

## Adobe Connect Chat Transcript

### CCT Review Plenary Meeting #35 – 1 February 2017

Brenda Brewer: (2/1/2017 07:53) Good day all and welcome to CCT Review Plenary Meeting #35 on 1 February 2017 @ 14:00 UTC! Please remember to mute your phone by pressing \*6 when not speaking.

Jonathan Zuck: (08:03) should be easy to reach consensus today

Waudu: (08:04) I cannot hear anything so I presume talking has not started

Jonathan Zuck: (08:04) correct Waudu

Waudu: (08:05) ok now I can hera

Eleeza Agopian: (08:06) Loud and clear

Pamela Smith: (08:06) Lauren, you are a presenter now so you control the docu

Pamela Smith: (08:06) You are in control of the document, Lauren.

Jonathan Zuck: (08:06) page 15

Waudu: (08:07) I did not get time to go through the 2 Lauren documents so I will try to add in as we go along

Jean-Baptiste Deroulez: (08:08) Lauren's paper on Consumer Trust is also available here:

[https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A\\_docs.google.com\\_document\\_d\\_14pk4ieJFHxsprrq9YWIN0RRqk0p3gQT4sRAPomdOAAA\\_e\\_dit-3Fusp-3Dsharing&d=DwICaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=kbiQDH54980u4nTPfwdloDLY6-6F24x0ArAvhdeDvvc&m=WWK3fwBSYNF3ne8F7\\_dn7K2SmonIT01z2CfaBjOqMMs&s=iJPd89aGYl10sWI2GK7kAcANUEf7cVsZTgGo1df\\_lpE&e=](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_docs.google.com_document_d_14pk4ieJFHxsprrq9YWIN0RRqk0p3gQT4sRAPomdOAAA_e_dit-3Fusp-3Dsharing&d=DwICaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=kbiQDH54980u4nTPfwdloDLY6-6F24x0ArAvhdeDvvc&m=WWK3fwBSYNF3ne8F7_dn7K2SmonIT01z2CfaBjOqMMs&s=iJPd89aGYl10sWI2GK7kAcANUEf7cVsZTgGo1df_lpE&e=)

Jonathan Zuck: (08:09) Do we have a guess as to how long it would take to get to subsequent rounds? That might inform this process and whether we're prioritizing or holding things up

Jordyn A Buchanan 2: (08:15) Maybe on the phone.

Jordyn A Buchanan 2: (08:15) Trying to actually make it call me.

Jonathan Zuck: (08:16) Agree

Carlton Samuels: (08:19) Morning all. the connection is not good from here

Jordyn A Buchanan 2: (08:22) I guess I heard the board say that they were waiting for us to finish but not that they were waiting for the PDP to finish. :-)

Laureen: (08:25) Isn't the whole purpose of the PDP to provide policy recommendations for subsequent rounds? If so, isn't the PDP's group work a necessary step before the next round?

Jonathan Zuck: (08:26) should we have a "priority" field, one option for which is blocking?

Jonathan Zuck: (08:27) probably a worthy exercise and perhaps something after we have more of the downside data

Calvin Browne: (08:27) blocking, recommended, non-blocking

Jonathan Zuck: (08:28) Priority: low, medium, high, prerequisite

Calvin Browne: (08:28) I'd simplify it by one ;-)

Megan Richards: (08:29) agree!

Jordyn A Buchanan 2: (08:29) Yes, I agree.

Kaili Kan: (08:30) Agree to have a matrix.

Jonathan Zuck: (08:31) Perhaps.

Jordyn A Buchanan 2: (08:33) I think it would be useful to try to switch the recommendations to have this notion of prioritization prior to the initial report.

Jordyn A Buchanan 2: (08:33) Should hopefully just take a couple of minutes per recommendation.

Jamie Hedlund: (08:33) +1

Jamie Hedlund: (08:34) we would need a separate discussion though to agree as a group on prioritization

Jordyn A Buchanan 2: (08:35) We could probably have that prioritization discussion next week while everything else is basically baked.

Jordyn A Buchanan 2: (08:35) Since this involves about one character worth of editing per recommendation.

Jordyn A Buchanan 2: (08:36) I'd be fine with that characterization.

Kaili Kan: (08:36) agree with high.

Fabro Steibel: (08:36) I am hearing all arguments. I endorse Laureen's proposal

Jonathan Zuck: (08:39) agree in principle. I just wonder what "low" would mean from an implementation standpoint

Jonathan Zuck: (08:39) sigh. Okay. I'll look at it.

Jordyn A Buchanan 2: (08:40) Maybe these are only relative priorities?

Jordyn A Buchanan 2: (08:40) (i.e., they indicate roughly the order that they should be tackled)

Jonathan Zuck: (08:41) perhaps it's actually a timeframe, independent of subsequent procedures. ie this must be done in the next two years. Dunno. I'll noodle it.

Jordyn A Buchanan 2: (08:41) That may make sense too. We just need to be realistic about ICANN resources and the number of recommendations we're going to make if that's the approach we take.

Jordyn A Buchanan 2: (08:42) I'm okay with this recommendation but I did like the last formulation a bit more.

Jonathan Zuck: (08:42) yes. it's a balance for sure

Jordyn A Buchanan 2: (08:49) Applicants do have to have a registration policy.

Jordyn A Buchanan 2: (08:49) But right now there is a bias towards "everyone can register".

Gaongalelwe Mosweu: (08:50) hello all

Jordyn A Buchanan 2: (08:51) Do we still have Lauren?

Megan Richards: (08:55) right

Kaili Kan: (08:59) Considering a "low" priority will likely never be done, suggest only to have two priorities: prerequest and not-prerequest.

Jordyn A Buchanan 2: (09:01) That just returns us to where we were at the start of the call, though.

Jordyn A Buchanan 2: (09:01) And hopefully it's not the case that Low will never be done.

Gaongalelwe Mosweu: (09:03) one hopes so too Jordyn. though I do share Kaili's sentiments

Fabro Steibel: (09:07) I agree

Fabro Steibel: (09:07) consensus

Jordyn A Buchanan 2: (09:07) I have a slight tweak to the language I'd suggest but I'm okay with the general sentiment.

Jordyn A Buchanan 2: (09:08) Sounds good.

Gaongalelwe Mosweu: (09:08) agreed Laureen

Jordyn A Buchanan 2: (09:37) I think that sounds reasonable.

Jonathan Zuck: (09:37) Yes, that sounds like a balanced statement

Jamie Hedlund: (09:37) Works for me

Jonathan Zuck: (09:38) Yes

Fabro Steibel: (09:38) works for me

Jordyn A Buchanan 2: (09:38) Sounds good.

Drew Bagley: (09:38) yes

Jordyn A Buchanan 2: (09:42) That sounds like a clearer recommendation.

Jamie Hedlund: (09:42) Would be good to clarify whether this recommendation would require amending Ry agreements

Drew Bagley: (09:43) we can work on tweaking the language and provide an interval

Jordyn A Buchanan 2: (09:43) I'm okay with this.

Fabro Steibel: (09:44) I am ok

Calvin Browne: (09:44) i'm ok

Megan Richards: (09:44) ok

Fabro Steibel: (09:50) Agreed

Fabro Steibel: (09:57) yes

Jamie Hedlund: (09:59) Speakiing selfishly, it would be helpful if all of the recs related to compliance data were consolidated in one place. That would force clarification of what is being asked and what is expected of compliance.

Jonathan Zuck: (10:01) That's fair Jamie. That said, I don't think we're going to figure everything out in the next few days. Let's start a to do list for a final report

Jamie Hedlund: (10:02) That's absolutely fine. Thanks, Jonathan.

Fabro Steibel: (10:03) old hand

Fabro Steibel: (10:03) and I agree to move the suggestion to the other section

Jordyn A Buchanan 2: (10:04) That's fine with me.

Megan Richards: (10:04) ok as I have to go to another meeting

Calvin Browne: (10:04) thanks - I have to dinner for kids ;-)

Calvin Browne: (10:05) \*to do dinner

Jordyn A Buchanan 2: (10:05) Okay.

Pamela Smith: (10:06) Have a good dinner, Calvin!

Dejan Djukic: (10:06) I am unmute

Jean-Baptiste Deroulez: (10:06) we can't hear you Dejan

Dejan Djukic: (10:06) I am ot avaliabel tomorrow, I am on whole day event

Dejan Djukic: (10:07) OK

Kaili Kan: (10:07) Meet you guys tomorrow. Bye!

Calvin Browne: (10:07) bye

Fabro Steibel: (10:07) thank you all

Drew Bagley: (10:08) thanks

Pamela Smith: (10:08) Thank you, everyone!

Dejan Djukic: (10:08) thanks

Laureen: (10:08) Thanks for such a thoughtful exchange today.