

QUESTIONS FOR ANALYSIS GROUP

1. Is it possible to test for significance of differences between new gTLD average wholesale prices and legacy gTLD average price caps or are there too few observations? **We considered testing for significance, but opted not to given the small number of legacy TLDs.**
2. Which are the two legacy gTLDs for which we have price data? Can we report which they are? Are their prices at the caps? **To respect the confidentiality of the wholesale price data that we received from some legacy gTLD registries, we can summarize the data that we have: we have wholesale price data for 12 legacy gTLDs in Phase II and had wholesale price data for 10 legacy gTLDs in Phase I. We do not have price cap information for all of the legacy TLDs for which we have wholesale price data. For those where we have both pieces of information, most (but not all) wholesale prices are at the price cap.**
3. In addition to wholesale prices, which data did AG wish it had had access to? One of our recommendations may be for ICANN to collect additional information and AG probably has the best idea about which data they should be. **Analysis Group would ideally have had access to the following data:**
 - Wholesale prices for legacy TLDs (as opposed to wholesale price caps for legacy TLDs)
 - Additional wholesale prices for new gTLDs. (We lack wholesale price data for some new gTLDs in our sample since the operating registry failed to provide such data.)

- Transaction-level data from registrars for both primary and secondary market transactions.
 - Transaction-level data for secondary-market transactions from Sedo and other similar entities.
4. Why did AG use prices from registrar websites instead of data from public sources such as <https://tld-list.com/> or <https://namestat.org/live/>? In Phase II, we have relied on data from DNPrices and supplemented that data by using registrar websites. We did not choose to use Namestat since their data had effectively the same coverage of our sample as DNPrices, yet was considerably more expensive. We weren't aware of tld-list.com.
 5. I had requested a table that provided a frequency distribution of registrars for new gTLDs, e.g., how many new gTLDs have between 1 and 10 registrars, how many between 11 and 20, etc. Is that being provided or have I missed it? We have almost completed this analysis and will share it with the CCT Review Team by the end of this week.
 6. Does AG think that it would be worthwhile to (a) calculate HHIs for the various "Groups" in Table 11 and (b) relate them to the average markups? [There may be too few observations to perform (b). As I noted some time ago, the absolute, i.e., dollar, markup might be preferred to the percentage markup reported by AG.] We believe that we have completed the analysis described in (a) above. Please see the attached Excel file. For request (b), we can undertake this work, but there are very few data points. In particular, we only have complete wholesale price data (and therefore markup data) for five "groups."

7. Status of parking data project. How long would it take to recalculate the various statistics once those data become available? [Some of this can already be done for new gTLDs where ntlidstat.com reports parking data. Note that we will not be getting parking data for ccTLDs nor historical parking data for legacy gTLDs. Note, too, that we have not yet settled on which parking measure to use.] **Depending on the quality of the data that are provided to Analysis Group, we anticipate that this project will take approximately one to two weeks. Our understanding is that ICANN is in the process of obtaining that data.**
8. At some point soon we should have AG review the write-ups that report the results of their calculations so that we are certain that our descriptions are accurate. **We have almost completed our review of the drafts that we have received and can share any edits/comments with the CCT Review Team by the end of this week. If there are more final versions of the write-ups available now or in the future, we are happy to review those versions when ready.**