

Relevant Text From Draft Framework	IRT Feedback	Notes
1.1 "Requestor"	Steve Metalitz--it seems as though this document does address jurisdictional concerns so if others have suggested edits please provide them	No suggested edits from IRT
1.4 "Requested Information"	Steve Metalitz: This should be edited as it goes beyond scope of disclosure as defined in the Final Report. This can be obtained through other means (subpoena etc) but this is a different process than Disclosure which is covered here. Suggest ending 1.4 in the middle of the second sentence "in the request submission."	Will propose redline with note re reasoning re: scope of this framework (disclosure only).
	Greg DiBiase: I agree with Steve. This is also problematic later on in the Policy, requested information is used along with Disclosure-- should be shortened to not include this other information that requires a subpoena which is a different track of request.	
	Alex Deacon--sounds reasonable	
	Eric Rokobauer--+1 Greg	
	Roger Carney--agree	
	Darcy Southwell-Agree with Greg	
1.5 "Priority Level"	Steve Metalitz: One way to address this would be to define high priority as including only requests of the type identified in 4.1.1.	In redline, will propose to add definition of "high priority" and "standard priority" for discussion.
	Vicky Sheckler--agree with metalitz	
2. Minimum requirements for disclosure request submissions	No issues raised with IRT proposal noted in C11	Add proposed redline "minimum requirements should include a verification statement (e.g. all provided information is true and correct)
2.1.2	suggestion--should "police authority" be added as additional example?	will add proposed redline to include "e.g. prosecutor, judge, police authority"

Relevant Text From Draft Framework	IRT Feedback	Notes
	Volker Greimann--what does that term mean?	will add proposed redline to add legal authority justifying provision of data (see comments in draft v1)
	Darcy Southwell--not sure police authority has ability to decide in the U.S.	
	Steve Metalitz--Ok to add, it will vary by country	
	Darcy--change i.e. to e.g.	
	Vicky Sheckler--+1 Steve	
	Roger Carney--I like that Darcy	
	Roger Carney--I think if we go with e.g. I don't think we have to get too specific about what it means, will be based on the jurisdiction	
	Eric Rokobauer--+1 Roger	
	Steve Metalitz--as long as this is e.g. this will vary by jurisdiction, I think change is fine	
	Re: suggestion to provide source of legal authority for request--would that fit better under 2.1.2? (originally suggested in 2.1.3)	
	Greg DiBiase--2.1.2 works too, probably better.	
2.1.4 priority level	Roger Carney--should justification of priority level be included here too?	Will add redline adding sentence from 4.1.2. here.
	Darcy--+1 Roger	
	Greg DiBiase--agree with Roger	
	Steve Metalitz--that appears in 4.1.2 and could be moved here.	
	Darcy Southwell: Rationale is especially important since I'm not certain that the Requestor always has authority to set this timefram	
re: IRT suggestion that "suggestion" be added before "deadline"	Roger Carney--I suggested this because deadline may be a decision made on current workload--also fits with language in 4.1.3 (re if provider cannot adhere to deadline)	

Relevant Text From Draft Framework	IRT Feedback	Notes
2.1.5	discussion re: IRT input on customer notifications	IRT generally agreed that any proposed edits will be proposed in later section re: notification (4.3)
3.1.1 Provider will establish a dedicated point of contact...	Volker Greimann--I oppose publishing the LEA contact on our website	Nick Shorey noted in chat--in terms of process--the contact point needs to be immediately accessible
	Alex Deacon--it seems if there isn't a different contact then I would assume the abuse contact would be used if nothing had been previously specified. I'm not sure if that's satisfactory.. I'd be interested to hear suggestions from those who oppose publishing the contact.	
	Volker Greimann--same as in the RAA	
	Alex Deacon--sounds OK to me	
	Volker Greimann--exactly--if it is good enough for registrars it is good enough for PP	
	Darcy Southwell--I believe PDP intent was to mirror RAA	
Should RAA 3.18 be adapted and pasted here?	Roger Carney--I think that is a good proposal	Will adapt 3.18 RAA for this section as proposed redline
3.2.1	Steve Metalitz--24 hours is to acknowledge receipt and completeness, not to act on request	Will draft proposed redline proposing 2 business days in the provider's jurisdiction
	Roger Carney--I think that 24 hours would still be pretty hard. It is a review but the clause of the last action if it isn't complete enough--it will be hard to determine that--24 hours is pretty unachievable consistently	
	Volker Greimann--we have weekends, holidays, etc	
	Darcy +1 Volker	

Relevant Text From Draft Framework	IRT Feedback	Notes
	Sarah Wyld--24 hours inadequate, even 48 may not be enough on a long weekend	
	Sarah Wyld--24 hours inadequate, even 48 may not be enough on a long weekend	
	Sarah Wyld--2 business days if not 3	
	Darcy Southwell--business days at the location of the Provider	
	Eric Rokobauer--agree with Darcy re: referencing business days	
	Roger Carney--we agree that we need to consider that there could be safety issues, but here what we are saying, we will be contractually bound to this number, we can respond faster but if people aren't available at the time due to whatever circumstances, 24 hours is fairly restrictive. it's not that it will always take 2 business days to respond, especially to higher-level ones, but 2 business days makes more sense for a contractual requirement	
	Greg DiBiase--2 business days works for me	
	Darcy Southwell--Agree	
	Sarah Wyld--agree	
3.2.2	No comments on call.	Leave in note for IRT members that concerns have been raised re: verification
4.1.2	steve metalitz: "Actioned in accordance with 4.2 and 4.3"?	Add proposed line edit "actioned in accordance with 4.2 and 4.3."
4.2.2		add reference for IRT in discussion document showing where these points originated in the Final Report
4.2.5		AB will add reference to Final Report in IRT discussion document

Relevant Text From Draft Framework	IRT Feedback	Notes
4.3.1	Volker Greiman-it sounds like we have to notify--that can't be right?	<b>Note--there is a problem with the recording starting around 1:14--IRT member comments are out of sync with host audio;</b>
	Steve Metalitz--If you look back at 2.1.5--LEA has to say this in their request--we don't care if you notify or we don't want you to notify the customer--that's kind of covered and wouldn't hurt to clarify that if LEA doesn't clarify then customer can be notified; under policy reqs providers are not required to notify-they have to spell that out in their ToS	Will note source of this in Final Report; in redline will propose clarification in line with 2.1.5