

Michelle DeSmyter:Dear All, Welcome to the Privacy and Proxy Services Accreditation IRT Meeting on Tuesday, 8 August 2017 at 14:00 UTC.

Michelle DeSmyter:Agenda wiki page:
https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_community.icann.org_x_ywUhB&d=DwICaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrw1l3mSVz_gfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=8_WhWIPqsLT6TmF1Zmyci866vcPSF04VShFqESGe_5iHWG1BLwwehFBfjrsjWv9&m=mRYCws-tnrmqQH-S_MP650BX9VLnkYD9hAtK5ZidPoo&s=kgOyLPSYddyKVdA41Qu_khw050su7Yru-b7YZRvAwGY&e=

Lindsay Hamilton-Reid:Apologies, I have not had time to read this but how are we defining minimum standard of acceptance? What form will the disclosure request take? Court order?

Sara Bockey:The problem with this timeframe is it doesn't take into consideration weekends or holiday. Not all PP services are 24/7.

Lindsay Hamilton-Reid:Thanks Amy - I will have a read.

Sara Bockey:What is the standard now?

Lindsay Hamilton-Reid:I agree with Sara. We should not have this written in stone if we can't respond in time.

Sara Bockey:No, not the RAA. I mean with PP services. I don't believe they currently respond within 24 hours

Sara Bockey:This isn't the RAA

Sara Bockey:it's a separate document

Theo Geurts:Privacy Providers are not in all cases Registrars, is it realistic we impose RAA 2013 obligations on them?

Sara Bockey:What if we change this to within 1 business day? Not 24 hours

Lindsay Hamilton-Reid:Agreed Theo and this is not in the RAA. Isn't this the point that there will be a separate agreement for privacy providers?

Sara Bockey:@Lindsay, exactly

Amy Bivins:@Sara, I see your question re: 1 business day, will be sure that gets raised

Ashley Heineman:Is there a reason to hold PP providers to a lower standard when it comes to law enforcement needs? Particularly if they are being accredited by ICANN?

Theo Geurts:I think it should not Ashley

Lindsay Hamilton-Reid:One business day works better.

Alex Deacon:Would an automated response to a request (e.g. "thanks we have received your response and will respond to your request soon....") meet this obligation?

Carlton SAMUELS:@Ashley: Should not be the case. Its the service we must focus on. Simplify the rules as best as possible but same rules for everybody who wants to provide the service.

Equal protection for all

Eric Rokobauer:Is it fair to say (regardless of a p/p provider is providing a service a domain or not), Registrars will get contacted as well?

Vicky Sheckler:agree w/ ashley and susan. pp should not be held to a lower std.

Sara Bockey:If automatd response is acceptable then no issue

Lindsay Hamilton-Reid:Under European law, we can only retain data for as long as is necessary. We have difficulties with one year, never mind two.

Lindsay Hamilton-Reid:Why do we need all this for the PPAA? Surely the registrar will have most of this information?

Lindsay Hamilton-Reid:Agreed Theo!

Vicky Sheckler:think we do need to have data retention at the level

Vicky Sheckler:at the p/p level. ok if for affiliated pp to have data at registrar level in certain scenarios

Lindsay Hamilton-Reid:Well not really. We have to bear in mind the purpose of a privacy provider.

Vicky Sheckler:we have already gone through in the PDP process areas where data needs to be disclosed. in order to disclose the data, it needs to be collected and retained for some period of time

Susan Kawaguchi:agree with Vicky

Susan Kawaguchi:I agree with these data points

Vicky Sheckler:ok w/ data points

Theo Geurts:still processing

Lisa Villeneuve:Is there a reason why registrant data was left off this?

Lisa Villeneuve:exactly - registrant name under the privacy

Lisa Villeneuve:ah, thank you

Carlton SAMUELS:I ahve always beleived the waiver process was makework for lawyers. Why not align it to "applicable law" and stop making these folks scofflaws in their own country

Eric Rokobauer:No issue at the moment, 5 year seems fine.

Susan Kawaguchi:5 years seems reasonable

Theo Geurts:5 is good

Carlton SAMUELS:No issue so long as it is connected to some kind of evaluative framework

Roger Carney:5 year is good

Alex Deacon:i think its good approach.

Vicky Sheckler:agree w/ alex.

Lindsay Hamilton-Reid:Agree with Theo

Vicky Sheckler:think we shoudl move forward with this unless we hear from an unaffiliated p/p provider why they can't do it

Vicky Sheckler:need to run. sorry

Alex Deacon:i think that makes sense Amy - given that this is a requirement on icann and not the PP provider.

Alex Deacon:thanks!

Roger Carney:Thanks

Eric Rokobauer:thanks take care all

Nick Shorey:Thanks all.