

Alejandro Hernandez

Alex Deacon

Alicia Kaelin

Ashley Heineman

Cyrus Jamnejad

Eric Rokobauer

Leana Melnichuk

Lisa Villeneuve

Luc Seufer

Phil Marano

Roger Carney

Sara Bockey

Seth Reiss

Steve Metalitz

Theo Geurts

Vlad Dinculescu

Staff:

Amy Bivins

Jennifer Gore

Mary Wong

Caitlin Tubergen

Owen Smigelski

Michelle DeSmyter

AC Chat transcript 20, February 2018

Michelle DeSmyter:Dear all, welcome to the Privacy and Proxy Services Accreditation IRT Meeting on Tuesday, 20 February 2018 at 15:00 UTC.

Sara Bockedy:Sorry for joining late..

Sara Bockey:what is the proposed frequency right now?

Theo Geurts:1 month

Vlad Dinculescu:+1 to Theo's comment. If this is just for data gathering, then frequency should be low. every 6 months seems fine

Leana Melnichuk:I agree with quarterly

Theo Geurts:not really Alex

Theo Geurts:very faint

Vlad Dinculescu:much better

Theo Geurts:perfect

Theo Geurts:I have so far not heard any strong arguments for reporting.

Luc Seufer:I would be afraid that those reports turn out to be used like the arbitration center stats. IMO the fact that an arbitration more frequently ruled for the complainant doesn't mean it's working well. Just like the number of disclosed requests won't be meaningful.

Luc Seufer:*arbitration court

Mary Wong:My recollection is that part of the reason for requiring aggregated reporting was to inform the periodic review of the Disclosure Framework as well.

Alex Deacon:+1 re data driven policy development.

Theo Geurts:As former DMPM WG member, I love data driven PDPs. if the data is good

Theo Geurts:No suggestions for now

Alex Deacon:can we have control of the doc being displayed?

Alex Deacon:thanks.

steve metalitz:@Amy wouldn't knowing the # of names be sufficient, rather than delving into # of contacts?

Theo Geurts:I rather not delve into them

Eric Rokobauer:I agree with Steve and Theo regarding moving those contacts out

Vlad Dinculescu:A per-tld report seems excessive. The more TLDs offered, the more work has to be done to generate the reports.

Luc Seufer:Reg. the IP classification who is responsible for this determination? Most often I am seeing so called "IP infringements" in our abuse queue that are in fact unrelated to IP but other kind of dispute between the registrant and a third party.

steve metalitz:@Luc this will be a benefit from implementation of the policy because there is a separate template required for IP requests.

Luc Seufer:so we classify based on the template used and not the content of the request

Theo Geurts:@Steve, that sounds practical

Alex Deacon:+1 Steve

Alex Deacon:Steve said what I wanted to say.

Luc Seufer:if it's optional and we can easily mark request as

spurious fine by me

Theo Geurts:Will the public comment be in phases on the several sections?

Luc Seufer:fine by me

Vlad Dinculescu:Seems fine

Alex Deacon:I need to drop off - thanks all.

Theo Geurts:cya

Vlad Dinculescu:Agree with Theo.

Sara Bockey:Agree with Theo. We need to see the rationale and breakdown for these fees. Way too high

Vlad Dinculescu:The One-Time Application seems high, maybe we can review that and justify the cost. I'm not seeing the need for the Annual Fee for such a small service

Luc Seufer:Please do.

Leana Melnichuk: I agree the cost is high

Luc Seufer:For already contracted parties?

Sara Bockey:so that explains perhaps the app fee, but not the annual fee

Luc Seufer:that explains the application fee for unrelated parties. Not for those already vetted

Sara Bockey:Annual fee should be for non-affiliated only, perhaps

Vlad Dinculescu:Agree with Theo

Luc Seufer:Do we have data regarding ICANN compliance workload? Do they really need to hire more staff to cover this program?

Jennifer Gore:There will be hard annual cost for affiliated and non-affiliated contracted parties.

steve metalitz:@Amy, please take a look at 5.1. It could be phrased more clearly I think.

steve metalitz:*could*

Luc Seufer:ih that's how it work. Let me try it @Amy strike the annual fee for allied parties, thanks.

Luc Seufer;;-)

steve metalitz:p. 50 I think

Luc Seufer:from a local court order or LEA request right?

Theo Geurts:I think I am okay with Steves suggestion

Ashley Heineman:Not representing the PSWG, FWIW. Pete is the official PSWG rep.

Luc Seufer:during business days

Sara Bockey:Must action within 24 hours is not realistic. Perhaps: Provider shall use its best efforts to action the request within 24 hours. What's important to note here is a court order/subpoena may still be required prior to release of any information. Registrar cannot be required to take any action in contravention of applicable law.

Luc Seufer:and how do you know a request is urgent without

opening it?

Ashley Heineman:Is section 2.1 not sufficient for some of these concerns being raised?

Ashley Heineman:specifically, 2.1.2; 2.1.4; 2.1.7.

Luc Seufer:let's stick to business day

Luc Seufer:we don't all have the capacity to run a 24/7 service

Luc Seufer:especially after paying all those accreditation fees you are going to charge us with

Luc Seufer:you still need someone seating at its desk on a 24/7 basis

Luc Seufer:if sending an automated email saying that a human will review the request during working hours fine.

Mary Wong:@Luc, all, per Steve's suggestion on email and this call, will using the phrase "take action in accordance with Sections 4.2 and 4.3" etc. instead of just saying "action" (which implies acting on something) help?

Luc Seufer:it wasn't clear from Steve if an automated email was enough. I understood it as needing a human intervention

Sara Bockey:Not necessarily. Given all the changes that have been made to this document, it is difficult to parse/read. Will know better once a "fresh" document is provided.

Ashley Heineman:agree

steve metalitz:+1 Amy re "exceptional circumstances"

Ashley Heineman:Agree with Amy any way

steve metalitz:Thanks Amy and all.....

Vlad Dinculescu:Thanks all'