

Michelle DeSmyter:Dear All, Welcome to the Privacy and Proxy Services Accreditation IRT Meeting on Tuesday, 17 October 2017 at 14:00 UTC.

Michelle DeSmyter:Agenda wiki page:

https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_community.icann.org_x_CCchB&d=DwICaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrw1l3mSVzgfkbpSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=8_WhWIPqsLT6TmF1Zmyci866vcPSF04VShFqESGe5iHWG1BLwwehFBfjrsjWv9&m=0b-SLoHSbfY-vzGV8Yx1togqZzU3rFDpLQ3CaSJW0TY&s=wv1rjj90B1-TnD-iGWwYijBBei1JLI_52gGVzHmteu0&e=

Margie Milam:What does RRI stand for?

Margie Milam:Thank you

Philip Corwin:DEA may be an unfortunate acronym...in the US at least it is associated with the Drug Enforcement Administration

Luc Seufer:I'd replace RRI by Centre for Information Access too

Margie Milam:It seems that the audit should include a check on the data in the aggregate to ensure that no records are missing

Francisco Arias:bye

Vicky Sheckler:i'm still working my way thru the latest draft

steve metalitz:I am also working through the draft. Besides minor editorial comments, I would flag the following sections for brief discussio: 3.12.1, 5.2, and 5.5.2.4 q

Mary Wong:All, please note that formation of a new Stakeholder Group will require a change to the ICANN Bylaws.

Margie Milam:@Mary-- perhaps it should be "constituency"

Margie Milam:instead of Stakeholder Group?

Mary Wong:@Margie, that's an idea - a new Constituency can be formed in either the CPH or NCPH by petition to and decision of the Board.

Volker Greimann:I just feel this should be similar to the Working Group definition in the RAA

steve metalitz:correction, I meant 3.12.2, not 3.12.1

Philip Corwin:Slotting a new constituency or stakeholder group into the current GNSO structure will be no easy task

Volker Greimann:so get rid of the GNSO and insert the accredited providers and ICANN

Luc Seufer:agreed with Volker here

Mary Wong:Perhaps just say "if, in accordance with the Bylaws, a new Stakeholder Group or Constituency is formed"

Vicky Sheckler:agree w/ Margie

Volker Greimann:the GNSO has no role to play in the negotiation phase of an agreement between two parties

steve metalitz:+1 with all of Margie's cmmnts

Leana Melnichuk:agree with Margie

Volker Greimann:if we take the RAA as a model, thos should be modeled upon that as well

Luc Seufer:if a new SG is formed it will become a pure contractual matter b/w this SG and ICANN

Darcy Southwell:Agree with Luc

Volker Greimann:there is no need to require the formation of a new SG

Luc Seufer:24/7 from LEA seems normal, business hours for private matters is the norm

Luc Seufer:*for LEA

Volker Greimann:@Steve: I have a hard time wrapping my head around that concept as IP law is civil law, whereas LEA usually deal with criminal law

Volker Greimann:if there is such an intersection, I have never seen it.

Volker Greimann:Where does this time requirement come from?

Volker Greimann:24/7 is excessive

Volker Greimann:excessive

Volker Greimann:no accident, see coment above

Luc Seufer:Do we really need to have staff on call on a 24/7 basis in order to ensure that complaint regarding designer replica bag be sold?

Luc Seufer:cannot

steve metalitz:@Volker, IP violations can be criminal offenses in appropriate circumstances --- even in EU!

Volker Greimann:Agreed, but we never had such a request.

Volker Greimann:either as registrar or as PPS

Volker Greimann:So one WG member gets to dictate policy?

Luc Seufer:Did he asked nicely?

Sara Bockey:If well founded reports are reviewed in 24 hours, I don't see that the 24/7 monitoring is necessary. It just creates problems.

Vicky Sheckler:apologies - i need to jump off

Margie Milam:Agree with Steve

Margie Milam:I agree with including it in the questions for the application

Leana Melnichuk:So do I

Lisa Villeneuve:+1 Volker

Luc Seufer:some providers allow for this disclosure, some insist on keeping both the provider and underlying registrant as codefendant

Volker Greimann:sounds better

Margie Milam:I think we should include it, but allow for an explanation by the Provider

Philip Corwin:FYI, RPM Review WG will reach its phase 2 review of the UDRP in late 2018. I expect that any Final report will not be delivered until 2020 and, if approved by Council and Board, would not be implemented until 2021 at the earliest. So no

imminent changes in UDRP.

Volker Greimann:that is what I though, Phil

Theo Geurts:Thanks for the info Phil

Volker Greimann:ICANN policy sometimes works at a glacial pace

Luc Seufer:if the UDRP is silent on the matter, doesn't this
PPP policy controls?

Volker Greimann:i need to drop for anopther call

Philip Corwin:In policymaking, glacial may be preferable to
torrential ;-)