
ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Everyone, thank you. Welcome back. Why am I getting an echo? Is it me? Let's see. How about now? Is someone trying to enter the Adobe Connect room as Kay? We'll let you in. There is an echo, hang on. Let's see, oh man. I'm just gonna start, and hopefully it'll get cleared up. Let me make sure it's not me. Is it me? It's coming into the speakers. I can try to speak. Are you going to be able to concentrate? Let's try this one. My fault. My degree is in communication studies, not technology.

That's five hours remaining, a half hour flat. The rest of the agenda for this afternoon was to spend about a half hour going over the metrics we've collected to date. These were the metrics that were recommended by the IAG CCT that we've been publishing. From there, we were going to break out into the two big sub teams, the competition in choice, and safeguards, and trust. We have this room and another room reserved so those teams can break off. I can run through this fairly quickly.

Really what I wanted to achieve with this session was to give you an idea of what we have, and where it is. Hopefully, you can take that back to your teams, and look at the data, what we're collecting, see if it's the right data, if there are further questions we need to be asking about that data. Then there's also a set of metrics that the IAG decided to leave up to the review team, to decide how you wanted to collect.

I think it's those two categories of metrics that each sub team needs to look at and decide how they wanna proceed with those, how you wanna consider them. I'll just quickly go through that.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

As I said, there was 66 metrics that were recommended for collection. 28 of them are being published online at this URL I have here, and I'll share that page with you in just a minute. 11 of them have been collected via the surveys that we have put up today with Nielsen, the consumer and registrant surveys. Three are collected via the economic study, that's analysis group's work. Two more, which we are not reporting on, but we will be able to, it was decided that these would really be captured by any work. ICANN, or other parties, do on universal acceptance. It has to do with whether or not New g names are actually resolving in different software platforms, and so on and so forth.

That leaves us with 22 that are in this realm of either data that comes with a cost, so traffic data would be one that falls under this category. Another one has to do with SLA levels. We initially thought we could report on the SLA reporting that our contracted parties do to us, but we can't publish those. We're not quite sure how to handle these. These are the first, I think it's 1.1 to 1.3 and 1.5 have to do with SLAs. I believe those are in the trust category. That's a conversation we can have with the sub team.

Then there's two others I wanna point out that kind of point in the direction of a qualitative analysis. This is another place where we'll need to talk about resources. One is 1.11, which has the question of IT cost related to, as it's raise in the metric policing of New gTLD names. The metric, it's long, you can read the whole thing. It asks what kind of new costs are there per brand, how much are they expending to protect their names and New gTLDs. There's a series of questions in there that are pretty hard to answer, unless we get some self reporting from brand owners.

Under this particular metric, we've had several conversations with INTA, the International Trademark Association. They're interested in working with us on

this because, obviously, the findings here are of interest to their members. They may even be willing to field a survey to their members. We're not quite sure yet. We've still had conversations with them, and again, this is something where maybe a few sub team members can engage with INTA on that idea.

That's something for which there isn't exactly an existing data pool. We'd have to find it somehow, and there are a lot of considerations as to what data we get. If it is coming from someone like INTA, that's an advocacy group. We have to consider that in the context of, how good is this data, or what are the parameters on the data that we're looking at.

Another one is on 1.22, which has to do with question 18, the mission-and-purpose question. This metric really got to the question of how well those applicants are meeting the obligations they said they would, or what they oblige themselves to do in terms of mission and purposes. There's a lot of different ways we can do this.

Another colleague of mine, Antoinetta, has been working on a research proposal of one way we might be able to do this, and we can present that to the sub team that has this metric in their bucket. That's another one to think about. It's kind of a little more complex than collecting just members, although I don't think any of these are just members.

With that in mind, those are the two major categories of metrics. I thought I would go ahead scroll through what we have, what we've published so far, as just sort of a guide so that you can see – I'm just gonna share my screen. Nobody Jabber me.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Eleeza, can I ask a quick question?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It's a process question, but I guess it's for the group as well, in terms of transparency. Is sharing something with this group the equivalent of publishing it? No, but I mean, I guess my point, are we able to deal with confidential data as part of this in keeping confidential in the team?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: If I can answer that. Right now, we've taken a very high level of transparency on this group. The email lists are all open. These calls are open to observers. The only real thing that isn't happening is that observers can't interact with you while you're having your meetings. All the documents are on our wiki. We can develop a process to address things that we don't want to be in the public realm if it's something that's sensitive, but we haven't actually done that yet. To the extent that we identify things that you would like to look at, that raise that level, then I will have to explore how to do that, and cognizant that everything is so transparent at the moment.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Two things, Margie, thank you. I think when we were developing that policy about observers, we had some caveat in there. Although we haven't gone into detail, we had some caveat in there about confidential discussions being the exception to that or something. It's just a question of figuring out what the

process would be, and restricting conversations on the regular list, or of etcetera about that.

We can keep things confidential. When you said that the SLA data, for example, you weren't prepared to publish it, is that the same as you weren't prepared to share it with this group because of conflicts of interest in the group, or something like that? I just wanted to figure out, get some clarity on that.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Thank you for pointing that out. What I meant was we can't just publish it on our website. What I should have said is that we need to figure out a better way of getting the data to those who need to review it, but it's not published here on this page, although we have the data. There's some confidentiality concerns around that. That's more of what I was getting at. As Margie said, we'll have to figure out ways to work through that, but the data exists.

STANLEY BESEN: Quick question, I take it we could publish, even the committee's report, could publish some recent statistics that don't develop individual company's information.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Correct. It depends on in what instances, but yes, in general, yes. That's what we've asked the analysis group to do, obviously, in their reporting is at a high level.

This is our website. Anna is also here. Anna is the intern on our team, but she's so much more. Sadly, she won't be with us for very long. She was recently

accepted to USC's Ph.D. program where she's going to be. She could tell you more about the details, but she's going to be studying Internet governance in a lot more detail.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I have an idea for a dissertation topic. Really, I think we could formulate a good one right here in this room.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Credit where credit is due, Anna has done a lot of very heavy lifting in parsing many, many data sources to put a lot of this together. She can answer a lot more detailed questions than I can, but I'm just going to give you a high level of the review of what we have here.

As I said, these are 28 of the 66 metrics that we've published. We broke them down into these categories, compliance, registries, registrars, registration, navigation, and RPMs, thinking that this might be a more helpful way at looking at the different types of data sets we have. That being said, under each metric, you'll see here we've noted which category the IAG has highlighted this particular metric for. While this might go to the trust group, I'm sure the choice group may also be interested in this data. There are lots of different ways to slice this, we thought this might be the most helpful way when considering some of the questions you'll be asking.

A lot of the data that is available on here is snapshots of what we have, or is a high-level summary of what we have. Going through here, notices of the breach issue, that's pretty clear cut. We know the numbers there. I'm gonna try to find one that's a bit more complex.

For example, we have a large data file that, what did we decide we're gonna call it? The master? The CCT master document, I think it's called, which Anna has put together, and it's really helpful. It includes every new gTLD as they're delegated, what the string is, and the local characters, as well as the EYD, as well as the language, script, who the registry operator is, where they're based, who the registry service provider is, so we can cut across all of these different categories, and count them in different ways. Is that up on this page yet?

We're still working on finalizing that document, but that's a very large piece of work that will be available to you, so that you can cut through these things yourself, and slice the data in ways that might be helpful to you. When you see something like this one, 2.4, which is gTLDs using IDN scripts, it's nice that you can see that there are six, that our Arabic language [inaudible], but you may want to know more about what those six are, where are they based? Are they in the Middle East? Are they elsewhere? Do they use backend providers? So on and so forth.

ANNA: No, actually, for 2.4, it asked for ID and scripts. We decided to break it out into languages and scripts. We report on both language and script here. If you're looking at, for instance, German, there are two German TLDs, they're in German. Those are technically, yes, they're the script type and the language. It's important to note that there are some differences there.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: How are you counting German TLDs? Berlin, I would think would also be German, but it's not in your count presumably.

ANNA: Yeah, so it's not today. We're counting IDNs specifically.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: In the case of German, it would be TLDs, these extended Latin character sets, is that right?

ANNA: Exactly. If you would scroll down a little bit, I think this was here. I don't think it said Latin scripts, so maybe I should put extended Latin script here, but you'll see the two that say Latin script, and then it should be there that the two German IDNs are counted. There are a lot more using the Latin script, obviously, than just two. Yeah, we tried to make that differentiation there.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Like I said, there's lots of ways of looking at this data and how we count it. This is one way that we've done it so far. That's why I think it's really important that you look at the full data sources that we have, and that way you can slice it as you see fit. I think I'll stop there with this page. You can scroll through. I'm sure there are a number of questions related to different metrics that are relevant to the sub teams you're working on. I think what we'll do when you break up now is Anna and I will split up, and we can answer those questions if you want to go through those with us.

The other thing I wanted to highlight, and I will stop sharing here if I could do that, is a document I sent around about the remaining metrics for discussion. How the heck do I stop sharing? One second. There we go. Let me just pull this

document up. It's the remaining metrics for discussion document, which I believe I emailed to everyone earlier. Come on.

These are the metrics I had mentioned earlier. What did I say? These are 22, I think. We need to figure out how we can provide these to you. The top four were the ones related to SLAs. Again, we have this data, it's a matter of figuring out how best to provide it, and with that confidentiality agreement that ICANN might have.

1.11, that's the one I had mentioned about intellectual property claims and costs associated with that. Then there are others, like 1.14. Quantity and relative incidents of domain takedown. How do we collect that? Do we ask registries directly for that? Who's going to report on that, and what do we consider a representative number? There's a number that raise questions like that, that I think will be good for the sub teams to discuss.

Moving on, this next set of four has to do with DNS abuse, everyon'e favorite term, abusive behavior, spam, fishing, bot nets, malware. There's lots of external sources that track this type of behavior and activity. The question is who we wanna rely on, and what data you see as being relevant, and most useful, and how we wanna define those terms.

Then there are some others where I think we need some more help from the team in defining terms. 1.21 has to do with errors in New gTLD zones. We got into this discussion a little bit with the IAG CCT, but I think we still need some help refining this because it still left too much room in the definition to really help our team narrow down what they're measuring. This would be to our technical services team. That's another one to think about.

I mean, I can go through all of them. 5.2 through 5.4 have to do with Facebook users, social media, QR codes, URL shorteners. Again, data that exists, but the question is where do we wanna get it from, how much do we want to spend on it, and what exactly do we want to prove with that data, what is the purpose of the data?

JONATHAN ZUCK: [inaudible] discussion got a little bit of a debate at the outside, and I think he never got to the point of discussing an actual budget. Is that something that we will try to peruse?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I have that data. I can share it later, I just got to pull it up. I think that's pretty much it. You can scroll through the document yourself, and I think you'll quickly see why these questions are left to you. They're much harder questions to answer on where we get this data, and how we want to find the questions so we get the data that you want, and that best represents what you're looking for. That's kind of it. I'll keep it short just because I think we can answer more questions in the sub team, and I don't wanna take time away from that effort. Any questions?

MEGAN RICHARDS: I had this question earlier because I didn't know what a QR code was.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Squares. Like that, which might be my new background.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I think they're really popular in East Asia, but maybe haven't caught on as much in the United States, except on airplane tickets. Can you use your mic's please?

That was all I wanted to present to you. There's obviously a lot more detail to what is there, but I don't need to explain every single metric. I'm happy to answer questions about individual ones, or we can use this time to break up into teams, and we can get into it more there.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thanks a lot, Eleeza. That's helpful. Again, it seems we're going to get into these in some detail. With an eye toward determining, both from that list and outside of it, what additional research we want, and especially that might lead to external cost.

As a question for the group, as far as what we do next, we went through a brainstorming exercise about the obligation process review that involved figuring out our verticals, or our high-level teams, or things like that. Is that worth doing together, or do you want to split up into teams, and do that within the individual teams, and kinda report that back? It's essentially codifying and supplementing what was done in the brainstorming session. That's just a

question about should we just divide up now, and each get your page full of stickies, or do we want to try to coordinate that at all? We can obviously re-coordinate when we reassemble and report to each other, and make comments to the other teams. It might be more efficient with smaller groups, that process, but I wanted to get feedback from the team and not be too authoritarian to early in the review process.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: We do have another room booked if we want to split up.

Can you use the mic?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Actually, we have three additional conference rooms booked. You could also use the space we just took the picture in upstairs. Then there is this room as well, we just ask that you don't leave the building and wander off, 'cuz we know you'll go to the beach.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Also because we have Kalli, and is Calvin still on the line? We probably want this room to be used – and Andrew – for the sub team that they wanna participate in, so they can listen. Do we have an idea which one that is?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Competition? Originally Kalli, do you still want to be in competition and choice?

KALLI KAN: Yes, I am in competition, he's already answered it.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Drew? Drew is typing.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I think Drew wanted to be in the safeguards group. That's his background.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: He wants to be in [inaudible] trust, yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: We could circulate a call-in number for him, and do a conference call, right? One of our bridges.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Yeah, Drew, why don't you put in your telephone number and we'll call you from the conference room, 'cuz that way you can participate in the group that you would like to participate in.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Absent additional suggestions, I think we'll split up, and make the first exercise to develop a high-level theme, like we did with the other thing. And let the group organize, and also select a leader. All right?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Did we decide who's in this one?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Is it just two groups? And I don't think we've actually done the selection process yet, so I guess this is similar to the other one, but fewer categories. Who wants to be in the competition and choice group?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: We may have to rebound.

JONATHAN ZUCK: We might, yeah. Then I guess, just to make it easy for Eleeza to pick you out, can you raise your hand if you want to be in the trust and safeguards session? It's pretty close to half, I guess, right?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Calvin, did you have a choice? For future reference, Calvin, we can put you on one of the groups now. Can you guys use the mic's, please, so they can follow along?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Who's missing from this meeting altogether?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Drew, Calvin, Kaili, and Robbie, Robbie Shoniker.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: He's typing right now.

JONATHAN ZUCK: He wasn't hearing all of that because our microphones were on.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah, Calvin, do you have a preference of whether you would like to be in competition and choice, or safeguards and trust? Even if you don't participate in the discussions today.

JONATHAN ZUCK: No preference, okay.

[off mic speaking]

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: You can wait until Robbie, to let [inaudible]

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right. So Calvin, thanks for being flexible. We'll let Robbie choose, if he's got a strong preference, and put you in the other group, then, based on his choice. Feel free to say now. Are we in the middle of his night or something like that?

Who do you want where? Does it matter? Opposition here? Okay.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Then the safeguards are going to go to spruce goose, so it's just down the hall on the left, right before you get to the hallway, it's to the restrooms.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: We'll lead you there.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Excellent. The trust and safeguards folks are going to be going to spruce goose. We have the extra conference rooms available today for sleeping rooms, but [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: If we're not going to use them, I'd like to release them.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Opposition here, and the spruce goose is the trust and safeguards.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: We had on your agenda to start your wrap up session at 3:45. Do you want to meet back in here then?

JONATHAN ZUCK: We're trying to start the wrap up at 3:45?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Yeah, or we could start at 4:00. We just wanted to allow for a break at some point.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Before or after that?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Before, so after the sub teams meet, maybe have a 15-minute break.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That makes sense. Would that mean that we take our break at 3:45?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: At either 3:30 or 3:45, I would say, yeah.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, let's say 3:45.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Okay. And then we'll reconvene at 4:00 with the whole crew.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right. Okay, perfect. Break. It's a football term, sorry, American football term. Split up.

[off mic speaking]

JONATHAN ZUCK: Eleeza's at it again.

As far as an outcome from this group, I think the first thing was forming it, the second this is identifying a team leader chair, and then I think what would be good, if folks agree, would be to go through the similar exercise that we went through yesterday with the sort of through lines of discussion that came out of brainstorming, and add to that etcetera. Then probably I don't know. Those would all be good byproducts. Hopefully an early deliverable, which isn't going to be today, is maybe identifying a deadline for it. It's to come up with additional research projects that we think would be useful to have. Obviously it's the only time to get it done.

You were going to give us budget information too.

ANNA: This is for the fiscal year of '16, so this ends in June, and then we're doing the new budget cycle for after June. We have \$381,000 for travel, and we have \$250,000 for professional services. That's until June, and then the nice thing is if we figure out what our resources are for the next part of the fiscal year, then we can get that request in. We have an amount that we submitted to Zadiyae [? 31:32] based on an average review team from past history. It's better to be more accurate based on what we want. The sooner we can identify what additional resources we need in the next fiscal year, the better for us, so that I can get that request in.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Do you guys have an expectation or a rough number in terms of between LA and America, how much the travel budget will be consumed?

ANNA: That number, \$381,000 was for two face-to-face meetings and two ICANN meetings. That is what we estimated, for a total of four meetings before the end of June.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: You're expecting that will cover America, wherever we happen to end up in the summer, this meeting, and then one other face to face? Okay.

ANNA: That was our estimate.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: \$250,000 for other stuff, that could be used if we identified additional research. Is that the principal place you expected to spend that?

ANNA: Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Can you guys give us any sense of what the expenses associated with the analysis group, and the Nielsen efforts are, so we know how to scope what that \$250,000 means?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: We have to take that request back. I believe that's confidential. I know that the implementation advisory group had made a recommendation on an amount, remember the spend? Again, we have to look at the contract and see if we're allowed to share that information.

MEGAN RICHARDS: I just wondered if you could give us an estimate for the kind of external funding that was required for the other – well, they're not all similar, they're all different obviously, but let's say for the HERT. It seems to me, without knowing the details of what was done in the HERTs, and some of the other reviews. In this case, we need a lot more external data, and objective information than one would've needed in those other reviews. If that's your assessment too, does that mean the amount we have is relatively more? Just 'cuz you said that the estimate you've made is based on previous reviews. My gut feeling is that, probably in this case, we might need more.

JONATHAN ZUCK: My inclination is for us to figure out what we would like, prioritize it, and fight for it, right? The prioritization may figure out where that line ends up being, but having a abstract decision about whether we need more, probably.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I wasn't asking the staff to tell us whether we need more or less, I was asking that, based on the studies that were done in previous reviews, what kind of external studies were done, just so we can get an idea. We, of course, will decide and determine what we need for our group. It gives us, also, a ballpark

idea of what amounts are required for such kinds of assessments. So far as I understand, you're telling us that both the Nielsen study and the analysis group study are outside that \$250,000?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Already out.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Exactly.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Right, that's not included in the \$250,000 we're talking about. Karen has some more information.

KAREN LENTZ: Just on the overall budget, I have some money allocated in my research budget as well towards this effort. What we have in this fiscal year is mostly intended to follow through on some of the metrics that we didn't start, in case we wanted to do the purchasing market data, or track data, or do a qualitative analysis, and that kinda thing. That's \$150k in FR16. Then I have allocated, or asked for the same amount for FR17, to cover any sort of ad-hoc request.

STANLEY BESEN: Given the fact that the analysis group and Nielsen are already started, it might be that we think of some additional work that we would have it, and have them do. It might make sense to augment their budgets if they don't. It might be amore efficient thing that finding somebody outside. Obviously I have some

ideas of what additional things I would like them to do, and they might. That might be a more efficient way to accomplish some of this stuff, since you're already familiar with the data, and are fielding the surveys anyhow.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: That's correct, you can certainly do that to the extent you see – areas that you wanna explore. We could go back to them and get an additional statement, and work to cover the analysis you'd like to see.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's right. In the case of Nielsen, he already said that, for example, we could have a micro survey of people that would otherwise be rejected under the survey, and it would just cost some incremental amount, and then we can discuss that as well. I think this is a difficult conversation to have in the abstract, and we ought to be pie in the sky initially, and then try to figure out what things cost to accomplish. I mean, the numbers that were banded around by the IAG may not bear any resemblance to what was actually approved by the board, or was a result of the contracting process where they were tryin' to find the best bid or something like that. I mean, those numbers were in the half million to three quarters of a million dollar range. They were both pairs of studies, but just to give you a level set for a really big – something like the Whois study is probably enormously expensive. Whereas getting the data on traffic is nowhere near that because it's getting data that's already been – it's going to run the gamut.

MEGAN RICHARDS: Just to follow up on that, it's what I wanted to ask as well. It seems to me that there's a lot of extant data already as well that we could use. Rather than starting a whole bunch of new assessments, aren't there some graduate students somewhere or other who could be given small contracts, for example – just an idea – to see what exists already. We could use existing data. I've circulated a couple of things to you that's based primarily on gTLD assessments. There's another one called the cum laude study. I'm not at all an expert in what's available, but it seems to me that a lot of people spend time looking at these things. Perhaps, if we look first at what exists, then we can decide what else in addition we need, no?

JONATHAN ZUCK: I think if we look at what we have, and then decide what we want, the first exercise would be to see how we might best go about getting it. It may already exist, be a slight variation on something that's already being done, maybe data that exists that we need to pay for, or maybe research that needs to happen, primary research. Those things will fall into those buckets, and we'll end up with a wish list budget, and then we'll try to sync that up through prioritization with the budgets that are currently set in place. I mean, it could very well be that the fiscal 2017 budget, we're trying to budget ahead or something like that for study because we're less likely to need these research projects later in the process than it is earlier. Again, some of these things just might be some kind of a tug of war with [inaudible] if we really get to a point where we really, really need something that breaks the budgets that currently exist.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Can we see the analysis group work statement? I assume that's not confidential. That is what they've been tasked to do.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Check, I mean, it seems like that makes sense.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I can pretty much guess because of what they did last time, and I assume they were going to update that, and then it would be helpful to see it, to know whether you're suggesting something that's within the scope or out of bounds.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Just a tactical question, Margie, in order to have useful influence on the FYI 2017 budget, when do we need to tell you what we need?

MARGIE MILAM: [inaudible] Like I said, we've already put in a request. I don't have the numbers on top, and I mean, it has to go through a formal process including board approval sometime in July, I think. The sooner it gets in, the better. Is it already open for public comment, or is it about ready to? I apologize, I don't know where we are in the budget cycle.

KAREN MULBERRY: I don't think anything's been published yet, but typically there's a framework version of it that's published. I think there's consultation on that, then once there's an actual proposed FY17 budget, that goes for public comment. Let me find where the reference is to the actual description of that, and I'll [crosstalk].

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: The CCTRC can just submit a public comment to the budget sayin, "We need more money."

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: We'll communicate it as quickly as we can. As I said, we have a placeholder amount already, I just [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: It seems like figuring this out is our first priority in any case, so hopefully we'll have that done very shortly.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I guess, at the very least, one of the byproducts of this afternoon's work should probably be setting some deadlines for figuring that out. As a first order of business, would somebody like to self identify some type of a chair for this sub team, and run this discussion?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I'll put my name forward. If no one else is super excited, then I'm also happy to step aside.

JONATHAN ZUCK: [crosstalk] It's all downhill from here. I know how this goes.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I say this with a caveat that I need to step out for 10 minutes at some point in the next hour, so I'll be a somewhat ineffective chair for, at least, our first session.

[off mic speaking]

JONATHAN ZUCK: So much productivity here.

[off mic speaking]

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I certainly don't want first mover advantage. If there's other people that are interested, certainly, I won't be offended.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Is anyone else interested in chairing the competition and choice sub team? So quiet. All right, all those in favor of Jordyn say – are you volunteering?

DAVID TAYLOR: No, I was just going to say, I'm very much in favor of Jordyn doing it.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Those in favor say aye, those opposed say nay, okay. Jordyn, you are now the chair of the competition and choice sub team. Maybe I'll go to the other room then, promote the creation of a chair there as well, so take it away Jordyn.

LAUREEN KAPIN: They already have it, yes.

JONATHAN ZUCK: They are on the ball.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I feel like, all right team, we have to pull together to catch up with the other team. We don't want to be outdone consistently. Why don't we just spend a couple minutes. I think Jonathan had us on the right track, but figuring out what we want to get done today. I think one of those things should be a rough expectation about how we want to spend our time over the next couple weeks. One quick question for staff. Have we given thought to – we have a meeting cadence – and maybe this is in the work plan – we have a meeting cadence for the whole CCTRT. Is there a meeting cadence already determined for the sub teams?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: It is up to you.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: That will have to be on the agenda. Agenda items are, we want to go through this exercise of identifying key topics. We'll start a discussion about research.

We'll talk about overall timing and milestones, including meeting cadence, and perhaps whether we need sub-sub teams. We'll find out. Are there other topics that people would like to spend some on here today?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thank you, chair. The only other thing that would be good, and might not need to happen conclusively today, but on the meeting cadence for the overall team, there are going to be reporting times from the teams where, in fact, you would be chairing the main call in order to report back to the bigger group, and lead the conversation and the feedback on whatever the findings are with this group. One of the, if not today, early things to figure out is what a broad schedule might be for how the work is divided, and how it'll get reported back to the group.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, we'll roll that into the overall timing and milestones discussion, so including reporting.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [off mic speaking] or appropriate for later. [inaudible] there's a session, I believe, in which we're collectively meeting, where you're meeting with a larger group. What are you expecting us to report, again, to the larger group? It's in two weeks.

JONATHAN ZUCK: It's not yet completely determined, but it's mainly meant to be a time for them to provide feedback to us, and to raise issues, that they want to make sure that

we're – to give their version of this exercise here, essentially. I'll probably just give a little overview of where we are, which won't be very far along, and then invite commentary that we can try to take on board in our [inaudible] meeting afterward.

[off mic speaking]

JONATHAN ZUCK: No pressure on you at all.

DAVID TAYLOR: I was going to say one of the things to look at, which is one I've raised before on this, is the competition aspects of community. There's a standard, whether it applied for the same TLD, and ICANNs, and the perceived wish that a community should take precedence over a standard, and what, in reality, we're seeing, so at times and with the theme I've been talking about.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Do you think that belongs here versus in the application and allocation of TLD process?

DAVID TAYLOR: I think it belongs in both, 'cuz you've got the allocation part, but then you've got the competition part as well. It's sitting in both.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I agree with that. In fact, I've been looking at the list of all the new [inaudible] and the number of registrants in each of them, at a very macro level. I think it'd be worth looking down at which ones are the least successful in terms of the number of registrants, and how they break down into the various categories. That, I think, would be a very interesting thing to do as we think about how that market [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: It sounds like we are now veering into – what are they key topics we want to – topics that talk about discussion. I'm going to take from that that we don't have any other high-level agenda items for today's meeting. Why don't we jump over to talking about our key topics? I think that same exercise we did yesterday for the application process will be, probably, a good place to start here.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Eleeza will pull it up.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: We don't have to limit ourselves to those, obviously, but that's a good seeding exercise, certainly.

DAVID TAYLOR: Maybe you should discuss [inaudible] about the date when we have our calls for our sub team.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, that will be something where we talk about overall timing, and yeah, we definitely will, thanks David.

I don't have Jonathan's [inaudible] voice to keep us entertained while we wait for this to come up. I definitely don't have a singing voice that will keep anyone entertained. We're going to start with the same process yesterday, by which the staff has transcribed the post-its. This is not the one we want, though.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I keep forgetting what group I'm in.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yesterday, we started off with the premise that we were going to ask questions, which I like the idea of doing again, but our questions all led with, "Was the application process effective at," I don't know if I have a good lead-in phrase like that that we want to use here. What do we think about the idea of identifying high-level questions that we seek to answer, and translating these things into questions?

JONATHAN ZUCK: You had the idea yesterday of actually going back to the EOC, and we can do the same thing. That's where the word effective came from. I think the word in the EOC is, "contributed to," or, "enhanced," or something. Maybe we can do the same exercise.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Megan, can you pull out your annotated EOC again? That may be helpful.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I can read it to you if you would like.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Megan, it sounds like you can [cross talk]

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: If you already have it up, it's okay.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: No, she's digging in her bag, so if you can read it, that would be great.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible] contemplate – let me just pull this up. This might be easier.

[off mic speaking]

WAUDO SIGANGA: At the end of the day, we're going to have the metrics. In one side, we had the, is it the activities? What did we call them? We're going to have our metrics, in which we are going to map your questions that we are going to create right now.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I would think that the way forward would be we go and identify the questions that we want to answer. For each of those, we would say, “What is the data that we need in order to try to answer this question?” That will lead into our second topic, which are what are the data sources that we need in order to be effective, including ones that might not exist yet?

JONATHAN ZUCK: One of the high-level topics might be about dependent registrations, right? In other words, under choice, are people using new domains for real purposes, or just to keep other people from getting them? There are some metrics that are already being collected that speak to that, but the survey that Michael Graham has been talking about inside of [inaudible] I don’t know if you’ve been part of those conversation. I don’t know where that left off, where they survey their members about the costs or something like that, and may come into play there. That’s an example of where there might be two parts to it. Here’s the metrics we already have, and where we might want additional information.

We don’t know, for sure, the study’s going to be done, but one of the possible studies was about IP owners self-reporting what the New gTLD program has cost them. One organization, an advocacy organization, INTA, had agreed to do a survey. Michael Graham [inaudible] was spearheading that, and he was on the IAG for a while. I just don’t know where it ended, and [inaudible] to do the check in on that.

There’s this issue about whether or not we would treat it as too biased or something, which I think was one of the things that came up in the IABC. Should be other with this of the review team is going to think that it’s not legit? We need to resolve that, or help them craft it in such a way that we would find it

more valuable or something. That's just one of the conversations where there's some metrics already, and some additional things we might wanna get.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I think it's a good idea to find out where they are at early on. I also think that some of these questions answered through this survey of the registrants. I have in mind a series of questions that could be asked of registrants that might actually get at that question as well. I think some of it is actually passed on to Nielsen, am I correct, Eleeza?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Yes, although they're not at the registrant, so they [cross talk].

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I understand that.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: We'll take that [cross talk].

JONATHAN ZUCK: They haven't read it yet, in other words. [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: They were taking a back fire.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I'll take off my chair hat for the moment [inaudible] for the moment, which is I suspect that the registrant survey is going to hit a pretty different segment of registrants than [inaudible]. I think it's good to understand both a broad cross sectional survey that the Nielsen survey would hit. Since the defense of registration concept I think, most people would think that would largely apply to brands as opposed to casual domain registrants. I think that the end of survey would seem more likely to be useful on that front. Although, maybe, we would also find that people that had .com's, and casually, maybe for their blog or something like that, they might also be registering defensively. That would be an interesting finding, I suppose.

[off mic speaking]

WAUDO SIGANGA: Jordyn, I think the defensive registrations were much more than just a front. We may find that out. I'm just wondering, what is the question now from [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Now that we're back to the EOC, and it looks like our charter is to examine the extent to which the introduction or expansion of gTLDs has promoted competition, consumer trust, and consumer choice. For the purpose of our exercise, we would wonder whether it promoted competition and consumer

choice, leaving consumer trust to the other team. The question, are you suggesting Jonathan, we could say has the gTLD program, or the expansion of gTLDs been effective at promoting...? I think questions like defensive registrations would want to phrase that as a different question, I would imagine, which would be –

JONATHAN ZUCK: [inaudible] opposite [inaudible] instruction [inaudible] useful.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: We just want to know both, I presume, right? We want to know both. Have it encourage fresh registrations, and also it's the cusp in terms of innocent brands being forced to register defensively.

STANLEY BESEN: I had in mind the following, ask somebody who was already in .com, and is now in a number of other domains, and didn't give up .com. So that's one question. Actually, how often did that happen? Then of the people who have [inaudible] registrations, if we could ask them, "Did you do that to protect your brand? Or did you do that because you thought there were additional benefits by being more domains?" It seems to me that's the way to go, that is the first part of this actual question, "What did you do?" Then we can ask it, "Why did you do it?"

JONATHAN ZUCK: I think it's a good idea. I think Jordyn's point is that the sample size of people that were engaged in defensive registration will be much smaller than it would be if a survey of brand owners, just on their own, were taken. Let's do both. I

think taking this all up a level, the first thing is just to come up with the big questions we want to answer, and then how to get them answered is the next step.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Correct. That's the idea. I'm going to suggest we just started to phrase general questions without the lead in. Then, if we want, later on, we can go back and try to formulate in a consistent manner.

Let's start with the list. The first is, if competition is not founded on price, what services should be identified for competition? That is a question unto itself. Is that one the headlining questions that we want to try to answer as a team? I think that seems a little specific, but does that roll up into some broader headline question we'd like to ask?

JONATHAN ZUCK: It has been effective in promoting non-priced competition in products and services, or something like that. Maybe it's from registries, or maybe there's versions of it or something like that. That might be the high level question.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I like that question as Jonathan just phrased it. Yeah, promoting non-price competition between TLD operators. Is that it, or do we want to include other actors as well?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Do we want to include other actors? The question is whether we want them all munged into one question, or actually have three versions of this question that have different actors, I don't know.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Kaili noted in the chat that this was his point, and Kaili, do you want to type in what you think the question ought to be?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Or you can talk.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Or you can talk if you have bridge access. We'd love to hear your voice.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Remember, this isn't a question of clarity. This is a group discussion about how to take this up a level of specificity so that others might be grouped under it that we find.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: May I make a suggestion that maybe it's not exactly the way you want. Why don't you divide into price competition and non-price competition? Those are the two big issues, aren't they? Then you can determine what goes under price competition and what goes under non-price competition? Under non-price competition you can have things like extra services, I don't know [inaudible], and on price competition, you have price obviously, but you have –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Wholesale, retail, secondary market.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I think that makes sense. Maybe we just start off with two core questions here, which is has the extension of gTLDs being effective at promoting price competition. Then we can prove some set of sub questions under that, and then we'll have the non-price.

[off mic speaking]

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Either or both. Stan?

STANLEY BENSON: Non-price competition could also include a wider variety of domains in which to register. It's not limited to auxiliary services.

[off mic speaking]

STANLEY BENSON: I understand, I just wanted to say it's not limited to that. One effect might be there are a lot more and a lot wider variety of domains in which you could register, and that's a form of non-price competition.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Stan intended to ask how we would determine whether to ask how we would determine whether the very existence of the TLDs therefore imply that there's more competition. Why don't we wait until we get to the next question, which is how do we start to answer each of these big questions, though, before I actually ask that.

[off mic speaking]

STANLEY BENSON: Just to anticipate, what we're dealing with is really a very hard problem here, which is how to define a market. Let's just stick with registries for a moment. Is it the market for domain names? The Department of Justice, when they looked at this in 2004, thought each domain was a separate market.

In the analysis group study, they grouped certain collections of domains that looked similar, that suppose they are a market, what does the [inaudible] of shares look like? Market designation is really hard. I don't think we're not going to answer it today. We probably won't answer it at the end. I think at the end of the day, what we're going to do, we'll say things like, "If this is the way you define the market, here's the nature of competition." You might get different answers depending on how narrowly or broadly you define the market.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I think, furthermore, we'll end up creating market segments, and looking at them individually, so that things like .cat, or something like that, things that

have a small number of registrations. There may be market and then that's in parenthesis. How should we define and segment the market, or something like that?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: This is the analysis group study. They have .bargains, .cheap, .deals, .discount, .gratis, .coupon, I guess. They thought [inaudible] perspective market definition, and then they looked at the shares. A perfectly reasonable things to do.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: This is a perfect segue into the very next bullet point in our post-it collection. I think this is the market definition question, it seems like. Which is, as more and more apps go directly to service providers, e.g. Facebook, the impact to the market for domain names and implications. Do we want to actually have a question that we're trying to answer that is specifically a, "What's the market" question.

MEGAN RICHARDS: I wasn't going to answer the what's the market question, but I was going to suggest something like are new technologies, and new mechanisms, and new systems having an impact on the New gTLD market? Because that's really what you're asking there. Theoretically, there's a market for legacy gTLDs and New gTLDs, etcetera. But there are also other new factors that are coming in, which are perhaps changing our impact in the market. Which could be the reason, I mean, this is a hypothetical assumption that even though the introduction of New gTLDs was supposed to increase competition, these other factors have had

such an impact that the New gTLD introduction has not been as successful in increasing competition because of these other factors.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Stan then Waudo, okay.

STANLEY BESEN: A slightly different way of saying that is that the nature of competition among GLDs is affected by other external developments. You might say if suddenly someone invented search engines, it would imply something about the nature of competition among gTLDs. I think you're absolutely right. The problem's the thing beyond the question of do gTLDs just compete, but what's the environment in which they compete?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: All right, Waudo?

WAUDO SIGANGA: I was agreeing with Waudo here. I think it's important to identify those factors that can impact on the completed nature of the gTLDs. There are external factors, the ones that might make the introduction not to bring up [inaudible] competition.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: One analogy, I think that you've probably dealt with, with your work at the FCC is that when you're looking at a merger between two cable companies, for example, and they define the market as cable television, then it'll get one answer. But if they define it as on demand video entertainment, then that includes people that are getting their Internet via FIOS or something, that are not cable companies. That's sort of the analog to this question. That's why, I tried, when we were coming to this definition to say Internet identity as a potential market, even though we may end up agreeing that it's too big for us to deal with, or that it's outside ICANNs prevue to try and influence that market, etcetera. But that may be the broad market we're starting from, and then tryin' to segment down from that.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Stan, did you want to add anything else?

STANLEY BESEN: Another example would be, should you include Netflix? I'm [inaudible] take the table system merger. I think we'll want to say something about these other factors. We may not be definitive about them, we may not have a ton of data about them that we'll have about the domain competition, but I think we should say something about it.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: It seems like we have a question here which is roughly what is the market that we're considering, and then this question actually goes in two ways. Number one is what are these extrinsic factors that potentially affect the competition within the market that we define. Then also, that market may include things

other than domain names, and then what's the effect of the introduction of these domain names upon that marketplace? There's interactions in both directions. Search engines could make it less likely that people can fuse domain names, or it could be that there are search engines, and we have these new domain names, and therefore no one needs to search anymore, that would be terrible.

[off mic speaking]

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Kaili has some questions. You might want to look in the chat and see.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Sure, thanks. Kaili has said, "Or maybe we can include a more fundamental question, what is the goal of competition? Why do we want it? Then we measure the competition according to price and other factors. And then we can look into whether competition is feasible in the industry and the market." Do we want to try to answer that foundational question of why do we want competition? Megan is saying no. Any other? Go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: It's an interesting question, of course, as a fundamental principal. I think, under the affirmation of commitment, we are presumed to be looking at promotion of competition. The argument of whether competition is good or bad is almost irrelevant. Of course, it's not irrelevant entirely, but in theory to our purposes, it's almost irrelevant. We have to presume that the competition is good, and we

have go ahead and look at what the – if someone else say it's bad afterwards, that's another issue.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I think I'm inclined to agree with that, for the purposes of keeping the scope of our exercise reasonable, we've been chartered to look at whether or not there is competition, not whether or not competition is awesome or not.

JONATHAN ZUCK: We may end up asking whether it was worth it. When we look at defensive registrations, or something, or costs there, or something, we may end up finding that there was an increase in competition, but there was such a big downside in trust, or consumer confusion, or something like that, that may have outweighed the benefit. We may end up asking that question, indirectly, we do know that we have to determine whether it's competition or user [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, we're asking the question not metaphysically, or not Marxism versus capitalism. What we're asking is whether or not, in this particular case, the benefits of competition outweighed the costs of the program, which seems like a reasonable exercise. I'm conscious of time. We only have an hour and eight more minutes, but we have quite a bit to get through. I'm going to try to, whoops, I was going to say push us through this list, but it disappeared.

In any case, it seems like we have a market definition question. Do we want to go with something as broad as what is the market that we are considering, or Stan, do you want to help us with a better question than that?

STANLEY BESEN: My prediction is that we will not settle, we probably should not settle on a single market definition for the purpose of this project. It's just going to be too hard and too controversial. I would favor us keeping our options open during a number of possible market definitions, alternative market definitions, and analyze the competition in each of them. I think it's certainly too early today [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Sure, so maybe the question, and I'm not proposing we try to answer any of these questions today, I'm just trying to enumerate the questions that we're interested in answering in the coming months. It seems like maybe a question is, then, what are reasonable definitions of markets that we might use to evaluate competition. Does that sound good? Did you get that, Eleeza?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I'm trying to get Kaili on the bridge. Can you say that again?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I think it is what are reasonable definitions of markets that we might use to evaluate competition?

STANLEY BESEN: A minor modification, and I trust guys would say relevant markets.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Sure, all right. Reasonable definitions of relevant markets.

STANLEY BESEN: [inaudible]

[off mic speaking]

JORDYN BUCHANAN: All right, so then how do we incorporate as more and more apps go directly to service providers, the impacts. Maybe we just put this as [inaudible] impact of non-domain identifiers. Does that make sense?

[off mic speaking]

JORDYN BUCHANAN: The next bullet, the post-it that raised this discussion was the one right below, which is as more and more apps go directly to service providers, the impact to the market for domains and implications. Should we just summarize that as saying as we look at the definition of relevant markets, we want to consider non-domain identifiers?

WAUDO SIGANGA: I think that relates to what you mentioned a little while ago about the impact of new technologies.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Maybe there's a separate question that I'm finding. I think we should add a separate question, that's not a market question, right? So then it's a, "What is the impact on new technologies on competition in the relevant markets that we will eventually [inaudible]"

WAUDO SIGANGA: No, no, no. I don't think it's the impact of the new technologies. It's the impact of the new technologies on, I don't know how to put it, on the impact of the New gTLDs. The New gTLDs have an impact on the competition. This was affected by the new technologies.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: No, I agree it's a two-way street.

WAUDO SIGANGA: There's a way in which this can be put.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Go ahead, Sam.

STANLEY BESEN: Two things [inaudible], you can think of these as exogenous forces that are affecting competition. It's like somebody invented search engines. But it's also

the other direction, which you might predict, many more domains, guessing would be less effective and people might use search engines more often, so that's your two-way direction.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I'm going to propose we do two things here. Number one is, under the reasonable definition of markets, like I said before, we have a thing that's flagged that we need to consider non-domain identifiers or navigation. Then there's a separate question, which is what the effect of these exogenous, that's a good word, influences of new technologies on our competition. Does that make sense, Eleeza? That second one is a new big bullet, not a sub bullet to the market question.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Do you mean this one?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yes, that's right.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: That's the new big bullet?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yes, and hopefully now we've captured that question.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: It's captured up here, right?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: It's captured in both, right? We've decided it has influences in both directions. Eleeza, just to keep me sane, can you put a line break between the things that we've decided on and the things that are just post-its?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Oh, yes.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: All right, so measuring innovation. Oh, go ahead, Waudo.

WAUDO SIGANGA: I still have a problem with that last one that we put there. Because we are not still looking at this set of exogenous influences of new technologies on competition. There's a way I think we should put it.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Why don't we say on the introduction of New gTLDs? That would actually scope our exercise better, anyways, to what we're supposed to be looking at. We replace competition with introduction of New gTLDs? That is standard language. I'm going to suggest, just in the interest of time, we don't need to get the words exactly right here, right? The idea is that we're going to look and say there's new technologies that are going to have some effect on the behavior of people in the market. We'll figure out exactly how to word smith this stuff later on.

The next one then is measuring innovation. We had quite a discussion about this yesterday. It's unclear to me, based on that discussion whether we actually want to pose the question around measuring innovation or not. I'll open this up for discussion. Starting with Waudu.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Actually I'm looking and this innovation cannot be measured [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Thanks Waudu. Any other opinions on this? Jamie's not here to argue on behalf of innovation. I am inclined to agree with Waudu. I would say innovation will weave through our investigation into these other questions, but we don't try to answer it as a standalone question. For example, as we look at non-price competition, I imagine a lot of what we'll be looking at there would be what a lot of people would refer to as innovation. Let's drop that one.

Now we have our first consumer choice question as opposed to competition question, which is choice or confusion. That's a pippy question that we could just leave, or we could try to reformulate it. Waudu, you like it as it stands?

WAUDO SIGANGA: As the introduction of New gTLDs brought more confusion than choice.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: David's claiming the topic and wants to talk, so go ahead, David.

DAVID TAYLOR: The question is, did the potential registrants learn so far that they make choice of domain, or the register, that was my thing that I was think about it. Are they confused with such a big amount of new domains, or are they aware that they have a choice?

[off mic speaking]

DAVID TAYLOR: Potential registrants.

[off mic speaking]

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I thought this was about the consumers. One way to interpret this is, the really good thing about the introduction of new domains is it gave consumers a much wider array of choice. It's registrants, right.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Our definition –

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Includes both.

[off mic speaking]

STANLEY BESEN: Yes, there's more choice but also potentially more confusion.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Stan makes a good point. Probably, as David just said, it's inevitable, right? You're not confused at all when there's only black telephones to buy, right, or black Model-T Fords. That doesn't necessarily mean that's good, and maybe once there's more choices, then you can buy a Model-A instead. That's confusing, and you have to think about the difference between the two, but it's added choice and confusion at the same time.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: For most kinds of markets we would say more choice is a mitigated good. It's just more confusing here. Not so obviously improvement, right?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Maybe the way to approach, go ahead David before I –

DAVID TAYLOR: No, I was just going to add to that because it was one of the things we used to talk on this years ago, in 2008, when the process was kicking off. I use to always use the example of today you may go to Hotels.com to look for a hotel if you're going to New York City. Tomorrow, you may go to Hotel.NYC, or may go to NYC.hotel, or may go to NYC.hotels, or you may go to etcetera, etcetera,

etcetera, or you may just go to Google. The only way we'll know is to see what the Google applies. That was basically where's the confusion, it's inevitable.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I have a proposed path forward on this question, which is maybe we should just ask does the benefits of the increase in choice outweigh the cost of potential confusion raised by the introduction of New gTLDs?

[off mic speaking]

JORDYN BUCHANAN: The potential confusion, the cost of confusion.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible] at least one of the two kinds of cost. The other one is the cost of defensive registration.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Correct, and we'll get to that in a minute, yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible] offset, ordinarily you would think of the benefits [inaudible].

KAILI KAN: [inaudible] Do anybody hear me?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Is this Kaili?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Yes, Kaili, is that you?

KAILI KAN: Yeah, okay, great.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Excellent, welcome Kaili.

KAILI KAN: Now, I am getting on the phone, all right, thank you, yeah.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Can we do anything about volume?

KAILI KAN: Excuse me?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: This is the part where I have to be a terrible chair. I have to duck out for about 10 minutes. Can we have a vice chair or someone hold the gavel for a few minutes, or take a –

[off mic speaking]

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Pardon?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I should be here.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Should we front load our 10-minute break into now? 10-minute break, let's reconvene at 3:00.

KAILI KAN: I will hang onto my phone, right?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Say that again, Kaili?

KAILI KAN: I will just still hang on my phone, right?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: If you don't mind, if you can hang on for 10 minutes, we'll be back.

KAILI KAN: Yeah, yeah, that's okay, yeah for me.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Okay. You can also put your comment in the chat if you can't stay on the line.

KAILI KAN: I'll stay on the line.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Thank you.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: We're going to restart. Do we still have Kaili on the line?

KAILI KAN: Hello.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: He is now capable of speaking with us, oh we hear his quiet voice.

KAILI KAN: Yeah.

[off mic speaking]

KAILI KAN: Hello? Yeah.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: We can hear you Kaili, you're just a bit faint.

KAILI KAN: Yeah.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: We will all get very quiet when –

KAILI KAN: Okay, yeah. So we have started again?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, so Kaili, thanks for joining us on the phone. Yell loud or something when you want to talk, and we'll all shut up because it's very quiet and hard to hear you otherwise.

KAILI KAN: All right, thank you. Maybe when I want to talk I raise my hand?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Sure, that sounds great.

KAILI KAN: Yeah, okay. That's the usual protocol, okay? Please go ahead.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Thanks, Kaili. Eleeza, can you move the question we just decided on up to the questions we've agreed as opposed to down in the –

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Yes, although it's not a complete question. Because I think I lost the thread towards the end.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: We'll re-word smith all these later. The cost of confusion, or I don't know. Let's word smith it later. We only have 39 minutes now, so I want to run through these relatively quickly. We asked community, versus standard, versus brand. Go ahead, David.

DAVID TAYLOR: This is really the competition between registry operators. Whether a community is standard in the brand, and how those are interacting, especially if it's applied for the same TLD. I suppose, really, maybe there's two sub points here I was thinking because this is really a competition between registry operators, and we've got a sub point being community, versus standard, versus brand. Then a second sub point, which would be, single TLD versus portfolio registry. Again, where they're applying for the same TLD or a similar TLD, and there we've got the competition aspect.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: This is just, in the version of market definition [inaudible].

DAVID TAYLOR: Right, that's where we were discussing on the terms of reference, and we were coming in there.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible] the community TLDs compete with –

JORDYN BUCHANAN: There's a slightly different question that I don't know if you're trying to get at or not, David, so we don't necessarily have to add it if you're not. But it is, is a community TLD more effective at competing against other TLDs than a non-community TLD, or where would a brand be better at it? That's different from the market definition question. It's like, do these things have advantages, or have they been more effective in the marketplace, or something like that.

DAVID TAYLOR: I think this is a different point, but I think it also comes down to the fairness. I think I'd come back to the thing that ICANN was saying that at the beginning it was the communities were the ones, in a way, that were backed better. And if you reach that high score, and you got your community stages, you had [inaudible] stages. At the beginning, we had brands wanting to be communities. We advised many, many brands on that that were coming through saying, "Well, we're a community, here's why we're a community. We have our community of users. We have our community of this. We want the community status, because then we trump a standard application."

It was a big thing, and that, to me, is the point there when you've got today, community applicants, standard applicants, and brands in the same market coming at them from very different angles. A brand has a lot of money, and a community is a small community, which might be from Africa, which might be from somewhere else, which has applied for the same TLD, but doesn't have the same leverage or competitive effect. That's really the point I'm coming to. The same on the single TLD or the multiple portfolio applications. Again, you've got a difference in leverage, so I think that's an aspect to look at.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: The applied for the same TLD question is one for the application process discussion. Because we're looking at effects in the marketplace after they're already in the market. Nonetheless, I think I like more Stan's question than my question, so I think I'd propose moving this up into the market definition.

STANLEY BESEN: I actually have another version of this [inaudible] question. E-commerce is using to looking at successful firms as when they have large market shares. Some of these may be quite successful with quite small shares because they're intended to appeal to very narrow audiences. Is that right?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yes, but that cat would be a good example.

STANLEY BESEN: They never expect to have a lot of registrants. They look like they're unimportant, but in fact, they do very well in the market that they're intended

to serve. It's going to be a little trickier when we look at the numbers about shares, interpreting what a very small share means. Some might be about to exit because they can't make any money, and others might say, "It's just what we expected them to do."

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Why don't I suggest, as a way forward, we take these two sub topics, move them up to the market definition for the moment, and then there's a separate question that Stan just posted, which is who do we evaluate the success of TLDs that are targeted at small markets. Does that not make sense? Small segments, yeah.

[off mic speaking]

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Maybe we could put that in market too. Jonathan?

JONATHAN ZUCK: The other thing is to not to forget about choice in this discussion of competition. In other words, part of what David may have been trying to get to is this notion of consumer choice, and the communities potentially created a different kind of choice for end users and registrants, and is it too difficult to compete with .club, which that's actually a single registrant, that's not a [inaudible] that's one that's somebody else, but versus a community TLD. There might be a choice question there that I haven't formulated in my head yet, but that's about the end users

and the ability to congregate around a community rather than a brand, for example.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: That might be something like are these different types of players equally effective or equally capable of providing consumer choice?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, something like that. Does the market lend itself to their competition between community versus open versus brand TLDs. I mean, I guess I don't know the –

JORDYN BUCHANAN: But now you're back to phrasing it as a competition question again.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right, no that's right.

DAVID TAYLOR: I think –

JONATHAN ZUCK: I don't have it complete. I was trying to –

DAVID TAYLOR: Yeah, no it is. It's the choice aspect if you're going and you're choosing your TLD to go to when they're both in the route, which might tie into singular or plural, where you've got a .pet, and a .pets, or a .sport, and a .sports. If one of them is a community and one of them is a brand, and the brand is saying it's – you've got all those aspects which come into play. If your community cannot hold your own in a marketplace, you're not going to be able to hold your own against a large brand, or a large portfolio player who's got it all, whatever.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Is it maybe that different types of TLDs provide, whew, and let there be light. Do different types of TLDs increase the range of consumer choice? Is that the question we're trying to ask?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Community TLDs have been able to provide an effective choice.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Alternative to standards?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Alternative is the work I'm looking for, to [inaudible]

JORDYN BUCHANAN: So maybe have community and brand. Do we care about geos? Have different types of TLDs provided effective alternatives to standard TLDs. And then we can look at each of community brands geo, does that make sense?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah.

[off mic speaking]

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Sure.

[off mic speaking]

JONATHAN ZUCK: [inaudible] in the, right, sorry.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Kaili has his hand raised.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: All right, Kaili, go ahead. Everyone be quiet so we can hear Kaili.

KAILI KAN: Hi, yes. As a matter of fact, I believe that we need answers to those sentimental questions, that is the question I ask, for example. What is the goal for competition? How would consumer choice benefit the consumers? Etcetera. I understand that we're already mandated with these assumptions. However, we

do need the answers to these sentimentals, otherwise it'll be harder to proceed. I would like to know, what are the answers to these questions before I can proceed. Otherwise, see if I don't know whether the competition is good for consumers or is not even feasible, there is no way to proceed. But I do not see the answers so far.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Thanks Kaili. For those who didn't hear, I think Kaili was mostly rephrasing the question that he had stated earlier, which is we need to understand the purpose, and the benefits of competition before we get to the other questions because it's fundamental to the discussion. We did discuss this briefly before, Kaili, and concluded that we were going to take it as a given that competition was good, but not necessarily that this particular instance of competition was worth any potential costs, that there wasn't a net benefit necessarily.

Kaili, can I suggest, just for the purpose of today's discussion, since we made that discussion earlier, I'll talk to you offline and we'll see if there's a way to weave this back and, and make sure your concerns are being addressed. In the meantime, we'll move through the others, and hopefully assume for the moment that we're just going to assess whether or not there is competition as opposed to whether or not competition is inherently good. We will take a look at whether the benefits of this instance of competition is worth the costs or not. Does that work for you, Kaili?

KAILI KAN: Yes, however, for example, the telecom industry. For fixed landline competition, it's no good. For wireless, cellular competition is good. This is not uncommon. It may not be uncommon in our industry as well. Thank you.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Thanks Kaili. Yeah, Kaili drew the analogy to fixed landlines versus mobile competition where you see different characteristics or ways that regulars have approached those markets, I guess. Like I said, I'll follow up offline with Kaili, and we'll make sure that his concerns get addressed here.

Let's move down through our topics, though. Actually, I'm going to take a really quick [inaudible]. We have half an hour left. I think there's zero chance we're going to get to the second topic on our agenda, which is what the data that we need is. So I'm going to propose that we get through this, and figure out what our high-level question is. Then, on our next call, which we will try to talk through in the agenda, that we focus exclusively on identifying data that we need in order to answer these questions, and then we can all take as homework in the meantime to come prepared for that conversation with what we think we need. Does that work for everyone?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Jordyn, a question.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, Eleeza.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I have these two previous iterations. Should I get rid of these that I have highlighted here?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, I think those are encapsulated. I think we ended up on that third version.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Okay, that's what I thought, but I just want to make sure.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: We do want sub-bullets under the third version for each, community, brand, and geo.

[off mic speaking]

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Does that look right?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Let's scroll down to the next bullet. How has the introduction of the New TLDs affected competition between registrars? That's a new question for us. That's my question. I'm going to say that's well formed already. Does that sound like a question we want to try to answer, and do we want to change it at all? Waudo nodded.

[off mic speaking]

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Jonathan's suggesting that is a good high-level question, so let's move that up as is. To what extent have New gTLDs displaced Legacy gTLDs and CcTLDs, and is that good for competition? This, I think, is another market definition question. Is that true? We don't currently have CC's up in our market definition, so why don't we put them up there, and use that as the exercise for this, well, for some definition of the market, that competition. I'm learning from Stan. How to – sorry go ahead, Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I guess to parse that a little bit, that question may be also asking whether or not there's competition between the New gTLDs and Legacy TLDs, or competition within gTLDs, right? In other words, if the goal is just to promote competition, it could be we've created this competitive New gTLD market, but they may not have at least had an immediate impact on Legacy TLDs. That's sort of buried in this question, in addition to a market definition.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I guess I do think that if we include Legacy TLDs in the market as well, then it seems like you would have to consider the effect on Legacy TLDs in that segment too. Go ahead, Megan.

MEGAN RICHARDS: So far as I recall, when the whole New gTLD round was introduced, it was based on an assessment that more competition in the field was necessary, and that the Legacy TLDs were too limited, and that the two previous rounds were also very limited. We have that basic premise that introducing New gTLDs would, by

definition, expand market use of the market and competition. I think we have to take that into consideration. That was one of the premises.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: What I will take away from Jonathan's intervention is we also need to make sure Legacy TLDs are included in the market evaluation. As we consider potential markets, Legacy TLDs needs to be considered as well. Eleeza, just make sure up in the market definition section we have CcTLDs and Legacy TLDs flagged.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I have this sub-bullet here. Does that capture what you're talking about?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Sure, we can just move it up there, and refine it over time, that's fine.

How to segment the market, I guess that's a further refinement, potentially? Do we know who posed this question?

JONATHAN ZUCK: It's actually just another way of saying what Stan has suggested, which is if we're going to come up with a number of theories for markets, an example in the analysis report where they came up with a market for commerce, for example, that's a potential market segment that we might look at to see if it was infecting [inaudible] competition in that segment. That's what [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Is that already covered by the existing?

JONATHAN ZUCK: I think it might be. That's what that point. I think it sort of segues into it.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: We will consider this already covered. Cost and cost structure. This is to what extent do ICANNs – is this intended to be limit? I think this is Carlton's question. I wonder if it's intended to be limited to ICANN cost and cost structure, and it includes registry services and so on. Go ahead Stan and then Megan.

STANLEY BESEN: My interpretation is that this was originally about whether or not were the costs of operating a registry primarily fixed cost or variable cost if that makes a difference. If they're primarily fixed cost, then you have to have some minimum number of registrants in order to cover your costs. That's an important factor. Understanding the cost structure of operating your registry is important.

I got up in the middle of the night and said that's an incomplete answer. It's an incomplete answer because some people operate more than one registry. It turns out that you might be able to operate a small rather, apparently, unsuccessful registry if it's part of some bigger enterprise. And, in fact, when the analysis group does this, they do market shares for registry operators, some of which operate multiple registries. Even that analysis isn't complete, as I term today because –

[off mic speaking]

STANLEY BESEN: No, I learned this because there are people called registry service providers. You could be a registry without actually really doing anything. You could subcontract this to somebody who has economy to scale. We want to understand how this operates. We have just one more, sorry.

I was thinking that a lot of people would drop out of the market, these small guys. Much more plausible they'll merge. One might expect over time, consolidation, if there are registries that are essentially too small to operate on their own. That's all.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Megan, did you have something else to add?

[off mic speaking]

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Oh okay, Kaili, go ahead.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Well, he's dropped off the phone, and now he's trying the computer mic, but it doesn't seem to be working.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I'm going to suggest a path forward why we see if Kaili can get voice working, or maybe type something. It seems like what we're interested in here is are the

New gTLD businesses liable over the long term? A sub bullet of that would be to examine the cost structures involved with operating them. Do we care about the cost structure for the cost structure's sake, or do we care about it as some broader question?

MEGAN RICHARDS: My question, sorry to do this, but my question is do we really care if it's viable over the long run? If competition hasn't changed, or nothing's happened, then whether they disappear or not is almost irrelevant. If it has increased competition, then we have an argument to say, "Yes this is something that was good, and useful, and should continue." Aside of all the arguments about how much money ICANN makes from it, except to say, those we won't go into.

WAUDO SIGANGA: I think what will be interesting in the cost structure of the New gTLDs, if we also had the cost structure of the Legacy, so we can do a comparison type [inaudible] that they can't be valuable if the comparison is favorable.

STANLEY BESEN: If it turned out that [inaudible] viable scale is really, really big, you've got to be as big as .com to compete, that's great, so one answer. On the other hand, it might turn out that competition's quite viable at the size of substantially smaller than .com, which would make the market very competitive. In a sense, we're asking the question, what is the minimum viable scale, and how many of the new entrants have achieved that, taking into the account the fact that you could combine two gTLDs under the same owner, or use the services of a RSP.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I like Stan's formulation. Is everyone okay with the question, "What is the minimum viable scale for a TLD registry?" Then cost structure is going to get incorporated there. Let me just read Kaili's intervention. Kaili said, "If the fixed cost is big for providing service and the variable cost is small, just like with [inaudible] network, this industry is a natural monopoly, and introducing competition is no good, or is unlikely to succeed."

One thing we want to include in the minimum viable scale is fixed versus variable costs as part of the analysis, and the magnitude of both of those as well. They could be that they're all fixed, but they're really small, in which case you still wouldn't need very much scale.

MEGAN RICHARDS: I just want to ask a clarifying question for this last one that we have. We have, "What is the minimum viable scale for a TLD registry?" That presumes minimum viable scale to stay in the market, continue, etcetera, that's how you're interpreting that?

[off mic speaking]

MEGAN RICHARDS: Yeah, good, that was just what I wanted to clarify. In that case, fine.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: David?

DAVID TAYLOR: I think that all depends on who is running it as well, wouldn't it? As long as we're covering that. A minimum viable for a single TLD is not going to be the same as a minimum viable for a portfolio TLD. Absolutely.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: All right, yes, we will get into that. Margie?

MARGIE MILAM: I just have a question about this question. Your assumption and your question is that everyone that's in it is doing it for money. They might be a non profit, and there might be philanthropical reasons why they're in there. I just want you to realize that that's what your assumption is in that question.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: So we can create a sub bullet here, which is are there registry operators willing to operate TLD regardless of its profitability.

[off mic speaking]

JORDYN BUCHANAN: They might not.

[off mic speaking]

JORDYN BUCHANAN: For example, a brand TLD might not cover its costs, right? It's purely an exercise in –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Demand?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Well, I actually think in many cases, and I'll say Google included, as a point of the TLDs is not to make money off of selling SLDs. That might be a nice side benefit, but there's more strategic objectives for the entity involved in operating the TLD, and that's definitely true for a lot of brand applicants, I would assume. It may be true for less crass commercial reasons, for some entities as well. Like, .cancerresearch.

STANLEY BESEN: [inaudible] for people much more knowledgeable than I, which is there were 900 of these guys. It'd be nice to be able to characterize them by these. How many are non profits? How many are owned by the same operator? How many use back office services from somebody else? Otherwise, you just look at them –

[off mic speaking]

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Yeah, that's exactly what we have in this master document we're working on. It has how many are, who are they owned by, so you can click on registry operator donuts and see how many are donuts, how many have the same registry service provider. You can kind of slice and dice it in those categories.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Are you sharing what the headings of the master document look like to make sure that all of Stan's questions will be addressed?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: We will. We're working on, there's a piece of it that gets complicated that has to do with where they are geographically, and it has to do with the countries where they are. We're trying to figure out how best to represent that to make it clear.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I'm going to move on because of time. The data on retail prices, I think that just moves up to the price competition heading. Market forces cannot be the only – yeah I know. I think we got to yesterday, this was a question about non-price competitions that, what everyone else's recollection is, Stan?

[off mic speaking]

JORDYN BUCHANAN: That particular question was retail prices. I agree that we also care about wholesale prices, so we can put that up in the [inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK: [inaudible]

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Jonathan's right. We should also include secondary market considerations in the price competition heading.

Returning to the next bullet about market forces, let's just copy and paste that up into the non-price competition for now, that's my recollection.

[off mic speaking]

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I think so, but we'll consolidate this stuff later on. TLD versus CcTLD price, let's move that up to price competition. Universal acceptance. This is an issue of whether they work, so it's both a competition and a consumer choice question I think.

[off mic speaking]

JONATHAN ZUCK: Is a New TLD a valid choice for a registrant if there's not universal acceptance of it?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: That sounds like a good way to phrase the question. Does that work for everyone? Did you get that, Eleeza?

JONATHAN ZUCK: You can put in betsyart.gallery as an example. That's my wife's website. I get to hear about it all the time.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: .gallery?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, I get to hear about it all the time about how, "I'm signing up for a bank account and they won't take .gallery."

JORDYN BUCHANAN: All right, impact of competition of New gTLDs in areas where the uptake of CcTLDs is low, I think that goes into the market definition. Who is responsible to promote gTLDs?

[off mic speaking]

JONATHAN ZUCK: It could be is the community sufficiently aware to allow for competition or something like that. Is there sufficient awareness –

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Megan is making skeptical faces.

MEGAN RICHARDS: I'm making faces. Maybe I misunderstand this one, but, I mean, theoretically, and Stan will correct me of course, if I'm wrong. But theoretically, if the system is adequate, and it promotes competition, you don't have to go out and promote it very much anyway. Because, by definition it will –

JONATHAN ZUCK: If it doesn't one of the reasons might have been that there wasn't enough promotion. Just turn that on its head. I think you're absolutely right, you don't need additional promotion if you don't need promotion, but if there's not competition, and there isn't sufficient awareness between normal market forces, you might end up recommending more promotion. Maybe, maybe not, right? Our first thing that we're doing is just findings, right? Which is there enough awareness of this to promote competition?

[off mic speaking]

JONATHAN ZUCK: That'll be a sub question. But the first question is, is there sufficient awareness to generate competition, I think.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: It is entirely possible to say no, and that doesn't actually mean it's ICANNs job to do it. It could just be this is a reason why these things aren't competing

effectively. They don't have big enough marketing budgets or something like that.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Could be that not enough time has passed is one of the reasons why.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: That could be another reason, yeah. It could be we say a hypothetical future thing is you can't apply for a TLD unless you have a \$10 million marketing budget or something like that, so people will actually know. But I don't think we recommend that, but that could be –

JONATHAN ZUCK: And we become a regulator, yeah.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: You might say, as ICANN considers financial models, a marketing budget's an important consideration to understand eventual adoption of the TLD or something like that. Again, does do a financial analysis to determine whether the business model is viable as part of the application process, or they did in the last round.

STANLEY BESEN: This one may already be captured, but you might be interested in the strategies [inaudible] gTLD operators. I learned, by re-reading this report that .xyz, which is by far the biggest of the new domains, doesn't charge you anything. Well, I understand, but that's consistent with a strategy that says charge low prices

beginning, build your network up, become an attractive place for people to want to register in the future, and raise your prices. This is a very standard kind of market penetration strategy. I think that's captured in here, but this competition is a little bit more complicated because there were strategic things that firms might do. Maybe that's what .xyz is doing.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I'm going to go back to Jonathan's formulation of this previous which is, is the community sufficiently aware, or are we just asking are consumers sufficiently aware?

[off mic speaking]

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, that's what I was saying, to allow to have for these – well, this is good. We'll work out language later on. Then Stan, you think what you were just saying is already covered in our existing language.

STANLEY BESEN: [off mic speaking] cognizant of the fact that we need the competition more than [inaudible]. Just what products are you offering at what prices, you may have a strategy which is low current prices that charge higher future prices [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Right, so we'll have to consider various business models.

STANLEY BESEN: [inaudible] think about it as models. [inaudible] you've mentioned business models, and that's the way you can think about it.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: All right, great. Are domains being allocated more efficiently to registrants who will use them well? Oh, go ahead Waudo.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Sorry, maybe just to go back to the previous question that are consumers sufficiently aware. Why [inaudible] to consumers? Why not even registrars, or are registrars already included in the definition?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Registrars are not included in our definition of consumers, other than when they're acting as registrants.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Certainly not have good knowledge about the New gTLDs, strangely enough, if anyways, how will you define the market.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: We could add a sub bullet.

[off mic speaking]

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I mean, there are definitely some registrars who don't carry all of the TLDs, whether that's because of lack of awareness or not, I think, is something we don't know the answer to.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Yeah.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, we'll add registrars as a sub. Do you want to add a sub bullet there, Eleeza? Are registrars aware? Just to make sure we remember what we mean.

Now, back to are domains names being allocated more efficiently to registrants who will use them well? This is my question. I'm not sure if we have any way to kind of answer this question, so it may be that we don't care. Go ahead, Stan.

STANLEY BESEN: Back to [inaudible]. A question of who the consumer is, is a little confusing. I guess what the analysis group says, the final stage of refinement is then undertaken by the customer after obtaining a registration of a domain name by a registrar, the consumer can choose to create blah, blah, blah. They're feeding the registrant as a consumer.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: In our definition, the registrar is a consumer, and so is the registrant, and so is an Internet user. I think we're going to attempt to also use the specific terms registrant and Internet user, where we specifically mean one category of them

in order to make it clear what we're talking about. In that, we would have said registrant instead of consumer. Do we want to try to answer this question of allocation to registrants?

JONATHAN ZUCK: It's your question?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: It is my question.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Can you clarify it?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, if you go scroll around in .com, or anyone that's tried to get a .com has often found that the domain name is registered to someone not doing anything, particularly, with it, and not using it well. Waudo has this experience, and so do you. The question is, and part of that is the price gap on .com because there's an arbitrage opportunity, right? If someone can buy a domain for \$10 and it might be worth \$10,000, so as a speculator, you might want to get a lot of those.

I guess my question would be, have the New TLDs had different or more effective pricing or allocations. You could imagine, pricing strategies are quite common now with the premium names. They'll say, "I'm not going to sell the name until someone's willing to pay more money." It might be they would only charge \$5,000, but the decrease of the arbitrage opportunity, and that makes it

more likely someone who will actually use the name will get it. Similarly, you could imagine – I don't think anyone's doing that at the extreme end, a registry could have an RPP process, right? They could say, "Oh, I'm only going to give you your name if you tell me what you're going to do with it, and you're going to do something awesome."

The question here is just there's valuable name space, essentially. Is it being better utilized post program than pre program? I think that's an interesting question. I'm not sure how we would go about answering it.

Jonathan says it's a great question, he said do other people want to keep this in the –

[off mic speaking]

WAUDO SIGANGA: The way it's framed is quite okay.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Stan?

WAUDO SIGANGA: We can put it in sub bullets connected in the choice.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, I think we can group this into choice.

WAUDO SIGANGA: [inaudible] choice, yeah.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: For the moment, let's just leave it as a standalone question for time, and I'll do some editing afterwards. We'll figure out how to consolidate, to roll some of the stuff up.

[off mic speaking]

JONATHAN ZUCK: More of an overall good, which is, is the system more inclined to lead to – well, it's part of the problem, but I mean, I sit more inclined to lead to what we would call typical or helpful usage of the TLD, or something like that.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, all right. Do Internet users expect different TLDs to have different types of registrants? I think that's a separate question that we haven't asked yet. This is a consumer choice question for Internet users, not for registrants, I think. I mean, it could also be for registrants, but I guess the question is if you look at it, if you see .whatever, .scientist, and you expect a real scientist is on the other end, that gives you an option versus going to .engineering, or .dumb where you're not going to get a scientist. That's why I would think of it as a choice question, but in any case, I think it's an important question to answer about

consumer expectations. I don't know if this belongs here or in the safeguards discussion though, Jonathan?

[off mic speaking]

WAUDO SIGANGA: Excuse me, that question is actually in the news report.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: What I'm going to suggest is that we keep this question here, and we coordinate with the trust group. We shouldn't try to answer this question twice.

[off mic speaking]

JORDYN BUCHANAN: But we should make sure it gets answered, yes.

DAVID TAYLOR: You could at least get the same answer.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I don't know what you think, overall chair, but I would prefer that we try to coordinate on key topics, and make sure that one group or the other is owning them, but I don't know if you have thoughts on that.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I guess I don't feel strongly, and we don't want to spend a lot of time on coordination that might take more time than coming up with two answers. Because we'll end up coordinating anyway, but we can try to do that. It may come down to phrasing too. I feel like that part of this may speak back to our market definition in a way that does the explosion of New TLDs create a new form of value in the DNS through a type of segmentation, or something like that.

And this is ill formed at this point, but the idea being if I dis-incented the use of a search engine or something by saying, "Now come to info.doctor," might be the place that if I created competition in that sense by improving consumer welfare in the DNS, generally, by creating market segments or something, I don't know. I'm not fully formed.

DAVID TAYLOR: I think, yeah, it's a label, and it's an expectation. So it's definitely consumer choice. You go to it because you're expecting to find something there. In the same way, you see that now with the disputes on the UDRP. Before you would say a .com, you ignore the .com. Whereas now, if you've got a .bike, and you see a bike manufacturer in there, you now look at the .bikes. So you're looking at it as a label, which a consumer must be looking at a label when they register it in the first place.

JONATHAN ZUCK: If I look at competition against Legacy's, that com is generic, right? It just means company. So if I created a form of competition by creating a narrowing of that

search field. So if I'm looking for a bicycle or something like that, or we may find it in the commerce area, right? That's .shop or something like that, again, that I'm drawn to a subset by a TLD. If I create a competition in that way, is why I see it as potentially [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Can I suggest, maybe, we move this question up to the benefits versus cost of choice above where we say, "Do these more segmented namespaces, and potentially more regulated name spaces, provide a benefit to consumers?" A better navigation experience or something like that for consumers, or Internet users.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I agree on the regulated thing, and we may not be able to answer this question either. You and I talked about it a little bit, Jordyn is that will there be a natural proclivity for people to self select into these categories even absent regulation?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yes, that's right.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Will you be more likely to find photographers in .photography or whatever, and even though it's not regulated, and nobody is actually appraising, will something natural happen that of course is going to improve consumer welfare?

DAVID TAYLOR: I was going to say that ties in perfectly with the competition because you're looking at something where it's a label, so .photography. So you're thinking you're going to have people interested in photography. You may have some sort of selection of people, but then it's a competition point as well. Because at the end of the day, the registry operator wants to sell domain names, and doesn't really care who registers in them, whether it's anything to do with photography, or to do with film. I think you've got aspects there.

JONATHAN ZUCK: A registry might make –

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay, I'm going to be a mean chair and cut off this conversation.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Oh, sorry. Just throw it in as a question, then we don't have to [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: That's right. Let's move this. I don't want to move it as phrased, but up in the competition versus choice, let's say is further segmentation and regulation of the name space valuable to consumers navigating to Internet sites and to promote competition. We'll have to come back and revisit this. We're in bad shape for time, so I've clearly failed in my chair duties.

What I'm going to propose is we're going to have to do two things. We're going to have to take the remainder of these. I will work offline, and if anyone wants

to work with me to work these back up into key questions, and send that around to the group.

Then I want to spend a couple of minutes before we totally run out of time to just talk about work cadence, and milestones, and deliverables, and so on. Actually, really what I want to do is get us to the next meeting at least.

What do folks think about meeting cadence for this sub group, recognizing that it's in addition to the existing meetings that we already have CcTRT as a whole? I would suggest, maybe, another bi-weekly exchange? We're really meeting every week, or at least on that much time commitment. We could do it opposite the other ones, or we could do it the same week, or whatever, but I think that's roughly the right cadence. Megan is making a face again, so why don't you take the might?

MEGAN RICHARDS: Sorry, I shouldn't make so many faces. You can't see my face, luckily. I'm just wondering, instead of having another meeting, can we not do a lot of this, as you call it, offline. You're going to do some work now, you're going to exchange it. We're going to be meeting in Marrakech in two weeks anyway. Can we not squeeze in a time during the Marrakech meeting so that we can have another meeting?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Well, we're going to have two days of meetings in Marrakech.

MEGAN RICHARDS: Exactly, but can we not squeeze in the sub group re-meeting during that period?
[inaudible]

[off mic speaking]

JORDYN BUCHANAN: That seems fine as a next –

[off mic speaking]

JONATHAN ZUCK: [inaudible] get the work done [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Correct, that will help us in two weeks, it will not help us forever.

[off mic speaking]

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I am fine to kick the can down the road to Marrakech just given where we are in terms of time, just two weeks, that's correct. Therefore, we need homework. We're going to work offline. We're all going to be good, diligent workers. Let's

identify the homework that we need to do between now and when we meet in Marrakech.

One thing is I need to go take a pass through this document, identify the key questions that we're going to try to answer, consolidate stuff, clean up language, move these last few things up. I will circulate that to all of you, and you all before we get to Marrakech, I think. We all have to have agreed upon those things. Actually, I'm going to set a deadline to try to make that happen by – when are we all going to start traveling to Marrakech? Let's say by the 1st, that's a good time. By the 1st, we're going to have to all agree on this document, that these are the questions that we're trying to answer as part of this sub group.

Therefore, everyone's going to come prepared in Marrakech with their answers to what information do we need in order to try to answer these questions. We'll spend most of our time in Marrakech focused on figuring out what the information that we need is, and that will then lend itself to figuring out the rest of our work plan, and Jonathan has something to say.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, I just wanted to go to the implications of that. Does that mean they will have familiarized themselves with the resources that have already been identified in terms of metrics and things, so that they come prepared to understand what supplementary information? Is that what you [inaudible]?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: No. I do think, separately, Jonathan, we may want to identify the metric ninjas between now and Marrakech, and make them. Someone from this team should

be a metric ninja. So when someone says, “I need to know X,” then the metric ninja can say, “Ah ha, we already have that in this data set.” I think it is fine for members of the sub team as a whole to say, “This is the type of information I need,” and then between staff and our metric ninjas, we’ll identify whether we have that information or not already. Does that make sense?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: We’re basically kicking the can down the road on everything else. I may try to work with Jonathan and with staff to figure out if there’s some other milestones that we want to try to identify going into Marrakech in terms of our work plan. We won’t discuss those today. I will wrap things up, unless anyone disagrees with the homework, wants to add more homework, or thinks there’s something else we need to talk about before we get to the joint session again.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Jordyn, I’ll send this document around to the sub team.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Send it to me first.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Okay.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: We'll continue to work it a little bit, and then we'll send it around to the sub team.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Got it.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: If anyone else wants to be involved in that little exercise, just let me know.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Speaking as chair now that we're all reconvened, before we take our break, I think what seems to be percolating up is that a large portion of our time in Marrakech should be spend in the sub teams. Given the high priority of identifying supplemental work, and that's kind of one of the number one things that a large portion of our time will be spent that way.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: That's what your next session is about.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I'm going to call this meeting of sub team competition and choice to a choice. You'll all have homework, which we'll remind you of, and the teacher will be very grumpy if you don't do it. More importantly though, I think we can't hold up the data gathering exercise much further than Marrakech, so if you're not prepared, you're probably not going to get the data that you want. We'll reconvene in Marrakech, and we'll circulate the list of key questions. Everyone

will agree on the list of key questions by March 1st, and silence is compliance, as of March 1st. The end.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's a break. We'll reconvene at 4:00.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I think we're ready to start.

JONATHAN ZUCK: At the end of the break period, it's just a perennial problem. You said there's a 15 minute break, everyone waits until minute 14, and then leaves the room.

[off mic speaking]

JONATHAN ZUCK: For those that don't know, I signed one the emails with a picture of a fearless leader who is the villain from the Rocky and Bullwinkle show that used to be on television a long time ago in the United States, that's right. My guess is that it was actually very widespread, to being a cartoon. I bet it was in a lot of markets, so it's meant to be a little bit ironic. What am I looking at on this screen?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I can punch time in here. I just sent out a few minute ago, a revised version of the concept of interest policy that we spoke about yesterday. Erika Randall has

returned to talk you through the changes that were made. If you don't mind, we can hand it over to her.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That'd be great.

ERIKA RANDALL: Eleeza, if you scroll to section, I think it's 2.2. As Eleeza mentioned, she mentioned she sent out the revised version of the conflicts of interest policy taking into account some of the feedback that we received yesterday. Essentially, what we've done, is we added a paragraph B to section 2.2. The paragraph is intended to acknowledge the fact that many people who are on the review team have direct experience in the New gTLD program, and essentially that's part of the reason why you're on the review team.

The presumption is that everyone on the review team will participate in all of the discussions, and the voting, and that it's really a rare circumstance under which someone would have to abstain from voting, because the review team has gone through the process and sort of determined that on this particular matter, or in this particular circumstance, that there is an actual conflict.

It just kind of gives more language and clarity around that, so that if the situation does arise, that language and that presumption is recognized by the policy. I think that will help to address some of the questions that came up yesterday. If there are any other questions, though, or comments?

[off mic speaking]

ERIKA RANDALL: Yeah, it's paragraph B. Also, the new language notes that having an abstention is intended to be in extraordinary cases. Again, the presumption is that everyone participates and everyone votes. Hopefully that addresses some of the concerns you had yesterday.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks Erika. Were there any other concerns that were raised here besides this one, or was this the primary one that you had the paragraph for?

ERIKA RANDALL: Yeah, this is the primary one that I think that, when we discussed yesterday we said we would take those comments back, and then kind of revise it based on that discussion.

MEGAN RICHARD: Just to clarify, now the conflict of interests arises only in the case where the covered person has direct experience in the New gTLD program? It has nothing to do with any of the other Legacy TLDs or any other issue, is that correct? That's how I read this new version. So then the definition of conflict, and the potential conflict is limited to just the New gTLD program, is that correct?

ERIKA RANDALL: No, the definition of conflict has still remained the same. I think this new paragraph was intended to acknowledge the fact that there are many people on this review team. It's not everyone, I'm not sure of the entire makeup, but that

have direct experience either served as applicants, or advisor, or advised applicants in the New gTLD program. That knowledge is what helps them to participate on the review team and add value to it.

It's kind of acknowledgement of the fact that this is kind of a special type of review team, in that, the issues that you may be discussing weigh directly on the program in which you were involved, but it's kind of needed in this particular case. The policy kind of recognizes that, so when you're evaluating potential conflicts of interest, you have that in mind, and that doesn't necessarily mean that an actual conflict exists.

The key thing, again, is just about disclosing it so that people know what your position is, or the clients that you advise, to the extent that you can disclose that and those kinds of things. Then if there needs to be the formal decision made by the non-conflicting members of the review team, that these factors are taken into account when that decision is being made.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: You may have mentioned this already. Did the definition of family get revised?

ERIKA RANDALL: No, that definition remained the same.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I read the dictionary definition yesterday, this is ancestors means progenitors beyond your grandparents, so by that definition, parents and grandparents wouldn't be included in that definition, which I assume is not your intent, but I think it demonstrates that the word is problematic, yeah.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Or irrelevant, because there wasn't an ICANN.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I do assume that ICANN intends that my parents are included in my family.

ERIKA RANDALL: We do intend that. But again, I'm happy to go back and change the definition if that would make it more clear. I think the idea is that –

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I mean, it's not a clear definition.

ERIKA RANDALL: Okay, great.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I mean, I'm sympathetic. I know that, especially, when you've used things before, there's a resistance to changing them. But that word is extraordinarily problematic. Even the dictionary defines it as something that you clearly do not intend, that to me, is a signal that it's ambiguous, and you don't want it to be ambiguous. You don't want it to be ambiguous either.

ERIKA RANDALL: Sure, okay, that's fine.

DAVID TAYLOR: Like Jordyn, I looked up the definition yesterday. I think it's capturing things that you don't want it to capture. Because, on the Merriam-Webster, for instance, the full definition of an ancestor, one from whom a person has descended, and who is usually more remote in the line of descent than a grandparent. So, you're right upon grandparents there, which is kind of a little bit too far.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: The thing is, I think it would be helpful to just say, specifically, if you mean parents, say parents. If you also mean grandparents, say grandparents. Presumably, you don't care about great grandparents, or great, great, great grandchildren. In any case, I think just explicitly listing what you mean would be helpful.

ERIKA RANDALL: Okay, we'll take that back.

JONATHAN ZUCK: My great grandfather used to bounce me on his knee and say, "Without competition there is no justice."

[laughter]

JONATHAN ZUCK: It's influenced everything that I've done since then. It's just stuck with me. I hereby disclose that.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Erika will send a new version to me, and I'll circulate that to the team.

ERIKA RANDALL: Anything else? Enjoy the rest of your talk.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Anything else, you jerks? We don't sign the conflict of interest policy, but it is, in fact, referenced in the statement of interest that we do need to re-sign.

[off mic speaking]

JONATHAN ZUCK: Recertify because it's a new document and refers to a new document, that's right. So it's like signing it, I guess.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: May I? Can I jump in for a moment?

JONATHAN ZUCK: You can, yeah. Do you want to lead this conversation?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Well, not necessarily lead it, just your next 48 minutes that are remaining were supposed to be devoted to wrap up and planning for the Marrakech session. Just one thing we didn't get to was talking about liaisons, the other team's work. I don't know if you want to talk about that now, or if that's something that's best left to the sub teams? I just wanted to slide that for your attention.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, and thanks for writing up this list. These are the things I was going to bring up. The other issue is identifying the metrics ninjas. That's another bullet that goes on this list as well. To Jordyn's comment, it might've originated with Megan, which is give us a break, we're meeting again in two weeks. The people for whom that is not true is this Nielsen analysis group, because we're trying to really get information to them really in the next week, by the 1st. Whoever signed up for that little sub team to work on new questions for Nielsen, etcetera, in parallel with the work that he's doing. That starts right away, and should probably have a call soon. That's another good reason that the sub teams don't have to calls before Marrakech because that one does need to.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Sorry, quickly, Nielsen said that they would send us, by tomorrow, a revised version of the questionnaire, so I'll have that to you by tomorrow.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Just a quick questions, Jonathan, that came up in our sub group, is there going to be time –

[off mic speaking]

LAUREEN KAPIN: This is Lauren, thank you Megan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: You can't with, Lauren.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Is there an expectation that our sub groups are going to have time within the scheduled time in Marrakech to meet? Yes?

JONATHAN ZUCK: You might not have been back there. I think a very substantial amount of time in Marrakech will be devoted. We'll circulate that. I'll work with Eleeza to come up with a proposal for what that might look like, but a very substantial, again, I think with the principal reason being dealing with the notion of supplemental research that might want to be launched in parallel.

The other issue with the interim recommendations too, the extent of which we're recommending some other process to be launched, a PDP process or whatever it might be, sooner rather than later is the deadline for those as well. Both teams will want to prioritize a need for outside research, and interim recommendations that we talked about. That's not within a week or anything.

Eleeza, we did identify who was on that group, right? The Nielsen –

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Yes, they're sending me a [inaudible] copy.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I guess once we have that, we should schedule a call within a couple of days after the receipt of this updated version, so we know what we're working from with that group, and set a deadline of getting some suggesting back to them very shortly after that, I think by the 1st. They want to field this within the first week of March, if they can.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: When are they planning to field the registrant study?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I believe it's May or June.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Could we get an email subgroup list for the competition subgroup and the consumer trust subgroup, just so it's for use of circulation?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes, we can.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Yeah, we can create two email lists. Any others? Do you want a Nielsen one as well, or have that be on the main list?

JONATHAN ZUCK: I think that'll actually just be a private list, private distribution initially because it's going to be so short lived. I guess the question that I'd like to raise again to that point is that Lauren and I spoke at dinner last night, and came up with a little bit of a clue that she could use to make use of both things like Google Docs and a tool like Slack. Before we disband entirely, are there others besides me that feel strongly that we ought to come up with an alternative to email as a way to manage our discussion threads? Carlos feels strongly about it, so are there others as well?

Because if so, do we want to talk about alternatives to the people like Slack as a possible alternative? I think we've maybe come up with a solution for Lauren that she could not be left out of that decision, which was really the issue before, because they have a clean room there for when they want to go to look for malware and things like that, right? I just want to open that up briefly for conversation, whether you think that's worth it. Carlos obviously did, I do think so, but I want to make sure that the group feels strongly, generally.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I'm happy to try anything like that. I've never used Slack, though.

JONATHAN ZUCK: For those that aren't aware, tools like slack and others like it are about just maintaining threaded conversations that are more granular. For example, we could set up threads that are related to each of these high-level questions in the review, and it would maintain a threaded conversation about underserved communities, right, was one of the ones that we had, etcetera. As opposed to finding where those things were based on how people titled emails and thing, there'd be sections where that conversation took place.

Presumably, for our transparency requirements, we could do a dump periodically of the Slack and post it on the Wiki or something to make sure that those conversations weren't necessarily confidential. It's just another way to structure the conversation.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Does it also include the group work on documents, or is it something else?

JONATHAN ZUCK: It's basically something else. There can be documents that are posted in Slack, like resources, but we already have the Wiki that's really our central resource. Probably wouldn't want to replicate that functionality. The Wiki's sort of the source of reference documents and things. The notion of document collaboration, which is where I put a document up on a server and allow multiple people to place comments, and change edits to it, is a separate functionality for which we would use Google Docs or Office 365. You would still have the same issue with your people, but you could still solve it the same way. They're two different solutions to two different problems. One's conversation management, the other is document management. Other questions about that, strong feelings one way or the other, objections to it?

[off mic speaking]

JONATHAN ZUCK: Nope?

[off mic speaking]

JONATHAN ZUCK: It's free.

[off mic speaking]

JONATHAN ZUCK: I don't know. I can look into that. If it costs, it's not a substantial cost. I think it's one that we can probably burden our budget with, if we need to. I don't know, staff, if you've had experience with it, and your teams have tried it, and you were secretly seething about it as we're talking about it, or anything like that? Please speak up [inaudible] if you have strong feelings as well.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I think our team kind of tried it, but we didn't really give it enough of a try. I think there are other teams within ICANN that are using it. It's gotten mixed reviews, but we're happy to try it if that's what works for everyone.

[off mic speaking]

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yeah, it's the same tool, Slack, uh-huh.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Email notification [inaudible].

[off mic speaking]

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's right. There is some email integration. In other words, you can create email addresses out of these threads so that if you wanted to, you could email to a thread, and not have to go into Slack in order to post a comment into the thread. One of the limitations, for example, is if an entire thread has happened, you can't go midway back up and hit – like you can in Facebook, you can reply to one of the comments in the middle of a thread, and you can't do that as easily, right? So that's part of the value of having these granular distinctions is that it's a continuous conversation, you're always appending to the end. You can't branch from the middle of a conversation.

[off mic speaking]

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I can look into it, I'm not sure, yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Enterprise is coming in 2016 it says.

[off mic speaking]

JONATHAN ZUCK: But it's in the \$6-\$12 a month range, so I don't think it's going to be something – it's like Dave's taxi in Marrakech. It's not like it's \$400 or anything like that.

[off mic speaking]

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: If you didn't hear that story at lunch, you need to hear it.

DAVID TAYLOR: Following on our Marrakech theme, does that mean we pay \$6 to be able to have the use, and then at the end of the year, if we want to have access to our emails and all our stuff, we have to pay \$6,000 to get back in?

[off mic speaking]

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's right. We can try it, and if it's not working, stop using it, right? I think that you'll find that it's an easier way to keep track of the different conversations that are going on. I'm just speaking from PTSD surrounding the CCWT process and all the emails that went there. Obviously we won't generate quite as many of those, but –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It was 13,900.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, it was insane.

[off mic speaking]

JONATHAN ZUCK: Since we have some specific to-do's prior to Marrakech for a very small subset, why don't we make part of the agenda a little bit of a discussion of it and a little demo or something like that at Marrakech, and finalize the decision there.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thank you. Then the other thing is the metric ninjas, if you're interested in being a party of Eleeza's metric ninja team, then since we're losing one of our metric ninjas to some vaguely-worded Ph.D. program, I just wish we could put some flesh on the bones of that concept, then please let her know. This is about becoming familiar with the metrics that we already have in place, where things are, and just being in a little bit better position to notify a group. There should be somebody in each sub team that is the liaison, if you will, that's like, "Oh

yeah, we do have a metric that covers that thing that you're talking about." If you're interested in that, then let Eleeza know.

The last part here was this notion of liaisons to these streams of related work. Karen, at one point, I think provided this list of things that are going on in parallel. I know this group has had a lot of questions along the way. "What about this? This is going on too. How does this relate to our work?" Karen covered that to some extent with what's meant to be a sort of critical path to our work. I guess the question is if there's opportunities to cooperate to be able to maintain awareness of what those other groups are doing. It would be great if we could identify people on this team to be liaisons to those groups, whether it's just making an occasional call to that chair.

I don't think it means you have to be on that working group or anything like that, it's just about keeping the lines of communication open. "Oh we're covering that too, or are we just commissioned to study about that X, Y, Z, and so we're not doing any efforts on that." I had volunteered for the gTLD marketplace health index 'cuz it felt so relevant to what we were doing during our metric phase. I'd be very interested in other things that people might be willing to be the liaison to, and maybe they're already on those workgroups. I opened that up. You should have the list in front of you of people who would like to self identify.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Drew messaged me earlier that he was interested in working as a liaison for the DNS abuse review.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Oh, excellent. Hopefully we'll come back with a definition of DNS abuse as a result of those activities.

[off mic speaking]

JONATHAN ZUCK: Trademark thing, yes.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: What do you mean by a natural liaison? Like people that are already in there?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: People already on?

JONATHAN ZUCK: No, that's right. I'm asking people. I'm opening it up for people to self identify as being either interested or already a part of a working group, or something like that, so don't be shy.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Is there anyone also participating in any of these other processes?

[off mic speaking]

DAVID TAYLOR: I'm happy to follow the RPM BDP working group, as long as it doesn't suddenly involve me providing reports to the RPM BDP working group about all what we're doing as well, because that's where it all starts getting a little bit insane, where you're suddenly reporting each week to many, many people, and you can't do any work.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's a good question David. I don't know what those roles and responsibilities of this liaison would be, necessarily. I think each would find it. It might just be trying to stay in touch, and we could identify some big questions. For example, if we identify a research product that we're revving up to try and have happen, it might be worth sharing that with these other groups, because A, they may be interested in it, they may be interested in kicking in and doing it together, those types of things happen. I mean, this will all be going on for significant periods of times, and it doesn't necessarily need to be a formal, "I'm reporting to you each week," kind of thing.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I proposed this role, and my intention was that it was very lightweight, just because as Jonathan just suggested, it's just someone is conversant enough with both sets of activities, that when you notice potential overlap or benefits that one [inaudible] could get from the other. Or, in some cases, we may need reports out. It may actually be that this group wants to know where the DNS abuse review is in that process, so that we understand how we could take that into consideration in the trust and safeguards more extreme, or something like that.

In the general case, it's just, "Oh, you're about to do something that's already being done over here," or, "That work would really benefit from this other thing that we're doing on the other side," as opposed to an active role.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Maybe lots of documents you are using are online [inaudible] websites. Maybe you can circulate the links of all of them, and then we can even search the links eventually to see if we find something, as an additional task or option task.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right. Again, the idea isn't to create a huge homework assignment, reading list, or something. My feeling is that periodic conversations with those groups, with the chairs in those groups or something like that will probably satisfy the need. Except the ones that are, in fact, critical path, like DNS abuse reviews, we're actually considering to be a feeder to our work. Somebody had their hand up, Carlos, go ahead.

CARLOS RAUL GUITERREZ: Yes, the two PDPs are in the in the initiation phase, they have not started, so they are free for everybody who wants to cooperate. We need people in the DNS software, the PDPs. I was planning to get into the subsequent rounds one, which is the first one there. Not exactly the same [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: You owe a dollar.

CARLOS RAUL GUITERREZ: It's called, their official name is New gTLD subsequent rounds.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

CARLOS RAUL GUITERREZ: Two dollars, stop saying it.

[laughter]

[off mic speaking]

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: For you it's like you have to say R-word.

CARLOS RAUL GUITERREZ: This is the project [inaudible]

JONATHAN ZUCK: Your first job as a liaison we'll get them to change the name of their PDP.

CARLOS RAUL GUITERREZ: I will try.

[off mic speaking]

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I left the word round out of the notes, and I'll put a dollar in.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Waudu?

WAUDO SIGANGA: I join Carlos in that one.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's the first one. David in the second one, health index is, to me, a trademark clearing house.

[off mic speaking]

JONATHAN ZUCK: [inaudible] excellent. Drew, DNS abuse review.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Sorry, who was trademark clearing house?

JONATHAN ZUCK: And root stability study, who's interested in that?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I'll reluctantly take on yet more work, but yeah, I'll take that. I was planning on following it in any case.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I'm managing that on the staff side, so I can help you with that.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Perfect.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, great, thanks guys for standing up. This has been a great group of people that haven't had to be voluntold for things, so that's very exciting. Eleeza, did you have more that you already outlined for me, or am I winging it from here?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: You're winging it from here.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I mean, I think what would be nice is if we could get both of the chairs we've – and let's first congratulate them, Lauren and Jordyn.

[applause]

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sub team chairs. I wonder if you'd be willing to, each, provide a short summary of the work that you did. I know that it was a lot of this work here, but if you want to go through some of those things quickly, I think we would be interested.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Sure, I'll jump in with my fabulous group. My caveat, since I'm all about consumer protection and disclosure, is that this is a work in progress, and I expect that it'll change, and everyone's going to take about a week to look at it so it'll be further assigned.

That said, what we tried to do was come up with buckets of issues that we see invoked by the safeguards and trust subgroup. We took the brainstorming work that had been done, and then we tried to focus on which things went together, and then drilling down a little bit about how those issues can be further elaborated on. We came up with two headings, well four headings thus far.

The first would be consumer trust, and that would include consumer and end-user behavior, the ability to navigate to a domain, perhaps focusing on issues where the domain doesn't resolve, and then the use of the domain. There's also an interest in developing countries in consumer trust. There's also procedural issues, ICANNs role, dispute resolution processes, sufficient data, when we're looking into these issues. Another sub issue in consumer trust is confusion, DNS abuse, and also registry privacy policies, how easy they are to locate.

Then, a second bigger bucket, was trademark issues. Under that heading, we have the relative costs of defensive registrations and, as a subheading to that, predatory pricing for certain domains, for example, .sucks. Other issues under

that were brands protection, risk of confusion for a brand, sunrise pricing, and rights protection mechanisms.

As another big subheading, we had the impact of the public interest commitments and other safeguards. Sub points under that, compliance, complaints, whether the fact of a public interest commitment or a safeguard reduces harm.

Then we have our other category, which is information we might be interested in obtaining. This is the “what else do we need” category. For the compliance data that ICANN already collects, we thought it would be very useful to see if there’s a way to divide that into a New gTLD versus Legacy gTLD comparison, since compliance is all about collecting these statistics, they showcase them on the website, it’s very organized, and I’m hopeful that will all that information gathering, they have to functionality to make that comparison for us, so that’s something we want to explore.

We’re also interested in exploring if we can go to registries and registrars and ask them for their numbers of complaints. I mean, almost all of them have a mechanism. They certainly are required to have an abuse point of contact, so they likely all have mechanisms for collecting complaints, and we’re hopeful that they might be willing to share that information with us.

Drew is going to be thinking about how to compare levels of abuse among the Legacy and the New gTLDs, and we’re also wanting to think about highly regulated sector gTLDs, and the incidents of either contractually required public interest commitments, or voluntary commitments that these gTLDs may have elected to institute in their procedures, and whether there’s any relationship

between taking on extra commitments, for example, in verification and validation, and a lower incidence of abuse within those domains.

Those are kind of our preliminary musings, and we're all going to be taking a hard look at this list that we've created to see where we can flush it out, if we're missing something, if there's other data we think we'll need. Then we'll move on from there as far as what our priorities are, timing, and that sort of stuff, since we think we really have to define this, and flush it out a little more, before we move onto timetables.

If we're missing something, please let us know in terms of what you expected us to accomplish during this time period just now.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thank you Laureen, you've more than met expectations, and obviously this isn't your final report on this document, but just your first start on it. So we'll discuss it further. I remember being in the room with you for a short period, and one of the things that was interesting that came up in the discussion was the issues of DNS abuse, etcetera, it was whether or not the percentage had changed. I wonder if that's really the only question, in other words, if the percentage remains the same, but you've multiplied it by 1,500, that might still be in that negative [inaudible] welfare. I guess that's just something to put in your back pocket, that just maintaining your percentage isn't necessarily the same as not creating an increase.

[off mic speaking]

JONATHAN ZUCK: See, looking at compliance statistics, and wanting to separate the gTLDs. If we say that of the number of registered TLDs, 1% of them have generated complaints, and that 1% holds in the New gTLD program, I don't think that necessarily means that we can imply there wasn't an increase in DNS abuse.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Right. I mean, in some ways we can say it's increased by the amount of the increase in gTLDs, so it's a net gain, okay.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Jordyn.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Thanks. In the company and choice sub group, I think we ran through, roughly, a similar exercise of attempting to take the ideas for investigation that we had identified yesterday on the post-it board, and turning that into some broader category headings that we could focus our work. We're not quite down to four yet. We may be able to further categorize these things, but we started to frame it in a series of questions that we would like to answer. The key questions that we identified were, first, to look at – this isn't even a question, so we did a bad job. Oh no, sorry, it is because we started off with this leading heading that we then abandoned in subsequent questions.

The first two questions we asked were has the expansion of gTLDs been effective at promoting price competition between TLD operators? And, to look at that, we would also want to look at data on retail and wholesale prices, at secondary markets, and the TLD versus CcTLD, and presumably New gTLD versus Legacy gTLD prices.

We also wanted to take a look at non-price competition. A particular sub question there would be if the competition's not founded on price, what services should be identified? Yeah, I think we have not flushed that general topic out very much.

[off mic speaking]

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I did not. Because Jamie was not involved, we explicitly decided we were not attempting to measure innovation as part of our effort. Sorry Jamie, I guess you chose the wrong group to agitate in.

[off mic speaking]

JORDYN BUCHANAN: A related question was whether the further segmentation and regulation of the name space was valuable to consumers in navigating the Internet. A sub question of that was do Internet users expect different TLDs to have different types of registrants? We actually think that there's some potential overlap here with the safeguards and trust group, we may just want to make sure that we're coordinating and not duplicating efforts, or at least staying well informed.

Many of our discussions were revolved around the findings of relevant markets for the purpose of discussing competition. We had this general question, which is, what are reasonable definitions of relevant markets that we might use to

analyze competition? Stan implied that we might end up either looking at multiple definitions of markets or saying, “Hypothetically, if you use this as your definition,” or maybe not hypothetically, “If you use this as your definition of the relevant market, then this is what we think about the effects on competition in that market,” as opposed to expecting to get to a definition of relevant market that we all agreed upon was correct.

Within that general heading, there were a number of areas that we thought that we would need to look at. One that we’ve talked about is considering non domain names, and identifiers, and their effects on navigation. So that would service providers like Facebook, or apps, or QR codes, etcetera, as we’ve been talking about in the past days. We thought we would need to look at community TLDs versus standard TLDs, versus brand TLDs, and see if they had an effect on how we thought about the market. Similarly, single TLDs versus portfolio registries.

Another question is how do we evaluate the success of a TLD that’s targeted at a small consumer segment. .cat is not a New TLD, but it’s the conical example that we are often going to turn to of people often say that’s a very successful TLD even though there’s only, like, 50,000 registrations or something in it, but it serves the Catalonian market extremely effectively. To what extent have New gTLDs replaced Legacy gTLDs or CcTLDs? Something that we’ll need to look at. In particular is the impact of competition of new gTLDs in areas of uptake where CcTLDs are low, so that will all follow into the market definition conversation.

A separate question that we identified, that we want to answer is in addition to the effect that the New TLDs might have on a potential market of domain identifiers, including Facebook pages or QR codes, where do the effects of external factors to the domain name industry, like, new technologies on the

introduction of New gTLDs. Is the fact that there are QR codes, does that affect the uptake of the New gTLDs and the effect of competition?

Then really important, our key heading on this topic of choice is, have the benefits of the increase in choice outweighed the potential of the cost of confusion with the New TLDs.

[off mic speaking]

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yes, exactly, another potential intersection. That's a key question we'll be looking at on the choice topic. Another question is, have the new types of TLDs been able to provide effective alternatives to other TLDs? Once again, looking at community, versus standard, versus brand, and seeing all the TLD portfolios.

A separate question from the notion of competition between TLDs is how has the introduction of new TLDs affected competition between registrars? To look forward, and to think about what the effects of this might be over time. What's the minimum viable scale for a TLD registry? How does the cost structure, fixed versus variable affect that, and even in fact, are there registry operators willing to operate their TLDs at a loss even if it's financially viable, per se.

Then we raised the separate question of is a new TLD a valid choice for a registrant if there isn't universal acceptance of the TLD, or if the domain name doesn't work consistently, would we still consider that as being a viable choice, or is that harming competition?

Another question is, are consumers sufficiently aware to allow for competition? Do they know that these things exist, and is it, therefore a reasonable alternative for them? Related to that is who's responsible to promote the TLDs and even at our registrars, as opposed to registrants, aware of the program?

Finally, we have this other question, once again, unrelated to the TLD competition question that, are second-level domain names being more effectively allocated to people who would use them for productive purposes, we'll say, as opposed to speculation and so on? Is that happening more often with the New TLDs than the Legacy TLDs?

There's a few other things that we didn't quite get to, but those are the high-level headings that we're going to look at, and the key questions we're going to try to answer. Obviously if you're not in this group, and you think there's an important question that I haven't enumerated yet, now is the time to let us know. We have a deadline inside our group by March 1st to agree on the set of questions that we're going to investigate. I guess that roughly applies across the broader group as well, but we'll be more tolerant of last-minute interventions from people not in the group than in the group.

JONATHAN ZUCK: We might see some changes as a result of the community feedback at Marrakech.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, certainly our goal would be to, yes, try to make sure that we're asking the right questions for the community to feel like we've done a good job as well.

JONATHAN ZUCK: One thing that's interesting, I think about this, is that we made sure that we don't have [inaudible] possible, don't have too many implicit assumptions in the way that we're phrasing a question. For example, if we say that domains are used, on that last example you gave, is there great efficiency in delivering domains to people who have used them well, as opposed to speculation. Which might, as a public comment or something, cause some push back from speculators who think that that's a reasonable use. I mean, we just have to be careful, probably, in terms of talking just about efficiency as opposed to making value judgement. I don't know.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, no, I agree, we shouldn't necessarily – that is a value judgment that I made, and we shouldn't necessarily bring that into the review. I do think, and Stan will correct me if I'm wrong, I do think there is a notion of efficient allocation in a lot of auction theory and so on. That relates to whether the person that's getting it is the right person to have the good, and that's, roughly, I think the question we're trying to get at.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Any other questions for the competition team? Okay, well so then, I think we are probably at the point where we can draw this today, our first face-to-face meeting to a –

[off mic speaking]

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sorry.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: No, you're not done, you're not done. A few more minutes. What about the structure of the open session with the community? Is there anything we want to – don't we have to input in the session information what –

[off mic speaking]

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: It's Wednesday after –

[off mic speaking]

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: No, no, no [inaudible]

[off mic speaking]

JONATHAN ZUCK: No.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: With the community.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: It's Wednesday at 5:00 p.m. I believe.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yeah, so it's late on Wednesday. Because we have to post a session information so that people know what it's all about. If we could take just a few minutes to see what we think would work. Obviously, it seems to me from what you've been talking about that a public-forum-type event, where you're getting information from them, is probably a good place to go. What do you think about sharing these questions? You don't want to be repeating all the stuff we've already spent two days on. I think you probably want to get information back from them on what's missing so that you can refine the questions on both of these categories. I mean, that's my suggestion.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, and I guess that's what I thought we were already doing, so I apologize. We talked about it briefly earlier. In response to Stan's concern about whether he had any responsibilities in the meeting. I think it makes sense for – and I don't know the degree to which we cemented David's chairmanship of the other review. There's still some prodding to go there, but maybe a little presentation of each of these sets of schematics, basically, for the group, and then encouraging people to find out where.

I guess I would say, to the three of you potentially, maybe be ready to talk about what those questions are, and then we'll just take a queue from there, and get

people to provide feedback. "I'm really upset about this. I'm really upset about this," and try our best to incorporate it. I think that's that session.

[off mic speaking]

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes, exactly.

[off mic speaking]

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah. Come up to the microphone, and Jordyn, that's a really good set of questions that you've asked there. I'm really impressed with what you've done in such a short period of time.

[off mic speaking]

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, exactly. Is that enough to make a description?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yes, that's perfect, thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Anything else that I'm stepping on that you had an expectation of us figuring out before we? I see a look on Eleeza's face.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I'm just thinking. No broader team call before Marrakech, but the sub teams may schedule their own calls? Is that right?

JONATHAN ZUCK: The sub teams, I think, are not going to, but we're definitely going to do the Nielsen call. We definitely want to schedule, very shortly after we receive [inaudible]. That's just coming in a couple days.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: That's all I need to know, yep.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: One more thing, sorry. We got the two days. We've just talked about the community session. How did we want to break up the two days? I mean, do you want to leave it with the sub teams on how much time? Do you want to give the entire Wednesday to sub teams, and Thursday for combined? I think probably a little bit of planning on how we want to break up the two days in Marrakech.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I did open that question up for folks, and it didn't get a big reaction before. What I had said at the time was that Eleeza and I would maybe put out on the mailing list a straw man for what the structure of that might be, and get feedback that way. What we did say is a substantial proportion would be

devoted to that, and so we just need to figure out what else needs to be on that agenda because almost all of the time could be spend in sub team work.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: One other thing to keep in mind, sorry Carlos, just one second, is if you want to spend, maybe, more time with Christine Willett on the program implementation review, because she will be there, and I don't know who else from her team might be there, but that's another opportunity to have a face-to-face session about that piece of work.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's a possibility. I know that we will probably try to come up with the cadences, as Jordyn puts it, of what the calls will look like, both for the whole team, and for the sub teams. That will be one of the objectives coming out of Marrakech, is what that looks like. It could very well be that the sub team work will take priority over the group calls in the near term. It's not a question of turning from every other week to every week by doing it, but instead allowing the scheduled CC review call to actually be to sub team calls instead, or something like that in the near term.

We do have this very near term objective of outside research that we want, and things like that, and that's the one thing that may affect the schedule for reengaging on the implementation review, is that based on Stan's suggestion, we're just elevating the priority of the first deliverable, if you will, of the sub teams, which is supplemental reserve research. It has budgetary implications, so it's just important for us to make a high priority.

That's going to be part of our conversation at Marrakech is to just kind of nail down what our work plan will be for the next few months. It may be that it's a de-emphasis of the broader group calls, and more of an emphasis on the sub team calls.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Megan will you please always sit next to me?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Next year we'll have voice recognition, and it'll just –

LAUREEN KAPIN: Right, right, you'll all know. What Eleeza circulated, which I haven't gotten a chance to take a look at, but that's the updated terms of reference, and so we're all going to be looking at that to make sure that that's actually what we all intend to sign onto, yes, yes?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Agreed.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay, so a deadline? Should we set a deadline?

JONATHAN ZUCK: I don't know. Our big, real deadline right now is Neilson, so I think we're focused on that. The deadline's probably a forward meeting together in Marrakech, before the two-day meeting.

CARLOS RAUL GUITERREZ: Carlos, I want to restate what Eleeza just asked. Will you divide the reading of the 200-page report in four groups? And this is the sub team of the whole, I guess, and there will be a meeting of the sub team of the whole, so that the groups report on what they read for the benefit of the other ones, and maybe [inaudible] the people from that report. In my view, it would be very useful if we used that segment to warm up, like, Wednesday morning, and then go into this separate sub teams.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Carlos, thank you very much. It's a good recommendation, and this is obviously up to the team as a whole. We have to remember this is a marathon and not a sprint, and so what we decided was that the near-term objectives of the sub teams on competition and on trust were a higher priority, from a timing standpoint, than the review that we're doing as a whole on the implementation report.

We're effectively, absent objection, I mean, if everybody feels like they're not overworked, we can try to do those things in parallel, right? I think absent objection, we're hitting pause on that. We've identified teams, read it on your own time, etcetera. Then, once the sub teams have delivered their recommendations for supplementary research, we'll go back and re-engage full steam on the implementation review portion of the application process portion of the review. Does that make sense? Okay, so that was the discussion we made, or I made as an assumption. But if anybody objects to that, there's no point in burning everybody in the first month of the review team.

[off mic speaking]

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's right. Sorry, is that all you were asking? I'm sorry.

[off mic speaking]

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I think that point makes a lot of sense, because I think if both groups are intending to identify a bunch of research that needs to be done, we'll actually, naturally, get to a pause in those two sub teams while we sort of wait for research to happen. During that time, it seems like it would make perfect sense to swap back in and do the application analysis, then we'll have a bunch of data that we can go back to in the sub teams again. I think that, as a rough sequence, seems to make a lot of sense with me. I would certainly rather members of my sub team spend the next two weeks figuring out with the key research topics are, as opposed to reading the implementation review.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All agreed?

[off mic speaking]

JONATHAN ZUCK: Any other questions? All right, I'm just looking over here at staff to see if they're going to be like, "No, no, no," again. Did everybody respond on whether they're going to dinner via the invitation? That's the last logistical –

[off mic speaking]

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: It's not cancelled, that was a mistake. It's still at 6:30, same restaurant.

[off mic speaking]

JONATHAN ZUCK: Carlos asked whether or not we need to sign or resign a statement of interest. And we will, in fact, eventually need to do that. It is pending finalization of this conflict of interest policy because it's referenced in that document. In other words, we're not handing them out now because we still had some feedback on family rights, was the issue.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I will research [inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK: Well, the answer is the definition of family, right? All right, so I think that's everything. Thank you all so much. I feel like this is a great two days. I really appreciate it. When the team was first announced, I'm sure everybody looked at

who everybody else was and wondered how it was going to go, who was going to be a good contributor, who was going to be quiet, was anybody going to be stooging for the ICANN organization? The truth is, it's my opinion everybody did a phenomenal job, and I want you all to give yourselves a round of applause, so thanks, thank you so much.

[applause]

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: We should add a special thank you to the chairs, sub chairs, and sub, sub, sub chairs, and all the other, and the ICANN staff, thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Oh yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Also the people who joined remotely at odd hours, bad hours, I.A. Drew and Calvin, yeah.

JONATHAN ZUCK: The dinner's cancelled, is that what I just saw? Oh.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]