ELEEZA AGOPIAN:

Thank you very much. This is a call with a small group in the CCT review to discuss the Nielsen Applicant Survey that's been proposed by the CCT Review Team. I sent an e-mail to the small group, which includes Jonathan, Laureen, Jordyn, and David, to get some thoughts on how we might proceed next.

What you see on the screen in front of you is my cobbling together of the questions that were suggested in DC that might be included in the survey. This is by no means final text, but just one way of thinking about how the questions might be laid out, what topics we may want to include in there, and which questions might apply to those who were ultimately successful applicants versus those who withdrew from the application process.

In talking this over with Nielsen, I had a call with them last week after our face-to-face meeting in Washington and asked them to start providing us with some pricing estimates for how you would do a survey like this with a known universe of respondents. They responded back with some concerns about doing a quantitative survey of this kind. That was in the e-mail I sent to the group yesterday afternoon, evening probably for many of you.

The primary concern is a better response rate. With 1,930 applications, many of those of course being duplicates of the same firm applying for multiple strings, they are concerned about how many people would actually respond and how representative of the universe that would be, particularly if we were planning on using this data in a way to make assumptions about the larger applicant pool. There's a little bit more

---

detail in the e-mail there. Jonathan, I know you had some comments that you sent back to the group on that.

I wanted to first start the conversation with you guys about what's our goal here and what's the best way to achieve our goal if we're to survey applicants. When I say survey, I mean either as an actual online type of survey or interviewing. What's our goal in speaking with applicants, and how much data and how detailed of that data do we hope to have?

Jonathan, I see your hand up. Please go ahead.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Eleeza. Amending my previous response, since our objective is to ultimately make recommendations for improvements to the application and evaluation process, we want something that's as extrapolatable as possible. It occurs to me that knowing more about fewer doesn't make anything more extrapolatable. That is our objective, is to make it extrapolatable. Maybe I'm unaware of what the focus group concept brings, but it seems to me that the data will be even less extrapolatable. We're looking for trends that we might try to address. If we find out that everybody that withdrew withdrew because of money, then that's something that we need to look at.

In retrospect, I responded differently to your e-mail because I was just sad. Now I'm thinking to myself that we need to just do what we can to get as much information as we can and assess it when we get to it, just because I don't know that knowing more about [fewer] will help us in our process of making recommendations or giving us anything measurable to judge the success of those recommendations.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:

Yeah, I would agree with that. Laureen, just before I call on you next, I hope or think that we would get a higher response rate because you're talking about a community that's more intimately familiar with ICANN and that probably will want to have their opinion aired and shared for the purposes of this review. Maybe I'm being optimistic. Laureen, go ahead.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

I just wanted to make sure I understand the big picture here. The big picture is we want to get more information about the potential challenges to the application process, and more granularly, why people decided not to move forward. The concern raised is that we may not get very many people actually responding to that. That's the concern as I hear it.

Maybe Eleeza and Brian are best positioned for this, but I open it up to anyone. My question is, wouldn't focus groups, even if they were not as big a number as we would like, wouldn't that still be valuable information? My understanding of focus groups, just from my own experience, is that they are by their nature a smaller subset. You delve into the issues in further detail to get that information, knowing that it has all the strength and weaknesses of it only being a small representative slice. You're still valuing it for what it is, which is a more in-depth opportunity to gather information. It goes to the weight of that data, but it's not necessarily a reason for not going forward with the inquiry.

I just wanted to get your sense of the value of information from a smaller source set, like a focus group.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:    I'll respond, and then Brian, I saw your hand go up so I think you have a comment on this, too. I think that there is certainly value in both exercises. I think the difference between it is that one obviously is a deeper dive on perhaps particular topics and I thinks folks may not win themselves as [inaudible] to identifying trends, but I think it certainly is possible to do that. Although in this instance, I think it would be hard to have a true focus group where you have a group in a room together or in a shared environment, bouncing ideas off of each other and responding to each other's ideas. I think you may miss that. This may be more like in-depth interviews.

One other thing I wanted to point out and that I was going to request of Nielsen is that in their pricing proposal, that if we did do a survey, have an option for people to say, "Yes, I'm willing to be interviewed." Then maybe go a step further with the survey responses. That may be an opportunity to have both data sets there.

Brian, do you want to go ahead?

BRIAN AITCHISON:    Sure. Can you hear me okay?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:    Yes.

BRIAN AITCHISON:    I think I'm going to just agree with what Laureen and Eleeza just said. There's a very limited universe of methods available to us. You have quantitative measures if you have a large enough sample size. You have qualitative measures when you don't have these numbers. Quantitative will give you breadth while qualitative gives you depth. We are just constrained by the size of our sample. I tend to be a fan of qualitative work because it does tend to give you that depth. I don't think it should be looked down upon in any way because it doesn't provide those nice, neat numbers.

For a lot of these kinds of questions we're asking, they tend to be fairly subjective. Subjective data is also quite amenable to qualitative analysis. There's always issues with any kind of method you use, whether it's qualitative or quantitative. As Laureen indicated, it's just recognizing the weaknesses of the method, noting it, and moving forward. That's [all I have to say] on that. Thanks.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:    Thanks, Brian. Jonathan, I see your hand's still up. Did you have more to add?

JONATHAN ZUCK:    I guess I don't, really. I've been typing it over in the chat. My inclination is to see what we can accomplish by reaching as many people as we can, and then as you noted, Eleeza, asking who wouldn't mind us following up for more in-depth information. We can finally get a sense of what

would have helped or something like that. My vote is for both if possible because I think we're interested to see how big a problem something is and get a chance to look at these.

The concern expressed by Nielsen was in some ways less about the overall survey, but about dividing it back into categories of withdrawn or delegated or active, etc. If they actually believe that they could get 20 or 30 of each of those for a focus group and we would get that number organically, I still feel that that would interesting, even if it led to a higher statistical error or something like that.

Again, I think my vote is to forge ahead, and then as you said, ask people if they're willing. The people we actually want to talk to might be more limited number. It might be the ones that dropped out as opposed to all of them and things like that.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:          Yeah, I would agree with that.

JONATHAN ZUCK:          Those are the people we want more in-depth information from because initially, we were only going to talk to the ones that dropped out. We'll just see what we get. That's my vote.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:          Okay. Laureen, did you have something you wanted to add?

| | |
|---|---|
| LAUREEN KAPIN: | I feel similarly to Jonathan. I think it's worth going forward. If we end up having concerns that it's just too small or there's something really unreliable about it, we can always adjust. But it seems to me we would want to go forward and get what information we can, especially because we're only get at these more granular questions about what the real obstacles were, I think, through this dual track approach of both qualitative and quantitative. |
| ELEEZA AGOPIAN: | Okay. It sounds like we're all in agreement. It sounds like Jordyn from the chat, you're also on board with this approach. Perhaps we should forge ahead with maybe refining the questions I pose here. Obviously, these are pretty rough, but I wanted to make sure that first I covered all of the topic areas that you think are worth covering and see if there are any questions or variations on questions we should ask, as well as talking a little bit through some of the responses.

I think for some of these responses, we can offer standardized answers. Others, obviously we'll want to have some open text boxes to allow people to describe their particular experiences.

I think I'd like to do that next, although Brian, I see your hand up. Why don't you go ahead first? |
| BRIAN AITCHISON: | I just want to make a general comment about the benefits about a more qualitative versus a quantitative approach, at least with the initial stages. One of the general weaknesses with quantitative approaches |

when you're surveying large groups of people about anything is that it puts the onus on the researcher to define the problematics, whereas with a qualitative approach, it's especially useful in an initial stage because it's more open ended. It allows the respondents to define the real problems. Then you can go through and build out a more robust survey of a large are group that would be informed by that early qualitative research.

That's just another general comment [on this]. Thanks.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:          Thanks. I think that makes sense and it' helpful to think about.

Turning to the questionnaire, I've put these in what I think might be a logical order, but I'm open to other comments, suggestions for topics. I guess I'll leave it there. I'm not sure if you all had time to look through these, but I captured the top chunk mainly from one of our conversations in DC, and then after talking through it with our team yesterday, did some rearranging and added in some responses.

Just to walk you through it, I think we'd want to ask this top nine questions of everyone, get a sense of how they came to the program, how they became interested in it, if they were aware of, for example, the applicant support program, if they received GAC advice, and so on and so forth. Then ask more detailed questions of those who did withdraw and why they withdrew. I'm sure there are more questions that are worth asking about, why they withdrew [inaudible] a broad brush attempt to ask these questions.

Any comments?

Jonathan, go ahead.

JONATHAN ZUCK:    I was wondering if it made sense to ask them to categorize themselves. One of the things we're interested in is understanding the cohorts of applicants or something like that. Does it make sense to figure out where they fall? Are they registrars? Are they brands? That sort of thing.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:    Okay. What categories would you include?

JONATHAN ZUCK:    I don't know. Part of it is trying to learn what the categories are. Part of me thinks it's an open text box, but maybe not. I think Jordyn has the most familiarity with that question. Maybe he could come up with categories. I don't know, but maybe we need them to respond openly.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:    Jordyn, go ahead.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:    Jonathan, is the idea here that we're asking what's your company's principal business or something like that?

JONATHAN ZUCK:    Yeah, I think so. Obviously, if it was L'Oreal, I wouldn't want them to say perfume. I'd take it to a broader characterization. "We're a major brand," or "We are a registrar." The types of people that we're applying. "We formed a company just to do domain names." I don't know. [inaudible] valuable.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:    We could probably come up with some general taxonomy and then have another box or something. It may even be like, "Would you think that the following things apply to your company?" There are some companies that would maybe fall into multiple categories. There's not that many of them, but it would be at least interesting to capture what those differences look like. Or maybe we don't worry about the those cases.

Similarly, I saw in here that – while I've got the mic for a second – there's this question about applicant support. There's three applicants that applied for applicant support. I feel like throwing this question out to the general population doesn't seem that useful. We could just ask those three people questions.

JONATHAN ZUCK:    "Were you aware of the program," though, is interesting because it's not whether you use it, but were you aware of it.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:    Yeah, I guess. It just strikes me as a lot more useful.

JONATHAN ZUCK:      It might be easier to test the negative, not the people who did apply but the people who didn't.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:    Sure. Anyone that's read the guidebook would probably be aware of it, at least, which is not to say that every applicant read the guidebook because some people did rely on outside help, obviously. This seems like a much more interesting question in the people that didn't apply than the people that did because obviously [there were people] who were impeded by the lack of the applicant support program.

JONATHAN ZUCK:      Because they did apply, yeah.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:    Right, and to some degree, successfully so. They have the 185,000. [inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK:      Right, which is the only thing that would have helped with, right? I guess I agree with Jordan, especially because we always want to get rid of questions whenever we add them.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: So the question would be more were you aware of the program, or would you have [inaudible]?

JONATHAN ZUCK: I think dropping the applicant support piece.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Dropping it entirely?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: We may want to separately contact the three applicants that actually applied for applicant support and ask them questions about it. We definitely want to ask people who didn't apply about applicant support, but the set of people who did apply, it's hard for me to imagine what useful information we're going to get from this. We're going to say, "Did you know about it?" They're going to either say yes or no. Then we're going to say, "Did you need it?" They're going to say no or they're going to lie. One of the two.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I totally agree with what you're saying, Jordyn. I think interviewing those who did apply would probably be more instructive, but I'd imagine you're also interested in those who [didn't] apply, what was their

[inaudible]? Would they have been interested in it? What if it had been promoted more widely?

JONATHAN ZUCK:         I guess Jordyn's point is they came up with the money that it would have gone toward anyway.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:        Yeah, I guess you're right.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:      These are by definition the people that didn't need it.

JONATHAN ZUCK:         Or at least didn't think that they did.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:      Right. They managed to lodge an application without it. In most cases, since no one failed the initial evaluation, they at least made it through the first step of the evaluation process.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:        Okay. Taking a step back, under question four, this was a topic we had talked about. Is there a better way to ask this or another series of questions around "Were you involved in ICANN before?" that might get at the responses you're interested in hearing?

JORDYN BUCHANAN:      Hey Eleeza, can you repeat that?


JONATHAN ZUCK:        Yeah, it's not a binary question. I think you're right about that. Jordyn, she's asking about question four. "Were you previously involved in ICANN?"


JORDYN BUCHANAN:      I think this we might be able to get out of the "What does your company do?" Do we mean the ICANN community process, or do we mean were you a contracted party? You're right, but once again, I think for a lot of these, we could probably create checkbox things.


JONATHAN ZUCK:        Yeah, exactly. I think that's the key, is to figure out what the level of participation was based on activity, as opposed to asking a binary question. Remember this is the thing that David Taylor raised, which is was there some notion of being an insider versus an outsider and gaining some advantage by being an insider? I think that's what this question is designed to address.


JORDYN BUCHANAN:      Right. We probably need some sort of taxonomy around modes of participation because we'll get pretty different levels of it.

JONATHAN ZUCK: "Did you regularly attend ICANN meetings or did someone from your company regularly attend ICANN meetings? Did you submit public comments on policy? Did you participate in policy development?" Maybe those three or something. "Were you a member of an SO or AC?"

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Right. "Did you previously have a contracting relationship with ICANN?"

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: So rather than asking me these binary questions, what about asking, "What was your previous involvement with ICANN?" And having all of these different ones and maybe having it be like a [inaudible] all that apply.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's right. I think that's right.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Plus maybe an "other" checkbox.

Moving backwards here, maybe I should start from the top. Let's go through each question because I feel like each one of these could be broken down into, as Jordyn said, a taxonomy of responses.

For current status of your application, I came up with three. There are many different stages of an application, but basically active meaning all but delegated, still in the process. Delegated is pretty obvious, and then

withdrawn. Is there any other category you would want to call out, or should we just leave it at those three?


JORDYN BUCHANAN: I think we might want to distinguish between active where the applicant is in a dispute resolution process versus active where they're just stuck for some other reason, likely because someone else is in a dispute resolution process.


ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I'm sorry. Say that again.


JORDYN BUCHANAN: The main reason why people are stuck is because someone else in a contention set is in a dispute resolution process, even though they're not themselves, but there's probably a difference between those two states. Like if you're [inaudible] with ICANN versus not probably matters.


ELEEZA AGOPIAN: All right. Then delegated and withdrawn. Do those seem okay?


JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:     Okay. On Q2, the big why. Is there a way to offer up predetermined responses, or is this just an open text box?

JORDYN BUCHANAN:    I think [we can] come up with some predetermined responses and then have an open text box. If we put in built-in answers, like we can more easily categorize it and suggest things. The downside would be people limit themselves to those responses. We would get more interesting responses by leaving it open.

LAUREEN KAPIN:      I would weigh in favor of keeping it open ended, precisely because I would want to know what we don't know, so to speak, especially since one of the things we're looking at in general is innovative products or new opportunities. I would like to keep that open so we capture the broadest range of reasons for applying, even those we haven't contemplated.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:     My only concern, not that I'm really anticipated essay level responses, but these could be fairly lengthy responses. I like the idea of having maybe four or five different responses and then asking people to respond to it. My only concern is, are you going to read through all of these? Do you want there to be any type of coding associated with this, or is this more fully grown edification to read what the various responses are?

LAUREEN KAPIN:          Could we put a word limit if you're concerned about a narrative?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:         I'm sure we could.

LAUREEN KAPIN:          That would get at it. We only want the 50 word or less response. We don't want five pages about the gestalt of why they decided to apply for a new gTLD.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:         Perhaps it's less intimidating at the beginning of the survey, rather [than at] the end when you're tired of answering questions. You may be willing to put more thought into your answer.

Moving on to number three, which is somewhat related to four, this is another way of teasing out whether these were so-called ICANN insiders or people who are new to this world. I think this would be a good place to offer some options. Any suggestions?

One, for example, could be ICANN meeting or "I was already an ICANN participant."

JORDYN BUCHANAN:       ICANN [did] some outreach, so it's like, "I saw an ad."

JONATHAN ZUCK:         Yeah, advertisement, commercial. [I heard] from a friend.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:     Yeah, word of mouth. There's a very specific category here, which is, "My IP lawyer came and told me that I should do it."

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:     Right. That was the other question I had. Is it, "My legal department [flagged] me to this," or something along those lines? How do you want to capture that?

JORDYN BUCHANAN:     I would be like, "Another entity that I work with that helps me manage my domains told me about it."

LAUREEN KAPIN:     You could just put, "Advised to do so."

JORDYN BUCHANAN:     "Advised to do so" is good.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:     Yeah, that's good phrasing. Any others?

JORDYN BUCHANAN:     Jonathan had one, which was, "I learned about it by participating in the ICANN process."

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:        Yeah, I got that one. I can work on the language around that.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:        There's one more, which is roughly, "I knew I wanted to apply for a TLD, so I was monitoring." I don't know how to express that.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:        You were waiting for a window to open. Is that what you mean?

JORDYN BUCHANAN:        Yeah, exactly.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:        Wouldn't you already be in the ICANN world, you know what ICANN is and this is how you [inaudible]?

JORDYN BUCHANAN:        Sort of, but I know some applicants who really knew they wanted to do it, but they weren't participating. Every meeting, they would wait to the end of the meeting and check, "Did the board do something?"

I think that's probably its own category.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:         Okay. I'll try to come up with a good way of phrasing that. Waiting for an application window to open?

JORDYN BUCHANAN:        Yeah, exactly.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:         All right. I think we got question four. Question five. "Did you use a consulting service or other outside firm to submit your application, and/or are you the firm that did that?" What's the best way to approach this topic?

JORDYN BUCHANAN:        I think just probably yes or no, and if yes, describe who did it. Describe who helped you.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:         Okay. Describe how would be an open text box?

JORDYN BUCHANAN:        You might want to have two questions. "Who did you use if you're allowed to say? Who did you use? Feel free to use a general statement if you don't want to identify the particular actor." Also, have boxes for what portions of the application they helped with, maybe.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:         Okay, so breaking down the application by pieces?

JORDYN BUCHANAN:     I would imagine it's technical, financial, general application, legal. Those are probably the main ones, and other.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:     Six probably should be higher up, probably following number one, actually.

Do we want much more detail? For example, this one [inaudible]. Or maybe it should be the first one. How many did you apply for? Then what's the status of all your various applications?

JORDYN BUCHANAN:     Do we care about the state of everyone's? Maybe it's just like checkboxes for if you have applications in the following states. I don't know. I don't care. I don't want to make them have to do a lot of math to fill out the survey.

JONATHAN ZUCK:     It doesn't have to be a matrix or something like that. It might make sense just to check all that apply, and if you only have withdrawn and we get the best category of withdrawn.

The problem is that's going to come up again in terms of why you withdrew if it's withdrawn. I don't know if we can get to the same kind of answer there, or do we need to again do all that apply but then get

some kind of text box in addition or something like that. That feels like more important information to me than status, but if it's withdrawn –

JORDYN BUCHANAN:     I agree. If you chose anything other than contention, then we'd want a box to be like, "Please elaborate on why you had to withdraw for this reason." Contention is pretty obvious.

JONATHAN ZUCK:     Right, but even getting at the fact that it's contention in one case and money in another… I guess it's [inaudible] to be money and contention is two different options.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:     I would be surprised if that happened, but we can say check all that apply and then elaborate on the ones –

JONATHAN ZUCK:     That are withdrawn.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:     [inaudible]

JONATHAN ZUCK:     [inaudible] money.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:        Where we think we need more explanation.

JONATHAN ZUCK:          Because the idea is to dig in a little bit into what the challenges were that they faced, right? So without finding those out, we're not going to be able to make recommendations.

As you said, everything other than contention probably, we're going to ask for an open text box, as well.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:        Or you could just do a thing after this that's just like, "Please elaborate on your reason." Or you could just leave it [inaudible]." I don't know. The Nielsen people could probably actually design the survey as long as they understand roughly what we're looking for.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:         [inaudible] we've jumped ahead here. In terms of having the TLDs –

JONATHAN ZUCK:          Part of what we can do – sorry.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:         Go ahead.

JONATHAN ZUCK:     Part of what we can do is if we ask them how many, I feel like it's the ones that only had one that withdrew them that were actually the ones that were most interesting in terms of withdrawal. If you had a whole bunch and you withdrew some of them, it's less interesting. It could be that we can narrow this. Instead of "if withdrawn," we could say, "if withdrawn and only applied for one, then why?" Or something like that. Does that make sense?

JORDYN BUCHANAN:     Is that true? L'Oreal withdrew from two thirds of their applications, including those that weren't contention sets. Do you want to know why they did that?

JONATHAN ZUCK:     I don't know. I guess I'm less interested in why they did that simply because those things weren't dispositive. If a third of their applications stayed in, then the tech requirements wasn't a barrier for them, right? Or am I missing something?

JORDYN BUCHANAN:     Not an absolute barrier. Who knows? Clearly the tech requirements probably aren't, but maybe the money is too much [to have] that many. I'm not sure we really care about giant corporations not having enough money to have as many TLDs as they want.

JONATHAN ZUCK:     Yeah, I don't know. Just to take a step back, Jordyn, when we were looking at this originally before it was a applicant [wide] survey and it was just those that had withdrawn, we were headed in a direction. I had already done a query to find the unique withdrawn applications of people who had only filed one application. That's where that thought was coming from, is that getting back to that would be interesting.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:     No, I totally agree that it's more interesting. I think if we gather it this way, then we can filter on it later and say, "Show me the answers [inaudible] have one withdrawn."

JONATHAN ZUCK:     So do we make it a group-oriented question? "Why did you withdraw the ones that you did?" or something like that?

JORDYN BUCHANAN:     Yeah.

JONATHAN ZUCK:     And then check all that apply, maybe?

JORDYN BUCHANAN:     Yeah, [that's] right here.

JONATHAN ZUCK:     So that they don't have to do a matrix answer?

JORDYN BUCHANAN:    Yeah, agreed.

JONATHAN ZUCK:    Does that make sense, Eleeza?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:    Yeah, I think it does. I'm just thinking through what you've all just said. I think what we want is a general sense of, with the survey anyway, how many applications did you apply for, what are the various states in which your applications are now, and then with these questions. Try to get some of the answer are, but I think ultimately, to drill down even deeper, you'll probably have to rely on these in-depth interviews or focus groups or whatever to find out [even] more.

JONATHAN ZUCK:    That's right.   If we, in question one, ask all that apply and if withdraw is one of the things that applies, then we would ask the [branch] question, and in that case, ask it as a group question. "Why did you withdraw the ones that you did?" Again, it can be all that apply and other or something like that.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:    Right. You'd come down the end and say, "Now think about the ones that you withdrew. Why did you [apply]? At what point in the process? What were some of the deciding factors?" So on and so forth.

JONATHAN ZUCK:            Right.


ELEEZA AGOPIAN:          Okay. I think that makes sense. We'll move Q6 up to the top. For one, we'll just have our check all that apply [as similarly] as they move on down, have all the answers be as widely applicable as possible.

Moving down to question eight on GAC advice, I've kept this pretty simple and I think it would [binary] followed by, I think it would be an open text box unless you want to pre-suggest answers for 8A.


[LAUREEN KAPIN]:         I think that needs to be an open text box.


JORDYN BUCHANAN:        Agreed. I think we were also going to ask something about 8B, maybe. "Did you understand the GAC advice?" Maybe even 8C, which is like, "Did you have a meaningful way to engage with the entity that issued the early warning?" [inaudible] we don't have to [inaudible] we can say government.


ELEEZA AGOPIAN:         With 8B, "Did you understand the GAC advice?" Yes? [inaudible] that answer.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I think one of the questions that we were trying to answer was whether the GAC advice was effectively – I don't remember the exact words. It was like, "Was it effectively communicated?" So if the applicants got it and they were like, "I don't know what this means or what to do with it," then [inaudible]

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I think your 8C is the more appropriate question then. "Did you have a meaningful way to engage, either with the advice or with the GAC representative or whatever the case may be."

LAUREEN KAPIN: I probably should maybe know this, but I don't. I'm just wondering how this actually was funneled because I know there were early warnings, but did the GAC communicate directly with applicants? I thought there was some intermediary here. My impression wasn't that the GAC was communicating directly with this sort of thing, but I could be wrong.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I don't know if the secretariat gave the warning to ICANN and then ICANN sent it out or whether the secretariat just sent it out, but effectively, the secretariat was the intermediary, even if ICANN was the one that actually pushed the button and sent the mail.

LAUREEN KAPIN: There would have been a difference in substance between receiving GAC advice on a particular domain application and an early warning on a domain application. Those were two different things.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:        Correct.

LAUREEN KAPIN:          So I'm wondering if we want to –

JORDYN BUCHANAN:        Yeah, in eight, it should be like, "Did you receive GAC advice or early warning?" Those should be checkboxes, right?

LAUREEN KAPIN:          Yeah.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:        Or one or the other or both. Whatever, but you should be able to tell us what you actually got. Agreed.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:         So which one did you receive? Then you would have, "What impact does that advice have?" Followed by or perhaps preceded by, "Did you have any interaction with the entity that you should be advised?" Is that what you were getting at?

JORDYN BUCHANAN:        Yeah.

LAUREEN KAPIN:  I was just wondering procedurally how these communications were handled because I guess I would be surprised if there were a lot of domain applicant to GAC communications.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:  They're slightly different. With early warning, it all channeled through the secretariat. Like I said, I don't remember exactly who sent the e-mail. I think ICANN did send the e-mail and basically said, "You've received early warning." It basically said, "Here's the warning," and it identified the country that had done it. I think that there was maybe even contact information. Like "Australia gave you early warning. If you want to talk to Australia, here's who to talk to," or something like that. I'm not 100% sure about that last one. We could verify it.

We were already participants in the process so it was easier for us, but we got warning from maybe just from Australia, but we certainly had the opportunity to then go and say, "This is the country that's doing it."

Then for formal advice, the formal advice always comes through the communiqué, obviously directly to ICANN as opposed to the applicant. In some cases, ICANN has explicitly told the applicant and the relevant government entity to go talk to each other, like [.spa]. It's like, "You guys go work it out."

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:  So in terms of posing this question on a survey, is it sufficient just to ask if they had a type of engagement with the one issuing the advice?

JORDYN BUCHANAN:     Yeah, I think so. What we're trying to probe for here is, "Did some faceless entity that you had no ability to interact with mess with your application?"

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:     "And what did you do with it once you got it? What was the impact on your application?"

That would be an open text box. The last one is question nine. It's way too broad. I wasn't sure if this is something that we leave open, if there is some sort of taxonomy we'd want to use here. I think I broadly understand what the point of this question is, but I feel like we've addressed some other types of challenges above. Are there particular challenges you want to get into more? For example, "Were you in a contention set? How was that resolved?" or "Was your application deemed to be confusing?" Similar things of that nature. I think that's part of what this question is getting at.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:     Probably this is generally not true, but, "Did you have problems figuring out how to offer the required technical services? Did you have challenges getting a letter of credit?" We can look at the principal requirements. I think we should have some structure here. That will take a little bit of work to identify all the significant requirements.

JONATHAN ZUCK:     Otherwise, you could ask for biggest challenge or something like that presumably. I think the letter of credit is an important one because we know that's something that's essentially driven policy change.

It may be enough to ask the biggest problem. This is a tough thing. I know that the PDP is planning on trying to go and do this type of survey. We're going to ask everything from digital archery on down. Maybe what we're going to be handing over to them is a list of the people that responded and were willing to discuss things further. Then they end up getting hit twice or something like that. I think they were going to ask much more granular levels of questions. I think what we want to do is maybe instead of going back to all the requirements associated with it, go back to the questions we identified as caring about the application evaluation process and make sure that we covered those.

Sorry. Go ahead, Jordyn.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:     I was going to say I think we may lose some data that way. Everyone may list the same thing as the biggest, but the second or third might vary a lot. If we ask for a top three or something like that, that might be a good compromise without having to create a giant chart for them to check boxes on.

JONATHAN ZUCK:     Makes sense. [I buy] that.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:          So ask for the top three issues faced?

LAUREEN KAPIN:          Yeah, I agree with that. I think just asking for the top one may leave some useful information off the table.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:          Do you suggest this as an open text box, or would we have some predetermined answers there?

JORDYN BUCHANAN:          This will require someone to go in and rescore because a lot of the stuff is going to be the same, but I think leaving it open is probably better because it's hard [as] they are.

LAUREEN KAPIN:          I agree.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:          Or will take a lot of work for us to guess what they are.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:          Right. That's all I had captured for those. These would obviously go to all of the respondents. Is there anything else more specific to those who are still in the application process that you would want to ask that may not apply to the withdrawn applications?

LAUREEN KAPIN:          No. The only other thing that comes to my mind – maybe it's too nebulous, but I'm wondering if there were unexpected hurdles, things that just really took people by surprise that they didn't expect to have to grapple with. Maybe that's going to be captured when we ask about challenges and that sort of thing. What I'm really trying to get at is something that really went against people's expectations. One thing that comes to mind is the public interest commitments I think took people by surprise because they were late in the process. I'm just wondering if there's something to get at, something that was very unexpected. Maybe that's too nebulous, but that is something that comes to mind.

I don't know what Jonathan and Jordyn think about that, if it's too pushy or not.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:       I think it might be interesting.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:        I'm just wondering if you'll get a meaningfully different answer from the previous question.

LAUREEN KAPIN:          Yeah. I'm just floating it. I don't feel strongly about it. It's just something that came to mind.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Yeah, and I can appreciate the sentiment behind it. I just wonder how you would differentiate that from the previous question or if the respondents could meaningfully differentiate that.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Maybe it's not differentiation but a qualification. In other words, were any of the threes that you listed unexpected? Did you expect to have problems with that and you did? I doubt it will create a new one. It won't create a new answer. Sorry, go ahead, Jordyn.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: There are some things, if you're putting together the application and you're like, "This is hard," or "It's annoying to get a letter of credit," but you knew about that going in, it's a different flavor of problem.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Right, exactly.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: "I read the guidebook. It was hard, but I submitted my application. Then this thing happened and it was totally not anticipated by my consultants or the guidebook or whatever."

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yeah, the blindsided issue.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:     Because it does feel different to go in knowing that something's going to be hard, and then it's hard versus going with no sense that something's going to happen. That's a bad experience.

JONATHAN ZUCK:       That's right. Do we capture that by saying, "Were any of these unexpected?"

JORDYN BUCHANAN:     Yeah. Maybe we should like, "Please identify any of these that arose after you submitted your application," or something like that.

JONATHAN ZUCK:       I guess we'll know that though, won't we?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:  From the response.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:     Probably, yeah.

JONATHAN ZUCK:       Because we already know what categories of things.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:     That's right. We can ask the question, "Were they unexpected?" Then we'll scratch our heads if they're like, "It was unexpected I needed this letter of credit." You're like, "But that was in the guidebook, so why?"

JONATHAN ZUCK:     Tell your consultant to read more carefully.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:     Yeah, exactly.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:     Okay. I'll suggest some language, and as I clean all of this up, we'll send it back to you and ask for your feedback on that.

Since we only have a few minutes left on this call, I just wanted to go over the withdrawn questions and see if there's any more we should add, or if you want to add or of course change my suggested responses here.

Number one is the big one. Why did you withdraw?

JONATHAN ZUCK:     The only other category that's been suggested is a reevaluation of the marketplace or something. There's certainly some who have suggested that people just jumped on board because it was structured as a round and it was like a Dutch diamond dealer, the way that we gave them out. We created false scarcity by creating a round. Then once people got into it, they realized that either they didn't really want to do it or they lost

confidence that there was a market for the TLD they were trying to put out there. Does that make sense to folks as a category?

Jordyn, why did you guys drop the ones you dropped, or did you drop any?

JORDYN BUCHANAN:      We dropped three because we applied for illegal TLDs and we dropped our [expert] contentions. That's not a very interesting answer.

JONATHAN ZUCK:        Not helpful.

ELEEZA KAPIN:         Maybe the answer is something like the marketplace was no longer attractive or something. Something along those lines.

LAUREEN KAPIN:        Not as alluring as it first seemed.

ELEEZA KAPIN:         Not as alluring, right.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:      This is the question that is maybe the closest one to the L'Oreal example. Clearly they applied for more than they're going to end up with. They still have all the capabilities necessary to get them because

they're getting some, but they decided that some subset of them they didn't want or need anymore. Understanding that arc would be interesting. I'm sure there's others. I don't know if Amazon dropped any of theirs. I don't think anyone other than us was stupid and applied for invalid TLDs. No, that's not true. There's one other [group].

LAUREEN KAPIN: Never underestimate the mistakes that a lot of people will make. It's rarely just made by one.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: No, there is at least one other person that applied for a country code. Who knew that the word ARE is a country code? It's a code for the UAE, no less.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Interesting.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: You would think the country code for the UAE would be –

LAUREEN KAPIN: UAE.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: You would be wrong.

JONATHAN ZUCK:          Because they're all two letters. They're all two letters, aren't they?

JORDYN BUCHANAN:        No, it's the three letter country codes. ARE is the country code for the UAE.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:    Arab Emirates.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:        Yeah, Arab Emirates.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:    Could I ask [inaudible] Jordyn?

JORDYN BUCHANAN:        Anyways, I'm not ISO. It would be interesting to see if there's other applicants. There's probably not that many who did partial portfolio drops. There's a few, like the brands that got all the way through the process and then didn't delegate. The one brand that got all the way through the process did delegate and then turned it off.

JONATHAN ZUCK:          At that point, I don't know if we're any longer critiquing the application and evaluation process. At that point, it's their thought process.

LAUREEN KAPIN:             You're critiquing the applicants themselves.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:          Yeah, once you get through delegations, [inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK:            Exactly. I think it's on you at that point.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:          Right. There's only one of those.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:           Sorry. I'm just mindful of the time because we're already a minute over. Are there any other big questions you would want to add here so I can maybe take a crack at those before I start to write a revised draft to all of you?

LAUREEN KAPIN:            Not for me.

JONATHAN ZUCK:            Are you happy you did?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:           Are you happy you did?

LAUREEN KAPIN:              No buyer's remorse.


ELEEZA AGOPIAN:           Do we need a survey? Can we just do a poll at the next public –


LAUREEN KAPIN:              All kidding aside, that is actually a valid question. I think it's such a short amount of time that has passed that it would really be a snapshot at a very early stage. In which case, I'm not sure how useful it would be except as a baseline. In that way, maybe it is useful.


JONATHAN ZUCK:           I just think it would be a fun statistic to report out as an interim report for the group. I don't know that it applies to the application and evaluation process. It's just generally speaking. "Of those that responded, 50% which they hadn't." I just think it would be fun to put that out as a statement sometime in the middle. I don't think it's directly applicable to our issue.


[LAUREEN KAPIN]:           Perhaps it's a question of scale. I think in all honesty, you [couldn't] ask the question of, "Were you satisfied with the application process [inaudible]?"

JORDYN BUCHANAN:     I was just going to say that. Maybe we should identify a few little sliders. "Were you satisfied with the application process? Were you satisfied with the evaluation process? Were you satisfied with the transition to delegate [inaudible]?"

JONATHAN ZUCK:       GAC advice.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:     Yeah, two of the few big categories and see.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:      Yeah, I agree. I think for all of these, you could ask a question like that with a sliding scale that would give you something a little more quantitative to play with. I can add that into the revisions. I will do that. Go ahead.

LAUREEN KAPIN:       The GAC advice question. I'm wondering how you get at the counterweight there because a lot of the advice was a red light advice. Stop. Wait a minute. Of course, if you're the person who's going 65 miles an hour and you're told to stop, wait a minute, you're almost always not going to be very happy about that. I'm just mindful that that's a loaded question, so to speak, in this context. I'm wondering how you would get at the other side of it.

JONATHAN ZUCK:       The slider might help with that a little bit, right, in that it's a question of degree?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:      I think the question might be [inaudible]. It might not be, "Were you satisfied with the advice," but "Were you satisfied with how your response rate was resolved or your interactions?"

LAUREEN KAPIN:       That would probably be a better way.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:      Something that gets at more of the end result, rather than the fact that any advice was issued at all.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:     Obviously, if you ask Amazon, "Are you happy with what happened to .amazon?" they're going to say no. The question is, how do you get at whether the process –

LAUREEN KAPIN:       How do you get at whether there was a beneficial effect? I'm not sure you get at that through this survey.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:     Sure, you won't. Similarly, Laureen though, if you look at the other side where if you said to the GAC, "Do you think the public interest was

protected?" And they were like, "Yeah, [inaudible]," and you didn't take the applicant side of [inaudible].

LAUREEN KAPIN:          Absolutely fair, Jordyn. Absolutely fair.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:        It's worth thinking about how to phrase it to try to capture the fact that it's talking about process as opposed to outcome, but I suspect it's still going to be pretty heavily colored by outcome.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:         Agreed. I'll take a crack at the language on this and I'll share it with all of you with all the other revisions, probably by tomorrow.

LAUREEN KAPIN:          Sounds good.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:         Anything else to add or revise?

LAUREEN KAPIN:          I had an off topic question for Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK:          Oh, God.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Oh, God. No, this is an easy one. Our next sub team phone call is scheduled during the ICANN Helsinki meeting. I wasn't sure we have an agreed upon policy about whether that should happen. You can respond to me offline, but I just thought I would raise it because I, for one, think it could be a conflict for those of us who are attending the meeting, which [means me].

JONATHAN ZUCK: I think so, too. I think we probably shouldn't have sub team meetings during [Helsinki].

LAUREEN KAPIN: That's where I was leaning also, but I wanted to get the temperature on that.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah. It might have been worth raising in the call about doing one in a week instead of two weeks, but now it probably needs to be three.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yeah. I think that's right.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Jordyn still has a chance to schedule one for next week if [he] wants.

LAUREEN KAPIN: We have a meeting tomorrow. I can raise it to the groups. I can still raise it via e-mail if folks are interested in talking tomorrow. I think we still have a window to at least ask.

Okay, that's useful. Thank you, Jonathan.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: All right. I think that's all. Thanks, everyone.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right, thanks, Eleeza. Thanks for your work on this.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Sure. Thank you. Bye-bye.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Bye.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**