

---

RECORDED VOICE: This meeting is now being recorded.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right, hello everyone. Should we get started?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, good morning, good evening. Welcome, thanks for being on the call. Is there anyone that's on the phone that isn't in the Adobe Connect that wants to introduce themselves?

And staff, is there anybody that is in the observation Adobe Connect?

I guess not. And does anybody have an updates statement of interest?

All right. Sounds golden in this case. So let's get the meeting started. We've got an update from Jordyn on the competition and choice sub-team. Jordyn, are you ready to take it away?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Let's hope. You guys hear me?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yup.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: All right. No technical problems today. This is Jordyn Buchanan for the record. So the competition and consumer choice sub-team continues to

---

*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.*

---

focus its work on market definitions, with the intent of being prepared to have, sort of nail down some working definitions of markets for the purpose of the rest of our work, by the time we get to our, by the time we wrap-up our face to face meeting next month.

So, we spent some time on the last call talking about two topics. Number one was just taking another look at data sources. We've got, a quiet of bit of discussion on the list and elsewhere, about possible data sources that we might use. A number of folks on the team, I think, led by Stan, are quite enamored by the NTLD stats data source, but we decided that while it's quite a handy thing to use, it may not be quite as accurate as some of the data that ICANN has available.

But fortunately, we can use the NTLD stats data initially in our exploration, and then perhaps go back to ICANN and substantiate some of our hypothesis by looking at the [inaudible] data from ICANN. There are a few exceptions to that, like park data where ICANN may not have the information and [inaudible], the NTLD stats is the best we can use.

But we've also identified a number of other data sources as well. So, [inaudible] but then, but the second half of our last call and a little bit of email time since then, talking about possible ways that we might look at definitions what the market place for TLDs is. And ultimately decided to look at, to start to investigate four different ways of thinking about markets.

The first of these is one that the analysis group already proposed in their initial report last year, which was to basically segment by topic area. And so the theory here is that if you buy, let's say a dot

---

photography domain, you might also be willing to buy dot photos domain, or dot photo domain. Or maybe even another one that is really, [inaudible] off the top of my head, but you know, there is a bunch of TLDs that are all in the same space, and you might reasonably decide that the market consists, the market consists, or a market for the purpose of evaluating whether competition has occurred, is to look at, yeah, to look at these, this set of TLDs and see how they interact with one another.

And there is other examples. I think the analysis group, one that we've been using online and in discussion is there an educational segment, so you might have dot school, dot academy. There is a legacy TLD dot edu, that might also, those might also be [inaudible] with a market for [inaudible] dot AC dot UK. So that's one way of thinking about it, is are these...

There are a set of sort of topically related TLDs that might be considered to form a market. The second big area that we are taking a look at is sort of geography, but you might consider people in a certain place might consider a set of TLDs as substitutes for one another. So the example I gave online yesterday, was maybe [inaudible], and so you think that [inaudible] would be something that you might register in, or you might register dot JP as a ccTLD, or there is an IDN version of dot JP.

You might register or where there is a [inaudible] TLD that we know, which his everyone. So those TLDs might be the set of things that you would consider registering to the domain [inaudible]. Similarly, obviously, people are aware there is other TLDs like dot Berlin, and

---

people in Berlin might think that dot BE would be part of that set of alternatives, etc.

And so there would be really to focus on sort of [inaudible] whether the set of TLDs that might be, that might address your market. I believe, as I understand things, this analysis is actually also being included, or some of it, in analysis groups, the two study that we expect to see later this year as well. So there will be some supplement of additional data from analysis group to support this sort of analysis as well.

And the third way of segmenting the market is that we are contemplating is by language. And so here, you might have a number, you might say, oh someone speaks German, what are the set of TLDs that a German speaker might consider as alternatives to one another that can pose a market for them? And I can't list all of the... My German is not very good, and there is quite a bit more of them in these other examples, but I know there is like German TLD equivalent of words like travel and insurance, and once again, dot Berlin might be one of the things people would consider, etc.

And so you might have a language based sort of set of domains that you would consider as composing the market. And then finally, we thought it would make sense to look at maybe, it makes sense to segment by looking at not necessarily by TLDs, but like when the registration is made, maybe looking at new registrations versus existing registrations might be an interesting way to think about the definition of a market.

So, those are the four big areas that we decided to take a look at, and then we've subdivided into big and smaller sub-teams. And Carlos, yes,

---

Carlos asked on the chat, does language include IDNs? Absolutely, Carlos. Obviously, you know, what you might look there are many, like Chinese IDNs, and those would all be included in the set that you would consider, you consider in the Chinese language.

Interestingly, often there is ASCII equivalents as well. For example, in Chinese, in particular, there is a number of Pinyin TLDs, and sometimes, in some cases, they represent the same word as the IDN equivalent, and they're just represented as the ASCII transliteration of that. So it certainly would be interesting to take a look at.

In any case, as I was mentioning, we had subdivided into sub-teams. Three of them looking at topic language, and geography. We're hoping that each of the sub-teams will come back at our next call with some proposed sets of TLDs to look at based on the segmentations, and we'll decide whether we can get some sort of working... Whether we think there is particular set of TLDs that would be interesting to look at, sort of working hypothesis for working definitions, or at least have some [inaudible] conversation around them on our next call.

And the last thing that [inaudible], not necessarily within our group, but also on the [inaudible] list, is there has been some discussion about definition of monopolies, which Stan kicked off, which looked at probably seen online, and you know, whether it's reasonable to consider TLDs as being natural monopolies or not. This is an area where obviously we expect to learn more about what the actual competitive [inaudible] look like, and probably have more consideration of what's going on in the marketplace once you've been able to dig into the data a little bit more. I think that's my brief summary of what we've been up

---

---

to. I know that Jonathan wanted to make these updates a little bit more focused on content as opposed to process.

I'm hoping that market definition discussion is helpful, but also certainly want to encourage if folks from the safeguards and consumer trust team have thoughts on the market definition, or segmentation exercise, how can you hear those either now or [inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks Jordyn. Kaili, I see that you have your hand up. Go ahead.

KAILI KAN: Yeah. I don't know... Can you hear me? [Inaudible] Can you hear me? Hello?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes.

KAILI KAN: Okay, yeah. Well I don't know if this is the right time to speak, to say something, but also, well, by the way, thanks Jordyn about your summary for the last few weeks. And also, from our task for categorizing the TLDs, gTLDs and so forth. But as far as something that I am somewhat puzzled. Well, this thinking from an end user, a registrar point of view, say a plumber, okay.

This plumber might have many, many attributes, when [inaudible] he is a plumber, okay. Another use is city. And [inaudible]... So anyway, any

---

entity would have many, many [inaudible]. So however, as we have more and more gTLDs as well as ccTLDs of what, since that, this plumber need to register many, many times, as [inaudible] every single attribute of this single entity that [inaudible], I'm still thinking about, whether that is from our internet address system, because that is [inaudible].

However, the relation between different registrants seems to be a multiple dimension, multidimensional matrix, whether that is a problem and we truly want every single registrant to register many, many times? That becomes necessary, then that seems like that system needs some kind of poof. [Inaudible] is not ICANN's intention to give every single [inaudible] through register many times and send it, spend money many times.

So that is one thing that has [inaudible] and sort of [inaudible]. Thank you. Bye. Not bye, but thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks Kaili for your question. We should definitely take that conversation up. There is a question about whether that's a new phenomenon because people, if they wanted to get [inaudible] specificity about attributes are already doing it at the second level domain. You know, somebody has a professional site for their day job, and then a separate little site for their photography, then they might already different domains, even if they're both in dot com.

And sometimes people have multiple domains that are at the third level, like a Flickr or a Facebook in order to accommodate. The people already have multiple presences on the web. Laureen, go ahead.

LAUREEN KAPIN: This was just a question to Jordyn. I just wanted to make sure I followed what you were saying, Jordyn. So basically on your first topic, four ways of thinking about markets. The first subdivision was things that are topically related, like your photos, photography examples. The second one was geographically. Was the third language? That's the one that I think that I missed. And then the fourth one was when registrations are made, a sort of chronological focus.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, that's right Lauren. The language, language was the third area, and the four is that roughly is that a new, [inaudible] are we looking at the market of new registrations versus renewals? And it somewhat gets into some of the conversation that's been had online about [inaudible] costs and so on. So maybe that, if you look at it differently when you're first registering a name versus when you are thinking about names that you already have.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay, thanks. I just wanted to make sure that I got the basic picture. Thanks Jordyn.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: No problem. And I actually raised my hand to briefly respond to Kaili's as well. It is an interesting question, which is, I think roughly covered by one of the big topics with the competition and consumer choice team to



---

take a look at, which is roughly are the benefits of increased consumer choice and competition.

Do they exceed the potential costs, for example, defensive registrations? I think the classic example that is given is not so much like the plumber, because obviously I think Jonathan is right. Like you might have someone who is a plumber who also really likes to take pictures in his spare time. And so he might get a dot plumbing, a dot photography, that those would probably represent few different opportunities for him to register a domain name.

He might have done that on his own previously in dot com. He probably doesn't want to have his plumbing site and his photography site on the same domain name in any case. But I think the question is more, are there companies or individuals that feel forced to register in additional domains? They don't really need for some reason, and that would be more like what the defensive registration looks like, and the costs of those defensive registrations exceed the benefits of competition and consumer choice.

Honestly first of all, we need to better understand both what the scale of those defensive registrations look like, and what the benefits of competition and consumer choice look like before we really can attempt to answer that.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks Jordyn. I have a couple of questions for you as well. I raised them in email, but I guess I'll raise them to the group as well. And one is

---

that in the categorization exercise that you're doing in the sub-team, is it all starting from the list of existing TLDs?

Or is there a notion from starting from a list of languages or a list of geographic regions, and seeing if, in fact, there has been expanded coverage? I don't know if that question makes sense, but [CROSSTALK] you may miss that a continent got left out or something like that.

JORDYN BUCHANNAN:

[Inaudible] that goes to a question of we also, one of our later questions that we want to answer as a sub-team, which is, how do the benefits of competition and consumer choice, are they spread equally or are they realized by consistently across different communities? Are there some communities where they are realizing the benefits more than others? Etc.

So I think that that later question, we definitely want to get to this notion of, are there areas of or... You know, either language groups or geographical areas are some other forms of community that aren't being served by the set of TLDs? And it's probably obvious that some languages or some types of communities, even if you just look at, maybe the types of professions represented, they're probably not consistently represented by the set of TLDs.

There is a dot plumbing, but maybe there is not a dot construction worker, or dot build or something like that. There may be different types of... There is not dot mason, I don't think, so is the community of stoneworkers not being addressed. So we will want to eventually take a

---

look and see how the TLDs are distributed across potential groups, and if there is something missed out.

For the purpose of our turn exercise, we're trying to get workable definitions of market for the purpose of understanding the competitive dynamics. And I think for those purposes, it's probably to focus on the TLDs that actually exist. If it's hard to say, oh yeah, how is competition working, you know, for the Thai speaking community, but there is no Thai TLDs, for example.

So those people, obviously the people that speak Thai can, if there were no Thai TLDs, I'm not sure whether that's true or not, they will be forced to, you know, either not use domains, or use ASCII domains. It would be, I think, much harder to create like a working market definition based on languages that aren't represented, the ones that are.

So I think, at least, for the purposes of this exercise, of market definition, it's probably most useful to focus on the TLDs that already exist. But, you know, [inaudible] for Stan or someone else to, has given some thought to it. Now maybe being put on the spot [inaudible] Jamie's hand as well.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Go ahead Jamie. I'll ask my question after you comment.

JAMIE HEDLUND:

Sure, thanks. So, I just came into some of the competition discussions recently, but one thing that occurred to me was that a constraint on anti-competitive behavior can often be potential competition. And so

---

there may be, for example, just making this up, there is a, you know, dot travel. And you can look at dot travel as a signal market, with no substance, again suspending fiscally for a second.

And you can imagine, if that were true, you could imagine a scenario where dot travel also leverages its market power in any competitive ways. But part of the policy of the new gTLD program was to have multiple rounds, sorry to use that word, I don't know, multiple launches. And so I was wondering whether there was consideration of the impact of potential competition and name from future launches that may constrain a TLDs ability to act in an anti-competitive way.

JORDYN BUCHANNAN:

Jamie, it's Jordyn again. I think we're at the phase still of looking at what's going on with the recent introduction of TLDs. I think that we might learn things that would help inform, for example, the subsequent procedures, PDP, that's going on right now, that might information additional release or delegation of TLDs.

But you know, what you're saying makes a lot of sense to me actually. It might be that we look, and we see, you know, maybe on this language topic again, we say, a-ha, the, a particular language community, there is only one TLD for that language community, and look, it has a lot of registrations and charges really have prices, whereas if we look at Chinese, there is a bunch of them, or English, there is a bunch of different TLDs that would address that market.

And look, there is, you know, still a bunch of registrations, but they're spread sort of more, they're spread around the different TLDs, and they

---

also, prices are lower. Say oh look, that shows what... Like as you say, something would push back again. The intended effects would be to actually have multiple options for consumers.

I think we're at the phase right now they're we get those definitions of markets, and sort of see if there are some that are more competitive than others, or maybe just have more options than others, and what the effect on competition would be. But I guess, I would use your suggestion to sort of urge the sub-sub-teams make sure that they get, as they go through this sort of segmentation exercise, they find some places where there is fewer options addressing a particular community than others, and that might help us decide whether the number of options available really have an effect on prices and consumer benefits.

JAMIE HEDLUND: Thanks, that makes sense.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks Jordyn. And one other question [inaudible] again, I don't want to drag down your update, but the, does it make sense to have another cohort that's economic in nature? I ask that simply because there is a lot of interest in this group for gaining an understanding about whether or not the new gTLD program has addressed the needs of the quote/unquote developing world, or the global south, etc. There is all sorts of different descriptions for that.

Should we be trying to look at the developing world as a market? Or something like that. Is there something versus...? I mean, I was thinking

---

of first, second, and third world, but that's sort of Cold War terminology, but is there something, some other terminology that we could use to come up with an additional cohort to capture that notion of the global south or the developing world?

JORDYN BUCHANAN:

So I guess you could try that if you believe that there is a set of TLDs that you could identify it or intended to target. They are sort of operate the set of alternatives that you might register if you lived in one region versus the other. My guess is that there is not enough in common amongst, for example, you know, people in the developing world look and see consistently, people in both India and you know, Botswana, to name places where we have participants from, they're going to look and say, a-ha because we both come from these developing nations, that we would want to register in similar TLDs.

And so I think for the purpose of the market definition exercise, unless we think there is a set of, a way to define the market in such a way that we could look and say there is some consistency in a way that, or some that people, by virtue of living in these parts of the world, would approach the market differently, will be hard to come up with a second [inaudible] exercise.

It maybe that we can get it up a little bit more narrowly by making sure some of our geographic segmentation includes different... You know, we might want to make sure, like one of our segments might want to be Europe, that might be a totally legitimate segment, and that obviously

---

will be mostly developed countries, then you might do a defragment and say, Africa, because there is like the dot Africa TLD obviously.

And then you might also look at individual ccTLDs and so on. You might look at the difference between those two markets that happen to have mostly developed countries, and mostly representing developing countries, and see if there is a difference in behavior or opportunities, but I think for the market definition purposes, it's hard for me, at least, to imagine how you would define a market for study purposes, that distinguishes between those [inaudible] but [inaudible]...

I do think it's an important area that we understand, and once this gets back to what are the benefits of the programmer being spread our [inaudible] I'm just not sure we'll be able to get at through the market definition exercise per se. We may have to get at it later through our analysis. But happy to hear [inaudible], I don't know if Jamie's hand is a new hand, but Carlos has certainly raised his hand as well.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Sorry, thanks. I'll call on Carlos in a second. Megan mentioned in the chat that it might be covered by geography and language, and I think in a way it is. It might just be a kind of a cross-section through them, right? In other words, if you combine Africa and Latin America, or something like that, to then create that additional cohort. It might end up being a super set of some of the subsets that we're creating.

But Carlos, go ahead.

---

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: Yes, thank you Jonathan. This is Carlos for the record. And after I raised my hand, Jordyn already mentioned the, an approach that might bring some light, have already discussed it in the email with [inaudible], and it is the fact that we might want to look at some individual, very active ccTLDs, and see how they behave with the introduction of the new gTLDs, and if they've got competition by some new gTLDs.

Like if we take a big one, the biggest one in Latin America is, of course, Brazil, is a very active ccTLD. They've got also a little bit of competition by dot Rio, maybe on the regionally. But I think it's worthwhile thinking a little bit deeper, maybe some case studies because it's going to be very difficult to do something for the whole global south, but it's worthwhile to keep a track thinking, okay, let's look not small countries, but some bigger countries in the south.

What has happened in terms of competition? I don't know it would apply to India, to compare ASCII with the new IDNs or something like that. I think it would be very interesting to keep an eye on at least one or two case studies or so, that we could compare later with the results of the efforts that ICANN is doing on the Middle East, African, Latin America. Thank you very much.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks Carlos. Okay, so, and thanks Jordyn for that update, and everyone for that conversation. So next on the agenda is a confirmation of lists of topics and data requests. I don't know how we wanted to go about doing that. Is that something to just show on the screen and then



---

people raise an issue? Or did you have a sense of that Jordyn, that you wanted to, how you wanted to address that topic?

Has that been circulated to everyone?

JORDYN BUCHANAN:

Yeah. So yes, we have a separate... Probably makes the most sense to view in the context of the sub-team, but we do have a couple of working documents that are intended to identify data areas. We also... I will mention that on the last call, we also got updates from analysis group and ICANN staff on the analysis group and Neilson studies, and identified some areas where we're still struggling to find data.

But I think we have pretty good working documents within the sub-team, which I'm happy to continue to circulate to the broader group, but so far we have identified a large number of areas where we need additional data from either staff or outside groups. I think the big area that we seem to be concerned about on how we get data on ccTLD, registry, and secondary markets information.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Okay, thanks Jordyn. And then, I guess the staff have developed a little bit of a work plan for the competition and consumer choice team. Alice, do you want to bring that up quickly, and sort of see what form that takes? Again, I don't think right now on the call to go through this in detail. But this is the beginnings of some milestones that are part of a work plan for competition and choice sub-team.

---

So if everybody wants to take a couple of seconds to look at this and if you have any immediate questions, but otherwise we'll circulate it.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah Jonathan. What I suggest is we circulate this to the team, and then on our next sub-team call, we should work through it and make sure we're happy with it.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That makes sense. Anybody have any questions about how this looks generally? So we'll circulate this document to everyone to look at, and you know, I give a sanity check to the competition and choice sub-team, and then on their next call they'll go through and go through it in detail. Well thanks Alice. I guess they've already been circulated.

So read your email people. All right, Carlos, I think that's an old hand, so what I'm going to do is hand the microphone over to Lauren for an update from the safeguards and trust team.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Thanks Jonathan. So we had a productive call last week, in fact it was so productive we didn't get through all of the things we wanted to get through, but that's okay. We first of all had some very good presentations. Francisco Arias was kind enough to join us and educate us a bit about what name collisions are, how high of incidences there have been of name collisions. And the headline there is that there don't seem to be that many.

---

I think there were, according to my notes, 32 and those were within a smaller number of gTLDs, 14. And involved no harm to human life, I assume there were other more, less significant harms. And Francisco also talked about the procedures that were in place to protect against name collisions, including SSL certificates, name collision reports, and controlled interruption.

So that was very helpful. And then Drew kindly started his presentation on the paper that the Secure Domains Foundation, which Drew is affiliated with, had put out on domain name abuse, particularly on the business case for pro-active approach to domain name abuse. Unfortunately, we ran out of time so Drew couldn't complete his presentation, and we hardly had any time for Carlos to dive in, so we're going to be taking those up again on our next call.

But certainly, the headline from Drew's presentation was that there was a business can for proactive domain name abuse, and we're going to look forward to hearing about the details there. We've started off our discussion with a couple of tasks. One was a chart that list domains in sensitive or regulated industries, that's something that the GAC had provided advice on, on several occasions.

This is one area where the GAC advice was not embraced by the Board, and it remains a topic of concern. And Carlos had asked for a chart that actually categorizes the domains into that category. And one exists, and our staff has located, I believe, circulated that chart. I also asked for a slightly expanded literature review, just to make sure we are capturing potential data sources, or sources of articles which point us to data

---

sources on the issue of new gTLDs and consumer protection, consumer safety.

Jamie had raised some scoping concerns as did staff, that one, perhaps that's not specific enough, and two, we don't want to blur the lines of our mandate. And I think that we're all mindful of keeping within the scope of what we've been asked to do. And I personally am very mindful of not sending staff off on a wild time consuming goose chase. So I think I've managed two discussions with Eleeza to come up with a way forward on that that's reasonable.

But I think the main take away from that, from the many perspectives of that discussion were that we do want to start from a neutral point of view, that we don't want to suppose that the new gTLDs have either promoted consumer trust or eroded consumer trust, you know. That we want to keep an open mind and really look at the data, and let that really inform many of our views and conclusions.

So I think that was a productive discussion. I also want to let you know that I've been approached by Ron [inaudible] who is very interested. And Ron is a former member of the Board and business constituency. He has a very keen interest on public interest commitments and how they've been implemented, and what sort of impact they had. And Ron was kind enough to pass on a lot of background communications that the business constituency and the ALAC have generated on this issue.

And also expressed interest in becoming an observer to the group, and Alice has kindly provided information on how he can do that. So I wanted to give people a heads up about that. And that is basically

---

where we are right now. We have a reading list that may expand a little bit. We have divided and conquered these readings, in that folks have been assigned to take a very close look at them and then report back to the group, although I'm encouraging everyone to read everything, because they're all good.

And I think once we have our brains around that, we will be able to take a deeper dive into our list of subtopics and think about how we may want to approach dividing and conquering those items. So that's basically where we are now.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks Laureen. On the backend name collisions, you said the headline was that there weren't many, but I guess the other headline from the standpoint a most recent comment about consumer trust is that, it does appear from the data that there could have been absent the safeguards that were put in place around name collisions, there could have been more. And that it appears that it was a real issue and, particularly with some of the TLDs, that it made sense to prevent the delegation, and that some of the measures that were put in place...

A little bit like UK, helped there not to be a lot of issues after the fact.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

That's an excellent point. Thank you for adding that.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Does anybody have any questions for Laureen?

---

Okay. And then Laureen, how are your topics and data requests coming? Does it look like you're going to be... I know you're going through a reading list now and that's part of the exercise to determine if you have an update, I suppose, but do you have any comment on things you're looking to try and get produced, or anything that we need to be on top of sooner rather than later?

LAUREEN KAPIN:

At this point, we don't have a specific ask, other than the ask that was discussed way back when in, what? Maybe in Marrakech or Los Angeles, I can't remember when now. But there were additional consumer trust questions we had talked about, first adding to the Neilson survey, and then concluding that it would be better to do that as interviews later on in the process.

So I mentioned that because I don't want it to get lost in things we discussed long ago and no longer remember. So I see that is still on the list, and we anticipate making data requests from ICANN compliance folks, because we know that the update source of the data, that's out there, that we're hoping to focus on. But other than that, right now, we don't have data requests.

I anticipate we will, however, have data requests in the future, as we are able to delve into these, into our reading list more and more.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks Laureen. And I guess a question for staff is, I guess the interviews are something that's going to happen as a result of these

---

survey question results, and that will help identify potential interview candidates, etc. and then compliance. Is there protocols or timing that we need to be aware of there? Is there a time by which [inaudible] making requests or anything like that? Or just a question of keeping it on the list?

And I guess, mute your phone if you're not talking. It sounds like somebody's moving around quite a bit with their phone.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Hi Jonathan, this is Eleeza. I don't think that there is, hi. I don't think there is any sort of deadline, I think you just need to keep us aware of who you want to, how you want to structure this and how you want speak to... We don't have a particular timeline.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, great. Thanks Eleeza.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Other than the work plans we're hoping to establish with the sub-teams and so forth.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right. So that gives us a good segue, if you want to bring up the safeguards and trust work plan. I don't know Laureen, if there is anything you want to share about this or important milestones you want to highlight.

LAUREEN KAPIN: This is... I'm going to take the same approach for Jordyn, the working group itself really hasn't had a chance to digest it, so I would prefer to let us have that as something we're going to talk about next week and then get back to the group.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. So thank you Laureen. If there aren't any additional questions for Laureen, I'm going to pass the talking stick to Eleeza to bring us up to date on the studies and surveys.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Sure, I'm happy to do that. So the first one I'll speak to is the Neilson consumer survey. I'm happy to report that they have now finished [inaudible], and have gotten all of the, reached all of their requisite photos. For, I don't [inaudible], so they are now working on analyzing the data and coming up with a report for you to review at your June meeting.

As I think I've mentioned before, we're anticipating, [inaudible] from Neilson to come and speak to you when you are all in D.C. at the beginning of June. So that piece of the Nielson work is on its way to being complete. On the registrar questionnaire, yesterday I sent to the questionnaire to the Nielson sub-team list, which we had created earlier on when we were looking at the draft of the consumer list. I may need to have a conversation with Neilson next week, and we'd like to have a call with those of you who are on the Neilson team [inaudible] who isn't



---

and would like to join, could just let us know, perhaps in the chat, and we'd be happy to add you.

So that we can speak to David about the changes that were made in the registrant questionnaire, and hear any comments or suggestions you have for changes in this questionnaire. So the goal there is to speak to him and hopefully get through any changes and get to a final survey within the next couple of weeks, so that they can begin fielding, I think our initial plan was to field in June. Hopefully we can still stick with that plan.

I take it that's all on the Neilson, and on the economic study side of things, the analysis group. The analysis group is continue to receive the data from registries. They haven't received it from all of the registries in the sample yet, but we're working with our won registry services engagement team to reach out to those registries that haven't replied, and encouraged them to participate.

To that end, myself and Karen and two representatives from the analysis group will be on the registry stakeholder group call later today. It's actually in about two hours from now, to kind of do a last ditch call of the study, talk about how the data will be stored and address any concerns about data security in that setting.

On the registrar side of things, there has been very little response with very little data to the request for retail pricing data from registrars. And at the suggestion of a few registers, after a conversation we had with Jonathan last week, I actually spoke to the analysis group, and they tear back their request to a shorter window of time. Hope that a small path

---

might result in more responses. So, an analysis group can sent out the revised request to the registrars sample, I believe, yesterday. And on our end, our team is reaching out personally calling registrars from our engagement managers at ICANN, and asking them to participate.

We're also going to probably send out a new note to the registrar stakeholder group list, and work on a few more outreach efforts there. But in the meantime, the analysis group has begun actually manually scraping retail pricing data from registrar's websites, just in anticipation of not getting enough from the registrars themselves.

I think that's all. If there are any questions, I'm happy to answer them.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Anyone have any questions for Eleeza?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Lauren, go ahead.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Lauren, go ahead.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Do we have a sense of what the concern is, other than perhaps competitive concerns?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: From the registrars, you mean?

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yeah, sorry I wasn't clear. For the registrars, why are we getting such a response?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Sure, yeah, I mean competitive concerns is definitely one of them. Obviously this is pretty sensitive pricing data for them. The other big one is the size of the ask. As I understand it, you know, some of these may be small registrars, and they just don't have the staff to pull together the quantity of data the analysis group is requesting. But I think, you know, I think those two things combined, might give them pause, and finally...

There is no requirement that they participate in this study, so it's kind of a hard sell to get them engaged in that end.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Stan, go ahead.

STAN BESEN: Eleeza, is the main problem with the registrars the price data?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Yes. I mean, they're either not responding at all, or responding that they don't care to share their data, that's right.

---

STAN BESEN: How about the quantity data?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: They're unwilling to provide anything, frankly.

STAN BESEN: Well, the reason I raised it, I have, incredibly, something from NTLD stats dot com. It's a 20 page report. It lists every registrar you can imagine, every registrar to registries, and it tells how many domains there are for each registrar in each registry.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Right. ICANN has that information.

STAN BESEN: That's the quantity data, so we have that. Correct?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Yes. That comes in our monthly transaction reports, and I think what NTLD stats [inaudible] but we have that as well in our monthly transaction report.

STAN BESEN: Okay, so just to be sure, I understand data are sensitive, quantity data are available.

---

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Correct.

STAN BESEN: Good.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Eleeza, this is Laureen again. Just brainstorming a little bit on this. Is it that they don't trust the confidentiality will be maintained in terms of the, and the competitive concerns?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I think that may be part of it. I mean, we haven't heard very many specifics, other than to say that the data itself is sensitive. You know, we've... In a few instances where we've heard back, the registrars have said we don't plan to participate, or this is too sensitive for us and we don't plan to... They haven't got into really a whole lot of specifics.

Yeah, we've tried to make the case that ICANN doesn't have the access to this data. This is all going to an analysis group who are, you know, well experienced in handling secure and sensitive information, all of the data will be destroyed after the study is complete. Everything will be aggregated and [inaudible] before it's actually published. But it's just been a really hard sell.

LAUREEN KAPIN: I was just wondering if there is any more pinpointed discussions that could be had with, I'll say, influencers in this, in the registrar community

---

to perhaps get a better perspective on how their concerns could be met. You know, it's just an unwillingness because there is a concern about maybe the data will reveal something they're uncomfortable with, well that's not something we would be able to address, but if it's the concern about confidentiality, or just a concern about burdensomeness, it seems to me, as we've already done, regarding burdensomeness, those are things we can address.

So I'm just raising the issue that if perhaps we had a more pinpointed understanding of what those concerns were, we can make more inroads into addressing them and maybe pull lose some more data.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:

Yeah, I absolutely agree with you, and we are attempting to do that. You know, part of the trouble is, like for example, like to speak to the registrar stakeholder group, and we're working on that, and speaking to others who are influential in that group. It's a very big group, they're not quite as organized as the registries are in the sense that things are quite as regular, they're not quite as active.

So it's a little bit harder to get this out to a wider range of that community, but we are working on that. And Jonathan is actually had some good ideas on reaching out to registrars, so they're working with him on that. There may be several registrars who might be willing to volunteer or at least provide their data.

And so part of the paring down the request was in response to that, so we're hoping we might elicit more of a response from them. But you know, I agree with you, basically we all want to see more data that will

---

only make the report stronger, and put you all in a better position to offer some analysis, but it has been an uphill battle.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

I think, Laureen, we shouldn't underestimate the burdensome part of this, because that is in fact, something that we have the least ability to help them with, right? I mean, without them opening their databases to outside consultants or something like that, just a mere fact that it's a bunch of work to them, and they don't clearly see an upside is probably the biggest issue, and that most of these other issues are, comparatively speaking red herrings.

I think it's just a big ask to get this data, and you know, the upside feels academic to them. I don't know if there is any more brainstorming we can do about how the outcome of this study, or the accuracy would be to the benefit of registrars, and maybe we haven't enough work to sell this in that respect and try to speak to their own self-interest in the success of the program.

Because right now, it's just us asking them a favor that they don't have to grant, and that's a lot of work for them. I actually think that's the biggest issue that we're facing.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

So, I'm wondering then, if any... I'm wondering, since we have [inaudible] for data gathering, maybe there is to be given some thought to subsidizing this in some way. If this is really important, and I ask that

---

as an if, not as a given, but if it's really important, is it important enough to devote some resources to?

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks Lauren. And I've kind of trotted that idea out, and it has some raised some eyebrows, I guess we haven't really figured out how to, how to operationalize that, if that's a word, that suggestion. But I can again try to... I don't know if it's something that's appropriate for Eleeza to mention on the call, you know, some outside help in getting some of the data.

Because it really is my perception that it's more that it's just a lot work and not a lot of upside, and I agree with you Carlos that they shouldn't be able to just stay out of it, but the truth is they aren't compelled contractually to participate. So I mean, it's, you have to appeal to their civic duty, and that can be tough if you're especially small and operating on a shoestring, and being asked to go and find a bunch of data.

So I don't know Eleeza, if you have an idea on how we could use money as a way to somehow help them through, you know, hiring a data person. I mean, that may just raise more security concerns than it answers. I don't know.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:

I think, you know, we've all have given it a lot of thought of different ways of getting it at this type of data and helping to answer the questions we want to answer with retail pricing data, you know, this cost enhanced way, not costliest way, but what the analysis group is



---

doing is literally going on registers and searching for different strings, and copying over the phrases, and that's a pretty costly way of doing it. And we've built that into the price of our contract, so they're doing that.

But in terms of actually working with the registrars to pay for it, you know, you're talking about a few dozen, and everyone has different systems, and convincing them of the security of doing some of this type of research. So it might be a bigger task than we imagined.

I think someone needs to go on mute.

So, that's kind of where we have. I haven't come up with anymore brilliant ideas.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

David, did you want put some meat on the bones? A suggestion about getting data from the register consistency itself?

DAVID TAYLOR:

Yeah, it was just an idea, because we seem to be struggling with the idea of getting data from the registrars themselves. I just wonder whether the registrar constituency might have some of that data, because it's the sort of thing that they may have already covered in some discussion. It may be limited to a certain number of the active registrars, willing to give it but then it's still data nevertheless, and if we could refer to it as coming from the registrar constituency, maybe it's stuff that we can use. That was really all I was thinking.

---

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Thank you David. I mean, I think it's worth trying.

JONATHAN ZUCK: We all, everybody shares this frustration, so it's just a question of trying to figure out the best way to work with them and make it into a win-win. Again, I don't know, getting back to Carlos's statement, I don't... It could be, that again, we haven't found the right buttons to press to make them feel like this is in their interest. And that it's worth spending their time and resources to comply with these requests.

And yes, moral pressure, Carlos. I feel like we've been exerting some of that. Probably the problem is we're keeping secret the list, it's sort of a randomly elected list, for data purposes, and so we can't apply pressure on any particular one or anything like that. But anyways, we'll keep thinking about it in the meantime in parallel. The analysis group will be doing its manual collection of data, even that results in significantly less significant updated sample.

Any other questions or comments?

Before I move on, I don't see Karen Lentz on the call, so this may be mute, but there was an email, back when we were talking about safeguards and trust, and picks, there was a notion of data, like a study plan to look at that particular issues. Is that...? I don't know how that got resolved. Is that something that Karen, you want to speak to here, or did you want to speak to it in the sub-team and wait to roll it up, I just didn't want to bypass it if it was something that we wanted to get discussed.

KAREN LENTZ: Sure Jonathan, this is Karen. I'm in the car, can you hear me?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes.

KAREN LENTZ: So yes, I sent a note to Laureen yesterday in the context of the sub-team work plan on safeguards and trust, just noting that we did have this recommended metric that asked us to look at question 18 of the applications, which was the mission and purpose for the TLD. And the metric was actually asking for a qualitative analysis of what applicants wrote, versus some look at their performance and their operations at a later date.

And in looking at, you know, how we might approach that, we also took a look at the GAC early warnings, and where they existed. Some of the voluntary public interest commitments to applicants base, so there were the, you know, the large picks apply to everybody, but there were also these voluntary sort of registry specific that we thought that we could take into account in looking at how things may have changed from what applicants wrote in their applications originally.

So my note was to sort of recall that that metric existed, and as you know, the stuff the team do, delve into picks, that's one aspect to recall. Thanks.

---

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks Karen. And I guess, as you suggested, I think it may have an effect on where it falls in the topic list from a timing standpoint, if we're going to decide to do some outside study of it. Laureen, go ahead.

LAUREEN KAPIN: I wanted to thank Karen for that, because it relates directly to one of the topics we've already considered as a thing to delve into, and certainly also coincides with boundaries and call as well. So I think that's an important topic, and I want to raise it for the sub-team, but the notion of what was in the application versus what's the reality, and I would add another layer of, when I say reality, I mean, what is ended up being in the actual pick, in the contract.

The other layer I would add is, you know, is there actual, are they actually adhering to the picks that they have in the contracts. So I think there is three different layers of inquiry here, and I think that will be an important topic for us.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Great, Laureen. Thank you. Again, I didn't know if you guys wanted to bring it up on this call or not, but I just wanted to create the opportunity, because I remember the email traffic. All right, so thank you. If there aren't any further questions on that, or further questions on the studies and surveys and the sub-team will go on to explore those questions and share that with the group on the next call.

You know, as we mentioned in an email, there might be some discussion about a separate branch for people that, in the registrant

---

survey that say they aren't registrants, to see if they're using alternatives, but I think we'll discuss that on the Neilson sub-team call. Next on the agenda is the report on the coordination call with the new gTLD subsequent procedures, PDP working group.

And for the most part, they were very receptive to the work that we had done to try and identify our most favorite topics. And so that was, I think it was a good call. I mean, they're very interested in trying to get a sense of our timeline, which is why these work plans are going to be important. And we need to get one done for this orphan sub-team on application and evaluation, which is our next topic, because that's where a lot of the overlap occurs with the subsequent procedures team.

And so, but for the most part, I mean, they've agreed to kind of, you know, give us time on the issues that we've identified as being as greatest importance. And Avri confirmed that again on her updates that she gave at the WSIS Forum on Monday. As Alice notes in the chat, there is a dedicated Wiki page for coordination meetings with the PDP chairs so that you can sort of stay up to date on the coordination. It's going to be an ongoing process.

And as I've said, their biggest perspective was getting an understanding of our milestones and timeframes. So we want to try and communicate that as much as possible. There are some areas we're kind of taking the lead, or they're taking the lead, and then there are some areas where we may want to try and coordinate, which I will bring up in the next topic.

---

But on the whole, the call went well, and they were receptive to our fairly finite list of priority topics, that we wanted to make sure that proceeded any policy development work. I will also mention that Jordyn, Avri is jealous of our CPT dot Wiki, so I don't know if you're able to use your connections to help them get a [inaudible] dot Wiki URL so they don't have to pass around this long URL, but that's, she asked me that [inaudible] on Monday.

Any questions about that? We're just going to dive into the substance of that part of our review. It looks like Jordyn is typing his response. So anyways, so Jordyn, yeah, they want [inaudible] dot Wiki, I can put that in charge of Avri if you want.

So the next topic of discussion is the application and evaluation portion of your review. And I call it the orphan portion of our review, simply because we've had a lot of things come in front of it in terms of data prioritization and coordination with the PDP, etc. But we do need to spend a little bit of time today just diving into this in substance. And so, what I wanted to do was go back through some of the questions that we raised in our initial brainstorming session in Los Angeles, and begin the same exercise that we have gone through with the competition, choice, and the trust and safeguards sub-teams to identify what the possible data sources might be for answering some of these questions, whether we have them or need to get them, because if we need to get them we need to get on top of that.

One of the most interesting issues... Do I have scroll control? Or does everybody have scroll control? Yeah, it looks like everybody does. So if you go to the... And thank you Alice for turning my ugly bulleted list

---

into a beautiful slide. As always, you make us look good. So, addressing the needs of the underserved areas and markets, was one of the big questions that came up quite a bit in our brainstorming session, and presents some unique challenges for this team.

I know that it is the intention of the PDP working group to, find the best way to refer to them, the sub [inaudible] team, to actually do some interviews with applicants. I think the primary purpose of that is to make life easier for applicants generally and to make the process less onerous, in a sort of general way. And I think that will have implications for, you know, underserved communities and there is often economic implications there, that the more burdensome the process is, the less sort of generally accessible that it is.

But I wanted to kind of put out for conversation how we might get at the notion of whether or not the application process served the developing world, given that it may be people that fell out of the process in the middle, or people that didn't engage in the process to begin with, because that might speak to, you know, what kind of marketing went into the program, etc.

Sorry this isn't a very organized thought. I think there is two parts of this. One is that as they do their surveys, we might want to think about additional questions and be engaged with them in those focus groups, but it could be that there is also another group of people that we want to reach out to, that they won't reach to, and I'm interested in your thoughts on how to even figure out who that is, and who we should be talking to.

---

Waudu, you ask when the data will be available, and no time soon. I think that we will be trying to do that in conjunction. So they're very early in the stages of doing the interviews they're going to do, that we might piggyback on, but we should try to figure out what it is that we're going to be trying to do ourselves.

So I just wanted to open that up for discussion about whether or not, about how we might begin to determine whether or not the application and evaluation process, served typically underserved areas and markets and communities, and how we, who might ask that question to. So, please raise your hand and let's just start having a brainstorming session about that.

I'm reading through a little bit in the chat, Carlos do you want to speak up and elaborate about your notion about the ccTLDs?

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ:

Yes, thank you very much Jonathan. This is Carlos for the record. I'm going back to the comment I made to Jordyn before. We have to assume that new gTLDs will take market share from somebody. And in the case of underserved areas, a proxy question that I consider we should test, might be wrong, is if new gTLDs will offer more choice as opposed to the standard offering in those countries, which is the ccTLD.

I don't want to bring the whole tie of ccTLDs into the discussion, but I think we can ask a few questions to the ccTLDs, if they followed, if they apply for new TLDs, we know some that [inaudible] resellers of new gTLDs are considerate. So there is some proxy questions we could address to the ccTLDs. I don't have a very clear idea, but I assume that



---

IDNs, the expanded choice of TLDs will reduce the market share of the ccTLDs. And maybe some of the fine economists in the group will help us define this hypothesis better. Thank you very much.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks Carlos. Obviously, I think it's worth getting some of that feedback. Obviously, as Jamie points out, there may be instances in which they're participating in the new gTLD program. There might be instances in which they become competitors to a new TLD, and there are you know, some ccTLDs that are their own hosts and others that use hosts in the developing world to manage their ccTLD.

So there is a lot of complexity there in understanding whether or not that market has been sufficiently served. And see, so I mean, again, some of this, we can look at backwards, if that makes sense, and look at some of the results that come out of the competition and choice analysis, to see whether or not those communities have gotten increased choice and product availability, and then from that, sort of assume that the application evaluation process didn't sufficiently serve that market, but it would be very indirect.

So we might want to figure out if there is a way to reach out to various communities, to figure out you know, how that process worked for them. And I know that the people... That it would be easier to get to the people that applied and dropped out. I know that, for example, letters of credit ended up being a very difficult thing for a lot of applicants, and so they're moving toward potentially having an authorized list of backend providers, so that you didn't have to, who

---

would then provide the guarantee so that the applicant would not need to. So that is one area that we ought to be able to get that information from ICANN about who dropped out of the process.

I don't know if anybody on staff can answer the question about whether or not there were in inquiries that didn't result in applications, or something like that. And Jamie, this has nothing to do with competition necessarily. I think it was about whether or not the application process served the developing world. Laureen, you have your hand up.

And [inaudible], maybe you can elaborate your question.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

Yeah. I just, you know, I think it's always the problem of how do you get at the group you don't know about. So I think that initial question you raised is really important, because I certainly can imagine that there were people in developing countries who thought oh, the notion of a new gTLD, that sounds like a great business opportunity, and then they have taken a look at all of the requirements, and said, not for me.

And then in an ideal world, you'd want to say, well okay, why wasn't it for you? And I'm just wondering what creative ideas we might have to try and get at that segment, because it seems to me, if we could, that would be important. And maybe if there are, you know, if there are various constituencies within different regions, that have more insights or contacts with, you know, groups with who would have liked to become involved in this process, but found it too onerous.

---

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks Lauren. I think that is one of the central questions. So I'm looking forward to those creative ideas. Jordyn, go ahead.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, thanks Jonathan. It's Jordyn Buchanan. I wonder if one way to approach this might be to look at who applied from the developed world, and then try to figure out who their [inaudible] would be in the developing world. And then go and ask, give them sort of survey of the cohort of the types of people that applied. So, you know, my impression is that you had a few sort of big buckets of applicants in the program, and they are sort of incumbent, either registrars or registries, sort of people who are called sort of insiders in the ICANN process.

Presumably there is some, you know, a lot of those entities are in the developed world that presumably, you know, there are some number of those entities also in the developing world. So we can do a survey of, you know, registrars and registrars and maybe ccTLD operators to the point that's already been raised. Ask them, did you consider applying for the program? Why not?

There are similar surveys from people that didn't apply from the developed world, and maybe included in applicants [inaudible], just sort of get some cross sectional data. And the other big bucket, other than sort of industry insiders, are sort of like large [inaudible] applying for dot brands, or generic names. So there is some, you know, there are some companies like L'Oreal, or Johnson and Johnson that applied for generic terms related to their business.

---

So maybe then you do a survey across sort of the bigger companies in the developing world, that would represent same sort of applicants that existed in the developed world and say, why didn't you apply? That may be one approach to get at it.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks Jordyn. That's a very interesting suggestion. I'll have to figure out what those analogs are, and try and identify them as part of our work to see if we can identify a list. I mean, I think registrars is a good place to start, so that was certainly a good... And registrars apparently love participating in studies. So we can look forward to that process. But maybe a survey will be a little bit, a little similar production than a data request.

Carlton, you had some input.

CARLTON SAMUELS:

Yes, this is Carlton. I wanted to [inaudible]... because I... We have a few... and might be interested in. [Inaudible]...

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Carlton, I feel like you're breaking up a little bit. Are you talking directly into the microphone?

CARLTON SAMUELS:

I have a headphone on. So I'm not sure. Can you hear me better now? Are you hearing me better?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Okay. I'm looking at... So we... [inaudible] in the got up... And so we said, you know... to get... the... show them... that... that was the first... And the...

JONATHAN ZUCK: Hey, Carlton, unfortunately you're fading in and out. I think everyone is having difficulty hearing you. Can we...? Are you on the phone or a microphone? Is it worth...

CARLTON SAMUELS: ...on the dial in to the US... Skype.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Oh, via Skype?

CARLTON SAMUELS: Skype.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah. You want... Do you want to try your microphone directly instead of the dial in via Skype? Or should we try to do a call out to you,

---

because right now we're having difficulty hearing you, and we're all very interested in what you had to say.

CARLTON SAMUELS:

Can I... ask...

JONATHAN ZUCK:

All right, that sounds like a good idea. So staff, if you could do a call out to Carlton, that would be helpful. Thank you. Jordyn, that's an old hand, right?

Okay. Any other thoughts on this? I see Carlos has been starting this list. Can we form a little sub-team to look at what those analogs might be in those three groups? The multinationals, etc. And then I guess, staff can we look at...? I guess we have to look at how we're trying to define the developing world too, but can we look at a, getting a list of registrars that fit that description?

And then think about engaging someone, maybe from Neilson but maybe it's somebody else, to ask them some questions? We may need to do less statistically significant survey, and just do some focus groups with them as well, I don't know.

So can we get a sub-group going to identify based on Jordyn's framework, who the potential applicants might have been in the developing world? So Waudo, that's the sub-group. Is using the three categories that Jordyn lay out, do some analysis of who we might be trying to talk to in a categorical way about what the, about why the didn't apply.

---

And then staff, if you can get us a list of people that fell out of the application process, let's look at what that list looks like as well. And see where they fell out, and see where they're from, and see if that can be a group of people to reach out to as well.

And again, I don't know who we should talk to about this, but it's somebody from the new gTLD team, is it possible to determine if there were people that made inquiries but then decided not to apply?

Jordyn, can you just put into the chat the three categories that you laid out for the sub-team?

JORDYN BUCHANAN:

Sure, I'm happy to do that. I also think we may just want to step back and take a look at this category, look at who applied for the [inaudible] applied from the developing, the developed world, but I can put what my guesses are as a first pass.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

That's right. Good point Jordyn. We need to help look at what some of those, who the applicants were that did successfully apply and develop those categories as well.

All right, Karen says it's probably not a single source. So Karen, I mean, let's just brainstorm about how we might get whatever we can from a list like that. This is a green field experience of trying to prove a negative here a little bit. As Calvin suggested, we should also look at applicants from the developing world, and understand their experience and see where it was onerous.

---

Again, I think some of that we captured, by the PDP. But let's try to look at the subset of applicants that we can identify things in the developing world, and make sure that we reach out to them directly. Eleeza, I see you have your hand up.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:

Thank you. I was just, I think I captured it now, so as Karen noted, we can look into what we have on those who may be fell out of the application process. You'd also noted registrars. Did you mean registrars as potential applicants, or was that in relation to something else?

JONATHAN ZUCK:

No, registrars as potential applicants. That's one of the categories of applicants that, from the developing world, that did apply. There are two [inaudible] and other...

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:

Right. Okay, thank you.

DAVID TAYLOR:

So Jonathan, David here. Just comment on that, when you said two [cows?], they're Canadian, does that count as developing world these days? I'm just being jesting. [Inaudible]



---

JONATHAN ZUCK:

You guys, you'll get in some trouble. This is a public call. I think they're shortly going to have an American refugee problem in Canada, given what's going on in our presidential politics, but that's another issue. So hopefully they're building some new camps or something like that for us, as we all try to migrate there.

Any other suggestions about identifying those communities? I mean, those are some good places to start. So let's try to move that forward. We have... Hopefully you guys have captured, staff have captured from the chat and people that have agreed to be on that sub-team to help identify some of those analogs or cohorts, and I'm happy to be on that group as well, brainstorming on that issue.

So then, you know, beyond that sort of interview area, the [inaudible] participation, we were going to look for providing, you know, dispute resolutions. We were going to look at some of the dispute resolutions that were going on, that looked like they were involved folks from developing worlds.

Again, I think if we look at people that fell out of the process to some extent, we'll begin to see where the system didn't work. But we may find areas where it did, and don't want to assume that it always didn't work. I think we're coming in with that assumption, and we should be careful about that.

So let's look at dispute resolutions as well, and dispute resolution process, and see where it involved parties from the developing world, see what those outcomes were, and see where, if there is some way to get some information out of folks there, too. So again I think, that's

---

probably in a way another way of getting at people that we ought to be talking to about this.

And then, the other issue was the application support. And again, I think this has a similar problem in that the number of applicants for support was very small. And I don't know, Karen, if you have some sense of similarly, whether or not there were people that fell out from that process, or seem more like people just didn't come to the process at all in the first place.

And maybe what we should also do is invite a couple of members of that, the JAT, or whatever it was called, the joint applicant support team to talk to us a little bit about what they were trying to do, and get their ideas about why they think it wasn't more used.

And so while Eleeza, it has to do with outreach, and I think that's possible. And so, we should also be looking at what kind of outreach happened. So I guess that's another thing that might be worthy of some presentation. Is that Karen, is it possible for us to hear from the folks inside of ICANN that were responsible for outreach and try to figure out what outreach took place? What was budgeted for it? And again, share reactions about what seemed to work and not work, so we can get a sense of the outreach that took place? Karen, go ahead, you have your hand up.

CARLTON SAMUELS:

This is Carlton. I'm in, I called with my mobile, I got in. I'm not sure what happened directly.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Your voice sounds great now.

CARLTON SAMUELS: I [inaudible] what I was talking about. Laureen said that, you know, she gave a simple kind of explanation. She doesn't think that, would you be interested and what you have to do, and then you look for the feedback. And that's exactly how we approached it here. In several jurisdictions, I know for Trinidad and for Jamaica and Barbados, we have meetings, events, where we talk about this new gTLD program.

And one of the things that we thought we were promoting the idea of becoming getting businesses more involved with the domain name system, by getting them in at the floor level in the market place. And we targeted a couple of the big companies, in our space multinationals, and the media companies.

And we said look, we had conversations with them. And we said, this is what's happening, and you can get all of the information from here and so on. The first pushback was they thought, if they get in, they have to look at their market, so they start looking at the regional market and what they do to attract a customer from the region.

So they start thinking what kind of community type applications or geographical type applications that would make that possible, that would, they think would have been attractive to regional consumers. And the first thing that we got back from them was that, they had a different sense of what a community type TLD was from what was

---

explained in all of the requirements. And they had a difficulty with navigating the geographic type ones, because of the various bumps in the road.

So that was the first two issues. And then the big was, when you said, well, how do you join, how do you get involved? The next big one was the price, and the big companies, I can tell you [inaudible] for example, has a lot of, been trying to build its business online. They were put off by the cost to enter. And so with that we're talking about the applicant support.

Of course, the restrictions on that, they would not qualify. So those barriers were real for them. The difference between their concept of what a community type TLD would be, and the geographic TLDs that they saw to give an interest to the region, how they would have to navigate was a big problem. They thought it was onerous, and then beyond that, no the price to enter the game was what was a big turn off.

And I know that for a fact, for the three, we targeted three major countries in the region, and that was what the response was. I thought I'd let you know that.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Carlton, thank you very much. I guess, is it possible for us to engage with those folks, again, as a team? And delve into some of these questions with them, so you know, with the acknowledgement that we're trying to improve the program and make it more understandable and easy to approach.

---

Do you think you'll be able to reach right out to the companies that you reached out before? And get them to interact with our team?

CARLTON SAMUELS:

I know that we could probably get to the [inaudible]. The other people, in the other companies have a long list, and the approach was the online people who have a sense of what the internet was and so is, and the business, the people were in charge of those properties. We're the ones, we went to first, and they came back to us and said that this was the response from inside.

So, I know we can [inaudible], but that's only one of the three. And we didn't go a major thing. We just thought if we could get one company from the region involved, that would have been a big success. So I think we can speak to the people [inaudible]. I think one person is still there, but the others [CROSSTALK]...

JONATHAN ZUCK:

And if you're on the sub-team, you know, hopefully you can identify some additional people that we can try to reach out to, or companies that we can try to reach out to that you didn't reach out to, and try to get some of these questions answered, because I mean, some of it may boil down to, you know, where that bar is that it's too expensive, or too complicated, or I don't know...

You were mentioning with geographic, is that issues with government and the concerns of the GAC surrounding geographic names? Is that one of the things that they bumped into?

CARLTON SAMEULS:

That was our sense of it, because remember, we you are talking to them about getting into business, the first thing they talk about was, but who are we going to [inaudible]? And so they started the regional market. So you know, we have 15 million people, we could probably extract. And so they made those calculations. And they start thinking, what kind of strings would attract them into this?

And the first thinking was that [inaudible] you know, serve the community, and to the wider community, the geographic regions, so they start thinking about that Caribbean was the one that came up, for example, and I know we went as far as to the regional body [inaudible] to see if they would be interested in putting up something.

And [inaudible] from the regional quasi political organization, they were also apprised, and that was a big thing. They [inaudible] geographic [inaudible]. You have to go through too many hoops, they thought. And that was the end of it.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Right. And I would love to... And I see some discussion in the chat. David's list is I think a good set of hypothesis. Again, what we want to do is get to something a little bit more specific. I mean, a part of how we're trying to do things differently is make this evidence based, and we could theorize about what it is that kept the developing world out, and we could, you know, try to make recommendations based on those theories.

---

I think what we want to do is try to find ways to measure their participation, and get some actual feedback from folks on the, on why or why not. They participated in the program, and then make recommendations that, you know, are really based on that feedback. And hopefully, a future team could use, to look at the data again to see if it has changed.

So I think this is going to be a harder one, then competition that's more sort of economically driven, etc. But let's look at trying to figure out how we can get some evidence, at least in the form of some direct feedback from actual applicants, applicants that fell out, and then as a sub-team forms to find these kind of cohorts in the developing world, you know, people that didn't even bother to apply.

So Carlton, looking for your help in reaching back out to some of these communities to get the answer to some of these questions. Stan, go ahead.

STAN BESEN:

Yeah. Carlton's statement that made me think about an issue we haven't really discussed very much, and that is the role of back ends. One of the ways for small or new entrance to overcome entry barriers is to contract out some of the activities. And so, I just have some memories here that, again, I got out of my favorite data source. It listed 978 new gTLDs, but with 40 backend providers which suggest that back ends are in fact supporting multiple multiples of registries.

And if we want to think about competition and entry barriers, I think we have to also spend some time thinking about the role of back ends.

---

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Stan, I think you're exactly right. I think that it's our intention to do so, from a number of different perspectives. I think one is whether or not the, one of the things that ICANN staff have brought up, and the PDP have brought up, is the fact that the application process, and part of the expense associated with it, is that with each individual applicant, there was a separate review process of their backend provider, even though that provider had already been evaluated as part of another application.

So there was some serious inefficiencies associated with the application process, because of that very statistics that you're pointing to, which was a common set of backend providers, that could be evaluated once and then become kind of a check mark for the application. The other piece was shifting some of the guarantees, and the letters of credit, etc. that were expected from applicants on the backend providers as well, because that became another application barrier to entry, that stems again from the same issues that you mentioned.

So there is that issue that is already in open discussion, and may already be addressed, because folks are switching between their host providers already, and that's causing a reevaluation process. So ICANN may already make that reform. So then the other question then that comes up... Go ahead Stan, go ahead.

STAN BESEN:

If I just put this in sort of narrow economic terms, if you can use a backend provider, economies of scale or less important. It may be



---

possible to, in fact, operate a registry with many fewer registrants than would be the case if you had to provide those services yourself.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, for sure. For sure, that's the case. And so one of the questions was to ask, was whether or not the backend providers themselves were sufficiently accessible, and whether the pricing was there in such a way that it made that economy of scale translated down to the applicant or not. And the final question... Yeah, go ahead.

STAN BESEN: One more piece of data, the top six back ends account for over 90% of all of the registrants for the new gTLDs.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Registrants or applicants?

STAN BESEN: Yes, they call them, they call them domains, but it's entities that register, okay? Of those, these top six back ends account for over 90% of all of the registries, of the registrants in domains, the final registrants. It's very concentrated.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right, sorry. The only thing I was trying to clarify Stan was registrants are people that get second level domains and applicants are the people that get top level domains.

STAN BESSEN: They actually call them domains in their data, but yes, applicants.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Okay. Yeah, no it is heavily concentrated. Jordyn points out in the chat, the last point that I was going to make is whether or not there is enough and if there is sufficient distribution of these backend host providers. In other words, is it, does there need to be some way to promote more hosts that themselves lived in the developing world? Or is that a red herring?

So we have to figure out, try and find a way to get at that notion as well. Like, does the host need to be local for an applicant to feel comfortable working with them? Karen, you have your hand up.

KAREN LENTZ: Thank you Jonathan. This is circling back to kind of the prior discussion about outreach and what the staff could provide and let that drop. You know, and I think most of the, you know, ways that we piece this together or what the team members have been saying. You know, I think we already have an action item to provide some background on, you know, the outreach per region then the resources that were applied to that.

I think primarily, in terms of communications staff who would have been involved in that, I'm not sure any of them are still here, however what might help is you know, we did have the [inaudible] in the regions, in the various regions, you know, active in promoting the program and

---

the availability of different aspects of it. And I think a lot of that knowledge is still hearing how... So that's one source. And as Carlton noted, as Carlton is kind of an example of, there were a lot of kind of ambassadors that, in the community doing outreach and you know, sort of spreading the word, doing their connections.

I think that's a key piece of input. You mentioned the applicants support working group. There was a panel. The [inaudible], but the panel that actually did the review of, [inaudible] qualification for applicant support, [inaudible] as well as the statistics that we have. I think with all that we have with all of that, we can kind of gather together some background that will provide some discussion on that. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks Karen. That will be very helpful. So hopefully, we can get some of those people on the phone or in the room with us on a face to face and have some conversations, because I think that will help, you know, whatever additional data collection that we want to do. It's clear that we're going to do either a formal or informal survey, and so a lot of our work is going to be just identifying people that we want to try to talk to.

So let's see what we can get done there as far as a list. And Carlton, thanks for your help. We're going to be leaning on you quite a bit in this area. So talk to you soon. David, you've got your hand up.

---

DAVID TAYLOR:

Yeah, thanks very much. I was just going to come back to the point from the registry operators and their location, and two things on that. Certainly first, in our experience, we put in quite a few applications and prepared them, and did quite a few reviews of the various registry operators for specific clients, we wanted them to decide who should they use.

So we spent a lot of time on that. And in the end, we might have come out with recommendations saying A might be technically better than B for a variety of reasons, but the anecdotal result was that the clients would tend to go with the registry backend provider that was in the same country or area as them. And certainly as I looked at the applications we did, that's what we found.

Which just leads me to the second part, that it might be something that we could search, because if we look at the, we look at where each registry backend provider is based, and we compare that to all of the applicants, and we've got all of that data, because ICANN has got all of that data of which registry data backend provider was used and the location of the applicant, we might have some useful statistics there, which we could just use quite easily and quite quickly to take that forward.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks David. That's probably worth looking at. Eleeza, maybe you can help us with getting that data. Obviously, with the high level of concentration that Stan mentioned, the options were limited, but we might still get some interesting information about the choices people

---

made from among those choices. And see if there was some [inaudible] toward proximity, and if so, that may be an issue that we may have to try and look at. If there simply wasn't a host that was proximate. I know that some ccTLDs have offered to operate as backend host providers, but there is plenty of ccTLDs that use hosts that are located in the global north.

So it's not a straightforward question.

DAVID TAYLOR:

Just to follow on. We've obviously got several in the US, but there is, you know, island [inaudible] in the UK, you've got France, you've got Europe, you've got [inaudible] and Australia. So we've got quite a good spread, nevertheless. I think that's where it might be quite interesting to see, I mean, where... Did any Australian applicant use anybody else other than [inaudible] registries national for instance?

I think that's, little things like that, we're going to get some useful data.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

All right, so Eleeza I'm dumping that on your plate to see if we can get access to that information. Okay, I guess given the time, we should stop the discussion there, but you can see from this slide that we have more discussions to have about this. So we're going to be having ongoing portions of our plenary that are devoted to the application evaluation sub-team.

It might end up being like first hour, second hour, or something like that at each call. So, let's keep this going. Maybe staff, we need to organize,

---

now that we have a little bit of a sub-team to identifying people with whom we should speak, it might be worth trying to put together a call of that sub-team. And so that we can get a little work plan in order there.

So, on the next item on the agenda is data from CENTR. I'll just mention that I turned that into a letter to Peter, and sent it to him. I've not yet heard back, but I only sent that a couple of days ago, and so hopefully we'll hear back from Peter shortly on the questions that Dejan and his group prepared for CENTR.

And then finally, under any other business, I wanted to mention that, we sort of run afoul of ICANN IT with respect to slack. It's difficult to make slack fit exactly in the way that we've always thought about how these discussions are open to the public, and how those archives are shared, and how people have observed [inaudible] versus right only access.

And the IT team was concerned that it was too much of a hack, and that they don't have the bandwidth to do additional research to accommodate our request to use slack. So, unfortunately, we're not going to be able to use slack for our discussions. So, we're going to need to find ways to be as efficient as possible in using email. There has already been some complaints about reply all with kind of frivolous messages.

So the extent of which you can take conversations private that the entire group doesn't need to share, or use the sub-team email alias if it's really a question for the sub-team, please do so, just because

---

people's inboxes are going to get very full, very quickly. So let's try to be as respectful as we can about how many emails we're sending to everyone, and meanwhile, I will compile list of tools, a couple of tools that might be of use to folks to help organize their emails as they come in, into categories and things like that.

So I'm sorry I got everybody excited about slack, but ICANN IT doesn't have the bandwidth to accommodate us at this time.

David, I assume that's an old hand. Laureen, you have your hand up?

LAUREEN KAPIN:

Yes, this is just real quick regarding emails. Since we're not going to be able to use slack, I just wanted to ask folks if they can be very clear in their headings about what the topic is about. Because if are heading is going to be one of the primary way we organize things, I think it's then up to us to be making sure that our headings are informative and clear.

And then second, if folks don't already know, it's happy Star Wars Day, and may the fourth be with you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Yes, thank you Laureen. May the fourth be with you as well. And thanks everyone for participating in the call. I don't know if anybody has any additional... As I said, I'll try to circulate an email about email protocol and things like that, and tools, and we'll make do. I'm very disappointed about slack, but it is what it is.

---

Anybody have any other business? Okay, great. Thanks everyone for participating on the call. I'm looking forward to everybody coming to DC, in particular my neighborhood. So Pam, I owe you some restaurant recommendations. And we'll, I'll give those to you shortly.

And if folks are coming in the night before, let's try to get you over to [inaudible] Morgan, or even over to my patio, if you guys are interested. Thanks everyone. Good work and let's keep at it.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**