ELEEZA AGOPIAN:	Thanks, everyone. Once again, this is Eleeza from ICANN staff. This is the call to discuss the Global Registrant Survey, the draft questionnaire, which Nielsen has put together for us and which I sent to you last week.
	We have a few of the team members from Nielsen on the call today; David Dickinson, Paula Coccia and Susan Rabel. You'll see them in the participants list here.
	I sent out the survey last week and I haven't heard back from anyone. I'm sure that you have comments. You probably haven't had time to put them into the Google Doc or to send them along to the rest of the team, but hopefully we can at least start discussing some of those today.
	I know there was at least one topic on our previous call, which ascended that we wanted to discuss with Nielsen [about adding] and also wanted to talk about potentially doing a branch off of this questionnaire for those who don't qualify, for those who aren't registrants. Jonathan had expressed an interest in asking them about other online identities they may use instead of domain names. So I thought we could talk about that a little bit as well.
	With that, I think I'll let Dave begin and maybe talk a little bit about some of the changes from last year's registrant survey, and then we can get into the discussion and questions or comments.
	Dave, go ahead.

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.

| DAVE DICKINSON: | Sure, thanks. Good morning, everyone, or good afternoon or evening, depending on where you are. The changes we've made in this questionnaire from the last way basically fall into three categories. The first category are those changes we've made just for compatibility to the consumer questionnaire. As we went to the design process for the consumer questionnaire, we modified some wordings. We added options for responses – things like that – and we made sure the two surveys, where they had the same questions, were aligned and we were capturing the information in a similar fashion. |

Then, as you'll recall, in the consumer questionnaire we deleted all of the registration-related questions. So the second class of changes was added all of those in here to make sure that we were getting those questions that we removed from the consumer questionnaire to shorten it and allow us to include other questions there.

Lastly, we added a variety of questions based on input from the team to get deeper into some of the registration issues, particularly around the perception of the new gTLDs and their efficacy and why people are choosing them or not choosing them and so forth.

In order to do that, in order to have the room for that, there are some questions that we had added in the consumer version that were mostly around security and trust-related issues, like did they feel comfortable entering certain types of information into websites? Those sorts of questions, where we did a deep dive in the consumer survey around some of the trust issues. We pulled those out of this survey and instead added questions about the registration process and the new gTLDs as registration options.

It was figured that, for those trust-related questions we really didn't have a hypothesis that, based on the prior research, the registrants were going to respond significantly differently to those trust questions than the general population. So that's where we made the room to add the more detailed registration questions.

That's basically it. The changes are reflected by the yellow highlight in the document. I'm not sure, Eleeza, if those show up in the Google Doc, but in the one that's one the screen today, any changes Susan has highlighted in yellow so you can easily identify things that are variations from the consumer survey.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: They do show up in the Google Doc.

DAVID DICKINSON: Okay. Susan or Paula, anything to add there?

SUSAN RABEL: No, except the yellow actually notes questions that are just for the registrants.

DAVID DICKINSON: Yeah. Sorry. Did I say something different? Yeah. Thanks for the clarity.

SUSAN RABEL: No problem.

DAVID DICKINSON: Yeah. Well, and I guess there is one other important difference. The consumer survey included this year a segment of the population of under 18-year-olds. We're not doing that in the registration study. Here the sample frame is the same as it was last time, and it's just 18 years or older.

Eleeza, that's the nutshell of what the changes are and what the status is.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Great. Thank you, Dave. I thought we could start off by talking a little bit about the suggestion from Jonathan to add a group of questions for those who don't qualify, so for non-registrants. We as ICANN have just [discussed] this separately with Dave and Nielsen team about how we can best do this.

There is a cost implication to adding those questions, and I've discussed that separately with Jonathan, as he's been sort of appointed to be the responsible financial party for CCT Review Team and he seemed to be comfortable with the cost.

But I thought we could use this time to talk about how the questions might be best framed and what we would get from asking those as a separate branch from this survey, so for those who aren't answering this at all, and then if we wanted to add a similar type of questions to registrants to ask them, "Okay. You have a domain name, but do you use other online identities? Do you find them," – I'm just kind of thinking out loud here – "more useful or easier for people to connect with their business?" For example, I think my neighborhood registrants

that only use Facebook to advertise their business and don't use their own domain name – that I know of, anyway. So that line of questioning.

Dave, we had talked about this a bit. Jonathan, I don't know if maybe you want to add anything to what I just said there, but I thought this would be a good time to talk about how best to frame those questions and where to include them.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sure. Thanks, Eleeza, and thanks, Dave, for being on the call. When we were first identifying the metric and what's been happening over the past five years that we would try to empower the review team with some data to draw some of its conclusions, a group within that metrics team wanted us to find a way to get at that notion of a market that went beyond just domain names but address the same need for a variety of reasons. So there's some issues about competition there. There's some issues about trust there in terms of: do you trust Facebook more than you trust the domain name system, etc.?

So what we wanted to do, before we got too deep into it, is try to validate some basic feelings about that broader market. I've loosely coined it "The Internet Identity Market" as something to be more inclusive than just domain names.

When we were at our face-to-face in Los Angeles, we talked briefly about the notion of having a branch on the survey that would be initiated if people said that they weren't a registrant. But as Eleeza points out, it may also be worthwhile to ask people that are doing both as well, so there may be questions to put in both places.

But the nature of the question on the negative side is: "Okay. You've said that you don't have any domain names. Do you have any other Internet identities?" I don't know the best way to frame these questions. I think that they fall into basically three different categories.

One is social media, Facebook being the preeminent. But there's certainly others. Again, I don't know whether this is like a "check all that apply" situation, or if a category is enough to ask the question. That's probably we can discuss. So one is social media.

Another is blogging type of accounts because those have become people's identity as well. That's like Blogger.com. There's a few others – WordPress.com, etc. – and then there's things like some people managing their Internet identity just via Instagram or something similar.

The third category is people creating more traditional web presence, like a website, but they're doing it through a third party that has made it free for them. I've been loosely referring to those as "third-level domain Internet presences." In other words, JonathanZuck.wix.com, for example, or .squarespace.com – and these things have increasing popularity as late as well – is a free way for me to have a true website, but I didn't buy a domain name for it.

So those are sort of the three broad categories. I think what we want to do is ask some questions about, if people are using them, whether they're using them as a substitute, or rather just a supplement, which would be the question for the other part of the survey, and then, to some extent, why? In other words, is it because it's cheaper? Is it easier to get into? Do people think that they'll be easier to find, or at least

equally easy to find and therefore not worth the cost because the search engine is going to turn them up anyway, etc.?

So that was the kind of notion of the branch off when people said no, that they haven't registered a domain name. The hypothesis is that, obviously, this is widespread, like Eleeza suggested. There are bands. There are actors. There's small businesses – restaurants, etc. – whose only presence on the web is something other than a domain-name-driven website.

So that's the idea behind it, and I guess we need to flesh out how that would translate into questions and manageable data afterward.

Carlos has got his hand up.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: Yes. Thank you very much, Jonathan. I strongly believe that this is a very important question. I don't know if we have the time and it's so long, but I believe it's a very important question. The only reason I raised my hand was to ask if you had also considered that this branching out is part of the trend that most of the growth of additional Internet users are acting through mobile devices, or if you didn't consider this infrastructure issue.

Then it's specifically about the delta – the incredible growth of users in, of course global [inaudible], if we know that it has been possible just because the people are combining it with their phones. They don't buy a computer. The phone is more important. So a big part of the explanation of the increase in users of the Internet is mobile devices.

But in any case, I agree with you that it's a very important trend because, in the end, there is always a website behind it, even if it's the same Facebook website that has been multiplied by the billions. There is a website behind that, and this is a trend of the domain names becoming more wholesale than retail. We have seen similar trends in many telecommunication issues.

So I'm very happy that you are explaining so clearly, and I'm perfectly convinced that it is very important. I hope we can follow it through this survey. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Carlos. Just to answer your first question about whether we have time, I think that that's a valid question. We're trying to use this survey to see if there's something to talk about. That may result in outsourcing further study or something like that. Jordyn may be able to speak to that, but I think what we decided to do on the Competition and Choice Team was to see what came out of this survey and have that potentially inspire further research, potentially by somebody on the outside, to look into this.

But it may also just be enough to, as part of our conclusions, make sure that people are aware that this competition and choice about which we are speaking is occurring in a context in which other trends and other competition exists.

In some ways, the interesting question is, had the New gTLD Program happened eight years ago, would it have done more in and of itself to create competition than it does today, when there are so many

alternatives? So that's one of the thing that might be an interesting question to at least pose the hypothetical of, if we have a little bit of data.

Fabro, you have your hand up.

FABRO STEIBEL: Can you hear me?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Yes. Go ahead.

FABRO STEIBEL: Well, I agree, and to add to what Carlos and Jonathan said on the [inaudible] questions, I think Jonathan raises three issues there that are important, that said [inaudible] and so on.

Looking at the Nielsen survey, I'm not sure if we can address it properly from the safeguards and trust issues in details of that, although I think it's really important.

So a possible suggestion is that we do have a section where we ask for [inaudible] codes. We ask for short URLs. Maybe we can use that section to ask questions about that type of access and how you search and how you find this information, such as adding two or three questions you ask: "Do you use Wix or other level domains?" and so on.

It would also be important not only to know how many participants, how much surveys are related to this topic, how much users do, but also to cross that with how much this affects trust or competiveness. If we

ask for some [inaudible] on the TLDs, it doesn't make a change if they access from Facebook or [inaudible] from Wix. Easy to [terrible] cross tabbing to do.

So my suggestion would be, in the [inaudible] code and shortened URL, to include the three questions to address the issues.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Thank you, Fabro. Dave, go ahead –

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Fabro. Carlos, is that a new hand or an old hand? Sorry.

CARLOS RAUL GUITERREZ: Sorry. It's an old hand.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Eleeza, it sounds like you have something.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I was just going to ask Dave what his thoughts were on that suggestion.

DAVID DICKINSON: Yeah. Sure. I'll comment on the general line of discussion. Regarding the time requirement, for the people who have not registered a domain name, it has no effect on the survey length, obviously. It's a wholly separate branch, where we would, rather than just terminate the survey at that point, ask them a series of questions. I think, basically, what we

want to know is, do they have these other online identities? Do they use them in some way that – I'll use the word "promotional" – are they promoting themselves? Promoting a business? Or doing something that would be directly more competitive with a domain name?

Also, I think we want to know: was it a reason – the fact that they had those – why they haven't purchased a domain name, registered a domain name? Or is it really a separate sphere of activity that they don't even consider and they just naturally gravitate towards those things as opposed to thinking about having a website, per se.

Certainly, the mobile use – the rise of apps to access things – would be one of the reasons why they might be going that way. It's just easier.

On the flipside, I think exactly where it gets placed in the questionnaire we can work through. We can always cross tab information. When it is a registrant, it does add some length to the survey. I think that's been accounted for in the additional costs that have been discussed. It's already a very long survey, but I think where there's room for a few questions about similar types of things, I think on the registrant side we want to know, similarly: do they have those other online identifies, and are they using them in those fashions? And what's the potential for impact on their registration activity?

It's just like how we're asking now, if they've registered a new gTLD: did they give up a legacy gTLD when they did that? We'd want to know is their use of that causing them to think about not registering new domain names or giving up existing domain names that they may have registrations for?

So it's a slightly different characteristic, but I think, with the limited amount of questions we can ask, the core thing that we want to ascertain as best we can is prevalence, which we know will be very high, but we'll look at that, and then what's the potential impact. What's the potential economic role that they're playing? Because it could be purely, like I said, separate spheres and they aren't really interacting much with each other. They're just multiple use as opposed to replacement use.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Dave. Their feeling about that is, I think, important and valuable, but their behaviors are ultimately going to be the distinguishing characteristic. If they own a restaurant and are doing it but don't specify that it has connection to why-oh-why they didn't get a domain name, I think we still know that it was a substitute, right? It's like people's personal poetry pages. It may be that part of it is that there's a bar in their mind of importance of the thing that they're doing or permanence of the thing they're doing, and once above that bar, they go out and get a domain. But below the bar, they don't, or something like that.

DAVID DICKINSON: Yeah. Let's take the example of a restaurant owner. What if I am solely using something like Yelp and OpenTable to promote my business and I'm not bothering to have a separate promotional site? Do you lump that under social media?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Well, I think that's a really good question, David. I don't know whether I'd lump that under social media or third-level domain, right, which was that other category because some of those sites begin to actually allow you to create a little subsite or something like that with your menu and things like that. It starts to feel website-like.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: May I, Jonathan?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah. Carlos, go ahead.

CARLOS RUAL GUTIERREZ: Yes. I think these [inaudible] of restaurants and places to go, and touristy places is a very good example of a very geographically limited scope. If I'm in Cartagena and I have a small restaurant, I want to address only the people who come to Cartagena. So Facebook and Google find them out, and TripAdvisor might be the best place for me to advertise because it goes directly to people who are planning to travel or are present right now. Let's forget about the rest of the world. It's very targeted marketing.

DAVID DICKINSON: Yes.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Carlos. That's a good point, that regionalization of that information. In other words, you don't even need to be seen unless it's

the result of a query somebody has already done on an OpenTable or a TripAdvisor.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: Exactly.

DAVID DICKINSON: Yeah. A vacation rental by owner would be a perfect example of that, it seems to me. So, yeah. Okay.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Some of it has to do with access to audience. This is why some of the why is interesting. I have an art exhibit coming up in a month here in Washington, D.C., so I've created an event page of Facebook. I have certainly previously created event pages as branches off of my website. But then getting them into people's hands becomes the challenging, getting people to see it. With Facebook, I can immediately invite my Facebook friends that I've acquired over a period of time, and there's a system built into it already for accepting invitations and things like that. So, certainly for something less permanent, I'm using Facebook instead of even in the case where I've already got a domain name as the way to promote something.

DAVID DICKINSON: Yeah. When we were looking how to accomplish this – and, Paula, keep me honest here – I believe that we looked at having not only the close-ended "Do you have these identities?" type questions but getting into the motivations and using a combination of both hypothesized lists of

motivations or reasons but then open-ends as well to make sure that we capture the full spectrum of why they're doing this, what's driving this behavior. And that's where some of the expense comes in, frankly, because somebody obviously has to translate and read and codify each of those open-ended responses.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right. That makes sense, Dave. So I guess one of the questions might be: we have a lot more flexibility on the – I don't know what to call it – the alternative branch –

DAVID DICKINSON: Correct. Yeah.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Than we do on the registrant survey. So I think the difficult question is going to be how to reduce this conversation to two or three questions for the registrants' side.

DAVID DICKINSON: That's always a difficult questions, yeah. Exactly.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Whereas we've got a little bit more breathing room on the alternate branch. Yeah.

DAVID DICKINSON: And, Carlos, I see your note there. It'll function like two surveys, but it's essentially a branch within the survey. Early on in the survey, we identify if people have registered. What we would have done previously is, if they said no, they never have, we would have just stopped the survey.

In this case, the survey will continue for them down a different path, where we ask them a series of questions, kind of "why not?" questions focusing around these issues. It's on the registrant side, then, that they will be folded in and be part and parcel of the existing survey.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Do you take a stab, then, David, at the –

DAVID DICKINSON: Yeah.

JONATHAN ZUCK: At these two sets of questions and then we circle back?

DAVID DICKINSON: Yeah.

JONATHAN ZUCK: We can find – is there something more we can do to help you?

DAVID DICKINSON: No. Eleeza sent over some of the early thoughts, and we've had some discussion about that. Based also then with the discussion today, we can take a stab at writing those questions and send them around for review.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right. Thank you.

DAVID DICKINSON: Yeah. What we would probably suggest is, please, don't let that stop you from doing your normal review of the registrant survey that is out there because we do not to proceed and keep on the timeline. So we'll consider this a supplemental effort, but if you've got any feedback on the survey that's out there on the Google Doc, send that forthwith.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Hi, all. I just put in the chat the three questions that Jonathan had originally suggested for adding, and we used those as a starting point for this conversation with Dave.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: I want to make a short comment on that, please.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Go right ahead, Carlos.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: Thank you. It's perfectly fine. I just wanted to make a note on the margin. Jonathan, you said you have considered two arguments. If

people are substituting a previous domain name or if people are supplementing a domain name, like the example you gave us with your additional Facebook work, although you have the White Pages into one.

I just want to make a mental note, maybe not for the Nielson report, that we have to compare the growth of Internet users with the growth of domain users and try to separate a little bit that many of the new users of the Internet arrive at the point of time where they might never use a domain name themselves, or directly. They will go through all these, let's say, intermediaries that, in the back, they will always have a domain name. So that's what I say the domain name system is becoming more wholesale, getting away from the retail user, because there are many, many intermediaries. This is just a mental note to the words that Jonathan used before in substitution or supplemental access to the Internet.

And of course, they are free, which is very important [inaudible] the domain.

JONATHAN ZUCK: But that's a good question, Carlos. I guess as part of what we want to get at, the fact that they're free is that why people are doing them? Or is it something else? Because, again, the cost of a domain name is not that high, even in the developing world. Relative to other costs in promoting a business or something like that, the domain name is not the thing that's holding you back. It may in fact be the complexity of hosting or something else, other than cost.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: Yes. Probably the wrong word to say is "it's free." The fact is that poor people are spending more of their income in accessing the Internet.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right. Okay. It sounds like we got this branch covered for today and that Dave and his team are going to take a stab at this. Are there other questions that folks want to raise about the –

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: [inaudible] in the end they give new margin of Internet users.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: In the end, although they don't spend that, I think in the domain name they are spending a substantial amount of their very low income in access. So there is a big incentive to do it in Facebook because they're already spending two dollars a month on Internet use, and they just want to promote their [inaudible] and so on.

So free is not the right word but for me is the difference between retail and wholesale.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Carlos. Are there other comments or suggestions on the other portions of the survey, if people had a chance to look at it? Issues they want to raise?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Jonathan, I heard you mentioned the topic that Stan brought up earlier, but I've not sure if these questions still get at what I understood him to be suggesting, which was asking registrants whether they've used certain TLDs as substitutes. Did we discuss that level of detail?

JONATHAN ZUCK: No, we haven't yet. No. That was still to be discussed. I was just trying not to hog the call, Eleeza. That's all. I was going to still bring that up. Carlos, I'm assuming that's and old hand?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: [inaudible] my own notes, so…

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's all right. Carlos, is that an old hand?

CARLOS RAUL AGOPIAN: [inaudible]

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Waudo, go ahead. Waudo?

WAUDO SIGANGA: Hello? Can you hear me?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes. We can hear you. Excellent.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Okay. Yes, I wanted to ask Jonathan and his colleagues. When they were doing the choice of countries to send the survey to in Africa, they have chosen two countries, both Anglophone. Now, in the spirit of being more representative in terms of the regions and the language, I would have thought it would have been useful to have a country from the Anglophone area. So I don't know why they didn't pick any country from the Anglophone area of Africa.

DAVID DICKINSON: Unfortunately, Waudo, I can't give you a definitive answer to that – oh there's an echo in my air. I can't give you a definitive answer to that because that decision was made – for the first wave of this geographic scope was – my understanding is the geographic scope and the countries involved were chosen to get to approximately 70 to 75% of the Internet population. That's my recollection.

Why the specific countries were chosen at that time, I don't know. We've kept them the same this year for comparability to the prior wave. One of the major objectives here is to look to see if there have been any shifts over the past year, and for that reason, we have to keep to comparability.

So that's the best answer I can give you. We weren't involved in the original design, and the rationale for those specific countries wasn't recorded. I apologize.

JONATHAN ZUCK: David, do you have a comment?

DAVID DICKINSON: No. Why? Is my hand up?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Oh, no. Sorry.

DAVID DICKINSON: Oh, other David.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah. Other David. I'm just looking at microphones that are generating some noise. That's all. I guess that was you.

DAVID DICKINSON: Oh, sorry. I'm using the mute button on my phone instead of *6.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Any other questions or comments about the survey?

To get at what Eleeza was coming up with Dave, we were just on a call at the Competition and Choice Team, and we are trying to get an understanding of what the different markets are for these TLDs so that we might look at things other than the worldwide market for our analysis. So there might be a geographic segmentation of the market. There might be a linguistic segmentation of the market, and there might

be a functional segmentation of the market. In other words, for education, places for builders or something like that. We're looking at experimenting a little bit with getting a sense of how the markets for TLDs can be broken up a little bit, and we can look at these little markets individually to see if choice was improved in one area but not in another, for example, right?

One of the questions that one of our economists raised is whether or not it was possible for you to ask someone who is a registrant if they felt like they had a choice in domains from which to choose. In other words, if somebody registered .photography, did they consider .photo also?

Maybe there's a generic way to ask that question so that you don't have to say, "Which domain did you use?" and then look at a giant database to see what the possible alternatives are. But is there a way to get at that notion that they felt that they were choosing from a list of possible yet equally relevant options? Does that make sense, David?

DAVID DICKINSON: Yeah. I'm assuming that the economist is basically trying to establish whether there was a sense of free choice there and an adequate range of options. Do I get that correctly?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah. Exactly. Because we're going to sit here and say that photos and photography are for the same person, right? And we're going to blend them together to say, "Look, this is the competition that has been created," or hasn't been created. The economist was interested to see whether people perceived them that way. Part of getting at that is

where there equally choices to the one that you chose that you could have just easily chosen? For example, if the domain you wanted wasn't available.

DAVID DICKINSON: Right. Yeah. We have some rationales about why or why not, but we don't really have – I'm scanning through the document – anything that says how satisfied were they in the range of choices that they had, just to register. That would be easy enough to add. As always, this is our litany. It's a long survey, and we need to be careful about adding length further.

I'll definitely draft that question. I think it's a valid question for the registrants. I'll draft that question and, as I draft these other questions that pour down the registrant path as well, we'll review the survey.

There are additionally things that we have the data from consumers, and I'm not sure that there's really high value in replicating that again from the registrants. We wouldn't have a strong hypothesis that they're going to respond differently, based off of last year's survey. So I'll also suggest a few things to cut so that we can keep it length-neutral.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That would be perfect, David. I think you're right that those exist, so if you could take the first stab at identifying, and then we'll try to be diligent in evaluating that list.

Carlos, you have your hand up.

DAVID DICKINSON: Well, just one more quick question before Carlos. If they registered for a commercial usage, we don't currently ask them what business sector that they are in. We ask them about size of business, but not sector. Is that something that, for your analysis, you think we should have?

JONATHAN ZUCK: I might ask Jordyn to speak up on that, but now that I'm hearing it, it actually does sound interesting.

Carlos, I'm going to just hold you for a second there. Jordyn, did you want to speak to that question?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Sorry. I just got the tail end of the question. Can you repeat that, David?

DAVID DICKINSON: Yeah. For anyone who has registered for some sort of commercial purpose, we're not asking them what industry sector they're in. We just ask company size and a couple of other, I think, general kind of things. So we've got all personal demographics, but we don't really have anything about their business demographics, and I was wondering, should we be adding in a question to classify what type of business they registered it for?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah. That would probably be interesting. I think that is not exactly the line of questioning that we had intended, or at least I think Stan had intended when he raised this, but I think it would still be interesting to

see if we see correlations between certain types of domain registrations and particular TLDs in certain industries.

I think Jonathan sort of touched on it earlier.

JONATHAN ZUCK: [inaudible], Jordyn.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, yeah. No, I agree that this would be additional, but this would be more interesting to see as to whether there's correlations as opposed to, between business types, what the range of options a particular registrant, which I think are both interesting questions.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah. Okay. Thanks. Carlos, go ahead.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: Yes. Thank you, Jonathan. Again, this is only a comment. I know that Jonathan makes beautiful photography, but one conversation after the lay meeting, I was made aware that some of the new registrars have combined effort in some areas, like cars and autos, and I think a third word, I think – I don't know, "car" or "cars" and "autos" – are now being promoted by the same group. So I just wanted to comment that maybe this is a more relevant example to use, if you were going to use an example with the question, then photography – nothing against a good photographer, Jonathan. It's just that this is a case where really they delegated very dissimilar words that don't compete with each other,

like "auto" and "cars," and this is a very good test case for that question. Thank you very much.

I can check with [Carlton] on exactly what the three words are because he knew a former ICANN staffer who is now working for this group.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks. Yeah, we'll evaluate the questions once the Nielsen team puts together some straw man on that, and we can dig into the examples there. I wasn't even suggesting photography being an example.

Jordyn, you have your hand up.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah. Just reacting on what Carlos said, I actually think "car" and "auto" are a bad example because I believe they're bundled together so that you get all three at once when you buy one. So they're not really alternatives. They're not substitutes for one another. They're just similar to "ong" and "ngo," which also come as a bundle. So you can't consider them to be alternatives because they are just one product.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: Exactly, Jordyn, but that happened after they were delegated. In the case of "ngo" and "ong," public into this registry request [inaudible] as such. In the case of "car," "cars," and "auto" wasn't after the fact or unarranged in the process. It was not planned. I don't think there's collusion, but it's an interesting case. [inaudible] Thank you.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah. I do think the business arrangements [inaudible] venture, but in any case, from a consumer perspective, you can't choose between "car" an "cars," whereas with "photography" and "photos," you could choose between those, so there [are reasons]. We could ask both questions. I just feel like in this particular case that, "car," "cars," and "auto" are better considered as one product, whereas "photos" and "photography" are two distinct products that a consumer can choose between.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: I got you now. I got the message now. I didn't understand it before. Thanks. I understand it.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Great. Thank, Jordyn. So I think, David, you have your margin orders on these two things – the industry sector and then this question of choice. We'll look forward to your draft on that, as well as your notions about questions that we might drop because the results are likely to be redundant from the previous survey. We'll let people react to that list, but I suspect that your list will be 95% in agreement with the group in terms of questions that could be dropped.

Are there any other questions for Nielsen, or comments about the survey, going forward? I think we all have to go back through the survey itself with some more rigor before we talk again. But if anybody's got any other questions, please raise your hand.

I'm seeing none. I'm going to pass it back to Eleeza to I guess help us figure out – Fabro, go ahead.

FABRO STEIBEL: Quick question. I noticed that some [scale] questions from the [inaudible] positive to negative implications on how you answer that. Some are left to right and other ones are right to left. I use an example of question 85 and 848. Just increase left to right, and then just [inaudible] is the case to make a standard of always left to right or right to left, just to increase consistency. Just a question. If it's not necessary, no problem. Thank you.

PAULA COCCIA: Do you mean going from starting with the negative response and going to positive, or vice versa?

FABRO STEIBEL: Yes.

PAUL COCCIA: Generally on the web survey we try to lead in with the negative to positive. If there are any ones that go from positive to negative and it's trended, we're going to leave that as is because we don't want that to upset the trending.

But generally, as a rule, yes, we do try to go from negative to positive.

DAVID DICKINSON: Yeah. And I'll just make a comment that the way it appears in the written document may not be exactly the way it gets programmed. For

those reasons, there are programming standards. It may not be perfectly reflected in the document.

PAULA COCCIA: That's right. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right. Thanks, guys, for that answer. Eleeza, I guess I'm going to pass it back to you to take control of this again – I apologize for stealing it away – in terms of timing and when we need to have another call and when we're trying to get this fielded and things like that. Bring discipline back down on the team. Oh, Waudo just raised his hand.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Yeah. Go ahead, Waudo, and then I'll take it back. Thank you.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Yeah. Okay. The mic is on? Hello?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Yes.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Is the mic on? All right. I just wondered what [inaudible]. The question on the [inaudible] year and [inaudible] month. Why is it divided into two? Why couldn't they not just ask for the [inaudible] day and the answer could be DD/MM/YYYY rather breaking it into two. It makes the

questions be one more question than less, I think. Is there a reason to break it into two questions?

DAVID DICKINSON: Paula, 271 and 270, if that helps. I don't know why.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Yeah. Between 271 and 270.

PAULA COCCIA: Really, that's just to –

WAUDO SIGANGA: [inaudible] to answer two questions.

PAULA COCCIA: Yeah, I'm with you on that. Really that's just so we can determine without asking their age how old they are and properly categorize them. We might be able to look at getting rid of the month born. I can look into that.

DAVID DICKINSON: Paula, was that added to when we were trying to recruit under-18 year olds for the consumer survey to make sure that we were in conformance with that? Because I don't think we asked it the same way last year, but I'm not sure.

PAULA COCCIA: I'm not sure. Susan?

SUSAN RABEL: It was just added. It's become one of our standard questions that we ask so that we can get an accurate age.

PAULA COCCIA: The bottom line is I'll still look into seeing if we could drop the month because I tend to agree.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Great. Thank you. If there aren't any other comments, what I'm going to suggest we do – I think first I'll pose the question to the Nielsen team: when do you think you can get back to use with the suggested changes in addition to what we just discussed?

DAVID DICKINSON: I'm just taking a minute to glance at my calendar. I think we can try to have them for you Friday. The only thing is I'm just wondering if I'll have enough time to review the registrant report from last year to really identify the things that I think are duplicative.

So worst case, Monday.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Okay. So let's assume Monday. I know that we don't want to hold things up too much. Perhaps we can aim to have another call with you all at the end of next week. In the meantime, if I can task our review team

colleagues with taking a close look at the survey draft that you have now and providing any feedback on that by, let's say, next Tuesday, the 17th, so before your next plenary call. That way, I can share those with the Nielsen team, and we can do this work in parallel, just so that we can start flagging any other issues you may see in the draft questionnaire.

Does that sound reasonable to all of you? If I don't see any objections, I'm going to say yes.

All right. I'll give you a deadline of next Tuesday to provide any feedback on the survey. Hopefully you can start looking at the Google Docs sooner than that. The longer we push this off, the further back we're getting in our timeline.

I don't have it in front of me right now, but was the goal date for fielding this survey? Paula, do you know offhand?

PAULA COCCIA: Susan, I know you drafted that and we went back and forth. I don't have that readily available.

SUSAN RABEL: Yeah. It was early August. I don't have it in front of me. I think we came up with a schedule a few weeks early than that going sometime mid-July so that we could meet the deadlines for the meetings, the presentations.

EN

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Right. Exactly. So, yeah. If we can get all of your comments by next Tuesday the 17th, and I will send a note to the team with that reminder. Then we'll schedule another call for perhaps next Thursday to continue the conversation with the Nielsen team.

Okay?

PAULA COCCIA: That sounds good.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: All right. Thank you, everyone, for your time and your thoughts and ideas.

PAULA COCCIA: Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Eleeza. Thanks, Nielsen. Bye-bye.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Thank you. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]