
JORDYN BUCHANAN: Welcome to the CCT-RT, Competition and Consumer Choice sub-team meeting. I'm Jordyn Buchanan, and I'll be chairing your meeting today. We were just talking about establishing an agenda.

I propose that we talk through an update on data sources and projects. It may be helpful as part of that – I don't know, Eleeza, I'm going to totally put you on the spot – but to see if we for the projects that we previously assigned to staff or to Analysis Group, if we have any sense of timing or additional information [inaudible] sub-team on those projects might be helpful.

And then start to transition to if we believe [inaudible] underway and we're going to start getting data, to start to talk through how we're going to approach putting together our report. For that part, it actually would be helpful to have Jonathan here so we can figure out how he imagined the two sub-teams combining together to put together the eventual report.

Any other topic that people would like to discuss on this call today? No? Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible] some problems with the [inaudible] analysis.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Oh, yes. Okay, so yes. We it would be good probably to talk through each of the major data analysis effort that's going on at the start. And

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.

we have our little spreadsheet of data analysis tasks up in the Adobe Connect if people would like to look at that. I'm a little scared of running through the whole list again.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Jordyn, if I can jump in?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Sure. Go ahead, Eleeza.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I can give you a pretty quick update on a few things.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Sure. Why don't we start with that? Thanks, Eleeza.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: The first being the list of projects for Analysis Group. They have begun the work on that and I think ultimately we identified five distinct projects for them. The first one was an update to a table which was the market segment grouping that Stan had done. That they're going to incorporate into their report, so you'll receive that with their report.

The remaining [items], they just had a conversation with them yesterday about how they anticipated delivering those because they those that they were not planning to include in their report. Their suggestion was to deliver each of those as separate Excel files that

contain the associated results, ongoing data, calculations with accompanying memos that explained each of the analysis. So this would be four different Excel files and four different memos.

They proposed getting that to the team by August 16. They wanted to know if that was an acceptable date for you or if you wanted any of those projects sooner than August 16.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Do we want them earlier than August 16? Sure. I don't know. Six weeks seems like a reasonable turnaround. Most of them, with the exception of the ones that are just really straightforward computations. It seems like, for example, the HHI and [inaudible] concentration calculations should be pretty mechanical assuming they already have that data. I don't know, Stan, do you have thoughts? Is Stan on the phone.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: He is, yes.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Stan, do you have thoughts about the timeline?

STANLEY BESEN: I think that's reasonable. I think the biggest issue is the missing pieces of data. They're going to be constrained by whether or not we get various pieces of data. They can certainly do some of the analysis by then, but apparently there may still be missing data at that point.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Sure. Alright, so it sounds like – is everyone comfortable with that August 16 date to get the projects back? Kaili?

KAILI KAN: Just to make clear, as I understand, before we were planning for end of August, 29th and 30th. Are we moving ahead by...?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: No. This is just to receive data from Analysis Group. That will be good. When we have our face-to-face, we'll have this information. That will really be helpful. Yes, that will help our next face-to-face. Hey, Waudu. Waudu has joined.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Hello, Jordyn.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Hello. How are you?

WAUDO SIGANGA: [inaudible]

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Pardon? The meeting has started. Okay, so thanks for that update, Eleeza. That sounds like good progress.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Okay, great. I'll let them know the August 16 date works.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I think one thing we had discussed previously was that they were doing these side projects to figure out some set of us, including at least Stan, one or more of us including Stan, to be working collaboratively with them as much as possible. Do we have a framework to actually do that as they dive into this work?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I haven't really discussed that with them. In terms of this analysis, they've taken your direction and are going to be constructing that, so I don't know that they need any more additional feedback. But I'm happy to try to figure out a way there [inaudible] calls with them or something like that if that would be helpful.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah. Obviously, Stan I think is the critical party, if there are other people that would also be interested in engaging with Analysis Group as they do work through the work. Previously, we discussed in some cases we're going to be constrained of relying on Analysis Group to do things because they have data that we don't have access to. But we wanted to be involved in continuous discussions with them so that we understood what they were doing and as a sort of control to make sure that we were confident about the output. So if Stan's willing, I would like Stan to

be involved with that and then anyone else in the sub-team presumably should also be welcome to join that effort as well.

STANLEY BESEN: I'll try to be available for calls with them if Eleeza can arrange them.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay. Is anyone else from the sub-team interested in joining those. Waudu is and [Dejan]. Okay. Eleeza, we can talk offline if you want to just talk to them and see if...

MEGAN RICHARDS: [inaudible] but it depends on timing.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: ...and optionally Megan.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Okay, perfect.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Let's just talk offline, but I think if you want to talk to them and roughly express that we want to be able to understand the methodology. They may just say, "Stan wrote down [inaudible], and we're doing it and we already have the data," and they'll tell you where they got it from. That's fine. But I think we just want to be confident that it's just not a black box that figures are emerging from.

STANLEY BESEN: Jordyn, [inaudible] your point. It would be useful if they would tell us as they go along where they are limited by data availability. Because again, I don't think we have at this point all of the data we need to do all of the calculations.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, agreed. That would be really helpful. Eleeza, maybe we could ask them explicitly that right now. In order to complete their projects, if they could identify things that they believe are missing in order to do that.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Okay.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Alright.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: So that is Analysis Group. I also wanted to take some of your time this morning, evening, afternoon to talk about the dataset I e-mailed you all about a couple of days ago. I sent you [inaudible] data. The other piece is the nTLDStats data. I've been corresponding with someone there, Dennis, about their capacity for doing more analysis for you.

Basically, what they indicated was that they might be able to ramp up the timeline a bit, but they basically have about two months' worth of

engineering and building to do to do similar analysis for either [inaudible] TLDs or ccTLDs. But he is definitely open to talking about what they could do for you. He just wanted to get a narrower frame of what the team would like.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Sure. So maybe it would make sense to set up a call with him and a sub-team. Anyone interested from the sub-team in joining to talk through both their capabilities and what we're interested in? Similar to what we did with Analysis Group in the Nielsen surveys as they got ready to field them.

STANLEY BESEN: There seem to be at this point at least two major holes. One is that we don't have a source for all the ccTLD data. Jordyn identified (I can't remember which one it was) open ccTLD, but there are other ccTLDs for which we do not have the basic data. And then quite frankly, I don't understand why it's so hard for nLDStats to generate the parking data. They seem to generate it for the new gTLDs almost on a real-time basis. Every time you go on, that number is different. People will understand it better than I do, but I don't understand why it's going to take them so long to do it, for example, for the legacy gTLDs.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, Stan. I tend to agree. It's confusing to me as well for the legacy TLDs in particular. For the ccTLDs, it's possible things like the IP addresses or name servers that people routinely use for parked sites are

different. Like maybe there are particular country hosts or something like that. But I would imagine that on the gTLD set, they would be roughly comparable between the new Gs and the legacy Gs, so I agree it's surprising. That's why I think it would be helpful to get some of us on a call with them to understand. Maybe there are things that they're thinking we want from them that we don't really need, or maybe it's more complicated than we think as well.

STANLEY BESEN:

Yeah. I'd just point out that they report many different parking statistics, and we don't need all of them. If that's the source of the delay, we can narrow our data request because at least all I think I want at the moment is the single number they report for parking. They have like seven other metrics, and I'm not sure that we need them all.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:

I actually think there's a separate thing that we'll need to do, and maybe we'll make this an agenda item for the next call, is to decide what we think parking is because there are a number of ways. Is a site that redirects to another site parked? Maybe that's defensive but not parked. A site that's just not used at all, are we calling that parked or are we going to have a different terminology for that? I think we'll probably need to spend a little bit of time thinking about how we want to approach that.

I think I had mentioned this earlier. While we were in D.C., I found an interesting paper about parked sites. I will send that around to the

group, and people can come into our next call more educated on the topic.

STANLEY BESEN: Jordyn, I circulated the other a single page from their website that, as far as I can tell, lists something like seven different ways in which they measure something like parking. That's how they do it for the new gTLDs. I'm not sure that we need it all. In fact, I'm quite sure we don't need it all. That's why I was wondering whether if we narrow our requests [inaudible] they could move more quickly.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, I think the main problem is that they're overall parked number is just a sum of those seven things.

STANLEY BESEN: No. It actually isn't quite that. I tried that too. But you guys understand this much better than I do. But if we just need one number from them, would that make their task easier?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Right. That's a good conversation that we should have. So let's [find] the following actions. Jordyn is going to circulate this paper on parking because it helps us just understand the various types of things that people do in parking a little bit.

I will also try to annotate the thing you sent around, Stan, with a little bit of description of what I think they're doing in each of those areas so we can understand what they're calling "parking" a little bit more.

Everyone else's homework is to read those things. Then we'll have a discussion on our next call about this. The right sequence would be to wait to do that and then talk to nTLDStats, but I don't necessarily want to wait two weeks before we have our next conversation with nTLDStats.

STANLEY BESEN:

Actually, I agree with that. I think what we should do if we can do it offline is reach a consensus on which of those measures we want and go back to them and say, "If this is all we want, could you do it more quickly?"

JORDYN BUCHANAN:

Right. That's what I was going to propose. We at least get the informational material out and then try to schedule that follow up discussion with them. I think a [live] session will be more useful than trying to lob them an e-mail or go through staff again. I think Eleeza has done a great job of getting the conversation started, but we probably want to have some sort of live call. And maybe I'll be the only one that shows up.

JONATHAN ZUCK: And [inaudible] I mean the other challenge we have is Eleeza's [inaudible] the accumulation of a list of all the research [inaudible] that we're trying to [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah. Can you get closer to the phone, please? [We can't hear,] Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sorry. [inaudible] I was just going to say we need to make some kind of a time box on the research requests that are going to require funding because we have a budget for this year and I'm pretty sure that budget is shy of what we need. We're going to need to go and request more funds, and we need to time box that because that will have implications.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: To Stan's point, I think we're just about there. I think we need somehow to get ccTLD data, which we'll talk about in just a minute. We want this parking data. So I think those are the last two [inaudible] in terms of research projects. There's still a lot of analysis that probably needs to be done.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right [inaudible] the other stuff from nTLDStats. So it's just the stuff that in accumulation we need to have a discrete list of all the outside data that we're trying to buy, I guess. The extent to which we're getting more work out of Analysis Group, we need to scope that as well.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Right, but it sounds like that scoping effort has already happened or is happening on Analysis Group at least, and we're talking with these other two data sources. But, yeah, I agree. Maybe we should shoot for July as a [drop-dead] date. You can't ask for any more money after the end of July.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah. That's the thing. We probably need to make a decision the point at which we're going to ask for money, right? We only want to do that once is my point.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Right. We could sum up at the end of July how much money we think we need versus what the budget looks like and decide whether...

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right, and that's not just [this group]. [inaudible]

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, totally. Across the Review Team entirely.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: With your chair hat on, is that a reasonable timeline?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: The end of July [inaudible] what we want?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: To know the sum of all the things that we would have to [inaudible] for the fiscal year.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yeah, I mean, sooner for us is better.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah. I don't know. If there's a way to that in two weeks, I think it would be better than four.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yeah.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Two weeks is better? Alright. So we definitely need to work this out with nTLDStats and [inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK: Which means doing things [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: So it probably means we need to try to have the call with nTLStats [inaudible] week.

JONATHAN ZUCK: What's happening as of the 1st of July is everybody is going to come to their managers trying to grab money. We need to be...

JORDYN BUCHANAN: [inaudible] soon.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Exactly.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Right because [inaudible] whatever we get and then we need more, [inaudible] a lot harder to get some more than it is to [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Right. Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: So we should inflate the numbers [inaudible]?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay. Does that make sense? Can we try to set up a sub sub-team – anyone who is interested – call with nTLStats next week sometime?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Yes.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Who is interested in that other than me? Jordyn is interested. Anyone else?

MEGAN RICHARDS: [inaudible]

JONATHAN ZUCK: Me too, but if I can make it. I'm not required [inaudible].

STANLEY BESEN: I am.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Go ahead, Stan.

STANLEY BESEN: I would like an education from you about the variations in the way their defining parking because that would help me think about what we really want.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah. I'll try to do that offline this week and then, Stan, if you still need more education, then we can do that early next week.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: But can you send it to all of us] Jordyn, so we all know what we're standing for and [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, the annotation I'm going to send out to the whole list. [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Okay. So we have a clear identification if it means renewals or how long [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, totally agreed.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Who is on the call then, Jordyn? I have Jordyn, Jonathan, and Stan. Is that it?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Megan and [Dejan].

MEGAN RICHARDS: Possibly, yes, I may. Invite me. I'll see if I can come.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Okay, and we're aiming to do this call with them next week, and in the meantime you'll narrow down the definition of what your seeking.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I'll send around some information for people and we'll try to offline [figure out] if we agree that this is parking, this is not parking. I suspect to get that final definition, we'll need a call. But we could at least start to see if there are things that we know we're interested or not interested in. I think the call will be helpful with them because they'll be able to tell us which parts are hard and we can decide, "Oh, well, we don't really need that thing that's really hard."

MEGAN RICHARDS: Put me in italics for the call because it's possible I can't make it [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Right. I think Megan and Jonathan both said their optional.

MEGAN RICHARDS: Optional, yes. If possible I would like to, [but I can't drop just everything].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: If we fall off the – if [inaudible] Doodle, then it's alright.

MEGAN RICHARDS: Yeah, you go ahead.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay, so that's nTLStats. Anything else on that, Eleeza?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: No. I think that's all.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay, and then you had one more update.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I did?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I think. You said three.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Did I say three? Oh. Well, now that you mention it, I was also going to update you on some of the staff-led projects that were in here.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Sure.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:

There were several boxes that were related to policies. This was at [Dan's] suggestion. So [Dan] and I have been corresponding about [inaudible] come up with a way to capture these different policies. Actually, I didn't invite him to the call because it's so early, but we have a [inaudible] started on our team. His name is Michael Karakash, and he has been working on this.

Basically, what we decided to do is look at the 30 top new gTLDs by registration and compare different types of policies and try to capture whether or not they have, for example, a privacy policy. What's included in that and capturing keywords. Then what we're going to do afterward with that spreadsheet is to turn it into more of a descriptive paper describing the similarities and differences between all of the different policies.

The other idea that was suggested was to maybe look at registering a few names in different new Gs and seeing what the user experience is like and capture that as well in this paper. I wanted to float that and see what you all thought of adding that into this project or this exercise as comparing registry policies as a [non-priced] competition factor.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:

Thanks, Eleeza. Yes, that's interesting. I think taking a look at the top 30 probably makes a lot of sense. I think we'll obviously miss some. Some smaller registries will obviously have very different policies. Like .bank won't be in the top 30, but they'll have very interesting policies. So we may want to also cherry pick a few otherwise.

STANLEY BESEN: A sample.

[MEGAN RICHARDS]: [Exactly].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Sample or cherry pick or something like that just to make sure we don't miss some of the variation. I suspect what we'll see in the top 30 is they tend to be the most generic. They're like .com basically. Whereas, the ones with more interesting policies will naturally tend to be smaller, especially ones that have limitations on who is allowed to register in them.

But I think starting with the top 30 sounds good and I think it will probably be less work than doing it 30 times because many of them will be from the same registry operator and you'll end up with very [opinionated]...

[ELEEZA AGOPIAN]: Right. And we did kind of do a quick analysis of how many in there are [donuts] and I don't have an answer at my fingertips here. But I think that's a good idea to add in some that you think might be truly differentiated like .bank and so forth.

[MEGAN RICHARDS]: I think that's a really good idea too because, just as an example, .eu is number 11 apparently of all [TLDs] but we know already what it's

policies are. We know how it works. It's very straightforward. I don't think it's worthwhile to have someone take the time to go in and check it out because you've already been given the information. Giving it to you again [inaudible], so I think the idea of sampling. I mean, someone should look at the top 30, obviously, and then see what's missing like .bank [inaudible]. An intelligent approach to the sampling then would be useful.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Sure. Educated sampling.

STANLEY BESEN: That's right. I think [inaudible] document it [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Right.

[MEGAN RICHARDS]: Exactly, so you know what the approach was.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Alright. That sounds great. Thanks, Eleeza, and thanks, Stan. Are there other staff projects with updates?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I believe that was it.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Actually, this is going to come back to a data source. I think one of the projects that you've said staff is capable of doing, we just need to tell them what to do, would be to look for trademarked terms across and count up how many TLDs they're in. But what we don't have is a list of trademarks that we want to use. I know Stan was looking at some of the papers on this, and I think, Stan, did you ever find the mysterious paper that we had by citation?

STANLEY BESEN: Eleeza suggested an alternative way to do it, which makes sense to me, so why don't you describe it? Because apparently for another project, Analysis Group is already collecting a list of trademarks. So why don't you talk about that, Eleeza.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Oh, sure. For the Trademark Clearinghouse review that Analysis Group has also been contracted to provide, what they did was collect a sample of all of the marks in the TMCH, 25% of them. So their suggestion was to just use that because it's an existing sample. Then for marks that are not in the Clearinghouse, Analysis Group also [inaudible] a sample from the USPTO trademarks and use those. I can't recall off the top of my head what the numbers were, but it's in the several thousands for all of these together.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: My personal reaction is that sounds – it’s really nice they’ve done that. The selection bias is pretty bad. I wouldn’t want to use that for science, but it may be that it’s good enough for our purposes. But if it’s just U.S. trademarks and just things in the TMCH, which really skews toward English-speaking countries I think... Pardon?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible] to some extent.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, I don’t know if that’s true for the TMCH, but it is interesting. Most big brands would be represented by someone who is already doing stuff with domains, I presume.

STANLEY BESEN: I think the earlier study that I looked at had about 1,000 trademarks. I believe those were U.S. as well, the previous study.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Oh, they were U.S.?

STANLEY BESEN: I think so.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I imagine there must be some list that INTA keeps, some regional trademark [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah. [inaudible] what do you think the topmost 2,000 important trademarks in the world are or something like that.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Or [inaudible] list [inaudible] a broader list and then a random alphabetically every 50 or 100 or something.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: It would be helpful to have David Taylor in this discussion. In any case, I guess we have a decision to make. We can do what Analysis Group has already done, which is going to have a little bit of a selection bias problem but seems totally plausible and is being used elsewhere in ICANN. So it has the benefit at least to be able to compare datasets to some degree as well. Or do we go out and try to make some determination on our own about let's use this list, let's use that list, let's ask someone to give us a list?

STANLEY BESEN: Just for your information, if you go back to the project list I circulated earlier, Footnote 12 describes two of the studies of this type and describes the list of brand names that they used. One was taken from the Fortune 500 companies and the other – I can't find it here, but you can see what other people have done. I believe they were also U.S.-centric. Oh, yeah. Here's one from the top 500 brands as ranked by Brand Finance.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: It's Fortune 500...

STANLEY BESEN: Take a look at Footnote 12.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Fortune 500 and what? Sorry.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: U.S.-centric. Because I know like the Fortune wealthiest people isn't, so didn't know if maybe the Fortune 500...

JORDYN BUCHANAN: So [let's just get back to you], do we want to spend effort trying to figure out a good way? It may not be that much effort, but we'll have to spend some amount of time trying to compose or arrive at a more international list. What do people think? Are we comfortable with the Analysis Group approach, or do we want to spend a little time on this?

JONATHAN ZUCK: I wish that we had already finished our analysis of the global [inaudible] and the implications there because I feel like that would drive my answer to this question. There are certainly those who have suggested that we don't have a problem, like Crocker in our last meeting, that we don't have the problem we think we do with the global [inaudible] but

it's different problem. If it's a different problem, then that would fundamentally change whether or not we need to really be fighting to try and build a global brands list. The one thing [inaudible] would be to build a better list.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Right. So Jonathan's natural inclination would be to build a better list. Stan, do you...?

STANLEY BESEN: Actually, let me go back here. The earlier study used 200 of the top 500 global brands.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: So maybe we could just take something like that, like the [inaudible] list is probably good if we want global brands.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I think that's Interbrand [inaudible] look it up. I think that's global [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: So we could supplement anything that Analysis Group has not already identified, we could take some sample or take the whole Interbrand list and just add that to it. That would be at least the really big global brands. But I would presume big global brands would also be the ones that defensive registration costs are affecting the most.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I think that's probably a reasonable assumption.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Once again, our [INTA] survey may help inform that assumption. So does that sound like a reasonable plan forward? We'll hunt down the Interbrand list, which is not very hard to hunt down since they publish it.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I've got it.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Oh, we've already hunted it down. Pardon?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: It is global.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: It is global, yeah. I guess we could ask Analysis Group take a quick look and see what fraction of those are already represented. That might be terrible methodology because some fraction of the global brands is also going to be U.S. brands and that may...

JONATHAN ZUCK: [inaudible] same [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, so maybe we should just ask them to add the 500 to their existing list. The main problem here is we [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible] 500 [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Right, but the problem is we'll need to understand. The slight translation problem we have here is we need to go from Interbrand brand to wordmark, right? Which may be really straightforward. Like Google is going to be Google. The link is probably Google.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Unless it's Alphabet now.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Right. Well, that would actually be a complication, right? Because Alphabet would how up, and you might want to say, "Oh, I really care about Google." But on the list of the brands will probably be [staying the same].

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: They also have names of Japan brands, there are Spanish brands, there are Brazilian brands, there are [inaudible] brands. There are brands by industry and by region. so I don't know if that's helpful.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I think it only helps if we decide we want to do some specific analysis.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: There are retail brands.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: You could imagine a project, which I think will be for CCT-RT (v 2), where you could take some of the same business segments that we've identified through our categorization effort and look to see what registration penetrations look like for brands related to that segment. That seems like pretty – we don't know anything right now, and knowing something seems a lot more useful than trying to dig into that.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right. Yeah, there's definitely some part of this final report that says...

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: More research needed.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, where with infinite time, these are questions that we would have addressed. Or not infinite time but more time having passed.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Right, or more time for [inaudible] as well.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: It's both. Both for [CCT] and for life on this planet, as it were.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Maybe the next step is just to ask Analysis Group if there would be a reasonable way for them to add this Interbrand set of brands to their existing trademark set. If they say, "Yes, that's really easy," then we'll go ahead and do that. And if they say, "No, it's really hard because we have to go look at each of them and manually figure out what the brand is," then we'll figure out what to do.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Could you send me that list, please.

STANLEY BESEN: I actually think if we're going to do two data sources, we ought probably not – let me think about it some more – but not to merge the two datasets and just do that calculations separately for both of them, realizing that one of them may have the bias you described. Mixing all the data from two sources, that usually creates problems.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I they're already mixing data. If they're keeping the existing list separate, then we could also keep this list separate. But if they're already mixing the TMCH data with USPTO data or whatever the trademark thing is, then that's already happening. But in any case,

maybe we can just ask Analysis Group if there's a reasonable way to add this to their list and either keep it separate or not, depending on whatever their practice is for the other two.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Just to be clear, this isn't among the list of projects we asked Analysis Group to do. I was suggesting this is something that I think ICANN could do internally.

JONATHAN ZUCK: [inaudible] the data from [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: That's fine too. Then if you guys want to give us the answer to that question, that's a fine answer as well.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I can also tell you just really quickly, I was asking Antonietta what the sample looks like from the TMCH report, and here's what she shared with me, "It's 57% U.S.-based, 8% is China, 8% is Great Britain, and Germany is 6%."

JORDYN BUCHANAN: It seems [this is a] particularly bad list in that, obviously, those are much more likely to be registered in Sunrise because 100% of the domains registered in Sunrise were on the TMCH list. So there's a very strong

selection bias with the TMCH list, and the USPTO list is presumably 100% American.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Well, I mean, foreign...

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Registered in the U.S. at least.

JONATHAN ZUCK: It might be a better list than you imagine.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, it's possible.

JONATHAN ZUCK: It's a popular place to register.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Sure.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I know that patent side of it is something like 70% porn.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Oh, really? Interesting. Mr. Metrics. Alright, so that takes us to the end of the project updates. The one thing we haven't talked through is ccTLD data, which I wanted to make sure we got to a discussion of today.

Eleeza was successful in getting it sounds like a great deal of cooperation from the Zooknic people. Now we have a big spreadsheet that she sent out earlier in the week or last week – I don't know, very recently – that give us I think three columns potentially filled in for each ccTLD that exists. The registrations as of the end of 2013, is that right, Eleeza?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Yes, that's correct.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Which is slightly before but not very much before the first registrations started in [.shabaka], which is the first of the gTLDs. Then we have end of 2015 data because Zooknic has told us they think their end-of-year data is the most accurate and most comprehensive that they have. Then finally, we have March – what's the most recent data, Eleeza?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: It's March '16. That's their most recent dataset.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: March 2016.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Which is the data we saw I think already.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Right. The surprising thing to me, and I didn't really take a close attempt to look at this, but it looks like there were a bunch of ccTLDs that were on the maps that we saw that were not in the spreadsheet. So I was trying to wrap my head around why there was a difference between the two. Do you have any sense of that, Eleeza?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I do not. I wonder if the map, I believe, was from Nominet, right? I wonder if they just had other sources for those CCs.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Maybe Nominet had some ccTLDs that [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Right, or maybe I'm making things up. Pardon?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: There are a few ccTLDs that [inaudible] I think that...

JORDYN BUCHANAN: And were on the map?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: No because it's in Cyrillic.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: No, [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: But there is [inaudible]

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Ah, cheeky.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: We can ask them.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: But are they on your map? [inaudible] question. [inaudible] What is Bulgaria? .bg

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: It looks like .bg.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Hmm...I like how this map has an ocean between Europe and Asia. I'm not seeing Bulgaria on this map either. Oh, here it is: .bg. Yeah, so they do show a number for Bulgaria. So somehow this map has some data that isn't in the spreadsheet.

STANLEY BESEN: [inaudible] mix of data which [inaudible]

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Why can't I read it? Is it just me, or do you have to read it on a big computer?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: The map?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: The whole business. I got something that doesn't [inaudible]. Oh, there it is.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Vatican City has 194. One thing we could do is take a look at how big the – we could basically look at what we're missing and compare the missing cells to the map and get a sense of how big these are if they're

all really tiny. If Bulgaria is the biggest one at 38,000, then maybe we just don't care.

For example, we're missing .tk in the most recent data, which is the largest. And you can see in this funny map [inaudible] .tk is bigger than Asia, this tiny island in the middle of the ocean. It's a little bit of an interesting infogram. So that's one that we would probably definitely want to get some handle on. There's a number here of 31 million, so someone thinks it's that big.

So there may be that we just want to look and see if there are any big gaps in the spreadsheet as a first step. If there are, then we probably should go to Nominet and ask them, "How the hell did you make this map? You say you used Zooknic data, but we talked to them and they don't have that data." We could do that. There are people from Nominet here. We could do that.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yeah, quite a few of them.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: We could do that this week. Maybe we should just do that. Maybe some of us that are here should try to hunt down someone from Nominet and see if we can ask that question.

Independently, does someone want to spend a few minutes to an hour to try to do a comparison between the map and the empty cells and see if there are any significant gaps in the empty cells?

[DEJAN DJUKIC]: [inaudible] I will try to find if there is data somewhere else.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay, so [Dejan] has proposed not only to do this analysis but to try to find the data for the missing cells, which will probably be more easy to do for recent data than to go back two and a half years in time.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I think it will be important if we can fill in the gaps for the open gTLDs because for some purposes we're going to want to include them with the gTLDs. So I think those are especially important.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, I see .tk consistently show up in every analysis of ccTLD sites I ever see, so someone somehow has a way to either guesstimate or get the number for .tk. And at 31 million names, we probably need to include that in our count.

JONATHAN ZUCK: But I wouldn't just focus on them. Isn't .tv big?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Uh...

JONATHAN ZUCK: I would always hear their ads. I used to hear ads for them all the time.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: So .tv charges, I think the names are [all really] expensive. There are 500,000 .tv names, but I think they make a lot of money by getting actual TV shows to pay them a lot more than a normal person would for [it].

JONATHAN ZUCK: Wow, there are only half a million.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, well, according to this map.

JONATHAN ZUCK: [inaudible]

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Oh, you're looking at the map. I'm looking and I thought, "How could you figure that out [without going to the Excel]?"

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah. But, yeah, I agree, Stan. We can go through the – so I have a few questions to ask people so we can get a rough sense of the room on do we agree on a few notions about data. Number one is, are we okay using the end of 2013 as the start of the gTLD program even though it's

not quite the start of the gTLD program? Everyone is nodding. Is there anyone on the call who thinks that's a bad idea? Alright.

STANLEY BESEN: I think it's a good idea.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay, thanks, Stan. So we'll do that. Our official start of the gTLD program is December 31, 2013, or something around there, the closest data point we have to that date.

Then the next question is, if we think Zooknic is the best data and they think their best data is from December 2015, is that close enough to now that we consider it good enough or do we want to rely on less reliable data that's more recent?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Well, once we've actually got that map into a database, we can perform the calculations again in December.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, that's true. We could just wait. That's roughly what I was thinking.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Do it twice I guess is my point. It's just a data import and [inaudible] click and you'd have it [inaudible] data.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: You make sure it didn't surprise, you got no new surprising results at the end of that.

STANLEY BESEN: I think that's right. Once the spreadsheet is set up and the formulas are entered, it's a piece of cake to change the data. In fact, if there's June data when we get a final report, you could use the most up-to-date data.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right, but if our most accurate data is year-end, then let's at the very least grab the 2015 data but then commit to doing an update in 2016.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, that's roughly the strategy that was in my head as well. That sounds good. Does anyone disagree with that strategy, the more recent [trunch]?

Alright, then Stan has suggested, and I think we generally agreed in the past at least in some of our analysis that we want to include some ccTLDs that are considered like gTLDs for the purpose of comparison. I sent around the Google list for this. I don't know of any other list. Does anyone disagree with using the list from what Google search considers to be [generic]?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Oh, I'm not sure I ever saw that. I'm sorry, I missed that e-mail. You have a list of ones that Google search considers to be generic?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I have this problem which I've already explained to you. You consider .eu to be a gTLD?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: So .eu and .asia I think are somewhat special case from that in that they say – so I'm fine treating those two differently. It's really just .eu.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I don't want it to be treated differently. It is a ccTLD. [inaudible]

JORDYN BUCHANAN: No, I'm sorry. What I mean is I'm fine treating those differently from the rest of that list in that I think what the list is saying is, "We don't understand how to treat these like countries," which is I think correct.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Ah, okay.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Because the EU is not a country, right? If you're in Germany, Google is not going to say that all the content in .eu should be targeted to people in Germany, whereas .de it would say, "Oh, if you're doing a search in Germany, you should get extra..."

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Not necessarily. That was the point I made as well. I can't remember if it which of these, if it was the Analysis Group or the Nielsen group. [inaudible] .berlin for example or .de, my argument was you should not just look at .berlin and .de within Germany. You have to also look at all other Europeans because they also look for those things. That's exactly the argument for .eu. You have to be registered in a European country to use .eu. But that's the whole point of a single market, that you should be able to use the whole business.

It's like the United States. Let's say you're registered in Ohio, but you want to know what's going on in California. Of course, you do if you live in Ohio. So that's my point. It's not like .tv. It's not like .tk, obviously.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Sure. Right. I guess the point I was making is that the statement that Google is making in that list is that it doesn't consider .eu targeted to any specific country because it's not.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Does it consider it targeted to a region though?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: It's targeted to a region, exactly.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: It's targeted to a region, right.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Exactly. It's targeted to a limited number.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: But Google doesn't have a notion of regional targeting. So it puts .eu and .asia together and it says these are similar in that they're targeting a region, and so we don't country target them.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible] list [inaudible]?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I sent it around to the list.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I'll look for it. I'm going to [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: [inaudible] 20.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: How did it target Guam?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Pardon?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Guam. The Pacific island. Yes, Guam. How do you target that or Puerto Rico? Is it targeted as a country or...?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I don't actually know the answer to that question. I'd be happy to look it up.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: .gm?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: .gm and .pr are not on the list I don't think, so they would be considered to be [targeted].

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Because I feel that [inaudible] it is a country or not itself, that is [inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK: Well, .pr, might be getting used as a – but I guess the other question too as we do regional analyses, .de is a perfect substitute...

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: For .eu.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Well, no, but for .com in Germany because it would have to be – so it is a generic in that sense.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Right. So that's true. The specific question we're trying to get at is we know that some ccTLDs are basically marketed and treated as generic.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Agreed. So for that as let's call it an international generic, so .com is an international generic, .tv is an international generic. We talked about doing regional analyses as well, and it's clear just from the numbers that .de is a substitute for say .com in Germany. So what we need to do is get the regional data out of Verisign or somebody like that in order to make a comparison.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: [That's correct], but a separate question that I'm trying to answer before we get off this call. I do agree that gets very much to the discussion that we were having in D.C. about market definitions, essentially.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right, and that's what I remember.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: That applies for every other country. So [inaudible] for example is a substitute for .com in [inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK: [inaudible] and so that's why I think we need to make them part of the market because these markets are regional in nature and not just international in nature.

STANLEY BESEN: I just went on the Internet, I did actually a Google search, and I found an article called "Registrations in Open ccTLDs." I'll forward the link. Maybe this would give us some idea of a slightly more limited list. This lists .cc, .tv, .ws. I'll just send this along in a few minutes.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: So here's homework. Stan's going to forward that. Everyone take a look. Let's try to decide by our next call either offline or on our next call what we consider to be the list of international generics.

JONATHAN ZUCK: International generics, okay.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Alright, so we have five more minutes. I think we're through the data discussions.

JONATHAN ZUCK: The only other thing is just for you personally before I forget. You were going to get me a contact at [inaudible]. It was one of the things I took on as a to do was to do a price comparison [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Alright, let's do that. Yeah, let's do that.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I don't mean to disrupt the meeting, but I just wanted to [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Alright, Jonathan, a thing that I put on our agenda that we'll only have a couple of minutes to talk about now is I think hopefully very soon we're going to stop talking about data sources and data and we're going to start getting data and writing some text, right?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Do you have a view on – are each of the sub-teams going to write their own sections of the final report?

JONATHAN ZUCK: It's interesting you raise that because Alice has been cracking the whip on me to answer that question as well. I'm going to propose a template because we're trying to do this evidence-based thing. I've been just

trying [to doodle] what that looks like because it's almost like a recursive tree when you look at hypotheses and evidence for trees. So I will circulate something. I'll submit it by the 4th to you and Maureen to look at that hopefully we can then [socialize] on the 6th.

What I may do is create a dummy section that's purely fictional from the application evaluation piece of something as a template that's prosaic in nature and then also creates a kind of an evidence tree diagram that will be a way for people to fill in things from data sources.

Those are the two things in my head, but ideally [if] the answer is yes, they would each create a section but they would be standardized in nature. That's the idea.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay, so it sounds like we'll talk about this on our next plenary call. Then we can pick up [inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK: We will talk about it on our leadership call, but I'll circulate it on the 4th.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Right, okay. Then on our next call, we could talk about how we want to start approaching putting together individual components of the text.

JONATHAN ZUCK: The other thing we might want to do is figure out based on what data we have and what data we have coming in in the near term some subset

of our questions that we could have draft answers to by the face-to-face end of August.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay.

JONATHAN ZUCK: It won't be all of them, but I mean...

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, okay.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Alright?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Sounds good. Alright, anyone else have thoughts on this.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible] with ccTLDs [inaudible] still need to contact [inaudible] after [inaudible]?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I think we should still talk to Nominet and find out what they did. Because they may just be like, "Oh, we have this cool database. Do you want it?" Then we would be really happy.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible] Nominet [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Then as soon as we talk to them and once they turn around to us and say, "Here's all the data you need," I think we should do the gap analysis and see what's missing [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I can tell you already from Nominet that they exclude .eu for some peculiar reason.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: It just seems to be the redheaded stepchild of the...

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: It's nonstop problems, actually.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Because they [inaudible] Britain.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Exactly. You see? It's Brexit anticipation.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: They knew.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: That's interesting, .eu is not on here.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I already complained to them and so did our [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Right.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible] I have [inaudible]

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Oh, do you? [inaudible]

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Alright, any other [inaudible]?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible] I think some of them [inaudible] I talked to him today
[inaudible] Nominet [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: So we're hoping these other data sources are [inaudible]

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible] Nominet [inaudible] It's good, but it's [inaudible] It has not got everything. It's a good start.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: But if you talk to specific gTLD [inaudible] that you sent [inaudible] knowing my region. I can only [inaudible] for the beginning point of 2013 [inaudible]

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Perfect. Okay. [inaudible] Alright, [inaudible]. Okay, thanks, everyone.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Jordyn, sorry, I have one more project that we haven't talked about that I wanted to get some feedback on if I can really quickly.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay. Yep, as long as we [inaudible].

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Okay, it's quickly on 2.5, this is a project you [suggested] which was for each new gTLD what fraction of the [inaudible] level domains are available in .com. I talked to our team, and we can do this calculation. I guess the question was, do you want a snapshot in time? If so, when? Is that just current data, or do you want to see this tracked over time?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: That's interesting. Let's connect offline, Eleeza. I will think about that and get you an answer.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Alright, I'll follow up with you on that, if that's okay.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: What fraction of names. It's like your BigShots.photography. What fraction of those [inaudible] .com at the time [inaudible]?

JONATHAN ZUCK: But is this the donuts research that they're talking about doing [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: [inaudible] doing it. ICANN has all the data they need to do this themselves. They know for every domain what names are registered.

JONATHAN ZUCK: [inaudible] a way to automate it? I mean, that's a big...

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Their technical team says that they can do this for us.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Do you have the – because I just talked to [Nevit] about getting theirs. I keep hearing about it but haven't actually read it. Do you have it?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I have the [inaudible] that they [inaudible]. I'll send you what I have. But I think having ICANN do it will be better because it won't just be for one registry operator [inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes, [inaudible]. I mean, I guess I feel like a snapshot is fine. [inaudible] question. It's just getting at this notion of whether consumers perceive – we won't necessarily know what the basis of that perception is – but if they perceive a value. Because I can't even tell you why I did it. But we can at least see that there's perceived value to that segmentation.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, I suspect that's correct, that a snapshot is fine. Let's connect offline, Eleeza, since we're out of time.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Okay, sounds good.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Alright.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I have a minor question for [Alice], but Eleeza will know this anyway. It's just about where are you planning to have your [inaudible] meeting? [inaudible]

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: But it's still [inaudible] 29th and 30th.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Of August.

JONATHAN ZUCK: It's sort of like a Whack-a-Mole problem with the terrorists I think is the problem. We're trying to avoid the places that they [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: You have to think future [attacks].

JONATHAN ZUCK: No, I know.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible] terrorists [inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK: No, exactly. I remember in the movie “World According to Garp,” the plane flies into the [inaudible] he’s looking at and the real estate agent is [depressed] and he says, “I’ll take it.”

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible] everything that could happen.

JONATHAN ZUCK: It’s disaster proof now.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Alright, everyone. Thanks.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]