JORDYN BUCHANAN:	Alright. Thanks everyone for joining. This is Jordyn Buchanan. I'm chairing the latest edition of our Competition and Consumer Choice Sub Team of the CCTRT. I have not published an agenda for today's call. Apologies in advance for that – or apologies in real time for that.
	The things I had hoped to do was briefly review the project list that Eleeza had circulated, in particular focus on any places where we still need a project definition. I'm operating under the assumption that things still need project definition at this point we're likely not going to pursue, and we'll just finish up the rest. In addition to that, there's been some discussion of a couple of data sources that I'd like to just try to see if we can hash out in real time on today's call because I think that will allow us to figure out which data sources we're going to use or an approach to doing so, particularly for ccTLD data. But there's also I think going to be some discussion about for example parked data arising from the call today.
	So that's what I had intended to pursue on today's call. Are there other topics that people would like to discuss? Okay.
	Go ahead, Eleeza.
ELEEZA AGOPIAN:	I just wanted to point out that I invited Greg and Stacy from Analysis Group to this call to talk about the projects that Stan had assigned to them or assumed that they would be taking over and they had a couple

---

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.

EN

of questions about the approaches in those projects. So maybe give them a few minutes to go over those too.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yes, that would be fantastic. What I intend to do is just step through the spreadsheet that you put together, see if we think it's actionable and if so, who we think could action it. And so if we think Analysis Group is the right choice then it's great to have them on the call to talk through that.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Great. Thank you.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay. So why don't we jump right into the project list in that case. I'm looking at the Google Doc version. It looks like it's being projected as well. I've this morning added a little bit to the Google Doc, so that's probably the most useful document you'll get if you can but the offline version probably has 90% of what we need.

So jumping right in, in row 3 we see the first project and this is to compare the pre and post prices in the string in the market. So I think Jonathan has described what we want to do here, but the main problem with this is that we still need a data source from CITO. We don't have any of this aftermarket data, correct Eleeza?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Yes, that's right. We don't have that data.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay. We'll need to flag as an action item here an attempt to – we don't need to limit ourselves to CITO obviously. I think there's a few aftermarket players and I think GoDaddys operates [and] acquired some of the other options in the realm as well. But Eleeza, why don't we take as an action item – I know people at both GoDaddy and CITO – so why don't we coordinate on figuring out getting out a request to these folks and we'll decide whether we want to… Jonathan's not on the call I guess today due to a plane flight but we'll decide whether it makes sense for it to be sent from Jonathan or from me or from staff.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Okay.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: That seems to be the next thing we need to do there. Row 4 is looking to see if there's a price difference between single string registry operators and multiple string registry operators. I'm going to hold off on row 4 actually for a minute until we talk about price analysis in row 7. And then I think row 4 is just a variant on that.

Actually, I'll do it in Google Doc. These are numbered so it's going to make the numbering weird. Alright, actually let's just come back to – help me remember to come back to row 4, Eleeza.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Sure.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Alright. Row 5 basic market share calculations. Stan has defined these calculations in some depth. I think we've agreed that these are actionable at this point. We know what we need to do, with the exception that I don't think we've agreed yet on the canonical source that we'll use for ccTLD data. But hypothesizing for a moment that we agree on a canonical source for ccTLD data, this seems actionable and this is just our simple calculation of the number of registrants.

So I'm going to actually clarify terminology here – I think we mean number of domains. I think we've agreed on that in the past. Is that right, Stan that we mean the number of second level domains registered, not the number of individuals registered?

STAN BESEN: Correct.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Correct. Alright. So we can do a global search and replace [in] E5 and just change this to number of domains instead of number of registrants.

So Eleeza, this seems like it could be computed fairly straightforwardly, once we have the data, by either staff or Analysis Group. Do you have a thought on what the best party to do this would be?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Not really. I agree that we can do it either way. It kind of depends on how many different variations. You see there's a snapshot in time numbers or if you want to look at historical numbers. Greg, maybe you could touch on because you've already done some of this in your report and are planning on doing some of this in your report. Could you talk about that for a minute?

GREG RAFERT: Yes, of course. I think as you mentioned, Jordyn, this is all do-able with data that is already existing except for potentially the ccTLD registrations which I think would need some help on. But yes, I think that using the monthly transaction reports, whether it's historical or just a snapshot in time, these would be relatively straightforward calculations to undertake.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: So I think as Stan envisions it, this is either sort of current-ish or some definition of current, probably dictated by what the most current ccTLD data that we can get is. Or there's not necessarily a snapshot in time but there is a delta from sort of pick a date when we decide that the gTLD program begins, perhaps when .shabaka opens for registration or something like that – from that date until our present look at what the delta looks like. But I don't think there's a notion of looking at snapshots along the way other than that.

I guess you guys to a certain extent may have computed something similar to this in the Phase One report which would give us at least a snapshot there.

EN

GREG RAFERT: That's correct. And it would be relatively easy to go back in time using the monthly transaction reports to calculate deltas at different points in time if that was deemed to be of interest.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yes, I think the goal here is just to see what the current market share is, and then what share of the gross new gTLDs have been responsible for. And so we don't need snapshots in order to figure that out unless we for some reason wanted to create a graph to see how it was changing over time. Stan, do you have thoughts on whether you were looking for any other than this delta from the start, whether you were looking for snapshots along the way?

STAN BESEN: No. My view is just the one time change – before and after.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Right. So Greg, it sounds like if you're already planning on doing some or most of this in your report, it may make sense just to incorporate all these calculations into the report. And since I think there's only a total of like eight total calculations here. So we just need to agree on the ccTLD data, I think, which we'll get to in the second part of this call.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Jordyn, I just had one quick follow-up question which is on the open ccTLDs which are, I think, kind of begin to show up towards the end of this set of calculations. Is that something that the CCT Review Team was thinking about, kind of determining whether a ccTLD was open or not? Or was there some kind of other third party source that you were planning on relying on, or something else?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: That's a good point. We should flag that as an action item as well here, as to define what we mean by that. And I think we mean by that not necessarily open but generic – like these are the ccTLDs that market themselves essentially globally as opposed to for a specific market. So for example, I think many ccTLDs might not necessarily be restricted to registrants in that country, but they still might market themselves and be primarily used by registrants in that country whereas .co or .me actively market themselves elsewhere. A somewhat fine distinction to make unfortunately. But let's flag that as an action that we'll need to resolve.

There is one data source – not to point out what my own company, my own employer, does – but Google search at least has a list of TLDs that it treats as global as opposed to located on a specific TLD. So it might be one possibility just to use that list. And I'll circulate that to the list afterwards and we can decide if it looks reasonable or not.

Alright, any further discussion here? It sounds like we need to A) agree on the ccTLD list, and B) decide what we think by these open ccTLDs.

Otherwise, Analysis Group can probably include this in the Phase Two report to the extent that it wasn't already included in the Phase One.

Alright, moving on to row 6 then. This is registry market share analysis. And this is just doing three calculations – which is [four firm] concentration ratios and HHIs with various definitions of market for these using for example all the new gTLD registries of the market, all gTLD registries of the market and looking at registrars and back end providers as well.

Once again, I think this is pretty well defined already, and this data should already be available. Eleeza or Greg, do we think that the data necessary to compute this is already collected?

GREG RAFERT: That's correct. [inaudible] just using the monthly transaction reports that ICANN's already provided to us.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Alright. And presumably for back end providers you somehow have to overlay that on the data that ICANN already has sort of mapping stuff to back end providers.

GREG RAFERT: Yes, that's what I was going to say. So we would need a little bit of guidance there.

EN

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Eleeza, you have in your giant chart of all the TLDs, you mapped to back end providers though, right?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: That's right. And then I provided it to Analysis Group yesterday.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay. So once again, I guess the question here is, since these are economic – I guess even though they're simple calculations I expect it would probably be best done by economists as opposed to ICANN staff people just to make sure that they're done correctly. So this I would opine would make sense for Analysis Group to do. So I guess the question is, do we think this is in scope for the Phase Two report or reasonable, or does this seem like add-on work that we would have to figure out how to contract with ICANN or is there some reason we think Analysis Group shouldn't be doing this?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: So, Jordyn, actually Greg, Stacy, and I had a conversation about this yesterday and some of this work [stripped] from this whole list does kind of apply to the work that we're already doing on Phase Two and that which does not – which might be adding to [that] other scope of work, I'll work with them on making sure we can add that to their scope in their contract.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay. Fantastic. But in any case, it sounds like we think that Analysis group should be able to do this and we'll target them to complete it.

GREG RAFERT: Yes, Jordyn, the only thing I would add is I think we're happy to calculate the HHIs and can relatively easily do so, but I think it's something that we probably would not want to include in the Phase Two report but we could of course provide you with the underlying data, the calculations, and then the actual estimates or the results from those calculations.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yes, that's fine I think. Stan, does that sound good to you?

STAN BESEN: Yes.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Alright. Then let's jump to number seven which is gTLD price analysis. So the first of these is probably the trickiest, which is the percentage change in the price of each legacy gTLD price. I think we established – does ICANN have this legacy TLD pricing information?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: We do not.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:	Right. So this is the main trick is that we don't have this data necessarily. Does ICANN have the price cap data?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:	Yes, we do. And we shared that with Analysis Group.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:	Okay. I guess my last question is, did we attempt to obtain price data from legacy TLDs as part of the Analysis Group report?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:	Greg, do you want to take that one?

GREG RAFERT:	So actually, Eleeza, I'm just a little confused because I thought we did end up collecting wholesale price data from the legacy TLDs, and then you provided the price cap information as well.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:	That's right. What I meant was that ICANN doesn't have access to that data.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:	Okay, sorry. We should be more precise I guess. Okay, so it sounds like Analysis Group does have both the price cap data as well as the wholesale prices from the legacy TLDs?

GREG RAFERT: That's correct.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Right. And how far back does your wholesale price data go for legacy TLDs?

GREG RAFERT: I would have to double check but I believe that it comes close to going back to when a given TLD came into the market, although I don't think that's always the case. But we can confirm and get back to you, Jordyn. But it goes back for a reasonably long length of time.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay, so we could probably look to see what the sort of rate of change was for the three years prior to the introduction of new gTLDs and then the three years after or something like that.

GREG RAFERT: Yes, at least for some of the legacy TLDs. And I think in particular .com is one of the ones that we have better historical data on.

STAN BESEN: I actually have a quick question. It would be useful to have whatever price data we have for the legacy gTLDs for the same date prior to the

introduction of the new gTLDs, and then do a before and after comparison.

GREG RAFERT: That's a good point, Stan, and I agree.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Thanks. I see Kaili's got his hand up, too. Sorry, I'm trying to look at the spreadsheet and I'm having a hard time also looking at the Adobe Connect, so feel free to just jump in if you have a question. Kaili?

KAILI KAN: Yes, thank you. I hate to look like I'm rocking the boat but right now as we're going to collect data and do a lot of [inaudible], I would like to ask the Chair about the market [inaudible] of the implementation of shall we say [grouping] of data. [inaudible] face-to-face meeting.

                      I don't think we have concluded what would be the criteria of grouping or [segmenting] the market. For example, as [inaudible] segment. Well, I don't believe that the [rental] is a substitute of pay off selling of a house. And also as an example, say Coca-Cola vs. Sprite – well, that to some people that is quite a substitute against each other. However, that is really subjective [inaudible]. For example, some people do not want to have caffeine, while others they want Coke instead of Sprite because they do want caffeine to help achieve them not sleep.

                      So therefore, I wonder if Analysis Group, the data collection and all the calculation following whether how would the AG segment the market. I

think last time the first time the Analysis Group [inaudible] the segments I also raised the question say for help or how help, say I wouldn't believe that gardening is a substitute of [inaudible].

So anyway, I don't want to rock the boat but I really don't quite understand or don't even see how this calculation and collection of data could work before the market is clearly defined in order to calculate the competition involved. So that is my question that maybe some others understand but I do not still quite understand how this could work. Thank you. And also I hope that Analysis Group can provide an answer to me. Thank you.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: So I think for the purpose of all the discussions we've had so far, in these projects Stan's identified there's not further segmentation beyond what's listed in the doc. So for example, we would at the calculation for all new gTLD registries and then all new gTLDs plus all legacy for example. There's not an attempt to segment into subcategories or submarkets or markets in any of the projects so far.

In theory as we look in row 8 for example, it might make sense to think about the segmentation efforts, but actually for today's purposes I want to distinguish between what the computations should be and who is going to do them and whether it's well-defined enough, and then what the market segments could be. Because we could have a separate conversation to get to agreement on what those segments should be. But for the purpose of today, it's just what the calculations would look like.

KAILI KAN: But if I understand correctly, that [inaudible] that we're not going to segment the market at all?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: For the purposes of some of the calculations that we're doing at the moment, there won't be segmentation at all. It's not saying that we're not going to do any segmentation, but the initial project definitions that we've discussed so far don't include that. And to the extent that we do identify places where we'd like to do market segmentation, for today's conversation I'd like to separate what the segmentation looks like vs. what the project would be once we agree upon the segmentation.

KAILI KAN: Okay. Because I don't know if we're looking at the same page or not, but on my screen for example, the bottom line of page one that is 1.1.6 here it says "Registry market segmentation analysis" and the last line is correlation…

JORDYN BUCHANAN: That's right, Kaili. But we haven't discussed that project yet. So we'll potentially get there. And like I said, I want to separate out –

KAILI KAN: [inaudible]

EN

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay, no problem. But when we do get there I think we're going to assume for the moment that we have a useful segmentation, and then we'll have a separate discussion about what that segmentation should be.

So back to row 7 or project 1.5, Greg, it sounds like only Analysis Group can do any of these price analyses because only Analysis Group has access to this data. Is that a fair statement, Eleeza?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: That's correct.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Alright, so we would have to rely on Analysis Group to do this price change analysis. And so in addition to the look at the price change, I think Stan has identified two other projects which is mean, median, top quartile, bottom quartile, prices of new gTLD registries and then [inaudible] one's mean price of new gTLD registries minus the mean price of legacy gTLD registries. And that might be a good example of one where we potentially want to do it across market segments once we had agreed upon what those segments were I would think. Does that sound useful, Stan, if we were to say look at individual market definitions that we had agreed or segmentation definitions that we had agreed upon and see what the price dynamics were within each?

STAN BESEN: I actually thought of this as a simpler calculation, but we certainly can think about what you're proposing.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Right. In your initial project, you had just proposed doing it for all new minus all legacy, is that right?

STAN BESEN: Correct.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: But in theory we could extend that project into individual market segments included both legacy and new gTLDs.

STAN BESEN: It sounds trickier, but possible.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Sure. And that assumes that Analysis Group has the pricing data for each of those definitions, which may or may not be true.

GREG RAFERT: If the TLDs are in our sample that we collected data for, then we'll have the wholesale pricing data, and then if they are not we unfortunately will not.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Right. And for the topical segmentation that you guys proposed, you made sure to request that from all of those TLDs, is that correct?

GREG RAFERT: That is correct.

STAN BESEN: Greg, how many gTLDs do you have the wholesale price data for?

GREG RAFERT: Right now we have a little over 160.

STAN BESEN: [Have we have] requests out for more?

GREG RAFERT: So actually it's that we requested for a 160. I'd have to go back and double check how many we actually ended up getting pricing data for. That's the full set with the additional set of TLDs that we added in for the Phase Two work.

STAN BESEN: Great. Thank you.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Alright, and Greg, are these projects well-defined enough that you guys feel like you could complete these?

GREG RAFERT: Yes, that's correct. They are well-defined enough.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay. Great. So then line 8 1.6. Yes, Kaili?

KAILI KAN: I have another question. How about registry pricing? I think e-mails that we exchanged I think I recall there was a setting that's saying that there are some registries somewhere in I don't know, a small island or something that they are just basically giving them away for free to each [inaudible] price as new. So we count that price as zero.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: That's Tokelau – that's .tk. I don't think Analysis Group would have that price because I don't think there's… Greg, you haven't made any attempt to get ccTLD pricing data, is that right?

GREG RAFERT: We sent this request to some ccTLDs and by and large received exactly no information from ccTLDs.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Alright, so as of now at least we don't have wholesale pricing data for ccTLDs. It is known, Kaili, that .tk has a wholesale price of zero but it's not included in any data set that we have.

EN

STAN BESEN: Actually, we have a small amount of ccTLD pricing data. It's in, I think it's the Asia Pacific organization. It's listed in the inventory that I circulated a day or two ago. But it's a very small number.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay. Thanks Stan. [inaudible]

KAILI KAN: If I remember correctly, I thought that by giving away for free that [inaudible] boosted the registration volume and so I don't know because speculation is a very serious issue for the new gTLD. For example, in China, China has more than half of the registrations and it is widely believed that the vast majority, well beyond 90%, are purely for speculation. And although the wholesale price is extremely cheap – less than a dollar – but there because of speculation the [inaudible] the registry pricing, are we talking about is that what we mean by wholesale price, or what?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: So once again, this is the .tk example in particular, is a ccTLD so the dynamics work a little bit different there. I think that registry actually takes direct registrations so there's not a registrar layer involved. So the retail and the wholesale price are actually identical in that case. [inaudible].

KAILI KAN: What in China is happening, it is not just ccTLDs but in new gTLDs.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I understand, Kaili. I'm just saying it's a case of the free domains, that
was a ccTLD. That was .tk. [inaudible].

KAILI KAN: That is free domain but [inaudible] consider the gTLD well – I cannot
remember correctly. If I remember clearly enough, I suspect there was
some reports where similar [giving] for free but I'm not sure. But
anyway, what I wanted to say is that we really need to caution about
why large scale speculation is [inaudible] the pricing data.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I think Stan has actually proposed – and this is actually not reflected in
the chart and so maybe this is a good topic to talk about – is to try to
look at the… do all these calculations on parked vs. non-parked domains
as well. And Stan, you imagine doing I think in theory you would like it if
we could do essentially all the projects you described so far on one
version on total and one version just on non-parked, is that right?

STAN BESEN: That's correct. I think the problem we have there is that I only know of
one source of the parking data, and that's in NTLD Stats. But yes, in
general you are correct. If we could do it with and without then it would
be two alternative ways of defining the shares.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Right. I guess I think I know the answer to…

KAILI KAN: That is going to be [tough]. That is going to be part of the work that Analysis Group is going to do [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: That was the question I was going to ask. Greg, do you guys have any data on parked vs. non-parked?

GREG RAFERT: I would have to double check, but I don't believe [that]. I'll take a look at the monthly transaction reports again to see what's contained in there, but I don't think it's possible using those but we can check and then get back to the CCT Review Team.

STAN BESEN: Greg, you've looked at the NTLD Stats data. There it's actually very extensive. So one could in principle do this for a subset of the data.

GREG RAFERT: That's right.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Alright. So that's something we'll have to flag as a discussion point, how we would do that analysis especially where we want to do it for

anything other than the new gTLDs because the NTLD Stats data doesn't extend outside the new gTLDs.

So we only have 24 minutes left. I'm going to try to run through the rest of the project list pretty quickly because I do want to talk about data things for at least the last 15 minutes or so. In line 8 which is topic 1.6, this is some of the segmentation. So I'm going to assume for the purpose of this discussion that we've agreed upon segmentation lists which I know we haven't done yet, but we'll revisit that topic probably on our next call and offline in the meantime. So Stan is probably just here roughly to do the Table 12 from the Phase One report with the additional segments and with the added request that we calculate HHI for each group.

And I think, Greg, we're proposing to come up with a set of market segments, one set of which is roughly modeled on the groupings that you did. Stan proposed a few changes to those. But then we also created, kind of came up with some sort of notion of geographic and language based segments as well. Presuming we're just doing this on market share, it seems like once again you guys would have the data to do this just using different sets of TLDs, is that correct?

GREG RAFERT: That is correct. We just wouldn't be able to look at, for example, the correlation between prices and HHIs because we won't have the pricing data at least some of the TLDs that Stan added in since we didn't request it.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Sure. Stan, are you proposing look at… oh, you are. This is the last request here is to calculate the price versus the HHI. So we'll have to see where that's feasible.

STAN BESEN: If we could do it, that would be good to do, but there are obviously data problems.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yes, alright. Okay then moving down to line 10 which is now we're looking at non-price competition. The first one of these is Stan has proposed a project to figure out how registrants have switched. This requires responses from the Nielsen Group Survey. Eleeza, have you had a chance to look, do we think all of Stan's questions are covered by the survey?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Yes. I did take a look and I think for the most part they are covered. I don't think there was anything that I didn't think would be in there.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Alright, great. So we'll push that off until we get the survey back. And then, Eleeza, on row 11 you were going to take a look at what staff might be able to do to understand what policies look like. Have you had a chance to work through that yet or is this something for a future call?

EN

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: No, I have some notes in here. So I talked to my teammates and looked at what we could do and what's feasible. What I would suggest doing is looking at a chunk of registries – so maybe the top 30 by registration, something like that – and looking for different types of policies, and there's a few projects that are [inaudible] policies to see if they had a use policy, a privacy policy, and so on and so forth and doing a simple spreadsheet that one says yes or no, do they have it, but then also includes some kind of key words so you could see what differences are in each policy – on how restrictive they are. For example, just to prove you live in New York City that you had a .nyc address, that type of thing.

So that would be my suggestion. I think trying to do this across 1000+ registries is just untenable and extremely time-consuming and I'm not sure that you would end up with a result that would be particularly useful. So that's my suggestion.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Thanks, Eleeza. So it sounds like if we were going to do this – so you're proposing roughly that we sample some subset of these and that we look – and I understand that we create this spreadsheet based on manual evaluation, is that right?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: That would be right, yes.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: So if we were to do this, we would have to do two things. Number one would be to figure out what the sample should look like, and number

EN

two define what the characteristics of that spreadsheet would be – what policy elements we would be looking for.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Exactly.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Alright. So it sounds like that we agreed that this would probably be useful and that's going to take some work on both fronts. [Dan], I think you were particularly interested in doing this. Would you – anyone else can obviously volunteer as well – but [Dan], I was wondering would you be willing to help sort of take the lead with staff in defining what this project should look like?

[DEJAN DJUKIC]:   Yes, sure. [I will] definitely.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Alright. And if anyone else is interested in working on that, let [Dan] know and he can join you into the effort. But, Eleeza, maybe you and [Dan] can work together – or whoever on staff and [Dan] – can work together to figure out what that should look like.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Sure thing.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay. 2.5 which is row 14. I published a link to a Donuts blog that defines this project generally but Donuts has claimed that 60% of their registrations the equivalent string was available on .com. So if you registered, they have the example they use the URL donuts.domains, so donutsdomains.com would have been available at the time of registration. So they've done that for the Donuts TLDs. In theory, this could be done across other new TLDs as well to see whether the .com was available. And then we could also extend that to other TLDs other than .com.

I guess there's a data question here which is, Eleeza, do we have lists of domains by TLDs somewhere? I guess we must because you guys do the intersection of which domains are registered across multiple TLDs, right?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: You're asking like the actual string?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yes. Do you know what – the list of SLDs that are registered in a particular TLD?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Yes. Yes we do. We have actually a metric that we were tracking that has to do with names that are registered – whether a name registered in a new [g] is represented anywhere else in the DNS. So we were able to compare unique second level strings. So I know the source is there.

EN

That's kind of the calculation we did [of] the proportion, but that was the data source.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Right. So I propose a slightly differing look-up which is for each TLD within a new TLD, is the TLD + SLD combination in .com available? Does that make sense?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: .com. Yes.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: For the moment just .com.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Okay.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Can you maybe check with the team to see whether you guys actually have a way to do that? Presumable if you guys have the data source it would make sense for ICANN to do that analysis.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Yes, that would be our technical team. They've been doing those calculations and I will check it out from them.

EN

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay, great. Thank you. Row 15 is the dispute resolution policy URS versus UDRP. I think [Dan] has added a little context here.

[DEJAN DJUKIC]:   Yes, I added some.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: [Dan], what's your proposal? Is this just a question that we're asking as a qualitative question to registrants, or are we looking for specific data here?

[DEJAN DJUKIC]:   [It's a] general question to registrants, how they are satisfied with previous [risk] mechanisms, rights protection mechanisms, and how they are [now with] trademark [within Carlton] and URS system.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Right. So it seems like this might make sense to cover as part of either the INTA survey or it sounds like it wasn't going to be covered in the TMCH Review. Karen's not on the call, I don't think. Do we know, does the TMCH Review have any sort of customer satisfaction metrics associated with it?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Antonietta is on the call. Antonietta, can you answer that?

ANTONIETTA MANGIACOTTI: This is something that is [inaudible]. This might be something that a clearinghouse provider may be able to provide us with.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Alright, so it would be good to look and see if that's available. Otherwise, it seems like this might be a good question for the INTA survey that David Taylor is looking at since that's largely targeted at trademark holders.

So let's see what we find out from the TMCH Review, and in any case, Eleeza, is it just David? Who is working with David on the INTA survey?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: We haven't quite worked directly with David on it. We've been working directly with INTA on this. I'll raise the question.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay, perfect. Thank you. So we have 13 minutes left and a bunch more topics. I think most of the rest of the things are assigned to me. So maybe Eleeza and I can have an offline conversation about the definition of those things.

The one exception that is line 21 which is, is greater regulation and segmentation more valuable to the consumer as a user and less to the registrar and vice versa? And we have Megan's name next to this but no project definition. Megan, have you had any time to give thought to how we might get at this?

Alright, so Megan hasn't had a chance to look at this yet. So let's consider until we can figure out how we might tackle this that we may not be able to perform this project. But Megan, if you can think of anything in the near future we may be able to add it.

I want to spend the last 11 minutes that we have here segueing for a moment to talk data sources. There's two important data sources that I think we need to talk through and get agreement upon what we're going to use or how we're going to approach it. The first is ccTLD volume data. [Dan] sent around a super helpful map/chart with ccTLD registrations as of a couple months ago. Similarly, I think Stan identified that Verisign in their periodic state of the domains report – I think that's what it's called – also includes a ccTLD registration number and includes the top 10 ccTLDs but no data beyond that.

So far we don't have historical data. We could go back for the Verisign data, back in time and get total number of ccTLDs from the inception of the program. On the Zook's data we don't have any historical data. So it seems like in either case, we may have to approach the data source and ask them if we can get some additional data to what they publish publicly.

I guess my question for the group is, do we have a preference on would we rather try to go after the Zook people if they can give us a three years ago snapshot, or would you rather ask Verisign to give us a bigger break-out? Should we do both in parallel? Does anyone have an opinion on this? I have an opinion but I'll wait to see if anyone else has thoughts on this.

Eleeza, have you [inaudible] [Dan's] chart have you seen any of the Zook stats?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: No. I've seen various references to the Zooknic stuff but this has been probably the best [and most] comprehensive I've ever seen.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Right. So I would suggest, just because Verisign is an interested party in these discussions that it would be ideal if we could get more of a third party data set. And so what I was going to suggest is that we reach out to the Zook people and ask if they can provide us with a snapshot. Stan, I think the only thing we need is a snapshot sort of at the inception of the gTLD program. Is there any other ccTLD data that we think we're missing at this point?

STAN BESEN: No. It's the same as what we discussed earlier. I actually have a preference. I think one thing this conversation suggests is that we probably are going to give up on approaching regional ccTLD organizations and try to get all the data from one source, which I think is a good idea. We may have to pay for it, but these people seem to have it. When they only published the top 10, they undoubtedly have data for the bottom 190. So one source I think is the best way to go.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yes, agreed. I think we want to agree on a canonical source so we're comparing the same thing over time. So Eleeza, maybe offline you and Jonathan and I can talk about how we can reach out to the Zook people and see if we can get the same data set for – I don't know, we'll choose the point in time and maybe we can sync up with Greg to you and figure out what we're going to consider the inception of the gTLD program for the purposes of these calculations.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Okay.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I would propose as a straw man, what do folks think about using the – if we can figure it out – whatever the first day that .shabaka which I think was the first new gTLD to launch started accepting general availability registrations. That should be considered the start of the new gTLD program for timing purposes. Or we may have to round to the nearest quarter in one direction or another, but roughly that date. Does that sound right to folks?

STAN BESEN: Yes.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Stan says yes. Okay, great. So we'll use that. Eleeza, if you don't know that already I think I can track it down.

EN

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I should be able to find it, too.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay, great. Let me know if you have any problems with that.

The second data source is one that we've started talking about and which I flagged in a couple of the projects that I was looking at, which is this notion of parked data and/or redirects and/or how domains are being used. And for this, it seems like the best source that we've seen – as Stan pointed out earlier in the call – is NTLD stats. But it only covers new gTLDs.

So Eleeza, I was wondering if it might make sense – or let's see what the group thinks – should we reach out to NTLD stats and see whether they would be willing – once again we may have to pay them for this – to perform the same parking analysis that they do on new gTLDs on a broader universe of domains, including the legacy TLDs and ccTLDs.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I'm fine with reaching out to them. I guess my only question would be that we get a clear answer on how they're actually calculated and [what's] their methodology for determining parking.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yes. I think that makes sense. So maybe we could do two things – we could ask them if they're willing to do it and if so, have them come brief us on the next call?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Okay.

STAN BESEN: I agree with Eleeza. We should probably get them to actually if we use them as a source to get them to write up a description of how they do it so we can include it in our report.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yes, that makes sense, Stan. So we could do both of those things. We have them write it down and then we could also have them come talk to us so we understand how to interpret the data, too.

STAN BESEN: Sure.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Alright. So, Eleeza, let's add that to the action that you and Jonathan and I need to talk about how we're going to reach out to them as well.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Okay.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Alright, we have five minutes left. I don't see any other projects that… Actually there's one other project with Stan's name next to it on the list. So I'm going to jump back to that really quickly, which is row 32, which is trademark registrations across gTLDs. And so, Stan, this is the new project you proposed since Washington, is that right?

STAN BESEN: It was actually assigned to me in Washington.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Right. So that's why it's happened since Washington.

STAN BESEN: I don't want you to think I volunteered.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Sure.

STAN BESEN: So this is a replication with more domains, more TLDs than a number of studies previously carried out. If you want the source, the references to all of them in footnote 12 of my project memo. But basically, the earlier studies did things like how many trademarks that were in .com were also in .biz. Now of course we have a lot more new TLDs so the analysis

is more extensive, but it's basically a replication of what has previously been done.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Right. That makes sense. Once again, Eleeza, this feels like something that if ICANN has the data on what SLDs are registered in what domains, it would be good to ask your tech folks if they could do this analysis as well. We would probably have to provide them with the list of trademarks we wanted them to check, but assuming that we could provide them with a list that they see – and it sounds like they're already doing this to some extent – for each trademark, what fraction of TLDs are they registered in essentially.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Yes. If you provide us with a string we can certainly do that. I guess the question is how many do you want to look at and we'll go from there.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Alright. So it sounds like the main problem here would be figuring out the list of trademarks that we would like to use in the sample.

STAN BESEN: My recollection is that the previous studies used about 1000 trademarks.

EN

JORDYN BUCHANAN:	Okay. And Stan, do you remember those top 1000 brand lists? We could probably use something like that.

STAN BESEN:	They don't give a list of the trademarks they used, but they describe how they constructed the list.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:	Alright, so we could look at that separately. It sounds like it's do-able by ICANN. We just need to come up with the list. So let's make an action item. Yes, go ahead.

GREG RAFERT:	Yes, sorry Jordyn. I don't know how much cross-fertilization there can or should be between AG's TMCH work but this is something that we've kind of… We have some of the data that would allow you to do this, in particular the list of trademark strings from the TMCH. So I will leave it there.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:	Yes, I guess the question is… Go ahead, Eleeza.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:	I was going to say, I was going to ask Greg to speak up on those because I don't know the details of the TMCH Review but Greg and his team are working on that as well, and there may be – I wasn't sure if this was an

exercise people had already taken. So we kind of don't want to reinvent the wheel, as it were.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: So what I was going to say is, it would be good to understand how this intersects with the TMCH Review. I wouldn't want to limit the list of trademarks that we were investigating to those in the TMCH, and in fact it might be constructive to compare what happens to a string whether it's in or not in the TMCH, if that makes sense. So you might say, "Here's 1000 brands of the ones that were in the TMCH. They were registered on average in 48 TLDs and the ones that weren't in the TMCH were registered in 300 TLDs," or something like that. That might be interesting to see the difference.

So it would be good to understand how this intersects, so maybe we could plan for some discussion like that on our next call. We're out of time. Speaking of our next call, that intersects with the Helsinki ICANN meeting and I think at least some of us are going to be in Helsinki. There was discussion on a separate Nielsen call yesterday to not hold Sub team meetings during the Helsinki meeting, which I think probably sounds right. It would be hard to get participation from everyone including myself. However, I'm not sure we want to go a month without a Sub team call.

So what I may propose is that we do a call in three weeks and another one in four weeks to keep up progress. Or Megan says can we meet briefly and unofficially in Helsinki? That's also possible, Megan. Let's

take this discussion to the list and see what we can arrange in terms of a next meeting.

Alright, and with that we're out of time. And hopefully we made some progress on actually getting some of these projects auctioned. And, Eleeza, we'll have to spend some time talking through how that's going to happen. But I'm hoping we'll start to see some of this work actually getting done over the next few weeks.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I'll follow up with you on that, Jordyn.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Perfect. Thanks, Eleeza.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Thanks, everyone.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Thanks, everyone.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]