
RECORDED VOICE: This meeting is now being recorded.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Welcome everybody. Thanks for joining the plenary call.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I'm still hearing a lot of [inaudible] noise.

JONATHAN ZUCK: We're not now.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Good.

CARLTON SAMUELS: There is an echo.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Is there an echo? I didn't hear the echo.

CARLTON SAMUELS: I'm on Skype, I'm calling on Skype, so maybe that's what it is.

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.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. So welcome everyone. Is there anyone on the phone that is not on the Adobe Connect?

Somebody is in [inaudible] environment, there we go. Is anyone on the phone that's not on Adobe Connect? Doesn't sound like it. And are there any updates from anyone's statement of interest?

Okay, perfect. Let's just launch into the agenda. I hope some folks have had some opportunity for some vacations. We have a well-attended call. I'm on vacation this week, so I'm probably going to drop off and let Jordyn, and Laureen, and Drew handle the second half of the call.

I thought we'd begin by taking a look at the hypothesis template that we came up with, and Jordyn was so kind to take note of this project and fill in. Jordyn, will you give a copy of it to Alice to upload?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I realize... Alice reminded me this morning that I hadn't sent it out, so I just sent it to the list. One second, maybe.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Do you want to bring up the project plan in the meantime?
[Inaudible]

SUZANNA: Hi Jonathan, it's Suzanna. Yes we can send you the project plan in the meantime. We've got that uploaded in the Adobe Connect.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks.

[MUSIC]

Wow.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Now I'm getting a piece of piano music.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah. [CROSSTALK] I guess the key is for everyone, please mute your line if you're not speaking. We're just getting all kinds of interesting background noises. Just mute your line if you're not speaking, thank you.

Okay, so Alice recently circulated the latest version of our project plan. And I wanted to bring it up on the screen for people to take a look at, to see if they have observations to make, or concerns to raise, etc. with the plan as it now stands.

I see that everybody has [inaudible] spoken for. Let's...

JAMIE HEDLUND: Hi, it's Jamie. Sorry to be late.

JONATHAN ZUCK: [Inaudible]. I have a small screen here. But if you scroll down to the draft report... [Inaudible] So if you look under 2016 under Q3, which is July, August, and September, and look at that report, you'll see there is

an intense level of activity in the quarter in which we are currently residing. And there is a lot of, that has not started [inaudible] yet.

So I just wanted to put that in front of everybody, that we're trying to just, a bunch of stuff written here in a month and a half, and hopefully we will have some [the bare bones?], as much as we can, in time for the face to face in Vienna. If we don't have... We're going to be... We'll have some findings, some studies.

Folks from the analysis group, and from Neilson, to go over in Vienna, that what we really want to be doing is looking at, you know, beginnings of explanations of some of the stuff involved in some of the structures, what we've been looking at.

So I wanted to draw people's attention to that. And then, you can see there that basically this quarter, next, because what we want to do is try to have, at the end of the year, [inaudible] so that's... An intense period of trying to get some meat on the bones of what we've been doing.

So I just wanted everyone to be aware of that aspect of the work plan. And then we will, you know, over the next year, launch some kind of a public comment to get feedback on [inaudible].

Are there questions about it?

Concerns? [Inaudible], etc.

CARLTON SAMUELS:

Jonathan...

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Thank you. Sorry, I was in the big screen. I am starting to catch up. I will have enough time before Vienna, so I'm working on it. I'm wondering after that, how do you, are going to weave all of these sections together, just with an initial chapter that will be drafted at the end, and so on. I see, well, we have to do a lot of work, I agree, and we have to go deep into some issues, but how are you going to build them together in a form of a final draft and not just a sequence of papers? If I may ask, thank you very much.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Of course Carlton, that's a good question. I'm working together with Alice to look at the structure for the overall report. And I hope to spend the last few weeks of August [inaudible]... So some, you know, put into prose some of the things that we've presented...

JAMIE HEDLUND: Hey Jonathan, this is Jamie. I'm having a really hard time here for you. Maybe it's on my end. Is anyone else having a hard time hearing...?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I'm having a hard time hearing Jonathan too.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Same.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Raise the volume.

DAVID TAYLOR: Same for me. I must say, David here, it's very rare...

JONATHAN ZUCK: How about this?

DAVID TAYLOR: Jonathan's back.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Much better, thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. How about this? [CROSSTALK] ...low tech gear here. I bought some low tech gear here in the upper peninsula in Michigan. So, to answer Carlos's question, I'm planning to spend the last two weeks in August on drafting around all of this stuff to try and come up, along with Alice, a framework for the report as a whole, and hoping to then come away from that exercise, Carlos, with a clearer picture of how we're tying things together.

Part of what we're going to do is... And that's why we're talking about the templates a little bit, is kind of roll out the research into the hypothesis worksheets, so that we can kind of create a, you know, hypothesis-driven structure for the paper.

And so that's why we're hoping to use the templates because of a hope to standardize the material that we create. I'm sure that a couple of us will probably work hard on a kind of an edit pass as well to try to make it all the same voice and inform the same structure as well. And we'll come up with a template, working in Word, but hopefully we can come up with a document template as well for the formatting as well.

We'll do that also before Vienna. So that's sort of the answer. I think we will have a chapter at the beginning that kind of summarizes the results, and then worksheets, Carlos, will be able to have daily standardized output from the individuals that are participating in the drafting.

Carlton, you have a question?

Carlton, I can't hear you. You might be on mute.

But I had heard you earlier.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Sorry, I was on mute, I'm sorry. Can you hear me now?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yup.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Okay. So I was saying, I was asking the same question along the lines Carlos is asking, and making reference directly now to the work plan. Because the work that I think that was one path that is missing from this work plan. It requires a small team to kind of give an outline of the chapters for the report, and then we would discuss it and agree on that as a team.

That line, which is very important in my opinion, is not on the project plan. And I was expecting to see right after the sub-teams reach discussion and discussion paper.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, Carlton, that's a good point. Alice, let's integrate that into the work plan. I think that we can plan on having a structure for the report, including the chapters and overall framework to discuss in Vienna.

And that's me and Alice. Thanks Carlton. David?

DAVID TAYLOR: Yes, thanks Jonathan. I just, more of a specific query I suppose, on the project plan. I'm looking at the economic study in terms of the results and the economic study final results which we've got there. And as you know, I've been looking at the RPM study that INTA. I just, I know that doesn't figure on the timings. [Inaudible] this is the impact study on the rights protection mechanisms, and I just wanted to, we should probably put that in, but also might or might not be the time to update, but we are there.

I had a quite a detailed call earlier this week with the INTA's chief executive, and various members of the Internet Committee, and I just want to confirm that it's going to be a proper impact study. It's quite a bit of discussion of rushing it, not rushing it, timeline, the need to have it, etc.

They do want to do it properly. They do want to do it by a third party provider and not have it as an INTA specific thing, which they're sort of putting together. But it looks as if the delivery date won't be before December 2016. So I just thought we could put that in. So we've got that in the timeline now. But it's important that it's not going to be September, so I was hoping it was going to be more like December.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Will we be able to publish it in December?

DAVID TAYLOR: Good question. We certainly...

JONATHAN ZUCK: Ideally we could include it as an appendix in the report, and just make reference to it in our draft, so that again as part of... So that it can be part of that public comment period. So let's put that as an objective, if we can, and maybe send you back in to [inaudible] on that.

DAVID TAYLOR: Yeah, sounds good. It would be good to get it in our project planning.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Now we have some dates to put in there, but let's make it a real objective to make it part of our document in some way, even if it's essentially independent.

DAVID TAYLOR: Great, thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Carlton, do you have something else?

CARLTON SAMUELS: No, not really. The thing I'm glad to see, David [inaudible] is doing an impact study. There were some data that was released that was showing the use of the RPMs over a period of time, that we have now, but there was some questions that I thought we, the data that we now have does not answer.

So, and that's about impact really, real documented information on impact. You have the [inaudible], you have the [inaudible] statistics. You have the statistics out of ICANN itself, but impact? We're light on it. So I'm glad to hear.

Somebody is breathing very hard.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Carlton, that may be Jonathan now that I turned my microphone up so high. So I apologize.

So, yeah David, any update you can give us along the way, that would be great. If we could see structures or plans that come together, so that we know how they will be incorporated into the report. That will really be helpful.

Okay, any other questions on the project plan? Because remember, silence is consent.

Okay. Thank you. Alice, have you received the document from Jordyn yet?

ALICE JANSEN: Yes, Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Jordyn, I would love to put you on the spot and just share your experience with filling in the template and what you felt like you were shoe-horning, or you'd like to see something changed, or how you interpreted the template. And then we can have some more discussion about that.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Sure. I realized that after our last discussion, I may have been using the wrong template, but I went back and searched for another one and

couldn't find it. So, it's possible that you have another one in mind for this, but if so, we'll have to give it another try.

But in any case, I took the analysis group for the competition and consumer choice team, completed their first of what we have defined as projects for our team. And this project was basically to compute statistics on market concentration. And I guess one thing that might be helpful, would also to be share the analysis group spreadsheet, which I didn't do, but we can do as a follow-up, maybe, for folks to see.

In this particular case, the actual spreadsheet produced by the analysis group is quite short, and so arguably the... Actually, I put together a response to it, is longer than the original, largely because I was trying to draw some English language findings, and/or apply a layer of analysis and conclusions on top of it.

So, you'll see here that, and this gets to the point of maybe I'm using the wrong template. One of the things that I ended up doing at the top is, this market share question relates to the issue of competition, I think fairly generally. Whereas, we have a number of more specific questions that we've attempted to answer.

And so, when I looked at the high level questions, I had to include all of the specific questions that this relates to, as opposed to focusing it on a single one. Partly the complication is as well, the analysis group analysis, or the analysis group's spreadsheet, included data on both market share for registry operators, as well as market share for registrars within the gTLD space.

And so, that gets to two different types of questions that we're trying to look at. One is, what the effects are on competition for, in the registry spaces, and the other is what the effective competition in the registrar space has been. But in any case, as you'll see, I've listed all of those high level questions.

And then from a [inaudible] perspective, I thought it was, a little bit both easy and useful in this particular case, at least, to try and just drill down, okay, we have some numbers. What do we think those numbers mean? And so, for example, one of the things that I saw, looking at the numbers, I had did a little research to remind myself what exactly these statistics... Yeah, what exactly these computations meant, but for example, I think US DOJ considers a market to be sort of concentrated if the HHI statistic is above, I don't remember if it's 16 or 1800.

But if you look at the concentration in the gTLD marketspace, in general, the HHI is something like 6360. So it's several times that threshold. So that market as a whole, looks very concentrated. On the other hand, the number was much lower if you just looked at new gTLDs. All of the measures of market concentration were quite low in the new gTLDs.

And so, I think the finding from that was essentially that, while the new gTLDs themselves seem to be more competitive and have less market concentration than the gTLD space as a whole, they are not yet a significant part, they are not part of that overall broader market, to have a significant effect than on overall concentration.

I see Megan has got her hand up, so maybe I'll pause and let her jump in before moving on.

MEGAN RICHARDS: Thanks a lot Jordyn. Just one question. I know what you're trying to say, but I'm just wondering, this has to be edited, and finalized, and see what we [inaudible]. But I'm just wondering if any other reader, except us, would understand the [inaudible] community market [inaudible]...

And I think, the [inaudible]... there are many different [inaudible]... distinction between [inaudible] that existed from the old ones, and the existing ones the new [inaudible] that they're established, and the new round of new gTLDs.

So I'm just wondering if it wouldn't be [inaudible] already...

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, so Jordyn...

MEGAN RICHARDS: ...exactly what we're talking about [inaudible] absolutely clear, because not only that, I think it would be a bit difficult to categorize the [inaudible] new gTLD market as the one from the new round, a significantly less concentrated than the overall [inaudible]... but I think that would be hard to assess.

But perhaps you have the data on that. [CROSSTALK]

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Go ahead Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

I was just going to say that, just to remind you Megan, that these worksheets, that we're working at are for us, so that we gather our thoughts in a kind of consistent way. That things will then be turned into prose in the report. And so, areas of clarity, clarification that are needed, footnotes, etc. will be a part of the prose of the report for sure.

Certainly definitions around what we mean by the new gTLD program, is something that we'll define early on in the document based on the affirmation of commitments request. So purposes of discussion, we are talking about the latest round of new gTLDs as a program and impact that that has had on competition.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:

Thanks Jonathan. Yeah, so that's roughly the point that I was going to make as well, it's just that, I agree. We have to come up with some definitions and some consistent language, since this is the first... [Inaudible] using a template, obviously we don't have that yet, and this is meant to be largely a trial run of using the document and to understand, to learn exactly the sorts of things that Megan is pointing out, which is that we'll probably would want to start to be using some common words to describe the same concept, so that even amongst ourselves, we know the language that we're talking about.

I think, Megan, just to answer your points directly. This gets back to what analysis group actually did as part of this. And they basically looked, did the same market concentration computations for adjusted gTLDs that have launched as part of the 2012 round, and then re-

computed it across the pool of all gTLDs. So both the new ones as well as any gTLDs that have been delegated prior to that.

And so just for context, the HHI computation for just the new gTLDs was 683 versus 6360 for the, in higher gTLD pool. And so, that's where I wrote that it's significantly less concentrated. I think, at least... I don't know what you use in Europe, but the DOJ seems to say, under 1,000 is considered to be not concentrated, where 1600 is, or 1800, I think, is considered to be a concentrated market.

And so the new gTLD market falls under the 1,000 threshold, and the total new gTLD market falls much higher than that. So that's where the conclusions comes from. So that is the data. So I see, Carlton said, asked the question, which is what high level questions came from in chat, and Carlton, those are the high level questions that have been identified by the competition and consumer choice subgroup.

I think we have six or seven of them that we've identified that we're trying to answer as part of the effort. And then I think Kaili might have another question as well.

KAILI KAN:

Yes. Thank you Jordyn. Yeah, I have a question, yes. My question is that, well, if we had the HHI that shows that less competition in the overall market, [inaudible] putting everything together, however, whether that could be interpreted into competition, being competitive or not competitive. Because, as I remember that we had all agreed that competition is defined as, it has been able to substitute each other, or say, substitute [ability].

However, the concentration, the [start] really defines such [usability]. And as we discussed before, that the, no matter gTLDs or new gTLDs, they, many of them either, they may not be substituted against each other. So even if we say there is less concentration, whether we can interpret that as being competitive, I sort of have doubts of that. Thank you.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:

Sure. And can I add...? I'm not trying to get to the findings that we'll eventually publish in our study, in our final report today. And you're right. I'm probably using some shorthand. I think, for now, it's totally fine to think of this as just talking about concentration as opposed to competition.

I do think that's a metric, if I understand it, that's a metric that competition authorities use to understand whether they consider the marketplace to be competitive or not. Whether or not we wanted to do that, I guess, is an open question. But in any case, this does show a difference in concentration amongst the new gTLDs versus the gTLD marketplace as a whole.

KAILI KAN:

Yeah. So, in that case, well I would suggest that maybe we would be careful when we use the language, competition, competitive, etc. And instead, we just say, let's concentration, or more concentration. Thank you.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:

Sure, thanks Kaili. So I'll just add, the other quick findings that I identified in this exercise, were that the registrar concentration metric hadn't, weren't significantly different between the overall gTLD market, the overall gTLD pool, and the new gTLDs.

And then lastly, that there was quite a bit of concentration sort of in the borderline to quite concentrated definition that the US DOJ uses at least, in the registry services provider market. And so then, I think those findings were fairly easy to, for me at least, to synthesize in this case. And then I tried to come up with some causes with this addresses.

And those were roughly that, you know, as I mentioned earlier, it's probably the case that new gTLDs are quite small still. They haven't had the opportunity to significantly change the overall marketplace, which they were much smaller than the legacy gTLDs.

But the registrar explanation, the cause of the registrar not changing is probably the fact the same registrars are generally used in legacy gTLDs and new gTLDs, so the fact that the mix of registrars has changed is probably not that surprising.

And then, perhaps a more controversial one, and I don't know that we necessarily have the data to fully substantiate this cause yet, but I threw it out to start to maybe identify the type of cause that we can suggest recommendations to address, would be that maybe it's the case that ICANN's requirements on like, for example, technical requirements, make it difficult for new entrants in the backend services provider, which is why we see a relatively more concentrated market there, then in the registry operator market itself.

And so, what I didn't do is try to create any recommendations or next steps at this point, because I think this was just a first set of data. There was a bunch of other information that we're hoping to look at with regards to competition and whether it's present or not, and I'd like to see some of that before we jump to recommendations.

So this was mostly an attempt to get some initial findings at least from the data.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks Jordyn. And I agree, definitely, with that approach. This is Jonathan. Carlos, you have your hand up. Go ahead.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: Yes. Thank you very much Jordyn. This is very interesting and [motivating] to continue with the other hypothesis templates. I have just a technical question. If we had general comments like, can we adjust it, and want to give all of this discussion, where should we discuss it? I don't want to [inaudible] your paper, because your hypothesis is very clear, but for example, if we want to discuss the difference between number of registrars and registries, and prize competition, which is a totally different issue, which is pricing of the domain names, where do we do this discussion without spoiling your template?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Sure. So Carlos, I would suggest a couple of possibilities. Number one is that I do have a Google Doc version of the template as well, and so that allows commenting and, you know, that might be a perfectly fine place

to have the discussion. And secondly, I think obviously, had we introduced [Slack?] I think we could have a [slack] discussion around this document, since we don't, I think just a follow-up to the email I forwarded to the list seems like a fine place to have it as well.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

And so, the other thing Carlos... This is Jonathan. I think again, we'll start a general framework document that had some definitions in it and things like that. And I think that's where a lot of these things may find themselves if they aren't specific to a particular finding.

So I think comments in the Google Doc, if they're specific, and then we will have another Google Doc, which is this overall outline and framework. And that will be a good place to have general conversations about definitions, and things like that [inaudible]...

Does that make sense?

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ:

It makes a lot of sense, Jonathan, and I commend you in the same line that Megan did a few moments ago, we're talking a totally different language then, for example, the health index that was published recently for comments. And the health index is really on a very, very general level, and is just showing positive growth numbers registrations.

And we have to be very careful there, because if we didn't make a regular statement, people will not understand how one ICANN document says one thing, and another ICANN document says a totally different thing.

So I think it's very, very important if these definitions and so on, and showing why we're going into such depth, otherwise there will be some cross [inaudible] there. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Yeah, and I'm not entirely surprised as one of the volunteers in the health index, I'm not surprised that there are some cross messages. So, that's going to lead to some interesting discussions, I think. One comment I have Jordyn, and for everyone, is we're just sort of working out the kinks of the template.

My intension at least, has been for the hypothesis questions to be more granular, and not to be the highest level question. So in this case, the hypothesis might be that the introduction of new gTLDs helped to decrease concentration in the gTLD marketplace. Something like that is what I'm thinking of as hypothesis, and that we then, and then when you relate it to a high level question, it will end up being a series of hypothesis that relate it to a high level question, that then we can draw our conclusions around.

Does that make sense?

JORDYN BUCHANAN:

So Jonathan, it does. In this case, [inaudible] making several of these documents, because again, it's because, you know, between the registrar numbers, the gTLD numbers, and backend operator numbers, is at least three possible hypotheses there. So this gets back to, I think

we need a different template for just sort of like, hey, here is a piece of, a set of data and what we're concluding from it, versus...

JONATHAN ZUCK: And that was the other template, that was the other template. So I'll point you back to the other one, which was just sort of research paper driven, or was one that had multiple hypotheses imbedded in it.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah. So if you can recirculate that, I can try to migrate this over. And then we can do, maybe just do one of the questions here... Or we can make the three, and just have them replace all of this for now, because we're waiting, we're presumably awaiting more data on these topics. If we're trying to look at the...

JONATHAN ZUCK: I think you're exactly right. So, the idea being that multiple of the other, I don't know the best way to say this, because I think it makes more sense showing it, but in the other template you'll have multiple hypothesis for the part that deals with the particular hypothesis, will roll into one of the findings for this hypothesis, if that makes sense.

So we'll circle back and try those two. I'll make sure to get that other template. Stan, you have your hand up.

STAN BESEN: Just a small technical point. The table that Jordyn has been referring to, reports concentration contemporaneously, that is for the latest data, date for which data are available. We can't really say that the entry of new gTLDs has reduced overall concentration among registries without data for the period before the new gTLDs were introduced.

I believe the analysis group is producing that, but the particular table he's referring to does not have the before data.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, great. Yeah, I know that would definitely be helpful. You just want to at least show a trend, one way or the other, if we can. Okay, so we'll circle back with this again, and Jordyn, maybe you and just need to schedule a call and we'll get a concrete example of that in front of people, because I think it will make more sense when we, in use than it is me talking around it.

So I'll get you the other template.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Great.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. The last thing I wanted to do, quickly, well, I need to jump off to go hiking with my in-laws, is to look back at a letter from Eleeza that had some documents represented, and I wanted to get some folks to volunteer to read those documents and report back on them. So Alice, do you have that email from Eleeza?

ALICE JANSEN: One moment.

JONATHAN ZUCK: No problem.

And Megan, I already have you signed up to, for that report that we discussed on our call. Is that right?

MEGAN RICHARDS: I promised to look at the GAC recommendations on evaluation and analysis. [Inaudible] I have it on my desk [inaudible]... And I have a bit more time now.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I need you to send me a photo of your desk, though, so I can put that into context.

MEGAN RICHARDS: Yeah, it looks a lot better than before because I had to move offices. [Inaudible]... So it's on the top of my priorities. I hope in the next week.

JONATHAN ZUCK: So, there is one document here, which is the... Which one is it here? The NGPC responses to GAC advice. That document. Can I get someone to volunteer to look through that document?

MEGAN RICHARDS: Jonathan, normally I wouldn't be offering to do so much, but since I'm already looking at the GAC advice, and the [inaudible] of GAC advice, would it not be useful to just add this in? I mean...

JONATHAN ZUCK: I couldn't agree more. I couldn't agree more. And then the third document was one that we just got back from the PDP folks, which is a questionnaire that went to the GAC, and came back from Thomas, and maybe I'll put that on your plate as well, and you can... Once you look at all three of them, decide whether it's too much, but if they all sort of fit nicely together, it will probably be a good idea for you to look at all three if you can.

I don't know how long that is.

MEGAN RICHARDS: Yeah, I think it would be more efficient. More efficient [inaudible]...

JONATHAN ZUCK: So, Eleeza circulated it. Like I said, it was a questionnaire that was submitted to the GAC by PDP on subsequent procedures, and Eleeza circulated, but Eleeza, maybe, if you can make a point to send it specifically to Megan, that would be helpful.

Is that all right Eleeza? Am I making sense with stuff that I'm talking about?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I'm sorry, I have four windows open. Can you please restate on what you would like me to send to Megan?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, just send to Megan... I think she probably already has it somewhere in her inbox, but the document that came back from the PDP folks that was their questionnaire to the GAC.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Yes, absolutely.

JONATHAN ZUCK: A letter back from Thomas, I think. Okay. Thank you very much. Those were the things that I wanted to try and address myself. And now what I would like to do, I'm going to get off the call and hand the call over to Alice to manage, but to hear progress updates from the sub-teams, and Eleeza will talk about the applicant survey questions, and incorporate in the subsequent procedures from the call that we had together.

And we'll go from there. And I'll see you guys on the sub-team call next week. Thanks a lot. Alice, I had the mic...

ALICE JANSEN: Thank you Jonathan. So I think we can move onto progress updates. Jordyn, would you like to start off with competition consumer choice?

JORDYN BUCHANAN:

Sure. Happy to. On our last call, we did a quick review of our projects status, as I mentioned, that is, we discussed earlier, we've seen the first of our projects come back from analysis group, which is a very encouraging sign. And we're also in the home stretch in terms of data gathering, I think.

At least in either getting it or giving up on it. With regards to getting it, I think we're mostly at the point where we have the ccTLD data that we think we're going to get, or going to. We have identified a source to get parking data, and just need to finalize that arrangement with NTLD stats.

And after some outreach to aftermarket providers, it seems like we may have a difficult time getting that data, which will make it somewhat difficult to draw some conclusions about effective price and legacy gTLD marketplace due to price counts, but may just be a limitation that we have this go around.

We also spent some time on our call talking about the template response that I put together that we just discussed. And got some status updates on things like the Nielson report, but we're expecting, over the next few weeks leading up to Vienna, to get a few more of these projects complete, and have some of these more templates fleshed out.

And I'm hoping to spend the bulk of our time in Vienna really just sort of talking through the data and analysis that we've seen up to that point, and starting to talk about the conclusions that we're able to draw from

them in an effort to start thinking about what our answers to the high level questions that we're going to answer are. Hopefully, for example, a bit more data on price, and around registrant behavior, we'll be able to start making some conclusions about the effects on competition, for example, and hoping that you know...

I'm a little bit optimistic that either [inaudible] or shortly thereafter, we'll really be able to start agreeing upon what the data that we've seen means, so that we can start getting into earnest drafting mode leading up to the December deadline. So overall I think, starting to see some... We did a lot of bootstrapping in sort of defining data and projects, and now we're starting to see the results of that, and I'm hoping we'll start to see that come over altogether, hopefully leading up to Vienna, but some of it will trickle in a few weeks later.

So I think that's all, unless folks have questions. And for some reason for me, Adobe has gone completely blank, so I can't see raised hands if there are any.

ALICE JANSEN:

I don't see any hands up in the Adobe room. Shall we move on to the safeguards and trust? Maybe we want to [highlight?] between Drew and Laureen here. Laureen is back from vacation and Drew filled in for her while she was away. Drew, do you want to start and then Laureen, you can take over?

DREW BAGLEY:

Yes, I will begin. I will say, welcome back Laureen. [CROSSTALK] Our main update are that Laureen is back, and as many of you may have seen last night with the ICANN email that went out, the DNS abuse study RFP is finally official, it's finally out there. I know we've been talking about it for months, and now it's finally out there.

So please spread the word to any potentially eligible vendors that you think should submit a bid on it. And in the academic community [inaudible], so that we can get as many proposals as possible. So that's our big thing. And then otherwise, we now have templates for all of our discussion papers that we need to complete before we arrive in Vienna. And we have not yet had a lot of movement on those papers, and so if you know, if anyone has any feedback, I'm sure we'll talk about it next week during our sub-team meeting, or people can shoot Laureen and me emails in the interim, so we can you know, see what's going on there.

But I think going through that exercise a little while ago with one of the papers was good. I think for our group, what's different from the competition group is that the data that we have to work with thus far are primarily, you know, a lot of readings and studies that have already been done, but not studies that have been tailored toward our research questions.

And so for us, a lot of what we're doing is a literature review to define the world of consumer trust and safeguards as it was, and then as it became after the implementation of the new gTLDs, but we don't have the data yet on the impact. And so, you know, I think that's something

that we'll probably all be working through as we're trying to fit that into these templates, now that we've driven into it a bit.

And so those are the, those are the main announcements for our group. So I welcome any feedbacks from the rest of the larger group, and especially if any of you even want to take a look at our discussion paper topics and provide feedback on anything that's come to mind in your research that we should be looking at with safeguards, these discussion papers. And with that, I will pass it to Laureen for entertaining any questions.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

This is Laureen. First of all, I'm very glad to be back, and I appreciate everyone's consideration of my vacation time. It was only thanks to everyone stepping up, particularly Drew, and of course, the great ICANN support team that enabled me to have a real vacation from the CCT's perspective. So I appreciate that.

I'm very happy to see the assignments for discussion papers. I think the groups are very well positioned. I also am happy to report that another source of data has come in, and that is from ICANN enforcement. [Inaudible] was very helpful in providing some data about registrar abuse and privacy proxy complaint. And a general Excel spreadsheet on numbers of complaints, and high level descriptions of issues regarding the types of complaints that enforcement was receiving during the one-year period between June 2015 and June 2016.

And they've also reported on the above distinguishing between legacy gTLDs and new gTLDs. So, I'm going to be looking at that, and I'll also

pass on the information to the group, but I think that should be very helpful. So, that is, that's the positive side. On the more challenging side, we have a lot of work to do between now and Vienna with really getting these discussion papers drafted, so that once we get to Vienna, we can really spend time discussing them, retooling them, focusing them so that we're really teed up to begin preparing our draft report.

And also as Carlos and Carlton have already noted, the challenging task of how we knit things together. So, I'm really hoping that our team can really find the time and focus that's going to be necessary to get these discussion papers drafted and off the ground, so that our time in Vienna is not spent on, in creating discussion papers, but really refining the discussion papers.

So that's my big takeaway message for today, and we'll be talking more about it in next week's call. So again, it's great to be back, and a huge thanks to the team, especially Drew and Alice and Pam and Eleeza and everyone else who has supported our ongoing activities. I really appreciate it.

So if folks have questions, now is the time. I'm looking to see if there are any hands. Carlos, I see your hand up.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ:

Thank you Laureen. Welcome back. I just started to work again on the CCT review team as per last week's call. I choose to work in the safeguards environment, because I understand less on the side as compared with numbers and economics, and we have very good economic people on the other group.

It was very good to have a first discussion of the first hypothesis by Jordyn today. I've been looking at templates, and I have a really hard time because also to safeguards hypotheses are the soft kind, with less numbers and so on.

So my suggestion, from my point of view, instead of glaring at this empty template, is to proceed very fast in discussing the hypothesis. So we get a bit of feeling, you know. I read the hypothesis that Jordyn proposed today, and Kaili's comments, and inevitably for me, there was a lot of questions and ideas to add. When I look at the empty template of the safeguards comment, like this publication [inaudible] go into the contract, I cannot imagine anything substantial.

So my suggestion is really, can we... Without spoiling the template, I'm afraid of spoiling the template, can I use the template or some parallel document in Google Docs to start commenting, or asking as [inaudible] as possible that...? That's my suggestion. Right now I have a big block, a wide screen when I look at the template, and I don't know how to start asking or putting some ideas without spoiling it.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

So, Carlos, I want to make sure I understand A) what your concern is; and then B) what your proposing. Just to go back to something that I heard Jonathan say. My sense is that he wants these hypotheses to be granular, and when I hear that, what I'm thinking is he means, instead of being big questions, i.e. did the new gTLD program promote competition or consumer trust?

He means them to be smaller questions. For example, we might just looking at DNS abuse, for example, with Drew's study... And I say that loosely because Drew isn't doing the study, but the study that Drew has championed and worked so hard on, with support from a lot of others, that question is really going to be focused on the levels of abuse in the new gTLD versus the legacy gTLDs.

And it will hopefully be able to give us some snapshots of that. So that might be a smaller question, to what extent of levels of DNS abuse changed after the new gTLD program went into effect. That might be a smaller question, and the hypothesis might be that it decreased, or the hypothesis might be that it has increased.

Those would be smaller, smaller questions. So I just want to frame that comment in terms of we're not answering the huge questions with these discussion papers, we're answering smaller questions. So, my understanding one of your concerns correctly, that you're not sure what questions we're asking. I also heard your comments that the questions were, I'm going to be soft. And then we hear you saying soft, what I heard you really saying is, there aren't going to depend on number data.

They're going to be more subjective. And I'm not sure, you know, in certain cases, we have some data like the Neilson survey, which is very specific. In that regard, I think we do have, you know, I'll call it hard data, specific data might be a better term, you know, to work with. So you know, I think in certain cases, we still have some specific data and we should definitely focus on that.

So I guess I need a little more clarity, Carlos, as to what you're troubled by, and what you propose to do to help us out with that?

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: Yes. I was not thinking in that direction. And you just gave me an excellent example to discuss. What I'm wondering is, the first box. What is the hypothesis? Like in Jordyn's, we had, do we get more price decision? Do we get more price competition? If we take your example, of Drew's study, my hypothesis would be just under here. Do people have enough possibilities and straightforward possibilities to air their complaints and about their views?

That would be my suggestion. Excuse me, let me finish. Because my comment, my only to Drew's terms of relevance, or so, was there is a sentence. We will go and look for reports of abuse.

Well, my question is, why does...? What are the reports of abuse? Where are they based? Are they just US based reports of abuse? Or European reports of abuse? Why does not ICANN have a special page for reporting abuse? I mean, how do we collect abuse? And looking forward to a recommendation. One recommendation might be, there must be a [inaudible] way that each normal person, anyone in the world, can report abuse.

That's what I mean with a granular, more... That's what I understand under a more granular approach. If we go out and it happens that the two key sources of abuse are just Euro-centric or US-centric, we might be missing half of the world. This is where I get a blank page, and I don't know where to start.

I also think it's a great idea. I read Drew's guidelines, but my question is, which are we able to use? I mean, are these used by everybody? Or are these used just by a few [inaudible] of the system? You see, this is the kind of discussion I need to start working with the template.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

So thanks Carlos for that. And I think what you're pointing to is, is both a substantive issue, which may lead to a recommendation. You know, in your example, which is that there isn't a mechanism in place, or a centralized mechanism in place, for people to report abuse. Or there isn't a mechanism in place that people know about in a centralized way to report abuse from all over the world.

So I think the, you know, in your example, the hypothesis might be that there isn't a sufficiently centralized and known mechanism for people to report abuse from all over the world. That might be your hypothesis, and then you would look to what is this? And what doesn't exist to discuss that and come up with a recommendation, presumably which is that a reform could be that there should be some centralized mechanism.

And I'm just using this as an example without being factually accurate one way or the other. But that might be one way to approach it, but I don't think that's a problem with the template, I think that's just a problem that may exist in the system, that we're going to be making recommendations on.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: I'm not saying there is a problem with the template. I'm saying, the template is wide, and I'm scared to bring these ideas to the template, because it was the outcome of your meeting, the point Carlos, don't spoil the template with your ideas.

LAUREEN KAPIN: No, no, no, no! Okay, I'm giving you permission to the extent that you needed it at all. Don't be scared, Carlos. This is exactly the sort of work we should be doing, and we should be discussing. And perhaps we can devote part of our sub-team call next week to having a discussion about these hypotheses, and having perhaps a short brainstorming session to make sure that we're all comfortable with generating some hypothesis for our discussion.

Would that be helpful?

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: That is great. That is great. If we could focus next session of our sub-team, just looking at the hypotheses, that would be wonderful.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay, yeah, let's do that. Other questions? And thank you Carlos, for raising that point, because I know you're not alone. And I certainly am also working through the process of coming up with this. So, I'm glad that you voiced what I'm sure a lot of people are grappling with.

Other questions, comments, concerns?

Okay. I'm not seeing hands up, or hearing voices, so I'll assume there are none for now, but with no prejudiced to people raising questions and concerns, either in our call, or via email, or whatever other mechanism they choose to communicate by.

And I see Drew is typing, so we may have some comments in the chat as well.

So Alice, I turn the call over back to you.

ALICE JANSEN:

All right, thank you Lauren. So I think we'll pass on the torch to Eleeza for the research updates. Thanks Eleeza.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:

Hey all, thank you. This is Eleeza, and apologies if you hear a crying toddler in the background. So I just want to give some quick updates on the surveys and economic studies, and then we can get into the applicant survey questionnaire, which you all have been including your comments on. So thank you for that.

On the Neilson registrant survey, we should be getting the results to you before you head out to Vienna, and in fact, [inaudible] Neilson will be joining us there, likely on Monday on your meeting to discuss the results and give you some time to go through those like they did in Washington.

And the analysis group, as Jordyn referenced, the discussion has been providing some interim data to the competition and choice team in

response to some of their requests for calculations. They should complete all of those calculations, including their phase two report, that builds off of last year's economic study.

So you'll have a draft of that report before you travel to Vienna, and Greg from analysis group will be there joining you for two days to go through the results and discuss the findings with the competition and choice team. And I think also, the larger team, I'm sure you're interested in hearing about the broader economic study and not just the work based on the competition and choice team.

The other piece of research I wanted to reference here, is the work done on the developing world cohorts that Andrew [inaudible] from AM Global has been doing. They produced a list of names of possible firms to interview in Latin America and Africa, and they're now continuing that research in Asia-Pacific, which includes the Middle East as well.

And they're actually beginning interviews with those cohorts this week from the Latin America and Africa list, to come up with a report for you on why these corporations or other firms and organizations didn't apply for the program, whether they knew about it at all, or if they would be interested in it for the future.

So that work is beginning, and I believe they'll have a report to us by late September, if I'm not mistaken. I see Carlos is asking for the links to Andrew's work. I'll make sure to send that out to the list once again, Carlos.

So, I think those are the main bits of research. We've also requested some data from NTLD stats on legacy parking data that the competition

and choice team requested. And I think Jordyn, you're working on refining that request for them. So that's where that data request stands.

Unless there are any questions on that topic, we'll move on to the applicant survey questionnaire.

Okay, I think my daughter has some questions. Okay. So, the applicant questionnaire, which is in front of you, involves a timely, I'll put this as a Google Doc. Alice, maybe you can share that too in case anyone wants to go in there and ask for additional comments. I think the comments you've all put in have been great.

On Monday, we actually shared with the PDP working group to solicit some input from them on topics they might be interested in reading, because we realized the results of this survey, excuse me, the results of this survey would probably be of interest to them, as they want to build upon the experiences of the 2012 round of new gTLDs, they consider policy change in future work in new gTLD, or future applications for new gTLDs.

So we've discussed that with Neilson, and they provided quite a bit of feedback. And I've added these here as my own comments. You could see where they made suggestions. One larger point that I want to bring up for all of you to consider, is that this has become quite a long survey.

We had initially spoken to Neilson about budgeting for a 15-minute survey, which would include seven, what they call, other [inaudible], which means questions that have dedicated answers, and that in other text box is a possible, another possible answer. And then seven open-

ended questions. We currently have, I believe, eight open-ended questions, and nine other [inaudible]. If you think about when you take surveys online, that's a lot of writing, and I think that might turn off some people from responding.

And Neilson is concerned about the quantity, or the quality of responses with so many open-ended questions. That being said, these are all important questions to ask, and I know that we want to get this from the nuisance of these answers. And you know, multiple choice isn't always going to get us the answers we want, but I'm hoping to consolidate some of these so we can make this a more concise survey.

So I've made some suggestions in a document about where we can consolidate things, and maybe combine some open-ended questions into one open-ended question rather than me having to code two or three answers, having to only code one answer might be helpful. The other thing to bear in mind is that we are inviting the respondents to be open to phone interviews after the questionnaire, and having these in-depth interviews will also add a little bit more context to the responses that you see here.

So I don't want to take up your time by going through a line by line edit, but we've given the PDP working group until Friday to give us any of their feedback. If I can ask this team to do the same thing, and provide any feedback on the edits and comments I have in there by then, I think that would allow us to go forward with a consolidated version, and give that to Neilson so that they can begin their process of doing some refining of the questionnaire as well.

They'll do some work to help us better phrase the questions for those survey respondents, and that is in fact what they do. And I think possibly through that process, Neilson we can come back to with a more final version before it actually ends up being surveyed.

It's about an eight to nine-week process, from when we engage with Neilson to getting the results. So I don't want to delay on this too much longer, which is why I'm asking for any final feedback by this Friday. Any questions on what you see before you now?

As Jonathan says, silence is consent. So I'm assuming I'll be hearing from you all by Friday.

ALICE JANSEN:

Yes. And as a reminder, when you do go through these documents, please make sure to check, I mean, record your computed action in the Google sheet that we have for action items. Are they both all, [inaudible] I entered the data in the notes when I surveyed this document for questions.

So with that, I think we can move onto AOB. If is there anything that someone would like to bring up on this call?

No? Okay. Thank you all for joining. As usual, the archives will be posted on the Wiki, and we look forward to speaking with you on the subsequent calls next week. Thank you all.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]