EN

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: This meeting is now being recorded.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I guess I'm going to take that as a sign that we should start. We're still waiting on Jonathan and Laureen to join, but Carlos and Jordyn, if you're okay with it, we can start going through the changes that were made in discussing next steps, since we're already nearing five minutes past the hour.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Sure. [inaudible] do have a [inaudible]. Great.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: All right. Let's scroll down here. Here we have the [inaudible] question 616, the changes to the country potential screening questions, I guess. Country lists or city goTLD lists, I should say. Any comments here? What do we think of these changes?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: These seem fine to me. Did they change the Chinese [IVN] goTLD?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: The [IDN] goTLD. Hang on a second.

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.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: The China one, number 48.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Oh, okay. I thought you meant in the other list. Let me look in the Word document. It might be easier to tell.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Sure.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: No, it looks like he just included what the translation was. I do think he changed it though because I recall that it was … Maybe it was Guangdong, or maybe that was [inaudible]

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, I thought that it was Guangdong as well.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: But I think that was under another question, and then there was a question about whether that was a city or a province. I think that was somewhere else in not in this list because it doesn't look like the text here was changed. They just added the [Foshan] translation.

Hi, Laureen. Are you on?

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: We just started. Good timing.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Oh, good.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: We're just going to go through the [inaudible] together.

LAUREEN KAPIN: That's fine. I couldn't see the information on my phone, so I just had to scramble a little bit to figure it out.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Understandable. We're just on the first change to the list here, to the goTLDs that were listed on question 616.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay. I'm turning to it now.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Using my amazing Wikipedia skills, [we] just added the name, the English translation, which seems fine. It's [Foshan], which seems to be a city, so sure.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: You are amazing.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I think it's the Internet that's amazing. Okay, any other comments there, or shall we move on? Hearing none.

Here we're on 620 about language, and I see there was a comment on adding a question to confirm this is their preferred language. I don't really remember the conversation around this item.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, I don't either. If David thinks it's a good trade-off in terms of survey time versus better results, then that seems fine to me. I don't remember discussing this at all, so it seems like a sua sponte addition.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Carlos noted that Guadalajara is spelled with the Q. You're absolutely right. We'll point that out. Thank you, Carlos.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: And I'm not sure that's the correct spelling for Tagalog. I don't know, but I didn't think it was spelled that way. I know that's not very useful, but [they] should just check the spelling for that.

EN

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: For Tagalog? Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yeah. I could be wrong. It just looks a little weird to me.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Okay. I thought that was correct, but we'll double check.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: It could just be me. I could be wrong.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: We'll double check anyway. Thank you.

Moving on, this is a question related to gender. We added in an option, other or refuse. The computer's very slow today. I'm sorry. [inaudible] page 5.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: It looks like Tagalog's spelled right, so never mind.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Okay. Maybe you're thinking of Tagalongs, the Girl Scout cookies.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:	I think I was.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:	They're pretty awesome. I moved down to page 5, question 625. Here we were discussing age limits. We agreed [inaudible] they will modify it to ask questions of those 15 and up where possible.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:	Sounds good.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:	Great. Moving down to page 6, continuing here. It looks like they just changed the numbering. Page 7, question 605 was deleted. These were all the questions, it looks like, that were related to registrants. We took those out of the survey to make space. It looks like that's right.
	Moving down here, and then it will be, as David noted, expanded. That question will be expanded in the registrant survey, which will be in a couple months.
	Moving down to page 9, on the country lists, we added .eu as an option in Italy, Spain, Poland, the UK, France, and Germany. I think that matched [your] request, right? To have it asked in all of the European countries that are being surveyed?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:	Yep.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Okay. Moving down to page 10, same thing. Page 11. I think this is another registrant question.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: This was likely to visit, yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: This is a weird likely to visit that we decided didn't really tell us very much.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yeah, wasn't worth it. Page 12, lots of [red line].

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah, I think these are all related to the likely to visit. These are all follow ups.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yeah, exactly. Moving on, page 13. This is a question on trustworthiness. Carlos, I see your hand raised. Go ahead.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: Yes. I followed the [inaudible] and I was [inaudible] in the e-mail. It's [inaudible] to the user. [inaudible] the [inaudible] so [early] [inaudible] [65] and [825]. Then [inaudible] the question is there is more development on [inaudible]. [inaudible] I'm on the phone.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Although you're echoing a little bit, Carlos.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yeah, sorry, Carlos. It's a little bit difficult to understand you. [inaudible] really clearly earlier.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I think I heard what Carlos was saying. Carlos, you're saying that in these early questions, 725, we're asking how trustworthy things are but not defining it, which I think is something that Laureen had asked about earlier, as well. Then later in the survey, they start to talk about more detailed scenarios.

My recollection of the discussion from LA was that David had suggested we keep this as is just so we'd have better comparability. Then possibly – I haven't seen whether it's done yet further down – use scenarios, as Laureen suggested, to figure out what actual behavior would look like.

LAUREEN KAPIN: To a certain extent, they do that, but I agree with Carlos' earlier email that they don't get into the behavior aspects until section 900. Not even

section 900. It's later than that. It's the domain abuse section, which is almost near the end. It's section 1100, section 6 on page 31. My comment is I'm wondering about the placement there, whether it might be more effective to get at these issues sooner, although I do see organizationally how they're doing it. They move from registering and then visiting and then using. Then they get into domain name abuse. I can see the logic, but I am just a little concerned that they don't get down to the nitty gritty about what is trustworthy until late in the survey, almost near the end.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Laureen, is there a logical place we can move it up to?

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yeah, I thought about the very same question. We could even put some of those questions right after this, if we chose to. My one concern is – and I'm of two minds, not being an expert on surveys – is that is there any downside to putting those questions immediately here in the beginning, rather than at the point where the survey is drilling down specifically into abusive behavior? I don't know the answer to that.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I don't know if this is possible, but one thing we could ask Nielsen is if maybe they could randomize between those two places so we could get responses both from people answering early on. We might even see if we see behavior differences between the two, which would be an interesting result in its own right, I guess. I think it would probably make

a little bit more sense closer to the end, but you might see people falling out of the survey, so here maybe it makes a little … Still there's [inaudible] to it here, and we might get a slightly higher response rate, so splitting between the two might be a good compromise.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: That might be a good way to go.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Go ahead, Carlos.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: I agree with Laureen's comment. I also have another comment specifically, which is our definition of trust in terms of our terms of reference. In our terms of reference, we're pretty detailed and we say, "Okay, [inaudible] is right, and you feel perfectly safe that you are in the right page." Then later on, we have these questions in the survey, like, "Would you be ready to give your personal data, your credit card, and so on?"

For me, it's also an issue where we draw the line in our trust work. Do we just stop at the terms of reference? That means we are on the right page? Or do we go into deeper problems like are people ready to use private information and so on? It goes pretty far in my view. I don't have a personal position, but I think it's very important to consider our definition of trust in the terms of reference and discuss it with

[inaudible] people. Make sure that they are aware that [inaudible] and they don't expect to go further down the side of trust.

LAUREEN KAPIN: It's an interesting question, Carlos, because the other thing that occurred to me – and I realize we can't ask everything – but besides account number and other identifying information, which I think are covered other than birthday, which I'm not passionate about – the only other category of information that I wonder about is sensitive health information.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: Sensitive what? [inaudible]

LAUREEN KAPIN: Would you be willing to disclose information about what prescription drugs you may want to buy? That sort of thing. That may go too far down the path, but that is the only other category that I thought we might consider exploring.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I do think that makes sense, Laureen. I think we have questions about .pharmacy as part of the questionnaire, so it seems like trying to tie behavior to that TLD if we're going to include it seems interesting, at least. Carlos, to answer your question, I think this is a little bit like the market definition question in the competition side where I think it's going to be hard to settle on a unifying consensus definition of what the

market is or what consumer trust means.

I think at the very least, it would be interesting to be able to tell the community, "What we learned is people trust domains in these ways, but not necessarily in these ways," or, "This is used as a signal, but not necessarily this." Maybe they're all be the same. We don't really know, but [inaudible] would be interesting information for the community to understand that when we say trust, different types of behavior are differently impacted by the new TLDs versus old or specific new TLDs or regulated TLDs or whatever it is. We may just find that there's no real signal coming out of these questions, but if there was a signal, I think it would at the very least be interesting information, and then we could leave it to people. As opposed to us conclusively saying, "Therefore there is trust, or therefore there's not trust," I think the information itself is interesting.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: I think [inaudible] can agree [inaudible] the [red line], but the [danger] is that each time we go [inaudible] the community [inaudible] the same question, so that's something [inaudible] [red line] definitions for those that we have to be aware that there's not [inaudible] [inaudible] every time we [inaudible] questions [inaudible] the community. I agree with your comments, Jordyn. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: So it sounds like perhaps we can add a question on the willingness for folks to disclose sensitive health information like prescription drugs, for example.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, that would seem like the really relevant one for .pharmacy. [inaudible] TLD if you're not willing to share your prescription drug information.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Right, exactly.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Sorry. Laureen, where were you suggesting this be inserted?

LAUREEN KAPIN: I would put it right after, for example, on page … Where's our domain name abuse? On page 11. I would add it to the list of questions for 1110. "Please think about three websites like .club or .bank." I think I might add .pharmacy to that question. Again, this is question 1110. I would add it. I would make it number six.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I agree with adding what Laureen's saying right now, but I think when we get down to these questions, I think David had talked about doing a grid for this section or somewhere around here. That seems more useful to me to see if there's different behavior. I would imagine some people

might be happy to share their financial information with .bank, but not necessarily with .club.

LAUREEN KAPIN: I agree. It has to be domain-specific, but I would want a question on inputting … Inputting's such a weird word, but inputting the list of prescription drugs. Drug prescriptions, I guess I would call it because it has to be theirs.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: So the question would be your willingness to disclose information.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Well, no. That's not how it's phrased. It's, "How comfortable would you be doing each of these activities on each website?" Inputting a list of your prescription drugs, I guess, or your drug prescriptions.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Okay, I see. Then getting back to the page we're on now, to 725, shall we then pose the question to Nielsen about moving 1110, perhaps, or some variation on that up to this section, to 725?

LAUREEN KAPIN: I think either that or doing as Jordyn suggests, which is divide it, randomize it so that some of the folks get this question early on, right after the trustworthiness, and others get it here, later on, with domain abuse.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I see what you're saying. I'll [inaudible] Nielsen and ask for their input on how that would work best in terms of how the survey is structured and what [inaudible].

LAUREEN KAPIN: And maybe you can tell them our concern that it's such a long survey that we were worried people [would] drop out, and this is a crucial question.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yeah, absolutely. That makes sense. That was 725. Should we move forward from here?

LAUREEN KAPIN: Sure. Let me get back to where we were.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: We're on page 14 now.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay, good. I love page numbers.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: [inaudible] the same question in [inaudible] [825] down the [road].

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: 825. All right, my mouse is really slow today. I can barely look around. I'm on 767, where David noted this actually refers to the pharmacy TLD. He says that it overlaps with question 865. He doesn't think it's needed. Please see my wording change at 865. Why don't we scroll down there?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Okay, so we're at 767?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yes. This was related to the purchase [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Right.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Let me scroll down to 867.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I guess this might be an alternative place for those ... No. I don't know. Just having [inaudible] [make it]. This could be another place after 770. That might be another place for these questions.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: About the restrictions?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: 770 is about the restrictions, about if we wanted to ask questions about the behavior, especially because this question really talks about, "Do these restrictions make it more trustworthy?" Although then I guess it would be through the lens of restrictive TLDs, which wouldn't get at the general issue, so never mind.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: 767 and 865 in general seem like … I don't know what we're trying to get at separately between those two questions.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I'm just looking to 865. "Consider what we asked you." To me, it seems to get at what messages are implied to people when they see certain domains. When they see .realtor, do they think it's only going to be licensed realtors? When they see .bank, do they think it's only going to be licensed banks? The same for .pharmacy. That's what I think it's trying to get at. What implied messages of bonafide-ys, so to speak, are implied just by virtue of a domain name?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I agree with that as a concept, just do you see 767 and 865 eliciting different sorts of responses from people?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I'm looking back at 767 because I was just looking. "I'd like to ask you, do you feel each of the following restrictions should be enforced?" I think they're similar, but I don't think they're identical because 767 talks about local presence and then [inaudible]. I think there are several differences.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Right. This is different types of restrictions, whereas 865 is how strict it should be.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible] keep both [builder] and pharmacy because I do feel like people have pretty different reactions to those two, but maybe there is overlap.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: You do or you don't think you should keep those two?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I'm totally torn now. On the comment that David added to 767, I see where he's coming from with saying that this is really a strictness question between number one and number two, and we [inaudible] that out in 865.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I actually would like to keep both of them in both. I want to keep both of them in both places.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: That was my gut instinct, as well. I can't even say why, but it feels right.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: So we're keeping them both?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yeah, I think we should.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Okay.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: I [inaudible] to keep these. The problem is, if I imagine the questions in Spanish, it's too wide, just restrictions or … What is the other word? [inaudible] example. Restrictions [inaudible] it's too general for my [inaudible]

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: It's hard for me to hear you, Carlos.

EN

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: Excuse me?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: It's hard for me to understand. It's hard for me to hear you.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: [inaudible] I agree to keep the questions. I feel the way they are drafted is too general. The restrictions doesn't imply much to me. If I imagine the question in Spanish, I can't do much. I can't do a lot with just the word restrictions.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: With just the word what?

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: Restrictions. Restrictions is too general.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: What word would you suggest?

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: It's not about the word itself. It's about what the people understand under restrictions. It's very general. I guess we understand restrictions later on in the new gTLDs, but we haven't gotten to the new gTLDs yet. New gTLDs is 800. We are still in 700s. We are talking about TLDs.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:	But Carlos, it gives specific examples in the question itself. It asks [you] to think about restrictions, but then it says … I think each of the subquestions is relatively clear what it means by it, is it not?
CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ:	There's no problem. You can continue. [inaudible] just a comment only.
UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:	Okay. I've moved down to section three on page 18. Some new questions here. These are open-ended questions.
UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:	There's just one little typo in 722. It should be "an unfamiliar domain name," not "and." I think. "What, if anything, might cause you to avoid a website with," yeah. "An unfamiliar domain name."
UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:	Right. I think it doesn't even need the "an." [inaudible] [unnamed] domain name extensions. Oh no, they took out the plural. I see what you're saying. Okay, next page.
	I'm on 800 on page 19. This is to do with [inaudible] certain names [in these] TLDs.
UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:	I'm sorry. Where are we?

EN

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: It's Q 800 on page 19.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Any comments, concerns here?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: It seems like he's found more data on the Alexa data, but they haven't updated the list. Is that right?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I think they [inaudible]. Yes. I think you are correct.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: How many do they have right now? They have [14.] If we went down to 15, we would get an overlap of seven. I would be inclined to go with the Alexa data. These are the ones that have actual sites that people go to, as opposed to the ones that have lots of registrations, and we still have a 50% overlap with the ones that have lots of registrations. I would think that the new set that he pulled together is more useful, but I don't know what other folks think.

EN

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: So you think this is more useful, Jordyn, with more information on these?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: We're asking, basically, have you heard of these TLDs? Then they chose a list based on how many registrations there were in the TLDs. I proposed at the meeting that instead we should have a list of the TLDs that have the most websites on them. That makes it more likely that you would have seen them than if just there was a registration that [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Right. It could just be a parked registration or something that's not used very [much].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Exactly. So if we take this top 15 list of most websites, that also includes seven or eight of the top registrations, so we actually end up with a good cross-section of both. I think this list is better than a list that has a bunch of TLD [inaudible] registrations and no websites.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I would agree with you.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [That], of course, includes the geographically relevant ones, too?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Correct. Just replace from email down to loan with … Maybe email is a special case, actually. That's obviously not going to have websites attached to it, so maybe leave email, but then photography through loan, replace them with whatever. The same number from the new list that [we] put together.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I see what you're saying. Carlos, any thoughts? I hope you're still there, Carlos.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: Yes, I'm still here. [inaudible] on the phone. I'm still on the phone.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Okay. Did you hear the suggestion to replace the list with the names that really came more from Alexa with TLDs that actually have websites associated with them?

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: Yes. That's what I understand from this list on the right side that we used, the most common new gTLDs. I agree with that.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Okay, great. Then we will pass that along. Moving down. On 805, the list will match what we just discussed about. On 812, there was the

suggestion to do translation for WildAnimalPhotography.com, which I thought was a good one. We've got that in there. 828. This was a question I think we discussed adding in. I think, Laureen, this might have been your suggestion.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I think that specific one was me.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yeah, I was going to say, it's a great one, but I don't think I can take credit for it.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Does this capture what you were going for, Jordyn?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Okay, great. 831 was related to registration, so that was taken out. Moving down to 827, change the language here. Any comments on this?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I'm okay with it.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: For 850, how is that different from 750?

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: 800 [inaudible] the new gTLDs and the 700 [inaudible] legacy.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Got it. Thank you, Carlos.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: I don't have a [screen] right now but I think that's the difference.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thank you, Carlos. I think you're right.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Okay. Thank you. Continuing down to 865. We already talked about this, the purchase restrictions. Anything further on this question?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: We should probably include [builder], since that was up above.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: That's a fair point. It was .builder.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I guess it's fine. The only problem I see here, but they already have this question in the last one, so I don't want to screw up the comparability that much, but most of these are pretty generic. I would be surprised if people expected a restriction on .xyz. I guess there's enough. There's .realtor. That's one that people might reasonably expect a restriction on. And .club, maybe people do, maybe they don't. I really have no idea. I would assume not, but I could be surprised, so maybe it's fine.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I was wondering about 910, which is crossed out. It seems like a good question to me. I don't remember if this is something we had discussed or if this was crossed out just in this next iteration.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: We had agreed to drop this.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Oh, we had?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah. I don't 100% remember the discussion around it, but I do remember deciding to drop this question.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: "How much do you trust the entities?" Did we think it was [inaudible]?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I think a big part of the reason why is because the actual questions down below, no one could understand what the difference between them were, and then we talked about what we were trying to get at with this question. No one was quite sure, so we decided to drop it.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: "How much do you trust the domain compared to [inaudible]?" This was, "How much do the [inaudible] domains related to each?" Gosh, I'm having a memory lapse. I don't remember the discussion. I kind of like this question.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: When you look at the three responses, how are any of those different from each other?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: "Take precautions regarding who gets a domain name." I do think one and three are related to each other: [screening] individuals and companies who register for certain special domain names. I do think those are related, but "Give consumers what they think they're getting." That, to me, gets at whatever messages the name of the domain itself implies. One and three get at [screening] behavior of the registrar. I think one is probably more general than three. Just take precautions seems more general than screening. But certainly we could think about wording these a little better.

I think it's a valuable question because it gets at both the consumer perception and the behavior of the folks who are in charge of the domain names.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: The problem is it's also going to really pull in registrars into the equation, as well, as opposed to the TLDs. It's hard for me to read these questions and not imagine they're talking about the registrar as opposed to the TLD operator.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: In my notes from that day, I have that we decided to drop this question and allow these responses or this type of behavior to be captured in the question that we're going to add about behavior, like whether you would share your bank details and that. They also noted that this, would it be a place where Nielsen would cut a small group from these questions, depending on their answers, getting a mix of people, and do more one-on-one interviews with them or get into that a little bit deeper, the smaller group. Not quite a focus group, but asking them more questions on those topics.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: That seems more useful to me in that you're going to need some … I think just phrasing the question anywhere near where it's phrased now is going to be confusing. I think we'll just end up debating a lot about what it means as opposed to extracting really useful [inaudible] from it, whereas seeing those more in-depth conversations. We could actually

try to explain the difference between the registry and the TLD operator and navigating versus registering and so on. Those focus conversations seem like they could shed some light on this. There's nuance to it, more than we're going to get out of the survey, I think.

Laureen, we do have the follow-up questions, just a general trustworthiness of the domain industry. That, I feel like seems useful, whereas these [to do] these specific tasks. I don't know. I just have a hard time imagining how we're going to use the data from this question because it's not clear who it would even apply to.

LAUREEN KAPIN: I think when they're saying entities that offer domain name registrations, wouldn't that be the registrars?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Maybe. If you're screening or taking precautions who you give the name to, choosing who gets it, that's usually a registry role, but maybe the registrar's also … This is one thing that's complicated because maybe it's worth understanding just from a pure base lining perspective, just to understand where people's heads are, but I think here, a lot of the restrictions are placed by the registry, but they're going to interpret this as a registrar question. Mostly they're [not] going to understand the difference.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:	Right, because it will flow down from the registry requirements. I understand that that may be confusing. What I think this question gets at that the other questions don't get at that I think is useful is getting at the specific, "How much do you trust that when you go to certain entities that there's going to be some cautions taken about who can get that domain name?"
JORDYN BUCHANAN:	Maybe a way to think about this is … We do have that question further down. Was it 865? Maybe we make a much simplified version of this question. We could put it right after 865 and say, "How much do you trust that that will actually happen?"
UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:	"Earlier we asked you [of] a specific extension. What kind of restrictions would you …" That's a good idea because it does relate to 865.
JORDYN BUCHANAN:	If we just tie them directly together, I think it will make more sense than just having the question on its own.
UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:	Yeah, I like that.
CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ:	Yes, I agree. I agree. It should be simple. It should be simple. You shouldn't go into the difference between registrar and registry. Just the

guy who sold you the domain name, do you trust in them? Don't go into the [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I think that's a good way to handle it. If we [inaudible], that gets us the behavior of the folks controlling the domains, as opposed to just the public's behavior about what information they're willing to provide.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Did you get that, [Eleeza]? [We] suggest moving this question down to answer 865 and making it basically a binary yes/no. Maybe not yes/no. Maybe on a scale or something, but do you trust that the entities that do the domain registrations will actually enforce these restrictions, or something like that.

[ELEEZA AGOPIAN]:   Use that same phrase, though? "Entities that offer domain name registration?"

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Sure. [inaudible] We don't want to try to explain the registry/registrar. I think we're just asking … The question above is like, "Do you think there should be restrictions?" Then below we're saying, "Do you think that is actually what happens?"

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Do you trust that's actually what happens?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yeah, and I like the "How much do you trust?" Put it on the same scale that they've been using. Very, somewhat, not very, blah blah blah, like in question 827.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: How much do you trust that [inaudible] actually do this? Don't have these three weird sub-bullets that are [inaudible]

LAUREEN KAPIN: I agree. The bullets are not so helpful.

[ELEEZA AGOPIAN]:   Sorry, then keep the question the same, but just make it three new questions?

LAUREEN KAPIN: No. What we want to do is follow 865, and if I'm understanding Jordyn correctly, track that language. "How much do you trust that the restrictions on purchasing the new gTLDs identified above will be enforced?" Does that sound right to you?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, something like that. That sounds good. You also can wordsmith it, but that's what we're after.

LAUREEN KAPIN:	Yeah, it should just track the language of 865, but, "How much do you trust that …"
[ELEEZA AGOPIAN]:	I'm sorry. I'm kind of confused because it's very similar to the language in [nine], then.
LAUREEN KAPIN:	No. It would be a new question, 866, and it would be, "How much do you trust that the restrictions on purchasing the new gTLDs identified above, i.e. in question 865, will be enforced?"
[ELEEZA AGOPIAN]:	And then have a scale.
JORDYN BUCHANAN:	Right.
LAUREEN KAPIN:	Exactly.
[ELEEZA AGOPIAN]:	Okay, and then delete 910.
LAUREEN KAPIN:	Yeah.

[ELEEZA AGOPIAN]: All right. That makes sense. Moving forward, on question 1005, we offered an example of a URL shortener and then an example of a QR code on 1020. Then we see, moving down to 1050 on how people find websites now.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: The engineer in me hates this question because he tells me that you don't use an app to find a website. You use an app instead of going to the website.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Good point.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: That's an excellent point.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I'll suggest a minor edit on this, just to be like, "What's your preferred way of interacting with a company," or something like that.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Contact, maybe?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I don't know.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I like interacting. I think that's a good way to put it.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: It's not quite right because it's, "How do you find the company?" It [mixes] up [this stuff] of using a search engine and using an app, which are pretty different use cases.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: It's asking about websites. It's not asking about any [inaudible]

JORDYN BUCHANAN: But then using an app doesn't make any sense.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Right, I agree. Maybe instead of asking about websites –

JORDYN BUCHANAN: [inaudible] asking about websites, but what it means is, "How do you interact with these entities on the Internet?" Except it's mixing up locating and interacting. I don't know. I understand we're trying to get at here, so let me just try to take it offline and see if I can suggest a text edit.

[ELEEZA AGOPIAN]:	Okay. Moving down, I'm at 1035 [with] some conversation about this. [inaudible]
JORDYN BUCHANAN:	I actually think we should ask Nielsen. They're doing the same thing with app and website owner here. Maybe they have research that shows people just can't tell the difference between the two. We're just being pedantic.
UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:	Too [inaudible].
JORDYN BUCHANAN:	We're trying to define things in ways that are technically correct, but users don't actually understand the difference.
UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:	Right. It's like how they use extensions instead of TLDs.
JORDYN BUCHANAN:	Right. I would want that to be backed by previous research as opposed to gut instinct because my impression is people would be confused by these questions, but if they have research that indicates that people use these things interchangeably on average or the vast majority of the time, then maybe it's fine to keep it how it is.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: It's an interesting question. I do think you have a much more nuanced understanding of this, Jordyn, than Joe and Jane Public. Certainly better than I would, which is [inaudible] the kindergartener [inaudible] approach.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Sure, but [inaudible] you still understand there's a difference between a website and an app on your phone, right?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I do, but I'm not sure that I would put it in a totally different box, so to speak. Not quite the level of different boxiness that you're [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I think even more importantly, you can probably understand the intent of this question and you would respond. I just don't want the question to be confounding to people where they feel like they're trying to answer a question that doesn't make sense.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Or also be just simply inaccurate because it's trying to group apples and oranges together as the same fruits.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: We don't need to try to wordsmith this on the phone. I think I'll either suggest some changes, or maybe we can just drop a note to David and see if they have some basis for how they're describing this. It could be

that they have research on this that we don't have access to, which would be helpful to know.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I agree. I think that's a good idea. I'll include a note on that.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I agree, Jordyn, that this needs more work. Just as a suggestion, on the one hand, there is this search engine or [trial and error typing names] and the other one is go for direct [services] through apps. I don't know what else, but I think it's worth finding a better way. I hope you will come with something better there. Thank you.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: All right. Let me see if I can. [Eleeza], do you want to reach out to them and ask them, if you would, what drives their thinking about using apps [as] websites [inaudible]?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I think we lost Carlos.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah. In any case, if you want to do that, I'll independently think about whether I can come up with language I would like better that seems less confusing to me.

[ELEEZA AGOPIAN]:	Okay. I'm going to send him all of these notes as soon as we're done here, and I'll ask him that question as well if you want to continue thinking about it. I'll let you know what answer I get back.
JORDYN BUCHANAN:	Okay, great. I apologize. I've got a hard stop now, so I have to drop off.
[ELEEZA AGOPIAN]:	Okay. It is 10:00. Laureen and Carlos, I'm not sure if you can stay on.
LAUREEN KAPIN:	I can stay on. I don't have really much to add.
[ELEEZA AGOPIAN]:	Okay. We're nearly done here, too.
JORDYN BUCHANAN:	I'll leave this in good hands and look at the notes after the call.
UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:	All right. Thank you, Jordyn.
UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:	Thanks, Jordyn.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Bye bye.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you, Jordyn.

[ELEEZA AGOPIAN]: Similarly, there's 1040. This was a tweak on the question about buying things over the Internet. We'll write the same question [inaudible] the answers here, but I think we've talked about adding this question in.

Then finally moving down this. This is getting to your point, Laureen, about personal information on a banking or healthcare website.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yeah. I would want to add the drug prescription to this question, 1110.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: [There's] my [inaudible]. I accept that. My only question is related to our definition of trustworthy. Why are these questions so late in the questionnaires?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I agree with you.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: I think some people may have [given up] to finish it.

LAUREEN KAPIN:	[Eleeza], when you're taking this back to Nielsen, I would ask. In addition to Jordyn's suggestion about randomizing it, I would also ask if there would be a negative impact if we chose to have these questions asked earlier in the survey.
[ELEEZA AGOPIAN]:	Okay. I think we had that note on the earlier question about either moving that up, but I'll point that out for this grouping of questions.
CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ:	[inaudible] either randomize or creating a chapter on trust. [It would] be so easy to have a few boxes saying, "Do you feel safe on the Internet? What do you consider to be the dangers? Do you give your information [trust] [inaudible] through the website?" Or something like that. I need an introduction on security issues. It could be very interesting. It could make the questionnaire a little bit more interesting.
UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:	I'm sorry. You said you want to see an introduction on trust issues?
	Carlos, can you respond?
	I wonder if we've lost him.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:	I see he's still on. Carlos.
CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ:	Hello? Can you hear me?
UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:	There you are. Yes, now we can.
CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ:	I just get the feeling that the trust issue is spread out and not very well focused.
UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:	I think part of that is by design because so many of the questions are related to trust, although it may not be in the wording of the question that it gets at that issue. That being said, I think we can certainly ask if there's a way to either group it together and move it up sooner or randomize it to make it stand out a bit more throughout the survey, as you've all pointed out that these questions do come later in the survey.
CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ:	Okay, I agree. I have [tendency] [inaudible] randomizing would be more interesting.
[ELEEZA AGOPIAN]:	Moving forward. I think we're nearly done. 1040 and 1045, I think we all agreed on deleting these questions.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yeah. I don't have a problem with that.

[ELEEZA AGOPIAN]: 1100. I think we talked about this earlier.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Right. These are the questions we'd want to move up, if we can. Then we would want to add to 1110 this inputting a list of your drug prescriptions.

[ELEEZA AGOPIAN]: Okay, we will add those and potentially move them up. Then scrolling ahead, this was 1111 on who should stop various types of behavior. I think this was deleted because we thought we didn't really see much useful coming out of it.

Page 34, I don't see anything. 35.

LAUREEN KAPIN: For 35, for question 1120, instead of impacted, which I think is not so great a word, I would say, "Have you been affected? Have you ever been affected by any of these types of abusive Internet behaviors?"

[ELEEZA AGOPIAN]: [1120]. That's on page 34.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Right.

[ELEEZA AGOPIAN]:   "Have you ever been affected?" Okay.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yeah, with an A.

[ELEEZA AGOPIAN]:   Okay. Anything else on 34?

LAUREEN KAPIN: No.

[ELEEZA AGOPIAN]:   Okay. 35? I think there was an addition on 775.

LAUREEN KAPIN: I'm okay with that.

[ELEEZA AGOPIAN]:   Then I think that's it. Now we get into the demographic.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yeah, that's it.

[ELEEZA AGOPIAN]:   All right. Thank you very much for staying on beyond the time. I will summarize these notes and send them to Dave and we'll let you know his responses as quick as I can.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Great. Thanks for leading us through this. Carlos, thanks for sticking it out with me.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: Thank you. It has been very interesting, and since we're spending so much money in this survey, we want the best.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Absolutely.

[ELEEZA AGOPIAN]:   Thanks, both of you, and we'll see you very soon. Have a safe trip.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay. Safe travels.

[ELEEZA AGOPIAN]:   Take care. Bye bye.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Bye bye.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: Goodbye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]