
AUTOMATED VOICE: This meeting is now being recorded.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Alright, I'll go ahead and start. Welcome, everyone, to the latest and greatest CCT review - Competition and Consumer Choice review - sub-team call. In terms of agenda today, I think we're just reviewing action items from last week's call - we had a number of them, with the deadlines this week. I haven't seen an update from [UNKNOWN], but both Dejan and myself have sent updates to the list in the last 24 hours, or probably more like 12 hours, so why don't we take a quick review of those action items.

Is there any other agenda items that anyone would like to add to the call? Okay, I see no further agenda items, so why don't we just right into the review of our action items.

The first one, on consolidating the registrant survey recommendations - that hasn't been completed. I believe it's actually going to end up being an action item for the plenary, since these recommendations are not actually targeted at the sub-teams. So, I will send that update to the broader review team list some time soon.

Moving on to recommendations 2, 3, 4, and 6 - Jordyn to update the rationale. I sent out an update with this last night, although, Jean-Baptiste, if you have that document available to present? Did it not... Is your PDF not catching the red line, or did the document I sent out not

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.

capture the red line... No, I see the red line in mine. I, at least, see the red line when I look at mine.

Hold on and bear with us a moment, folks, we'll see if we can get the red line version [UNKNOWN].

Okay, great. So, this version does show the red line. Number 6 is actually quite simple, because I didn't change anything, but when we run through the rest, just as a reminder - we'd already discussed any potential changes to the recommendations themselves, and this was just a review of the comments to see whether there was any changes that needed to be made in the rationale, or other surrounding texts. Largely in support of, or largely to address the comments that it's not clear why we would be recommending some of these things, what the benefits were. I've tried to elaborate somewhat in the rationale text of the recommendations for number 2, 3, 4, and 5.

Can you turn on scrolling, Jean-Baptiste? So we can scroll down to the later recommendations. Great.

For the moment, let's concern ourselves with 2, 3, 4, and 5, [UNKNOWN] additional text. I messed up on recommendation number 3, and that red line text should actually be up one line, at the end of the rationale, not on [UNKNOWN] line, next to ICANN Organisation.

Yeah, Waudo - if you don't see anything under the display, the Word document is the same thing.

Trying to find reference points... okay. So, just quickly summarising for recommendation number 2 - I added some text saying that we weren't

able to compare new gTLDs to [UNKNOWN] prices because we didn't have the wholesale prices for [UNKNOWN] gTLDs. Does anyone have any questions or comments about that change?

Okay. For recommendation number 3, which is about transactional pricing, I included some text to say that we were able to get - well, not really us, but the analysis group was able to obtain - base prices for the new gTLDs, but because they didn't have transactional prices, a lot of domains were sold either at promotional rates, or as premium domains, and therefore we weren't able to do a very good analysis of the actual selling prices of domains in the marketplace. So, it'll be important to have transactional data to do that. Any questions or comments about the changes to recommendation number 3?

Okay, recommendation number 4 is looking at retail pricing, and here I just said two points - first that the expected benefit here of lower prices, would be to pass on lower retail prices for consumers, and looking at the prices that registrars charge would actually allow that analysis. Then, further, I made the observation that for the registrars themselves, and for the general public, through their website, this information would end up being publicly available, and therefore wouldn't require new data collection obligations on contracted parties. Some of the other recommendations do, with the caveat that registrars don't sell in that manner, so we wouldn't capture their pricing, but that's, I think, to call out the fact that there's some difference in collecting retail data [UNKNOWN] data in terms of methodology and availability of data.

So, any questions or comments about that recommendation? Waudo, I see your hand up. Go ahead.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Okay. You can hear me?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yes.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Hello? You can hear?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yes.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Okay, I just wanted to say something in general about recommendation 3, in general about the recommendations - when you mentioned the [UNKNOWN], I think that's from an outside perspective. [UNKNOWN]. I believe, from my perspective, that [UNKNOWN]. I was wondering whether we could maybe get a [UNKNOWN] we can substitute it with another [UNKNOWN], a little bit softer.

[UNKNOWN] it hinders, it inhibits, it impedes - because we have used this verb so many times in our report, I don't know what I think about it. I think it's a bit of a harsh word. [UNKNOWN] hinder, inhibits, impedes - something like that.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Sure. So, it's Jordyn - I don't have a problem with that necessarily. This language has existed since the initial report, and then went out for public comment. I don't think any of the public comments took issue with the word, but 'hinder' is a fine substitute in my view as well, I don't, yeah.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Yeah, if you feel it's okay, alright, but [UNKNOWN] because it appeared so many times in the reports [UNKNOWN].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I see Jonathan typing, so...

WAUDO SIGANGA: Yeah.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I think Jonathan [UNKNOWN] that word, so.

WAUDO SIGANGA: [LAUGHTER] Okay, it's just an idea, so.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I'm not wedded to it at all, it's just a...

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Alright, Waudu, we'll- [INTERUPTED]

WAUDO SIGANGA: We'll look at it? Okay.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Alright, hold on [UNKNOWN]. Okay, that's a lost cause, [UNKNOWN] stuck in traffic. Alright, so, Waudu - I'll take a look at that suggestion, and maybe consult Jonathan, get any other suggestions, if he wants to change it. But that's, as you say, not specific to any of these particular- [INTERUPTED]

WAUDO SIGANGA: No, just general.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay, any other comments on the revisions to recommendation 4? Okay, then I will move on to recommendation number 5, which is the to collect parking data. This just adds to the rationale that we were able to get a one time snapshot of legacy gTLD parking data, but to do a more significant analysis, we would want [UNKNOWN] data from the legacy gTLDs as well as have further study on the relationship between parking and other phenomenon such as [UNKNOWN].

Any questions or comments about this revision? And I assume that's an old hand, Waudu. Okay, not seeing any questions, or comments on recommendation 5 - we'll move to recommendation 6.

Recommendation 6, I think we are the- I have reviewed the comments, and the recommendation rational. I thought it already explained what we are attempting to do reasonably well, and so, I don't suggest any changes here.

Okay, so, sounds like there's no objections to any of these proposed changes. That's the second action item here - I'm going to jump ahead to recommendation number 10, which is a separate action item, which was that we have an added details or success matrix for recommendation number 10.

In terms of details for recommendation number 10, we obviously just suggest that the relevant PDPs take a look at it, so there's no real substantive suggestion here, so let's call that on the details. In success metrics, I've tried to propose metrics where it would be successful if the total number of registrations decrease, in particular, if there is a reduction in the number of defensive registrations per trademark by the registrants with the most defensive registrations. Again, the goal here was to reduce the burden on the small number of trademark holders who are registering large numbers of defensive registrations. That seems like the best measure, whether or not that has been successful or not.

Any questions or comments about these new details and success metrics? Okay, it seems like these changes are relatively uncontroversial, and we can - when we have our final changes we want to submit to the plenary - we can include these as well, so, we'll go along with the changes for 7, 8, and 9 that we've previously decided to forward on to the plenary.

We had an action item on recommendation number 11, which was for [UNKNOWN] to take a look at the rationale, which, unfortunately [UNKNOWN] before the call hasn't provided that, so I'll roll that over to next week's call.

Lastly we have an update from Dejan on the updates and success metrics for recommendation 12, so. I think Dejan updated, consolidated 7 and 8 as well, so, why don't we go ahead and pull up Dejan's changes if you've got them available, Jean-Baptiste?

JEAN-BAPTISTE:

Hi, Jordyn - sorry, I had my hand raised. I just wanted to ask you a quick question. As for the [UNKNOWN] recommendation that [UNKNOWN] before - apart from recommendation 3, can these be then presented on the plenary call?

JORDYN BUCHANAN:

Yeah, I think they all can. I think I'm going to take a quick look to see if we can change that word in the rationale - 'frustrate' - but other than that, I think it's ready for presentation to the plenary.

I don't know how Jonathan actually wants to go through these - line by line in the call, or do we just want to send them out to the broader list in an update. Maybe we can discuss that on the next leadership call - how we want to handle these updates. They're mostly pretty minor.

JEAN-BAPTISTE: Okay, the reason I ask is just because we have a [UNKNOWN] plenary call on Tuesday, where we'll review the updates to the application and [UNKNOWN], but if there is time, that might be an idea, to include them as part of the agenda. Just an idea.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, that's fine, I think we can do recommendation- the consolidation that we've done, across the- [INTERUPTED]

JEAN-BAPTISTE: Yeah.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: - recommendation 8, as well as the updates, so. I think we can probably include 7, 8, 9, 12, and the ones that I updated - so it's most of our competition recommendations.

JEAN-BAPTISTE: Thank you, Jordyn.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay, great, thanks. So, Dejan - do you want to walk us through your updates here?

DEJAN DJUKIC: [UNKNOWN]

JEAN-BAPTISTE: I don't know about others on the call, but I can't hear you properly.

DEJAN DJUKIC: [UNKNOWN]

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, it sounds a little like you're underwater.

DEJAN DJUKIC: Can you hear me now? Better?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: That's a little better.

DEJAN DJUKIC: [UNKNOWN] microphone. [UNKNOWN] for recommendation 12, because there are not any changes to recommendations 7 and 8 [UNKNOWN].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, can you turn on scrolling, Jean-Baptiste? It looks like that done, Dejan, so everyone should be able to scroll down.

DEJAN DJUKIC:

Okay, so, in recommendation 12, I had some minor changes in the text. In the last sentence, I changed the part when we specifically said about issues such as the possibility that [UNKNOWN] protecting [UNKNOWN], from ICANN Organisation to GNSO [UNKNOWN] details that I had, that despite the registrar agreement, the [UNKNOWN], there are still some registries who had unusual terms. [UNKNOWN].

In the success measures, I add that we measure the development of relevant policy and [UNKNOWN] updates of registry agreements.

That's all the changes since the last call.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:

Alright, thanks, Dejan. Alright, so, it looks like there's been some updates throughout this recommendation, so I encourage people to take a look and make sure that they're comfortable.

I guess one question I have, that maybe we should take a broader look at, is how we're using the details section in the recommendation - it seems a little inconsistent from one recommendation to the next. I don't expect us to necessarily get this resolved here, but maybe that's a good discussion for either of the senior leadership calls, to make sure we're consistent in how we use each of these fields.

I see Jonathan typing again. Jonathan has suggested - just add a description beyond the title, which is fine, I guess. In some cases we've provided a fair amount of detail in the recommendation itself, which [UNKNOWN] detail, so we probably should just introduce some consistency, I'm [UNKNOWN.]

Is that a new hand?

WAUDO SIGANGA: Yeah. Jordyn?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, go ahead, Waudo.

WAUDO SIGANGA: I don't feel this section needs to be standardised in it's presentation, because every recommendation is very different from another one, so I think it's - should [UNKNOWN] a place where you can thoroughly explain the recommendation, and we need the recommendation to be in a place where we can put the recommendation in a short form, then the details [UNKNOWN] is [UNKNOWN]. But, the point I'm trying to make is, I don't think it's necessary for the details parts to be standardised.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, that's right, Waudo - I agree we don't need to try to standardise the details parts. I guess we should probably just provide some guidance to the folks what the expectations are about how it's used. In particular, should we try to shorten some of the recommendations, and leave more into the details - but I agree, this is a very non-urgent problem.

I see Dejan's hand is up, though. Go ahead Dejan.

DEJAN DJUKIC: Yeah, I agree it's not necessary to be standardised, but it would be very useful if we had some instructions for writing this, so. [UNKNOWN] standardising in every recommendation, but [UNKNOWN].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay, so - Jean-Baptiste, why don't we flag this as another topic for next week's leadership call. Other than that, I didn't have any comments about Dejan's changes, but I just came in this morning, so I may try to take a closer look and see if [UNKNOWN], but I think the overall intent of these changes is sound.

Any other feedback for Dejan? Okay, I think that's it then - thanks, Dejan, for providing the edits. So, this adding to recommendation 12 is probably ready to be discussed at the plenary call as well. It's already included in the notes.

And, with that, we are out of agenda, so I'll check again if anyone has any other suggested topics for discussion for today?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Jordyn? I'll reach out to you off-line, but I now on my to-do list is writing something up on the choice section on mono-culture, and I realise that I don't know all the details, like the TLDs that attempted to be restricted and weren't, so I could reach out in an email to get some of those examples.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Sure thing, that sounds great.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Alright.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay, great. So, it sounds like we're done on this call for today. We've got a few action items remaining, but it looks like we're actually getting close to completing our review of the public comments on the recommendation. There is still some discussion going on about how we're going to review the findings, so we'll be doing some more work there, but I think we're in the home stretch, and doing well with regards to our sections of the report, and being ready to conclude for the final report soon.

So, thanks everyone for your participation today. As a reminder - there's two calls next week. There's both a sub-team call, and a plenary call next week, I believe. The sub-team call is on Wednesday still, and the plenary meeting is on Tuesday, both at the same time slot. We'll look forward to have extra discussion next week. Jean-Baptiste is typing, maybe [UNKNOWN].

JONATHAN ZUCK: Waudu.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Go ahead.

WAUDO SIGANGA: I'm just wondering - for the plenary call on Tuesday, is there any information that can be shared before the call, from the other sub-team. I think it would be useful for us to have some idea what we're going to discuss then, if there's any information. Maybe [UNKNOWN] can find out.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, I'll - it's Jonathan - I think [UNKNOWN] cover me, so I'll try to circulate something by the end of the week.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Alright, great. So, looking forward to those discussions next week, and in the mean time, thanks everyone for your contributions today.

Alright.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you, bye.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Bye.

JEAN-BAPTIST: Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]