JORDYN BUCHANAN: Thank you. I want to kick things off. This is a meeting of the CCT RT's Competition and Consumer Choice Sub Team on the 27th of April. And in terms of agenda today, I had initially put together just a two-pronged agenda.

Number 1 is some ongoing discussion of data sources, taking a look at the sources we've identified so far, maybe get a quick update from staff and Analysis Group as to how both the consumer survey, as well as the Analysis Group data collection is going. And then there's been a thread online about other data sources that's probably worth some discussion of. And then to use the second half of the call to start to talk about possible market definitions, or how we're going to approach that.

I guess I'll start off by saying, are there any other agenda items that other participants in the call would like to make sure we address?

Sounds like no. So why don't we dive in? The first of our two topics is data sources. I believe, based on the back-and-forth I had with staff, that it may make sense to do a quick update on where we are, in terms of the two surveys, the Nielsen survey as well as the Analysis Group study. So maybe if someone from staff and/or Greg want to kick that off, that might be just a helpful quick update for us, and see if there's anything else we can be doing right now to assist in either of those efforts.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Hi, Jordyn.

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.

GREG RAFERT: I can provide –

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Oh, go ahead, Greg. Why don't you start, and I'll talk about Nielsen afterwards?

GREG RAFERT: Okay, that sounds good. So on the Analysis Group side of the data collection, we have received data on registry wholesale prices from 28 out of the 68 registries from whom we requested data. And from those who haven't yet sent us data, we have sent them a nice reminder, just letting them know that we would like to receive the wholesale prices that we requested. The 28 registries that we have received data from cover just a little over 100 TLDs in our sample.

On the registrar side, we received very little data, which is kind of consistent with our experience from the Phase 1 study last year. We are kind of in progress of trying to come up with a pared-down data request for the registrars that will hopefully lead to a little bit more, in the way of a positive response and giving us data.

And I guess I should also note that in anticipation of not receiving much in the way of data from registrars, we're beginning to manually collect the retail prices and then the various add-on prices from the registrars' websites.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Thanks, Greg. I have a question for you, but does anyone else have any questions for Greg at this point?

All right, I'll pose mine then. So, Greg, I know there's been some attempt to talk to various registrars. Has Analysis Group had a chance to address the Registrar Stakeholder Group leadership, or as a whole, or anything along those lines at this point?

GREG RAFERT: We have not had a chance yet, but we would be happy to do so.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Sure. So it seems like that's an action item we should continue to take. I know Jonathan had done some outreach, so I'll follow up with him and see if there's a way we can facilitate some conversation. I know you're scheduled to talk with the Registry Stakeholder Group a week from today. Is that right?

GREG RAFERT: That's correct.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay. So at least we'll have that opportunity for outreach. But that seems the less problematic of the two. And is there ongoing attempts right now from Analysis Group to gather either ccTLD or aftermarket data? Or are those separate efforts?

GREG RAFERT: There were some operators of ccTLDs in our sample, and so we had requested data from those. We have not received – actually, I think we received data from one ccTLD, but we haven't attempted to collect additional. And I think we've had discussions about this in the past, so I think we're aware of potentially good data sources. We would be happy to look into those and think about collecting data from them. And then on the aftermarket data collection side, we haven't yet started to collect that information.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay, great, thank you. Any other questions for Greg?

Okay, no. So, Eleeza, do you want to give us an update on the Nielsen side?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Yes, I do, thanks. I just wanted to go back to what Greg was saying on talking to the Registrar Stakeholder Group. We've also, as ICANN staff, been in touch with our Registrar Services Engagement Team. And I think this week they will be reaching out to those registrars in the sample who haven't replied, and encouraging them to participate. And we're also working with that team to see what's the best way to communicate, whether it's talking to the full Stakeholder Group, or the executive committee, or sending another e-mail. So we're kind of trying a few avenues as well for getting in touch with them, particularly if and when Analysis Group decides to pare down the size of the time window for which they're asking for data.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay, thank you.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: If you have any questions on that, I'm happy to answer that. Otherwise, I could talk about what's happening with the survey.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: So before we jump to the next item, on the chat, Waudo has asked a question, which is, "Which ccTLDs have been requested for information?" I believe, based on what I heard from Greg, you guys have only requested information from ccTLDs that happen to also be gTLD operators included in your sample. Is that correct?

GREG RAFERT: That's correct. And I would have to go back to our data request to actually give the precise list of ccTLDs that we requested data from. I don't recall off the top of my head.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Right, but I guess to rephrase that, there hasn't been an attempt to create a representative sample of ccTLDs?

GREG RAFERT: That is correct, there has not.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay, thank you. Does that answer your question, Waudo? I think so. Okay, great.

So, yeah, Eleeza, if you want to give us the update on Nielsen, that would be fantastic.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Sure. So Nielsen is nearly done with fielding their consumer survey, so that's quite exciting. I think the biggest chunks remaining are capturing the teen demographic. They're doing that [inaudible] in a separate process, so that's taking a little bit longer.

And then in terms of the registrant questionnaire, which we discussed before, they're working on finalizing the revised questionnaire; revising the questionnaire from last year, I should say. And I should be sending a draft of that to all of you, probably early next week.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay, thank you. So, "In progress," is the rough response?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Yeah. I was just looking for the number. We have 5,715 complete on the consumer side.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay. And do you know what the expectation is from the time the completion of the survey process is to when we see results?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Yeah, it'll be probably about a month. What our goal is, is to have David Dickinson, from Nielsen, who you met with in Los Angeles in February, join the group in DC in June for a few hours to go over the survey results. It takes some time for them to do their processing and write up a report and so forth. So that's the goal. I think we should meet that goal.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay, fantastic. Any other questions about the Nielsen survey?

Okay, seems like no. So why don't we move on, and we'll move the discussion to topics of other data sources? There's been quite a bit of discussion over the past couple of weeks about the various places we might look for data across a broad spectrum. I think Stan had put together a brief document, starting to list potential additional third-party data sources.

I have actually turned that into a Google doc and added a couple other things, which I will now reveal to people in the chat. So that might be a good a place for us to just sort of keep track of reading lists or places we might turn for data. But I think at some point, we're going to need to map it back to specific either questions we're trying to answer or bits of analysis that we're trying to do.

One, I think, discussion that's taken place on the list is I think Stan's indicated he's quite fond of the nTLD stats data set, because it's quite rich, at least for all the New gTLDs. It provides a variety of information,

ranging from volume to… For example, he sent out, I think, information over the last 24 hours showing breakdown by registrant's country, which is somewhat useful, and also includes information about parked domains, for example. That seems quite helpful to me, although I guess the question I raised on the list is whether we believe that the nTLD stats data, how closely it aligns with the canonical registration data that ICANN has.

And, Eleeza, I asserted on the list – I think this is correct – based on the monthly reports that ICANN receives from registries, you guys should have registration volume numbers that include both delegated second-level domains, as well as those that are registered "not available" on the zone file. Is that correct?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Hi, Jordyn. Yeah, that is absolutely correct, and we are already tracking that and publishing that on our CCT metrics site. So my understanding is the monthly reports are a bit more accurate than what you see on the nTLD stat site. And I've had a conversation with Stan about this in the past.

My suggestion with this site is it's definitely a helpful starting point, particularly because visually it's really easy to absorb. But maybe if there is a particular statistic or a particular number or a particular question we're interested in, we can look at something, go back and look at our monthly reports and compare them and see what we come up with.

We also have another metric we're tracking. That is we're using samples of WHOIS records to get a sense of geographic breakdown as well. That's another way of looking at that particular country breakdown, which Stan had sent out. I think it was yesterday.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Right. So I think what you've proposed might be a really helpful way forward, which would be we can use the nTLD stat site as a first pass to slice and dice, identify trends that we think are interesting, maybe make some initial hypotheses. And then we could turn back to the ICANN data sources, where we think that they might be more authoritative to confirm or perhaps get a little bit more accuracy that we might expect from the nTLD stats site. Is that roughly what you're suggesting?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Yes, that's exactly right. And so the only caution I would use here is my understanding is the nTLD [inaudible] on the zone files, the monthly reports, which ICANN receives, obviously we receive monthly, but we can't release any data from them publicly until three months after we've received them. So there is a little bit of a lag in what's available there, versus use zone files, which are a bit more immediate. So I just wanted to offer that caution.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Right. So if there is a sudden trend that we saw emerge very late in the nTLD stats data, we wouldn't be able to confirm that against the ICANN data.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Correct, not for three months.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Right. Right. So, yeah, I guess I would be a little surprised if we ended up seeing something so late in the process, like a very late trend that we needed the last three months of data to confirm. But I guess we'll see.

Let me open this discussion up to the group. Have folks had a chance to look at the nTLD site? Do we think that's a useful starting point to frame some of our discussions? It sounds like we'll probably tend not to use it as the authoritative source, but it seems like probably a really helpful starting point for our discussion. Does that sound like a reasonable approach to everyone on the class?

Waudo is typing. Still typing. [inaudible] Waudo says, "It's a reasonable starting point." That's great.

And then I guess if we see data, like for example the nTLD stats site also includes data on parked domains. Does ICANN track the notion of parked domains at all, Eleeza?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Not that I'm aware of.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay. So there may be some things that nTLD stats track that we would either have to rely on them as the authoritative source, or we'd have to

figure out some additional data collection exercise if we wanted to do something different.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Yeah, I'll double-check on that. I'm pretty sure the answer is no, but I'll ask around today.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay. The other question I'd ask folks is between this doc that I think Alice has projected now, and I think the obvious additional sources that aren't on here are the Analysis Group study, the Nielsen Group survey, and they various ICANN data sources. Are there additional data sources that folks are aware of that we should be looking at? In particular, I think there's still discussion about ccTLD registration information. And I know this has been a topic of conversation, so I'm wondering if folks have thoughts on where we should be going if we want to try to get information on ccTLD registration volumes or other information.

The silence on this call may be representative of the trouble we've been having trying to get data on ccTLDs, although I see Waudo is typing again. So Waudo suggested that we have to approach the ccTLDs, but we need a standard format for the questions.

I might actually use this an opportunity to segue to the discussion of market definitions, if people don't have any other thoughts about data sources at the moment. So let me give a last opportunity for folks to chime in on the data sources subject. Otherwise, I would encourage

folks to take a look at this list and add any additional data sources that you're aware of.

I think the two big gaps that we have so far are, number one, ccTLD data. It sounds like we may just have to do that by trying to approach CCs directly, because we don't see a lot of external data sources. And number two, I think we don't have very good secondary market data at this point. So the extent folks know of additional data sources for either of those two areas, I think would be very helpful to add to the list. So feel free to add them to the Google doc or to e-mail me directly, and I can do that.

And Waudo suggested that perhaps we could divide up into regions and see what data we can get, because he personally knows managers of some ccTLDs in Africa, as well as the manager of the umbrella continental origin for the ccTLDs.

Yeah, and I think you're right, Eleeza, that number 7 is funny. That is a Google search, but I think you're right, it should be RegistrarStats.com. I will change that in the Google doc, even though I don't think that will show up online, the analysis doc.

It's not self-promotion. Stan put together this list.

In any case, if there's no other comments about data sources, I want to move to initial discussion of markets. And Jonathan notes that we can fund additional data-gathering exercises, which is important, I think, if we identify areas where we don't have data and we think we need it. So ccTLDs or secondary market may be places where that's important.

All right. There's no other questions or comments. Let's move on to the discussion of market definitions. I think our objective, going into the June meeting, which I think we'll have two additional Sub Team meetings between now and then in addition to a couple of plenary calls, is to have some working definitions of market definition for the purposes of our study, at least. And so these definitions, I think, are those that we will agree upon to use as plausible definitions for the purposes of our report.

Waudo said that Stan is the expert, and is he on the call? And I do not think I have seen him on the call so far, unfortunately. So we will have to muddle on a little bit without him. Fortunately, we have other folks that have some expertise, like Carlos and Kaili on the call as well.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Oh, I was just mentioning that Stan's not here, but we have other folks that have some background in economics to maybe help us with the discussion if we get stuck. So no particular call out yet.

In any case, I don't imagine we're going to make a huge amount of progress by just sort of brainstorming on this call, although I'm open to that. But I wanted to kick off the discussion with, how do we start to approach the question of what the market definitions should look like? Maybe a helpful way to do this, I think Greg did this last time on the previous call, but Analysis Group, maybe Greg, could you run through

again the segmentation efforts that you guys performed in the initial Phase 1 report that Analysis Group did?

GREG RAFERT: Yeah, I'd be happy to. So what we had done is we had, for those TLDs that were in our sample, we looked into what groups are kind of topic areas that they might plausibly fall. So I think one of the examples I had used last time was TLDs that might fall in the education space. And the reason why we did that is although it's certainly subjective to some extent, one could potentially think that TLDs that are education-themed might compete against each other. So, for example, .school, .college, and then other TLDs in other languages that get to the same idea. So we tried to come up with groups of TLDs that we thought might compete against one another, and then we made sure that all of those TLDs were basically in the sample of data for our data requests, both to registries and to registrars.

And so we collected wholesale prices for those TLDs, retail prices for those TLDs, and then we also have monthly transaction reports from ICANN. And the idea was that we would take the snapshot in Phase 1, which we did, but then observe what happens over the one year between Phase 1 and Phase 2, to see whether we see any signs of competition within the groups that we defined.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay, great. And the groups that you defined, I have two questions about those. Are those all included in the Phase 1 report, the group definitions that you guys did?

GREG RAFERT: They are. I forget the exact table number, but it's one of the tables towards the end of the report, where basically we identify the groups that we used, but we don't call out the specific TLDs, because we didn't want to make it so that individuals could determine what the wholesale prices were.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Sure, that makes sense. Okay, I see Kaili has raised his hand. Kaili, do you have a questions?

KAILI KAN: No, I just have a few comments that was just mentioned. May I say something, just a comment?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, sure.

KAILI KAN: One is, first of all, I must say that Stan is the real economist in our group, and I'm from engineering background but just happened to teach economics in China for ten years. So also, Stan is much more familiar with dealing with data, which I don't have much experience. So about the data analysis, and also the collecting of the data, I would like to hear from Stan.

However, I have a few suspicions, which I don't want voice or talk about over the last few meetings. One is especially according to last meeting, Stan's explanation, or [maybe teaching], but I strongly, strongly suspect that the New gTLD program, that that effectively introduced competition. That was my strong suspicion. It still needs to be proven by data.

But however, according to last time's meeting, the data I saw and explanation, I also strongly suspect that the data would not be able to prove that competition has been introduced, and especially effectively introduced.

Thirdly, seems to me that, of course during next face-to-face meeting, we're going to really take a hard look at the data. But however, I also somewhat suspect that the data collected will not be as much help.

So anyway, those are my suspicions and comments. And then if the effective competition cannot be proven been introduced by the New gTLD program, I suggest that we also look at the side effects of the New gTLD program, which are not really that welcome. So therefore, at the face-to-face meeting, if we can reach some kind of a conclusion, I would suggest that we then take a hard look at the New gTLD program and then make some recommendations about whether it needs to be changed and how it should be changed. That's all, thank you.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Thanks, Kaili. I think Jonathan has noted –

KAILI KAN:
I'm going on [inaudible] of our progress. That's just thinking out loud, tell everybody what I'm thinking about. Thank you.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:
Sure. Thanks, Kaili. Jonathan's noted in the chat that we may need to ask some more nuanced questions, and I think I agree with that. I think, you know, one common example that's given in more historical, the previous introduction of gTLDs in 2000 and 2004 rounds is .cat. And we could say if we accepted the notion that Catalonia was a market, you might look there and see that .cat actually is very widely used, and maybe even more so than .com or .es in Catalonia. I don't know if that's true or not, but certainly, based on my last trip to Barcelona, it's extremely common. And you might say in that particular market, if we thought it was one, there might have been very effective competition, whereas there may be other markets attempted to be addressed by specific TLDs where we haven't seen as effective competition.

So it may not be that there's a universal answer to this question. Competition, has it been successful or not? It may depend quite a bit on the specific markets that we attempt to define or to take a look at. But, yes, we do want to have this be a data-driven exercise and see what it tells us as we go through the process of trying to read those tea leaves.

Waudo's also said on chat that maybe we need to de-link the definition of market from the concept of competition. We need to find the market first and then determine where there's competition. And I think that's right, Waudo. But one of the things that I think we learned from Stan on the last call was that sometimes you need to refine the definition of

market based on what you see, in terms of the competitive landscape, because sometimes you create definitions of market that look implausible after you go and actually take a look at the data. But I agree, the exercise we're trying to get through right now, Waudo, is exactly to try to come up with some market definitions. And it sounds like Analysis Group had attempted to do this based on these topic areas in the Phase 1 report, and we'll see some additional data from that in the Phase 2 report.

Greg, can I ask, are there additional attempts that you guys made to segment out other notions of market? Or was it just based on the topic of the TLDs?

GREG RAFERT: Not in the first round, or the Phase 1, study. But for the work that we're undertaking right now, we are also looking at certain geographical regions as well. So, for example, Berlin or Las Vegas or New York City. So there was a little bit of an attempt to think about defining a geographical marketplace in the Phase 2 work.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: All right. Okay, so in Phase 1, we had, what is the topic area of the particular TLDs? What are they trying to address? Phase 2, when you say, "geographic areas," are you talking about the geographic area of where the registrants live or –

GREG RAFERT: That's correct.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay.

GREG RAFERT: Yeah, it's where the registrants are located.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay. So you're saying people in this – this might get back to the Catalonia example, right? People in this particular area, do they view some set of TLDs as being the market that they might choose to register in?

GREG RAFERT: Yeah, that's exactly correct. And I don't recall the precise number of geographical areas that we are obtaining data for, but I think it's on the order of 15 or 20.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay. And you mentioned Las Vegas. Are they city-sized geographic regions, or are some of them country sized or some other sizes?

GREG RAFERT: They're generally city sized. There are a couple of larger regions. I can't recall. I don't think we included any countries.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay. I think Carlos has suggested in the past, for example, like Costa Rica. I'm not saying we necessarily want to use Costa Rica as an example, but Costa Rica has different dynamics than other countries because the ccTLD in Costa Rica is so expensive that people might tend not to buy the ccTLD. And therefore, you'd look at having a slightly different set of alternatives for them, mostly based on gTLDs, I suppose.

Carlos, am I summarizing your previous statements about Costa Rica correctly? I don't know if Carlos is trying to talk, but we can't hear him.

All right, meanwhile, Jonathan has suggested online, "Geo, language, countries, topic, new reg renewal, secondary market prices." Jonathan, could you elaborate? Are you saying those are all independent definitions of market that we want to look into, or something else?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, can you hear me?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yes.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. I'm in an airport, so that's why I was doing more chatting. Yeah, I mean, I was just brainstorming on what I could be potential market segments and that when we do observations, I think, as Stan suggested, we're going to come up with a series of market definitions and not reach any kind of single conclusion, but instead say that we were

successfully here but not here, and then make recommendations to sort of address those different areas.

So these were all areas that I thought made... I agreed with you that I think we need bigger segmentation than cities probably, like even continental regions, as part of our definitions: Latin America, Africa, etc. And so I was just looking at other areas to be considered markets for purpose of our analysis.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, thanks, Jonathan. I think that's helpful. Certainly, the notion of language as a potential market definition seems plausible to me. And I guess there's only some number of languages represented in the set of New gTLDs that have been introduced.

Does anyone from staff or otherwise know how many languages are represented by this past round? This is a little bit complicated, because in some cases, we can look at IDNs and say, "Oh, that's a distinct language." But then we also have, for example, some German or French TLDs that are still using ASCII TLDs. Or I think there's some, both Chinese and Japanese, that still use ASCII script. They're obviously in those other languages.

But does anyone from staff know if there's been an analysis done on language-based segmentation?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Hi, Jordyn. I don't know of any. I could ask our IDN Team. That might be something they've looked at in the past. But that doesn't sound… That's nothing that I've been tracking.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay. Yeah, as I said, I think the IDNs would tell us something, but we'd have to do some further analysis of the ASCII TLDs to really understand it.

What do folks think? Language strikes me as potentially an interesting factor. In a lot of cases, language and country may overlap somewhat. But certainly, you could imagine there's a number of German TLDs, and there's at least the three big German-speaking countries: Germany, Austria, and Switzerland. So those would all potentially be included in a German-language targeted…

Jamie has said online, "Since domain names resolve globally, shouldn't the default segmentation be global, unless there is something particular about a TLD to target a smaller geo-market?" Which seems correct to me, but obviously, something like a language-based, you could even argue an English TLD, even though they're somewhat global, tend to be targeted towards English speakers. Maybe .com is so generic that that's not true. But we certainly see a number of specific language-based TLDs that you would imagine would be either targeted at the country where they speak or the people that speak that particular language.

Jamie said, "For example, IDNs in Chinese characters do not necessarily limit themselves to China," which I agree with, Jamie. That's why I think Jonathan's notion of a language-based segmentation still may make

sense. It's not necessarily just in China, but it's people that speak Chinese, I presume.

What do folks think? Is it worth trying to investigate more or take some look at a language-based definition of market? Waudo suggests script based. And sometimes script based and language based are the same. As I indicated previously, I think that, for example, Chinese is interesting, because there's some pinion ASCII TLDs that are also clearly targeted at the Chinese speakers. So even trying to get to a definition of what a language-based segmentation would look like would require us to think about whether we're talking script based or whether it's the language itself.

Stan?

STAN BESEN: Sorry for the delay. We had a second fire at my metro station in five days. I think at this point we should just try to collect as much data that would permit us to… We shouldn't be constraining ourselves now, or making these decisions now. We should collect data in a way that gives us maximum flexibility to define markets as we go along. So all these suggestions that made, I think, seem to me are all possibilities. We just want to make sure that the data-gathering effort does not preclude some of these alternatives if we decide to do them later on.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Thanks, Stan. I think that's helpful. I guess the problem is, based on what I heard Greg say about how Analysis Group is conducting their

survey, and it's maybe too late to fix this at this point, but based on the topic areas they previously identified, and now perhaps these new geographic definitions, they made sure to include all of the TLDs in a particular topic area, or presumably all the TLDs intended to target a particular geography, in their survey, whereas if we decided after the fact, "Oh, no, we really would like to understand competition in the Chinese-language TLD space," they may not have included all of the Chinese TLDs in their survey. So we would have an incomplete set of data.

So unless Analysis Group's charter were changed to get data on all TLDs, for example, their survey wouldn't include all the required data for us to come up with a definition on the fly later on.

STAN BESEN: Yeah, but the data source that I've identified, I think it's called [NDS], in fact lists every New gTLD. Presumably, we can figure out, for example, which ones are Chinese language. And we could use those data. Is the Analysis Group data price data, or is it share data?

GREG RAFERT: Share and price data. Sorry.

STAN BESEN: Yeah, you can't get price data from [NDS], but you can get share data. And you could cut those New gTLDs any way you like.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, so that's totally fair, Stan. But I guess the thing we'll be missing is we wouldn't have price data on any TLDs that Analysis Group didn't include in their study.

STAN BESEN: That is correct.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: So that's the main downside to not realizing until later that we've missed a definition of market [inaudible].

STAN BESEN: But it doesn't prevent us from doing market shares and HHIs, which you could use the [NDS] data for.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Correct.

STAN BESEN: The shortcoming there is that it's missing ccTLDs. That's the major shortcoming.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, and you missed the earlier part of the call –

STAN BESEN: Yes, I'm sorry.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: No problem. But we identified ccTLDs, I think, are still one of the big areas where we're lacking data and we need to do some more work to identify additional places.

So I guess, Stan, if we think it's potentially premature to start to lock down definitions of market, we have, for example, the nTLD stats data. How do we get from here to having working definitions of the markets that we're trying to explore? I guess that's my question.

STAN BESEN: The way to do this – and you'd have other information or maybe just simply *a priori* expectations – but you're basically thinking about which TLDs registrants regard as substitutes. We're probably not going to be able to get market data. The kinds of groupings that Analysis Group did before, the ones that were bars and lawyers and all that stuff, was basically quite reasonable *a priori* reasoning. And we could do the same thing here. We could say, suppose there is a Chinese-language market. How concentrated is it? And even there, not having price data is not a problem from the point of view of simply calculating market shares and concentration. It obviously has limitations.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Right, that makes sense. So if I go back to Jonathan's initial list, it seemed like he identified, I think, four big buckets that seemed pretty interesting as potential ways to look at markets. And those are language

based, geographic – he said countries, but I think geographic; we'll have to think through what the right level of geography is – topics, and that would be similar to the Analysis Group. And then finally, there's this notion of – I guess any of the other ones could be sliced this way – new registrations versus renewals or versus the existing registrations.

Those all seem, to me, like areas that it's at least worth us trying to do some investigation in. I guess I'd ask, do the other folks on the call agree? And are there other ways of segmenting that we think would be interesting and would want to start to look at, as well?

Okay. Oh, Stan's raised his hand again. Go ahead, Stan.

Stan, we don't hear you, if you're trying to talk.

STAN BESEN: I'm sorry. I think I raised this question with Eleeza earlier, and it's the same question that Jordyn raised yesterday. The [NDS] data are presumably not as accurate as the ICANN data. The question is, should we be trying to replicate the [NDS] data from ICANN? I like the [NDS] data a lot, because it has a lot of information. Is that accurate enough for our purposes?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, so, Stan, we actually discussed this briefly earlier on the call.

STAN BESEN: Sorry.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: No worries. But I'll give you the summary, which is the [NDS] data has a nice interface and is easy to work with. And we agreed to use that to do some initial hypothesizing and doing first passes of analysis. We do think in general that the ICANN data will be somewhat more accurate. But in general, for most things, there's some areas, like the number of parked domains, ICANN doesn't have data. But in many other situations, like registration volumes and so on, ICANN will have more authoritative data. They already have that, so we could ask them, once we hone in and we say, "Okay, we think that nTLD stat is telling us X. ICANN, can you pull the authoritative data, and let's take a look at that to make sure that we're not off in the wrong direction or making bad conclusions based on the nTLD stats data?"

STAN BESEN: Sorry for being behind here. Is that also true of the registrar data?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: You mean which registrars have how many registrations and individual detailed dates?

STAN BESEN: [NDS] has, for each registry, a list of every registrar and the number of registrants within that registry. So, for example, if we wanted to see how concentrated registrars are within registries, you could use the [NDS] data. But does ICANN have registrar… Can they tell us for each

registry which registrars are there and how many registrants there are within a registry?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, that's a good question I don't know the answer to. Eleeza, can you tell us that?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Yes, we do. Those are in the monthly transaction reports, as well.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay, great. So "yes" is the answer to your question, Stan.

And do you have –

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: And we – sorry, go ahead.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Is that data, the registrar breakdowns, is that exposed in your data tool?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: It's not, primarily because it wasn't one of the suggested metrics. But, Greg, we talked about including that as part of your Phase 2 report. Isn't that right?

GREG RAFERT: Yeah, that's correct.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay. So let me ask this. So if we have these four general buckets of topic, language, geography, and new registration versus existing, does it make sense to try to… Presumably, we're not going to be able to fully explore, possibly with the exception of new versus existing, all the possibilities within each of those segmentations. It sounds like for the topic area, Analysis Group did some amount of clustering on their own. And they're doing something on geography as well, although we'll have to have some further discussion on geography. Is it the geography targeted by the domain, or is the geography selected by the registrant?

I guess I was going to wonder if it made sense for us to try to, within each of those areas, identify some candidate pods of domain names or viable definitions of market. So for topics, we could maybe just start with the Analysis Group clustering as a first pass and see if we wanted to add anything or agreed with the selection of TLDs they've used, etc. We could do that exercise for each of the four big buckets that Jonathan identified. Does that sound reasonable to folks?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Sorry, Jordyn, could you repeat what the exercise was again? I didn't quite –

JORDYN BUCHANAN: So basically for each topic, we have these four big buckets: topic, language, geography, and new registrations versus existing. And so for

each of these buckets, we would not be able to look at every possible topic-based segmentation, so let's choose some subset of them that we will actually study. So Analysis Group has already done that, and so we could even say, "Okay, we'll just adopt theirs," or we'll tweak theirs, or we'll come up with our own brand-new definition, whatever it is.

And then I think for language, so far no one has attempted to do that. So some people would get together and try to make a pass at selecting TLDs that would cluster by language. And then geography, we would make an attempt to build some clusters as well. And then on the new versus existing, I guess it's mostly just a matter of saying, "What are the data points that we would want to look at to try to tease that out?" Does that make sense?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Yes, that does, thank you.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay. So hopefully that was clear. Does that sound useful to folks? We've only got two minutes left. Because if it does sound useful, I'm going to give people homework. Jonathan says yes. Anyone think that doesn't sound useful?

All right, so what I'd like to do is create four little sub teams of our team over the next two weeks, to try to task each of them to come up with some segmentation options under each of those areas. So once again, the areas are topic based, geography based, language based, and new registrations versus existing. And so I'd like to dispatch folks off to do a

little bit of work offline between now and our next call, and then come back with suggestions.

Does anyone want to volunteer to work on any of the specific sub-things? Otherwise, I can assign people, which we can do offline. But it would be great if people volunteered, which you can do now or we can follow up by e-mail. But if anyone has any of those that they're particularly interested in, now would be a good time to let us know.

Okay, no one's volunteering. So what I'll do is I'll send a follow-up note. I'll solicit volunteers. If I don't hear anything by the end of the day, they'll be randomly assigned. And then hopefully folks can work together over the next couple weeks to come up with a couple of segmentation options for each of the big areas that we've identified.

Other than that, I think we've come up against the limits of our time. There's been some discussion in chat about completion amongst registrars, which I think we're not going to get to today. But it raises the point that we have identified competition as registrars as a topic we'd like to look at. So in a future call or on e-mail, we'll have to discuss how we might want to attack that problem.

Any other last comments or questions before we wrap up today's call? Okay, that's it. Thanks, everyone, and look for e-mails on these smaller subgroups to try to get to clustering in each of these big areas. Thanks.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]