

Adobe Connect Chat Transcript – CCT-RT Plenary Meeting #20 – 13 October 2016

Brenda Brewer: (10/13/2016 07:32) Good day all and welcome to CCT-RT Plenary Meeting #20 on 13 October 2015 @ 13:00 UTC!

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: (07:53) Hi. I'm in the GNSO Council call and will come to the CCT as soon as possible.

Jonathan Zuck: (07:57) Thanks

Jonathan Zuck: (07:58) Hey staff any idea what new and interesting features we get in return for this being a separate app now?

Jordyn A Buchanan: (08:00) Get to pay Adobe more money?

Jonathan Zuck: (08:00) Google's biased against apps Jordyn so your opinion needs to be discounted

Jonathan Zuck: (08:02) We don't have Lauren today, right? so we're just waiting on drew?

Calvin Browne: (08:02) morning/afternoon/evening all

Alice Jansen: (08:05) #20 :

Jordyn A Buchanan: (08:05) #20!

Alice Jansen: (08:05) :)

Gaongalelwe (mobile): (08:07) hello!

Megan Richards: (08:07) apologies for the delay - am here now - and with sound on :-)

Waudou: (08:08) hi all. Sorry ive logge din late. Im out of station so took time

Megan Richards: (08:08) ok for me - Stan and I have had some exchanges already

Megan Richards: (08:11) are we sure that none of these are duplications ?

Megan Richards: (08:11) ok - thanks for the confirmation

Megan Richards: (08:13) was the price the same ?

Megan Richards: (08:14) that question was for Jonathan but the principle is for all

Jordyn A Buchanan: (08:14) Megan, there's a big variation in prices in the new gTLDs.

Megan Richards: (08:15) in principle the new gTLD prices are higher than the .com prices so there must be more than price that is attracting the punters

Jordyn A Buchanan: (08:15) But I think the general conclusion that we drew is that new gTLD prices are, on average, not lower than the legacy gTLD price caps.

Jordyn A Buchanan: (08:16) But yes, often people are paying a premium.

Carlton Samuels: (08:21) Would these be an example of secondary market transactions?

Carlton Samuels: (08:21) https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A_domainnamewire.com_2016_06_23_end-2Duser-2Djune_&d=DQIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=kbiQDH54980

[u4nTPfwdloDLY6-6F24x0ArAvhdeDvvc&m=nG5xFqwScWZ4M1TisGkx1ZXvSA-Nx9bel8NEzdGXilE&s=SIDoeP7Vxg9JwoON1hEe_vB5RbU0vQYSaIjzTAWJ9Oc&e=](https://www.linkedin.com/company/dly6-6f24x0aravhdedvvc&utm_source=gmail&utm_medium=share&utm_campaign=share)

Carlton Samuels: (08:22) OK.

Jordyn A Buchanan: (08:22) Unfortunately, we don't have any visibility into secondary market data.

Jordyn A Buchanan: (08:22) So everything is always primary market unless we get more information.

Pamela Smith 2: (08:22) Whose is the phone number beginning with 661, please?

Carlton Samuels: (08:23) Trying to help understanding of how these prices are explained in light of the cap on .com prices

Carlton Samuels: (08:24) Lost my Skype call

Carlton Samuels: (08:26) Back

Megan Richards: (08:28) looks pretty clear to me

Megan Richards: (08:31) Stand - should say "acquired through market" - small typo - I noticed a few also in some of the other reports - not very important at this stage but we should use a spellcheck in any further drafts closer to final

Jordyn A Buchanan: (08:33) That one's Megan.

Megan Richards: (08:33) my hand is up by mic not working ! I will send my comments to Stand (similar one to Jordyn on his overview)

Megan Richards: (08:33) that's me

Megan Richards: (08:34) mic is on but not working - sorry!!

Pamela Smith 2: (08:35) Yes

Brenda Brewer: (08:35) Yes, we will call Megan

Megan Richards: (08:35) happy to take comments or a call

Megan Richards: (08:35) :-)

Jonathan Zuck: (08:36) of course DGComp has a much lower bar ;)

Megan Richards: (08:36) @Jonathan - ha ha !

Kaili Kan 2: (08:37) Regarding industry structure, I still believe my expression of "as the time period of their existence is still limited, and as their cost structure are to be further explored, it remains to be seen how many of them will survive over a longer period of time" is more objective instead of speculative.

Waudou: (08:37) I will read that benefits/confusion paper later and send questions via mail. It's been a topic here in the meeting I'm attending in namibia

Pamela Smith 2: (08:37) Megan, I sent you a private message. Please review. Thank you.

Pamela Smith 2: (08:39) Whose is the phone number beginning with 415, please?

Jonathan Zuck: (08:42) we can hear you but you need to mute when not speaking

Jonathan Zuck: (08:43) we know

Alice Jansen: (08:43) @Megan - may I suggest that when you to rejoin the Adobe Connect room and to have the system dial out to your phone number

Jonathan Zuck: (08:43) Pam can you mute Meagan's line for now?

Megan Richards 2: (08:44) so just send comments and I will amend document as necessary

Megan Richards 2: (08:44) am switching back to the other machine

Megan Richards 2: (08:45) I did do the telephone Alice but it doesn't connect for some reason

Jonathan Zuck: (08:45) we were able to hear you Meagan

Megan Richards: (08:47) oh good ! thought you couldn't hear

Megan Richards: (08:48) I have some problems with this overall draft findings regarding the comment "so the structure of the industry may make it possible for many small gTLDs to continue to operate even with low registration volumes"! We don't know whether they will be able to be sustainable in future, these may be "loss leaders", or very patient investors etc so I would prefer to adjust the tone of that part

Jonathan Zuck: (08:48) seemed like you weren't able to hear us though

Megan Richards: (08:49) no I couldn't hear you

Waldo: (08:50) Hello Jonathan and team: I'm attending another meeting and I'm required inside. I have to re-do the project on registrar competition so can I beg to leave the call? I also happen to be in a noisy hall which may disrupt the call.

Carlton Samuels: (08:51) @Jonathan: Yes, Stan's suggestion is one likely effect

Megan Richards: (08:51) also on market structure I think it may be misleading to say "new gTLDs represent a significant portion of the growth in domain names since the launch" as they were about half the growth compared to overall growth but there are nearly 1000 new gTLDs and about 16 legacy gTLDs so "per capita" growth is still rather limited (not bad of course but let's not oversell it)

Carlton Samuels: (08:51) So the new gTLDs gaining traction may be one

Eleeza Agopian: (08:52) @Jonathan, yes, I can inquire about those cross-tabs.

Jordyn A Buchanan: (08:52) Megan, that's why I wrote "in aggregate".

Megan Richards: (08:52) yes but it leads readers to assume that growth has been much higher than it probably has been "per capita"

Megan Richards: (08:53) and they were half

Megan Richards: (08:56) on trademarks can we really say that the new gTLD programme has

been "relatively low" for trademark holders ? is it less costly than for legacy ? I am afraid that there will be an interpretation that new gTLDs costs are lower than legacy

Jonathan Zuck: (08:56) of course, we'll want to refer back to the data points as measures of the success of our recommendations

Megan Richards: (08:56) three

Megan Richards: (08:57) it is perhaps still early days to see failures - many have just come onto the market

Megan Richards: (08:59) but we need to know the cost basis to make that assumption I think

Megan Richards: (09:00) I prefer to adjust the wording somewhat -

Megan Richards: (09:00) I will make a proposal

Megan Richards: (09:01) market structure

Megan Richards: (09:01) yes but it's misleading to someone who doesn't know the volume

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: (09:01) Hope Jordyn saw my comments in the google docs

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: (09:02) Please Jordyn confirm

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: (09:02) the GNSO call is about to stop and I will be able to come to this call shortly

Megan Richards: (09:02) I have a point on trademarks too

Megan Richards: (09:02) it's in the chat

Jonathan Zuck: (09:03) go ahead and cut and paste it Megan. Thanks.

Megan Richards: (09:03) again:

Megan Richards: (09:03) on trademarks can we really say that the new gTLD programme has been "relatively low" for trademark holders ? is it less costly than for legacy ? I am afraid that there will be an interpretation that new gTLDs costs are lower than legacy

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: (09:03) txs Jordyn

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: (09:04) I see my comments now

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: (09:04) @satff I have arrived. My excuse but I was in a council call that was not rescheduled as this one

Megan Richards: (09:05) agree Jordyn

Jonathan Zuck: (09:05) I think the issue is that we need evidence to make a recommendation but in the absence of evidence we can't make a recommendation about it. I think that's the key

Megan Richards: (09:07) we could say that registrations of below X may not cover costs of a gTLD registry but it is up to them to decide whether to continue or not at a loss

Jordyn A Buchanan: (09:07) Megan, there's fewer trademarks registered by trademark holders in the new gTLDs than in the legacy ones.

Jonathan Zuck: (09:08) Jordyn, you mean per TLD, right?

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: (09:08) no please

Jordyn A Buchanan: (09:08) Only about half of the trademarks that are registered in new gTLDs that are registered in legacy gTLDs.

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: (09:08) I want to comment on that point of failure

Jordyn A Buchanan: (09:09) Sorry, let me restate: if there are 100 trademarks registered in legacy gTLDs, there are ~50 in the new gTLDs.

David Taylor 2: (09:10) ok, yes this topic

Jonathan Zuck: (09:10) Thanks

Jonathan Zuck: (09:10) let's ignore brands in this analysis

Jordyn A Buchanan: (09:10) Just a note, Carlos: we're excluding .BRANDs from this analysis.

Megan Richards: (09:11) but Jordyn there are 1000 new gTLDs and only 16 legacy

Jordyn A Buchanan: (09:11) Right, but that's across *all* new gTLDs.

Carlton Samuels: (09:11) @Carlos: Size really is not a major talking point when we have .brands in the mix to consider. +1

Jordyn A Buchanan: (09:12) And the average trademark that is registered in new gTLDs is only registered in 3 of them.

Megan Richards: (09:12) yes - but that is my point on market structure too - by aggregating we tend to distort the picture I think

Jonathan Zuck: (09:12) graph would be good

Megan Richards: (09:12) good idea for a graph - should help

Carlton Samuels: (09:13) In terms of industry structure though, we are making 10K as a significant inflection point. Why is that?

Megan Richards: (09:13) but a simple graph would explain more clearly

David Taylor 2: (09:13) agree and thought a nice graph in the high level summary would be good

Megan Richards: (09:13) the table is rather too detailed and should be fine for background

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: (09:15) @Calvin +1

Carlton Samuels: (09:15) @Calvin: So you introduce a good measure, can they pay the ICANN costs!

Megan Richards: (09:15) I said something similar in the chat Calvin

Jordyn A Buchanan: (09:15) I think if we had some data that would help us understand minimum viable size, we could include that.

Jordyn A Buchanan: (09:15) But we don't have that data.

Megan Richards: (09:15) plus application fee

David Taylor 2: (09:16) 4747 number is me dialing back in for audio

Calvin Browne: (09:16) megan - application fee can be written off as a bad investment

Calvin Browne: (09:16) is it sustainable after that?

Carlton Samuels: (09:16) @Jordyn: Now we talking! There are some attributes to survivability that can be explored.

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: (09:16) It seems that we have some hard \$ figures on this issue....

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: (09:17) It is in the ICANN books

Jordyn A Buchanan: (09:18) I think it's definitely true that standalone registries may have a hard time at small scale.

Stan Besen: (09:18) Where do we get the cost data?

Jordyn A Buchanan: (09:18) But what we see happening is that the TLD itself moves into a portfolio.

Carlton Samuels: (09:18) @Stan: I remember that talk. But what they did not address is the effect mediated by business models like a portfolio owner could adopt.

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: (09:19) Flag it is a good point

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: (09:19) txs

David Taylor 2: (09:19) sorry yes

Jonathan Zuck: (09:20) Kaili the ongoing problem is the lack of data both about the speculation in new gTLDs AND in legacy so the only thing that matters is the comparison between the two

Stan Besen: (09:21) What is the status of the parking data project?

Carlton Samuels: (09:22) @Jonathan; True, speculation happens in the old and new. My question is, how does this play out in addressing 'real' demand?

Jonathan Zuck: (09:23) Carlton it's about the ratio I think

Eleeza Agopian: (09:23) Stan, we're still working on that with NTLDstats

Carlton Samuels: (09:24) @Jonathan: Yes, ratio would be very interesting. And if the ratio is higher in new than old, then that could be indicating something else too

Jonathan Zuck: (09:24) exactly

Jordyn A Buchanan: (09:26) Chinese speculation is definitely affecting domain registrations, we just don't know if there's a differential with new gTLDs.

Jordyn A Buchanan: (09:27) Carlton's article made that pretty clear.

Jonathan Zuck: (09:27) indeed

David Taylor 2: (09:27) All, As I am going to have to drop off the CCT Review call now on at the 90 minute mark, and the INTA Impact Study is flagged for AOB to come, so I thought easier to

circulate a summary to you whilst on the call:As you know we are eagerly awaiting this Impact Study.Starting with what we don't have:• Don't have a due date• Don't have a confirmed expected date for the moment.We do have a potential date of 16 December and at the least we hope we will have some preliminary results for then.Where exactly are we with the INTA study?The RFP is just out for the survey organization so they should be selected soon.There are some discussions going on to refine the potential questions based on the specific questions developed by the ICANN Metrics team for study and the latest version of the questions developed by the INTA Subcommittee with our input which we will provide more on after sub team consideration. The latter INTA Subcommittee questions includes additional questions that focus on the TMCH and defensive regs

Eleeza Agopian: (09:27) Yes that's right

David Taylor 2: (09:28) I've just sent that to our list also as easier. Sorry I have to drop off at 90 minutes.

Jonathan Zuck: (09:28) DAvid, what is the deadline for comments on the questions?

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: (09:29) agree with Kaili

Jordyn A Buchanan: (09:29) Agreed. There will be many places where we recommend further study.

Carlton Samuels: (09:30) @Carlos: Happy to hear this discussion

Carlton Samuels: (09:31) I agree with the decision

Megan Richards: (09:39) I think there is because they are very specific

Carlton Samuels: (09:39) @Jonathan. Maybe .co and .tv are indicators?

Megan Richards: (09:39) I mean specifictiy of the name rather than the policies

Jonathan Zuck: (09:40) but Megan, THIS paper is policy based competition, no?

Megan Richards: (09:41) right but where the policies are the same between ccTLD and gTLD the choice would be made based on the "name" - perhaps we are saying the same thing

Carlton Samuels: (09:42) @Jonathan: That was the question I was answering by asking whether we could extend it to ccTLDs?

Jonathan Zuck: (09:42) we already know that names represent non price competition

Jonathan Zuck: (09:42) good question @STan

Eleeza Agopian: (09:43) The Nielsen survey includes questions on "restrictions" but not explicitly about registry policies.

Eleeza Agopian: (09:43) I'll share the relevant page numbers in response to your email thread on this topic.

Jonathan Zuck: (09:44) right. i don't think we have that data but we can provide what we know

objectively to be true about the policies

Carlton Samuels: (09:46) @Elleza: Is it possible to keep a running tally of the issues we think more or better data could assist in answering?

Eleeza Agopian: (09:47) @Carlton, each of these papers indicates where we don't have data that would have been helpful for the analysis.

Carlton Samuels: (09:48) The price cap is the equivalent of a political third rail!

Kaili Kan 2: (09:49) I agree with Stan that, in asymmetric regulation in order to promote competition, the usual practice is not to allow the big guys to lower price instead of setting price caps.

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: (09:49) A question we can't avoid.....

Megan Richards: (09:49) brave man !

Eleeza Agopian: (09:50) AG requested wholesale price data from all the legacy gTLDs and received very little in return.

Jonathan Zuck: (09:50) understood

Jonathan Zuck: (09:51) I also don't know if it would make a difference if the "real" market price is higher than the cap. we have no way to determine that without removing it

Jonathan Zuck: (09:52) awesome

Jonathan Zuck: (09:52) that could change though and is irrelevant to us and our analysis

Carlton Samuels: (09:54) @Jordyn: I agree the real deal is the penumbral effect of cap in .com on the so-called 2nd tier gTLDs

Kaili Kan 2: (09:54) @Jordyn when was the price caps of .com set by DOJ? with new gTLDs in place, assuming competition could be introduced, this policy should be changed.

Megan Richards: (09:55) didn't Stan already ask that ?

Kaili Kan 2: (09:55) when?

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: (09:55) @Jordyn I agree that it is an issue of wholesale prices. And we should go back to the Analysis Group II report

Jonathan Zuck: (09:57) exactly but in this case they're not really specialized. just higher cost per unit

Jamie Hedlund: (09:57) The impact on VRSN is highly speculative. Perhaps report should focus on questions for next review team.

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: (09:58) It has some analogy to the wholesale interconnection (regulated) prices from the telecom industry

Carlton Samuels: (09:58) @Jonathan: True but it is not entirely neutral if treated from the new gTLD perspective

Jordyn A Buchanan: (09:58) Well, the DOJ has paid professionals to figure out whether the .COM price cap should be in place.

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: (09:58) but then we have to assume TLDs are an INPUT

Jordyn A Buchanan: (09:58) I don't think we need to try to answer that question for them.

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: (09:58) quite different from how we have been looking at them so far

Jordyn A Buchanan: (09:58) I've got a hard stop at the top of the hour, so need to drop off in just a minute.

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: (09:58) I AHVE TO LEAVE AT THE TOP OF THE HOUR. I'M SORRY

Stan Besen: (10:00) Can someone circulate the DOJ/DOC price cap materials?

Jonathan Zuck: (10:00) but OUR goal is to say whether the price caps impact competition by others although we might not have enough data to prove it one way or another . It's the same question but from another perspective.

Eleeza Agopian: (10:00) @Stan, I'll provide you with some relevant links later today.

Megan Richards: (10:01) and we can say that the price caps did not stop the new gTLDs from having higher prices and from having registrants

Jordyn A Buchanan: (10:01) I've got to drop off.

Jonathan Zuck: (10:04) but the decrease is within the margin of error Carlton

Jonathan Zuck: (10:04) Nielson aren't trying to support the conclusion that trust has decreased among registrants

Eleeza Agopian: (10:05) @Carlton, there should be awareness data for South America and Asia Pacific. I will find the citations for you.

Eleeza Agopian: (10:10) pp. 42-46 of the phase 2 consumer report has data on awareness of new gTlds by all regions.

Eleeza Agopian: (10:11) sorry, 42-45

Drew Bagley: (10:12) would awareness be one of the factors in Section 3. What attributes/practices of new gTLDs have lead to increased trust?

Gao M (tablet): (10:13) thanks Eleeza.

Eleeza Agopian: (10:13) You're welcome.

Gao M (tablet): (10:14) thanks Drew

Calvin Browne: (10:16) could manage

Kaili Kan 2: (10:16) yes

Dejan Djukic: (10:16) i'm ok with that

Drew Bagley: (10:16) yes

Megan Richards: (10:16) depends on what day - for me from Wednesday to Friday are not

possible

Stan Besen: (10:16) OK

Alice Jansen: (10:16) Staff is happy to send a poll out to identify a date if that helps

Megan Richards: (10:17) thanks Alice - a poll is useful

Gao M (tablet): (10:17) I am available Monday to Wed.

Kaili Kan 2: (10:17) Thank you all. Bye!

Calvin Browne: (10:17) ciao

Carlton Samuels: (10:17) Thanks all. Very good call today

Dejan Djukic: (10:18) bye

Carlton Samuels: (10:18) Thanks Jonathan