

Michelle DeSmyter:Dear All, Welcome to the Privacy and Proxy Services Accreditation IRT Meeting on Tuesday, 16 January 2018 15:00 UTC.

Sara Bockey:what page are we on again

Eric Rokobauer:+1 putting that clarification at the beginning

Greg DiBiase 2:This section makes sense to me

Owen Smigelski:A frequent time Compliance sees proxy or privacy services enabled is in response to a Whois inaccuracy complaint

Owen Smigelski:So data that appears inaccurate is then masked, and it's not clear if it's fixed. There could be a change, or not, but the Whois inaccuracy complaint would be closed because the data is changed in the public Whois.

Owen Smigelski:This could be a gap, because according to the public Whois, at least with the enabling of a proxy service, the RNH has changed.

steve metalitz:Thanks Owen for providing a concrete example of why this validation may be needed.

Greg DiBiase 2:sorry what page?

Eric Rokobauer:+1 Greg That ultimately is what I was trying to refer too...that we are referencing two separate contracts. Notifications to Registrar should still happen.

Greg DiBiase 2:the original information would be listed

Margie Milam:I am going offline - but will remain on the call

Greg DiBiase 2:agree with input from both

Sara Bockey:Would still be an issue for unaffiliated provider - no?

Sara Bockey:OK, got it

Greg DiBiase 2:I think Steve's comment makes sense

Vlad Dinculescu:Agree with Steve

Susan Kawaguchi 2:agree with Steve

Sara Bockey:Agree with Steve as well

Roger Carney:+1 Steve

Leana Melnichuk:yes I'm ok with it appearing there and i agree with steve it should be more clear

steve metalitz:+1 Susan's point re gaming

Greg DiBiase 2:The label is including the ICANN url which will provide the necessary information

Margie Milam 2:+1 Susan's point

steve metalitz:@Greg, correct , but will Whois users understand that?

Susan Kawaguchi 2:Thanks Amy

Lindsay Hamilton-Reid:We need to only include what is necessary and if a clause applies. Just because it doesn't hurt to have it in, doesn't mean we should. I think we should answer Theo's question.

Lindsay Hamilton-Reid:Thanks Amy, I still think we need to look

closely at what we include in this agreement. I am concerned we are overcomplicating matters.

steve metalitz:@Theo's comment, 1.3.6 specifically deals with privacy/proxy services (at least potentially).

Lindsay Hamilton-Reid:Agree with Theo on this one.

steve metalitz:This section is an illustrative list. Don't understand why it should be edited in this document.

Lindsay Hamilton-Reid:That's fine - I just don't want there to be any confusion with regard to current policies in place or the processes of registrars or resellers.

Eric Rokobauer:Thanks Amy - And I had made those comments before Peter had the opportunity to add on this document

Ashley Heineman:Not to sound flip, but won't GDPR require that these companies have a privacy lawyer? I'm just trying to understand the concern about these companies not having access to lawyers.

Lindsay Hamilton-Reid:Not necessarily Ashley - you need to be a certain size to appoint a data protection officer but the legislation does not mention anything about employing a lawyer.

Susan Kawaguchi 2:I was going to support what Steve said

Susan Kawaguchi 2:I am sensitive to small businesses but we cannot design this for the lowest common denominator

Peter Roman:2 business days to even determine if a request is high priority is way too long

Peter Roman:determine

Sara Bockey:We should keep in mind that we have TEAC with the registrar for this reason. For immediate responses. Perhaps the Provider should not be the first contact, it should be the registrar

Lindsay Hamilton-Reid:Agree with Sara on that suggestion.

Ashley Heineman:Have to drop off, but the argument of being too small to be responsible is getting a bit tenuous.

Vlad Dinculescu:Thanks all

Lisa Villeneuve:Thank you

Lindsay Hamilton-Reid:Thank you

Peter Roman:Thank you