

---

JORDYN BUCHANAN: This is the Competition and Consumer Choice subteam of the CCT review process on May 11, 2016. I'm Jordyn Buchanan, and let's go ahead and start.

In terms of agenda, I think we have three items. Number one – I'm going to mix this up a little bit. Assuming that we have [Greg on], which it looks like we do, there's been some discussion of registrar price data sources on the list and offline. I think we wanted to have some time to talk through options on that. I'm not sure how engaged Greg wants to be for the rest of the call, but I know that there was interest in that discussion. So why don't we do that up front in case Greg wants to drop off subsequently?

Then we'll talk about the work plan that the staff has proposed, and then we'll pick up again our discussion of market segmentation and market definitions. Are there any other topics that anyone else would like to add to the list?

All right. On this registrar price data topic, I think Stan has, in his ongoing search for additional data sources, has identified a couple of additional opportunities on registrar price data. So Stan, maybe do you want to kick off the conversation on this topic?

STAN BESEN: I'm actually not sure that's right. What are you referring 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.*

---

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Oh, was it not you? Maybe it was Eleeza. Who found this stuff? It was Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I think it was me, Jordyn.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Oh right. Sorry, sorry. Wrong credit.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I feel like Stan began to dig into it.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Do you want to kick off the conversation with what you found, and then we can figure out how we want to think about using it?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah. Sorry, I wasn't ready to do that, but I can. There's just a couple of different data sources out there that I came across. One was at Namestat.org, which I can put in the chat. The other suggestion was about figuring out if there was a cheaper resource to scrape data. In other words, given that we're resorting to that, was there a way to do more of it? It was really just the other part of the suggestion. To try and pay somebody else that are cheaper per hour to do the scraping of the data. Those were the two suggestions.

---

Stan has taken a look at Namestat.org, and I think thinks that the data looks useful. The other part of the suggestion, we haven't yet discussed. That was my last foray, my little mic drop on the e-mail, and I haven't gone much further than that.

Eleeza had some ideas about how we should shape our questions. I thought the first organization is somebody we probably need to license the data from. There's a question about whether or not we should just try to get it for Analysis Group or try to get it for us, and what the security of the data would be and things like that. That was the conversation, I think, that we wanted to try to have today, how we might make use of the data.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:

Thanks, Jonathan. I think, to summarize, it looks like Namestat has compiled some sort of database of different registrar prices for various TLDs. I don't think we know whether the Namestat data is comprehensive in terms of covering all registrars offering a particular TLD, and they may be relying on public price data, as well, but they've already compiled it into some sort of database that you can look at on a per TLD basis. So it might be possible to ask them for some or all of this data, either for us or for Analysis Group. Secondly, I guess on the DNPrices concept, that's basically saying, "If we're going to have to go manually scrape data, there's probably some tools or some people who could help us do that, as opposed to Analysis Group paying people to type it into dozens of registrar websites." Is that the idea?

---

JONATHAN ZUCK:                      That's right.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:                Okay, great.

JONATHAN ZUCK:                      The end result with the Analysis Group is we didn't really get enough data.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:                Sure, sure. That sounds really helpful, Jonathan, getting this off to a stronger start. I don't know. I know Stan has taken a quick look at it, and Eleeza had some reactions on the list. I don't know if anyone wants to jump in the queue to react to what we've seen so far or kick off discussion. Stan's raised his hand, so we'll start there.

STAN BESEN:                            I'd actually be interested in Greg's reaction to the data. The one thing that struck me when I looked at it was the very wide range of retail prices for the same registry. That surprised me. They're very wide. Part of that may be the fact that the product being sold is not limited to the name. There may be some ancillary services, which is something that Analysis Group worked on when they did their initial analysis. I'd be interested in Greg's reaction, if he has one at this point, to those data, where they could be used and whether we'll have to adjust them to take into account the fact that not all of the prices are for the identical set of services.

---

GREG RAFERT:

This is Greg from Analysis Group. We have had a chance to look at both the Namestat data and the DNPrices data. At least our first reaction to them is I think they're likely to be useful for collecting retail prices from registrars, as opposed to what we had previously done last year, which was basically having [poor] analysts go to all of the registrars' websites and look up prices.

Yeah, Stan, I agree with you. It's a little surprising, and it was surprising last year how much variation we saw in the price for a given TLD across registrars. I don't think we're quite sure, at least at this point, why that is the case, but I think it would be something that certainly would merit more research and looking into. Although I can't say this definitively, I don't think that the reason we're seeing the price variation is because the other ancillary services are being bundled in. We clicked on a couple of low priced registrars and a couple of the high prices registrars yesterday, and it seemed like they were offering the exact same services. We obviously haven't done that in a comprehensive manner yet, so it's possible that that's the explanation, but we haven't seen it yet.

At least, our first reaction is that we should probably switch to using either Namestat data or the DNPrices data for our retail price collection, but I think we want to do a little bit more stress testing of the data to ensure that we're actually comparing apples to apples and there isn't anything odd about the way in which the data is being aggregated.

---

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Thanks, Greg. I know the answer to this question, but have you received any data from registrars at this point?

GREG RAFERT: We have received data from a couple of Chinese registrars. I think it's something like three or four, but the data were not comprehensive, so I would say that effectively, we haven't really received data from registrars.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Greg, I guess my question is if you got some more data from registrars directly, would it be possible to use that to sanity check against some of these other data sources or use your existing manual process to sanity check against these to make sure that they seem correct?

GREG RAFERT: Yeah, that's a good point. I certainly think we could use either. I'm guessing that we really won't receive much in the way from registrars. Assuming that's correct, I think a little bit of manual sanity checking is probably in order.

STAN BESEN: I have a quick reaction to what Greg said, if I may.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah, go ahead.

STAN BESEN: The good thing about what Greg is said is that apparently the prices are all for the same thing. He's suggesting that it's not because of differences in the bundle. That's the good part. The bad part is that the price variations are so wide that it's hard to talk about the price. If we went to analyze what factors determine, for example, the differences in competition among registrars lead to different levels of prices. It's a bit of a puzzle to me as to how we would define the price for a given registry because of the wide variation.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Thanks, Stan. One thing that Analysis Group did last year, I believe, look at price dispersion as opposed to absolute pricing. I would imagine that might be a useful technique, as well, when you look at the number of registrars to see if that has any effect, and/or try to look at roughly the variation around the mean or median to understand. Maybe it increases the range of available price options or something. Or I guess one thing we will have is registry wholesale data, so we could certainly look at what averages look like relative to the wholesale prices to see what markups look like.

GREG RAFERT: I haven't given this much thought, but one other option would be, you could imagine constructing a weighted average price for a given TLD based on the prices charged by the various registrars, but also the total number of registrations, just to get to a single price for the market.

---

Although this certainly does ignore this dispersion issue, which we did do a little bit of looking into last year.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Stan, you've got your hand up again.

STAN BESEN: Yes. Does anyone know why there's so much variation?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Jonathan's put into the chat that he pays different prices for similar domain names, and he can't explain why.

STAN BESEN: This is for the same domain name, purchased from different retailers.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I think there's a couple of different factors at work. One is that there are legacy registrars that charged more and that haven't been along longer, Network Solutions being the first one. That's an example of where I know I'm paying more to manage all my domain names at Network Solutions than I would if I had them all with GoDaddy. I'm likening it to getting Tide versus Walgreens brand laundry detergent. I'm not entirely sure if some of it is just none of it's enough money to be worth switching over to another provider. Another is I have a perception of GoDaddy that's different than I do of Network Solutions, legitimate or



---

illegitimate, based on their advertising, managements and everything like that.

Also, I think that I'm not entirely in agreement that it's exactly the same product. I know that some registrars try to differentiate themselves. There's specialized registrars like MarkMonitor that go out and charge \$1,000 per TLD because of additional services that they provide. This is not a ding on Greg. It's just a crazy Wild West market out there, but I don't know that we've done enough analysis to conclude that it's exactly the same services that are being provided by every registrar. But I can see that most of it is irrational. At least, it is on my part.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:

My reaction is that the market is still, for new TLDs in particular, is not probably as efficient as for .com, and in particular, I feel like there's a little bit of what I would call the Southwest effect going on. I believe in the airline industry, Southwest did a really good job for a long time of convincing people that they were always the cheap option and built in long-term relationships or patterns of purchasing with their consumers. Southwest isn't in most of the online aggregation tools, so you have to search separately for them. Other than the tool that Jonathan pointed us to today, the DNSPrices tool, I haven't seen any aggregation tool for domain registrations. You basically have to go to each registrar and search. If you become convinced that a certain provider is the cheapest or built an existing relationship with them and default going to them, you'll probably continue to register at that particular provider, just like I think a lot of people continue to buy airplane tickets on Southwest,

---

even though it's often not the case anymore that they're reliably the cheapest option on any given route.

I think there's some combination of, as Jonathan pointed out, none of the prices are that high in absolute terms. Certainly, if you have existing domains, there's a switching cost. Even just to switch to another registrar might be higher than the value of the domain, plus some amount of quality of marketing or how you've convinced people your pricing structure is might not actually match how cheap your prices are in reality.

Sorry, Stan. The one other thing I'll add is many registrars also use domains as a [loss] leader for other products. Depending on how much other stuff they have to sell you potentially, they may be more or less willing to take the margin on the domain name versus other products that they may be just luring you into to buy with the domain name.

All right, any other questions or comments about this topic? It sounds like, based on the discussion we've had so far, the Analysis Group will continue to take a look at this and likely use this to either supplement or be the primary tool that they'll use to take a look at registrar pricing data. We'll try to sanity check that either with data we actually get from registrars or manual analysis, if I'm summarizing correctly.

All right. Hopefully yes. If there's no other thoughts on this topic, we'll move on to the next one, which is the work plan, which we had up earlier and is back. Thank you to staff for putting this work plan together. This is an exciting work plan in that it gets us to a draft report

---

by... I assume this 15 September date at the bottom is 15 of October. Is that right, Alice?

ALICE JANSEN: Yeah, sorry. Yeah, that's a mistake. It's October.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay. Otherwise, there's a little backwards in time problem. It gets us to a draft report by the middle of October, and presumably keeps us on track to maybe not get done in 12 months, but closer to 12 months than 18, assuming that we think that the goals are realistic. One thing I'll note is obviously the work plan gets fuzzier the farther out from today that we go, but that's not surprisingly, probably.

Is the idea, Alice, that this would be a living document and that we would adjust it as we moved along? Do you want to maybe just walk us through it and tell us how the staff put this together and what the objectives behind the work plan are?

ALICE JANSEN: Yeah, Jordyn. This can be a living document, but it should also be considered as a roadmap as you progress through work. You can see it's structured using the topics, but also some steps, like doing the analysis and then defining conclusions and then producing interim recommendations. There are different milestones and steps for each topic.

---

Something else you might also want to consider as part of this is extending the duration of your biweekly calls. I think it's important for the team to have sufficient time to conduct work. We could look into a two-hour call, or 90 minutes if two hours sounds too much. I know everyone is very busy, but yes. This is the objective here.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Alice, I guess one thing that's missing for me, at least, is: are the milestones clearly laid out here? Because for example, we have on the calls, we would develop findings for topics one, two, and three. That happens over a couple of calls, but is the expectation that once we stop seeing that particular... Like after the July 6<sup>th</sup> call, we would expect to actually have the findings for topics one, two, and three?

ALICE JANSEN: Yes, but this also assumes that there will be some discussions on mailing lists.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Sure. I'm just wondering. The notion of milestones seems extremely helpful to me, but I also think it would be helpful to more clearly identify them in the work plan. For example, if there's a point at which we expect to have completed the findings for a particular set of topics that we would clearly have that laid out in the work plan. For example, you might say before July 20<sup>th</sup> or something like that, complete findings for topics one, two, and three.

---

ALICE JANSEN: Okay. Yes. I can refine this and use more of a completion [screen] for this. I can do that, yes.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, just to clearly lay out what we expect the milestones to be. I have a reaction to the substance of the work plan, but maybe wanted to open it up to the team to see if they have any thoughts on the work plan, either the substance or just general structure.

All right, I'll talk then. My inclination is that the hard part of our mission is going to be the findings for topics one, two, and three. Once we figure those out, I suspect the rest will be relatively more straightforward exercises or refinements of the general approach that we took in the earlier topics. I guess I would be surprised if, on these topics, we had to spend a large amount of time. Assuming we're being data-driven, once we have the findings, I'm hoping that the recommendations will be a relatively more straightforward part of the exercise, as well.

I think on balance, I would shift the work plan to have a little bit more time for those first three sets of findings, and a little compressed for the rest of the plan. I wonder if other folks on the call have thoughts about that. Maybe Stan in particular, you've identified in the past these notions of little projects that we would do to complete some of the findings. Let's say, Stan, we finished our market segmentation and said, "We wanted to look at whether there's competition for a particular market segment, for Chinese language registrants or something like that." Under this, we'd have roughly a month to get from identifying

---

market segmentation to having completed those exercises. Does that feel realistic to folks?

I see Jonathan's raised his hand, and [inaudible] Stan on the spot, as well. Go ahead, Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Jordyn. I guess it's difficult to predict, but I'm with you that I think that getting those numbers is going to be the hardest thing we do. It might be a little bit optimistic to suggest that the recommendations will just fall out of those findings. I think what the findings will help us do is more easily produce the measures of success for the recommendations. In other words, if we are data-driven in our problem identification or success identification, then once a recommendation is made, I think that we can be data-driven in how we suggest people look in the future at whether or not the recommendations worked. The recommendations themselves, I guess could be all over the map in terms of trying to figure out what to recommend to try and solve the problem that we've identified. We've [at least] identified one.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:

Thanks, Jonathan. Yeah, it's definitely possible I'm being overly optimistic. I guess I would have a follow-up comment, which would be at least in the areas of competition and consumer choice, as between getting solid findings versus solid recommendations, I would rather have the output of the review team be solid findings, especially since there is the subsequent procedures PDP happening in parallel to this process that could dovetail off our findings. Whereas if we have

---

recommendations that are not well-grounded in data, I would think that would be the less useful of the two.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Agreed completely. That's back to old school reviewing. I'm with you 100% on that one, Jordyn. I just obviously prefer not to choose, so it just may mean it takes longer. I think overall, I'm supportive of taking more time, probably. Maybe this is dependent on Stan's answer to develop and define this [in the first place].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: All right, great. Thanks, Jonathan. Stan.

STAN BESEN: I'm going to say at this point, these are quite general statements. I think Jordyn said the magic word before: projects. I think the next step has to be to have, under one, we have A, B, C, D, and we identify particular projects. Each of the projects, I would say, are ones in which we ask a specific empirical question and identify the data we use to answer it. At this point, these are very general, and it's not clear to me exactly what the specific projects that we have in mind under each of them.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Right. So we don't know how long it's going to take.

---

STAN BESEN: It's not only that. I would say that it's incumbent on us in the next step of this for us to try to identify projects under each of those, topic one, two, and three, that we can agree that we want to undertake. My view is we haven't yet done that.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, I would agree with that. My hope has been roughly that we – Maybe we should get this mapped into the work plan if there's agreement. By or at our face-to-face meeting in Washington next month, we will have settled this discussion around what the plausible definitions of markets that we're going to be working with are, and have a few different market definitions that we'll use in order to then define some projects around them for these individual questions that we're trying to answer. Go ahead.

STAN BESEN: But we can identify projects in parallel to defining markets.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I don't disagree with that as a matter of theory. Given the slow traction we've had in working offline – and maybe this is to Alice's point that we need to increase the call time – that we, as a matter of just bandwidth from the team, we may find that it's not possible to make progress in parallel.



---

STAN BESEN:

Let me make a proposal that each of us take some responsibility to try to identify specific projects and feed them in. I think it's hard to do this on a call. When I sit down, I think of a project, I can describe in a few sentences a project, the data I think we would need to do it, and what it's intended to show. I'm not the only person who has ideas like this. We should be trying to come up collectively with a set of projects. I worry that if we don't do that until... We can do that now. We don't have to wait until June. We can start doing it.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:

I agree. I agree we ought to be able to do that. So far, our ability to collaborate and make progress offline has been poor. We'll have to improve that if we want to... I take responsibility myself of being a little slow sometimes with turning stuff around. We'll get to our discussion of market definitions in a moment, but I feel like over the last couple of weeks, we've made very little progress on that topic, for example.

I like what you're saying. We'll have to work hard as a team to live up to the premise, I think. In any case, I do feel like I agree with what you're saying, Stan, which is that we probably want to go from... Along with the [produce interim] recommendations, it may be useful to have this project definition built into the work plan. Does that make sense, Alice?

ALICE JANSEN:

Yes. Just to clarify, Jordyn, can we extend the calls to 90 to 120 minutes?

---

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I tend to agree with Stan. I suspect we're not going to find it incredibly productive. The types of work that we need to do are not work that is likely going to be productive in a call with this many people. It is possible we need to have a lot more people working on their own or very small group collaborations that we don't have particularly good tools around. This gets back to, I think, Jonathan's original notion around collaboration tools. I think he was worried about e-mail in particular, but we don't have very good interactive ways to build some of these projects. We may just need to continue to think about our tools and think about how we're collaborating in smaller groups on some of things. I'm not convinced yet that our problem is that we don't have enough time on calls, but we'll see, maybe, Alice, after we jump into this next conversation on the market segment definitions, what the best way to approach that is because I think that will be emblematic of the types of discussions that we need to figure out how to drive.

ALICE JANSEN: Understood. Okay.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Any other thoughts on work plan? Jonathan's hand is still up. Is that an old hand, Jonathan? All right. Any other thoughts on the work plan? Otherwise, we'll move on.

I guess the final takeaways on the work plan are, Alice, I think we should give more time to the findings for topics one, two, and three, and we should also build in as interim milestones the project definitions that Stan spoke to.

---

ALICE JANSEN: I think notes capture the outcome of the discussion, but if not, let me know. Thank you.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: That's right. Our last topic today is to, once again, pick up on the discussion that we had last week about trying to develop some plausible definitions of markets. As we discussed on last week's call, we were going to look at four big buckets of markets. Markets defined based on topic areas, markets defined based on language, markets defined based on geography, and markets defined based on new versus incumbent registrations.

I assigned some people on the subteam to each of these subteams and solicited volunteers to be repertoires for each of the subteams. Waudo volunteered to be the repertoire for the geographic subteam. Thanks, Waudo. No one else volunteered, and if I were to bet, I would guess we haven't made much progress on this overall.

Do we have anything to report back as to progress in this area over the last couple of weeks? Stan's got his hand raised.

STAN BESEN: This is a very much work in progress, but we have made some progress. This isn't the final report of our subteam. This is on the area of topics. If everyone remembers, the Analysis Group report had a table that identified ten groups where TLDs were grouped together in what might plausibly be markets. For example, there's beer, there's education,

---

there's photography, there's legal. We started with this list. By the way, for each of those, the Analysis Group calculated shares based on the then-existing data.

Our thought was the following. We would start with this list. We would see whether there are, for those ten groups, we would determine whether we agreed with the groupings. That is, whether we thought other things might be added or some of those might be deleted. That's refining the Analysis Group list.

Then the second thought was to see whether we might identify other groups in addition to the ones that Analysis Group identified in their table. Just to give you some flavor – again, I'm not roping David and Jamie in on this, but this was initially my first pass. In addition to the ones on the original group, I have science and technology, finance, expert consulting, medical, dental, and cars as possible additions to the list. We're still in the process of refining this, but we had the advantage over everybody else of starting with the Analysis Group list. We're working with that and trying to refine it.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:

Thanks, Stan. I'm going to mark you as the volunteer repertoire for your sub-subteam based on this.

STAN BESEN:

I was afraid of that. I was afraid of that.

---

JORDYN BUCHANAN: But thank you. That's a helpful report. It seems like an extremely helpful approach. Stan, one of the things you'll be doing, I gather, in addition to looking at the new TLDs would be to look at, for example, legacy TLDs or even possibly ccTLDs. I gave the example in the education one of adding .edu or things like ac.uk or ac.nz, at least for registrants in those geographies those might be relevant alternatives. Certainly .edu seems like a relevant one from the legacy [inaudible].

STAN BESEN: None of this is straightforward. At this point, we don't have market data. It's the sort of thing you'd have liked the Nielsen people to have asked. For example, when you signed up for .bar, did you consider .beer? Did you consider .xyz? We don't have that. There's lots of possible permutations here. I take your point. We don't want to have an enormous number of them, but again, we probably shouldn't have a list that's too short because we don't want to hang our head on a single set of market definitions.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I guess my point is I think Analysis Group limited themselves to just defining these groupings based on the new gTLDs. They didn't make an attempt to see whether there were existing options that were available to registrants in any of these topic areas.

STAN BESEN: I take your point.

---

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Jonathan's got his hand raised.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Hey, Jordyn. I was just going to speak up and remind Stan and everyone else that the second registrant survey is not yet in the field. If we have a couple of questions that we think will be really helpful to ask based on a particular branch or something like that, let's make sure that we build them into the conversation.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: That's a great point, Jonathan. I think part of the reason why I would think there's some urgency around defining these market segments is that we could go and ask. We could validate our opinions, basically, through the Nielsen report by saying, "Here's what we think are alternatives that you might consider. Does this actually match your perception as a registrant?"

STAN BESEN: I like Jonathan's point. The question is, could we ask Nielsen to ask somebody, "You signed up for .beer. What else did you consider?" Can we do that?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: We're going to have a call with Nielsen in 20 minutes.

---

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes, Stan, we can, and we can probably base it on people. This survey is just people who have registered something. That may not include people that haven't used new TLDs yet, presumably. It could be that we will have difficulty determining. I think there will be some challenges. We have a call coming up, but right now, we don't know if they've registered craftbeer.com, if they considered craft.beer, necessarily. We have a call coming up, but I think the question isn't going to be as simple as that, Stan. We're going to have to figure out what triggers that question.

STAN BESEN: I agree.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I do think it is possible, though we'd probably have different upfront screening to figure out who the intake into the survey was. Maybe we need to do multiple variations on the registrant survey, which could be a place where we spend some of our budget, but you could imagine seeding it with a list of people who registered in .beer, having a beer-specific survey or having a question being, "Have you registered a domain name in .beer?" And then for those people, having a branch that asks these questions. We could talk with Nielsen about how to actually get to the right set of people in order to ask those questions, but it doesn't seem implausible to me that we could test some of our hypotheses through actual survey data.

All right. Thanks, Stan, for that readout from the topic-based sub-subteam. I think that sounds like exactly the right approach overall to

---

identify whether there's any additional topic areas other than the ones that Analysis Group included. Once that's done, also, may take a look and see what the right set of TLDs in each of the topic areas are. So thanks. That sounds like a great approach, and hopefully we'll look forward to seeing the final list.

Waudu has volunteered as the repertoire for the geographic subteam. I know there's been a very little bit of e-mail traffic, but I don't think we've made a lot of progress. Waudu made a definition in here today. Waudu, do you want to let us know how the geographic sub-subteam is doing?

Waudu's typing. Give him just a moment. While Waudu's typing, can I just ask, is anyone from the language group interested in being the repertoire for your group? We may have to appoint a volunteer. Arm-wrestle offline or something like that.

Waudu's typed into the chat that he doesn't have audio out, but he's given a draft definition that could be refined. I've got [Dejan].

DEJAN DJUKIC: Hi. Can you hear me?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yes. Thanks, Dejan. Go ahead, Dejan.



---

DEJAN DJUKIC: Okay. So far, we've started with creating a list of strings which might be language-based. We still don't have a draft of definition, but first thing we want to do is to create the complete list of [inaudible] language-based domain names. We agree that all IDN strings are for sure language-based, but there are also the other strings which are [not] IDN that are language-based. After we create the list, it will be in the next few days, we will start with the definition and we will have it, I hope, very soon.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Awesome. Thanks, Dejan. That's helpful. Dejan, since you're talking now, can we mark you as the volunteer repertoire for the language-based group?

DEJAN DJUKIC: Okay.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Thanks, Dejan. Dejan, the other question I have for you is do you guys have a list of the IDN TLDs? That obviously seems like a good starting point for that exercise.

DEJAN DJUKIC: I find it on the ICANN website where are all [inaudible] strings.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Right. You can just filter by IDNs?

---

DEJAN DJUKIC:                    Yeah.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:            Okay, perfect. Yeah, that obviously sounds like the right approach. Yes, you're right that there's a bunch of Latin strings. For example, there's several German TLDs that are obviously not IDNs.

DEJAN DJUKIC:                    Yes, or Spanish or Chinese.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:            Yeah. There's a number of Chinese [inaudible], as well. Okay, that's great. Another thing that might be helpful on the Chinese front, in particular, is there's a small number of registries that are specializing in Chinese TLDs. I could send you a couple of those. It might be a good starting point just to look at those registries to see if they have [inaudible] transliterations.

DEJAN DJUKIC:                    Okay, it would be great.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:            Okay. Thanks, Dejan. That sounds like good progress. Jonathan's got his hand up and has been patiently waiting. Jonathan.

---

JONATHAN ZUCK: You don't know that I've been patient. I just wanted to speak up for Waudu. We're on the geographic names team, so we've bandied about this definition and very recently talked about what our process would be, but we haven't started to parse through the list of names yet to actually put them into those buckets yet. But we came up with the filter that we would use to do that, so I think we can get that done in the next week.

I guess one question I have is, is there a list of delegated domains? Maybe Analysis Group has this or ICANN does. In an offline document that we could work from as opposed to the webpage.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: That's a great question, Jonathan. I was going to ask that, and then had a follow-up question which maybe we can bundle together. ICANN staff, does the tool that you guys have allow us to identify TLDs that you guys have identified as being geographic identifiers?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Hi, Jordan. This is Eleeza. I can answer that. We've created a few Excel sheets, and unfortunately our metrics website has a number of bugs in it, so it's not up there now, but we have a few metrics where we're capturing this in different ways. Right now, we have a really large Excel file that we're calling our master file. It has all of the delegated strings, who the registry operator is, who the backend is, where they're located, what the languages are so you can sort and filter in a number of different ways. The file is really big, and we're actually working on updating it now. We're turning it into an access file because it's just so

---

huge that I think we've exceeded Excel's capacity at this point. We do have something that I'm hoping to get to you before the end of this week. You should be able to use that to sort and filter for language, for geographic region, and so on and so forth.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: And Eleeza, you say for geographic region. That includes an indicator of whether ICANN considers it to be a geographic identifier or not?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: That's a good question. I don't know that we've categorized it that way, but we might be able to add that as another category.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: At some point, someone at ICANN had to categorize it as such because as part of the geographic review process, you had to determine whether or not it was on the region list.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Right. The problem is a lot of the stuff we are capturing from ICANN disparate databases, but they're not all in one place. That's why we're building this whole table where we can have everything in one location. It might be easier to search for things to answer these types of questions.

Waudu just pointed out, I'm also looking at the new gTLD application status page. That's a helpful way to sort, as well.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay. Maybe, Eleeza, if you can take this as an action item to identify some way for us to get the list of TLDs that ICANN considers to be geographic identifiers and would require support of the relevant authorities in order to be delegated. That's not going to be the full list that we want to consider, but would be a helpful seed, at least, for the geographic subteam.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Okay.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: But it sounds like Waudo may already be able to point us at that, which would be great.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Yeah, I think I just found it, as well. I will share that with you and explain how you can get to the geographic list by looking at delegated strings.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: All right. That sounds great. Jonathan hinted that we might be able to, within a week, make some good progress on the geographic side. Does it sound plausible to everyone that we could do a further readout on the progress of these efforts at next week's plenary call? Jonathan's trying to get us to do more substantive updates on the calls as opposed to procedural ones, so that might be a good way to do it.

---

All right. I'm going to hope the answer to that is yes and assume that Stan, Waudu, and Dejan are going to be ready to help provide some update. Ideally speaking, we would have draft segmentation exercises from each of the sub-subteams of the plenary call for broader discussion.

Great. Eleeza's just given us a pointer to find the [geo] TLDs.

Any other discussion points on this topic right now? All right, I'm going to loop back to our previous discussion of data projects that Stan had raised on the hopes that we can do some of this in parallel. Stan, I'm going to put you on the spot again. Do you have thoughts on what's the level of granularity we need in order to define these projects? Is this just like a sentence or two, a paragraph, or is it more like the data tables you put together previously for some of the [inaudible] or competition readings within a TLD?

I may have put Stan too much on the spot. All right, I'll work with Stan offline.

STAN BESEN:

I'm sorry, I was muted. I think these should have, at the very least, they should be hypotheses. Then the types of data one would want to have to address the hypotheses. These are not dissertation prospectuses, but they've got to be at least a few sentences describing why we're doing it and what the kind of data we would use and how we might interpret the answers. Maybe it's a page, maybe less, but it has to be sufficiently detailed so that someone else picking it up would know why we're doing it and what data we need to address the hypotheses.

---

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Thanks, Stan. Maybe what we can do is I'll try to sync up with you offline and we can put together an example or two and send them around to the ground, and then we can use that to solicit additional projects from the team.

STAN BESEN: Did I just volunteer again?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Not as directly. We'll figure out how to do it. Possibly.

STAN BESEN: Thank you.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Little did you know what you were getting into when you signed up for this project.

STAN BESEN: I now do know.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: We've reached the end of our agenda. We have five minutes to go, but I don't think we have to use the five minutes if we're at the end of the

---

agenda unless anyone else has any other topics, I'll wrap up the call at this point. Last chance for commentary or questions.

JONATHAN ZUCK: This is Jonathan. The Nielsen subteam call is the very next call. Is Stan on that subteam, or do we want to invite him to be on that call?

STAN BESEN: Jonathan, I can't do that. I have a speaking engagement across town in a little while, so I can't stay.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. I think we get what you're asking. This is probably not the last Nielsen subteam call, but we'll try to communicate it and report back to you about what they say.

STAN BESEN: Thank you.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Thanks, everyone. We'll wrap up this call of the Competition and Consumer Choice subteam. For those of you who are on the Nielsen call, it sounds like we're going to be on this same Adobe Connect experience, so feel free to hang out. If you're not on the Nielsen subteam call, then we'll consider your service for the day complete, and thank you for your time.



**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**