

---

JORDYN BUCHANAN: All right. It sounds like we're just about ready to begin or resume. We are going to move on to a discussion of topic number four, which is: "Is segmentation/regulation valuable to consumers?"

Okay. So we have three projects identified here. Project 4.1, as we discussed yesterday, is just a subset of the work that Dejan's already doing to identify policies. And Dejan, do you already have this flagged as, like, one of the policies you're looking at, whether there's eligibility criteria for the TLD?

DEJAN DJUKIC: [Inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah. On the registry policy project, is one of the things you're looking at eligibility requirements? Okay. So that's already captured for this [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [Inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Right. Okay. All right. So 4.2 is looking at the Nielsen survey data. Oh, around registration restrictions. We know that data exists. We talked about it quite a bit in our conversations with David yesterday. In one respect, for, well, no but... You mean the assignee?

---

*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.*

---

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [Inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: No, no. So that's who suggested the project which is not the same thing as who is supposed to do the follow-up work on it.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [Inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Is, there is a correlation to that but it's not one to one. So for 4.1, for example, apparently, Eleeza suggested that but it's actually going to be Dejan following up on that. But we already have that assigned.

4.2, Nielsen has done the survey and now we need someone to do the interpretation. So Megan had suggested this one. So [those] we did. I'm looking at the Nielsen survey to see whether regulation and segmentation is more valuable to consumers. So we might assign this one to you to look at that data and see what it says.

Yeah. Yeah. So I think it's just going to be to look at both the consumer survey and the registrant survey to see what they say about, what did David say was eligible? He had two different words. There was one that was restrictions and there was another that was eligibility or something.

---

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Validation.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Validation. You're right. That's the other word.

And then 4.3 is a project that I have never defined largely because I don't have a good way to define the addressable market. This idea here was to say if .doctor is intended to be for medical doctors, which apparently it's not, then how many medical doctors are there and then when you look to see how special it is, you would look at how many registrations there were relative to that market.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Concentration in the [inaudible] market.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, exactly. But the problems is, like, how do you define the intended market? And I think we've –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [Inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Well, let me do an easier one because, let's say .cpa. Pardon? Yeah, that's why I chose this. It's an easier one. So CPA is an actual credential that you can get. So the addressable market is people in the world with CPAs. That's the denominator. And then you take the total number of

---

registrations and say, what fraction of the potential addressable market does this TLD reach?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [Inaudible] addressable market.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: That's what I meant.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Addressable and reachable are the same. Percentages of CPAs that bought TLDs the new [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [Inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Basically. It's to somehow measure. Like, the example that he's talking about is like .bank. .Bank might only end up with 1,000 registrations, but if there's 1,000 banks in the world – maybe there's more of the banks, but if there were 1,000 biggest banks in the world, that would probably be a really good outcome for a .bank.

So we wouldn't want to look at .bank and say, "Oh, you guys only have 1,000 registrations; you guys suck." We would want to say, "You have 1,000 registrations; you're awesome." You know, and similarly, if you

---

have .asia and you only have 1,000 registrations, that's probably not that good because there's a lot of people that live in Asia.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: How do you know [inaudible]?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Even having half a million registrations isn't good in the case of Asia.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: On the risk of being accused of being an elitist European again –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [Inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Would you like me to repeat that for the microphone? At the risk of being accused of being an elitist European, the CPA, the .cpa case is good within those jurisdictions where .cpa applies to – it's charter public accountant, isn't it? – but many jurisdictions don't use that term. They have different terminology and they don't use English and they use different descriptives, etc. So the entire –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [Inaudible]

---

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Well, that's my point, that the CPA market is a limited market.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, the only reason why I chose CPA is because it's an easy example.

JONATHAN ZUCK: [Inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yeah, exactly. Exactly. So you could identify –

JORDYN BUCHANAN: No, there's only three countries you could look at to figure out –

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: The market in those cases.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: So the meaning is, .com is intended, .com you would say that it's addressable market is basically the entire world. So it's, I don't know, it's –

JONATHAN ZUCK: [Present] the penetration by .com registrations into [inaudible].

---

JORDYN BUCHANAN: No. So it's like 130 million divided by some 8 billion plus however many businesses there are or something like that.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Oh, I thought you were still going to do it by the market. So that's the other thing that I think is, sorry. I forget about the microphone sometimes.

It feels like, when we look at these segmented markets, that you want to find a way to put [.com] in there with each of them somehow. And that feels like the case here as well, that you'd almost want to see how many CPAs, what penetration into the CPA market com has compared to .cpa as opposed to comparing .com to the addressable universe of individuals and businesses, right?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: So my suggestion is already hard enough, but now your suggestion is now you have to go into .com and figure out who's in there. Like, the problem in my task is figuring out what the denominator is supposed to be for each TLD. Your problem is, like, the denominator is easy because it's the universe and now you need to, like, go figure out what the numerator. Or no, it's the exact same problem. You still have to figure out how many CPAs there are and now you have to, like, figure out the numerator as well because you have to go and find all of the CPAs in .com. So I think mine is really hard and yours is impossible.

---

STAN BESEN: No, I was going to, I have to agree with that. In the first place, it's kind of late in the game to start doing this, number one. And I think if we're going to do it, we have to quickly define what we're going to do and come up with a set of candidates on the cause of TLDs that we might analyze.

So I think if we're going to do this, we're going to have to actually get ready to do this pretty quickly and we have to figure out whether the candidates are ones that you could actually get the denominator.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: So I agree with both of those statements. Yeah, so sorry. I'll follow-up answering your previous question, actually, which is how to compare to .cat. So with .com, I would say the answer is 130 million or whatever divided by some number billion. And with .cat, it would be however many they have divided by the number of people that [inaudible]. Maybe we'll just do number of people instead for simplicity's sake.

So we would say, "Number of .cat sites divided by the number of people in Catalonia," or something like that. Really, it should be Catalan speakers, but it's probably easier to use the geographical thing.

STAN BESEN: But we need to actually define this very precisely very soon.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah. So I agree if we're going to try to do this, we need to do that. The reason why nothing has happened on this so far is because of I'm not



---

sure how feasible it is to actually define the denominator for any of these things.

What we could do is choose a handful. The only way to do this probably is through a very small sample of the new TLDs and probably choose the ones where it is most obvious what the denominator is supposed to be. The .bank is probably a good example, .pharmacy, the more regulated ones.

It would probably be worth thinking about some of the non-heavily – I don't know. It would be interesting to see how the regulated ones compare to the non-regulated ones were for comparison's sake.

STAN BESEN: .[bank] seems quite feasible. What fraction of all of the banks in the U.S. are registered at .bank? [Inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah. No, I agree. So .bank, there's probably, someone probably has a good number on the number of banks.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: 8,000.

---

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Oh, the cities are a really good example. That's a non-heavily regulated with a very clear denominator.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [Inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: No, no. But in the case of .bank, that's not true because they've decided...

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I know, but [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Right. Except that the .bank people decided that they are, right. When I started off [inaudible] it out with that doctor, that if it were for medical doctors – and then I said, “which it is not,” – then that would be the population. Bank is for licensed, chartered banks, right? So that would be an easier one. Margie.

STAN BESEN: You could say what fraction of all the commercial banks in the United States are in .bank. I mean, there might be other potential markets but you could calculate that number.

---

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah. Agreed. I suspect that several of these, we could ask the bank people who they think is eligible for their TLD and how many of them there are.

MARGIE MILAM: My question is a little higher level. Even if you get this data, what does it tell you? Say a few TLDs aren't successful, how does that affect the whole program? You know, how do you jump to the next level? Did the program increase competition in choice? That's my question.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: All right, so I've got Stan, Jonathan and then [inaudible].

STAN BESEN: I think, I would be interested if somebody created .bank. I'd feel differently if it was 5% of all the banks in the U.S. registered than if it was 85% of all the banks in terms of it equates the range of choice. That's one of the things in our title. But the question is, did people actually avail themselves of those choices? And I don't know about you, but that would be an interesting number to me. Wouldn't you care?

MARGIE MILAM: It's interesting, but how does it, I guess, there's a lot of data that's interesting but how does that help you determine whether the overall program was...

---

STAN BESEN: Well, if a bunch of new domains are created – how does this work? – if we do something and no one turns up, you didn't accomplish a whole lot.

MARGIE MILAM: Right. In aggregate, that makes sense. But on a per TLD basis, does it still? I mean, it's your choice how you interpret this, but I don't see the connection.

STAN BESEN: Well, I think the idea is that these specialized TLDs were created to observe particular groups and I would be interested in whether or not a large number of the apparently targeted group, in fact, signed up.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: All right, Jonathan and then Jordyn.

JONATHAN ZUCK: This is compared to the market definitions that we're talking about in defining these submarkets and I think that the downside risk is that if we look at aggregate numbers, as Jordyn said, the total number of registrations might not be indicative of the success of the program, particularly in these areas of [segmented] markets because if they're addressing a large percentage of the potential market, then that's something where specific competition was created with the generics through some of these specific restricted TLDs. Even though their total

---

numbers are low, they're high within the market that was defined for them, so that's a positive indicator for the program as a whole.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:

Yeah, and just to build on that, I think one of the things that we started to tease out of the conversation yesterday was that if you look at a macro level, maybe the affects on competition are harder to discern, but as you start to look at these – I mean, [inaudible] – as you start to look at these smaller markets, you can see it evidently.

If one of the premises for the program is that these more specific TLDs help better serve specific communities, I think then it's useful to go and say, like, "Okay, well, this one's targeted at a particular community and not necessarily in the ICANN community sense, but in the just, like general notion of the banks being a community or soccer players being a community or something like that.

And if we see that, like, I think .cat's a really excellent example of a TLD that's not that big by the standard of .com, but if you go to our Barcelona, half of the URLs are .com addresses. And so it seems like it actually has been quite successful at serving the Catalan speaking community.

And to me, since I think it is going to be, I think when we look at the macro level, we're going to look and say, "Oh, it's hard to quantify what the benefits of the program are." I think that you can say, like, "One of the benefits are, like, these communities, some of these groups of people seem to be really interested in registering in TLDs." I think at least I show that there was interest.

---

JONATHAN ZUCK: There was a [inaudible] example in the summary about the impact.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, [inaudible].

STAN BESEN: We have this list of TLDs. Just looking down here, I think for many of them, it will not be easy to figure out what the denominator is. Like .hockey, I don't know what I'd have for the denominator of .hockey, so you might just want to go through this list and see whether, in fact, a number that look like they're [inaudible], you can find the denominator.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah. No, so I think that's right. So, it sounds like there's some interest in this so I will hopefully take another stab at it.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Do you have regulated [inaudible]?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah. So I think that'll be largely what it is. And fortunately, those are, the GOs, in particular, are super-easy to figure out the denominator because I can look on Wikipedia.

---

STAN BESEN: .Democrat.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Do you have regulated [industry]? [Inaudible] is going to count for 95% of the [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah. So, I'll take a look at that and then it should be once we know the denominators, the numerators, we already know and so the exercise of doing the math is, I think, quite easy.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Not quite the reason.

STAN BESEN: .bank is worldwide, right?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah.

STAN BESEN: So you could do it for all U.S. banks, in which case you would take the number of banks in the U.S. and the numerator would be the number of registrants that are U.S. banks. Or you could do it worldwide, but I mean, it's not obvious that there's only one way to do it.

---

JORDYN BUCHANAN: So what I would, probably.

STAN BESEN: But that [inaudible] other possibilities.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: So like I said, I actually think with the regulated ones, the best bet will be to just ask the registry, who do you think is eligible to be a member to sign up for your TLD and how many of those people are there? And I think in most cases, those on the registry should have a pretty good sense of the [inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK: [Inaudible] the business plan.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah. Well, that would be the requirement.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That is a requirement.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I could easily, we have .phd. I could very easily write a requirement saying you have to have a Ph.D. in order to, you have to be able to show us a document and give us your dissertation in order to get one. But I don't know how many. That wouldn't help me know how many there were.



---

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [Inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: You have to send us your dissertation. But in any case...

JONATHAN ZUCK: [Inaudible] reading them all to really [inaudible]. You need a level of academics [inaudible] quality.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: There's a quality test. Yeah. I could send them to Kaili for that, actually. Oh, it was a joke. Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Can you explain exactly what you're going to do and what you might need our help on?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: You're going to need to do the math once I figure out what the denominators are.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: So identify the denominators.

---

JORDYN BUCHANAN: So I'll be like, Berlin. So what I'll start off doing is sending you the deal ones and I will say, "There are n million people in Berlin. Can you divide however many registrations there are in Berlin by n?" and then I'll say, "There is 8 million people in New York City. Can you divide however many registrations there are in NYC by 8 million?"

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Okay. I mean, you have those registrations.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Do I?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yes. Enter 2.9.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay. Maybe. I don't think it was for TLDs and denominators [inaudible]. Margie?

MARGIE MILAM: So in that situation, I mean, the answer is going to be really, really low. I mean, obviously, the population of any of those places are much higher and not everyone in the city is going to want the TLD. It's a domain name. So I'm still struggling with what's the benefit of highlight that data.

---

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I think it will be interesting to compare. Like, the number for .com is really low too, right? Like if I take 130 million and divide by 8 billion, it's still a pretty small percentage, right?

MARGIE MILAM: Right.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: So the fact that it's going to be a low percentage across the board is expected. The question is, like, as compared to .com, like how much are they reaching out compared? If someone were at, like, 85%, I would be like, that would be amazing.

Well, this is the numbers. Certainly in the gTLD, the numbers are still going to be really low. It is possible in some of the regulated TLDs, they may get higher percentages. I don't know.

MARGIE MILAM: Okay.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: And that would be one of the things that would be interesting to call out. If .bank really has 10% of the bank market, that would be a huge number compared to what all the other banks are doing. I think that would be interesting to know.



---

Hopefully that's all we have. So then let's jump down to number six, our last high-level question. And this is, "Do consumers have expanded choice in regions and languages?"

I think the idea here is if you speak not English, probably, and/or live in the global south, probably, do you, as a result of the gTLD program, do you have more options to register domain names that in the past? And that includes both do you have TLDs you can register in as well as do you have registrars that make it possible to access those TLDs?

So we proposed only two projects to address this. The first is in the registrant survey, which is do registrants in these places... You, the relevant TLDs [inaudible] expanded choice. I'm not sure we quite got that out of the survey.

I guess when you ask what are the reasons that you registered, what are the benefits, [inaudible].

Slide 54, registrant waive to support [inaudible]. There's a note that someone just put in there presumably [inaudible].

MARGIE MILAM:

So in the registrant report on slide 54, it asks the question, among those who are [inaudible] summarizing, among those who are considering switching to a new gTLD, primary reasons for doing so are money, with modern, better targeting, and better focused mentioned [inaudible] frequently and lower on the list is allows more flexibility to use my language in their name. So that came in at 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 8.

---

JORDYN BUCHANAN: And then I guess the other thing we could look at here is whether there has been a change from 2001 to 2002 in the... Is it easy to register domain names for these countries between those two surveys for countries that are outside the global [inaudible]. Let me make a note of that.

MARGIE MILAM: [Inaudible] maybe we can ask somebody that poses questions and [inaudible] helps us interpret the data [inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK: From the [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: So we have to have both. I don't think... Do you have files for the old surveys?

JONATHAN ZUCK: [Inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, yeah. Well, yeah. So [do that]. That's a pretty easy [inaudible]. So we choose a list of countries which will probably be crazy, the ones that are not are going to be the U.S. and Europe probably.

MARGIE MILAM: So yeah, what would the question be?

---

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I'd have to look at the... There's one, at the very least, the one that is, "Is it easy to register a domain name?" And possibly, there's a few others as well, so we can just look at the list of questions. Any questions that are relevant to sort of making it possible to get a domain name.

MARGIE MILAM: What language is it possible?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, and then just show and compare across the countries in the global south. Or maybe just, I don't know, some combination of language and/or status will probably be pretty easy to [inaudible]. Probably the countries that are not in the U.S. are [inaudible] is roughly what we're looking at.

JONATHAN ZUCK: [Inaudible].

MARGIE MILAM: In North America, we surveyed the United States and Canada and Mexico.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Right, that would be a good question. That's true. I don't think, I have not heard very much from people who are French speakers or Spanish

---

speakers that the lack of accents would be an impediment to their using domain names.

MARGIE MILAM: The other countries on the survey if you want to identify, I know are U.S., Canada, Mexico, Argentina, Brazil, Columbia, France, Germany, Italy, Poland, Spain, Turkey, UK, Egypt, Nigeria. South Africa, China, Indonesia, Japan, Philippines, Russia, South Korea, and Vietnam.

So which countries, which ones should we throw out? Maybe that's an easier question.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Right.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [Inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK: Everyone in Europe.

MARGIE MILAM: What about the Spanish speaking ones?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I'd leave them in for a minute. We were trying to do two things at the same time with this, unfortunately, which is we're trying to vote



---

[control] for language and sort of access to market. And so we'll probably be permissive in who we leave it.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Well they know what languages [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I guess my point is we might keep in, like, Brazil and Argentina because those are places. Those aren't really developing economies there, but those are places where...

JONATHAN ZUCK: Those are [inaudible] global south.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: They are part of the global south, yeah. So we might include them because they're global south even though we don't think Spanish is a particularly challenging domain name.

MARGIE MILAM: What about Mexico?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [Inaudible].

---

JORDYN BUCHANAN: That's true. No, I mean, you raise a good point, right? It could be.

JONATHAN ZUCK: We could do a cross-tab by global south and by language.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, that's probably what we should do.

JONATHAN ZUCK: We already have a column for language, I'm sure, in the [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah. So for language, you just kick out everyone that's English. Nielsen will know.

JONATHAN ZUCK: You can just do them all and you'll see deltas and you'll be able to see [inaudible]. As soon as you kick anything out [inaudible] like Portuguese.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: No, I understand. Yeah. Okay, so they could do a language-based cross-tab for this set of questions which we'll have to identify shortly. And then we need a global south cross-tab, their commonly accepted definition.

Eligible for the ICANN fellowship program. I think that's probably [defined].

---

You guys have a list of countries that you have to be at in order to be eligible for the fellowship program. I don't know how it works. Whatever that list of countries is, that seems like the list of countries that ICANN considers to be.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Africa, Central America and most of Asia or [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Right. Well, part of your problem is most of Asia.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [Inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I think you should just intersect that with the ICANN fellowship program eligibility list and whoever's, whatever countries are on the ICANN fellowship eligibility list, that's your definition of the global south or the purpose of doing this exercise.

Okay. Because I imagine someone smart has already given thought to what countries should be on that list as opposed to us. We'll just be like, "Oh, I think their economy is crappy."

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [Inaudible].

---

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Well, right. But I guess my point is someone has already done that work.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right. But it may [inaudible] saying [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I don't know. Maybe.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: The other proxy is the GAC participation subsidy. For some of the GAC members, you – not you, ICANN – pays for their travel to the GAC meeting. So that's another. Just look at the two lists and see if they [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I believe ICANN already maintains one or more lists of countries that it believes to be developing. Let's use one of those. We will be happy with whatever. And you're right. Maybe it will accidentally [include] Turkey, so I don't think that one country [inaudible]. I don't think we will do necessary a better job of curating the list ourselves and it will take a bunch of time and the errors around one or two countries are probably not going to influence the results.

All right. So, and then maybe, Eleeza, the next break, we can just go through the questions really quickly and identify which ones we want to use.

---

Okay. And then our last project that we're going to talk about today – or, it's even on this list – is 6.2. It is very complicated what is written here. Registrants/users per region/languages compared to new gTLD [inaudible].

So Megan has written some more text which is, “Here the idea was to cross-reference users according to region/language, if that can be defined, to see if the new gTLDs have created a new market for those users.”

So for example, say, German users were using Berlin.com in German and they might have used .berlin. Is it possible that seeing a reduction in the users of Berlin.com and then an increase in .berlin?

From your particular example, by pure luck – I know this group already did that, I think.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Greg, do you know the answer off the top of your head?

GREG RAFERT: I don't know the answer off the top of my head. But we can get back to you.

---

JORDYN BUCHANAN: But the question is, so Greg, you did that analysis for your set of topically-related TLDs and they did it for your sort of GO. If there were some other categorization we would want for this analysis, that's not been done. Like a language, you didn't do a language-based.

GREG RAFERT: We did not do a language-based. No.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: In the presentation that Greg did yesterday, one of his bullets talked about .NYC and I just assumed correctly that they had also done it for the other GO TLDs that they had on the list.

GREG RAFERT: Yeah, we've done it for a number. We can provide a list after, but .berlin did get included as an example.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

GREG RAFERT: It is not yet.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: All right. Well, we will take a look at that. So we'll get some sort of regional version of this. And it's not really telling us that people switched out, jus telling us how growth rate changed, right? Things

---

would be very hard to get switched out. All right. So we'll note that this is coming from AG for GO TLDs.

All right. Those are our only projects for, "Do consumers have expanded choice in regions/languages?" Jonathan?

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Just a quick question. Eleeza went through the effort of identifying metrics, just figures that were proposed by the work group as GNSO and [inaudible] to look at these different questions. Have we gone through the exercise of seeing whether we find them relevant or their duplicative or anything like that? We're reminded of them, looking at them right here, that there's some data that they're already tracking that at least the work group in ALAC found would be useful for answering these high-level questions.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:

Yeah, we have nothing to add and fortunately, we're ahead of schedule so let's just do it now.

Before that, other than what we may find through that exercise, is there anything else that people think would be helpful to know to figure out whatever consumers have expanded choice in their region or their language.

Okay.

---

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANANA: That's fine. It's also fine to say, "I'd love to know," or all sorts of things, but I don't think we're going to.

I think what we have here will tell us something that we could write about which is. Yeah. I mean, the survey data in particular will hopefully, I mean, we'll see if there's a difference in the cross-tabs.

Okay, so let's look at these metrics really quick. So 2.6.

JONATHAN ZUCK: [Inaudible] brought it up [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah. No, I know. So we'll now go through the exercise as we're going back through all these questions and taking a look if there's any obvious follow-up projects.

Pam, can you see and project what pages are only PDF? Can you go to the metrics page?

JONATHAN ZUCK: While we're doing that, our conversation with [Dan] about the interplay between our work and the work of the health index that have been pretty aggressively using some of the metrics that are collected on the metrics page.



---

Part of our output might be to help supplement the things the health index are using with other measurable metrics that they might want to include, and then if they we something smart that they're using, we might want to incorporate [inaudible] let the two projects inform each other, kind of. There's also a webpage of them too.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yes, I was just saying we could look at the webpage itself.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: We just look at the high-level descriptions of the metrics. There's always a chart that shows you a sample of the data. I want you to be on the thing called CCT Metrics Reporting. Can you do a thing where you look, and you make it me looking at me looking at me? Nothing, I was just like, can you accidentally show the screen that is already the screen, and that would show that screen?

So that's the [inaudible] start of the wiki. That's easier. Okay, so –if we make that bigger?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Again, I think we can go through the metrics, but Eleeza did go through our questions and identified, so we should probably do this side by side somehow.

---

JORDYN BUCHANAN: We could just look. It's 2.6, 2.7 and a 2.11 that were identified for this topic. The 2.6, do you want to click on – we're on project – we're working from the bottom up, so we're at project [6]. This is a look at the number of IDN registrations that occurred each month, relative to the total number of new gTLD registrations that occurred each month.

Oh, no, this is total number of registrations, and there's also one that's change in the spreadsheet. Thank you. The idea here is you can see what fraction of the total registrations are IDN, and you can see whether or not that was changing over time. It looks like at the end.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: The premise here was we could see – the reason why – what the topic says, "This metric will demonstrate whether growth in IDN TLDs is comparable to growth in all new gTLDs. So we know that the answer is that it is not comparable, it is less.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yes.

---

MARGIE MILAM: Initially, in 2015 – I forgot the number that were delegated in the initial startup phase. Now, there are thousands, so you have to look also at the increasing number of new gTLDs over time, and was the increase in IDNs consistent with the increase in delegation of that overall number?

You're comparing a little bit apples and oranges, so you have to measure the apples and oranges properly. That's all. I'm not saying that it's not – it's useful, but you also have to measure the other aspects along with [it].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: [Eleeza], did you have....

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: It was a separate related point that if you look in the chart, we don't have good number of TLDs that would indicate what the growth percentages are, so you see what the percentage rate, growth rate is for new gTLDs month over month, and IDNs month over month and you can actually compare them.

And we also totaled monthly non-IDN new gTLD registrations, so [it's hard to tell] non-IDN.

---

JORDYN BUCHANAN: It probably does make sense to reference the data in – so I guess the question is, should we be doing short write-ups of all of these [using] metrics, regardless of whether or not we –

JONATHAN ZUCK: [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Because for this, I think it may make sense. We have observed that growth in IDNs was lower than growth in the other TLDs, and there are various possible – we can go through the whole exercise of, “Do we have any recommendations that could be derived from that observation?”

JONATHAN ZUCK: I certainly don’t think that we should look at our review through the lens of these metrics, but do the reverse, and look based on questions that we decided were important, to go back and see if there were metrics that essentially are the equivalent of mini projects, to see if they are ones that we didn’t think of, or that we’ve already [inaudible].

That’s more the exercise that I was thinking of, from that perspective of our questions and the priorities we set, go back and look at the metrics and say, “Oh, here’s a mini project that was already accomplished,” and we incorporate that into our narrative.

---

JORDYN BUCHANAN:

Yes.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

I think it will end up being some subset of them as a result of that.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:

Sure, that makes sense. In this particular case, it does seem like it would be useful to just write up the findings of what IDN growth should look like. Once again, we don't really understand whether –

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:

You have to [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN:

I think in this case, because we didn't commission this as a project, there's probably other things we might have wanted to look at. Certainly, there are universal acceptance problems relating to IDNs that are more problematic than on normal TLDs. That might be one.

That's a hypothesis that might explain why the growth is lower, but we didn't test that at all, so we would just have to say, "These are some of the factors we think might be contributing."

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:

What I'm saying is that the data must be there that would allow us to also show not just this growth in one compared to the other, but also

---

the baseline provisions. How many new TLDs came on during that period, how many were IDNs, etc.

And if you just add that extra information, which is available, it's there, you will have a much more robust view of the situation. That's all I'm saying. I'm not saying we should reject it or not use it, I'm saying it should be put in context, and the data must be there, by definition. It can't be not available.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I see [they] put together a list of how many TLDs were launched during this month, or total, for both IDN and non-IDN, or total.

STAN BESEN: I'm trying to help you. So the question – I suppose one question you're asking is, did the number of domains, the number of new TLDs grow faster than the number of TLDs implicated by the first column? The first column refers to a subset of all TLDs, right?

So you're saying, in fact, the question you're asking is, perhaps it's true that they sort of topped out in July and no new ones came on board, whereas the right hand column – see, I'm trying to help you – the right hand column, a lot came on, that explains why that tripled. Right? That's what you want to do.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I'm saying let's use the existing data, which must be available, and we don't – as I said, we don't have to go into such a granular thing. You just

---

need the overall. So if you look from – I don't remember the starting point – 2015 to 2016 IDN growth, increase in registration, and then you look at 2013 to 2016, IDNs that were available at the beginning and at the end, and overall at the beginning and the end.

And you can see quite clearly, if – I rather suspect it was – let's say there were two IDNs at the beginning, there are ten at the end, whereas there were two overall, and now there are a thousand. So you can see that there's a growth difference, and that would explain part of this change. I'm not saying –

STAN BESEN: Your hypothesis could be that the left hand column, the number of TLDs sort of flattened out earlier.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Exactly.

STAN BESEN: Whereas on the other one, it continued to grow.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Exactly. I'm just saying it's possible. I don't know why. Maybe there's no interest, but in theory, that shouldn't be the case. If you just look at China, which has a huge population, a huge number of users, it doesn't make sense, if you have new IDNs coming on in Chinese script, that you

---

would have such a limited growth. See, I'm just using logic perhaps wrong.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Alright, so that's a specific –

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yes, the specific request is to add a column for the number of launched TLDs for IDN and not-IDN to 2.6.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Just for the beginning and end, or for each month? Wouldn't it be more relevant to see it for each month?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I think each month. I'm on Team Eleeza.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: You can do it for each month –



---

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: And only [launched] TLDs.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Launched TLDs. Number of launched IDNs, and number of launched total new gTLDs.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yeah. At the end of the day, you're only going to look at the growth, aren't you? Or are you going to look at each month, Eleeza?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Oh, yes, you do a graph. Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I've asked you to look at these in January.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: We're looking at them right now. This is a [forcing] function of everyone's in the room, and we're going to look at it together.

STAN BESEN: [inaudible].

---

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Not at this meeting.

STAN BESEN: [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yes, correct. Alright, 2.7. You have to do a find, and not in sequential order.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: You need to go back to the main [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yes, go back to the main, and then find. Okay, 2.7 is legal regimes where new gTLD registries are based. Do we care about this number at all? This is like AE. What's that, United Arab Emirates? There are three TLDs based in the United Arab Emirates. There are two here in Austria. There are 28 in Australia. Does this provide us a proxy signal for access? Does this give new registrants more choices?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Well, I think it's related to choice, so part of the choice that you might measure is the legal regime, i.e., privacy law.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: So I understand why – yes, I understand that that is a valid line of thinking. I guess the question is, do we care about it enough to have

---

---

someone write about it in our – I would say this is a secondary indicator for what you really want, which is like the questions [inaudible] in the registrant survey, which are like, “Do you feel like you actually have more choice?”

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I think this is something you would cite in that paper in addition to the data that you have [inaudible] one more [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Should you not be comparing it with what the situation was before, and the situation now? And you could also compare with the IDNs that are based in those countries as well, if you wanted to do something that was a little bit more robust in the sense of looking properly at consumer choice.

The numbers are interesting. I think it’s an interesting and useful thing, but it doesn’t give you quite as much information as you might want to –

JONATHAN ZUCK: [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: And the other data must be there.

---

JONATHAN ZUCK: These were data elements. So the task that got laid out in front of the working group and on the IAG at a certain level was to look at these numbers, and come up with three-year targets for them and things like that.

So the way that they exist now on this page is as snapshots, as they currently stand, but presumably, the historical idea was to look at them before and after, and to look at the delta to see if you were trending the right way. I don't know what the best way is to look at that, but I think they've been being tracked for some time in most instances since the IAG finished its work, basically.

So it is possible to look at the deltas for them, but this particular page is always a snapshot of them.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay, so I don't think this data is very interesting, but it sounds like Jonathan and Megan do, so if one of you wants to volunteer to write something up, then we could write something up.

MEGAN RICHARDS: I'm happy to write something up, if I have the other data. So if it –

JORDYN BUCHANAN: So you want to have time based, you want to know what it was before [inaudible].

---

MEGAN RICHARDS: I want to know what it was before the New gTLD Program started. In other words, pre-2013, because I'm presuming – what's the data [inaudible]? 2016 [inaudible] – today, that's fine. Give me pre-gTLD, you must have a number, and the IDN breakdown. And I'm happy to write something.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: So for each country, you want to know the total number of gTLDs and the number that are IDN. Alright.

MEGAN RICHARDS: Yes. You can put them in parentheses for the ones that are IDN. And I can tell you that in EIG, which is the very bottom, is 90% sure to be registered in Belgium, so it's not something that exists in [those] jurisdiction.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: What we did to identify the jurisdictions in this chart was based on what was listed as the jurisdiction in the application.

MEGAN RICHARDS: This doesn't exist. There's no such thing as an [EIG] with no jurisdiction. Believe me.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: That's how it was written.

---

MEGAN RICHARDS: Yes, I'm sure that's what they wrote, but that doesn't exist. [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Since Megan is going to write this up, you can also look at the applications.

MEGAN RICHARDS: I can also say [in brackets] Belgium, and an international organization, by definition, is in a jurisdiction [inaudible] let's say –

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [In,] but that's not how the contract is written. We're trying to base it on something that's more concrete.

MEGAN RICHARDS: Okay, that's fine.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Alright, Stan.

STAN BESEN: I hate to agree with Megan again.

MEGAN RICHARDS: Again?

---

STAN BESEN: It seems to me if all we're going to do here is replicate these charts, then it's – there was somebody is already doing it. It only makes sense if it's some value added, and what Megan is suggestion is a way of interpreting these that's not in here.

But unless we have some value added, I don't see any great value to replicating this stuff in our report.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I think the goal, Stan, isn't to replicate the report. It's to say – like Jonathan said before – has ICANN already accidentally done a project for us that we could then – the value added would be then drawing an inference from the project.

STAN BESEN: [We have to be] careful interpreting it, because all by themselves, for the most part, the raw data has to be interpreted, and we may have to control for other things. So it's not just a matter of lifting it and putting it in. There's extra work involved.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: So I think we're all okay with this. We've identified 2.6, we identified a little bit of stuff we wanted to add on 2.7. We want to add a little bit of information.

---

MEGAN RICHARDS: Can you please reiterate to me what you'd like added on 2.7?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: On 2.7, we want two things. Number one is we want the same exact chart for October 2013 [from legacy TLD]. And then for each country, in addition to listing the total number of gTLDs, we want [the count of] IDN TLDs.

Now, this is adding to a list of 50 things that staff may come back to us and tell us they can't do all 50, and they want us to choose which of them we want to do, but it sounds like if staff is able to do this, then Megan can write something about it.

MEGAN RICHARDS: Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: That data is there. 100%, the data is there.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: This is an easy thing to compile.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Oh, good. Can you put that in [inaudible] things to be done?



---

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: It's literally one of 40 easy things I have listed, so the question is, how do you want to prioritize the easy list?

MEGAN RICHARDS: It's easy to write up, so for me, it's not an urgent thing.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Alright, so 2.11.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: This is just a sample, right? And you guys don't extrapolate out what the total number would be if you weren't sampling? So really, we should –

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: It's purely based on the samples of those records.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: We should do – probably the best way to represent this is percent of samples of those accounts because otherwise, we're sort of giving a misleading impression that will make 10,000 registrants livid, at least in China.

---

This seems useful. It seems like if we're going to say to people – I think – do you guys have this sample from pre-New gTLD Program?

JONATHAN ZUCK: [inaudible] trend.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Right. Because one of the interesting questions here would be, did the new gTLDs change the distribution? And do you guys only have this for new gTLDs? [inaudible].

MEGAN RICHARDS: That data comes from the WHOIS accuracy reporting system, and that's not limited to new gTLDs. It would also be legacy [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Legacy. So maybe actually what we should just do is a comparison between legacy and... because of the sample.

MEGAN RICHARDS: That was probably what was in the sample at the time.

STAN BESEN: Choose the gTLDs and then sample them, or do you just take a random sample of registrants?

---

MEGAN RICHARDS: It's a complicated formula that we worked out with the University of Chicago that helped us scope the sample out. As I recall, we were trying to hit all of the TLDs that were delegated already, where there were actually registrations in some fashion, and then we were trying to get a sample.

I think we started off with a sample of 100,000, and tried to make sure [inaudible] .com, say, half of the sample. So we tried to reflect it in the percentages of market shares.

STAN BESEN: [inaudible] sample.

MEGAN RICHARDS: Yes.

STAN BESEN: Can we get a description of how it was sampled?

MEGAN RICHARDS: Yes, I have a report we got from University of Chicago that explains how the sample is designed.

STAN BESEN: If you could [inaudible] that's very good.

---

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay. But surely, part of the reason why [inaudible] probably like top brands are probably not going to end up in the sample [inaudible] they have a bunch of different registrations [inaudible].

Okay, so what we want to add to this is number of registrants in new gTLDs versus number of registrants in legacy gTLDs. Does that makes sense?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yes, there will be three columns instead of two that we have right now. It will be country, number of gTLD registrants, and number –

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Oh, is this registrants or registrations? What does the star say?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I know, but why does it say star? How is there an asterisk but no corresponding asterisk? That's just mean, and kind of weird. All of these

---

only show a sample of the report. There's an excel file that's linked that has the full data.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yes, they just don't want to overwhelm us with –

JONATHAN ZUCK: [inaudible] 100,000 [inaudible] 37,000.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: 37,500. This really is number of registrants, because they're based on WHOIS records, right.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Right. In any case, whatever this is, the thing that you're counting for new gTLDs, have another column to the right of that, for the thing that you're counting for legacy gTLDs, just so we can see if the distribution of registrants is different in the new gTLDs versus the legacy ones.

---

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Exactly, what changed.

STAN BESEN: [inaudible]

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Correct.

JONATHAN ZUCK: [inaudible] sample.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Correct.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I already said that.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: So in the notes in the Excel file, it indicates it's based on WHOIS output [inaudible] 2016 [inaudible] sample of 50,000 names, in the 850 – at that time – delegated new gTLDs. So that this is –

---

JORDYN BUCHANAN: That means there's not legacy TLDs in this?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yes, this is only across new gTLDs. It's jurisdiction where new gTLD registrants are located.

STAN BESEN: Why is it July 2015? Do we have up to date information or not?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: We do. [inaudible] There is updated data, yes.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: So we don't have a way to compare this to legacy gTLDs.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Unless we have a WHOIS sample for the legacy. This exclusively looks at new gTLDs.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: So can you maybe just take as an action to find out whether you have this data for legacy gTLDs?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I think we might, because – yes, I'll [inaudible].

---

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I think this is not going to be very useful. This will not be very useful if we can't make a comparison.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: It is a comparison, is it not?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

STAN BESEN: Sorry. [inaudible] about whether these are parked. There's no [permission] about parking here, correct? So, many of those Chinese registrations may, in fact, be parked.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: That's another story.



---

JONATHAN ZUCK: [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: It doesn't matter if they're registered names in this instance.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Depending on what we're trying to figure out, but I think when we're trying to determine whether or not we're facilitating competition, asking the question of whether the names are parked or not is a very useful one, because we want to know if it's the same kind of good, essentially, or if it's being used in an equivalent fashion.

I think when we're just asking the question of, "Are we letting people in different places register domains?" I don't think it actually matters whether they're parking them or not.

STAN BESEN: I think, suppose parking rates differ wildly across countries, and this presented distribution is going to look very different than what we did here.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I assume the reasonable thing is to ignore the parked [inaudible].

STAN BESEN: Well, I said [inaudible].

---

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I guess I agree with your statement that if you'd backed out the parked domains, it would make a difference in that. If you combine your hypotheticals, then the outcome is correct. I'm not sure that I agree that it makes sense to back out the parked ones for just a count of who's registering where.

I think the statement we'd make is, "There are more people in China registering new domains under new gTLDs than there are in the U.S." Based on this, it does not look like it's 90 – oh, 53%. It still doesn't even look like it's 53%, but it's obviously a big chunk are coming from China.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Definitely true, but then we might look and see in the – it might be interesting to note that maybe in the legacy TLDs, China is only a third as many registrants as the U.S., and then we can say, "Oh, there are a lot more people from China registering in the new TLDs than in the legacy TLDs." Partially.

I think that would be a true statement, regardless of whether the people in China were parking their domains or not. Now, we're going to go to question five, which is the cost benefit. Have the benefits of choice exceeded the cost?

And for this, Eleeza suggests that we, once again, look at question 2.6. Which one was 2.6? That's the IDNs, so we're already dealing with that. 2.9, which is the relative share of domain names in new gTLDs existing –

---

relative share of domain names in new gTLDs existing in legacy TLDs prior to expansion.

I really hope that the explanation of this makes more sense than the title. This metric looks at the relative share of new gTLD registrations already having the same domain in legacy TLDs prior to expansion. This data we'll present is a snapshot in time. 25 TLDs were randomly selected.

I have no idea what this is.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Okay.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Do you know what it means, Eleeza?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Let's just get back to the DONUTS data?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible].

---

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Pardon?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible].

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Here's the explanation: when it says same domain, it really should say the same second level domain. So if the string at the second level existed in a legacy TLD before October of 2013, but now it also exists in a new gTLD, that's what's being counted, on a per new gTLD basis.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, that's about people choosing new TLDs over legacy ones for the same strings.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Or [inaudible] instead of.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Presumably they're – in, or in addition to.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Or in addition to.

---

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: We can't judge what it is, but they have now – if you had jonathan.com and now you registered jonathan.[inaudible] now we know that both those names exist.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Or someone did.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: You duplicated it. Well, it's not even that you duplicated it, the name has duplicated. This isn't compared with WHOIS data.

JONATHAN ZUCK: If the name is available is what you're saying? It's available for sale?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: No, it's the opposite.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: It was registered previously in a legacy TLD before new gTLDs were launched.

JONATHAN ZUCK: [inaudible]. This is about now I have the ability to get my name when I didn't before.

---

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: No, and in addition to the name I have. It's not that I didn't have it before. You did have it.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay, so these two things are just months, so the comparison is over time.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Okay, so let's look at .academy. What this tells you is in .academy, in March, there were 18,843 names that were registered in a legacy TLD prior to any new [inaudible] launching. Those same names now exist in .academy, and then it shows you the growth over time.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Right, so –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Because the growth is the delta between the two.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible].

---

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Right minus left equals growth.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yes. This would be more useful if it had –

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: The total registrations.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: The total registrations, yes.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: So you need to – I thought we had this [templated.] I might be thinking of a different chart.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I looked in the spreadsheet.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: It's not in the spreadsheet.





---

JONATHAN ZUCK: [inaudible].

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Yes.

STAN BESEN: Is this like one of the buckets we talked about yesterday, that these are the people who duplicate?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Presumably. We don't know the registrant information at this level. So I can't tell you if it's Stan who registered these [inaudible] names. Maybe I registered the same name as you.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Exactly. This could tell us one of two basically opposite things: one of them is –

STAN BESEN: Perfect data, then.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: One of them is, you, Stan, already had stan.com, and so when stan.economist became available, you also got that.

---

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Exactly.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: And the other one is that –

STAN BESEN: Jordyn registered it Stan.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I was really angry that you had stan.com, so I registered stan.economist, and then I put bad stuff about you. No, or I just was frustrated –

JONATHAN ZUCK: Or your name was Stan too.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: My name is also Stan.

STAN BESEN: So why do we care about this?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible].

---

JONATHAN ZUCK: I know. It's my fault, I was trying to remember. But I guess the idea behind it was to get a sense of the second case, which is, did you create choice by –

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right. By creating more top-level domains, did you make the same string available to new people, kind of, I guess, was the idea, and was the extent to which that was –

STAN BESEN: Jordyn's example, there is a concept called observational equivalence. We have two hypotheses, we have a piece of data, it's consistent with both of them.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right, so it may not work, [inaudible].

STAN BESEN: It's not helpful in distinguish between them.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible].

---

STAN BESEN:                   What's that?

JONATHAN ZUCK:             It's what?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:     [inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK:             I'm trying to –

STAN BESEN:                 I'm sorry, I missed that. Oh.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:         So I have a third hypothesis, which I think is actually what the data tells us. Because if you look at 3.8, there are not very many unique domains registered, and I would say that my hypothesis is regardless if it's the same dude or other people, people tend to register really common words first when a new TLD becomes available.

That was also true in the legacy TLDs, so all we're seeing is that people are registering really common words.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:     So what?

---

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I agree with your “so what?” Thanks for pointing us the other way, Eleeza.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: This is the first one –

JORDYN BUCHANAN: So far, we’ve liked the other ones. And I think that the numbers – I mean, it’s possible that if only unique things were being registered [inaudible] ones we would think that was interesting probably in a way that we don’t think this is interesting.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Right, exactly. So I find this unsurprising, and –

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Well, if I can offer my value judgment, it’s unsurprising, but also worth noting, I think, in your report, to show that this is the behavior. If there aren’t that many unique registrations happening, this is what the

---

market looks like, then I think that's a sign of this is a young market, and this is what happens when it's just starting and these names are only just becoming available. I think it's still an interesting point.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I'm not saying it's not an interesting point, but does it address the issues we're supposed to be looking at, which are competition, consumer choice and consumer protection?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: It means that there was choice available for these strings that previously existed. Now you have more opportunity to register that same string in more TLDs. So it opened that up. It's a sign that those names that existed, there was some demand for those names to exist again in new gTLDs. Someone was interested in registering them.

JONATHAN ZUCK: It potentially speaks to this – the problem, again, is that you could – if it's the same people defensively registering, it's one outcome. If it's different people, then it deals with the scarcity issue and meant that there was more choice. The problem is we can't distinguish between those two.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible].

---

JORDYN BUCHANAN: The problem is we don't know if it's a cost or a benefit.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's right.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: And once again, if we frame this in terms of a cost/benefit analysis, it's a hard piece of data to do anything with. I suspect, Eleeza, this still may get referred to as a footnote somewhere, but it's probably not going to make it into the main text.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: And I need to look back at all of them, but right now, I'm looking at an IDN that's 70%, almost 71% unique. That's kind of interesting.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Sure, okay. We should sort by –

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible].

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: If all of the IDNs are more unique, I think –

JORDYN BUCHANAN: We should sort by unique and see. We should look at those.

---

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Well, then you should look at the table.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yes. Alright. 3.8, sort by most unique. Because I think it's probably true. My guess is that's probably an IDN with a language that wasn't available before.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: And it's filling a new –

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Right. Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: And the thing that you're pointing out, just to feed into the paper that you're writing –

MEGAN RICHARDS: Hit me.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Hit me, right?



---

MEGAN RICHARDS: [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Right.

JONATHAN ZUCK: [inaudible] by definition. We did have second level IDNs before.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: We don't know. It could be – well, two things are true: number one is, second level IDNs are kind of crap. Like if your point is you want to use your native script, and then you have to, halfway through typing your domain, switch back to some other script, that's kind of crappy.

JONATHAN ZUCK: [inaudible] happening. It did exist. There are plenty of IDNs [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Sure, but it is also possibly the case – I don't know if this is true – it's theoretically possible there could be an IDN script that was not supported in any legacy TLD. I don't know if that's the case.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Then the number should be 100%.

---

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: No, because they could also have – there could be Latin strings inside a – like you could have a thing that’s, whatever, Ethiopic as the script, and someone could have registered stan.whatever. I don’t speak Ethiopic.  
[inaudible].

We know that there were definitely Chinese second level IDNs before.  
In any case –

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Oh, I’m sorry, [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Why don’t we just sort by most unique? Does this tack onto the other work, Megan, or should we assign this somewhere else?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: We’ll give this to Megan. Because we think it’s related to her other work.

---

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: We need to give – Dejan and Waudu have been off the hook. We have to give Kaili some projects too. Alright, let's go up though, to project five. Oh, we already did that. So project four – or thing four. Thing four is, is segmentation valuable? Uh oh. Eleeza suggests we look at two giant pages.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Can you give him that link? Oh, so it's –

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible].

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I realize this looks like a lot, but they're pretty simple, descriptive [stats.]

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay, so 2.4 is TLDs using IDN script. So this is purely – we know that before the new TLD program, there were zero gTLDs, so we don't even have to do math in order to figure out what the delta is. I think this is mostly interesting – we should keep this table in mind, but this will

---

mostly be descriptive, right? It'll say, "There used to not be these things, and now there are."

JONATHAN ZUCK: Now there are. Now there's this many of them.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yes.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: 2.7 we already talked about, it's legal regime that the registry operators [obey].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: 3.1 is quantity of TLDs. I'm sure we will reference that number in the report. Don't worry, that work is not wasted. I'm sure that was the hardest part.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: It was really hard.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: 3.2 is quantity of gTLDs. 3.2A, removed gTLDs.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: They removed one.

---

JORDYN BUCHANAN: There was one.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: We thought it was worth at least noting that the one does exist.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I think Stan wants to talk about – or Kaili wants to talk about registry failure.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Because you wanted to talk about whether these registries are going to survive, right?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Not on our subteam. We can't give him an assignment.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

---

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Right, that's also true, yes.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: That's right.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: So we know that there's one new TLD that failed, I guess, because it was taken out. It went into the root, and then it came out.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: No, Doosan. Presumably, they decided they didn't want to deal with it anymore. It's a brand, so yes. And as far as I know, the company did not go out of business, so it's not because the company failed. It's because they didn't want their new TLD anymore.

---

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: No. Once you get all the way to delegation, then you get no money back. Which you shouldn't, because you got your TLD, you just decided you didn't want it anymore.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible] has nothing to do with our work, but does that mean that theoretically, someone else could apply for Doosan, and ask to have it brought back?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Next process. Once people can once again apply for TLDs. There is, today – do you know if they signed Spec 13? There is a thing in Spec 13 that gives brands somewhat more control over – although not of being deleted and then being re-registered. The .brand thing.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yes, but all it does is control whether or not – it limits how much ICANN can give your TLD to someone else, but if it gets deleted, then I don't think there's any limitation on it being reregistered. Which is, I think, okay. Our experience at Google, at least, is we were pushing pretty hard

---

for that limitation on it being – we didn't want a competitor to be given our TLD, even if we decided we didn't want our TLD anymore.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: We would also like that. But in the normal application process, we assume that there would, once again, be a legal rights objection or something like that. So if someone else were to apply for Doosan, then Doosan could object against them. So we're only really worried about the risk of ICANN delegating outside of the process with the objection period and so on. But I think that's probably not a big deal that it could be re-delegated. Okay.

In any case, I think 3.2A we'll assign to Kaili.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Let's not have a long, drawn out conversation though. That's not going to...

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].



---

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I don't know, to write something about –

JONATHAN ZUCK: The one.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: There's only one that's failed.

JONATHAN ZUCK: [inaudible] failed.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: There's only one – if your definition of failure is that you get drawn out, withdrawn from the root, or go through EBERO. Alright, 3.3, number of unique registry operators, registry service providers. 3.6, what does it mean?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: 3.6 refers to registry operators who did not exist prior to the program, who were not operating a registry prior to the beginning of the program.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Alright, and this would include – does this include – does right side count as a legacy registry – oh, no, because they were just a registrar before. Interesting.

---

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:                   Whoever was the registry operator for the listed TLDs we have, below is the legacy TLD. That's who we considered as the old group, and if you were not among those group, you're considered a new entry.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:               Right, so like Afiliás' TLDs would be in the legacy group, and ICM, presumably, [inaudible] VeriSign –

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:                   VeriSign, [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN:               Have they even launched yet? There are only 23 here, so it must be – it's only delegated. Maybe they delegated it. [inaudible] Anyways, yes, and VeriSign.

JONATHAN ZUCK:                   [They had] a couple of IDNs, I thought.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:               No, they did apply, but they applied for enough on their own that I feel like they can't be counted in here, but maybe Afiliás just didn't win very many auctions. I really don't know. Alright, do we want to do anything with that statistic?

---

JONATHAN ZUCK: [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: You mean you think it relates to –

JONATHAN ZUCK: I don't know that it stands on its own as something to discuss, but it becomes part of the discussion around – so I think some of these might not stand on their own as new questions, but might be feeders for some of the existing questions that we're already asking, so the fact that the New gTLD Program created many more businesses in addition to just new strings held by old businesses seems relevant.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yes, I think a lot of this page will end up being introductory material, but I don't think there's additional analysis or standalone write-ups that we need to do of –

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right, I don't think a lot of it is standalone write-up, but I think it's about – as we're writing about that type of topic, this is one more statistic that we're putting in there.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Sure, agreed, and I guess everyone should – this is helpful context for everyone to know, that the vast majority of the new gTLDs are operated by new providers. Certainly, when we talked about the market

---

concentration numbers, for example, we could talk about the fact that all these new people came in and they're making the market less concentrated, for some definition of market.

JONATHAN ZUCK: It could have just as easily been different. [It could have been] legacy providers [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yes, agreed.

STAN BESEN: [inaudible] a count of the numbers. 97% of the number of [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: No, it doesn't count number of registrations.

STAN BESEN: Not 97% of the registrations in the new gTLDs.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Correct.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Just the number of them.

---

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Although in this particular case, I suspect if you were to switch the number, it would become even more operated by new entrants, because the legacy operators have not been very aggressive in launching new TLDs. Like VeriSign, for example, we talked about. I don't think they'd actually launched any of their –

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible].

KAILI KAN: How does that relate to our job, competition, customer choice and –

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Because –

JONATHAN ZUCK: It's very basic, but it means that there are now more players in the market than there were before. That's all.

KAILI KAN: Okay.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: If the numbers up here were 0 and 100, then there might be more choices for –

---

JONATHAN ZUCK: There might be more choice, but if VeriSign, PIR and affiliates were the ones that had applied for all the new strings, then that would create more choice, but not necessarily more competition. There are at least more firms that are now involved in the market.

KAILI KAN: [inaudible] whether there's more competition, or at least, we should say, more providers. [inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK: More competitors.

KAILI KAN: Whether they're in competition or not –

JONATHAN ZUCK: Whether they're successfully competing or not is another question, but there are more competitors.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: If we didn't have more providers –

KAILI KAN: Yes, more providers –

---

JONATHAN ZUCK: This is what allows for the opportunity for competition, if nothing else.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Exactly.

JONATHAN ZUCK: If this number was zero, then we would know by definition there wasn't any.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Although the nuance to that is, in theory –

JONATHAN ZUCK: Affiliates taking over.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Affiliates could come in and get – well, no, affiliates could come in and compete more effectively against VeriSign, if they got [cooler] TLDs. In any case, that's not what happened. Mostly, we got new competitors, which seems good.

JONATHAN ZUCK: And worth mentioning.

---

JORDYN BUCHANAN: And worth mentioning, but we probably won't assign anyone to do anything with that either. But we will keep it in mind. Alright, we have a whole other page of metrics that Eleeza wants us to look at. CCT metrics domain name registrations.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: [We] skipped over the one [inaudible] policies and allocations policies. I don't know if those are [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Oh, aren't those things that Dejan's already looking at?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Yes.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yes, that's why I skipped those.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Those are kind of the baseline [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Right, Dejan's already working on them.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].



---

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Those are – that file is sort of the baseline of the different policies, and what was available.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yes?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Is it 3:30?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: 3:32.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: 3:13.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Fine.

---

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible].

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay, and then we have until 4:30, is that what's going on?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Correct.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Alright, so when we get back, we need to talk about next steps, so be back exactly at 3:30, and then we're going to spend an hour talking about what we're going to do next. Okay, give Jonathan a few more seconds. We waited enough seconds. Okay. Welcome, Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thank you, Jordyn.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Alright, so let's resume. We have an hour left, 55 minutes left. I want to spend a little bit of time talking about our path from here forward, both to Hyderabad and to a report, even better. Good that Jonathan is here, because he can probably help think about this in the context of the overall effort.

---

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: We might, if we have time, but this is more important, relatively speaking. We now have a number of assignments for people to look at data, write stuff. Some of that's been done to an intermediate format at least, which is Jonathan's template.

Some of that has yet to be templated, and some teams, we're still waiting for data. But I think based on our conversations here, in most cases, there's actually quite a bit that we could start to write about. I know Stan has expressed that he's eager to be writing even more than we have been so far, just to start writing.

STAN BESEN: [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: You've written some things. I guess the question is, what do we want written? And there are two possible things that we could – I think the general plan, what the other team is doing is they're turning all of their reading into write-ups using Jonathan's template.

JONATHAN ZUCK: And that's what we're trying to do in the application evaluation [inaudible].

---

JORDYN BUCHANAN: And then what do you expect – so that’s good for internal discussion.

JONATHAN ZUCK: So I think that the sequence of events is to talk about things in a relatively consistent way, so that when we go to write, the components of what we write will be fairly consistent. So that’s the purpose of the template, and then it also will allow for the creation of a kind of bulleted discussion, and so I think, ideally, the sequence of events is probably a presentation to this group of the answer to that question to which you were assigned. That probably involves one slide or two slides, and some explanation, and then from there, a presentation to the whole review team of that information, because they haven’t been privy to the conversations the subteam has been having. And I suspect that it is to that, and that’s probably what will occupy the majority of the plenary calls in the near term between now and Hyderabad, is actually the sharing of information and conclusions with the team, and double checking on people’s work and things like that, and that Hyderabad, that public session will be, to the degree possible, a larger presentation that is a roll-up of those individual presentations about findings to date and things of that sort, with an eye towards, by the end of the year, having something written in [prose] form, which will probably start before Hyderabad, but the actual delivery for Hyderabad would be the ability, probably, for you, me and Lauren or something like that to give a presentation, overall, of what had taken place, and get sort of verbal feedback from the community on it. And I think that’s the timeline, and Alice and I have been working on a schedule that is a little bit arbitrary,

---

because it kind of lists by topic what will be discussed on this plenary, and you'll want to [jigger] those based on the order in which you think they'll actually get done, but the idea is to just roll things up in that way. make a presentation to this group, make a presentation to the plenary, and then eventually roll that up into a presentation that's made to the community by Hyderabad for the data that we'll have in time to do that.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: So in some of these cases, we've effectively done the presentation to this group while we're here, right? So Stan didn't write up using your template, or he didn't share if he did, actually. I think he didn't share it with the group. A templated version of the basic [inaudible] market share calculations.

What we discussed here in this room, the data, summary of the implications, so I guess we could ask Stan to put that on the template, or we could figure out an appropriate other...

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right, I didn't have much luck getting Stan to put it in the template.

STAN BESEN: [inaudible] objection?

JONATHAN ZUCK: None whatsoever. I guess that may end up becoming the model then for everyone's writing. I guess coming up with an outline that's

---

standardized. I don't know the best semantics for describing this, but it's even like saying that these are – and you started to do it in the write-up you did, that here's the background reading, things like that.

Just in list form, this is what the format is going to be for how these are written up in these cases. All the template is meant to represent. So that if anybody is missing any of those things, they know that, "Oh, I need to go back and add this section." I think that's more what with were trying to get at, so that there was some consistency across the [prose].

So if we could back out of your first draft a list of what that structure was, then that structure could be just as good as any other, and then, yes, go ahead and write before November any of the [prose] there's nobody holding anybody back.

STAN BESEN:

[inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK:

And that's not meant to be for every instance. The key is, can you take the first instance, and templatize it so that every instance after that, you're following that same outline? That's more what I'm getting at, not doing it each time.

---

JORDYN BUCHANAN: So I suspect – when we’re talking about writing stuff that – like Stan, you want to write down facts, and how we got to the facts, as opposed to interpretations.

STAN BESEN: [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay, you’re ready to start writing interpretations?

JONATHAN ZUCK: He wants to start drafting the report.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: My observation is you guys haven’t had an analysis of the observations to come up with whatever. You’ve gotten the data, you’ve identified how you think it’s going to be useful, but you actually haven’t debated yet what the conclusions are from that data, so I think it’s premature for Stan to be doing that at this point.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: That’s why I was trying to make a distinction between the two. Hold on, we’re going to – I’m going to finish what I was saying, and then we’ve got Megan, and then – you’re trying to get in, Kaili, or [inaudible]. No? Okay.

---

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay.

[MEGAN RICHARDS]: So for the subteam calls, maybe that's where you do that. Because you have subteam calls in addition to the plenary calls. It just seems like if you're jumping to the writing part, you skipped over the proceedings.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: My [inaudible] was going to be to distinguish between the interpretation and the facts themselves. I think it would be totally fine for Stan to go through the process I'm seeing him do right now, which is background reading, here's the thing that the Analysis Group did, here's what the data says, essentially, and now, then, draw any conclusions from that.

I think that's where – then, we need to decide how we're going to have the conversation about the interpretation, and we could do that one of two ways: we could put together a few – when I put together my template, I put together some findings. I said, "I think that based on what I know about how competition authorities look at these numbers, that the legacy gTLD market probably looks like it's pretty concentrated." That is somewhat of an interpretation, and I put that into the bullet, then I think that's a good – and then Kaili sort of said, "You're saying competition, do you mean concentration?" So that's a fine conversation to have, and the template, I think, is somewhat useful



---

through the context of that conversation. And then once we agree on the output of the template, [inaudible] findings, and I even – I didn't get to recommendations, because I didn't really know what to recommend, but the alternative is, like if Stan is saying, "I'm not very good at writing – the reason we don't want me to write a four-page narrative about this is because if you guys don't agree with my interpretation, then I'm going to waste my time and have to [inaudible] up and write something else."

STAN BESEN:

You can complain about it, but you'll see it early on in a fairly complete form.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:

Right, but that's what I'm saying. I was saying the reason why I would personally want to present that in the outline form first is that I wouldn't want to spend two hours writing some [prose] and have you guys say, "Jordyn, you're an idiot, that's totally not what we're saying," and then come to a different conclusion and have to rewrite all that stuff.

Whereas the thing that Stan's saying is he doesn't work like that, that he would rather just write down the whole prose, acknowledging that we might not agree with him, and then we'll have to figure out how to work through his text after the fact. That's a cost/benefit tradeoff –

STAN BESEN:

I don't want to put off the writing until November.

---

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yes. That's a slightly different statement, but alright, let me – I've got Megan [inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK: You got to be careful about that, but I don't think we need to wait until November to start writing. All I was trying to say is that the deliverable for November in the public participation is probably a PowerPoint, not prose. But having that PowerPoint ready prior to that meeting and starting. So once the PowerPoint for your question is done, start writing, but that is a deliverable for Hyderabad [inaudible] presentation that we're going to give the community as opposed to a document we're going to give them. That's all that means.

STAN BESEN: I can write [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I think there are two aspects: one is process, and one is content. I suspect that Stan, when he starts writing, is not going to go off in 29 different directions. He's written for many years. I suspect he's going to follow more or less the issues that we have in the template, even if not in form of the template. He's going to say, "What is the question? What is the data we have to show it, and what are the conclusions?" Isn't that right? Something like that, and if it's not exactly like that – so it's not that it's going to start with a conclusion, then a recommendation, then somewhere throw in the data. So I'm not too worried about that, and

---

we're all going to follow more or less a template, even if you don't call it a template. Firstly.

Second, I find it much easier to work from a written document, and to look at what the assumptions were, what the analysis is, what the recommendations are, the conclusions, etc., instead of going around and around in circles, as we may do if we start discussing the conclusions orally, for all sorts of reasons.

For many people, English is not a first language. For a second reason, it's always more difficult to retain things, at least for me, if they're done orally, and if you have something written down, it's very useful, you can always go back and refer to it, and you can ask for clarification. So I must say, I am very much in favor of written submissions. They don't have to be long, but they give us a good basis for what we're doing, and then they can be put together in various combinations and ways when we come to a final, big presentation.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:

I actually don't think there's any tension between your position – or at least I don't understand the tension between your position and Jonathan's template, as opposed to Stan's prose, which is, I think Jonathan's template also encourages us to write things down and have a document in a particular structure, and not just be forced to rely on the oral conversation. But it won't include the footnoted description of the methodology that was used.

---

STAN BESEN: [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Correct.

STAN BESEN: That the document has. And if you want to look at something and see if it's okay, like what are the assumptions, what are the data I used, how did I get there? A skeletal outline of what you did will never give the reader enough information to judge whether it's any good.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I 100% agree that we want to get to, at some point, the full document, with Stan-like prose, throughout the report. The question is, do we want to get to that point for discussion within the group? Which is a different statement, and I think you could use Jonathan's template to summarize findings.

I think you could take the thing I wrote. Let's use that as an example. The thing I wrote about market concentration. I think we had a discussion about that in here. Kaili told me things he didn't like about what I had written. I think we mostly agreed on the general conclusions, which were that the market for legacy gTLDs was – the overall market for gTLDs was pretty concentrated. The market for new gTLDs was a lot less concentrated, but they weren't yet a significant part of the total in order to have much of an effect on the total, right?

---

So we sort of all agreed on that, and so now, I would say, “Okay, we’ve had that discussion, I’m going to go write all that prose that you have suggested, and I’m going to be very careful to say concentration instead of competition when I do it,” and then for me at least, I would feel more confident about whether I was investing my time, because I had done it in that sequence as opposed to writing a long thing first.

You’re saying it’s easier for you to go the other way around –

STAN BESEN:

No, not at all. That’s exactly what you said. We had this [inaudible] discussion, I have the results, I will write it up just the way you described. And then it’s very easy for me, at that point, to produce a PowerPoint for a presentation to a larger group.

By the way, if you feel better about it, I could write it up, I just won’t circulate it.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

There are a lot of dynamics in play. One of the issues that comes up – and I think in some ways more in the other group than in this one – is that they had a huge reading list. So easily half of the articles in their reading list were not relevant to the questions that they had asked, that they boiled down the questions.

So you had people creating summaries of what were in articles. So the exercise became one of summarizing a bunch of reference materials, rather than answering the questions. So the idea behind the template

---

is, what question were you trying to answer, and what sub question were you trying to answer? What hypothesis were you trying to prove?

So it was creating a structure that drove your activity through the lens of the exercise that we're engaged in, as opposed to whatever exercise random researcher XYZ was engaged in, which was part of what was starting to happen there.

It's that kind of thing, and your work, as Megan says, will follow that structure, and you're going to title your papers and [inaudible] based on these questions, because this is so much more project-driven in that way. In other words, you're not looking at random information, it was only the result of having asked a question in the first place that you have anything to look at.

The constraints are a little bit different. The idea was just to create some consistency of, if we traded things that we were looking at, say we're looking at the same thing, "Oh, here's the hypothesis, here's what the findings were." That's all. We don't need to put too fine a point on it.

STAN BESEN:

Let me ask a very specific question. I circulated thee two little literatures to [inaudible] One about the effect of – this was back about .biz on competition. It was about what we learned about trademark duplication. What I would want to do is say, "Okay, that's the first part of it. Here's what people knew before we started, and here's what we found out about the same questions now." Does that make sense?

---

JONATHAN ZUCK: it does. I don't think this is a productive discussion. Do whatever you would like to do. No, I'm serious. Write the way you want to. We will come back to you later to try and bulletize things for presentation purposes. We will consume the stuff in the form that's easier for you to produce, Stan. I think that's fine. Let's not – we don't need to shoehorn this.

STAN BESEN: Thank you.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay. Kaili.

KAILI KAN: Just one thing: the document. No matter if in PowerPoint or in text, this will be also the presentation to the community, on behalf of our whole team. And in most of the issues, it seems like our whole team have agreed on a conclusion, as Jordyn had mentioned. But on some, maybe to a lesser degree.

So I just want to – no matter what kind of procedures we'll take, I'd just like to see that this will conclude the whole team's opinion, including [inaudible]. There are some points we truly cannot agree with each other, then just like the Supreme Court, it is a five versus four. There is a majority opinion, there's a minority opinion in that format. Just to make sure that our opinions are fully presented.

---

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Waudo has been waiting for a while.

WAUDO SIGANGA: The presentation in the public meeting in Hyderabad is the one that's going to be in PowerPoint, but our reports to the subgroup are going to be in the template.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Three things need to happen. The first thing that needs to happen is we need to have a discussion related to these projects. We need to be able to talk about what the results of the project were and what the findings were. I think Megan is right. We need to have something written down in order to inform that conversation. My opinion – and I'm not the dictator. I'm just the facilitator. So we can talk about whether my opinion is the right one or not, but in my opinion, that written form could be either Jonathan's template or a full prose writeup as Stan suggested.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Sorry. I think there was some confusion because I've heard talk like we are going to make some reports in PowerPoint or prose. [inaudible] making in PowerPoint. The PowerPoint would be the three of you when you're going to present to the community.



---

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Right, so step one...

WAUDO SIGANGA: But for us, it's to bring the report in the template.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Right, or if you want, in full prose as Stan has suggested.

WAUDO SIGANGA: So it's either template or prose? Not prose or PowerPoint?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Correct. So step one is we're going to have a conversation, and in order to have the conversation, you need to write something down in either prose or template, one of those two things.

WAUDO SIGANGA: I think, for the record, I really prefer the template because everything else [inaudible] some standard format so that we know how we are moving. Also, it will be easier for the three of you when you are extracting the information for the presentations to the community. I think it will be much easier if [inaudible] everything is standardized.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I think the majority people are going to use template because it will be less writing. So that's the first thing we need. Then from that discussion

---

and the template, we will extract, we will make a PowerPoint that we will present in Hyderabad.

JONATHAN ZUCK: [inaudible] present first in plenary.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: In plenary, sure.

JONATHAN ZUCK: And then the [inaudible] of that because we probably won't have enough time in our public session to literally go through every single project.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: No. That's true.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Then sometimes we're going to [inaudible] project [inaudible] question. That's the other thing [inaudible]. Project-centric view is not the way that we're going to put this information [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah. I think [inaudible].

---

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, and we can give the background. I suspect in Hyderabad it will be more interesting to talk about the findings than the work that was done in order to get [inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK: Oh, I agree.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Since we've been talking about nothing but the work that we've done up until this point.

JONATHAN ZUCK: [inaudible] findings [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: So that I agree with. What I was going to say is then the last thing that we're going to do is we're going to draft prose for all of it. That can be happening in parallel. We don't have to wait until we've delivered the PowerPoint in Hyderabad to do that.

But I think if we want to be pretty... I for myself and it sounds like Waudo and others mostly agree that it sounds better to use the template for that initial discussion to get confident about what the outline is going to look like, what we want to write in terms of the

---

prose. I would prefer to do that just because I don't want to write a lot of prose and then have you guys tell me I'm dumb and then have to rewrite it.

So I would encourage folks to use the template for the conversations. What we'll be doing is presenting each of the projects in the form of one of the templates. Hopefully, most of them will be not controversial and will have relatively short conversations, and in a few cases, we may have more controversial things that will take more time.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

Sorry. Just to maybe play Devil's advocate here, I'm just wondering [inaudible] when you're making the [inaudible] final prose report. I know, for example, Stan is very good at coming up with footnotes and all that kind of thing. How would you get that when the information just came out of the template? Will we go back to the original people that were doing the project to get that kind of specialized information?

JORDYN BUCHANAN:

[inaudible] the same people will be doing [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

Oh, after the discussion? After the debating?

JORDYN BUCHANAN:

Yes, exactly.

---

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: The same person will do the [inaudible]?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: The same person will do it.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Alright. That answers it.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: And then there will be... some of the editing that happens later just combines all together and probably get consistent voice and consistent style and stuff like that. But the actual drafting would still be done by the people that do the projects.

Okay, does that sound like the right process to everyone? Okay, good. What we may even want to do in some cases because we're running out of time is have people present their templates on e-mail and read the e-mails and then have the discussion on the mailing list and then just identify places where we think we need to have [live] discussion and reserve the calls for the few topics that really need the [live] discussion.

Okay, so let's make that a goal. Let's also make it the goal that everyone has assignments coming out of here are going to finish them by – I'll get a little bit of [inaudible] because I'm going on vacation right after this and I don't want to give myself a deadline while I'm on vacation.

---

JONATHAN ZUCK: [inaudible] everyone makes sense, or some of it's dependent on data availability too.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Right. We haven't given assignments to people yet where there is not the data availability. So this is if you have a project that the data is available for, then let's say September 15, which is basically two weeks.

JONATHAN ZUCK: How long is your vacation?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: A week.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Oh, okay. So those two week [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Well, it's sort of two weeks. I mean, I will have [a few days to] [inaudible] when I get back.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

---

JORDYN BUCHANAN: We will circulate a list of the assignments. The list is, yes, I just need to bring up the project tracking spreadsheet.

STAN BESEN: [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: So that would be next Wednesday. This was a plenary week call, but next Wednesday is your scheduled call if you still want to have it [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Although there is some discussion about switching to only plenary calls, so we need to I guess see how [inaudible] and whether we want to [inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK: [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, I think that's probably true.

JONATHAN ZUCK: So I think we need to [inaudible].

---

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Your next subteam call.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: What I might suggest...

JONATHAN ZUCK: [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I mean I can – I'm a little motivated by the fact I'm going to be on vacation, but I was going to suggest [inaudible] anyway. I would suggest if we don't think we're going to have very many of these templates complete in a week, it might be time better spent having people allocate the time they would be on the call to write instead. And then the following, the 21<sup>st</sup>, everyone would have had at least six days to digest all of the projects.

JONATHAN ZUCK: [inaudible] Stan [inaudible] reporting assignments for the [inaudible]. Discussion already in this meeting that we feel comfortable that the next [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Right. There has been probably some topics where we've already had discussion where we could assume that the presentation – we don't need to have more discussion in the group. So all the places where we



---

actually talked about numbers and conclusions here or in the past, then we can move back to the plenary [inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK: [inaudible]

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, when I send out the list, I'll mark the ones that I think are at the point where we're writing up something for the entire group instead of just the subteam. There's not very many.

JONATHAN ZUCK: And maybe assign some of those to present on the 14<sup>th</sup>.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: On the 14<sup>th</sup>? Sure, that's fine. So that will mean those people have deadlines that are one day earlier. Or at least, it probably really should be like the 10<sup>th</sup> or something like that. The 12<sup>th</sup>. I don't know. Somewhere in there.

JONATHAN ZUCK: [inaudible]

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Instead of chopping [inaudible]. Yeah.

---

JONATHAN ZUCK: Be able to present to the group.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yep. Okay. Does everyone agree? That's our plan of action. We're going to try to have lots of conversations on our mailing list. Everyone has to write stuff and read what other people write while we're not face-to-face or on a call.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Subteam. Correct.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

JORDYN BUCHANAN: The 7<sup>th</sup>. You're going to keep that block on your calendar, and you're going to spend every minute of that time writing stuff.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes, Jordyn, [inaudible]. The subteam call on 21<sup>st</sup>, and when is the deadline for sharing or for finishing the [inaudible].

---

JORDYN BUCHANAN: The 15<sup>th</sup>.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: The 15<sup>th</sup>?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay, it's moved from the 9<sup>th</sup>. Okay.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Did I say 9<sup>th</sup>.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [Originally] it was 9<sup>th</sup>.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: [inaudible] 15<sup>th</sup>. 15<sup>th</sup> of September. Then there are going to be a few things that are going to be due a little earlier in order to allow discussion on the 14<sup>th</sup>. There are a few things that are due on the 14<sup>th</sup> to allow discussion with the plenary on the 14<sup>th</sup>. But that is mostly stuff that either Stan or I will be working on.

The things that will be discussed at the plenary are things that we would have already talked about the data here. So those things we feel more

---

comfortable assuming that no one is going to say anything crazy that the rest of the sub-team doesn't agree with.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible] circulate those points that are to be [presented] at the plenary.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yes. There will not be anything [inaudible], I don't think.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [So we'll know them in advance]?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: It won't be things we're working on for the plenary because we didn't get to the findings for your topic.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah, but it's good to know [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, I know that. We will. It will roughly be – I'll tell you now what it's going to be. It will be the basic market share calculations, the price analysis, and the – where's the one I did – the concentration ratios. That's what we'll discuss.

---

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I'm just [inaudible]. I'm trying to [inaudible]. There's also a tracking spreadsheet. I will also summarize it and people can look at that. I need to add a few things [inaudible].

Alright, now we have 20 more minutes, so we can go back to Eleeza's other metrics. Is anyone confused about what you're supposed to be doing?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay, we can do that. That is roughly analogous to – yeah. What would you like to say about them?

STAN BESEN: This relates to the question I [inaudible] before about registrars. It turns out that if you are a registry, you can acquire various inputs through [inaudible] two markets. One of them is you can hire registrars in effect to do your distribution, and you can hire backend providers to do the technical work. That's actually helpful because that makes entry easier. You don't have to enter at all three stages of the process. You can acquire inputs for [two] inputs from the market.

---

We've already said, I think the general conclusion is, it looks as if the registrar market is one in which there seems to be for many gTLDs a fair number of registrars [for whom] to distribute. I think that's [inaudible]. Overall, although it's different for some particular gTLDs, that market seems very unconcentrated.

The backend market is a little trickier. If you look at the concentration numbers for the market as a whole, it looks a good deal more concentrated. I forgot the exact numbers, but [inaudible] number. Nonetheless, my impression is that there are something like four or five major backend providers with whom a new gTLD can contract. And in many markets, even though they look concentrated, many markets exhibit a high degree of concentration if [inaudible] significant [inaudible].

So my impression – and I'm interested in people's reaction – is that in fact there are – [acquiring] that particular input is probably going to be acquired in a market that looks to me relatively competitive despite the fact that it's by standard kinds of measures fairly concentrated. But that's an opinion based on the data and reading the literature about the relationship between concentration and competition. But that's what I would want us to say. We have to say something about that. We've collected data on backend providers, and that's what I would propose to say. Okay, can I just write it up?

---

KAILI KAN: [inaudible] as a matter of fact I totally agree with you on that. As a matter of fact, my option is backend providers that lowers the threshold for [competition], especially for new players. So that is very helpful.

STAN BESEN: The only tricky part of it is the fact that it looks concentrated, but I think in this case it's probably not a problem [inaudible] significant size players.

KAILI KAN: Or to go one step further, yes, as long as there are four or five major big players, there's a very low possibility of collusion. So therefore, this monopolistic competition or whatever – no, no – a few players.

STAN BESEN: [inaudible] it's one in which [inaudible].

KAILI KAN: [inaudible]

STAN BESEN: I think it's fairly competitive behavior.

KAILI KAN: Yes, yes. So whatever, that is help for the healthy growth of the DNS market, especially in terms of new players and...

---

STAN BESEN: Just let me say one more thing. [inaudible] would prefer, and I apologize to Jonathan in advance, I would propose to put a footnote or two that cites the literature that suggests that despite the fact that this looks quite concentrated, we would expect that in many markets that look like this you'd expect fairly competitive behavior. That's all you can really say. I'm sorry.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I was just [inaudible] we do also consider where these backend providers are situated [inaudible] locations.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Because the jurisdiction...

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I think there is just a figure somewhere by region where the backend providers are located. It could have an impact.



---

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Not really, but you know the jurisdictions aspect could have an impact on the ease of reaching [inaudible] and so on and so forth.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I think that [inaudible].

KAILI KAN: May I also say something? Another extension about the backend providers, as you mentioned, there are four, five, six – about five? Okay. Coming back to our registry new gTLD market. We have been calculating HHI of four of eight. Even if the four or eight shows a very high concentration, it may not necessarily mean it is bad because same as your backend provider [inaudible] five actually that is healthy. So what is really serious is the [inaudible] side what .com that shows a very strong almost like monopolistic nature. So I think whether we can not only have HHI of four, of eight, which is the standard, but I wonder if we want to also if feasible to calculate the HHI of two. Was it... mathematically if that wouldn't be hard. But would that make sense or not? I must just say that there are some shortages in calculating only HHI for four and eight.

STAN BESEN: [inaudible] My recollection is the fifth biggest backend provider has a share of like 14%, which in many markets – often the critical factor in

---

competition in markets is how big the third, fourth, and fifth biggest firms are. It looks like here even the fifth biggest – am I right about the numbers?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: [inaudible] seeing slightly different numbers, I think. So the fifth biggest backend provider if you just look at gTLD registrations is 7%.

STAN BESEN: 7?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: It's .01% if you look at [inaudible] TLDs. You get 1.5% if you look at all TLDs [inaudible].

STAN BESEN: [inaudible] from memory.

JONATHAN ZUCK: This is recent registrations?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, it's recent registrations. Oh, you're asking for the top four [inaudible]?

---

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:            Maybe you're right. [inaudible] remember the fifth being about 14%.  
   Maybe it's only 7.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:            The fourth one for all gTLDs is 13%. Maybe that's what you were looking  
   [inaudible].

STAN BESEN:                    Okay, so the fourth one is 13?

JORDYN BUCHANAN:            Yeah, for all gTLDs.

STAN BESEN:                    And the fifth is 7. It's not really tiny. I mean, it's big enough to  
   presumably be a player.

KAILI KAN:                      And the biggest one?

JORDYN BUCHANAN:            For which? For all TLDs?

KAILI KAN:                      Uh-huh.

---

JORDYN BUCHANAN: 79%.

KAILI KAN: Oh. Who is that?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Verisign.

STAN BESEN: But let me go back to my general point. I think...

KAILI KAN: So [inaudible] provide their own backend?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right.

STAN BESEN: I think that we would like a writeup about the fact that new gTLDs have access to both registrars and backend providers that they can acquire, that they needn't be fully [inaudible] integrated, but in fact that's not a barrier to entry here because you can acquire those inputs through other parties. I think that's an important point as to why entries can actually occur. That's why I wanted to not forget to talk about backend providers.

---

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Just to add, I did put together a table matching all registry operators to their backend, including their jurisdictions and whether or not they're [inaudible] jurisdictions, and about half are [inaudible] where the backend is [inaudible] legal jurisdiction.

STAN BESEN: [inaudible]

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I will resend it.

STAN BESEN: Resend it, yes, okay. By the way...

JONATHAN ZUCK: [inaudible]

STAN BESEN: That's okay. It got pushed. Just as a reminder about the facts, [ntldstats.com] in fact for the new gTLDs in fact provides backend information for every one of them. In fact, it's another alternative way you can [inaudible]. I think you get at the share data at least for of course the gTLDs. That's the fact they got started on this because I

---

began to look at those numbers and thought there's a fair number of them. That's all.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay, so I feel like we have a plan there.

STAN BESEN: I'll write it up [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay, that's the plan. Okay, now we have ten minutes left for the remaining metrics. We were on the domain name registration page. Not that one. I can put it in chat. Oh, I'm in the wrong chat. What chat are we in now? [inaudible], okay, great. Okay, 2.7 is the same. We've already seen this. 2.9 is the same. We've already seen this. 2.11 is the same. We've already seen this.

3.7 – Quantity of Second Level Registrations Per New gTLD on a Monthly Basis. [inaudible] is not very popular. This is just volume numbers over time, right?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah. I mean, we're using the total numbers in our [inaudible], but I don't think we need to use...

---

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I can't imagine that there's a project around these numbers in their own right as opposed to using them in conjunction with other things.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah. [inaudible] there's other places where we've already asked staff to intersect total registration numbers or analysis [inaudible] just by total registration numbers with other metrics. So those seem [inaudible] very useful, but I don't think we need the [inaudible] numbers on a per TLD basis. So we will not use that as a new project.

3.8 we've already talked about.

4.4 – Percentage of Non-Resolving Domains. A name that does not...

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

JORDYN BUCHANAN: That will give you – when you attempt to navigate to it, you'll get a DNS error.

---

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

JORDYN BUCHANAN: No, 4.8% of the names inside .academy.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

JORDYN BUCHANAN: [inaudible] Oracle? Presumably that is the .brand TLD. No, actually, there's another brand. I think that's a Japanese brand.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay, I'm going to challenge your guys' math ability because isn't the total registrations for .komatsu five? Wait, hold on. So this is three out of – April 25<sup>th</sup>.



---

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: The non-resolving domains, and then the percentage that that represents of the registrations in that domain.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: [inaudible] right, three out of seven.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

JORDYN BUCHANAN: So .komatsu is a brand, so presumably they're not.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Right. Correct. Right.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: So the way we calculated this was the technical services team looked at each zone file and compared it against registrations with BRD, the Bulk Registration Data. If it appeared in the BRD does not appear in the zone file, then it was considered a [inaudible].

---

JORDYN BUCHANAN: So that's only one way of [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: That was the method that we agreed upon with the IAG, and that's what we've been calculating.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: [inaudible] I think ntlstats.com is doing the same thing with [inaudible]. So we probably want to use the ntlstats.com data for this. This is one of the parts of the [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Correct, yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Correct, but they do a version of non-resolving that is better than the [inaudible] version of non-resolving. So if we were to use non-resolving, we would [inaudible] ntlstats.com [inaudible].

---

STAN BESEN: [inaudible]

JORDYN BUCHANAN: We're probably not going to use non-resolving as the [inaudible] definition. It may be one of the things we sum up to [inaudible] definition.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Sure. So anyway, so we're probably not going to use this data. These numbers seem actually very low to me. But that may be because I was just looking at the zone file. Yeah.

Alright, gTLD Registration Growth on a Monthly Basis. So this is the total number of global gTLDs. This is an interesting number that we use in various contexts but we probably don't look at as a standalone project.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Right. I mean, the one thing I would be [serious] about is what was – I guess analysis group has already looked at this – like what was the [trend line] before and after the New gTLD Program. So fortunately, the

---

only project that I would think would be good to look at here someone has already done. Alright, so...

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

JORDYN BUCHANAN: That is a pretty big – yeah. I don't have a good answer for why that's so variable.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: This was a difficult one to capture because it was either going to have to be a very manual check of every single registrar, but the other way to do it is if they offer .coms, then presumably you can register an IDN if that registrar will accept an IDN. So that's when we decided to rely on this Verisign list of who offers IDNs because they're also offering .coms. But there are probably more. We never could come up with a good

---

methodology for capturing this, and it's not something that we were tracking internally either.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay.

STAN BESEN: [inaudible]

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, go ahead, Stan.

STAN BESEN: I met someone in Marrakech who worked for a firm that they registrar for like 500 TLDs. That's sort of interesting to me that these guys are not – it's not 1 to 1 or even 2 to 1. It's like some of these represent hundreds of TLDs. This is just sort of an example of that. It sort of shows the wide – a single registrar is actually offering a very wide range of services. It's representing lots of different TLDs, and I presume that this is very [inaudible]. Is that correct? That they're also representing TLDs that have IDNs. Is that correct? [inaudible]?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible] this is referring to registering an IDN at the [inaudible], which would include TLDs that are [inaudible].

---

STAN BESEN: Yeah. So I go to a registrar's website and I could register something in Arabic and .xyz. It's like one-stop shopping, if you like. [inaudible]

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: If xyz takes Arabic as a second language.

STAN BESEN: No, no. They could do both.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I don't think I understand [inaudible].

STAN BESEN: I'm sorry. Do these websites offer only IDN?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: No, it's not only IDN. They offer IDNs in addition to other registrations.

STAN BESEN: That's what I was saying. The website that [inaudible] here that's offering IDN may also be offering a [inaudible]?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Presumably.

---

STAN BESEN: Yeah, it could.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: It could be offering any number of [inaudible].

STAN BESEN: Any number.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Most of them do.

STAN BESEN: I think that's interesting because – that they're prepared to in fact represent lots of different TLDs. [inaudible] wrong.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

STAN BESEN: We know they do. My point is this is just an aspect of that.

JONATHAN ZUCK: [inaudible] specific to IDNs was whether or not they're in widespread distribution. I think that was the purpose of the metric. Again, most of these things are meant to be tracked over time to see if the trend is going in the right direction. So did the New gTLD Program result in more

---

registrars offering IDN TLDs for sale? Right? I mean that's the – this was all meant to roll up into a consumer price index that sort of says, okay, here are our indicators. I think, Stan, as we discussed earlier, we're going to want to find ways to supplement these and come up with a watch list of indexes that they track on a continual basis as part of the [health] index. So none of these [inaudible] by themselves, but they roll up to have implications for the overall health of the ecosystem.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay. I don't know what to do with this number.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Pardon? It exists. Some registrars offer IDN. Some of them might also have resellers that offer IDN. I think it's good to know this fact, but it's probably not a project that we're going to...

WAUDO SIGANGA: Sorry. The growth of the registrars offering IDNs has not been as high as the growth of the [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, the percentage has decreased.



---

WAUDO SIGANGA: Yeah, it has decreased. The growth has decreased but the number offering IDNs [at the second level] has gone up. [inaudible]

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah. I mean, we could point that out.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Yes.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I think it is helpful to have knowledge of this number, but it is probably not going to be something we do a standalone writeup for anything like that. I'm going to suggest we keep it in our pockets.

And we're out of time. What other? We have quantity of [registrar] numbers, and that's it. Whoa, number of registrars increased a lot. That might be worth pointing out.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: The only other – I'd like to point out too that we haven't covered yet is the metrics that are related to [RPMs] at the bottom [of the metrics] page. We have all of the UDRP and [URS] complaints that were made, decisions, how many were against registrants, who [prevailed in their dispute], as well as shares of sunrise registrations and domain blocks [inaudible] sunrise registration [inaudible].

---

JORDYN BUCHANAN: You have counts on domain blocks?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: No, we don't.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Oh. I was like, "What?! That would be amazing!"

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: That was what was requested. We haven't [inaudible]. It's not data that we have. Sorry.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay. I have a [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

JORDYN BUCHANAN: At lunch, we were talking about the one gap we have on this stuff is domain blocks, so that would have been really nice.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: There is quite a lot of data that we've combined from all of the different registration providers that I think is useful because it's hard to find those all combined.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah. So I think this will mostly be for the other teams.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: For the other teams. But if you're interested in the results of [inaudible], you can see them there.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay. Alright, we have to move to the other room presumably?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Presumably.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Thanks, everyone. I will send out assignments. It'll be awesome. It will be even more awesome to read all of your writing.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**