



# Public Safety Working Group (1)

ICANN 58 Working Session | 11 March 2017

## Introduction and General Updates

- ⊙ Opening by PSWG Co-Chairs
  - Alice Munyua, African Union Commission
  - Cathrin Bauer-Bulst, European Commission
  - Wanawit Akhuputra, Thailand
- Introduction of PSWG Members in attendance
- ⊙ General PSWG Updates
  - PSWG Newsletter: <u>Issue #1</u> released on 9 March 2017 (translations expected)
  - PSWG Activity Report to the GAC: well received first edition of regular email
- Review of Working Session Agenda



## Agenda

#### Introduction and General Updates

- 1. Abuse Mitigation: Follow-up on Annex 1 of Hyderabad Communiqué
- 2. Consumer Choice & Consumer Trust (CCT) Review Team
- 3. Security Framework for Registries to respond to Security Threats
- 4. Privacy/Proxy Services Accreditation (PPSAI) LEA Disclosure Framework
- 5. Registration Directory Services Review

#### As time permits

- 6. Next Generation RDS and Data Protection
- 7. Review of ICANN Meeting Schedule & Working Session 2 Agenda



### Annex 1 of Hyderabad Communiqué - Background

• 2009 -2012: GAC endorsed Law Enforcement Due Diligence

Recommendations, implemented in the 2013 Registrar Accreditation Agreement (RAA) and New gTLD Applicant

Guidebook (AGB)

■ 11 Apr. 2013: Beijing GAC Advice on Safeguards applicable to New gTLDs,

implemented in part in the New gTLD Registry Agreement

(RA)

• 8 Nov. 2016: Questions to the ICANN Board on DNS Abuse Mitigation by

ICANN and Contracted Parties

(Annex 1 of <u>Hyderabad Communiqué</u>)

• 8 Feb. 2017: Answers by ICANN's CEO



#### Annex 1 of Hyderabad Communiqué - Analysis of Answers by ICANN

- Challenge: public interest commitments in a contract between private parties
- Registrar-related provisions and enforcement
  - WHOIS Address Across Field Validation requirement not yet implemented
    - Part of the 2013 RAA Whois Accuracy Program Specification
    - Effort on identifying commercially reasonable solution still ongoing:
       Registrar WHOIS Validation Working Group reformed in January 2017 to consider <u>ICANN's</u> <u>strawman proposal (ICANN 57)</u>
  - Answers lacking information to assess:
    - Enforcement of WHOIS Requirements (incl. outcome of the 32,000 annual WHOIS Inaccuracy complaints)
    - Standard of diligence applied to registrars in their response to reports of abuse
- New gTLDs Registries provisions
  - No data on content and use by ICANN of statistical Reports on Abuse (Specification 11 3(b) of Registry Agreement)
  - Inability to assess effectiveness of the related Safeguard Advice
- Anti-abuse activities of ICANN
  - Lacking information to assess effectiveness of collaboration of ICANN Contractual Compliance and SSR Departments



#### Annex 1 of Hyderabad Communiqué – Next Steps

- Proposed GAC Follow-up Scorecard to Annex 1 of GAC Hyderabad Communiqué
- Discussion with GAC Plenary <u>Tuesday 14 March 13:45-14:30 (Hall A2)</u>
  - <u>Goal:</u> explain to the GAC why this is so important, recommend follow-up (including potential GAC Advice)
  - Outline of fundamental challenge: Public interest clauses in a private contract how to hold the parties accountable for enforcement?
  - Examples to illustrate: Overview of analysis of ICANN Answers
    - Delayed implementation of key contractual requirements (RAA WHOIS Across Field Validation, RA Spec 11 3b)
    - Missing information to assess effectiveness of contractual enforcement
  - Proposal for follow-up process, notably GAC-ICANN Board meeting and follow-up question; review procedures?

#### Potential Recommendation to the GAC

- Annex 1 Follow-up including <u>time</u> limits on implementing Across Field Validation, Spec 11 3b
   Advisory
- Processing of Complaints: Transparency to complainant on measures taken to address the complaint
- Use of New gTLD auctions proceeds for Abuse Mitigation (among other Public Interest issues)



### Annex 1 of Hyderabad Communiqué – Next Steps

- ⊙ GAC-ICANN Board Meeting Wednesday 15 March 09:00-10:30 (Hall A2)
  - Goal: come to an understanding of how to move forward with this issue
  - Concrete situation (Annex I): agree on timeline for follow-up by ICANN Board; appoint persons in charge to report back at next GAC-ICANN Board Meeting
  - Possible creation of a common set of indicators for regular reports to create transparency for GAC to ensure compliance



ICANN 58 Cross Community Session: <u>Towards Effective DNS Abuse Mitigation</u>: <u>Prevention, Mitigation and Response</u> on <u>Monday 13 March 13:45-15:00 (Hall A2)</u>

### Objectives

- Seek to "Turn a page" on how abuse is addressed at ICANN
- Focus on ICANN's Efforts, based on answers to questions in Annex 1 of the <u>GAC Hyderabad Communiqué</u>
- Not a panel discussion
- Instead: a series of topical presentations + Q&A with ICANN community
- Ensure effective outcome such as best practices identified

#### Presenters

- Greg Aaron, APWG
- Craig Schwartz, .BANK/.INSURANCE and vTLD Consortium
- David Conrad, ICANN CTO
- Maguy Serad, ICANN Contractual Compliance



### 2. Consumer Trust & Consumer Choice Review

### Background

- Part of regular reviews at ICANN (form. Affirmation of Commitments, now Art. 4.6 of <u>ICANN Bylaws</u>)
- Review Team formed in January 2016
- To determine the extent to which the introduction of new gTLDs has promoted competition, consumer choice and consumer trust in the DNS.
- To assess the effectiveness of (a) the application and evaluation processes, and (b) safeguards put in place to mitigate issues

### ⊙ Update

<u>Draft Report</u> released for public comment on 7 March 2017

#### For PSWG Discussion

- Implication of findings for other work tracks (Security Framework, RDS Review, Next Rounds of New GTLDs, etc.)
- Contribution to <a href="Public Comment">Public Comment</a> by the GAC (due 27 April 2017)



## 3. Security Framework for Registries

### Background

- Framework for Registries to respond to Security Threats called for by an <a href="ICANN Board Resolution">ICANN Board Resolution</a> (June 2013) in response to <a href="New gTLDs Safeguards">New gTLDs Safeguards</a> <a href="Beijing GAC Advice">Beijing GAC Advice</a> (April 2013)
- Drafting Team formed in August 2015, drafting initiated in Dec. 2015
- Challenge for Registries and PSWG to agree on substantive voluntary measures and standards

### Drafting Team now working on the Jan. 2017 re-draft by the PSWG

- Feedback expected from Registries on latest edits (v4)
- Several meetings during ICANN 58:
  - PSWG only: <u>Sunday 12 March 11:00am 12:45pm (Hall B3)</u>
  - Meeting with registries: <u>Tuesday 14 March 5:00pm 6:30pm (Hall B4.1)</u>
- Goal: Reach Drafting Team Agreement on final draft during ICANN 58



## 3. Security Framework for Registries

### Discussion by the PSWG

- Briefing of GAC Plenary in Copenhagen <u>Tuesday 14 March 13:45-14:30 (Hall A2)</u>
  - Reminder of Background
  - Latest Update on Progress
  - Planned Next Steps, incl. endorsement of Draft Framework
- Endorsement of Draft Framework by the GAC
  - Seek endorsement before submission of draft to Public Comment
  - Consider level of changes requiring new endorsement after Public Comment



## 4. Privacy/Proxy Services Accreditation (PPSAI)

### Background

- As a follow-up to the <u>2013 RRA negotiations</u>, the GNSO conducted a <u>Policy</u> <u>Development Process</u> on the issue of accreditation of Privacy and Proxy Services Providers (Oct. 2013 Jan 2016)
- The GAC Helsinki Communiqué (June 2016) advised the ICANN Board on public policy concerns that should be addressed as part of implementation, in particular:
  - Confidentiality of law enforcement and consumer protection requests
  - Need for consideration of cross-border issues
  - Access of Privacy/Proxy Services to domains engaged in collection of money
- In August 2016, the <u>ICANN Board adopted</u> the policy recommendations
- In October 2016, an <u>Implementation Review Team (IRT)</u> was formed to assist ICANN in its implementation effort, several GAC and PSWG members joined as volunteers
- On 13 December 2016 the <u>ICANN Board encouraged the IRT</u> to continue working with GAC/PSWG to address the Helsinki GAC Advice



## 4. Privacy/Proxy Services Accreditation (PPSAI)

### Drafting of the LEA Disclosure Framework

#### Current Status

- ICANN GDD requested that PSWG draft a proposal in consultation with IRT
- Nick Shorey (UK) issued a call for volunteers to GAC and PSWG in Dec. 2016
- A PSWG Task Force of 7 members was formed in Jan. 2017 and has started meeting and deliberating, and engaged with IRT during ICANN 58

### Key questions

- Definition of a Law Enforcement Authority and issue of jurisdiction
- Definition of requirements for acceptable disclosure request
- Processing and prioritization of requests
- Notification of registrant

### Next Steps – For PSWG Discussion

- Briefing the GAC Plenary <u>Tuesday 14 March 13:45-14:30 (Hall A2)</u>
- Seeking GAC endorsement of PSWG Disclosure Framework proposal



## 5. Registration Directory Services Review

### ⊙ Background

- Review mandated by the new <u>ICANN Bylaws</u> (Article 4.6) to review enforcement of ICANN policies relevant to RDS and explore structural changes to improve accuracy and access to gTLD registration data
- Following 1st Whois Review Team (<u>Final Report</u> was published in May 2012)

#### ⊙ Status

- <u>Call for Volunteers</u> issued on 28 Oct. 2016 and <u>last extended</u> through 22 March 2017
- 3 PSWG applicants appointed by the GAC on 22 February 2017:
  - Cathrin Bauer-Bulst (EU Commission),
  - Lili Sun (Interpol),
  - Thomas Walden (US DOJ)

#### Scope of the Review

- The GAC expressed PSWG concerns over ICANN's proposal to limit the scope to reviewing implementation of 1st Review recommendations
- GNSO advanced an <u>alternative proposal</u> to address issues of concern for contracted parties (such as RDAP) as well as to "ensure no duplication of work that is the responsibility of the GNSO's RDS Policy Development Process Working Group"



## 5. Registration Directory Services Review

### For Discussion by the PSWG

- 1. Fist task of Review Team: determine scope of Review What specific topics should be included in the scope of the Review?
  - WHOIS Address Across Field Validation (Annex 1 of Hyderabad Communiqué)
  - WHOIS Accuracy Reporting System Implementation (CCT Review Team)
  - Other elements of the <u>GNSO's scope proposal</u>? Other suggestions?
- 2. Process for GAC and PSWG Input into the Review
  - Ensure opportunities for update to and input from GAC/PSWG
  - Draw from experience of PSWG representatives in the CCT Review Team
- Item for discussion with the GAC Plenary <u>Tuesday 14 Mar. 12:00-12:30 (Hall A2)</u>
  - Proposal on scope of review
  - Proposal on process for GAC Members input and update



### 6. Next Generation RDS PDP WG

### ⊙ Background

- The <u>RDS PDP</u> was Launched in November 2015, following the work of the Expert Working Group on gTLD Directory Services (<u>Final Report</u> in June 2014)
- To deliberate in 3 phases, including on whether or not a new RDS system is needed
- As of Oct. 2016 there were 7 GAC and 4 PSWG representatives in the Working Group

#### Status

The working group developed preparatory documents for its deliberations, including: a
 <u>Problem Statement</u>, a set of <u>Example Uses Cases</u>, a Draft <u>Statement of Purpose</u> for
 Registration Data and Directory Services and hundreds of <u>potential requirements</u> it
 identified for a Next Generation PDP

#### Recent Key Focus: Data Privacy Issues

- The PDP WG will meet with Data Commissioners during ICANN 57 (<u>Wednesday 15</u> <u>March at 13:45-15:00 in Hall C1.4</u>)
- PDP WG developed <u>a set questions</u> for this event addressing issues of interest to Public Safety Agencies



### 6. Next Generation RDS PDP WG

#### Main Issues of Concern for the GAC and PSWG

#### Data Protection and Privacy

- Possibility of conflicts between RDS Policy and national or supranational law such as Data Protection Rules
- The GAC 2007 Principles on gTLD WHOIS services call for a balance between privacy and law enforcement/public interest in attribution of responsibility for online content or services

#### Gated Access to registration information and jurisdictional issues

- Implementation of a Gated or Tiered access RDS may create jurisdictional issues for law enforcement when requesting data from private entities across borders
- Adopting an accreditation scheme that would entitle law enforcement authorities to access gated (or protected) data on a global scale may be difficult to achieve

#### Next Steps

- Highlight Issues to the GAC Plenary for information and discussion
- Continued participation of PSWG Volunteers in RDS PDP WG



# 7. Working Session 2 - Agenda

PSWG Working Session 2 – <u>Tuesday 14 March 08:00-09:00</u>

- 1. Child Protection
- 2. New gTLDs Subsequent Rounds
- 3. Defining a Strategy for the PSWG







# Public Safety Working Group

ICANN 58 Working Session | 11 March 2017