CCT Meeting #75 - 29 August 2018 @ 13:00 UTC

**Attendees:**

**Team:** Kaili Kan, Jamie Hedlund, Laureen Kapin, Waudo Siganga, Jordyn Buchanan, Gao Mosweu, Jonathan Zuck, Dejan Djukic, Megan Richards, Calvin Browne, Carlton Samuels, Fabro Steibel

**Observers:**

**ICANN Org:** Jean-Baptiste Deroulez, Brenda Brewer, Steve Conte, Alice Jansen, Brian Aitchison, Antonietta Mangiacotti

**Apologies:** David Taylor

**Agenda:**

1. Welcome, roll-call, SoI
2. Review of final report submitted edits/comments, and initial call for consensus. Rearticulate call for objections/edits/comments/dissent (if any)
3. Next Steps: ICANN org
4. A.O.B.

**Documents:**

- PDF
- Final Report Draft

**Recordings:**

- Adobe Connect
- mp3 replay

**Chat Transcript:** EN

**Transcript:** EN

**DECISIONS REACHED/ACTION ITEMS**

On Executive Summary (p5)

- Adopted with following edits:

  - P8:
    - Action item: Drew review the definitions of abuse provided in the footnote 11.
  - P11: Corrected: “were meant to stand”
  - P11: Added: “the length of the survey”
  - P11: Added comma - removed “brand owners”
  - P11: Removed “considering the effectiveness” and “in providing choice”
  - P11: David Taylor to clarify whether “assess patterns of abuse” - Add: making it difficult to assess whether this review is tied to common actors
  - P11: Replace “survey reveals” with “survey suggests that as many as”
  - P11: “These results suggest”
  - P11:
    - Action item: David Taylor to review updated paragraph on defensive registrations and confirm approval of paragraph

On Data Driven-Analysis section (p31)

- Adopted with following edit:

  - P31: Added definition of parking: “(…but are not yet being used as primary identifiers of typical websites. Instead, these domains are forwarded to other domains (including sub-domains), used only for email, monetized via advertising, or simply do not resolve, perhaps held in reserve by speculators or as premium domains by registries. websites)”
  - P34: Added to footnote 80 “has considered the review team recommendations in implementing certain changes described in the blogs of”

On Competition section (p65)

- Adopted with following edit:

  - P11: Removed “in to these systems ... secure DNS.”
  - P13: Change “level of technical abuse” with “level of DNS security abuse”. Update draft report accordingly.
  - P13: Added to footnote 24 “has considered the review team recommendations in implementing certain changes described in the blogs of”
• P66: Add footnote to paragraph to refer to substitution analysis.

On Consumer Trust section (p76)

Adopted

Action item: (as per action item identified on plenary call #74) Jordyn to provide language for rationale on recommendation 12: “add a reference to above recommendation, mention of (3) the safety and security of users’ personal and sensitive information (including health and financial information).

On Safeguards section (p86)

Approved with following edit:

• P105: Move suggested addition to a footnote - tie to recommendation 19.
• P113: Added to footnote 430 “has considered the review team recommendations in implementing certain changes described in the blogs of”
• P124:

Action item: Jamie/Drew to review sentence “This precedent established that use of the PICDRP was relegated to analyzing the operator’s adherence to its own rules rather than considering the merits of whether the registry was effectively violating its commitments through a totality of actions. This gap between intended PIC goals and accountability mechanisms mirrored the gap between PICs and outcomes for some registries.” (Comment from Jamie: Is this new language? If so, it is opinion and not fact. It seems that the complaint here is that the RO should have been bound by obligations outside the contract and its own policies that can only be seen through an examination of the totality of its actions. In fact, whether it’s a PICDRP or ICANN Compliance, the only obligations that are relevant are those that are spelled out in the contract, including RO policies incorporated by reference. There was no precedent established here. This reflects standard contract enforcement.”

• P132:

Action item: David to review suggested edit from Jamie: There is nevertheless fairly substantial anecdotal evidence that brand owners are reluctant purchasers of Sunrise registrations and many see it as a cost that is overly expensive:

• P140:

Action item: David to provide reference to discussion mentioned in details of recommendation 29:

“Details: There appears to be considerable discussion on whether the TMCH should be expanded beyond applying to only identical matches and if it should be extended to include “mark+keyword” or common typographical errors of the mark in question. If an extension is considered valuable, then the basis of such extension needs to be clear. ”

NEXT STEPS

• 2 September – 23:59 UTC: Deadline to complete all action items
• 4 September - 23:59 UTC: Deadline for any final objections and dissent report (if any) to be submitted
• 5 September: Final consensus call and adoption of Final Report; confirm implementation agents