



ONTARIO  
**TORONTO**  
18-21.APR.2010

# Customer Confidentiality

---

Draft Policy 2010-3

# 2010-3 - History

Origin (Proposal 95)	<b>9 June 2009</b>
Draft Policy (successfully petitioned)	<b>2 February 2010</b>

Aaron Wendel has control of this draft policy through ARIN XXV

## **AC Shepherds:**

Bill Sandiford

Owen DeLong

# **2010-3 – Summary (Customer Confidentiality)**

1. Allows ISPs to substitute their mailing address and phone number in place of their customers when registering reassignment information.
2. Requires ISPs to provide full customer information to ARIN when asked by staff
3. Stipulates that ARIN will hold information in “strictest confidence”

# 2010-3 – Status at the other RIRs (Customer Confidentiality)

- **Draft policy is unique to ARIN**
- **Current policy:**
  1. **AfriNIC, LACNIC and RIPE NCC**

No such policy
  2. **APNIC**

Similar policy (by default reassignments are not displayed in WHOIS)

# 2010-3 – Staff Assessment

<p><b>Legal: Liability Risk?</b></p> <p>“This new proposal permits ARIN to obtain the information it needs to fairly and accurately access utilization. The proposal appears intended to afford privacy protection of customer contact information. However it must be balanced by risks that may create. The proposal defines ARIN's treatment of customer data using a non-legal formulation, e.g. “strictest confidence”. Such a term conveys an intended sense of how such data should be treated, but is open to wide interpretation. This language, if enacted, could potentially increase ARIN’s legal risk that current ARIN practices might be deemed insufficient under this standard. Current policy attempts to addresses privacy protection for IPv6 reassignment data. For example, NRPM 6.5.5, which states “IRs shall maintain systems and practices that protect the security of personal and commercial information that is used in request evaluation, but which is not required for public registration.” More precise language, such as that in 6.5.5, might also be considered as a substitute for the term “strictest confidence”.”</p>	<p><b>Yes</b></p>
<p><b>Staff Comments: Issues/Concerns?</b></p>	<p><b>No</b></p>
<p><b>Implementation: Resource Impact?</b></p>	<p><b>Min.</b></p>

**Assessment available:**

- Discussion Guide
- <http://lists.arin.net/pipermail/arin-ppml/2010-March/016856.html>

# 2010-3 – PPML Discussion

- **72 posts by 32 People -- 7 in favor, 16 against**

1. “This proposal, while not going far enough, is at least a step in the right direction.”
2. “...it really should be between the ISP and the customer as to who gets listed. Totally ignoring the privacy issue...a policy like this would actually allow for faster response to problems in many cases.”
3. “We are opposed to policy 2001-3 because it would make internet security harder.”
4. “whois must contain valid contact information for the person/entity directly responsible for the host(s) using a given IP. I oppose this and any other policy which undermines this fundamental requirement.”
5. “I believe you are likely to get BETTER quality data if you actually allow people some control over who USES that data and HOW. I don't think it's an unreasonable demand for people these days to request some controls/tracking over who gets thier information and why.”



ONTARIO  
**TORONTO**  
18-21.APR.2010

# Customer Confidentiality

---

Draft Policy 2010-3