

---

RECORDED VOICE: THIS MEETING IS NOW BEING RECORDED.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Good point. First of all, welcome everyone. This is the latest and greatest Plenary of the CCT Review team. I believe this is Plenary number 45. It's Wednesday, May 3<sup>rd</sup>. As you see on the agenda, we'll be covering a few topics today, but mostly discussing, in terms of substance, the country specific market shares which we will get to in a little bit. I believe a number of smaller topics along the way, including some discussion I think everyone's been waiting for around ICANN59 in Johannesburg. Before we start though, is there anyone who is on the telephone who is not in the Adobe chat for roll-call purposes?

LAUREEN KAPIN: This is Lauren. I'm only on the telephone, not in Adobe chat.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay. For whatever reason, we see you in Adobe too, but I guess you're a grey person not a blue person, so that's how we know you're only the phone.

LAUREEN KAPIN: I'm a great person, Jordyn.

---

*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.*

---

JORDYN BUCHANAN: And it looks like maybe we have Drew maybe on the phone as well. Okay and does anyone have an update to their Statement of Interest?

DREW BAGLEY: Yeah, I'm on the phone.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay, thanks Drew. Okay, moving on to the next agenda item then without any update for Statements of Interest. Why don't we hear from Jean-Baptiste about a overview of public comments received so far?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Hi, Jordyn, and thank you for taking over the Plenary call. Yes, unfortunately there are no other public comments received since the past few weeks. We still have the two public comments on the Public Comment Page but, there are more comments -- oh sorry, there are more remarks on the report than real public comments. So we still encourage you to share via the Public Comment Page and try to encourage community members and your contacts to read our report and to send their public comments. So just to the confusion so far, we still have two public comments on our draft report.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay, thanks, Jean-Baptiste. As I think Jonathan's indicated in the past we probably expect to see the majority of the public comments submitted very close to the deadline. Which means it's hard to continue to evaluate them as we go along, but we'll wait to see what

---

comes in. Jean-Baptiste, you also have the next agenda item which is the draft report updates.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: That's correct. And just on the privacy point, I just wanted to confirm again that the closing date of the public comment period is May the 19<sup>th</sup>. Okay, so on the second topic on our agenda, the draft report updates. So what I would like to run through with you now is a suggested process on including and incorporating new sections and comments and edits into the draft report. So, what I've been working on recently with our editor is to get a Word version of our draft report, which was currently as a PDF.

And so there were a few formatting issues which I was working on and so later on after this call I will be sharing a clean Word version that will also be saved on the wiki and you will all receive a copy in your email. So, what we suggest is once we have this clean version ready and that you use this version to include your edits. And what we require is that any edit is made either in track changes or in comment boxes. So once you have made your edits we will ask you to send your edited version of the report to the [cct-review@icann.org](mailto:cct-review@icann.org) email. Why is that? It's to encourage transparency when you send your edits. And secondly, so what we're going to do is that support staff will be the penholder to compile all the different comments that we receive in the master versions. So just to give you an overview on how compiling these edits will look like, so here on your screen in the Adobe Connect room.

---

So, for Laureen and Drew, this is just an extract of the draft report. So, appearing as a comment, so we will see, for example, here an edit from Laureen on a given date, with the description of her edit. And then we will list under all the different edits, whether there were any comments. And again we'll list who has made the comments and on which day was this comment made. So, what we'll do to share these comments and edits, we will work through the master documents on plenary calls and we will seek the Review Team's input on the different edits and see whether they can be incorporated or dismissed. On each Thursday at the Plenary call we will be working on incorporating the approved edits and we will send you a revised version along with a shopping list of all the incorporated edits.

And what we'll do as well is that every time there is a new version we will save that on the wiki so that if you wish to add any edits you can always refer to the wiki and that will be saved, the latest version. So, as for the last point, number 6 on the screen, so all the approved and incorporated edits will be reconfirmed on a plenary call or via email. So, what I'm looking to now is whether you have any input on this process. If you would like to add any updates to that? And if you have no input, we use these steps moving forward when we wish to update the draft report.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:

Thanks, Jean-Baptiste. Does anyone have any questions or comments about the process? There's some typing. Jean-Baptiste, I have a question. The comments in chat are supported. That's great, both Calvin and Fabro say this looks good. I see David's raised his hand. My

---

question is, so this makes sense to me for, I guess, relatively minor edits. Presumably though, there's going to be sections like the DNS Abuse section where there'll be quite a bit of new drafting going on and I imagine there we'll use a process more like creating the original report where we have members of the Review Team as penholders? Does that make sense?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yeah, I think it's a good reasoning for more important sections just like for the DNS Abuse. I think you're right, where there will be many changes on that. So, yes, that makes sense that for these sections it can be treated separately.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Right, okay. Yeah, I think we'll just want to triage the sections where we imagine there's going to be a significant amount of redrafting done as part of the updated report. David has his hand raised. Go ahead, David.

DAVID TAYLOR: Hi, can you hear me okay?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah.

DAVID TAYLOR: Okay, thanks. Yeah, no, it does make sense, very logical, clear. My question is just on timing. Roughly do we know when we're going to be

---

doing this from (inaudible), etcetera, so that we can try and plan that in to the Review Draft Report? I'm sorry if I missed that.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Hi, David. Well, this was in fact discussed when we were presenting the work plan. I will upload that. Just give me a second. Hi, David, so you should have a look on your screen, and for those who are not in the Adobe room, so what I have uploaded is the approved work plan that we have reviewed I think two plenary calls ago. And so we're currently looking at the months of July and especially after Johannesburg, we'll start looking into all the different edits and concerning which ones should be included or not in the Draft Final Report.

So, in case you missed that, David, so just to remind everybody what we'll do is that, we will submit for public comment the Draft Final Report. Why is that? It's because there are a few sections which will be incorporated such as the DNS Abuse Study which were not yet submitted for comments to the community. So we'll file that public comment together with other minor edits, following comments that we will have received on the current public comment period. I hope that answers your question, David.

DAVID TAYLOR: Yeah it does. That's great, because that takes into account the public comment period, so that's great. Thanks.

---

LAUREEN KAPIN: Jean-Baptiste, it's Laureen. Since I was on that call but I confess I don't remember the details and now I can't see the screen. When are we planning on getting our Draft Final Report out for public comment?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: So, we plan on sending it for public comment on 31<sup>st</sup> of July.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Gotcha. July 31<sup>st</sup>. And then our Final Report, when is that comment period closing?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: So, what we plan for Final Report is everything's done around October, so on the 6<sup>th</sup> of October will be the final deadline to receive comments and edits on the Final Report. And by October 27<sup>th</sup> we will send the Final Report to the ICANN Board.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Got it. Thank you.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: You are welcome.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Alright. Thank you. Any other questions for Jean-Baptiste? Okay, thank you. And then moving on in the agenda then to ICANN 59. I believe

---

some of you have seen some news on email already but Alice and Jean-Baptiste, do you want to give us a (inaudible) schedule?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yeah, sure. So indeed, you should all have received my mail and also information regarding Johannesburg. So, I'm happy to confirm that the CCT Review Team will be meeting in Johannesburg so we have our face-to-face meeting which is planned on June 24<sup>th</sup> and 25<sup>th</sup>. And the official date of ICANN59 is on June 26<sup>th</sup> until the 29<sup>th</sup>. Then in terms of approved travel dates. So you have from June 23<sup>rd</sup> until the 28<sup>th</sup> of June.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay, thanks. Anyone have questions about ICANN59 or anyone hasn't seen the travel details yet? I see Kaili is typing. (inaudible). Go ahead, Kaili.

KAILI KAN: I'm saying that I'm sorry to be late again. It's just because of a internet connection.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay. Thanks Kaili. And Calvin says he's already set for travel. Alright. It looks like there's questions or comments about the travel here. Okay, well, moving on then to the substantive portion of our agenda. We wanted to revisit, I guess, one, potentially two papers. The first of which is the Latin American Market Analysis paper that Stan had put together. This was sent around by Jonathan in advance of our last call



---

and is now being projected. Hopefully everyone's had a moment to read this. I guess, for background, I think the Latin American Market Study took a look at, actually looked at WHOIS data for a large number of registrations and identified registrations that were associated with particular countries by the registrants.

And then we were able to use that data that they had collected in order to do the same types of Market Share and Market Concentration Analysis on a per-country basis that we did for the global market in the principle part of our paper to date. I think that in particular, we looked at shares of new gTLD's, legacy gTLD's and ccTLD's, which is similar to what we did in the global market as well. I will overlay a little bit of personal interpretation there and say that the results show that there's a fair bit of variation from country to country.

I think if you look at ccTLD market share, for example, you see a range from in the mid 90's for Costa Rica, and in general, Costa Rica, Brazil, Chile, all had 80% plus associated with the ccTLD's. Oddly, like Costa Rica, has only a very tiny fraction, less than 1% associated with legacy gTLD's, but quite a bit with new gTLD's, 6.7%, which was the highest, despite also having the highest ccTLD market share. And then in the lower end you see countries like Dominican Republic and Peru with only about 30% of ccTLD market shares. New gTLD market shares range from about 0.75 up to about 6.

And looking at Concentration Ratios, I guess, none of these would look very competitive, I think, to a regulator, or at least the sorts of numbers that we see. The market's concentration numbers were all quite high, and I think as Stan points out in the paper, that the concentration

---

numbers were higher than in the global marketplace. Given the market shares of the ccTLD's in a lot of these countries, it's probably not particularly surprising, that even in Dominican Republic and Peru, where the ccTLD's have lower market shares, you still see very high concentration numbers.

I guess I would say compared to those level markets in Latin America, at least these numbers seem to show less new gTLD registration. Costa Rica's an interesting variant where you see quite a bit more new gTLD registration and legacy gTLD registration. Maybe Carlos has some perspective on why that might be the case in that particular country. But otherwise, I think this shows that we see quite a bit of variation from country to country. And also that the Latin American market as a whole looks quite a bit different from the global statistics. Beyond that I don't see any sort of strong inferences about, you know, that we would take away and affect specific recommendations. And I know Stan had thoughts about whether he would build any recommendations from a set of data analyses here. But I see Carlos already has his hand up. So why don't we start with Carlos.

RAUL GUTIERREZ:

Thank you, Jordyn. Just a short comment. I mean the data that this study used was provided by the ccTLD providers. And I hardly believe that it really represents the registered domain name from the simple fact that the ccTLD costs \$100 per year in Costa Rica. If you take a short look at the touristic logo that the Costa Rican government shows a few years ago, essential Costa Rican usage dot com. The fact is that all the people who do the web design and so on, they just show up in Godaddy

---

and probably the who list is not absolutely reliable. But if you go across the most important brands, hotels, and firms in Costa Rica, you will get a slightly different version.

It's true that the ccTLD has a strong position in Latin America throughout, but I have already commented, and other people have commented that this paper was produced—I mean, one of the partners that produced the paper was the Association of Latin America ccTLD's themselves. LACTLD signs this document. So, just those comments for the time being. LACTLD was hired by ICANN to produce and participate in this document, so there must be a slight level of bias there. Thank you.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:

Thanks, Carlos. That's a helpful perspective. You mentioned, I think you hinted the domain privacy might be a factor in this. Do you know in Costa Rica in particular and in the Latin American marketplace in general, are there—I know in the US for example, domain privacy is prohibited. Do you know if that's the case in any of these ccTLD's as well?

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ:

No. Most of the ccTLD's at least in the Central American and Caribbean area -- I don't know more about southern column -- but they're absolutely liberal. And another indication you might—if you look at Mexico, and in the Mexican ccTLD has, I don't know, 300 resellers or registrars because most of them are not allowed to do the registrar business. So, I don't know. I understand countries like Brazil and

---

Argentina have some stricter rules. But in our case, we tend to use Godaddy and use a credit card and don't worry about anything else. Thank you. [AUDIO BREAK]

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I think Stan's on the call.

STAN BESEN: I lost my connection as well.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I got it back. Okay, there it goes. Stan, did you hear my question?

STAN BESEN: No.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay. So Carlos asked two questions in the chat, but the second one was: What does the DCL's on the gTLD registrations in Costa Rica affect you? Which strings are favored? I don't think the deal we got back doesn't include per TLD data, right? It's just legacy versus new, or do we have a per TLD break out?

STAN BESEN: I'm sorry. I don't understand the question.

---

OLIVIA: This is Olivia, I can answer that one.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Oh, go ahead.

OLIVIA: We did get the per TLD break out.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay. So we can take a look to see in a particular country, which of the new gTLDs are most popular?

OLIVIA: Exactly.

STAN BESEN: Actually, can I make a general comment if I may? I think we shouldn't over-analyze these results. The purpose of this, in my view, was to demonstrate the feasibility of going this kind of analysis. The reason we're looking at Latin America is because we had data from Latin America. And the thing says as much. We don't pretend these are representative in any sense. We're just showing that in fact you can do an analysis on a country-level basis, and it's possible the results in a country can differ from the results that you see overall. The other thing I would say—and I actually had a brief conversation with Brian about this—I plan to write a few sentences that appear earlier in the report that foreshadow this section.

---

Basically, to point out that all the other concentration analysis—almost all the rest of the report—assumes that the market is worldwide, the geographic market, and assumes that the product market is just TLD’s. And I want to foreshadow the fact that I think we should foreshadow the fact that somewhere else in the report, the reader will see an analysis in which the geographic market is a country, and the product market includes ccTLD’s. And I plan to draft a few sentences and look for some place earlier in the report to insert them.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:

Thanks, Stan. I think the other thing that I would take away from this—this is probably actually not correct to think of the market as being global, because you see quite different dynamics per country.

STAN BESEN:

No. Yeah. I think that’s the point of saying—of what I described as sentences that I’m going to write. And this is alluded to in the first few sentences in this section, but I think the reader ought to have it—when he sees the other analysis which feeds the geographic market as worldwide, he should realize that we understand that the geographic market could be narrower, and in fact we’ll present some results later for narrower geographic markets.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:

Right. Yeah. Understood. I guess I was just taking it a step further and saying that our global analysis, while the best available that we had given the data that we had is probably not the best way to think about

---

the markets, since these individual results show that it's not really a consistent market from one to the next.

STAN BESEN:

Yes. And I think the other interesting thing is—well, at least for Latin America, I don't want to get overzealous—is, this is sort of interesting because, it's usually the case when you add another firm, concentration goes down. But here it's the opposite. Because the guy you're adding has such a large market share that he actually pulls the concentration numbers up. Which can happen, and it does happen.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:

Right. Okay. Thanks, Stan. And then, Carlos has also asked: Are there any compelling reasons for the high ccTLD concentrations? I don't know if you, Stan, have an opinion on that. It's not likely that it comes out of the data. I don't know if you or other review team members would have a perspective on that question.

STAN BESEN:

I don't. If somebody wants to suggest a sentence or footnote or something that explains it. Again, I wouldn't overanalyze this, but if somebody could say something about that, if there's a sentence or two that we can add, I would be happy to consider adding it.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:

Okay, thanks. Carlos, is that an old hand, or do you have a new thing to add?

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: Sorry.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: No problem. Anyone else have—okay, Kaili, go ahead. Although Kaili, if you're trying to talk, you're still on mute, it looks like.

KAILI KAN: Hello? Sorry. Yeah. Normally, I would ask—right? Yeah. But is this appropriate time to have a talk about parking?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: So we didn't have parking scheduled on the call today. I am still in the process of trying to add the text to the previous paper that Stan had put together, based on our discussion last week. And I think we were going to talk about parking next week.

KAILI KAN: Oh. Okay. Thank you.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Sure. Yep. All right, any other questions or comments about the Latin America paper? I see there's been some discussion in the chat. But I don't know if there's anything we need to call out here. And it sounds like Stan is going to be suggesting a little bit of language, outside paper to sort of point to it or foreshadow it elsewhere in the report as well. I



---

think it is interesting to see the different per country dynamics here. It certainly demonstrates to me at least a more perfect analysis of competition would probably help use a different definition of market in the global market than we tend to use in most of our analysis. Okay. Any other questions or comments about this paper? Otherwise we'll move on to any other business?

Actually, we have one other paper to potentially discuss. All right, so the last paper for discussion. Once again, Jonathan had previously sent this out. This paper was originally drafted by Laureen, I think, and then Stan had posed—oh no, never mind. There was quite a bit of discussion. I guess this was drafted by Stan. There was some back and forth between Stan and Laureen on this paragraph that Stan had written about restrictions and safeguards. Stan, can you speak to—is the intent that this paragraph goes into the existing section written by Laureen? Maybe help contextualize the paragraph you wrote.

STAN BESEN:

Yes, Laureen and I have discussed this. And the idea is, and she has [inaudible]. But the idea is that this paragraph would go after two other paragraphs that discuss restrictions on registrations. That's already a section in the report. The paragraph that I wrote, I think fits nicely after that. Laureen has the pen and she'll worry about whether that fits, and doing a segue and all that sort of stuff. But, we handled that offline last week.

---

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah. Great. So there may not be that much to discuss here. Laureen, do you want to add anything on this point? On this paragraph?

LAUREEN KAPIN: No, Stan, and I captured it. We've chatted about it, and I'm going to figure out a way to make it fit seamlessly into our report. And I may add a cite to another source if I can find one that's on point. So, stay tuned. And what I'll do is I'll recirculate that section as an excerpt with the new language put in so people can see how it flows. And then if people have comments or concerns, we can discuss it during a plenary call.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay. That makes sense. Thanks, Laureen. We'll look for that update in the future. Any other questions or comments on that section? Although it sounds like it probably makes sense to see Laureen's revised section overall. All right. I will move on to the last topic, which is any other business. Does anyone have any other topics they'd like to discuss today? And as I mentioned to Kaili earlier, we'll be revisiting the parking discussion next week. Calvin, go ahead.

CALVIN BROWNE: Yeah, I was just wondering if you're doing any outreach or anything at the GDD meetings next week in Madrid?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Not that I'm aware of. Someone from staff, do you know of any outreach going on at the GDD summit?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Hi Jordyn, this is Eleeza. I'll be in Madrid. We haven't planned on anything other than to mention that the report is available for comments. I'm not sure if anyone else here is planning on attending?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Calvin, will you be there?

CALVIN BROWNE: Yeah. Look, I'll be there. And I was just wondering if I could encourage people to look at the report and comment on it, I guess. Which I'll do anyway.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, that's a great idea. Maybe Calvin and Eleeza, you could reach out to the registry and registrar stakeholder group chairs, just to let them know that Calvin and Eleeza will be there. And it may make sense to just remind folks that there's an opportunity for comments and any limited amount of engagement they want to do with Calvin there.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Sure, happy to.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: All right, thanks. And Alice reminds us that yes, in general, please encourage any of the participating ICANN bodies, SO/AC's, or otherwise

---

---

that you participate in, to join the comment period. All right, any other topics for today? [AUDIO BREAK]

All right. Thanks, everyone. We'll wrap up with a shorter call, and look to resume next week, where at a minimum we will have a further discussion of parking. Thanks, everyone.

MULTIPLE SPEAKERS: Thanks, Jordyn. Thanks, everyone.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]