

UTC

---

MICHELLE DESMYTER: Welcome, everyone, good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the Privacy and Proxy Services Accreditation IRT Meeting on the 14<sup>th</sup> of November 2017. In the interest of time today there will be no roll call, as we've quite a few participants on-line - and as a reminder to all participants, please state your name before speaking, for transcription purposes, and please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise.

With this, I will turn the meeting over to Caitlin Tubergen.

CAITLIN TUBERGEN: Thank you, Michelle. Welcome, everyone, to today's call. Last week I sent out an email out to the group, and I posed a few questions to the group, and I didn't receive that much feedback, so, I just wanted to make sure that everyone had a chance to review those questions, so, I'm going to pose them again in case anyone did have any feedback that they wanted to provide it on the call, rather than on the list.

So, the first question is if this time-slot works for everyone. I know we received one note saying that there might be a conflict from one member of the IRT. We changed the UTC time to move forward an hour, so the actual time, in most peoples' respective time zones would still be the same. If anyone has any objections to this time, or a problem with this time, and would prefer to move it so that it's effectively an hour earlier in most peoples' time zones, please let us know by raising your

---

*Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.*

hand, or typing in the chat. If we don't hear anything, we'll assume this is the most preferred time going forward, and we'll keep it at this time.

Okay, I'm seeing no hand nor any comments - I'll take that as a message that we'd like to keep it at this time going forward, for the remainder of the year.

Secondly, you may have noticed that we received a few requests from the members of the IRT board for additional time to review the draft accreditation agreement, and the date that was proposed by a couple of members of the IRT was December 1<sup>st</sup>.

So, I had asked the group if there were any strong objections to that date, or if anyone needed even more time, or less time, or what the general consensus of the group was, and there was a little bit of talk back and forth, but it seemed that most were okay with allowing the group to have until December 1<sup>st</sup> for review, but I wanted to confirm on the call if everyone is still okay with that date, or if anyone believes they need more time, or if December 1<sup>st</sup> is too much time, etc. If anyone has any further comments on that, please feel free to raise you hand or type in the chat now. Steve, please go ahead.

Steve, if you're speaking, you may be on mute. If you're not, you can go ahead.

Steve, I can't hear you - I'm not sure if others on the call are able to hear you. It appears no. You may need to dial back in, or type in comments into the chat at this time.

Okay, thank you, Steve. So, it appears that we have some comments in the chat from Sara in support of the December 1<sup>st</sup> date, also from Eric. Steve says there's no objection to December 1<sup>st</sup>. Okay, so, I'm not seeing any objections in the chat, nor am I seeing any hands raised, so we'll go ahead and keep that December 1<sup>st</sup> date. Thank you for your feedback on that.

I know that we have several documents that the IRT has been reviewing, and so I wanted to go over that list again, just to make sure that we're all on the same page.

So, as we just mentioned, there's a red-lined version of the accreditation agreement that was distributed to the IRT, I believe, in October, and the members of the IRT have requested December 1<sup>st</sup> to be the deadline for the review of that document. As we just discussed, there doesn't seem to be any objection right now to that document, so. The status of the accreditation agreement is it's currently under review by the IRT, and we will set a deadline of December 1<sup>st</sup> for feedback, and then, as a group, we can begin discussing all of the feedback we've received, starting December 1<sup>st</sup> and after.

We also have the policy document, which the IRT reviewed and agreed to, earlier this year. However, we did put a place-holder on the policy document, understanding that there might be some provisions that change, if there are corresponding revisions in the accreditation agreement that change. So, there will be another opportunity to review the policy document after we receive all the feedback on the accreditation agreement document.

---

So, that's the status of the policy document. The third document is the application document, which we've been referring to as the applicant guidebook, or the application, interchangeably. That document has been reviewed by the IRT over a series of a few weeks. The feedback has generally been incorporated - the feedback from all IRT members, rather.

The one issue that seemed to not have broad consensus was the issue of the wholesale elimination of background checks for affiliated providers. So, we have a place-holder in there, and we'll mark that for public comment, but what we proposed to do was to follow ICANN's current process, which is if we have a recent background check on file, for an affiliated provider, we would not need to conduct a new background check. And, we'll redefine a recent background check to be a background check that is within one year. So, if the background check is over one year old, we would need to perform a new background check on any affiliated entity, but apart from that issue, it seemed to be that that document had been fully reviewed by the IRT, and so, that is ready for public comment.

Again, if anything in the policy document, and/or the application document, changes anything that- excuse me, the accreditation agreement, or the policy document, would need to change anything in the application, or applicant guidebook, then we would amend that document and have the IRT review it again.

Then, lastly, we have the de-accreditation process document, which the IRT also reviewed over a series of a few weeks, maybe even a few

months, and it seems like that document is also pretty much finalised. The one issue that we were going to flag for public comment was the issue around transition providers - if a provider is involuntarily terminated, the situation with where would abuse complaints be filed, would the clock start over? So, what we've done, just as a reminder, is we have added some text to the de-accreditation document that provided that any abuse complaint received between the time a de-accredited provider has been notified that they are being terminated, and that termination date, the terminated provider would have an obligation to send any outstanding abuse complaints to the [UNKNOWN] provider.

So, that has been added into the agreement, and as we discussed, it may or may not happen, because sometimes, during an involuntary termination, involuntarily terminated providers stop responding entirely to any request, and then don't co-operate at all with the [UNKNOWN] providers. That's just a note that we have added that in, per the IRT's feedback, but we'll still flag the issue for public comment in the event that anyone in the community has any other suggestions for how to handle that problem.

So, that's a general status update, where we are on all of the documents that are under review by the IRT. Really, the two outstanding documents are the accreditation agreement, that should be reviewed by all, and any feedback provided will be by December 1<sup>st</sup>, and the policy document, which has been reviewed, but may need to be updated, and at least the provision in the policy document will need to be changed, since the accreditation agreement may have to be updated as well.

---

That's the status update of all of the documents. Does anybody have any questions on any of those - where the documents stand, or any of the proposed deadlines? For those of you who may have joined in the middle of my spiel - I had thrown out to the IRT if anyone had an objection with some of the IRT members request of a December 1<sup>st</sup> deadline for the accreditation agreement, and there was no objection on the call or in the chat, so. If anyone has any comments on where we stand with any of these documents, or the proposed deadline, please feel free to chime in in the chat, or on the call.

Okay, I see a comment from Eric that says - appreciate the update, feel good here. Okay, thank you, Eric.

Okay, I don't see any hands raised, but- Oh, Steve's is typing, so I'll let him finish his thought. Okay. He has said - that's very helpful of you. Thank you, Steve.

So, with the administrative questions out of the way, there has been some talk on the list about the overarching concerns either with the speed that the IRT is moving, or some general concerns with the accreditation agreement, or the way that we've been reviewing the accreditation agreement on the call. So, I wanted to give everyone the opportunity to either let us know [UNKNOWN] ICANN, or we can [UNKNOWN] facilitate your views of the agreement. I know that we have pushed the date back to December 1<sup>st</sup>, so that may ease some concerns with how quickly we were reviewing the agreement, but if there's anything else that might [UNKNOWN] in your review, please let us know, or if there's any overarching concerns that you'd like to bring

to the group's attention, please feel free to raise your hand now, or speak up in the chat. I'll just leave a minute or two if anybody has any additional comments on other concerns with the accreditation agreement.

Okay, I'm not seeing any hands raised, or anyone typing in the chat. So, I think what might be the best course of action is to, obviously, keep checking in with the list to see what the issues are, and if there's anything that we need to specifically schedule a call to discuss, then we can schedule ad-hoc calls, but I think that in the interim, it might be confusing to go over some significant changes to the agreement while many members of the IRT are still reviewing a certain version of the agreement. So, for version control issues, it might make more sense to just wait, unless there are things that the IRT believe we can discuss in the mean time, or if we should continue having calls and discussing what we have received already.

I think it would probably be more helpful to get all of the feedback at once, and discuss it at once, but, again, I leave that up to members of the IRT - what they think would be the most helpful. I see some are chatting, so I'll let people type in there thoughts.

Okay, so Sara Bockey says - agree that is would be beneficial to get feedback and review in a holistic manner. Darcy Southwell says - agree, we should wait to get all comments back before reviewing or discussing draft documents. Steve Metalitz says - there were a couple of general issues raised that perhaps can be discussed on the list, for example, whether [UNKNOWN] match all definitions, GDPR, etc.. Vicky is also

---

typing. Vicky says - agree with [UNKNOWN], so long as we keep to a firm December 1<sup>st</sup> deadline for comments.

Okay, thank you, Vicky, and thank you Sara, Darcy, and Steve. That's helpful.

So, we'll go ahead and pause on having IRT meetings prior to December 1<sup>st</sup>, just to allow everyone to devote that time to reviewing the accreditation agreement. Behind the scenes, we'll be working [UNKNOWN] ICANN org to make sure that we're working on system preparation for the privacy proxy applicants, and be prepared to receive those.

Sorry, we have a couple of other comments in the chat. Lindsay Hamilton-Reid says - agree with Darcy, there are a lot of issues with the current draft, and Steve says - +1, Vicky, regarding firm December 1<sup>st</sup> deadline. Okay, thank you, Lindsay and Steve.

So, there seems to be general agreement that we have a December 1<sup>st</sup> deadline to receive all the feedback, and I'd like to remind everyone that you're welcome to submit feedback to the list. It's also helpful to track your feedback in the issues list that I provided to the IRT in an email - I'm happy to resend that if anybody doesn't have the issues list. It just helps to have all the feedback for a particular issue in a single column, so we can discuss it all - as someone mentioned, I think it was Sara - holistically.

So, we'll keep to that firm December 1<sup>st</sup> deadline, and we will pause our IRT meetings until that deadline.

---



Does anyone else have any comments, questions, or concerns to bring to the IRT before we go ahead and close out this call? Additionally, if there's anything that would help from your review, or from ICANN org, please feel free to let us know - either now, or via the list.

Steve says our next call will be December 5<sup>th</sup> - Let me just do a quick calendar check. That's correct, Steve. Yeah, so, we'll plan on our next call being December 5<sup>th</sup>. Again, please be respectful of that December 1<sup>st</sup> deadline - that will give ICANN org a few days to be able to compile all of that feedback to send to the IRT, and remember that December 5<sup>th</sup> call. So, again, please be respectful of that December 1<sup>st</sup> deadline.

Did anybody else have any questions, concerns, comments? I'll just give one more minute, in case anyone thinks of anything.

Okay. Seeing no-one typing, and no hands raised, I'd like to thank everyone for tuning into the call. Please feel free, again, to type any general issues you see to the list, and please provide any of your feedback via that issues list that we sent around. If you'd rather provide it via email, I'll go ahead and plug it into the issues list for you.

Again, thanks everyone - we will regroup on December 5<sup>th</sup>.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**