

Privacy and Proxy Service Provider Accreditation Program IRT



Amy Bivins

PSWG Consultation (Continued)

11 July 2017

Agenda

- ⦿ ICANN59 Recap
- ⦿ Continuation of IRT/PSWG Discussion
 - Section 3.1:
 - How to provide LEA with PP's designated LEA contact?
 - How should LEA identity be verified?
 - Section 3.2.1: recommended extension of review period to 2 business days in Provider's jurisdiction
 - Any other topics?
- ⦿ Next Steps

ICANN59 Recap

- ⦿ IRT distributed proposed redline edits, discussion topics to PSWG on 22 June

- ⦿ IRT and PSWG discussed the following at ICANN59:
 - Section 1.4: scope of “requested information”
 - **Resolution:** Redline edit proposed.
 - Section 1.5: additional clarity about “priority level”
 - **Resolution:** PSWG members in attendance appeared to agree to this change

Discussion Topic: Section 3.1

- ⊙ IRT and PSWG also discussed Section 3.1: process options for sharing designated LEA contact information with LEA
 - Discussion noted that other work is going on within ICANN re: differentiated access; could leave room for any new solution that is developed to be applied in this context
- ⊙ Alternative options proposed before meeting
 - Provider could publish mechanism for LEA to request confidential LEA contact
 - ICANN could maintain list of Provider LEA contacts
 - No clear consensus support for either option
- ⊙ Other suggestions raised
 - Follow what RAA requires
 - IRT could identify information that LEA should submit to verify their status as LEA

Discussion Topic: Section 3.2.1

- ⦿ PSWG proposal said, *“Within 24 hours of the disclosure request been submitted, the Provider will review the request, and confirm that it has been received and contains the relevant information required to meet the minimum standard for acceptance.”*
- ⦿ **IRT concern**: Evaluation of whether a specific request meets minimum criteria may require consultation with outside counsel or others who may be unavailable to complete this review in 24 hours, particularly on weekends/holidays.
- ⦿ **IRT recommendation**: Change “24 hours” to “two business days (in the Provider’s jurisdiction)”
- ⦿ **Note**: Upon consultation with Contractual Compliance, “in Provider’s jurisdiction” may be unnecessary, as this is understood from Compliance perspective

Next Steps

- ⦿ What is the PSWG's preferred mechanism for refining this document? Options could include:
 - Holding additional PSWG/IRT calls to discuss
 - Passing drafts between IRT and PSWG, beginning now;
 - IRT could incorporate proposed edits into framework and solicit PSWG feedback at ICANN60 and during public comment period

- ⦿ Goal is to finalize this process for public comment as soon as possible so that it can be incorporated into draft PPAA (public comment period planned to open before ICANN 60)

Engage with ICANN – Thank You and Questions



One World, One Internet

Visit us at icann.org



[@icann](https://twitter.com/icann)



facebook.com/icannorg



youtube.com/icannnews



flickr.com/icann



linkedin/company/icann



slideshare/icannpresentations



soundcloud/icann