Ivan Rasskazov: (1/18/2017 14:01) Good Day Everyone

Michiel Henneke: (14:01) Good eveniung everyone

Katrin Ohlmer | DOTZON: (14:02) good evening everyone!

Svitlana Tkachenko, .UA: (14:02) Hello everyone

Alberto Soto: (14:02) Hello all!

John McCormac - HosterStats.com: (14:02) good evening all

Steve DelBianco: (14:08) fine by me

Phil Buckingham: (14:09) fine by me

Katrin Ohlmer | DOTZON: (14:09) fine

John McCormac - HosterStats.com: (14:09) ok with this

Ivan Rasskazov: (14:09) Fine so far, once the data comes back, we can make other changes as needed

Svitlana Tkachenko, .UA: (14:09) fine,

Alberto Soto: (14:09) fine by me

Andy Simpson: (14:10) this is better for continuing the discussion for the rest of the definitions

John McCormac - HosterStats.com: (14:11) Scripts offered might lead to confusion. Perhaps 'languages and language scripts offered ' might be better.

Svitlana Tkachenko, .UA: (14:13) "Geo spread of registraNTS or registaRS" ?

Katrin Ohlmer | DOTZON: (14:14) I agree - it is about the geographic spread of registrars, isn't it?

Phil Buckingham: (14:16) domains (and other domain name related services) - perhaps.

John McCormac - HosterStats.com: (14:16) Steve's proposal would take a lot of work to do properly.

Svitlana Tkachenko, .UA: (14:17) ok

Steve DelBianco: (14:17) b) Domain name and service terms available in desired language and script

John McCormac - HosterStats.com: (14:18) Number of languages and scripts per registrar.

Katrin Ohlmer | DOTZON: (14:18) there are a lot of registrants in certain regions which depend on fery vew registrars - which influences ompettition

John McCormac - HosterStats.com: (14:18) If the registrars provide it, it would be simple. If not, complex.

John McCormac - HosterStats.com: (14:19) The registrars provide the script and languages in which they provide service.

John McCormac - HosterStats.com: (14:19) if they provide this, it makes the data gathering simple.

John McCormac - HosterStats.com: (14:19) Otherwise it means checking each registrar for languages/scripts.

Steve DelBianco: (14:20) See Godaddy.com, there is a pull-down listing languages they support on their website.

John McCormac - HosterStats.com: (14:20) Ok Mukesh. The main thing is to make it a smooth process.

Ivan Rasskazov: (14:22) 1a) - privacy whois would be factored out I presume?

Ivan Rasskazov: (14:23) The problem with measuring what registrar is chosen for domain is cost. Many times, the registrant chooses the lowest cost registrar independent of where they are.

John McCormac - HosterStats.com: (14:23) Don't think that the professor actually understood the domain name business. Perhaps we should use our expertise to derive this data/metric.

Steve DelBianco: (14:24) Agree, Ivan. I can't see why we care where a registrar happens to locate their office

John McCormac - HosterStats.com: (14:24) There are also transnational super registrars who have percentages of most country level markets. (Godaddy/Enom etc)

Phil Buckingham: (14:24) + 1 Katrin , with a few registrars in a region - can fix prices (higher) - oligopoly market. It is where the registrant is physically based , which registrars they are using / price paid in their region. Very hard to track though .

Steve DelBianco: (14:25) all that matters is serving registrants with choices relevant to them. ICANN is not charged with economic development activities, such as planint registrars in every country

John McCormac - HosterStats.com: (14:25) Could ICANN request a country level breakdown of registants from the registrars?

Ivan Rasskazov: (14:25) I agree with Steve's point

Alberto Soto: (14:26) +1 Ivan, but still in emerging countries

Jonathan Zuck: (14:26) +1 SR

Steve DelBianco: (14:26) An aspiring registrant benefits by having choices AND by having multiple registrars competing to serve them.   I just cannot see why it matters WHERE a registrar is located

Phil Buckingham: (14:27) +1 Steve ,, and so to John M point .

John McCormac - HosterStats.com: (14:28) Some of the new gTLDS will take a year 2 hit this year and some could go negative.

Ivan Rasskazov: (14:28) So the worry here is concentration of this growth. Especially for nTLDs that could get dominated by speculators.

John McCormac - HosterStats.com: (14:29) Some gTLDs have used zone stuffing to increase the size of their zones by heavy discounting. It may be a risky metric.

Ivan Rasskazov: (14:29) I've seen very high concentration in some nTLDs which makes them look a little better on overall registration numbers that it appears.

Jim Prendergast: (14:29) simply measuing Growth doesnt factor in what is happening in secondary markets for resale of domains. Case in point - the NamesCon auction taking place next week.

Katrin Ohlmer | DOTZON: (14:29) Growth does not only relate to pure # of registrations but also to usage

Phil Buckingham: (14:30) need a breakdown of all gTLDs - because they are all launching at different times , different business cycles - then there are renewals into the play .

Ivan Rasskazov: (14:30) Right, so in terms of strategic definition, I think #2 works. Provided it is supplemented with key data that breaks that growth down.

John McCormac - HosterStats.com: (14:31) It could but it is a very small percentage of domain sales. Most sales are retail.

Steve DelBianco: (14:31) for #2, how about "Demonstrated by growth in new gTLDs RELATIVE to all gTLDs"

Andy Simpson: (14:31) From a definition standpoint, this wording implies that all TLDs have to be growing for their to be robust competition. As others have noted, base sizes fluctuate but that doesn't mean there are fewer TLDs competing for end users.

John McCormac - HosterStats.com: (14:32) Steve, some new gtlds are growing slowly and it would not reflect well or be a good comparison (new tld vs mature tld)

Phil Buckingham: (14:32) Marketplace - are we talking about all OPEN TLDs - so ignoring closed . brands ??

Sam Frida: (14:32) Secondary Market should count - some of the nTLD registries' model is to build revenue from sale of premium names, not necessarily by new adds...

Katrin Ohlmer | DOTZON: (14:32) +1 john

Steve DelBianco: (14:32) note, Phil, that brand TLDs will have very few registered names, generally

Ivan Rasskazov: (14:32) My only concern with Steve's point is nTLDs are in different cycles

Ivan Rasskazov: (14:33) can't really compare a 2y nTLD to one that launched a year ago, may not even be able to compare they cycle to cycle because they

could be narrowly targeted to specific market

Jonathan Zuck: (14:33) to Jim's point. parking is a real issue

Phil Buckingham: (14:33) Exactly Steve, a market within a (different) market

Andy Simpson: (14:33) sorry, still thinking on that one... trying to get to the core of what needs to be measured to illustrate competition is challenging

John McCormac - HosterStats.com: (14:33) Brand gTLDs are a separate class. Perhaps they should not be grouped with the ordinary open new gTLDs.

Phil Buckingham: (14:33) + 1 JZ

Jonathan Zuck: (14:33) agree with Steve's construct

Steve DelBianco: (14:34) the word I added to #2 was "relative to"

Steve DelBianco: (14:35) Q: would "new" include an entity that has some kind of relationship with an "old" provider?

John McCormac - HosterStats.com: (14:35) Steve, some new gTLDs are only doing a few hundred new domains a month whereas a mature TLD like .com would do a few million in the same period.

Mukesh Chulani: (14:35) JOnathan, we can hear you

Andy Simpson: (14:35) jonathan is very quiet

Katrin Ohlmer | DOTZON: (14:36) why has the new definition been narrowed down thanto keep the previous version?

Katrin Ohlmer | DOTZON: (14:37) yes

Katrin Ohlmer | DOTZON: (14:37) the previous definition is open to any player

Katrin Ohlmer | DOTZON: (14:37) not just limited to backends, registrars, registries and resellers

Katrin Ohlmer | DOTZON: (14:38) i'll send feedback to the list

Svitlana Tkachenko, .UA: (14:39) agree with Katrin

Ivan Rasskazov: (14:39) We should make a decision and simply be flexible once we have the data. I am willing to bet our view or outlook on these definitions will change once we have it.

Svitlana Tkachenko, .UA: (14:39) add 'and other players" (secondary market, for example)

Phil Buckingham: (14:39) #3 . Yes but high entry barriers IMO - deterring some .

Katrin Ohlmer | DOTZON: (14:40) +1 svitlana

Mason Cole: (14:41) Thank you Mukesh

John McCormac - HosterStats.com: (14:44) Consolidation happens as markets mature. Should this definition be included?

Phil Buckingham: (14:44) Definately need to revise. Do we need this metric. - could be very misleading

John McCormac - HosterStats.com: (14:45) Market instability is an element of a healthy market.

John McCormac - HosterStats.com: (14:46) A stable market is a dead market.

Jonathan Zuck: (14:48) agree with John and Steve

Phil Buckingham: (14:48) What is going to happen / is happening is consolidation / acquisitions in the market. There was a huge increase in registrars recently - but it was ONE registrar with multiple applications - solely for drop catching. bad metric here .

Ivan Rasskazov: (14:48) This is tricky. Stability is a key aspect of a strategic regulator like a Federal Reserve. Does ICANN have to worry about a large registrar or registry going down? Can it step in as a regulator or operator of last resort?

John McCormac - HosterStats.com: (14:49) Ivan, there is a registry of last resort in the registrars list.

Steve DelBianco: (14:49) That's the "Disease" project, Mukesh?

Ivan Rasskazov: (14:50) So the question here is whether ICANN wants to be the CFTC or the Federal Reserve of domain markets? My understanding is that ICANN did not want to head that way.

Alain Durand: (14:50) I'd like to point out that we have a public comment period on ITHI ending on 1/23

Jonathan Zuck: (14:51) Exactly!

Ivan Rasskazov: (14:51) Alain, could you post a link just for convenience?

Alain Durand: (14:52) ITHI public comment period: https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__www.icann.org_public-2Dcomments_ithi-2Ddefinition-2D2016-2D11-2D29-2Den&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwll3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=uerz4ckt1v4Qhbv-TplkjKTey9bgtdWrvLyZDu0mXuk&m=CmEtfBu5vPnQA3r2vxnbkLvatRd08YtL7HDjIdTLcFQ&s=WSE_H3G1zlbPNfI7r1v3Smh4ZCi8X9flVt_6pHasAv4&e=

Ivan Rasskazov: (14:52) thank you

John McCormac - HosterStats.com: (14:53) Def 2 is almost a Trust issue than a Marketplace Stability one.

Jonathan Zuck: (14:54) More compliance data!

Steve DelBianco: (14:54) @John -- well, I think it's about keeping promises to registrants (customers)

John McCormac - HosterStats.com: (14:55) Well it is more in the compliance/IP/breach category than stability

John McCormac - HosterStats.com: (14:56) It is a tricky definition, Steve.

John McCormac - HosterStats.com: (14:56) it has elements of stability and trust.

Ivan Rasskazov: (14:56) I will be there and would be interested.

Olivier MJ Crépin-Leblond: (14:57) I won't be at Namecon

Sam Frida: (14:57) I would be too.

Mason Cole: (14:57) i'm there and would be

John McCormac - HosterStats.com: (14:57) Won't be at Namescon.

Katrin Ohlmer | DOTZON: (14:57) I'm at NamesCon

Jim Prendergast: (14:57) Ill be there and would be interested

Olivier MJ Crépin-Leblond: (14:57) but if there is a F2F meeting, as long as there's the opportunity to participate remotely, I'd be fine with that

Phil Buckingham: (14:57) @andy - would like too , but very very unfortunately I am no longer going - but would like to skype if you could arrange (with others there)

Steve DelBianco: (14:58) No more questions from me, Mukesh. Thanks

Ivan Rasskazov: (14:59) Thank you.

Andy Simpson: (14:59) yes, thanks! i'll look for a good time to have an informal meet up

Katrin Ohlmer | DOTZON: (14:59) Thanks all

Gabriel Vergara: (14:59) Bye

Andy Simpson: (14:59) thanks all

John McCormac - HosterStats.com: (14:59) Thanks.

Svitlana Tkachenko, .UA: (14:59) Thanks all.

Olivier MJ Crépin-Leblond: (14:59) Thanks - bye

Phil Buckingham: (14:59) thanks

Mukesh Chulani: (14:59) bye all