
RECORDED VOICE: This meeting is now being recorded.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks everyone and welcome to the nineteenth plenary call of the CCT review team. Is there anyone that is on the phone but is not in the Adobe connect?

JAMIE HEDLUND: Jamie Hedlund.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks Jamie. And are there any updates to anyone's statements of interests? Alright. George said that he may try to connect in via his airplane Wi-Fi but we won't hold our breath on that. So, let's roll right into some recent discussions. And then I'll do some discussions with Eleeza about the registrant survey and any other business. So, why don't we go ahead and jump to the duplicate names summary presentation. Who is going to be doing that?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Jordan was.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Oh Jordan was, ok.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: He asked if he could be the cover station if he's not able to make it.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Oh, for this one as well. Ok, alright. I was going to do the trademark ones.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: We do have a re-cap of the points that Jordan prepared for the trademark.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I do have them.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: We do have them on the screen here.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Excellent. Thank you. So Stan did some excellent analysis of the data that we were given by the analysis group and Jordan has coupled these up to a couple of bullet points for discussion purposes. And so there is basically three points. As with the previous expense of the gTLD space, some trademark holders engage in defensive registrations. The sample sent by the analysis group said 54% of trademarks registered in dot com were registered in one or more new gTLDs. Most of the trademarks are only registered in a small number of gTLDs [inaudible] of three. Although a smaller number of trademarks are registered with many, sometimes hundreds of gTLDs. So those were sort of the summary points from Stan's analysis that we wanted to put out there. The one thing that isn't captured yet and I don't think that we've identified the

best way to capture it is the cost associated with blocking. But hopefully that will be part of something that services as part of the inter-survey so that we'll have a better stance of the level of blocking that's going on. Because governance is one of the biggest purveyors in new gTLDs and they offer a blocking solution. So those were the findings. Does anybody have any questions about them? Or which - I'll try to direct at Stan, I think but if they make sense then we may direct back to the text that was written by Stan. So does anybody have any questions or comments about these three findings? Carlos, go ahead please.

CARLOS RAUL:

Thank you Jonathan and I hope you get better soon. I just - a comment, can we include a fourth bullet where we compare with the number of trademarks that jump into the first level? Does it make sense? Because right now it doesn't mention that some trademarks just jump and move upwards into the first level. I don't know if that is possible, but it seems to me that it gives some kind of context. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks Carlos. I think that the issue there obviously is that not everyone's motivation for doing that is defensive in nature but more often pro-active. And so this particular thing was about how trademark holders are handling things at the second level domain. So if you can make the case for why that constitutes a defensive registration, then please make it. But I'm not sure that that's in evidence anywhere. Thanks Carlos. Laureen, go ahead.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Thanks. I was wondering Stan or anyone - I understand that these are numbers of perhaps defensive domains and the comparison between folks who have a domain registered in dot com and the new gTLDs. But I was wondering have we, or should we perform any analysis about whether the domains that exist in both dot com and the new gTLDs, whether the ones in new gTLDs are actually active and being used. And I think this goes back to the whole heart issue that was raised during our last call. So, let me put it more simply. For all these new gTLDs that are being - for all the domains that are being registered in new gTLDs, are they actually being used? Or are they just being bought?

JAMIE HEDLUND: So this is Jamie, I'm on the phone. If I could come in at some point that would be great.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Oh Jamie, go ahead.

JAMIE HEDLUND: So I think we've had some discussion about this before. My understanding is it's not always clear that multiple registrations are necessarily purely defensive in nature. It can also be for traffic aggregation, re-direction where they think that the search may point people in a different place. And so I was wondering if there will be a discussion about the difficulties that exist in identifying whether or not something is in fact defensive. For example a second level in a new g that points back to a brand's dot com address is not necessarily

defensive at all. It could be part of a broader marketing and traffic strategy. Thanks.

[AUDIO BREAK]

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Jonathan you may be on mute. Jonathan? Ok, we'll have to go to Calvin while Jonathan fixes his phone. Thank you. Calvin?

CALVIN BROWNE: Ah yes Calvin here. I was just wondering if any work had been done on the [inaudible] previous registrations. Although, Jamie's question kind of make this important. I was wondering if there is anything like that at all.

[AUDIO BREAK]

JONATHAN ZUCK: Stan, do you want to address that?

STAN BESEN: Yeah, I actually have a few things to say. I think personally, it's a reasonable question. I don't think anybody at this point has data on that, and it would be useful to get it. Actually, let me respond to a couple of things that have already been said, just very quickly. This document is slightly different from the document that was circulated about two or three weeks ago. And I'll just quickly tick off the things that have been done in response to comments that were made. One is that Megan pointed out that not all duplicate registrations are defensive. That's the point that Jamie just made. And so there is a big

discussion of that. Second, [Eleeza] pointed me to a question in the Nielsen survey that talks about or gives reasons some of the registrants gave for duplicate registrations. And so there is a brief discussion of that. David pointed out that notwithstanding the availability of what I might think of as quasi-legal ways of preventing someone else from using your trademark. He points out that some of his clients nonetheless engage in duplicate registrations because that's cheaper than the [inaudible] legal process. Four, this reflects Jonathan's comment on the earlier call about blocking. And so there are a couple of examples of registries that offer a blocking service, which is apparently less expensive than duplicate registrations. I don't think we know how costly those are. But there's a discussion of that in the draft. And finally, Jordan made the point that probably the media is a better measure of the extent of duplicate registrations because of the skewness. The one guy who apparently registered four hundred domains. So, this is a living document and any comments that people send me, I actually prefer getting them in writing, because it's clearer to me what the questioner wants to put in. But I have been trying to respond as people give me comments and as you can see there are at least these five changes since the earlier draft. That's it.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks Stan and thanks a lot for the updates that you've made in the document. This is always going to have been a problematic statistic. When we were in the planning phases for the CCT trying to come up with measures of defensive registrations, we didn't come up with any really. And so these are just proxies for that that hopefully give over a series of different statistics, and the survey begin to get some

indications of the level of defensive registrations. And hopefully we'll get a better understanding of that, including the use of blocking from the trademark holders survey. We'll get a better understanding of where the trademark strategies have morphed, because the old strategy that was used primarily by those in the financial industry I think, like PayPal, etcetera, just sort of registering everything, everywhere, just isn't feasible under the new gTLD program. And so everybody is changing the strategy. Hopefully we'll learn more about that from the [inaudible] survey.

Stan, I had it in my head that we actually had some indications of what the costs were for blocking. Did the stuff that we find not end up being rigorous enough to cite?

STAN BESEN:

You would have to remind me where that is. I don't really know it. What I did after you mentioned this on the last call is I went to the website of a couple of registries. The one you recommended and another one. I don't believe any of them provide price information for example. But if you have more data, I'll be happy to include it.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Ok, Stan. I'll get back with you. It wasn't data provided by them. It came in directly. It was in some analysis argument articles but I'll try to track those down again.

STAN BESEN:

That's great. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thank you Stan, thanks for your work on this. Calvin is that an old hand?

CALVIN BROWNE: Yeah thanks. That answers my question, thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Jonathan, have we lost you or are you on?

JONATHAN ZUCK: I'm sorry. Thanks. Let's move to the duplicate name summary. Sorry. Hopefully I didn't say anything of any importance when I was muted.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: We will never know.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's right. I certainly won't. A little under the weather. Okay, so this was the question that we talked a little bit about on the last call. And Jordan might have used my example from the big shots photography that I bought and frankly couldn't explain why I did it. So the sub question is, your registrant [inaudible] new gTLDs even when an equivalent SLB is available in dot com. So that equivalent means, in the case of big shots photography – bigshots.photography I purchased even

though big shots photography dot com was available. So that's sort of the equivalent that we're looking at. And in 18% of the registrations in new gTLDs, the second level was available. So that's fairly small. That means that if somebody has actually bought good dot something else when good dot com was available. So that is fairly small. And of the TLDs with at least 1000 registrations, 32 had less than 1% of the registrations available in the form of second level domain. So for the most part, com was taken in these registrations. IBM had to have more equivalent second level domains than com, and those are the three that are most popular. And 30% of the second level domains registered in gTLDs were available in dot com. 82% of the registrations, the [inaudible] TLD was available. So in other words, if you've got good dot example, good.example.com was available. And so I think you've made some trajectory hearing causes that in some cases users prefer to register the new gTLD even when the second level is available in dot com, the vast majority of the new gTLD registrations could have been registered in com instead of in the form of SLD TLD.com. It [inaudible] appears the new gTLD registrants prefer the shorter form over the longer form. For many gTLDs this is despite the [inaudible] retail price for the gTLD is typically higher than for dot com. Overall registrations at the second level in new [inaudible] tend towards common terms already registered in [tom].

Are there any questions about these findings or comments? If I may be bold, I think this is one of the most interesting findings that we have. Because it does suggest that - and coupled with the registrant survey, questions around a desire to have a keyword based [inaudible] for the internet sort of. I think these two go hand in hand, and I think that's

interesting. Other folks with comments and questions about this? Because the next step will be Jordan turning this into a paper, much like the ones that Stan has circulated. So this is the time to get at the main points if you see a problem with them or a problem with the conclusions because the next thing that we will be looking at is the draft.

Okay. If there are no further questions then the next stage for this will be pros in conjunction with information about the registrant survey and we'll move on to registry policies.

ALICE JANSEN: Jonathan, sorry to jump in. Could we get a deadline for any comments on the papers? So everyone is clear on when they should submit their input.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sure. Let's say that any comments on these worksheets need to be done by the time of the end of next week. I mean, we really want to let things get to draft form if people don't have objections. So, try to get your comments in even sooner if you can.

Okay, thanks Alice.

ALICE JANSEN: Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: You want to move to the registry policies?

ALICE JANSEN: Sure. I'm not sure that [Dehan] is on the call though.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, I don't see him. [Dehan] are you on the call?

Alright, well let's skip over this in case he gets on the call. And we'll switch over to Laureen to discuss Consumer Trust.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Thanks Jonathan. So, what I've done in this discussion paper is I've looked at both the Nielsen consumer survey, the Nielsen registrants survey and also an NCC paper on consumer trust and tried to pluck out the portions of those surveys, at least the Nielsen studies that deals with consumer trust, because they deal with a lot of other issues as well. And I'll go through this but at a high level, the comparison between the level of trust for new gTLDs and legacy gTLDs is that consumers tend to trust the legacy gTLDs approximately twice as much as they do for new gTLDs. And then certain factors come in to play about why consumers visit gTLDs, what is important in terms of trust. We have some findings regarding consumers behavior, and also interesting findings regarding expectations for restrictions.

So, with that as a high level, I'll move through the findings. What we find from these surveys is that consumers visit top level domains in general based on the relevance of information they're trying to find. And also they tend to visit domains that they're more familiar with. They don't visit new gTLDs as much as legacy gTLDs. In 2015 - well I'll do 2016

because it's more recent. But there was a comparison of 81% for legacy gTLDs in terms of high visitation rate versus 12% of new gTLDs having high visitation rates.

The second wave of the Nielsen survey added some more new gTLDs to their questions and that thumped up the visitation rate slightly to 15%. The NCC study, which I'll note does seem in part to have a focus on propounding the benefits of trusted brands, but that study indicated some discomfort with visiting websites ending in new domains. About half the survey respondents reported feeling very comfortable, which of course means that almost half didn't feel comfortable.

On the question of whether consumers trust new gTLDs as much as legacy gTLDs, again, we have this finding that for new gTLDs, at least in 2016, 45% found new gTLDs very or somewhat trustworthy and that's compared to 91% finding legacy gTLDs very or somewhat trustworthy. And it ticked up a little bit in 2016 compared to 2015. When the question was more specific to certain specified new gTLDs, the Nielsen survey had a collection of new gTLDs. The numbers increased 60% in 2016, found the specified new gTLDs as trustworthy. And those gTLDs were dot news, dot photography, dot email, dot realtor, those were found trustworthy. Dot news was the most trustworthy. But I believe there was a question as to whether all of these gTLDs were in fact even delegated. Which means that the respondents may have a comfort level with certain words that are familiar, but it doesn't actually mean they visited the site and found that to be trustworthy. It seems that the very familiarity with the word may lead to some perception of trustworthiness.

For registrants, their perception of legacy gTLDs as trustworthy actually went down in 2016 from 83% to 79%. And they associate the term trustworthy with legacy gTLDs more than new gTLDs. That's for registrants.

Question 3 is - and maybe we can - do people have independent scrolling capability here? So, folks scroll down to question 3. You'll see that this gets at a behavior issue which is very important because it gives us an objective measure of an action that's associated with trustworthiness. So the question asked was whether consumers felt comfortable providing sensitive information, i.e. health or financial information to new gTLDs, compared to legacy gTLDs. And then we asked that for several different measures. And generally speaking, again, we see that the consumers rated new gTLDs as about half the amount of trustworthiness or comfort level, I'll say, because that's the precise wording, they were only half as comfortable providing sensitive information. So, if we're talking about financial information for example in 3 D. For dot coms, 52% of consumers felt somewhat comfortable but for new gTLDs, only 36% did.

For question 4, we have a question about trust offering whether consumers trust new gTLDs to take precautions regarding who gets a new domain name, give consumers what they think they're getting, screen individuals who register for certain domain names - and those findings are a little bit more optimistic. Overall the consumers trust the domain industry to perform those functions. And another interesting finding is that 55% expect websites registered under domains to have a very clear relationship to the gTLD to which it's registered. So, for example, and we've talked about this on calls before, our dot

photography domain, consumers would expect that if they're visiting a domain with dot photography that it actually has something to do with photography.

The questions under question 5 deal with another important topic, and that's an expectation about restriction and whether that contributes to consumer trust, restrictions on who can purchase domain names. So when we asked do restrictions on who can purchase domain names contribute to consumer trust, in 2016 the answer was yes. 70% for all gTLDs and the registrants survey also supported that finding. And regarding new gTLDs specifically, in 2016 73% expected restrictions on new gTLDs and registrants also favored strict or some purchase restrictions.

Going a little more quickly, for question 6, consumers do expect restrictions to be enforced, and they trust that restrictions will be enforced.

Question 7 for the consumer survey was a text box where we specifically asked what makes domain extensions trustworthy. Some common answers were reputation and familiarity. The NCC group also asked related questions to this. What factors increased confidence in new domains? And a lot of these had to do with communications about what steps the domain is taking to secure your personal information on the website. Some sort of evidence of a standard of security. And there were also specific questions about verified brands, i.e. brands that somehow go through a procedure or screening process. When we asked the questions in the converse, what are the reasons for avoiding unfamiliar domain extensions, again, this lack of familiarity and concern

about security ranks high. In a related NCC finding shows that there is an increase in 2015 to 2016 regarding concerns of showing financial information and personal information. So a fear of stolen credentials or identity theft.

So, when we look at the big picture here to summarize, trust really seems tied to familiarity with the gTLD and the reputation of the gTLD and how often the consumer uses that gTLD. That those seem like two issues that really are key to trustworthiness of the gTLD, whether it's a new gTLD or a legacy gTLD. And familiarity with the gTLD depends upon visitation and the questions in the surveys seem to point to relevance to the information sought as a really high factor for visitation. And then finally there is a recognition that both consumers and registrants expect that there are going to be some type of restrictions in the sale of gTLDs and this expectation increased in 2016 for both legacy and new gTLDs.

So those are a summary of the trust findings that are evident in the consumer survey and the registrants survey and also the NCC survey on consumer trust and I'm happy to take questions.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Laureen, this is Jonathan. I guess my first question is, do you feel like this starts to feed into a narrative that's less driven by the questions of the survey and more some overall conclusions that you feel that we can begin to state from the survey results?

LAUREEN KAPIN:

I think the narrative would be that people are less familiar with new gTLDs and therefore inclined to trust them less, at least at this point.

But this is all still very new. In a sense, this is - to keep using that photography image - this is a snapshot in a sense. I think we're going to have a much clearer image over time. But the narrative I think would be that consumers as a whole are less familiar with new gTLDs, therefore visit them less and trust them less. However, factors that can increase trust relate to the relevance of the domain for the information they're seeking. If they're seeking very specific information and that's in a new gTLD, they would be apt to visit that new gTLD more and, assuming they had a good experience, likely trust that new gTLD more. And then the other key finding I think goes to this expectation of restrictions that not just anybody is going to be able to buy a new gTLD and that that combined with a heightened anxiety about threats on the internet, dealing with stolen credentials or impermissible use of folks sensitive information feeds into this expectation for restrictions. So that would be the narrative I see emerging at this point.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's Lauren. David's got his hand up.

LAUREEN KAPIN: David! David we can't hear you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Lauren, you want to tackle Carlton's question in the meantime while David figures out his AV?

LAUREEN KAPIN:

Yeah, I'm just reading it. Carlton has asked, for those on the phone - "In context of information seeking behaviors, do you think the way consumers navigate to the gTLD would be important"?

It's an interesting question and I would have to give it more thought. I think the way people navigate to a gTLD may actually mask whether they know where they're navigating to. So if they're just typing in a search term and it's in Google perhaps or any other search engine and then they're clicking on a result that seems relevant, they might not even be focused on whether it's a new gTLD or a legacy gTLD. They just may want the information sought. In that regard, I don't know that it would make a difference whether it's a legacy gTLD or a new gTLD to the person trying to find the information. The most important thing would be the relevance of the information. So, I think in that way it could be important. But the other issue would be, I think some of the findings point to different comfort levels in how people are navigating to new gTLDs and comfort levels perhaps with search engines but not with social media, for example. We see one is more or less trustworthy. So, I'd have to think it through more but those are sort of my preliminary thoughts.

JAMIE HEDLUND:

Jonathan, can I get in here? This is Jamie.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

We're waiting on David to get audio back again. So you are at the front of the queue Jamie.

JAMIE HEDLUND: So, this is really about both sections or both sub groups and that is as we've discussed before, we're obviously early in the life cycle of new gTLDs. There is a lot of data that is going to be tentative or inconclusive or not there yet. So I was wondering on your question Jonathan about a narrative, whether in this part of the overall report we wouldn't sort of recommend questions and areas to pursue for the next one based on what we've found thus far. So if there's - as Laureen was saying with the sort of mixed results on trust, do those change? Do people trust them more with more familiarity? Or do they continue to not trust new gTLDs? Similarly with the competition thing. What questions could we ask [inaudible] that would look at the market in the way we try to but weren't able to because it just wasn't [data].

LAUREEN KAPIN: Thanks Jamie.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks Jamie, I think that is a good point. Oh, go ahead Laureen.

LAUREEN KAPIN: I think we were going to say the same thing.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I was waiting for you to say it.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Okay. I think it's a good point Jamie. [inaudible]

[CROSSTALK]

JONATHAN ZUCK: Jamie, you've had your [inaudible].

[LAUGHTER]

I think it's actually a good general point in that throughout the paper as we see areas where data deficiencies or better phrased questions or things like that would be helpful, we should make sure that we're mentioning them and it is part of our prescription for the next CCT review. So there is time and there is also sort of what we have learned about some of these topics as we've delved into them that'll help dictate the type of study that future teams do.

David is apparently back with us and has his hand up, so I'm going to hand the microphone to him.

DAVID TAYLOR: Hello everyone. Can you hear me now?

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yes.

DAVID TAYLOR: Oh, thank goodness for that. Sorry about that before. No idea what's going on. I've got a headpiece and everything so I wasn't using the audio of the computer. There we go. I could hear everybody perfectly, and then suddenly when it was my turn to speak, no one could hear me.

So just a couple of comments on number three Laureen, where we got whether consumers feel somewhat comfortable. I suppose really my take away from that when I looked at this was, you know we're looking at 34-48% for the new gTLDs being somewhat comfortable, which is half the two thirds of [inaudible] are not comfortable providing that information to new gTLDs. That seems to be quite a pertinent thing on comfortable. It just seems to be that somewhat comfortable, sort of seems [inaudible] a little bit. What I would see is a general uncomfortableness in providing anything. So I don't know whether that was a takeaway which you also felt was there or not or to discuss. I've got another point as well but hopefully you have thought that one through.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

Yeah, I mean when you flip these numbers for the new gTLDs around, you do see that a majority in all cases and in some cases almost two thirds don't feel comfortable. That's what the numbers tell us.

DAVID TAYLOR:

Okay. That's certainly a take away. And then on 4 A, when I was looking there, the 71% believe consumers get what they think they're getting. And again I think that the very pertinent thing there to question B is, is that true? Because that is very high. There is a certain amount of gullibility in there perhaps. If you go to a website and 71% believe that they think they're getting what they see there. It's high - very high. Higher than [inaudible] trust generally. Certainly when I go to a website, I don't believe it unless I know the domain name. So I think that's something which is key for that, is whether it's true or not and how we

get at that data because that's something which will then become very pertinent. So again, I was just throwing that out.

And then on 4 C, yes, I think it was where we got 55 - this is back to my point [inaudible] in the beginning a little bit. 55% expect the website to reflect a very clear relationship to the TLD. We've discussed the dot photography or the dot film. So, I suppose the question is that is that expectation borne out. So, of course as many TLDs out there with second level registrations without any control whatsoever, so is that level borne out or not and how do we get data on that, because that, again, seems to be quite key to me, or pertinent. That was my thought.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

And I think, as Jonathan observed, that may be a place where we identify that as an area for further study in the future and thought given, as to how you would collect that data. Whether it involved sampling certain websites and having folks review that under certain criteria. It would require some good thinking to figure out how you would get at that data regarding whether these expectations being met.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks Dave. Laureen do you want to address Jordan's text from the chat?

LAUREEN KAPIN:

Yeah. Yes, Jordan is speculating that a lot of the surveyor responses are speculative since its people saying 'I've never heard of that and so I wouldn't trust it that much'. And he's contrasting an inquiry that would

have been based on actual consumer behavior when encountering these domains. So the truth is we don't know. These surveys ask people questions and then trust that people are going to be giving thoughtful, accurate responses to the best of their ability. But whether that actually happens, we don't know. And I think Jordan is thinking about some sort of different study that would put people actually face to face with perhaps different websites and seeing what they do. That's an interesting idea.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Right. Intimidating at the moment, but it is interesting and I think that Jordan's supposition is somewhat confirmed by the notion that in the awareness portions of all these surveys, there's a higher awareness of words that are easier to understand and things like that too. So it is all in a way kind of hypothetical, but [inaudible] behavior for consumers that their familiarity with the term, their familiarity with the URL would lead to an increased trust. But I think we can draw that kind of conclusion as opposed to necessarily drawing one that there isn't trust.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

I'm sorry. I didn't understand the last part. The last part of your conclusion. So, familiarity is the answer to trust I understood, but what was the last part?

JONATHAN ZUCK:

So the last part is that a lot of what we can glean from this is that familiarity breeds trust. Whether it's with the term in use or an understanding of it. So that's the more or less the conclusion in some

respect than the actual statistical measures of trust that we got out of this survey. It's more about understanding consumer behavior as opposed to the numbers in trust itself.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yeah, I think that's a fair conclusion.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Any other questions for Lauren?

Okay, we got back some answers to questions that we had posed to the Nielsen group, so I wanted to hand it over to Eleeza to share those answers with us.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Hi Jonathan, thanks. I'll just go through this at a high level but I want to just read the paper for you. But basically these were answers to questions that you all... [inaudible] after [inaudible] some presentations to you. So the first walk was an additional note on the methodology that [inaudible] selected for panels. You also need the consumer research panel where they contact people for a variety of purposes and if you meet the qualifications for a particular survey, that's how you end up within a sample of a given survey. They provide some details there.

The next question had to do with who tends to register a domain under a new gTLD. So, we have a couple of characteristics here that Dave was able to [inaudible] out some demographics that we had available. They tend to be younger, they tend to be registered for personal uses. And in terms of business uses, tends to come for larger companies.

I apologize, I'm juggling my daughter up and down so you might hear her.

So, we also have some information on the motivations and behaviors of the gTLD registrants, so a little bit more detailed there. And I just made my text very small. There.

So they're more likely to register people with the domain name which we just discussed. They have more names in total. They looked a little bit into the details of those who were not familiar with the new gTLDs and where else they would consider registering, as well as some information on switching behavior, which we talked a little bit about this in detail, but more with Stan and the competition subteam, because this was a topic of particular interest for them on why new gTLD registrants are registering duplicate domains.

This was a bit of a tricky question to break down because the way the question was answered gave registrants the opportunity to say 'applies to all', 'applies to some', so you see a lot of that going on across categories. And you see the breakdown in front of you. And then we also got into some questions related to trust. Like we have in here whether those who experience bad behaviors for example or abusive behaviors, if there is a co-relation between familiarity and experience there and trust. I think there doesn't seem to be a strong relationship there.

And then finally, a little bit more detail on the restrictions on registration and people's perceptions of how that impacts their level of trust and use of TLDs or how they think TLDs should be restricted in terms of registration. So it's a really high level overview, but those were

the general topics that we discussed. And I'm happy to answer any more questions or if you have more requests [inaudible] on cross tab, we can go back on some of these questions if you would like more detailed answers.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Any questions for Eleeza?

Okay. So there was some discussion about the surveys generally on the last call and I guess in particular on the super trust call. I don't know how many of you saw Kevin Murphy's blog on the surveys. So I touched on this a little bit before but I mean, one of the things that happened basically is that the fourth survey, the second registrants survey was kind of an anomaly in terms of its absolute figures. And so it looked like some fairly dramatic changes had taken place when they hadn't really. And so the awareness question in general is part of the biggest problem that we face. And I think that we're at a point that it's too early to really tell. And the variations were within the margin of error for the surveys. And so if we look at the first and the second consumer surveys, we see that the numbers on trust are fairly similar. And we also see a correlation between what consumers and registrants thought on trust. So it's kind of reasonable to assume that there hasn't been much movement in consumer trust associated with that fourth survey, and that the absolute values themselves are more of an anomaly.

But it does show that there has been some interesting relative choices that people make from within the survey, and we discussed a little bit of that, that there's an interest in these restrictions, there's an interest in... I guess some of you questioned, I know Calvin asked about the notion of

a taxonomy and I guess I didn't mean a hierarchical taxonomy in my blog post, but instead was talking about sort of a keyword based taxonomy of the web in that the survey seems to reveal that there is an interest in these words having meaning when you get to them, and that they're not entirely generic. So, those are some of the conclusions that we're able to get from the surveys. And I think that it's very easy to see that there hasn't been a dramatic ding in trust over the course of the one year that we've been delegating into the root. But it's difficult and the data doesn't give us enough to say that there has been an increase in trust either from the consumer data. So, in some ways, the surveys are more interesting when looked at against themselves as opposed to compared over time, which was our original intention.

So, that's sort of the conversations that I had with Nielsen about the surveys and some of that is captured in Kevin Murphy's blog, some of it isn't and I think it got confused along the way. But, I think that's the overall narrative on this notion of awareness and trust, is that what we're seeing is how people think they feel as opposed to how they really feel which distorts things as well.

Alright, Calvin, go ahead.

CALVIN BROWNE:

Okay. So it almost seems to me as long as trust isn't going down and it's just more competition or more choice, when it's on a winning streak...

[AUDIO BREAK]

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Calvin thanks. I think that that's a good observation. Obviously, remember in the - and Laureen may speak to this as well - the narrative around consumer trust where we started to make a distinction between trust and trustworthiness, and so some of the issues that will hopefully be revealed as part of the DNS abuse survey may suggest a trustworthiness problem in some of these domains that needs to be addressed which just hasn't hit people yet and caused a decrease in trust. But, I think generally what you're saying is true as we are looking at a balance of interests here and all things being equal. I think that giving people the freedom to have these strings is the objective of the gTLD program. We just need to make sure that we're looking at some of the down time consequences for trademark holders as well as looking more carefully at some of the DNS abuse, because there has been some more anecdotal data about DNS abuse in the new gTLD. So, I don't know how that study will turn out so I don't want to get ahead of myself but I think that we need to make sure we don't get ahead of ourselves in our narrative until we've looked at some of the downside conflict [inaudible] the new gTLD program, and we haven't really looked at those yet.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

And Jonathan, I just wanted to jump in. This is Laureen. I agree. Our narrative on consumer trust is distinguishing between the subjective use of whether consumers trust the DNS, trust the legacy and new gTLDs, so that we have a point of comparison. And then looking at moving to the objective, is there trustworthiness. So we're hoping to be able to gather some data that compares levels of abuse between legacy gTLDs and new gTLDs, and seeing what that data shows us. Then of

course there's information that we have just by way of comparisons. There are different requirements and restrictions in place for new gTLDs that don't exist for the legacy gTLDs. And those in and of themselves are information that we can look at regarding trustworthiness. So, there are different factors that apply and it's not just the subjective component, it's the objective component.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

That's exactly right. Well stated Laureen. And I forgot to mention that we also have an upside objective measure that's related to the [inaudible] and things like that that might suggest an increase in trustworthiness, in addition to the things we're looking at where we're trying to see whether there was a decrease.

Any other questions? Okay folks, this is going to be a short call. We need to really get on top of getting these templates done and circulated within your sub team so that we can do these presentations in the plenary and get by from the team on them so that people can begin to draft actual pros. So I'm going to give some thought to some best practices for how we engage with each other going forward in the near term here. We are short on time and we need to turn up the heat. And at the same time try not to get testy as a result. So, let's make sure that we keep our opinions at bay and focus on provable points and keep our comments constructive. I'll be writing something down and running it by the other team leads to circulate for your approval. So I'll get to work. Use this time to work on the things that you have in front of you and let's make sure that we are getting these findings done in presentable form in time for the Hyderabad meeting.

Alright everyone, thank you so much.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thanks Johnathan.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]