

8:24:52 From Michelle DeSmyter : Dear All, Welcome to the Privacy and Proxy Services Accreditation Meeting on Tuesday, 17 April 2018 at 15:00 UTC.

09:01:01 From Sara Bockey : I'm concerned that there are not enough registrars on this call so proceeding may be ill-advised.

09:01:17 From Sara Bockey : Is there a reason this IRT has not yet been paused like the RDS WG?

09:01:56 From amy.bivins.icann : Hi Sara, it's my understanding that most registrars support the edits you proposed on the LEA specification draft so the default at this point is to add these edits absent significant concerns from other IRT members. do you still see an issue with proceeding?

09:03:34 From Sara Bockey : Well I guess that depends on what you view as significant concern

09:12:44 From Ashley Heineman (US) : As noted, Pete Roman is not able to participate in today's call. The following is Pete's feedback on the edits currently proposed: I think the whole phrase is problematic and "without limitation" is especially so. I don't understand why they want to be in the position of making legal judgements about requests from law enforcement. It only increases their liability and they have no relevant expertise on which to base their decisions. In essence, they seem to repeatedly be asking for the ability to make arbitrary and capricious decisions about emergency requests. Feel free to tell them that I said that.

We should suggest that they take some comfort from and expect a reduced exposure for turning over information from requests that have been passed on to them through their local law enforcement, as these will be.

09:13:13 From Ashley Heineman (US) : [cont'd] Similarly, the contract is there partly to protect them. The more the contract restricts their ability to say no for no apparent reason, the less liability they are likely to face if somebody is injured when they say no (or yes).

The more the contract allows them to say no because they just don't like law enforcement, the more exposure they have for any decision they make. And the more lawyers they will need to hire and have available when making those decisions.

09:18:41 From Sara Bockey : I can live with Steve's edit to 2.1.10

09:18:41 From Ashley Heineman (US) : I'll ask that Pete send something to the list.

09:18:57 From SJM : I think the comments Ashley posted have to do with 4.2 and should be discussed then.

09:21:59 From Sara Bockey : I'm ok with the edit to 3.2.1.

09:22:20 From SJM : +1 Sara re 3.2.1

09:25:09 From Roger Carney : +1 Sara

09:25:30 From Leana Melnichuk : +1 Sara

09:25:49 From Alicia Kaelin : +1 Sara

09:25:58 From Lisa Villeneuve : +1 Sara

09:27:11 From Sara Bockey : Relating back to 3.2 - I think that 4.1.2 should be moved under 3.2 Receipt Processing. It's already prioritized b/c it's high priority. If it's moved under 3.2 it would seem to provide clarity.

09:28:43 From SJM : Not sure why moving this provision would make things clearer.....

09:29:21 From Leana Melnichuk : I support moving it

09:31:50 From darcysouthwell : Steve's drafting suggestion is a good idea.

09:32:10 From Sara Bockey : Agree with Steve... either way.

09:32:11 From darcysouthwell : Provides more clarity for process.

09:32:43 From Roger Carney : @steve, I think that might read better

09:33:20 From Leana Melnichuk : @steve, great suggestion

09:35:29 From mary.wong : @Steve I believe that's right (in terms of where the specific language originated, and for consistency).

09:37:06 From Sara Bockey : I believe "without limitations" was in the final report

09:39:28 From Sara Bockey : I don't understand the question

09:41:59 From Sara Bockey : Ok, I will take that back and think on it

09:42:04 From Sara Bockey : Thank you for clarifying

09:43:11 From SJM : No issue with 4.2.2.4

09:44:09 From Sara Bockey : This one reflects language from the RAA

09:46:52 From mary.wong : “well-founded” comes from 3.18.2.

09:48:25 From Sara Bockey : The contributor is not on the call and I will not speak for them

09:51:03 From Sara Bockey : No comment.

09:52:20 From Sara Bockey : If it doesn’t hurt anything by reiterating, then there is no harm. Belt and Suspenders.

09:59:11 From Sara Bockey : OK, gotcha! Thank you. Clearly I need more coffee

10:06:41 From SJM : So is section 4 the only changed provision of this document?

10:10:22 From Sara Bockey : Yes, itemization of the fees. Needs to be very specific

10:11:15 From Sara Bockey : Zoom can record

10:15:52 From SJM : Thanks Amy and all

10:15:54 From Sara Bockey : Thanks all

10:15:55 From Lisa Villeneuve : Thank you.

10:15:57 From Roger Carney : Thanks!!