

Adobe Connect Chat _ CCT RT Plenary #31 – 18 January 2017

Pamela Smith: (1/18/2017 05:30) Hello, everyone, and welcome to the 31st Plenary Meeting of the CCT Review.

Pamela Smith: (05:31) A reminder: This meeting will be recorded. Please mute your phones by pressing *6. Press *6 to unmute.

Jamie Hedlund: (06:02) Good morning everyone

Jordyn A Buchanan: (06:02) Yes.

Waudu: (06:04) I have no audio yet. trying to connect

Waudu: (06:04) ill restart

Waudu 2: (06:05) Im ok now

Carlton Samuels: (06:06) Morning all

Jordyn A Buchanan: (06:06) It might look like a phone if you're dialed in.

Waudu 2: (06:06) looks like a lantern croosed out

Gao Mosweu (PC): (06:09) Good day All.

Carlton Samuels: (06:10) Might we have scroll control please?

Jordyn A Buchanan: (06:12) I think we should have a long name for things (e.g., Nielsen Wave Two Registrant Survey) that we use the first time and then a short version (Registrant Survey) that we use throughout the rest of the document.

Dejan Djukic: (06:15) Agree with that, it's much easier to follow in that way

Megan Richards: (06:16) could you send again - pretty sure I haven't seen it but perhaps missed

Carlton Samuels: (06:18) Staff, can we please have scroll control enabled for viewers?

Carlton Samuels: (06:18) Much obliged

Megan Richards: (06:18) there are two Nielsen reports - one on consumers and one on registrants - both are considered end-users

Jordyn A Buchanan: (06:19) Other way around, Megan. Both end users and registrants are types of consumers. :-)

Megan Richards: (06:20) ?? so what is the difference between an end-user and a registrant ? what I cited above is what I was told to use in the texts I was drafting or revising

Jordyn A Buchanan: (06:21) An end-user is a person who resolves DNS names (e.g., by browsing to a website or sending an e-mail) whereas a registrant is a person who registers a domain name

Carlton Samuels: (06:21) Waudu is cutting out

Jordyn A Buchanan: (06:21) Footnote 1 lays this out, as Laureen just said.

Waudu 2: (06:22) sorry lost connectivity for a while

Carlton Samuels: (06:22) @Waudu: Why not use Jordyn's definition as the 'regularised' one?

Megan Richards: (06:24) doesn't this make it very difficult for us to base our results on the Nielsen survey since the definition is different ?

Eleeza Agopian: (06:25) Nielsen didn't exclude registrants from its definition of consumers, it just didn't query the respondents on this point.

Gao Mosweu (PC): (06:26) I agree with elevating the footnote to the main text, so that it is clearer for the reader.

Megan Richards: (06:26) I noticed that some aspects of the consumers' survey seemed to apply also to registrants but am worried that we are going to confuse readers

Jordyn A Buchanan: (06:27) I don't think we think that Venn diagram of consumer/end-user/registrant implies that end-user and registrant are completely distinct.

Jordyn A Buchanan: (06:27) I'd imagine essentially all registrants are also end-users.

Megan Richards: (06:28) indeed - registrants are obviously also end-users - (as are consumers in my simple view :-)

Jordyn A Buchanan: (06:28) There's probably a few people who are registrants without being end-users, but they are probably few and far between. I wouldn't want to have to try to find people like that and certainly everyone in Nielsen's online surveys are also end-users.

Carlton Samuels: (06:28) Maybe y memory is fading but I think we discussed this way long ago. Carlos raised it first. And we agreed to treat it just as the footnote laid out.

Jordyn A Buchanan: (06:29) That's correct, Carlton.

Megan Richards: (06:32) small note to the person who is taking "attendance" - I am participating but don't seem to be on the list of attendees, seems to be the same for Gao so far as I can see

Gao Mosweu (PC): (06:33) thanks Megan. I have been thinking the list of attendees will be updated

Megan Richards: (06:34) and Carlton

Calvin Browne: (06:34) i can hear you

Carlton Samuels: (06:34) @Laureen: Look at the penultimate and last sentences again. Why the last one?

Waudu 2: (06:35) are you on recommendation 1 or 2?

Carlton Samuels: (06:35) Recommendation 1

Carlton Samuels: (06:37) Packets from Waudu getting dropped!

Carlton Samuels: (06:39) @Laureen back to the last two sentences in Rec 1. Seems to me as is read here, the last undermines the previous one.

Jordyn A Buchanan: (06:39) I think Waudu has a ton of lag on his connection.

Jordyn A Buchanan: (06:39) Like 10 seconds worth.

Waudu 2: (06:40) Ill type. continue with others meantime

Waudu 2: (06:41) My worry is that the suggested survey will assume that the different visitation rates are due to familiarity/awareness when there could be a myriad factors...?

Carlton Samuels: (06:46) @Laureen: My concerns with the actual written word underscores Jordyn's point. The recommendation itself might not be so useful in that context.

Jordyn A Buchanan: (06:48) I don't read this comment as having anything to do with content, FWIW. Maybe there's something we could do to make it clearer.

Jonathan Zuck: (06:49) Ultimately, the next CCTRT will be asked to somehow measure deltas in trust

Jordyn A Buchanan: (06:50) Laureen, I'll take another look and see if I can suggest any revisions to the language.

Waudu 2: (06:50) I will make a suggestion when we reach recommendation4, which is related

Carlton Samuels: (06:51) @Laureen, please address my question.

Carlton Samuels: (06:51) I am without voice access

Carlton Samuels: (06:51) Starting with "We recommend.."

Carlton Samuels: (06:52) Then look at that sentence against the final one

Carlton Samuels: (06:52) If the information is useful for potential applicants then why not do it before the next round?

Jordyn A Buchanan: (06:53) If applicants know this is coming, they can elect to wait for more data before applying.

Jordyn A Buchanan: (06:53) But I agree with the timing concerns Laureen has.

Carlton Samuels: (06:54) Ok. If its a "nice to have" let's not make it the first one on the list

Megan Richards: (06:57) indeed - isn't a recommendation just that - no obligation per se

Waldo 2: (06:57) Related to Recommendation 3&4:

Jordyn A Buchanan: (06:58) That's how I read it too, Laureen (and Megan)

Waldo 2: (06:58) We recommend ICANN to work with stakeholders, industry and professional groupings as well as authorities to formulate a framework/guidelines to ensure that restricted gTLDs conform to restriction requirements. A periodic survey of restricted gTLDs should be undertaken to ascertain levels of compliance with registration restrictions. Such restriction requirements must be firmly embedded in Registration Agreements

Calvin Browne: (06:59) sure

Carlton Samuels: (07:03) @Laureen : "Incentives for registris to meet public expectations" is written in the PICs and RA already. What we need is clarity on enforcement.

Jordyn A Buchanan: (07:09) There's a discussion of Parking in the Competition paper.

Jordyn A Buchanan: (07:09) (And I don't think we agreed on harm from parking.)

Carlton Samuels: (07:11) @Jordyn: Yes, your paper does address parking. And reason for lack of consensus on its effect was the lack of qualified data. So I believe the recommendation for more information from the field is appropriate

Jordyn A Buchanan: (07:11) As an aside: I just got some more granular parking data from the UCSD people which I'm hoping to incorporate into the parking discussion.

Waldo: (07:15) Ill ask my colleagues in the BC about spec 12

Calvin Browne: (07:17) looks good would be my feedback

Jordyn A Buchanan: (07:17) Drew, I'm just taking a look at this for the first time since I've been on vacation.

Megan Richards: (07:17) better approach :-)

Jordyn A Buchanan: (07:17) I'm not saying I oppose, but want to take a closer read.

Jordyn A Buchanan: (07:17) Which I'll do by EOD.

Calvin Browne: (07:20) again - my feedback would be positive

Jordyn A Buchanan: (07:20) We might want to analogize this recommendation to Question 18 in the last round, which was to "explain why the goal of this TLD is", which wasn't really evaluated but did help put a marker down for future discussion.

Jordyn A Buchanan: (07:20) There wasn't a way to indicate the goals in the previous PICs.

Carlton Samuels: (07:21) @Jordyn: +1

Carlton Samuels: (07:22) I will ve to drop off at 10:30p

Carlton Samuels: (07:23) @Waudu: Maybe it goes back to my original assessment of them. But I should think ambiguity is bad ,voluntary or not!

Carlton Samuels: (07:25) @Drew: +1 to everything said!

Waudu: (07:25) thanks

Carlton Samuels: (07:29) @Jamia: Here's the disconnect as I see it. The insistence that PICs, voluntary or not is subject to oversight makes it just sensible to know the nature and tenor of the animal we'd be dealing with.

Carlton Samuels: (07:29) Simple rule: If they do not adress an issue or meet a PI goal, don't bother even voicing them!

Megan Richards: (07:30) would it be iuseful for applicants to include the principles of expected voluntary PICs at the time of application? as a recommendation not obligation

Megan Richards: (07:30) it could be used as an additional criterion for evaluation couldn't it ?

Jordyn A Buchanan: (07:31) Megan, the evluation is binary in the current model.

Carlton Samuels: (07:32) For the record the recommendations in principle have my support. I'm sorry, I have to drop off now. Duty calls. Thanks all

Jordyn A Buchanan: (07:32) You either are "good enough" or not, so it's hard to imagine how some amount of explanation is going to go towards that binary choice.

Jordyn A Buchanan: (07:33) I'll try to get some feedback from registry colleagues on whether this is likely to have a dampening effect on future PICs.

Waudu: (07:34) I'll hold too and wait for Jordyn's talk with his colleagues

Eleeza Agopian: (07:34) Hi all -- I have to drop out of the AC room, but will remain on the phone.

Jordyn A Buchanan: (07:34) Will do.

Waudu: (07:36) I thought there is a public comment period for PICS?

Waudu: (07:40) For any applicant, having PICS that they do not (intend) to keep would be counter-productive. That is alsready a control

Megan Richards: (07:42) objections and GAC EW are different processes - so the ICANN staff keeps reminding me :-)

Jordyn A Buchanan: (07:44) Well, the GAC has two mechanisms.

Jordyn A Buchanan: (07:44) Both early warning and objections.

Jordyn A Buchanan: (07:44) EW is individual governments.

Jordyn A Buchanan: (07:44) But the GAC as a whole can object to an application.

Megan Richards: (07:44) objections are not raised by GAC per se

Jordyn A Buchanan: (07:45) Proposed language: All PICs should be submitted during the application process such that there is sufficient oppotunity for GAC review as well as prior to the deadlines for community and LPO objections.

Jordyn A Buchanan: (07:45) Or something.

Jordyn A Buchanan: (07:45) Can work on better language.

Megan Richards: (07:45) Jordyn can you give me an example of the GAC having objected as GAC ? haven't seen one myself but perhaps they exist and I missed them

Waudou: (07:45) I heard Jordyn give a good background/history of voluntary PICS - maybe that can suffice for the intro you needed Drew?

Jordyn A Buchanan: (07:45) LPI

Jordyn A Buchanan: (07:46) Megan: .amazon

Jordyn A Buchanan: (07:46) :-)

Jordyn A Buchanan: (07:46) .africa

Jordyn A Buchanan: (07:46) .dotafrika I mean

Megan Richards: (07:46) agree with Jordyn's proposed text - what I was trying to get at too

Waudou: (07:47) ok

Waudou: (07:50) we have another meeting tomorrow? with Agenda TBD

Pamela Smith 2: (07:50) Use the "plus" button to increase the size.

Jonathan Zuck: (07:51) might be worth putting this up as clean docs rather than track changes for readability on the call

Jordyn A Buchanan: (08:03) I've got to drop off.

Jordyn A Buchanan: (08:04) Talk more tomorrow, it seems!

Jonathan Zuck: (08:05) staff will do that for sure. we just need to get the substance correct

Gao Mosweu (PC): (08:09) WE are still here

Jamie Hedlund: (08:10) Thanks all!

Jean-Baptiste Deroulez: (08:10) https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_docs.google.com_document_d_1In5QQ1frXuYByFAiO0F-5FAFpUSXgtfaDSr37KRdBp-2D0_edit-3Fusp-3Dsharing&d=DwICaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=kbiQDH54980u4nTPfwdIoDLY6-6F24x0ArAvhdeDvvc&m=NYDBnzGqeWemW8uwxfjiV0l4_dC_hFKscMi0f-ZC2lc&s=d9WdrHjdz4Ph1uMGolwQRp9gMQcLKIRvpcNK2Ox1J7M&e=

Gao Mosweu (PC): (08:11) Thank you.

Gao Mosweu (PC): (08:11) Bye

Kaili Kan 2: (08:11) Bye

Drew: (08:11) thanks for all the feedback!