

IAG-CCT Conference Call (London)

25-June-2014

14:00-15:30 UTC

- Tony Onorato: Hi Charla -- is there a dial in number as well or only audio through the computer?
- Eleeza Agopian: Hi Tony -- I'm remote, too. Charla is working on the bridge now.
- Eleeza Agopian: May just be audio through the computer.
- Tony Onorato: OK -- thanks
- Tony Onorato: If there's no bridge, I can just follow along -- I haven't had success going through the speakers in the past but maybe my set up is flawed
- Eleeza Agopian: I think Charla can dial you in. She just dialed me in.
- Tony Onorato: ok -- i am at 212 506 3933
- Charla Shambley: @Tony - we have listen only audio links on the session details page <http://london50.icann.org/en/schedule/wed-iag-cct>
- Mike Nelson: Mike Nelson is on the phone
- Mike Nelson: Certainly makes sense. Even worrse than trying to identify "potential voters." How potential?
- Mike Nelson: We can really reliably determine if someone HAS registered a domain name.
- Nathalie Coupet: What would be the impact on the budget of adding potential registrants to the scope?
- Charla Shambley: @Mike - we do not have an audio bridge for this session. I can read your comment on your behalf
- Mike Nelson: Sure, I can.
- Mike Nelson: But why even ask the quesiton??!?!
- Mike Nelson: This is silly.
- Mike Nelson: No we are not!
- Mike Nelson: But even asking this question this year and then asking the same question in 2 years will sample two populations.. How would we interpret a decrease or increase in # of Potential registrants?
- Michael R. Graham: @Mike -- I suppose the only way to do so would be to use a captive population and follow-up after 2 or 3 years. I would imagine cost could be an issue.
- Nathalie Coupet: @Jonathan +1
- Michael R. Graham: Adopting "longitudinal design" should actually cover this.
- Nathalie Coupet: Is our budget flexible?
- Nathalie Coupet: Can we decide anything, to puruse any method, no matter what the cost is?

- Nathalie Coupet: All IPv6 surveys use Web surveys.
- Nathalie Coupet: Hahaha
- Tony Onorato: The definition of spam is not consistent with US law in that permission/consent need not be given in advance, at least under CAN SPAM - - and it might reference "commercial" in the definition
- Tony Onorato: Also, I don't think that a recipient would be able to discern whether the email was bulk -- i.e., part of a larger collection of messages
- Mike Nelson: Webopedia has some VERY good definitions for IT terms.
- Mike Nelson: For instance, "domain parking" = Related Terms domain parking park round robin DNS DNS SEC split DNS dynamic DNS DNSBL DNS - Domain Name System rDNS user defined function In the Web hosting business, DNS parking is a service that the Web host will offer to its clients as a way of securing a domain name for future use. The Web host registers the domain name with the InterNIC and "parks" the domain name on a server until it is ready to be made active. By doing this, the Web host ensures the availability of the domain name for the client's future use so that another individual or company cannot register that same domain name.
- Mike Nelson: In the Web hosting business, DNS parking is a service that the Web host will offer to its clients as a way of securing a domain name for future use. The Web host registers the domain name with the InterNIC and "parks" the domain name on a server until it is ready to be made active. By doing this, the Web host ensures the availability of the domain name for the client's future use so that another individual or company cannot register that same domain name.
- Mike Nelson: http://www.webopedia.com/TERM/D/DNS_parking.html
- Eleeza Agopian: Thanks, Mike.
- Eleeza Agopian :I'll look into that.
- Mike Nelson: The definition for spam is odd. There is a definition for "bulk" but we don't use the word elsewhere in the definition. Webopedia definition is cleaner: "Spam is electronic junk mail or junk newsgroup postings. Some people define spam even more generally as any unsolicited email."
- Tony Onorato: For spam, I might simplify to say "commercial email that the recipient has not requested from the sender"
- Tony Onorato: There are varying definitions for spam -- in the US, generally, in order to be actionable, the spam must also be false/misleading, but for these purposes, I would try to simplify and since non-commercial email can be classified as "spam" (e.g., political /news email) but is generally not considered as problematic from standpoint of abuse of the DNS, I would suggest we limit to commercial
- Nathalie Coupet: I agree with Tony
- Tony Onorato: As i mentioned further up in the chat, the definition of spam (in the presentation) is not consistent with US law in that permission/consent need not be given in advance, at least under CAN SPAM

and I don't think that a recipient would be able to discern whether the email was bulk -- i.e., part of a larger collection of messages

- Tony Onorato: I think "unwanted" is too broad to be useful, which is why we ought to focus on problematic spam -- commercial email typically deployed in an abusive manner -- so I would suggest "commercial email that the recipient has not requested from the sender"
- Mike Nelson: I think it would be very problematic to ask a survey question that uses the word "spam" (at least without a clear definition). I agree with Steve: Spam is more than just commercial. "Unwanted or unsolicited e-mail" is a good phrase to use.
- Tony Onorato: Cybersquatting -- I might say marketable and/or TM-related, and I would remove the rest -- squatters also use the sites for counterfeiting etc.
- Berry Cobb: You might want to refer to the old RAPWG report that defines some of these abusive terms.
- Mike Nelson: Wikipedia definition: Cybersquatting -- Cybersquatting is the act of registering a popular Internet address--usually a company name--with the intent of selling it to its rightful owner.
- Berry Cobb: It has a specific definition for Cybersquatting for example.
- Tony Onorato: cybersquatting is registering, trafficking in, or using a domain name with bad-faith intent to profit from the goodwill of a trademark belonging to someone else -- whether US or not, I think it relates to TM
- Mike Nelson: + 1 Steve. Some cybersquatting is for personal names (not trademarks)
- Tony Onorato: I don't think it's limited to selling it, including to its "rightful owner"
- Nathalie Coupet: Yes, bad faith is the key term
- Berry Cobb:from RAPWG report - Cybersquatting is currently defined in the gTLDs as the deliberate and bad-faith registration and use of a name that is a registered brand or mark of an unrelated entity, often for the purpose of profiting (typically, though not exclusively, through pay-per-click advertisements). Cybersquatting is recognized as registration abuse in the ICANN community, and the UDRP was originally created to address this abuse.
- Tony Onorato: I think Berry has got it -- bad-faith registration (I don't think use is necessary) of a name that is a registered brand or mark of an unrelated entity, often for the purpose of profiting
- Nathalie Coupet: +1@Berry, @Tony
- Charla Shambley: Thank you for participating on today's call and/or attending the session.
- Tony Onorato: thanks all
- Nathalie Coupet: Thank you!