JORDYN BUCHANAN: Alright, good morning, everyone. This is Jordyn Buchanan, and this is the latest version of the Competition and Customer Choice Subteam of the CCT Review Team. I'll start off by asking if anyone has any updates to their Statements of Interest.

Seems like no, so projected in the CCT notes is the proposed agenda for today, which is a quick update on the research projects that we have going on, then spend most of our time talking about the process of putting together summaries of the research that we have received, and making sure we have assignments for those, and the briefly, at the end, see if there's any other prep that we want to do leading up to Vienna. Are there any other topics that anyone would like to make sure we discuss on this call? Alright, still no. Okay, so let's go ahead and proceed with that agenda.

In terms of updates on research and projects, I haven't seen any new research or projects presented to us over the past two weeks, since our last call. Eleeza, have I missed anything, or is that correct?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I'm not sure about the last two weeks. I [inaudible] few things, but to follow up on [inaudible] group project, they're nearly complete. Jordyn, I actually sent you a note a couple of days ago. They had a couple of questions on geographical things, and I [inaudible] names for you, I can forward that to you again. They needed your help with that to finish and give us project [size.]

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.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay, sure, we can take a look at that. Are we expecting to – sorry, go ahead.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Oh, I was going to give the rest of the update.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Great.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: The registrant survey, you should have that before you arrive in Vienna, as well as the phase two economics study, and then on the parking data, I'm waiting to hear back from some TLD stacks on their contract. I need some paperwork back from them, and I haven't heard back yet, so the ball is kind of in their court right now.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay, great, that's helpful. So it sounds like we're expecting quite a bit more over the next few days, unfortunately, so hopefully, everyone can be ready to do a little bit of reading either on the plane or once you get to Vienna, because we'll have quite a trove of additional information coming in between now and Monday, it sounds like. So exciting, and a little scary.

Let's move on to topic two then, which is what we're going to do with all of this research. What I've started to try to put together is the project

tracking matrix, which is currently being presented in Adobe Connect, and the idea here is to identify each of our projects from our overall project list, so there's quite a bit more than this. We have 30-some line items from that, so maybe we should populate this to show that this is where we don't have complete research either. But for the ones that are in fact completed, we're going through the process of assigning individual projects to people, and then having those people write up short summaries of the project.

I did this for the concentration ratios project, and we discussed that a couple of weeks ago, and I made somewhat arbitrary assignments of work on projects 1.5 to Stan, 3.1 to Waudo and 2.2 to 2.4 to Dejan, and I know that Stan and Dejan have had some time to do this, since I just volunteered people, including Waudo. I wasn't expecting that everyone would actually be able to complete it by this call, but I guess I wanted to see – so Stan I think forwarded his summaries to me, but Stan, you didn't submit that to the group yet, is that right?

STAN BESEN: That's correct.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay, so we will work on getting that done between now and Vienna as well. I think Dejan has already sent out a first pass of his stuff to the group. So I guess my question – I'll ask maybe in sequence, first of all, before we ask a bunch more people to do this. Either Dejan or Stan, do you find it possible to work in the templates, and does it seem useful to everyone to have our projects translated into these templates, or

should we have some other intermediate staging work? Stan, based on your experience so far, are the templates sort of workable in terms of an intermediate stage from the projects for you?

STAN BESEN: I actually am doing my best, and the reason I sent them just to you is to make sure that I was complying with what you wanted. As you know, I'm not entirely clear about that. I think some of these could be written up much more straightforwardly than even going through the template stage, but if that's what you want, I'm prepared to comply with that.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I'm actually mostly deferring to our fearless leader, Jonathan, who's I think looking just for some consistency across the two groups, and from project to project, so that we get some consistent output. I agree that in some cases, the findings section is going to be quite brief, but hopefully, it will be useful for folks. Dejan, could you talk about your experiences working with the template?

DEJAN DJUKIC: Yes. I think it's useful, and it's possible to work with template and all those resources related to policy and privacy, and it's possible to translate in the template. So I just created, so far, high level questions and sub questions, and sent it to you to check, is it going in the right direction, and if you think it's okay so far, I will continue for other subtitles and write the rest. I have one technical question in general. I sent this e-mail yesterday, first I discovered maybe it's the wrong

address, because it was written [inaudible] and I sent it again around 7, and it appeared on the list, I don't know, maybe seven or eight hours later. Is it supposed to work like this? I remember before, messages appeared on the list right after sending.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yes, I think your second message – let me check headers really quickly. I think I got it actually fairly quickly, and that wasn't also CC'd to me, so it's possible it got to the list quickly, but for some reason it didn't get back to you.

DEJAN DJUKIC: It was later on the list, I don't know, a few hours.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: You sent them both at the same time?

DEJAN DJUKIC: Yes.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay, as far as I know, Eleeza, the answer to that is no, it shouldn't take a long time for messages to get through the list, from submission to the list. Is that right, Eleeza?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: That's right, but I've seen strange things happen on this list before, so [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Right, so it's not intentional, and if we see significant problems, we can work to try to debug it.

DEJAN DJUKIC: Okay.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: So thanks, Stan. Jonathan's not here to talk about his intent with the template, but one thing I noticed that both Stan and Dejan did is in the high-level section, put the question relevant to the project – actually, a specific question relative to the project at hand, and I think the intent of the high-level questions is to actually tie it back to one of the sort of key questions that we're trying to answer as a subteam, but I can send those around again. But those questions are very high-level, of the sort of – for example, "Did the introduction of new gTLDs increase price competition? Did the introduction of new gTLDs increase non-price competition?"

So those are the high-level questions, and those are probably the guide we should be using there. And then Dejan has put together, for example, a list of sub-questions, and I think we can put all of the more specific questions in that area. I think that's just mostly so that we can then – as we go about trying to answer our key questions, we'll know which of the projects to sort of sort into those questions. That'll help us

divide up the scope, the process of answering those sort of six key topics that we've identified for the subteam to answer. So that would be the one thing I noticed, just as guidance to you, Dejan, but also do not offline as well if I have any other odds.

DEJAN DJUKIC: Okay.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: And then Waudo, someone arbitrarily assigned you the project on registrar prices, and I'm hoping you might have a chance to take a look at that before Vienna. Is that reasonable? Okay, Waudo has agreed.

I asked Eleeza, are there – this goes back to the question I asked [inaudible]. Are there projects that you know that have been completed that are not on this list right now?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Yes, which is why I have my hand raised.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay, great. Sorry, I had scrolled down to see the participants, and therefore I can't see you.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: That's alright. I had initially thought this captured everything, and I just remembered at least one, possibly two more that we could include on

here. One is 2.5, which I think was your idea, the number of strings in new gTLDs where the name is also available in .com. We did that calculation and I sent that to you about a week ago. To the whole list, I should have said.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Actually, I'm just going to add that to the list, to the Google Doc on the fly, to make sure we don't lose it.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Okay, and then the one [Denise] had on URS versus UDRP, I don't think that we really agreed on a source, but we do have a lot of data on URS and UDRP decisions available on the CCT metrics page. So I don't know if that would help for that particular project, but that's something else to consider. You'll see in the green bar beneath it that includes all of the different UDRP metrics that may be worth considering.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay. Sorry, what was the project number again?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: 2.6 on URS and UDRP decisions.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay, and so for this project, we think we have some data available, but project isn't defined fully. Alright. Okay, great. So for the 2.5, since I came up with that project idea, I will take responsibility for heading that

up, so I've added myself as an owner. I also note that it's not reflected on the spreadsheet, but Stan also volunteered to take project 1.3, which is the basic market share calculations, so I've added his name to the project.

Is anyone interested in taking a look at the URS versus UDRP decisions for project 2.6? So I think that is Dejan saying "I can." So that's great. So we'll assign that to Dejan as well. Thank you, Dejan.

And then it sounds like since we don't have anything else complete at this point, we're going to have to wait until we get additional – I think everyone's main homework is going to be reading the new research that comes in between now and Vienna so we can have a fruitful discussion in Vienna.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I have one more, if I can add one more.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Go ahead.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: On 5.1, which is on whether brands have moved to their .brand TLD, I had sent a note to the group a couple of weeks ago about the .brand observatory. They have a lot of data available on their site, and I've seen it in reports, although they're proprietary reports that I don't know if I can share them, but they have a lot of data on how brands are using their TLDs, so I'd recommend looking at their website to [inaudible]. If

there's anything on there that you can use, and if not, we can certainly reach out to them. I think they might be willing to provide you with some data to help with that project.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I'm sorry, Eleeza, I'm totally misremembering it. Did we decide that we actually have enough data from the TMCH review to complete the trademark projects?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: The trademark project is 5.2, that has to do with trademark strings registered in different TLDs. This is [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Sorry, I was asking a new question.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I'm sorry, yes. Did we decide if it was enough? I think we decided that there's a new project that we assigned an analysis group to basically do a calculation you all were interested in on trademark registration, using the same [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Using the data that they already had.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Correct, yes.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay, and so we still haven't seen that. Is that correct?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: No, that's one of the projects they still owe you.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay. Alright, does anyone have the time to take a look at the trademark observatory for 5.2 between now and Vienna? Okay, and Waudo has signed up for that. Thank you, Waudo. Alright, so pretty good dispersion.

We have, I think, four people doing two of these each, so that's great, that's a great load sharing amongst the team. We'll have to find some projects for Kaili, maybe between now and Vienna or while we're in Vienna and for Megan, too, but she's not on this call, so I'm not going to assign her any work right now.

We have quite a bit of time remaining, and the only other topic I had was next steps to Vienna, so maybe I'd actually ask – I know Stan has actually gone far enough in his project to have written up some initial findings for the projects that he was looking at. Stan, do you want to maybe just talk through your initial findings so we can actually talk about substance for a few minutes instead of process? Sorry to put you on the spot, this wasn't really on the agenda necessarily, so if you [inaudible].

STAN BESEN: Thanks for the warning.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: If you're not prepared, that's fine, we can just kick it to you.

STAN BESEN: That's okay. In fact, I've had a brief talk yesterday with Stacy about one additional piece of information that we need, but we have a couple of sort of – what I described as basic statistics that I think we're going to want to use. One of them is essentially a rough calculation of the proportion of the increment of registrants across either all gTLDs or all gTLDs plus ccTLDs proportion accounted for by new gTLDs. Now, it's a temporary question of how to interpret that, but we have some numbers for that, so for example, of the increment since the round began, roughly half the new registrations have been in new gTLDs.

So that's an example of a statistic. I think something like a third are – if the denominator is all gTLDs and all ccTLDs, the number is about a third, and I asked Stacy yesterday to produce one more number, which would be – the denominator would be all gTLDs, plus open ccTLDs. We don't have that yet, but she's promised me that. In addition, of course, I think we had talked about this the last time, we do have information about market share, measures of market concentration before and after the introduction of the new gTLDs.

We talked about those on the last call. Obviously, overall, by most standard measures, concentration is lower, but it's not substantially lower, and the reason for that is that even though concentration is

relatively low among new gTLDs, the increment of new registrants is small enough so it doesn't move the needle all that much. So there's some reduction of overall concentration, but it's not very large, and I think those are the sort of high-level stuff.

There's one other issue I would sort of want to raise, and I raised it with Stacy yesterday, and I think I need a tutorial for this in Vienna. So I hope somebody there will talk through the – this is about prices, and I hope somebody there will talk through the price cap regime as it applies to legacy gTLDs. I have some confusion about what the caps are, which entities are allowed to raise prices over time, whether prices are at the cap throughout the entire period. That's something I think if we can just have a five or ten-minute tutorial in Vienna, that would be very helpful to me.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay, great, Stan, that's good to know. Eleeza, do you think it would be possible for someone from staff to give a brief tutorial on the price caps in Vienna?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Yes, I'm not sure who would be the best person to do that, but let me look into that.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay, thank you. So it's interesting, Stan, you mentioned that with regards to the growth of new registrations, it's 50% if we look at just in gTLDs, and about a third if we look at all ccTLDs. So that implies –

STAN BESEN: No. If the denominator is the increment in all gTLDs, it's about 50%. If the denominator is the growth in all gTLDs and all ccTLDs, the number is about one third.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Right. So I guess the intuition I have from that, or the mental math I'm doing is that, of growth, if we look globally, about a third has been in new gTLDs, a third in legacy gTLDs and a third in ccTLDs.

STAN BESEN: Yes, I think that's right. There's an obvious question which the data do not tell you that answer, and where I think the Nielsen survey may be relevant, which is, well, who are the new registrants? They could be people who would otherwise have been in ccTLDs, they could be duplicates – that is, people already in the legacy gTLDs and have a second registration – and they could be people who would not otherwise have registered, but registered in the new gTLDs. There's a logical manner that exhausts the possibilities. You can't tell which of those, what proportion of the total is explained by each of those, and I was hoping that the Nielsen survey would give us some guidance about that.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yes, that will be interesting to see if we can get a good sense of registrants' behavior. The other alternative – no, that seems like the right place to look. The other interesting sort of reaction I have to the

data is this general concept that we see relatively less concentration – I'm not going to use the word competition so Kaili doesn't take issue with my wording, but we see quite a bit less concentration in the new gTLDs relative to either the legacy gTLDs or the combined legacy plus new "markets."

But, as you say, the effect of the new gTLDs on the overall space has been quite modest. I guess I take from that – maybe this is something we should look at, this means that we don't have like a widely exponential growth. In some industries, changing what's happening in the new parts of the business, if growth is on a really strong exponential curve, we'll pretty quickly swamp the install base, but here we're seeing the opposite happening, the install base is really dominating over the new registrations. Is that fair to say, Stan?

STAN BESEN: I think that's right. I think there are a couple of things we should say whatever sort of qualifications. One is not a lot of time has passed. So it's possible that if you look at this data a year or two from now, it might look somewhat different. The other is an overall sort of running qualification, which is there's no adjustment for parking, and one hypothesis is that parking is even greater in the new gTLDs. If that hypothesis is correct, then the situation looks even worse than what you described.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Right, then we may have a lot of speculation in the new gTLDs, but not a lot of usage.

STAN BESEN: We don't have data on that yet, but that's something that given the importance of parking, it's my biggest worry about the data that we're looking at now, that we haven't controlled for parking yet.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: And we're working on getting that data, and I think we had agreed on methodology, we now just need to get [inaudible] actually do it for us. So we won't have that by Vienna, unfortunately, so I'll have to draw some initial conclusions, sort of pending that data.

Okay, Dejan, I know you just started highlighting initial questions, but do you have any initial questions, but do you have any initial observations from taking a look at the policy matrix, or do you want to defer that discussion to Vienna?

DEJAN DJUKIC: If you agree that my sub-questions are okay, in that case I don't have other questions. I think [inaudible] in that way, so what do you think? Are sub-questions put in the correct way or...?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Sure, so we can have a quick look at that, pull it up really quickly. So the sub-questions Dejan identified are "Do registries share registrants' data with third parties? What steps are they taking in order to protect the personal data of the registrants? Under what circumstances are they disclosing registrants' personal data? Do they use registrants' personal

data for strict purposes of the domain name registration, or they can use it to send registrants different information not related? Do they collect other data, such as DNS traffic data? And do they have a published privacy policy?" That's just on the privacy part of the matrix. Is that right, Dejan?

DEJAN DJUKIC: After I'll change high level questions, then I'll put in the same file questions related to the general policy. My first thing was to create two different documents: one related to privacy policy, and another one for general policy, but now, after we agreed to change high-level questions, I'll put this in this file.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Sure, okay.

DEJAN DJUKIC: [inaudible] sub-questions with the general policy.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yes, I was going to say, Dejan, it's also fine to still have those same three breakouts, because sort of have it resemble one for a project that we have listed, but just keep the high-level question listed also go with [inaudible] the high-level question that we have identified. But I think this would relate to non-price competition, I think we're basically looking to see whether different policies have an effect, like whether

we're seeing different policies emerge, and whether they have an effect on consumer behaviors. Is that the idea behind doing this work?

DEJAN DJUKIC: Yes, it is.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: So the high-level question that needs our addressing is non-price competition, but then for each project, you could still break it out into sort of privacy, registration policy, etc., if you wanted to. It's up to you how you want to consolidate the data.

DEJAN DJUKIC: Okay, great.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay, so hopefully, we'll have [inaudible] to discuss your findings from that in Vienna. We have a couple of other projects in flight as well. So, I think with that, we'll wrap up this agenda item, and then just briefly talk about next steps leading up to Vienna, and expectations coming out of Vienna, I suppose, as well.

Leading up to Vienna, we now have eight project write-ups assigned to folks, so hopefully, we'll have at least those projects we'll be able to talk about in some depth, and start to talk about findings and whether we can agree on findings.

We'll also have the Analysis Group and Nielsen – at some stage, we'll have additional information from both Analysis Group and Nielsen, we may have additional Analysis Group projects completed as well. So I would ask everyone to read as much as possible of all that, even though it's going to come in fairly last minute, before we start work on Monday morning. So that's the homework I think we have now between now and Vienna.

In terms of what I expect out of Vienna, is we have quite a bit of breakout time for the subteams identified. I think that's how we're going to be spending most of our time, and my goal is roughly to look at each of our high-level questions, look at the data that we have now or we're expecting to get, and start to identify, do we have findings? Is there additional information that we need? Are there refinements in terms of findings? Are there questions we're just not going to be able to answer? And try to come to some sort of consensus on a path forward, in terms of what we want to start writing about in terms of conclusions, at least on the finding side.

Possibly, we'll even see some recommendations at this point, but I want to really focus on findings at this face to face, with the idea being that we can actually spend quite a bit of time working on prose between Vienna and Hyderabad, and then in Hyderabad, we'll be largely talking about that prose and what recommendations look like with an eye to the publication of the draft report the following month, in December.

So come to Vienna expecting to discuss as much as we can the data that we've received so far, and what conclusions we were able to draw from

it, and specifically related back to our high-level questions, which I'll recirculate to everyone later today.

Any other questions, thoughts about Vienna? Kaili I see has typed something in chat about market definitions. Kaili, it is possible that once we see the registrant survey and how registrants think about substitutes, that we'll have a better sense of what the markets look like. Otherwise, I think we'll have to go back to [expand] the initial hypothesis, and we'll just have to come up with plausible market definitions and look at the results through those various lenses. Based on the data I've seen so far, I actually don't think the market definitions are particularly going to change our conclusions, but maybe that's not true, we'll have to take a look and see.

Alright, any questions about Vienna, any thoughts, anything else anyone would like to make sure we talk about while we're in Vienna, to make sure that we schedule time for it?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Jordyn, I just wanted to add that when you're looking at your projects in the projects Google sheet, I've included references to a lot of the CCT metrics that have been collected, that I think would be helpful for each of the projects, so I really urge you to look at that data as well, in addition to the additional data that was commissioned for those projects. It might help round out some of your conclusions.

EN

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Sure, and what we can probably do is link back between the two Google docs, or maybe we can just put these in two separate tabs in the same sheet or something like that. Either way is fine.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Okay.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Alright, thanks for that, Eleeza. Sorry, the difference between host and participants makes it very hard to keep track between the two in my small Adobe Connect screen.

Alright, any other questions or thoughts about Vienna? Alright, not seeing anything, so not to torture anyone with sitting in dead silence on the call for 20 minutes, I'll go ahead and wrap things up. Thanks, everyone, for joining. Thanks to the volunteers for the work you've done so far and the work you'll do between now and Vienna. I'll look to see most of you Sunday night, it sounds like, at the cocktail reception, and Kaili, we'll see you Monday morning.

PAMELA SMITH: Jordyn?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Oh yes, go ahead.

EN

PAMELA SMITH: I would also ask that everyone review their e-mails, because you have actually received invitations to the individual sessions within Vienna, so please respond to the individual session invitations, please respond to the invitation for dinner Monday night, please respond to the invitation for the cocktail party. Go ahead and make sure that you accept all of those events, that would be a huge help to us as far as planning is concerned. Thank you.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Alright, thanks. Yes, so if folks can just take a look at those calendar events and make sure they're responding to them, if they're expecting to attend, that would be helpful.

Alright, once again, I'll see all of you in Vienna, looking forward to the discussion, and we'll actually be talking about substance and results for once instead of process and what questions we want answered. So I'm very much looking forward to this enlightening new phase of our review.

Thanks, everyone, and we'll see you in Vienna.

DEJAN DJUKIC: Okay, see you.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]