

Amy Bivins

From: amy.bivins@external.icann.org
Sent: Thursday, September 13, 2018 1:01 PM
To: amy.bivins@external.icann.org
Subject: [Ext] Adobe Connect - Chat Transcript from PPIRT

Amy Bivins: (9/13/2018 11:18) Welcome to the Privacy and Proxy Service Provider Accreditation Program IRT meeting on 13 September 2018. We will get started shortly after 1600 UTC.

Theo Geurts: (11:51) alrighty

Theo Geurts: (11:51) works fine

Theo Geurts: (11:53) 'lo Jen

Theo Geurts: (11:53) yes that is more correct

Jennifer Gore: (11:53) Hi Theo!

Jennifer Gore: (11:53) Volker is silent

Theo Geurts: (11:54) he is prolly still in shock due to some progress on the rPDP

Theo Geurts: (11:54) ePDP

Jennifer Gore: (12:02) please mute yoru phones

Jennifer Gore: (12:02) thanks

Jennifer Gore: (12:02) your

Volker Greimann: (12:02) someone is conducting frankenstein experiments while drinking a slurpee?

Theo Geurts: (12:03) lol

sara bockey: (12:08) FYI - I'll need to drop from the call around :15 to the top of the hour

Darcy Southwell: (12:09) @Staff, can you give us scrolling rights? It's tough to read as it's being displayed now. The comment is cut off.

Darcy Southwell: (12:09) Perfect, thank you!

sara bockey: (12:12) Agree with Volker here. PP is a service and the registrar contract supercedes and covers it already

Theo Geurts: (12:13) agreed, these agreements need to be simple

Volker Greimann: (12:13) simple we will never get, but "simpler" would be nice

Theo Geurts: (12:14) lesss is more :)

victoria sheckler: (12:14) agree with Steve

sara bockey: (12:15) This is out of scope and would need to go back to council to even give it thought

Greg DiBiase: (12:15) it's clearly out of scope

Roger Carney: (12:16) Agree out of scope

Volker Greimann: (12:16) does it provide added benefit though? The registrant already represents the same to the registrar

victoria sheckler: (12:16) i spoke w/ Per Roman about this and while I can't speak for him, I believe he will give on this request to get the p/pIRT done

Darcy Southwell: (12:16) Agree on out of scope. That's a policy issue.

Volker Greimann: (12:16) yup, don't mind me, Amy!

Darcy Southwell: (12:21) The added language is unnecessary.

victoria sheckler: (12:21) i agree w/ Theo that the addition of the can be generic email address can be deleted as it just creates confusion. Also agree with Theo re: going overboard re: contractual obligations re: GDPR

Theo Geurts: (12:23) Steve I was one of the people who suggested to strike that

Theo Geurts: (12:24) I am more intrested where I can file a complaint at a registrar rather than see who is an officer.

steve metalitz: (12:26) @Theo does your objection extend to providing this informatoin to ICANN?

Theo Geurts: (12:27) No Steve

Theo Geurts: (12:27) I think ICANN should know, but it should not by on the website

Volker Greimann: (12:27) the issue is publication, not disclosure

Theo Geurts: (12:27) correct

victoria sheckler: (12:28) i think officer info should be provided to ICANN
sara bockey: (12:28) Providing to ICANN is fine.
Greg DiBiase: (12:28) providing to ICANN is fine.
Eric Rokobauer: (12:28) Fine with providing to ICANN
Volker Greimann: (12:29) there needs to be a justification for publication, not for non-publication :-)
Theo Geurts: (12:29) Steve is is my data not the companies data...
Theo Geurts: (12:30) As such it is subject to GDPR
Theo Geurts: (12:30) As i am in the EU:)
Darcy Southwell: (12:30) Why seek data on company officers from ICANN rather than from the body that incorporates the entity?
Theo Geurts: (12:31) Good point Darcy
Theo Geurts: (12:31) That is differs all around the globe Margie
victoria sheckler: (12:35) agree w/ steve
Theo Geurts: (12:36) If it doesnt hurt no problem right to leave it in ?
Margie Milam: (12:36) Need to drop off the call
victoria sheckler: (12:36) agree the disclsoure framework covers the issue - better to leave language as is
Theo Geurts: (12:37) Clear is better, agreed Volker
Theo Geurts: (12:39) Voker is 1000% right here.
Theo Geurts: (12:43) We will keep hitting language issues years after this thing is done, just like we find gems in the RAA 2013
sara bockey: (12:44) I need to drop but Volker is correct. Privacy needs to be removed before transfers to an unaffiliated registrar
victoria sheckler: (12:46) so are you seeing for affiliated registrars & p/p providers, then transfer all / terminate all service (registration+ p/p)?
Volker Greimann: (12:47) no victoria, just deactivate privacy and replace the ownerhsuip information before the transfer.
victoria sheckler: (12:48) @volker,thx for the clarificaton
Theo Geurts: (12:49) page 33
Theo Geurts: (12:50) agreed that works better then the current language
Theo Geurts: (12:53) It can be drafted better agreed
Theo Geurts: (12:55) that is correct
Theo Geurts: (12:56) less is more :)
Theo Geurts: (12:56) I was sure we addressed this months ago
Darcy Southwell: (12:57) It seems like there quite a few questions that need Legal's input. I think Steve asked last week for an explanation of something that required Legal and he suggested inviting Legal to this call. Including Legal would be more efficient to allow us to talk through issues and avoid delays.
Volker Greimann: (12:57) great, thanks
Volker Greimann: (12:57) hopefully legal is faster this time around
steve metalitz: (12:57) +1 Darcy, can we get legal on the call?
Volker Greimann: (12:57) being legal myself I know that is a lot to ask sometimes
steve metalitz: (12:58) or at least have written feedback from legal
Theo Geurts: (13:00) agreed Steve
Eric Rokobauer: (13:00) thanks all
steve metalitz: (13:00) thanks all!
Lisa Villeneuve: (13:00) Thanks