

DRAFT: Privacy & Proxy Services Implementation Review Team - GAC Public Safety Working Group Disclosure Framework

Purpose:

This document sets out draft principles developed by representatives of the Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC) working group on Public Safety (PSWG), and endorsed by the GAC, regarding the policy implementation for the processing of disclosure requests by accredited Privacy and Proxy Service providers, in accordance with the GNSO Final Report on Privacy & Proxy Services Accreditation Issues Policy Development Process.

This disclosure framework will provide guidance to the Privacy and Proxy Services Implementation Review Team during the development of policy in response to the final report and related GAC advice on this matter.

1. Definition of terms

- 1.1. The “Requestor”: Law enforcement, consumer protection, quasi-governmental or other similar authorities designated from time to time by the national or territorial government of the jurisdiction in which the privacy or proxy service provider is established or maintains a physical office;¹
- 1.2. The “Provider”: The entity who provides the Privacy and / or Proxy service;
- 1.3. The “Customer”: The subscriber of the Privacy or Proxy service;
- 1.4. The “Requested Information”: The data asked for by the Requestor. This must be detailed in the request submission.

¹ This definition is based on Section 3.18.2 of the 2013 Registrar Accreditation Agreement, which provision spells out a registrar’s obligation to maintain a point of contact for, and to review reports received from, law enforcement authorities 14; as such, the WG notes that its recommendation for a definition of “law enforcement authority” in the context of privacy and proxy service accreditation should also be updated to the extent that, and if and when, the corresponding definition in the RAA is modified. (See final report, p. 8).

Commented [AB1]: Rationale: Redline proposed based on definition of “disclosure” (see Final Report p. 8), “the reveal of a person’s (i.e. the licensee or beneficial owner of a registered domain name) identity/contact details to a third party Requester without Publication in the WHOIS system.”

In the IRT’s view, this process should be limited to disclosure requests. This does not mean that LEA cannot request other information, such as items identified in proposal, but that LEA should use other means to do so, such as a subpoena, court order, etc.

OFFICIAL

- 1.5. The “Priority Level”: The urgency with which the disclosure request should be actioned. ~~Disclosure~~ requests may be categorized as “high priority” or “standard priority.” “High priority” requests are limited to circumstances that pose an imminent threat to life, serious bodily injury, critical infrastructure or child exploitation.

Commented [AB2]: Rationale: Redline proposed to clarify specific criteria for a request to qualify as “high priority.”

OFFICIAL

OFFICIAL

2. Minimum requirements for disclosure request submissions

2.1. As a minimum standard for acceptance, disclosure request submissions must contain:

- 2.1.1. Domain name or URL involved;
- 2.1.2. Deciding authority (e.g. prosecutor, judge, police authority) behind this request and source of legal authority for request;
- 2.1.3. Details of Requested Information;
- 2.1.4. Priority Level, including detail about threat type and justification for Priority Level, and / or suggested deadline for response;
- 2.1.5. Instructions regarding timeline requirements for customer notification;
- 2.1.6. Requestor contact details, including instructions for identity verification;
- 2.1.7. Any details otherwise required by national or international law.
- 2.1.8. A verification statement (e.g. all provided information is true and correct).

Commented [AB3]: Rationale: Redline proposed to provide additional examples and make clear that this is a non-exclusive list of deciding authorities.

Commented [AB4]: Rationale: Redline proposed to add legal rationale/source of authority for LEA request.

2.2. To assist the Provider, further additional information may include:

- 2.2.1. Evidence of earlier contact (attempts), if any, and if deemed relevant by the Requestor;
- 2.2.2. Requestor contact details for the customer;
- 2.2.3. Reference to applicable national or international law(s), ICANN regulation(s);
- 2.2.4. Details of decision to order disclosure of information.

OFFICIAL

OFFICIAL

3. Receipt Process

3.1. Pre-Request:

3.1.1. The Provider will establish and maintain a designated Requestor point of contact for submitting disclosure requests.

Commented [AB5]: Note 1: Majority of IRT members opposed the idea that the LEA contact should be publicly available on a provider's website, as this will result in spamming of contact, slower processing times, and non-LEA complaints being sent to the LEA contact. IRT proposed using RAA approach (See Section 3.18 of RAA). Redline proposed based on adaptation of RAA Section 3.18.

As alternatives to publishing the contact on the Provider's website, two alternatives have been proposed:

- (1) Providers could publish a way for LEA to request their LEA contact via the Provider's website; and/or
- (2) ICANN could maintain a list (not publicly available) of Provider LEA contacts so that LEA could request a Provider's LEA contact directly from ICANN.

3.2. Receipt Process:

3.2.1. Within two business days (in the Provider's jurisdiction) of the disclosure request been submitted, the Provider will review the request, and confirm it has been received and contains the relevant information required to meet the minimum standard for acceptance. If the request does not meet the minimum standard, the Provider will notify the Requestor.

Commented [AB6]: Rationale: Redline proposed in light of IRT conclusion that 24 hours is too short a window. This proposal would accommodate holidays/weekends.

3.2.2. Where the Requestor is not known to the Provider, the Provider will verify the identity of the Requestor.

Commented [AB7]: Note to IRT: Concerns have been raised about challenges associated with verification here, but no suggestions have been made for substantive edits. Please review and suggest any edits you would like to propose to mitigate concerns.

4. Provider response actions (two-tier prioritization)

4.1. Prioritization:

Commented [AB8]: Note: The preferred ICANN style is to spell this word using a "z" instead of an "s"

4.1.1. Upon completion of the Receipt Process, the Provider will action in accordance with 4.2 and 4.3 the disclosure request in accordance with the Priority Level. High Priority requests can include an imminent threat to life, serious bodily injury, critical infrastructure or child exploitation.

Commented [AB9]: Rationale: Redline proposed to clarify the meaning of "actioned."

4.1.2. Where a disclosure request has been categorized as High Priority,

OFFICIAL

OFFICIAL

this must be **actioned** within 24 hours. The Requestor will detail the threat type and justification for Priority Level.

Commented [AB10]: IRT question--how is "actioned" defined?

4.1.3. For all other disclosure requests not identified as High Priority, the Provider should seek to action these in accordance with the deadline identified in the request. If the Provider cannot adhere to this deadline, the Provider should notify the Requestor and provide a reasonable timeframe for response.

4.2. Disclosure:

4.2.1. Within the appropriate timeframe consistent with the Priority Level, the Provider will disclose to Requestor using a secure mechanism the Requested Information it holds against the account.

4.2.2. Disclosure can be reasonably refused, for reasons consistent with the general policy stated herein, including without limitation any of the following:

4.2.2.1. The Requestor failed to provide to information to meet the minimum standard for acceptance as outlined in Section 2;

4.2.2.2. If disclosure would lead to a contravention of national or international law;

4.2.2.3. where the customer has provided, or the Provider has found, specific information, facts, and/or circumstances showing that disclosure will endanger the safety of the **customer**.

Commented [AB11]: Note to IRT: Final Report, p. 16, item 20 (last sentence) recommends that any LEA framework that is developed include this provision.

OFFICIAL

OFFICIAL

- 4.2.3. If disclosure is refused, the Provider must state to the Requestor in writing or by electronic communication its specific reasons for refusing to disclose. This must be completed prior to any Customer Notification, irrespective of the reason for refusal;
- 4.2.4. In exceptional circumstances, if the Provider requires additional time to respond to the Requestor, the Provider shall inform the Requestor of the cause of the delay, and agree with the Requestor a new date by which it will provide its response under this Section.
- 4.2.5. For all refusals made in accordance with the policy and requirements herein, the Provider must accept and give due consideration to Requestor's requests for reconsideration of the refusal to disclose.
- 4.3. Customer Notification:
 - 4.3.1. The Provider will notify the Customer of the disclosure request in accordance with its published Terms of Service and the timeframe identified by the Requestor.
 - 4.3.2. The Provider may voluntarily set a generic timeframe for Customer Notification (for example 90 days), which can be extended at the behest of the Requestor. Details of any generic timeframe must be published on the Provider website, and the Requestor must always be informed in advance of any time limit being implemented or changed.
 - 4.3.3. The Provider must notify the Requestor at least three working days before Customer Notification takes place.

Commented [AB12]: Note to IRT: This language is copied from the IP framework, Final Report p. 92, item E.

Commented [AB13]: Note to IRT: Concerns have been raised about this section but no substantive edits other than those marked below have been suggested. If you would like to suggest additional proposed redline edits, please do.

Commented [AB14]: Rationale: This redline is being proposed because the Policy Recommendations do not require customer notification—the Provider must simply spell out whatever processes it follows for notifications in its terms of service.

5. Issues of Non-response / non-compliance with LEA requests

- 5.1. In cases of the Requestor receiving no response from the Provider, or non-compliance with disclosure requests within contractually defined or mutually agreed timelines, the issue may be escalated to ICANN in accordance with existing compliance mechanisms, or other appropriate legal mechanisms available within the jurisdiction in which the privacy or proxy service Provider is established or maintains a physical office.

OFFICIAL

OFFICIAL

6. Additional guidance

- 6.1. The Provider may voluntarily action disclosure requests from non-designated government authorities in accordance with the processes detailed within this document, where such action does not conflict with national or international law(s).
- 6.2. A Requestor must comply with all applicable data protection laws and to use any information disclosed to it solely for the purpose to determine whether further action on the issue is warranted, to contact the customer, or in legal proceeding concerning the issue for which the request was made.
- 6.3. Customer notification should take place at the earliest opportunity, unless such disclosure would pose a risk to operational sensitivity; safety of individuals; or is prohibited by law or court order. Such circumstances must be detailed in the disclosure request.

OFFICIAL