is claimed). But is there a reason applicant would not be required to show that what it asserts to be its form of business organization is in fact reflected in "documentation demonstrating that the Applicant entity is legally established and in good standing", to quote Q.5 of the registrar application? Because in some circumstances the provider could designate the jurisdiction in which it is organized as the venue for resolving disputes, wouldn't it be important to document that it is in fact organized there, that it is subject to service of process there, and that it is in good standing in the eyes of the courts or other relevant authorities?	

	A	C	D	E
1	Relevant Text From PDP Report	Specific Question for IRT	IRT Feedback	Proposed Resolution/Response
58			Eric Rokobauer (on-list): • Why is some of the draft P/P application reorganized from what is used for registrars? For instance, line 2 has legal for form of applicant for registrars, but that seems to be missing for P/P providers. Not sure of the reason for these differences.	
59			Eric Rokobauer (on-list): • A.1 for the P/P draft has a note stating "combination of Rr APP Qs 1 and 4". What was the reasoning there	
60			Eric Rokobauer (on-list): • Regarding line 5 - do we not intend to ask for documentation of good standing for P/P providers the way we do for registrars? Was it not the PPSAI PDP WG intention to hold the P/P providers to the same accreditation standards as registrars?	
61			Eric Rokobauer (on-list): Leading into comments below, might work to start off the application with "Are you affiliated with an ICANN-accredited registrar?" for clarity and to help streamline.	
62			Eric Rokobauer (on list): • 12 months makes sense for a timeline. I remember one comment came up during our last call inquiring if ICANN would take applications before month 3 when application window starts. Any update there?	
63			Eric Rokobauer (on-list): • Is there interest in reducing the application window itself (between month 3 and 6)? Less time to apply, but quicker turnaround for all? Interested for thoughts here from IRT.	

	A	C	D	E
1	Relevant Text From PDP Report	Specific Question for IRT	IRT Feedback	Proposed Resolution/Response
64		<i>Is this proposed process consistent with the intent of the Policy recommendations?</i>	Eric Rokobauer (on list): Yes, but the misalignment of requirements (line by line) between the current registrar application and the p/p draft makes this difficult to compare the two. Can we realign or display in a different manner?	
65		<i>(c) Are there areas where ICANN should consider streamlining the evaluation for registrar-Affiliated providers?</i>	Eric Rokobauer (on list): This was something I had called out in our last call. Certain questions specifically associated to registrar operations (data escrow, registrant validation/verification) should be sectioned together. If applicant states to be affiliated with a registrar, ICANN will be able to quickly take that said group of answers and cross check with what should already be available from the accredited registrar provided.	
66		<i>(d) Are there processes/criteria that may require "implementation adjustment" (as noted in p. 6 of the Final Report) in the case of providers that are not affiliated with ICANN-accredited registrars?</i>	Eric Rokobauer (on list): Yes. Unaffiliated P/P providers need to complete the full application with all requirements for operation answered.	

	A	C	D	E
1	Relevant Text From PDP Report	Specific Question for IRT	IRT Feedback	Proposed Resolution/Response
67		<i>(e) Should ICANN consider reducing the number of evaluation questions and instead ensure that the applicant understands and agrees to comply with the relevant requirements via the required applicant educational program (and screening test, as discussed in April?). If so, which questions do you believe could/should be evaluated in this manner?</i>	Eric Rokobauer (on list): Yes. Primarily those that looked to have been designed for registrar operations. Details that P/P provider applicants may not necessarily be privy to.	
68		<i>Re: specific draft application questions</i>	Eric Rokobauer (on list) D.2 - Length of time already providing service. How does that impact approval if applicant properly answers requirements asked for elsewhere in the application?	
69			(Eric Rokobauer on-list) D.4 - Registration volume. How would that impact the approval of the accreditation?	
70			Eric Rokobauer (on list) D.6/D.7 - Both seem to ask the same thing? Consolidate or refine?	

	A	C	D	E
1	Relevant Text From PDP Report	Specific Question for IRT	IRT Feedback	Proposed Resolution/Response
71			(Eric Rokobauer on list) D.8 - Staffing - Maybe something that can be grouped near registrar operations questions. If applicant is affiliated with a registrar, I do not think it will be easy to call out how much staff specifically will be involved with this part of operations.	
72			Greg DiBiase (on-list) • start off the application with "Are you affiliated with an ICANN-accredited registrar?" for clarity and to help streamline.	
73			Greg DiBiase (on-list) • If applicant states to be affiliated with a registrar, ICANN will be able to quickly take that said group of answers and cross check with what should already be available from the accredited registrar provided.	
74			Greg DiBiase (on list) There should be some type of mechanism to confirm things like "same address as registrar" without having to fill out these fields all over again. An option for registrars to have their registrar information populated and simply change any fields that are different would be great.	
75			Greg DiBiase (on list) Regarding the reduction of requirements, I agree that Eric's examples are not necessary for the p/p provider application.	

	A	C	D	E
1	Relevant Text From PDP Report	Specific Question for IRT	IRT Feedback	Proposed Resolution/Response
76			Theo Geurts (on list) I agree with Eric and Greg.	