

---

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Alright, fantastic. So, welcome, everyone. This is the latest and greatest, I guess 28<sup>th</sup> meeting of the competition and consumer choice sub-team of the CCT review. I think we'll probably have a pretty short agenda this morning, because we don't have a lot of new material. But why don't we run through things and make sure there's no other business that we want to attend to. Yes, let's go ahead and get started, then. The first item on our register, for transcription purposes, I'm Jordyn Buchanan, the chair of the sub-team. But why don't we go ahead with our first agenda item, which is to discuss the revisions to the parking paper? I don't know if there are any, or if there's topics for discussion following on last week's call, but I'll turn things over to Jonathan, briefly, for any updates here.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Jordyn. I didn't make changes to the parking paper for this call, I'm sorry.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: No, I think this call is going to be a call full of updates, unfortunately. But just for the general information of participants, I think we're really focused for the next few weeks on trying to deliver the updates to the DNS abuse report, those related to the info study, and then we will be trying to ship the replaced parking paper as part of our supplementary reports, as that takes into consideration the new legacy gTLD parking data that we didn't have at the time of publication of the initial reports.

---

*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.*

---

I'm certainly going to – I guess we'll look for any further revisions or discussion around the parking paper over the next couple of weeks.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Yes, I have a couple of to-do items. You had a to-do item about trying to update some of the data, I think, as well. Maybe we could convene offline to figure out everything that needs doing. I'm on top of the edits. I'm not concerned about the edits that came on the last call. They were pretty straightforward.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:

Yes, that's fine. Yes, we can go through and look at all of the data points and update the data points that need to be brought to the December 2016 timeframe. Alright, so why don't we move on, again, to item three? I have an updated – which is just running through our revisions. I haven't updated recommendations two and three. Dan's not on the call, so I think the one thing we might discuss today is if Waudo had any chance to have further revisions to recommendation nine. It looks like the answer to that is yes. Waudo, why don't I turn it over to you for any further recommendations. Oh, Megan is here.

WAUDO SIGANGA:

Okay. Thank you, Jordyn. I've looked at recommendations in relation to the public comment, and I've done a report that I speculated—I apologize, I speculated it a little bit late, so maybe some of you might not have gone through it or seen it. But that report just kind of just establishes [INAUDIBLE 0:04:03] against recommendation number nine,

---

to see whether they are saying something that could require a change to the recommendation. I think I can just go through quickly, recommendation by recommendation, rather than comment by comment. There are so many. A lot of them don't even touch on recommendation number nine. So I think it will be quite fast.

Starting with [INAUDIBLE 0:04:32] had the two papers [INAUDIBLE 0:04:35], but there was no mention there about recommendation nine. They don't touch on recommendation nine, so nothing to be changed there. Then number three is a business constituency. The constituency is the transfer of the comment. The recommendation was that we combine recommendation nine and ten. Now, I've noted there that that might not be possible, because the recipients or the people who are addressing the recommendation are actually different for the two recommendations. They are a lot different. The recommendations are different, so they are different there in my notes. [INAUDIBLE 0:05:24] as well, but they are different, so it's not possible to combine from what I've seen there. Then, they are suggesting maybe there could be specific questions for Brian. I've indicated that there should be questions for Brian. That does not have to be put in the recommendations, but it should be put in the appendix for the recommendations. Which, in this case, it's indicated plenty. But for those of you who saw my email, I think we also need to look at this appendix properly, because it's actually been titled a consumer survey, not a registrant survey. I think we may have to create another appendix for the final notes, which is incorporating the questions that we would like to be included in the future registrant study, which is different from appendix, which actually

---

is for consumer survey, and I think the two surveys are quite different. That's just a small note there. That takes care of the DC.

Then, I think there was the Canadian International Pharmacy Organization, or something like that. I've just put it here in short. They didn't have any comment about recommendation number nine. Then, there was an individual – I can't recall the name, but there was an individual there, number five on my chart. He said that we combine recommendation nine with fifteen, and I have indicated that it's not possible, because recommendation fifteen falls under the trust group. Recommendation nine is dealing with choice. It could be difficult to combine them because of that. The next one is [INAUDIBLE 0:07:23] has given the actual comments that they have done, and it's quite a long one. Maybe we'll read it later, but I've indicated there that those changes are required for the recommendation, but comments regarding questions that can be asked to registrants can be included in the appendix. As I said, I think we need another appendix later on. But for now, this is a placeholder.

Then, I'll go down to feedback from the public interests, VIP. They didn't have anything to say about recommendation number nine. The next one is the GAC. The GAC also did not have a specific comment about recommendation nine. GNSO [INAUDIBLE 0:08:32] as well did not have a comment about the recommendation nine. Then, ICANN organization – they had quite a bit regarding handling. You can see there, they want recommendation 9, 11, 15, 26 and 33 to be bundled together, because they're all dealing with registrant's data. They also say that the third recommendation in the report, two through 9, 11, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19 [INAUDIBLE 0:09:13] of data or studies. The important comment here is

---

---

that some of these studies can be put together with other studies that are happening within ICANN, such as the health index. My comment here is that what the ICANN org is suggestion, it's for the team to decide what we should do with that, because there's quite a bit of talking about the handling, some of the recommendations as well as our requests for this survey, the requirements of other processes that are going on within the larger ICANN. That's to get some ideas for the report.

Then there's INTA. Basically, INTA – I think I mentioned it last time – their main worry was that they talked to some of their members and they saw no member that had participated in the survey, in the registrant survey, so they were suggesting that in the future, something specific needs to be done to ensure that INTA members are included in the survey and their views are taken into account. But if you can recall what we mentioned last time, it's that that should not be the case, because we would like the survey – the sampling to be done in a random way, so that it's representative of all the registrants, irrespective of all the specific types of registrants. For that, again, I've left that there should be no change to the recommendation. In terms of [INAUDIBLE 0:11:22] constituency, they have nothing for number nine, same as the North American something, something – I can't quite recall what their name is, and commercial stakeholder groups, I think they have nothing to say.

Then there was a comment from Houston, and I put it there. They said the study should be designed and continuously improved to collect registrants then for appendix F, they commented that "Given that there are millions of registrants, proper selection is integral to achieve a

---

representative sample with limited numbers. The course of this study should be considered against the utility of the data given, the sample of respondents.” The first part, again, is talking about what INTA was suggesting, that there should be some efforts to make sure that the specific types of respondents are included in the survey, which I’ve already dealt with when we say that as a review thing, it’s important for the sampling to be random of all registrants. That does not translate to any changes to our recommendation. One thing I’ve put here is the course of the survey should be considered against the utility of the data given, the sample of respondents. I’ve not thought about that one, so I’ve not put any comment about that. We have a public comment from pharmacists. They didn’t say anything about recommendation nine. Then, the registry stakeholder group asked, “what is the perceived benefit of this recommendation? What will be the cost?”

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: It seems we lost Waudo.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah. Oh yeah, we lost him from the call entirely. Well, let’s give him just – oh, he’s just a presenter. Waudo, we don’t hear you anymore, if you’re hearing us. We’ll give Waudo just a minute, to see if we can get him reconnected. It seems he’s back now. Waudo, can you hear us?

WAUDO SIGANGA: Yes.

---

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Waudu, if you're back, you can just pick up again. You were just talking about the register stakeholder group comment when we lost you.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Okay. I didn't know. Sorry. Okay, that's interesting. Okay, that was number seventeen. Yes, the registry stakeholder group, their worry was the benefits and whether the benefits were key to the cost. I think there was one time in our discussions, we were talking about the cost. I think we were mentioning that it will really require somebody with an economics background to come out with the tangible or the medical cost, but it's not possible. I think the cost that we have indicated in our earlier reports were just the ICANN or the future reviews will have – Maybe I put it here. Yes, the ability to determine [INAUDIBLE 0:17:42] motivations and data for strict study competition and choice in the CMD marketplace. The benefit there is that the future studies will have this information. That will be the benefit. Then the cost was actually given to us by ICANN in their public comment. They have indicated that in the ICANN site column, \$160 for the survey, but future surveys, of course I think it'll be a portion of that as indicated. Then, after the registry stakeholder group, there was a few other comments. But none of them are regarding number nine. So, I've not put anything against that. Then, on the final page, I put what is my suggested recommendation or amended recommendation. It should remain the same except for the area of the details.

In the area of the details, we have – I've added some information there, regarding the cost, and also the small correction that I talked about, consumer survey should actually be registrant survey. I was suggesting

---

that, in the report – I don't know how many pages we had. But if we don't have an appendix for collecting questions on registrant survey, then we need to create another appendix for that, so that we are not talking about the consumer appendix, the consumer survey appendix. That is all of it. I didn't go again.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:

Thanks, Waudo. So, just to recap a little bit, it sounds like you're suggesting some change to the details here. Keep the recommendation rough. I think there's an open question that you flagged earlier, as to whether this should be consolidated with other recommendations, as an ICANN organization comment suggested. Most of those other recommendations are from the other sub-teams. That seems like something we'll either have to take up in a plenary call or by email, although it's not the set of proposed consolidations that Maureen had flagged, at least. We'll have to consider – it may be a good starting point to ask her whether she took a look at that recommendation from ICANN staff, when she was putting together her proposed consolidations. Any other questions or comments for Waudo about this analysis? Thanks, Waudo.

It's a very comprehensive review of the comments. Alright, I'm not seeing any other questions or comments. It looks like we'll presumably accept Waudo's general direction. Waudo, I have a few minor line edits that I might propose to you, as I've done with Dan. But I think in general, it looks fine. We'll largely keep recommendation nine as is, with some further detail. Alright, I don't think we have any updates on any other of the sections right now, unless I've missed something. So, if



---

that's the case, we'll move on to any other business. Does anyone else have any topics that they'd like to discuss today? Alright, we'll wrap things up today, then. Thanks for joining. I think Jean-Baptiste, at this time slot next week, will be having a plenary call. Is that correct?

JEAN-BAPTISTE: No, the plenary call would be on Thursday, but the two calls would be on Tuesday.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Oh, so there's nothing on Wednesday?

JEAN-BAPTISTE: There will be an ANCA call on Wednesday. I just wanted to say that no invitation was sent yet, because we have just discussed that with David. There should be an invitation in your inbox for those concerns later today.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay, great. So, what was I going to say? I'm not sure we're going to have content for a sub-team call next Tuesday. We'll decide that by the end of this week, whether we're going to all-in on Tuesday or not. But we'll plan on just to have everyone note on their calendar that there will be a plenary call next Thursday, and for those that are interested, an INTA sub-team call Wednesday, and possibly a sub-team call on Tuesday. Alright? Thanks, everyone, and look for those updates by email. Thanks, everyone.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**