

---

RECORDED VOICE: This meeting is now being recorded.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Alright, welcome everyone. This is the Competition and Consumer Choice SubTeam Meeting of the CCT Review Team on July 5<sup>th</sup>, 2017. This is our first meeting since the last face to face meeting in Johannesburg, where we agreed we'd be working through public comments as the SubTeams.

I think it's probably worth also -- I think we don't have too much of an agenda on this call, so it may be relatively brief, but we'll be at least talking through work plan and how we expect to approach the public comments in the weeks to come, and I think we'll also have to talk through how we want to approach the fact that, at the moment at least, we don't have Stan on the team. He's been shepherding a lot of the actual competition portion of the report to date. So we'll have to figure out how to divvy up that work and work through it.

Okay, we didn't have any formal agenda. Is that right, Jean-Baptiste, or staff? Mostly because I haven't sent one out.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: I didn't catch what you said, Jordyn. We didn't have any [inaudible] what?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: We don't have any sort of written agenda, is that right?

---

*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.*

---

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: For this call, as far as I am aware, no. I'm [inaudible] the email that I sent yesterday, all the different action items that were identified during the face-to-face meeting. I'm happy to list those again in the Adobe Room if that helps.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Sure, that would be great. For some reason I'm not catching the reminder emails, so yes, that would be fantastic. [AUDIO BREAK]

Actually, I can read through them really quickly, so the action items -- I'm in New York City traffic. The action items were the subgroups to review recommendations and consolidate related recommendations and eliminate duplicative ones; to review wording to ensure that it's addressed in a manner so that the Board can adopt our recommendations verbatim; to review recommendations to harmonize terms such as "should", "shall" and "must"; to clarify which group will implement the recommendations if the Board approves and to review assigned recommendations and add details on rationale and success.

So those are the action items. I think principally what we'll need to do today is talk through how we're going to -- I think mostly in the past we'd assigned -- the majority of the recommendations have come from Stan's paper. On competition we have several related to pricing and then we had some additional recommendations related to parking.

And then in the Consumer Choice section we had a recommendation related to doing the returning Registrant Survey and then on to some

---

Defensive Registration protection potentially. I think of the total recommendations we have, all but two were in the competition papers and assigned to Stan, so we'll have to figure out how to divide up that work going forward.

So, what I would suggest -- I actually have a -- for how we might approach parking, I mean not parking, the pricing data, based on the conversation that we had with the Registries Stakeholder Group. I can spend a little bit of time coming up with the consolidating and duplicative portion of the parking data—sorry, of the pricing data. And I've already written a re-draft of the parking paper.

So, it seems like what we may want to do is perhaps take a look at the other action items related to Stan's competition related recommendations. So that would be review wording, harmonize "should", "shall" and "must", clarify who's to implement them and review assigned recommendations and add details. [AUDIO BREAK] Review the public comments and recommendations from the competition paper with those four action items in mind over the coming weeks. [AUDIO BREAK]

So far not seeing any volunteers. I guess... [AUDIO BREAK]

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:

Jordyn, this is Eleeza. You broke up a bit as you were talking. I think we may have missed some of what you said.

---

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Dejan, have you had a chance to review the comments of related recommendations? [AUDIO BREAK]

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ Calvin, can I invite you to mute your line, please?

CALVIN BROWNE: Pardon? [AUDIO BREAK] Sorry, Jean-Baptiste --

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Jordyn, there was a lot of noise on the line. We think it might have been from Calvin's phone, so you might need to repeat what you just said.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay, I was just asking -- I realize that I had not mentioned the fact that Dejan's paper on Privacy also had its own recommendations. I had wondered if Dejan had had a chance to review the public comments with regards to his paper.

DEJAN DJUKIC: Yes, I read the public comments to write those two papers that I wrote. Mainly, most of them are in a way that recommendations should be more precise. So, I think it won't be difficult to do some additional language in to make it more clear.

---

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay, great. So, Dejan, could I ask you for your paper or for your recommendation? Can you go through each of the action items that Jean-Baptiste listed and make sure that you've completed those for your recommendation, including as you say "Making it more precise", which is one of the specific recommendations.

DEJAN DJUKIC: Okay.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay, great. So, I guess what I can do is, since I already have an approach suggested for the pricing data, and I've taken on the parking issue already, I can take a look at the [inaudible] and public comments on those two topics which is basically all of Stan's. Which leaves us only with the recurring Registrant Survey recommendations. Jean-Baptiste, do you know which recommendation that is off the top of your head?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Sorry Jordyn, I was typing, can you repeat, please?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay. There's a recommendation that says to redo the Registrant Survey periodically. Can you tell us which recommendation that is?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Let me check.

---

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Sorry, I'm not at my computer, so I'm slightly hobbled.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: No problem. [AUDIO BREAK]

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Or if anyone else knows the answer to this, we don't have to just rely on Jean-Baptiste. [AUDIO BREAK]

In any case, once we identify -- we'll get the exact number from Jean-Baptiste, but Dejan, could I ask you to take a look at the public comments on that other recommendation as well regarding the Registrant Survey and do the same analysis there?

DEJAN DJUKIC: Registrant Survey, which part on the report you mean by that?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Jean-Baptiste is looking that up right now.

DEJAN DJUKIC: Okay.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: It's just a recommendation to redo the survey periodically.

---

DEJAN DJUKIC: Okay.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: There are two recommendations mentioning the Registrant Survey. There is the number 11: the next consumer end user and registrant surveys to be carried out to [inaudible] of questions to solicit. Additional information on the benefits of the number availability and specificity of new gTLDs. And [inaudible] one making a reference to it is number 15: ICANN should repeat selected parts of global surveys, including Registrant Surveys to look for an increasing familiarity with new gTLDs, [inaudible] of new gTLDs and [inaudible] of new gTLDs.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: So maybe I'm wrong. Are those recommendations in our section or are they in the other team's section of the report?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: 11 and 15 --

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Sorry, this is Eleeza, 15 is in trust and 9 and 11 actually refer to the Registrant Survey; that's in the choice chapter, I just found them.

---

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Right, okay. So those are the ones I was thinking of, it's 9 and 11, Dejan, that we want you to take a look at.

DEJAN DJUKIC: Okay, I will take a look, but whose was those papers? I think it was Megan. It would be better if I meet with Megan in person, is the best way -- analysis of those recommendations and public comments.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay, Dejan, that makes sense. We don't have Megan on the call, so if you can follow up and work with her, that would be great. Actually, why don't we just briefly run through—either Jean-Baptiste or Eleeza, could you just -- since I don't have the report in front of me right now, could we just do a brief run through of each of the recommendations in our report and make sure we have a clear assignee to follow up on them?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yes, I can put the recommendation summary on screen.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay, let me see if I can read them on my mobile device. I turned on my flashlight, not quite what I meant to do. [AUDIO BREAK]

Okay, so recommendation 1 -- is Jonathan is not technically in our section, is that right? In any case, that's you, Jonathan, I presume. [AUDIO BREAK]



---

Hopefully, in any case, I assume that's Jonathan. Number two, three -- oh man, this is the worst thing ever; four, are all related to pricing, so that's assigned to me. Number five is Parking, also assigned to me. Number six, Secondary Market Data for Pricing, maybe that's not pricing; let's put a question mark next to six for a moment.

Number seven is collect TLD Sales on a Country by Country Level, so that's not pricing related; let's put a question mark next to that. Number eight is Create Support and/or Partner with mechanisms to collect TLD Sales at a County by County Level, so that goes with number seven. Six, seven and eight don't have assignments for.

Number nine, we just assigned to Dejan and Megan. Number 10, The ICANN Community should consider whether the cost related to Defensive Registration, sort of small number of brands, that's my recommendation, so that's me. Number 11 is the other Registrant Survey or/and Consumer End User Survey, so that's also Dejan and Megan. Number 12 is the Privacy Recommendation, so that's Dejan.

And now we move on to new tasks. So six, seven and eight that we still have open. These were all in the Competitions Section, so that's Stan's paper. Does that sound right to people? But six is actually a price topic, so let's assign that to me as well. Seven and eight are the Country by Country data. [AUDIO BREAK]

Dejan, sorry to keep picking on you, but is it possible—so [inaudible] was assigned to Stan, so maybe we will actually try and have Megan do the Registrant Survey. I can follow up with her and then maybe seven

---

and eight you could do on your own since we don't have Stan available anymore.

DEJAN DJUKIC:

Those parts are involving some period of drafting, so that sounds really well for Stan's papers, so I couldn't help with six but with seven or eight it's okay with me.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:

Okay, perfect. Alright, so will send seven and eight to Dejan, nine and eleven will take Dejan off of those and just Megan responsible for those, hopefully. I will reach out to her. Then hopefully everyone can complete this review by the next call and then submit any proposed revisions. Or at least be ready for a discussion of them a week from today.

Fortunately, we have a lot less recommendations than the other SubTeam, so I'm hoping we can be quite efficient. Let's [inaudible] at least as an initial task to try and complete those action items by the next call or at least an initial analysis to indicate whether there's recommendations or there's input from the public comment related to the action items identified by Jean-Baptiste. [AUDIO BREAK]

Alright, seems like we have assignments there. The other topic I wanted to briefly discuss is Data Update. I see Brian is on the call. Brian, you and Stan had already gone through the competition paper and updated most of the tables and language with more recent data. Is that correct?

---

BRIAN: Yes Jordyn, that's correct. Everything, every table that's in the report now should be updated with the latest data we were considering. Sp yes, short answer.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Right, okay. I was just looking at Stan's last email and he said we should try to update some of these with additional, more recent data. Did you and he discuss specific tables or specific data that we expect to update between now and the issuance of the final report?

BRIAN: Yes, and we had kinda left it up in the air as to whether we wanted to do that, but basically the tables related to NTLD Stats which are fairly straightforward updates that we can do the week before publication or sometime earlier that. They're easy updates.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay. I should take a closer look at the revised paper that Stan had sent out with the updates, but were any of the changes -- in terms of the data points, did they change the trend or the sort of outcome significantly or is it just more data that roughly says the same thing in your view?

BRIAN: I think it's the later, Jordyn. I've been on holiday for a few days and haven't looked at it for awhile, but my recollection is that we changed

---

the numbers to correspond to what the new data in the tables and there wasn't any significant change to the narratives by my recollection.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Right, okay. So we're a little bit more up to date. Probably we don't need to change any of the surrounding narratives.

BRIAN: Correct.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Alright. I suppose as we get a little bit—after we've don't this initial round of comment review, we can look to see if we wanna change any of the other narratives other than the recommendations but for the moment we won't worry about that with regards to data updates at least, we'll focus on the public comments.

BRIAN: Sounds good.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay, great. So I think that's maybe all we have in terms of an agenda today, unless there are other topics that other people would like to discuss on today's call. [AUDIO BREAK]

---

Okay, seems like no, so I'll encourage folks to use the next 33 minutes that we have available in order to actually start to take a look at the public comments for your assigned section.

And I would ask that to the extent you can send out updates and analysis, try to do so not just by the next call but by sort of this time on Tuesday's so one has at least a day to react. Otherwise, I guess we'll wrap up and look forward to resuming a week from today at the same time. [AUDIO BREAK]

Okay, thanks everyone.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPT]**