

---

RECORDED VOICE: This meeting is now being recorded.

JORDYN BUCHANNAN: Thanks everyone. And now it is May 25<sup>th</sup>. This is the competition and consumer choice sub-team of the CCT review. I'm Jordyn Buchannan, chairing today's call, and we'll start off with a quick request that, or question. Has anyone got updates to their statements of interest?

All right, no. Looks like on the call, we've got Jonathan Zuck, myself, Kaili Kan, Karen Mulberry, Megan Richards, Stan Besen, and Waudo Siganga. And there is staff support.

The definition, and it looks like Dan has just joined us as well. In addition, I think the agenda is being presented. In the big section of the meeting today, the agenda is, first of all, doing what we're doing now, which is welcome.

Second, review the work that we have done on our markets segmentation work. Then third, to review the project lists that is around last week. And see if folks have feedback on that, and importantly to start to align it to the data forces that we have available. And then finally, and then related to identifying the next steps.

Is there any other topic that anyone else would like to talk to on today's call?

Okay. Let's go ahead and start then. So the first agenda item, is the discussion of our sub-sub-teams on market segmentation efforts. As a

---

*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.*

---

reminder, we have three of those. Market space on topic areas, market space on geography, and market space on language. And oh, Megan has asked for... Before we get into this, Megan has asked for a overview of yesterday's meeting that she couldn't attend, nor could I.

So maybe we'll add that to any other business, Megan.

Okay. Back to the market definition discussion. Why don't we get quick status updates, and we'll see if there is discussion points on the market segmentation efforts. And we'll do this by the order that shows on the agenda. I think we have rapporteurs for each of these subgroups now, and for the topic area sub-sub team. I think Stan is the rapporteur. So Stan, can you update us on your efforts?

STAN BESEN: Nothing new to report. There is a list being circulated, and I'm waiting for responses.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay. Stan, was it you? Someone sent around, yesterday, another list, topic area from the 101 domain site, I believe.

STAN BESEN: I actually did. That's correct. [CROSSTALK]

...for our purposes, so I thought that might give somebody some additional ideas.

---

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay. So you're working off the previous you put together.

STAN BESEN: Yeah, it was circulated a while back, and I don't want to put it forward as our sub-sub-team's response until I hear from the other members of my sub-sub-team.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: All right. So I'll just ask the other folks on Stan's sub-sub-team to get back to him. I would like to have working market segmentations that we can start to align the projects to by the time we're together in Washington. So that's in about 10 days. So hopefully everyone can get back to Stan shortly.

So the next sub-sub-team is the geographic based one. Waudu, do you want to give us an update on that effort?

Waudu, if you're talking, we can't hear you yet.

All right. Still can't hear him. So I'm going to pass by and see if Waudu is muted, his audio is not working otherwise, I can maybe jump in...

WAUDO SIGANGA: Hello? Hello? Can you hear me? Okay, sorry. It took a little bit of time to connect. So we had a small sub-sub-team of Jordyn and Jonathan. What we have decided is that in our definition of geographic markets, we are going to concentrate on the geo-political and administrative

---

boundaries, the domain names that are registered to just be of reference to specifically political and administrative boundaries.

So we are going to not to take into consideration those ones that are, you know, based on ethnic, or linguistic, or cultural communities. Of course, this will give us some problems with a few [inaudible] that perhaps seep into the two categories. So our definition for this particular sub-group, we just had it to concentrate on political and administrative boundaries.

Then there is a little bit of [inaudible] that we're going to do. Maybe I'll just tell you, as part of our planning for the sub-sub group, we are planning parts for the next presentation to talk about the population shared in the new TLD markets. And a few other things that we're going to look at regarding the TLDs that are falling on the political and the administrative boundaries.

I think that's it. Unless, of course, my two colleagues would like to add something.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: This is Jordyn. [Inaudible]... Well, I think we're getting a bit of an echo from you.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Yeah, I'm switching off.

---

JORDYN BUCHANAN:

Thank you. So one thing, Waudu has already done some work. Well, he talked about population shares. Waudu has already done some work to identify the top gTLDs by total market shares. They're generally quite small as a share of total market. I think he identified that...

I think Waudu had identified that dot NYC was the largest of the new TLDs, with 77,000 registrations, that's 0.43% of the total new gTLD registrations. So our goal in looking at the population share was to see how, what fraction of the, I guess world's population, but I think even more helpful would be the registrant population based New York City representative.

We'll see what that means about how geo TLDs were doing in terms of potential registration dates. So just to provide some context behind that.

Any questions for Waudu or for sub-sub-team?

All right. Then we'll move to the language based group. And I think Dan had volunteered to be the rapporteur for that group.

DAN:

Yeah, thank you. We're still working on the list of language based strings, but we had some progress with draft definition. And I will send in the chat our draft definition and the other different group, with their comments. But this [inaudible] we are not 100% agree on that definition. So we are still working as well on the list and on definition. [Inaudible] right now.

---

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Thanks Dan. And when you say, thanks. And [inaudible] looking at language based strings, does that just mean you're looking at strings that are in languages or that would appeal to languages other than English? Or are you looking somehow for like a dot Spanish sort of TLD?

Or would you just look for something like [inaudible] would be an example of a Portuguese string?

DAN: Yeah. We're looking on strings in other language than English, and also include that all IDN strings.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Sure. Okay.

All right, thanks. That's helpful. Any questions for Dan?

DAN: Here is a draft of the definition.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: All right, Dan has put a draft of the definition on the chat, if anyone has any feedback on that. I'll give you one minute to read it. Anyone on phone only? Someone is on phone only, two people.

For me, that definition looks fine. It's just a question of identifying them and then gathering them by language.

---

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Jonathan had his hand up.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Sorry, what?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Jonathan had his hand up.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Oh, Jonathan did have his hand up? Oh, scroll down. Sorry about that. Jonathan, go ahead.

JONATHAN ZUCK: No problem. I wrote it. I see in the definition something about spoken language in countries and territories. And it seems to me that, if it's, there is already a geographic thing that linguistically, it might transcend national boundaries. I mean, like you know, French is spoken in a lot of different places. Spanish is spoken in a lot of different places. And I... Conceivably, a linguistic based market definition could be to transcend national boundaries.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Thanks Jonathan. Yeah, I suppose the particular example of that might also be someone had registered a Latin TLD, which I don't think anyone did, that might be something that's not spoken in any country really, but still would be linguistically based.

---

That makes [inaudible], do you have a thought on the tight of the country and territories?

DEJAN DJUKIC:

One thought [inaudible] from this, in this moment. I'll discuss it [inaudible]... I'm not sure at the moment, but [inaudible]... But generally, languages are in some of this country a jump, and mentioned [inaudible] Spanish. I think Spanish is one of the official languages, more many countries in South America. Also French is some countries in Africa, I think, official.

Maybe it's not the first language, but it's the second [inaudible] because that country speaks and can [inaudible]... public administration on that language. But maybe there is a reason for [inaudible]... to consider it.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks Dejan. Jordyn, if you don't mind, I'll follow-up a little bit. I think part of the source of my question is, as we explore the choice issue, which is about potential registrants having a choice of places to go for second level TLDs, right? And at the same time, we are in the application evaluation process, looking at why there has been under application, another word I'm looking for, under participation in the program for the developing world.

We might still find that enterprising people in the global north have created linguistic based strings that present choice and that are made available to folks that are for where there isn't a registered operator, or registered service provider, but still will create a new choice for that



---

market. And so that's why, like I might be creating a Spanish space, you know, top level domain here in the United States, that has in fact created choice for folks that are elsewhere, if that makes sense.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:

Thanks Jonathan. Sounds like Dan is going to take that back and speak some more with Megan and Kaili, and hopefully incorporate that feedback. I agree. On the geographic group, we had looked at the Wikipedia definition of a gTLD, and it included factors such as language and ethnic group. And as Waudo indicated, we're trying to not include those other factors just to keep the definition sort of truly focus on the geographic scope.

So it may make sense on the language side to do the same thing and not incorporate these other factors that potentially overlap. But I see Kaili has his hand up as well now, so go ahead Kaili.

KAILI KAN:

Yes. Well, I agree with proposed [inaudible] proposed by [inaudible], and well, as a language especially in Asia-Pacific language, is especially diverse, and many of them not in Latin characters or alphabet, there are many, not even spelled language, for example Chinese, but also for example Chinese also has a so-called Pin-Yun version. Pin-Yun is an assistant for pronouncing Chinese characters.

And some of those gTLDs are in China actually using Pin-Yun. So probably it's the most diverse and complex in the Asia-Pacific region, so that means there is some careful consideration. Thank you.

---

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Thanks Kaili. That's a great point. And maybe just to give people good example of that, Google applied for three variations of China, the Chinese TLD based on the Chinese translation of Google, which is [foreign language]. I'm not pronouncing it right probably. But there is two IDNs, both traditional and a simplified Chinese IDN TLDs for [foreign language], but then also a Pin-Yun, which is just G-U-G-E in ASCII.

And that's intended to be a Chinese transliteration of the Google, and I would certainly that ought to caught as a Chinese [inaudible] even though it's written in an ASCII script.

KAILI KAN: And in addition to further complicate the issue, is that the Chinese has a [inaudible] form, which is you [inaudible] in mainland China, and also, I believe in Singapore or Taiwan and Hong Kong, although Chinese, but they have [inaudible]... Well, so let the purists of the same caption will look different, and in different written forms, so well, it's pretty complicated. Thank you.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Thanks Kaili. I guess that raises the question of whether we consider simplify the different written forms of Chinese to qualify as different markets, even though spoken language might be across the... It's an interesting question for the sub-sub-team to take up, as to whether simplified and traditional TLDs on the IDN side ought to be count as the same language or separate languages for market definition purpose.

---

KAILI KAN: Excuse me, hello? It's just one more comment on that. Well both Taiwan and mainland China have agreed that no matter simplified form or [inaudible] form, they are both the same language. However, I believe the IDN is not exactly fully [inaudible] yet. So, I don't know what is the current status, because that is [inaudible] for quite a few years so far. Thank you.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah. Thanks Kaili. So it sounds like the language group has a little bit of a challenge in this particular topic. So look to see what you guys come up with. So, just to recap what I said at the top of the call. I would like to agree for a set of deliverables for each of the sub-sub-teams by the time we all convene in Washington in June.

And what I was going to propose is that we have managed, by that point, to firm up the definitions, and then also have each of the times with a proposed set of market segments to use in terms of analysis. So for example, the topic area based group might, you know, have, I don't know how many on Stan's list already, but it might have 10 topic based clusters that we can use for the performance of analysis.

And the geography group might use each of the cities that there are TLDs for, or maybe to define other geographic regions, including ones where cities don't apply... For example, I think that in Germany, there is a TLD for Byron which is more like a state, or a larger geographic region, that [inaudible] but it's a bigger region, so it might be useful to look at some of those bigger divisions as well.

---

But in any case, maybe 10 or 20, however many geographic segmentations make sense, and similarly, on the language side, I would imagine that we might be almost be able to be exhaustive, so there is probably less languages represented, fewer languages representative groups, but whatever the sub-team is the, the sub-sub-team thinks is the right set of segments.

So come to DC with both a definition that we're using, that we can put in our final report, as well as proposed individual segments that we can do analysis on. Does that seem like a reasonable goal to everyone?

All right. Seeing concurrence in the chat, so we will assume that everyone agrees with Megan and Jonathan that that's a reasonable approach. All right. So, we have some homework then between now and DC, hopefully we can get everyone on. And in the meantime, I'm going to move on to the next topic on the agenda, which is to review the project list, and then start to consider that relative to the relevant data sources, and what we need to do in terms of next steps there.

So Stan put together the project list, I put it into a Google Doc which I shared last week, I don't think I've seen any additional edits to the project list, unfortunately. But maybe Stan, could I ask you to quickly run through the objectives of the project list, and maybe a quick recap of the ones that are already represented there.

STAN BESEN:

At this point, it's my project list. As Jordyn points out, no one has responded to it. I was hoping that I would get both comments on these and suggestions for additional projects, but for better or for worse, this

---

is where I am at this point. And these are fairly straightforward projects. I try to identify what data were required to respond to each of them. In a couple of cases, I see it suggested that we might not be able to do some of these, but I put them down on the list.

I don't want to go through the whole list, because it will take me a while. Everybody is seated, and I'm just curious as to what kind of responses people have to that, where they have additions.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:

That's a good place to start. All right, I will open the floor. Does anyone have thoughts on the project list that Stan suggested? I guess the context I'll add is that we were trying to use this as a seed, as Stan suggested, for folks to either edit or importantly suggest additional projects, but we wanted to get the examples of how these project lists could be scoped such that they could be acted on by staff, or analysis group, or whoever we thought the right group to actually perform some of this analysis was.

So, one thing I'll ask is feedback from the sub-team, but I may also try to get some feedback from staff as to what they think these [inaudible] well enough that they can actually be executed on. So, let's go ahead and first get the feedback on... Actually, I'm going to reverse that. I wonder if anyone from... It looks like Greg is not on the call today so we can't get feedback from the analysis group, but from the staff side, have you guys have a chance to review Stan's list?

And do these look well specified enough that we think that, assuming that we had existing data sets, that we could either staff, or analysis

---

group, or maybe we need to hire someone else to perform the analysis could actually sort of crunch these numbers.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:

Sure. This is Eleeza. I can [inaudible] that. So, I'll just scroll them one by one. Under the project one, category I think Stan note this in his footnotes, these are all numbers that we do have that we can provide from the monthly transaction reports, such as Stan notes, we can provide those publically after they've been, three months after they've been submitted. There are other sources for coming up with different registration numbers.

But that seems reasonable to me. Under the second project, excuse me, for the concentration ratios and HHI's, I think this, the data for this, I'm not sure this is, maybe that's done by analysis group. That's not by staff, or perhaps calculated by the team itself. So I have to think about that one a little bit more.

Scrolling forward. On the third one, the price analysis, depending on how many prices you want to look at, obviously this is the data that analysis group is gathering. I [inaudible] access to this, so this would have to come from them as well. And similarly for the fourth ones.

And I'm sorry, I've looked at all of these. I just need to look at it again to remind myself of the responses.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:

Eleeza, it's Jordyn. I just wanted to clarify. I think the goal here is not like whether, I don't think we need to, at this point, determine like

---

whether it should be staff or analysis group or something else doing the work, or whether the data is available at this point. We're just asking the question, are these well specified enough that we agree...?

Like for example, in number one, you said that, I think, that data is available, that staff will do it, which is enough definition from this description that Stan's given that you did form that work.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:

Yeah, I certainly would begin to do that. And I feel like we answered some of these questions in the Google sheet that you put together, Jordyn, with the required data and the data sources when we talked about what was available, and I think pretty much everything that's in this document maps back to that. And I indicated there, you know, what's available and what could be done with those data sources.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:

Right. Okay, so I think we can have... We'll get to in a minute the discussion of data availability. And I think maybe offline, Eleeza, we should have a conversation about sort of identifying if we want to proceed with these projects, who should do them and what do we need should these staff analysis group, do we need third parties to the group itself?

I just mostly wanted to get a general sense of what this seem like the right level of specificity as to be able to take action if needed, sounds like the answer to that is yes. So this is a good template for us to use at least.

---

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Yes, I would agree.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay, great. So I see in the meantime, Kaili has raised his hand. So Kaili, go ahead.

KAILI KAN: Thank you. Well I just, just to clarify. So basically where it's going into [inaudible], two calculations. One is using for all registrants, and the second calculation, we'll be using the [inaudible], is that correct?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Are you talking about project number one? Right Kaili?

KAILI KAN: Well, actually that is the first line, perform all calculations using data for both all registrants and all [N-POC?] registrants. Then we're going to do two calculations, just to clarify if my understanding is correct or not. Thank you.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay. That's a good question Kaili. Is that right [inaudible] of the sub-bullets you have one and really 1A. One would be number of registrants over the number of registrants, new versus all, and then you'd [agree?] with that on [non-parked?]?



---

Can't hear you Stan, you may be on mute.

STAN BESEN: Jordyn, are you asking me that question?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, sorry. I think Kaili is asking to clarify what that one is.

STAN BESEN: Yeah. The reason I put it up at the top is that I intend for it to apply to every project. The reason is there are a large number of parked domains, according to one of the data sources. And it seems to me, at least when I think about them, it might be appropriate to put those in a different category, and that data source provides the data in both ways, we could easily calculate, do every calculation, proposed data sets. So for both sets of data.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay, that makes sense. Thanks Kaili. So Stan, I had another question about the product, so I'll jump in, since there is no one else in the queue. In project one, for example, you talk about number of registrants, and I think of a registrant as an individual who may have one or more domain names registered. Are you thinking about this as number of registrants? Or as number of domain names?

---

STAN BESEN: Domains. In fact, sometimes the co-registrants are NTLD stats refers to them as domains, and that's what I mean.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay. I think that's probably an easier definition, otherwise we would have to somehow correlate back the domains registered to individual registrants, which is probably a challenging exercise.

STAN BESEN: You're quite right. And they call them domains, but I believe in other context, these are some type of purchase registrants.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Right. Okay. So we may want to come up with as part of [inaudible], Stan, and I could maybe take a pass at doing it, a set of definitions at the top, just so we can all agree on what the units of measure that we're using further down are.

STAN BESEN: In many cases, of course, it's going to be dictated by the way the data are assembled.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Right, yeah, agreed. All right, any...? Do other folks have questions or comments for Stan on the project list that we put together so far?

---

STAN BESEN:                     Actually, I would just ask people to go over this again, and I don't pretend that this is complete. Probably if I had more time, I would have added more projects. So, I would very much appreciate other people's thoughts about additional projects that we should be undertaking.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:             Yeah, absolutely. So that was the next thing I was going to suggest. One question I have for you Stan, just to try to understand how we should be looking at this. So you have a price analysis in project four, and you have a volume analysis in sort of project one, or market share analysis in project one. In your mind, would it be a separate project to sort of intersect those two and look at the relationship between price and volume?

Or is that implied by the fact that we have those other projects that was...?

STAN BESEN:                     I think of them as two different types of analysis. The ones, like for example, one and two, are I think of it as market structure, sort of, you would describe concentration, okay? And that's a way of characterizing the structure of the market. The price analysis, which I think is a general matter is harder to do for a whole series of reasons, is what economists usually talk about as performance.

And the analysis would be simplest terms, trying to relate the degree of concentration to the observed level of prices. And so I think of those as,

---

they used some of the same data, but they're, one of them just looks at structure, and the other looks at outcomes.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:

Thanks. So, I guess it's not obvious to me, just looking at project three, and so if there is a... It looks like we're looking at prices and getting data on that, but not necessarily relating it to the volume or the outcomes of the...

STAN BESEN:

That's true of project three. Project three is a... You're quite right. Project three is an attempt to describe what prices look like. And I'm particularly interested there in the question of whether or not the entry of new gTLDs has had any observable effect on the prices charged by legacy gTLDs. I'm not sure we can do that, because I'm not sure we actually have access to those data, but I would be interested in that.

Sub two and three under that, are basically an attempt to sort of, again, to describe what prices look like in the new and legacy, well new gTLDs. Project four is really, project four sub two, is really an attempt to do what I described earlier, which is to say, in cases where there is more concentration among registrars, for a given registry, are the observed markups higher?

Is there a relationship between the observed markups and the extent to which this competition among registrars for a given registry?

---

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay, thanks Stan. So I guess it might be either a separate project or a separate bullet to say, let's look at, so retail prices per TLD and see whether that's related to the number of registrations in that TLD.

STAN BESEN: Yes. That's correct. But again, I think this all uses the same data. I mean, in all cases we're talking about collecting data on, if you like, market structure, or shares, or something like that, and prices. I think the price analysis, while we're talking about this, is going to be very hard. For example, one thing that struck me when I looked at the data source that Jonathan identified earlier, was how variable the retail prices are for a given registry.

That actually is sort of a very serious problem to try to overcome in terms of analysis, because there is nothing like, it's not easy to describe what the price is that you're analyzing.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, that's a great point. I think, it maybe that we'll have to look at other factors. My impression is certainly that some of the TLDs that have very high registration volumes, at least the wholesale price is very low. If I would guess that if we were able to get the data together, we would see a fairly strong correlation between these lower priced TLDs and volume.

Not exclusively. Some of them have achieved success through other factors such as marketing and maybe the quality of TLD. But certainly there is a number of TLDs that are high up the registration volume list,

---

that much, are very low priced, at least in a large number of their domains. So that [CROSSTALK]...

STAN BESEN:

...small point here. Some of what I have in mind here are, I think are often called descriptive statistics. They try an attempt to describe behavior, just either respect the price or shares. We can just describe them as best we can what the markets look like. A more complicated analysis, is when you're describing just a moment ago, which is describing, or analyzing behavior.

That's just inherently harder as a general matter, and it's generally more challenging here because of data issues. But I put those in different categories. We may not get beyond descriptive statistics in our final report. I think that's a real possibility.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:

Thanks Stan. That's a helpful clarification. All right, any other comments, questions, suggestions at this point before we turn to homework on the project list?

All right, it looks like no. So Alice has asked in the chat, what the deadline you would like to propose for comments on the project list? I think once again, I would like to spend some time in our DC meeting sort of talking about how we're actually going to perform these projects, or in some cases maybe we could even ask for some initial analysis on this in DC.

---

So why don't we set a deadline for....? Why don't we ask for people to try and take a look at this this week? And certainly by a week from today, so I guess that would be the date of our next plenary call, try to provide some feedback. So I'll ask everyone to read the project list, and please try to think of additional projects or analysis that you would like to see performed.

I think if we don't identify this fairly soon, it's just not going to happen for this report. So if you're wondering something, or if you think it would be helpful to know something as we put together an analysis, I think we're going to need to get this identified in projects right away so that we can achieve the rest of our milestones.

All right. Okay, so that runs us through our agenda, but we had added to any other business a summary of yesterday's discussion on the application and evaluation process. I'm wondering if someone that was on that call yesterday might be able to volunteer to speak to, give us a brief summary of that call?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:

Jordyn, I can speak to that. Dan and Waudu were on as well, but I'm happy to give a summary of particularly what we're going to be doing on that.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:

Thanks.

---

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:

So we had setup these calls initially based on the break out groups that you all had identified with at the Los Angeles meeting, breaking out the program implementation where you report different chapter sections. I think Jordyn, you had done, and you know, I think we didn't have a clear... We haven't set clear expectations for these groups.

So the first group that met was actually on Monday, excuse me, and they discussed three chapters having to do with the applicant support program related issues. And that was actually, it was a useful discussion, it helped us wrap our heads a little bit more around how to reach those who either withdrew from the application process, or those who didn't actually apply.

Yesterday's discussion was focused on two chapters, three and four on objection procedures and contention resolution. And it end up being kind of a short discussion. We talked a little bit about these topics in the ones of what the team is interested in learning about, and we decided to regroup. But after talking it over amongst staff, and having a conversation with Jonathan about his expectations on what this portion of the review would do, we decided to hold off on holding these calls until we get to a point of where we have a little bit of the better structure understanding how we want to approach this portion of the review.

So one task the staff has taken on, I think at Jonathan's very good suggestion, is to look at all of the different data sources we've come across so far, including all the ones that are recommended on the list [inaudible] review, and trying to map those back to the sort of high level



---

brainstorming research questions that you come up with at your Los Angeles meeting.

So we can see what we have and what maps back to those particular questions, and then allow for this discussion and analysis to go from there. So I think I'll stop there. Stan, or Waudu, or Jonathan, since you're on, if you want to add anything to that.

Or if not, I'm happy to take any questions.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:

Thanks Eleeza. It looks like that answered Megan's questions as well. So is the plan then, Eleeza, will we be discussing this more at the DC meeting or on the plenary to figure out how to proceed with the sub-sub-teams on the front of the application analysis, application evaluation project? I see Jonathan has his hand up, so I'll take it over to him.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Hey Jordyn. Don't mean to hijack your call, but the... I think what we want to do... What we had done in LA was a document-centric organization, and I think where we seem to be having the most success is on sort of a question centered focus on these, and so I think making individual assignments for the questions that we raised as part of the application evaluation process, and in associating multiple publications with those questions, is the way forward.

---

But before, I was hoping on our next call with you and Laureen, that we would get on the same page about these things before the DC meeting. So that's kind of where my inclination was to go.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay. That sounds great. Thanks Jonathan.

All right. Looks like that's addressed Megan's question. So unless anyone else has any questions about that call, we'll [inaudible] wrapped up. That also brings us to the end of our agenda for today. I will do a last call if there is any other topics folks would like to discuss today.

STAN BESEN: Yeah, this is Stan. I just want a quick report on a call we had with CENTR yesterday.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Sure, that would be great.

STAN BESEN: Which I think was actually very useful. I believe CENTR has agreed to provide us with their best estimate of a total number, I'll call them registrants, in ccTLDs in their members ccTLDs. In addition for a subset, a large subset of their members they will be able to provide us, I think they will provide us registration data on a TLD by TLD basis. That will be very useful to have.

---

I learned two things yesterday about CENTR. One is that when they described data worldwide, they don't really mean that. They mean, their members, not all of whom turned out to be European, I discovered. So we're missing data on ccTLDs that are not members of CENTR.

With that in mind, we've made an effort to... Carlton has started the effort of trying to get data from the equivalent organization in Latin America. I think there is also an equivalent organization in the Middle East. And if we want to get comprehensive ccTLD data, we're going to have to approach them.

Finally, apparently CENTR has done some market analysis where they have defined markets in a couple of different ways. And I believe they have agreed to supply us with information about the various methodologies that they used, which may turn out to be useful to us in thinking about market definition.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay, thanks Stan. That sounds like that was a very productive call.

STAN BESEN: It was.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: That's great to hear. And it looks like we're identifying some other regional organizations on the list. So if Carlton is taking the lead on contacting the Latin American organization, I wonder if we couldn't look

---

for, if there are ccTLD members who have contacts at these other organizations, it might be helpful to reach out.

I'll volunteer. I think I have contacts at the AP TLD organizations. I'm happy to reach out to them. Waudo has volunteered to reach out to the AF TLD group. So, folks have other contacts, please let us know and we'll see how we do outreach in the other regional organizations.

I think, my guess is that CENTR has its, is somewhat more advanced in terms of data collection and analysis than some of these other organizations.

STAN BESEN:

I went to the website for the Latin American one. There is a report that looks like it has the data we want, but it's locked. So I've requested a locksmith.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:

All right. Okay, well we'll hope that Carlton's effort is successful at opening that report. And I will... It sounds like we've got a couple of other outreach efforts underway as well. And if we, it sounds like we don't currently have contact, if there is a Middle East based organization, so we may have to do a call to broader teams to see if we can pull that off, but it sounds like we've got Latin America, Africa, and potentially Asia Pacific covered, if our initial outreach efforts are successful.

---

STAN BESEN: By the way, it turns out that, for example, the Chinese TLD is apparently a member of CENTR, at least they have data for the number of registrants in that. So they're much more comprehensive than Europe, which came as a surprise to me.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yes, they really need to rebrand their organization.

All right. Any other business that people would like to add? I see Megan is leaving, that's probably perfect timing because I think we've reached the end of our call today. So thanks everyone for your time. Once again, please do take note of your homework for each of the sub-sub-teams.

We're looking for a final definition and put those groupings of TLDs for the market segmentation efforts, prior to the Washington call, Washington face to face. And for everyone to please review the project list and make suggestions. I hope everyone could make at least one concrete suggestion to the project list over the next week. That would be very helpful.

All right, thanks everyone and we won't speak again before the Washington meeting as a sub-sub-team, so I'll see you there. Thanks.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**