

[IRT Discussion Draft v1] Privacy and Proxy Services Accreditation Policy Section 6

VI. Reviews and Record-Keeping

A. Record-Keeping

- i. Privacy and Proxy Service providers SHOULD maintain statistics on the number of Publication and Disclosure requests received and the number honored.ⁱ
- ii. Privacy and Proxy Service providers SHOULD provide these statistics to ICANN in aggregate form to ICANN for periodic publication, as specified in the Privacy and Proxy Service Provider Accreditation Agreement, as may be updated from time to time.ⁱⁱ
- iii. Privacy and Proxy Service providers SHALL retain additional data that is required to facilitate future reviews of this Accreditation Program, as further specified in the Accreditation Agreement.ⁱⁱⁱ

- B. A review of the IP Disclosure Framework SHOULD be conducted at an appropriate time after the launch of this Accreditation Program and periodically thereafter, to determine if the implemented recommendations meet the policy objectives for which they were developed.^{iv}

ⁱ See Final Report, page 18

ⁱⁱ See Final report, page 18. The Final Report states that “the WG recommends that providers should be required to maintain statistics on the number of Publication and Disclosure requests received and the number honored, and provide these statistics in aggregate form to ICANN for periodic publication.” ICANN org proposes to specify here that ICANN will designate the format for these statistics.

ⁱⁱⁱ The Final Report, at page 15, “The WG recommends that a review of this Disclosure Framework be conducted at an appropriate time after the launch of the program and periodically thereafter, to determine if the implemented recommendations meet the policy objectives for which they were developed.” ICANN org reads this as indicating that the GNSO, rather than ICANN, would initiate this review. However, this review could require additional data to be collected and retained so that it can be used for the review. ICANN org plans to discuss this with the IRT in the context of the IP framework section of the Policy and the related contractual requirements. Example data points that may need to be collected might include: information about how the RDS record changed over time, information about requests submitted under the IP framework, and others.

^{iv} See Final Report, page 15, “The WG recommends that a review of this Disclosure Framework be conducted at an appropriate time after the launch of the program and periodically thereafter, to determine if the implemented recommendations meet the policy objectives for which they were developed.”

Commented [AB1]: Note to IRT: It is likely that these provisions will ultimately be combined into a different section of this Policy (e.g. the proposed final section on general accreditation program requirements and processes).

Commented [AB2]: Note to IRT: This was not in the Final Report, but is being proposed for discussion in light of language contemplating a future review of the IP Framework (as directed in the Final Report). It is possible that broader reviews might also be initiated that could require relevant data. This, this is proposed for IRT discussion and feedback.

The specific information to be retained will be discussed with the IRT in the context of the more detailed contractual provision.

Commented [AB3]: Question for IRT: Did the PDP WG intend for this review to be done by ICANN or the GNSO? If the former, this does not need to be in the Policy, as noted above. If this is a GNSO review and should remain in the Policy, this provision might ultimately be moved elsewhere, possibly to the IP framework section or the final accreditation processes section.