**Adobe Connect Chat Transcript**

**CCT RT Plenary Meeting #36 – 2 February 2017**

Pamela Smith: (2/1/2017 16:09) Welcome to the 36th Plenary of the CCT Review.  Please note that this meeting will be recorded. Please remember to mute your phones by pressing *6. Press *6 to unmute.

Waudo: (2/2/2017 08:03) Could someone speak pls to enable me check my audio...

Waudo: (08:04) ok, Got that. Goodevening!

Pamela Smith: (08:04) Yes, sir! Good evening. :)

Jean-Baptiste Deroulez: (08:06) do you presenter rights Laureen?

Calvin Browne: (08:11) good afternoon - apologies for my late joining

Jordyn A Buchanan 2: (08:11) Do we want to make it clear that the general recommendation would be sufficient to replace this?

Calvin Browne: (08:11) I'll probably also not be able to stay for the full two hours

Calvin Browne: (08:12) what page number on we on again?

Waudo: (08:12) am not on mute continue with another qsn I type mine

Jean-Baptiste Deroulez: (08:12) p9 and 10 Calvin

Pamela Smith: (08:12) Recs. are on pp. 9 and 10 of the document, Calvin

Calvin Browne: (08:12) ah yes - thanks - where we left off yesterday

Waudo: (08:12) I wanted to ask what is the practice with complaints now - is there a format or they are just made in free form?

Jordyn A Buchanan 2: (08:12) My audio is super choppy--I keep losing Laureen.  Is that just me?

Eleeza Agopian: (08:13) I can hear clearly.

Jean-Baptiste Deroulez: (08:13) same here

Pamela Smith: (08:13) +1

David Taylor 2: (08:13) I can hear Laureen perfectly also.

David Taylor 2: (08:14) But I have had a dial back to a real telephone

Jordyn A Buchanan 2: (08:14) I have a real telephone, but I'll reconnect.

David Taylor 2: (08:14) :-)

Pamela Smith: (08:14) OK, Jordyn.

Waudo: (08:16) what I thought is that if there was a format then it can be easier to capture classifications of the  complaints

Waudo: (08:24) soryy must be old hand

Gaongalelwe Mosweu (PC): (08:25) We can hear you Laureen

Jordyn A Buchanan 2: (08:28) If the argument is that "we want it, but we don't want it to block the next round" then that's the definition of a recommendation that's non-blocking.

Jordyn A Buchanan 2: (08:29) We shouldn't say things that are blocking just to futz with priority.  That's why we agreed to indicate prioirty explicitly.

Gaongalelwe Mosweu (PC): (08:34) Thank you Laureen. Agree

Kaili Kan: (08:35) In order to better define "prerequeset", we shall need to wait for the definition of priorities.  By Jonathan?

Waudo: (08:37) please add the word "respectively" between measures ad commensurate, just to indicate health and finance are 2 different things

Waudo: (08:38) sorry, add after :health and financial information"

Waudo: (08:40) i,e, add the word "respectively"

Waudo: (08:52) problem with my audio...

Waudo: (08:53) I'll log in again

Jordyn A Buchanan 2: (08:55) Yes.

Jean-Baptiste Deroulez: (08:55) yes

Eleeza Agopian: (08:55) Yes

Calvin Browne: (08:55) yup

Jordyn A Buchanan 2: (08:56) Seem okay.

Calvin Browne: (08:56) ok by me

Jordyn A Buchanan 2: (08:56) (I'll note that we're accumulating a lot of High priority items, though, so we may need to loop back and make harder choices at some point.)

Jordyn A Buchanan 2: (08:59) Seems like overall we're proposing a study on these highly regulated domains, which seems interesting to me but I miight bundle all the points up that way.

Calvin Browne: (09:02) fine on 3&4 by me

Kaili Kan: (09:20) Are we talking about cases like .bank ?

Kaili Kan: (09:22) I believe these MUST be prerequests.

Jordyn A Buchanan 2: (09:23) Kaili--what harm are we trying to fix by making this study a prerequisite?

Waudo: (09:24) is he objective f recom ! to establish if restrictions work?

Waudo: (09:24) recpm 1

Jordyn A Buchanan 2: (09:25) Yes, that seems to be the objective of all of these--are restrictions helpful or not?

Jordyn A Buchanan 2: (09:28) I agree that the rationale is self-explanatory, but it's not obvious why that would make it a prerequisite.  This just seems like another area where our study would have been more effective if we had had more information.

Jordyn A Buchanan 2: (09:34) As is probably clear, I think this is another non-blocking item.  :-)

Calvin Browne: (09:45) ok - need to run - bye everyone

Jamie Hedlund: (09:46) On 2, it should also look at subset of TLDs for which registration restrictions could possibly be appropriate

Brian Aitchison: (09:49) fwiw SIDN has already studied the effect of registration registrictions on abuse (phishing) ccTLDs. so it's methodologically possible

Brian Aitchison: (09:49) and they were able to determine a causal relationship

Jordyn A Buchanan 2: (09:51) I don't object to #4, but we may again want to think about how to action it.

Jordyn A Buchanan 2: (09:51) But that's a minor refinement.

Waudo: (09:53) which one Megan?

Jordyn A Buchanan 2: (09:53) We have scrolling.

Jean-Baptiste Deroulez: (09:53) Everyone has access

Waudo: (09:54) nothing on my screen

Eleeza Agopian: (09:57) Isn't that a separate recommendation to the GNSO PDP?

Jordyn A Buchanan 2: (09:59) Makes sense to me.

Jordyn A Buchanan 2: (09:59) I've got to drop off momentarily as well.

Jamie Hedlund: (10:01) All of these seem to be about surveys except for the one regarding the GNSO cionsidering "preventative measures." Maybe at the very least this should be a separate recommendation with its own rationalle?

Jamie Hedlund: (10:01) It could also benefit from further explanation

Jordyn A Buchanan 2: (10:02) I've got to run!

David Taylor 2: (10:03) I have to run also, been quiet as been on another call this second hour also.

Kaili Kan: (10:04) Thank you all.  Bye!

Pamela Smith: (10:04) Thank you, everyone.

Gaongalelwe Mosweu (PC): (10:04) tHANK YOU ALL.

Drew Bagley: (10:04) Thanks Laureen!

Gaongalelwe Mosweu (PC): (10:04) BYE