JORDYN BUCHANAN: Hello, Jonathan and friendly staff members. This is the latest and greatest version of the competition and consumer choice subteam of the CCTRT meeting on March 27, 2018. I'm your host, Jordyn Buchanan. Before we start, Jonathan, you have an update on the statement of interest. I see no answer, so I assume the answer is no.

In terms of agenda today, we had two possible items. One was to talk to updates to recommendation nine that Waudo had put together. We don't have Waudo, so it looks like [inaudible] talk about that. The other item was to talk about the follow-on analysis of the dot-com versus gTLD endings for the substitution analysis paper.

I would suggest … I think [inaudible] unmute him.

BRIAN AITCHISON: I think I'm still on. Can you hear me?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay, great. Yeah. I think this is mostly going to be a conversation with you, so probably makes sense to keep you on the line.

We're talking about the substitution, the two spreadsheets that we had previously put together, that the ICANN staff had previously put together.

Just a reminder, one of these looks at for each TLD, dot-photography, it looks to see if there's [inaudible] registered is [inaudible] dot-com also registered or I guess available.

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.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Hello.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: It looks like we've got Waudo on.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Yeah, I'm on now. Hello.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Great. So, why don't we do this the other way around then? Let's pause and maybe have a brief discussion about recommendation nine and then come back to the discussion around the follow-on projects, if any.

Waudo, I guess Jean-Baptiste had sent around the latest documents for recommendation nine. Do you have any … Do you want to introduce the discussion or is there anything we need to talk about with recommendation nine?

WAUDO SIGANGA: Yeah, I guess a couple of things. First of all, I apologize. There might be some background noises. I'm at a meeting in a hotel and I'm sitting in a room where there's music in the background. If you hear something like that, maybe you could just excuse it.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: No problem.

EN

WAUDO SIGANGA:	Also, apologies for being on late. I had given a [inaudible]. It's unreachable. It's an alternate number.

I think [Laureen] did a very good thing last time, because what I was doing earlier on was just concentrating on the recommendation, but from what you said last time, I think we've added the background, the text that was [inaudible] the recommendation and I think that one or two things I think we need to discuss on this call so I can see how to proceed with them.

Jean-Baptiste, I think you sent out two documents. The text for the report as well as the summary of the public comments, I'd like to start with those public comments if I can just open them on my computer here. I think I need a little bit of guidance. There were two submissions in the public comments and I need to agree with the group here how we are going to take those into account going forward.

The first one is the comment by the International Trademark Organization, the INTA. There was this statement that was in the report about the cost of [inaudible] registrations in new gTLD [inaudible] appear to be lower than some had feared [inaudible] section of the program. Now, the INTA seem to have taken some kind of – I don't know how to put it. Not quite in agreement with this statement. I thought maybe we could discuss it here because if I remember correctly this particular statement emanated from Jordyn. Maybe you can guide us what we should do about the INTA comment in the report itself, in

the amended report. How should we incorporate that or should we just leave it out?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: So, here's the thing. I would say we could do one of two things. Number one, procedurally, we could just ignore it because they're not actually … That statement was in the original draft report. It's not new. It doesn't relate to any of the changes in the supplemental report. So, procedurally, we could probably just ignore it. That's because we told people to only comment on the new material. Having said that …

WAUDO SIGANGA: Well, maybe before you go forward, if you say we ignore it, what they are saying is that it does not appear to be supported, which is rather strong. It doesn't appear to be supported. If we leave a statement there which somebody is saying is not supported, do you think we are fulfilling our [inaudible] even work?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I was going to suggest the other approach. I think procedurally, if we were a court, we would just ignore it. We would say you guys are too late. You should have said that last time when asked for comments on that particular text. But, we're not a court, so we can make up whatever rules we want, I guess.

The other approach is we could just add a footnote to that statement and give an example of the types of statements that people give. I think we tried to find these before and we were having a rough time…

WAUDO SIGANGA: Sorry, Jordyn, I think you're talking very fast. I need to hear that second option that you're saying about adding a footnote. Maybe just repeat it.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: We could add a footnote citing some of the apocalyptic statements that were made prior to the new gTLDs about how companies would be spending millions of dollars with [defensive] registrations or the like.

                        I think we made a brief attempt prior to the publication of the draft report to identify some of those previous hyperbolic statements and I think we didn't come up with anything, but it should be possible if we think it's worth the effort.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Can we concentrate additional [inaudible] text just to this comment over [inaudible] forget about the other apocalyptic statement. Just this one of INTA. If we [inaudible] issue of what costs are being incurred and how they compare to any benefit that might occur from a further expansion of new gTLDs. Is there any way [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: The second thing isn't true, right? The entire premise of the entire CCT review is that we're trying to weight the costs and benefits.

WAUDO SIGANGA: This [inaudible] not true.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Well, there's two statements they made. The first statement is that the statement that the costs are not as high as people as predicted, that is not substantiated. I think that is a true statement. We did not substantiate that.

Then, they made another statement which is, "You guys don't make any effort to relate cost to benefits." I think that's wrong. I think that's the entire thing that we're doing throughout the entire report.

I think they made one statement that's true and one statement that's false.

WAUDO SIGANGA: So, the one that's not true, can [inaudible]. Sorry, there's an echo.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I would defer to Jonathan, but I would say we don't need to do anything to address the statement saying that we're not trying to relate the cost to the benefits. That's just the [inaudible] statement, I think.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Okay. Now, the other submission by the Business Constituency, they wanted us to add something to the text to the effect that the [inaudible] registrations do not promote either consumer choice or competition. They are simply a [inaudible] cost of no benefit to the DNS, the market,

EN

or the end user. Can we agree to add some text, that I can add some text to what we had in the main report earlier on?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I mean, I think we already say that. I'm just scanning through the text right now.

WAUDO SIGANGA: I was suggesting to add some text that could be on page three just before the paragraph that starts "in addition to defensive registrations."

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Hold on a second. I really thought we had some text about defensive registrations being a sunk cost, but I totally can't find it.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Not in this particular text that Jean-Baptiste sent out.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Jonathan, I don't know if you have a perspective. Neither of these comments address anything new. I don't really have a problem reflecting them because they're both reasonable statements, but they're also, procedurally, these both have been totally reasonable comments to make in response to the draft report as well.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right.

WAUDO SIGANGA: So, do you think I can look for some text to reflect this comment from the Business Constituency, some additional text, that probably some stakeholders after going through the [inaudible] report [inaudible] some registrations, some defensive registrations, do not [inaudible].

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I guess we could view this as a reaction to the INTA survey. I mean, it is true that … I think we agree that defensive registrations are not useful. So, I think it's fine to add a statement like that.

WAUDO SIGANGA: We can make a statement like that, [inaudible] something.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Sure.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Okay. That's something then we can agree the actual text later.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I will separately look and see if I can find a footnote to add to the ….

JONATHAN ZUCK: On the [inaudible] thing.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Exactly. I feel like I was [inaudible] about that.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, I think you're right. [inaudible] testified. But, there's a bunch, like [inaudible] published a bunch of papers and press releases. There's endless people. We could probably get public comments from ICANN. Both public comments and public forums, statements, of how the new gTLD program was going to destroy the Internet. There was endless hyperbolic discussions prior to the program about how it would destroy trademark holders. It shouldn't be that hard to find something. It seems like a reasonable thing for us to do.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Okay. Hello, Jordyn, are you still on?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, I'm here. It sounds like the next steps here are you're going to try to write some, send in some text about how defensive registrations are useless and the sunk costs. I'm not sure [inaudible].

WAUDO SIGANGA: Yeah, I do [inaudible]. Okay.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Separately, I will try to find one or more people saying ridiculous things prior to the gTLD program launch.

BRIAN AITCHISON: Can I jump in for a second?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, go ahead, Brian.

BRIAN AITCHINSON: I was just going to say I [inaudible] hyperbolic statements [inaudible].

WAUDO SIGNANGA: There's a lot of echo and I can't hear ago.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Can I ask everyone to mute their lines if they're not talking, please? Thank you. Go ahead, Brian.

BRIAN AITCHINSON: Domainmondo.com, which is I believe John Poole's website has all of that hyperbole almost as a list in a way if you scour his website. Just a little pointer.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Thanks, Brian. I'll take a look there.

BRIAN AITCHINSON: Sure.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: So, it sounds like we've got clear next steps there. Anything else? Any other comments or questions on recommend nine? Waudo?

WAUDO SIGANGA: Yeah. This main report, also, that last paragraph of the main report, it's talking about the blocking [inaudible]. Then it says that although we expect to obtain more information prior to the publication of our final report, is there some activity that we want to do to fulfill that, by what it's saying in that final paragraph there? Is that more information about blocking services? Should we eliminate that?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I'm not aware of any ongoing data collection efforts around that. It's probably good to edit that to say something different than it says right now.

WAUDO SIGANGA: So, we can eliminate that? We can remove that?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, that's right.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Thank you. I think that's all for me.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay. So, let's move on then to the discussion about the follow-up project related to substitution analysis. Actually, it's good timing. It's good to have this other document open because our previous text about these reports is in the trademark analysis, the CCT … Oh, no, not the CCT. The trademark part. It's in the CCTRT analysis part of the text around consumer choice that Jean-Baptiste sent around prior to the call. In particular, what page is this? On the third page of that document, you can see what we found from these existing spreadsheets, which is that 82% of registrations and new gTLDs had identical matches in dot-com.

So, if you registered example.tld, then you could have gotten example.com. That mostly I think just tells us that dot-com is pretty full. A lot of people try to go get example.com and they couldn't get it, so they'd get example.somethingelse. Although it looks like that's highly variable, depending on probably what type of registrations people were getting. We say in particular some of the TLD – 32 of the top 414 at the time were 99% or more were in dot-com. That's a lot. But, there were a few gTLDs that had hardly any, or had less than half of their second-level domains, especially dot-com. Anyway, I'm not sure that we're going to do anything more useful with that.

Then, we looked to see if we combine … This is the Big Shot Photography example because bigshot.photography and instead we looked for was bigshotphotography.com available. We found that 92%

of the time you could've gotten bigshotphotography.com even though you registered bigshot.photography.

So, yes, Jonathan, this is the point the USG made, which is, okay, that's fine for bigshots.photography. It's probably a reasonable [inaudible] or bigshots.photography, but bigshots.xyz, probably no one is going to register bigshotsxyz.com because that doesn't make any sense.

So, the previous question posed to Brian is roughly could we look and see, separate out the TLDs that are generic, so xyz, where it's just like you wouldn't expect people to be registering bigshotsxyz, or bigshotstop, or bigshotsdip.com. VIP is a questionable one. So, those are bad endings to use for this analysis, whereas photography or taxi or accountant or [LLC] are probably reasonable things that people would register at the end of their domains in dot-com.

So, the question is … Brian, you said, "Yeah, we can do that, but it will take a long time and a lot of effort, so do we really, really want that?" So, I guess the idea today is to talk about there's some narrower version of that analysis that would still be useful.

I think on last week's leadership call, we discussed at least two approaches. One would be the total anecdotal approach, like we could just randomly choose two or three in each category and compare the numbers and see if it's useful at all. Actually, we could probably do that on this call.

The other is to maybe just figure out … I had suggested let's just do that analysis, but only for the top 20 or top 50 TLDs or something and [look at] the scope that way.

I don't know, Jonathan or Brian, if you have any more thoughts over the past two days or what else you thought on how we could get similar … We could get some sort of useful result here without making the staff crunch away for weeks and weeks of figuring this problem out.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I wish I could say I had some brilliant idea, but I don't. I've tried to sort of sketch it out, Jordyn, and try this list, the top 50 TLDs just on the back of an envelope kind of thing and see how we could possibly tease out examples to compare with dot-com and I just don't see to even do that part to select which ones we want. It sort of becomes a fairly significant exercise. But, we can certainly run a different data filtering if we need to, if there's a way we can think of that that might be useful, but I can't think of anything very clever to do that. I'm happy to also schedule a dedicating brainstorm meeting, too. I guess that's what we're doing here, but that's about all I have.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah. Let's just consider this meeting as our dedicated brainstorming. The one idea I had just right on the call, which I think is totally and statistically invalid because it's [inaudible] problem. Why don't we just look at the TLDs that if you look for that ending in dot-com is really common in dot-com because that would show that people wanted to get … That was a good ending that people would want to put on their domains. But, that's the exact thing we're filtering for later on. So, of course, that's not a very helpful … Of course, the domains, the TLDs we selected that way would have a lot of registrations in dot-com relative

to ones that we didn't select that way. That seems like a bad [experiment].

My inclination might be just to try to do this anecdotally, then. It might be helpful … We can just pull up this spreadsheet right now, shout out a few, and see if it looks at all interesting, and if so, we can just put some anecdotes, just like we sort of do in a couple places already, like with the Chinese TLDs or whatever. We can just say we looked at a few TLDs and here's what we saw, and it's not that meaningful, but it sort of shows an interesting pattern that other people might want to look at more.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right. I picked photography and pizza – sorry, not pizza. Let me start over. It's early. I picked dot-xyz and dot-photography because they were semantic versus non-semantic. So, I was looking for sort of a kind of juxtaposition or dyadic type relationship and maybe there's others like that we could do.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah. I'm trying to see if I can convince [inaudible] to do a sort of quick … Oh, I did it. I guess I want to see a percent, too. Just to be clear, I'm looking at existing registrations in com against new gTLDs. This is the one that shows if the domain of the xyz registrations, what fraction of them was bigshots, xyz. Looking at the row for xyz, there's 6,596,956 total registrations. The only difference between these two columns [inaudible] registered in gTLD.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah. I've had to read that about 1,000 times, too. So, you're looking at dot-com names ending with gTLD would be bigshotsphotographyxyz.com.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay, great. So of the six million, only 354 were registered in the other form. If bigshotsxyz was registered, only 354 out of the 6.5 million xyz have that form in dot-com, which is totally unsurprising because xyz is nonsense, so why would you put it at the end of your dot-com name.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Exactly.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: So, xyz certainly makes the US government's point and we could talk about that. Totally, this was going to be some tiny fraction of a percent [inaudible]. T

JONATHAN ZUCK: If I could just throw some interpretation on that, it just points to how perhaps … Well, it's sensical to say this, but the semantic meaning of the TLD has an influence on how in demand it is. You could probably surmise that the market share being taken away from dot-com is divided mostly among new gTLDs with some kind of semantic meaning. Generic new gTLDs with some kind of semantic meaning, like the dot-

accountant that I think you mentioned. So, [inaudible] look at. Does that make sense?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah. I've just been doing some copy/pasting. So, we go down the list. All these top ones are actually pretty … So, club might be one that you would think someone might register.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Well, aren't there two different types of competition, too? In one case, it's because there's a word I want and it's not available in dot-com and I might get it in dot-xyz. It's just the same second-level domain because it's a word that I want. In the other case, it's somebody placing a value on a semantic top-level domain.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I'm just clarifying. So, either you want a word in dot-com, but you can't get it, or you like that semantic meaning of the new gTLD.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's right. So, you're going to see a different type of competition coming from dot-xyz which is a more direct substitute. Obviously, if you look at xyz and just see is that same domain name in dot-com, there's probably going to be a high proportion of them.

In the other case, it's because you value the semantics. That was the original notion was that photography is more interested in

bigshotsphotography.com because it's that whole we prefer semantic web concept. But, the people registering in dot-xyz are far more likely to be not choosing it over [inaudible] but just choosing … Like, if jonathanzuck.com wasn't available, then I would try and get jonathanzuck.xyz. It's two different types of competition, I guess.

BRIAN AITCHISON: That makes sense.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I'm confused at some of these numbers. I'm confused. I'm totally confused. I guess we're agnostic … So, Brian, if you look at some of the ones with low registration numbers like [mini], it has 28 registrations in the gTLD, but then the second column C is 618. So, I'm presuming we didn't actually look to see … We weren't doing a match of is the name registered in [mini]. Just looking at all the dot-coms with [mini] as an end. It's not looking for a match of was the particular name in dot-[mini] registered in dot-com. Is that right?

BRIAN AITCHISON: So, there would be 618 names in dot-com that would be examplemini.com and there are zero names which would be example.mini.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Okay. Is column D then the ones that are … Oh, column D then is the ones that are registered in dot-mini and they're also registered in dot-com. Is that right?

BRIAN AITCHISON: That's right, but it takes me about half a day to figure that out. Yes.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Well, it only took me like 20 minutes. Hold on. I need to compute my numbers. Just give me one second here. [inaudible], Jonathan. I totally agree with you, Jonathan. I'm just wondering if we can look at what the [inaudible] around this look like. Are there particular TLDs that people are really opting for the semantic version versus the dot-com [inaudible] instead?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Brian, [inaudible] in the example you found, it was only like 50% for dot-photography. Right?

BRIAN AITCHISON: Right. I think it was 60% and then for dot-xyz, it was 99% availability.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Well, right, so that's of the catenation. In other words, there's almost by definition going to be a high percentage available of catenated version of the TLD for a non-sensical one than a semantic one. But 60% still feels like a pretty high number. [inaudible] 92% or whatever.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: [inaudible]. Hold on. It's not letting me just sort them. I guess I should have copied this in the Google doc so you could all see what I was doing. I made a column which is the percent and I'm going to sort by that. [inaudible] column E. You want it ascending.

BRIAN AITCHISON: Jonathan, can I ask you a quick question while Jordyn is doing that?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Of course.

BRIAN AITCHISON: This section that Waudo sent around that we were just reading where we said this is kind of useful to have up, it seems like this is also a kind of substitution analysis in and of itself, or at least this sort of scratching the surface of it. It seems like your section would fit here well and it would kind of build out the substitution section. It's just sort of a thought. I don't know exactly where …

JONATHAN ZUCK: As far as where to put it you mean?

BRIAN AITCHISON: Yeah, to try to …

EN

JONATHAN ZUCK: I don't know which document of Waudo's that you're talking about. I need to go back and …

WAUDO SIGNAGA: The one on consumer choice that Jean-Baptiste sent?

BRIAN AITCHISON: Yeah, just this morning. Yeah, just now.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Yeah. It [inaudible] substitute the issue.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah. It's a great sort of literature review of substitution and then [inaudible] more of the details. Just something to think about. Maybe they'd work close together.

WAUDO SIGANGA: You have [inaudible] think of a way of combining the substitute.

BRIAN AITCHISON: It's just a thought. It might be something just to help us … To make it look bigger. [inaudible] bigger substitution. [inaudible] coming organic.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: So, if we limit ourselves to column D which we must not have done last time we ran these numbers, which seems like actually the right number, there's basically all of the domains registered in TLDs would have been available with dot-com. It's much higher than 92% actually. There's three TLDs that are 75% because they have four registrations and one of them is in dot-com. But, other than that, the next lowest number is 90% … Oh, no, 85%. 83 and 85% … Oh, SAP doesn't really count. That's a brand. [inaudible] is 85%. Oh, no, sorry, only seven registrations. The first one that had significant registrations is dot-[cash] with 5,972. 96% of those are available in dot-com. Essentially, all of the … When I sum it up, when I sum up column D and divide it by column B it's 100. So, significant digits that [Leeberry Office] is showing me.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I haven't gone back and checked the numbers, but I thought that Brian found that dot-photography was only …

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I think he must have been looking at column C, not column D. He was looking at [inaudible]. Yeah. How many domains in dot-com end with dot-photography regardless of whether or not they're registered? So, photography is a pretty common … Like, using it as a percent is just wrong because you could have more registrations in dot-com than are registered in dot-photography. That's the one [inaudible] give some indication of is that a really popular ending in dot-com [inaudible] dot-photography, it probably is. But, if you look at the fraction that are actually registered, it's like a tiny, tiny, tiny fraction. Almost everyone

that's registering a dot-photography could have gotten their dot-com. Unless I'm misunderstanding the data. It would be good for Brian to go and check that, but that's what my [inaudible] showed me. It shows me that we did [inaudible].

BRIAN AITCHISON: Jordyn, I'm sorry. Could you just say that one more time? Everyone registering a dot-photography, based on the number, probably could've gotten a dot-com is what you're saying? What is that based on or how did you arrive at that?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I divided column [D] by column [B]. I mean, or just [inaudible], right? Everyone that registered … Like Jonathan got bigshots.photography and he could've gotten bigshotsphotography.com because bigshotsphotography.com was not registered. I think that's true for essentially everyone that registered a new gTLD. Not everyone. Let me look at the total numbers. Out of 24 million new gTLD registrations, 67,000 of them wouldn't have been available getting the combination in dot-com. So, essentially everyone. Not quite everyone, but essentially everyone registering a new gTLD could have gotten their thing, the string that they registered dot-com. I think we should just publish … We should double check that math and then we should probably just republish and say, "Oops, we were wrong." [inaudible]. It doesn't even matter. Choose whatever TLD you want, xyz or dot-cash and it's still essentially everyone. Our point still holds up.

EN

JONATHAN ZUCK: I guess their point, if I understand it correctly, is that the percentage of registrations where that fact is relevant is low.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Sure. But, I guess I'm saying you can look at any … Sure, that is a fair statement and it's because … In order to do [inaudible] properly, we'd have to do what Brian was suggesting earlier which is go find all the TLDs with semantic endings and add up the total registrations in those and that would represent that class of people that are looking for the more semantic meaning that would tell us the scope of that kind of competition. Then, the generic ones would represent the other kind where people are just like, "Oh, I either don't want or can't get my dot-com and I'm just going to get this other generic ending instead," or it's a better deal. Whatever. There's some reason. So, they're not particularly motivated by saying, "Oh, what I really wanted was a more semantic TLD."

I guess my point is it totally doesn't matter. For both classes of users, they could have gotten the dot-com and they chose not to for some reason.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right. They could've gotten the catenated dot-com.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: That's right. You couldn't have gotten bigshots.com, but you totally could've gotten bigshotsphotography.com, which is the only point we were trying to make.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right. They're just saying that that particular statistic is bias by the fact that the most popular TLDs, that statistic isn't relevant. The larger number of people fall into the looking for an alternative. I guess we could say it doesn't matter due the size of the competition and the people that were looking for words that were already taken are getting that as well. I feel like their point was not to question our statistics, but instead to say who cares whether or not bigshotsxyz.com was available.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Well, I guess either way it's a substitute, right? If someone is like, "I can't get my dot-com. I'm going to buy an xyz instead," that's a direct substitute.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's right. That may be the point, I guess. That's a good point to make.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I guess in reaction to … I guess my takeaway is they were right. It was done to conflate xyz and dot-photography because people would have different behaviors around those two TLDs. Going back to look at the numbers a) we were totally wrong the first time. It was not 8% were available. It was essentially 100%, but the 8% were already taken in dot-com. It was essentially 0%. And b) it doesn't matter what TLD you look at, even the most semantic of the TLDs. It's not like there's a big difference between the xyz and dot-photography. It's essentially everyone choosing a domain in a new gTLD could have gotten the

catenation and for whatever reason, they chose … Either because they don't want the catenation because it doesn't make any sense or because they don't want the catenation because they want the more semantic web. Either way, they're making the choice. They could have gotten the catenation in dot-com and they're choosing not to. I totally agree that doesn't make sense with xyz, but regardless of what TLD you choose, that general statement holds up. And we don't need to do a bunch more analysis to figure out what the difference between the generics and the semantic ones are because the number is essentially 100% for both classes.

BRIAN AITCHISON: I think it's starting to sink in for me, Jordyn, what you're saying.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I think what you're saying is accurate. I just want to make sure that we're taking their point on directly. In some ways, we're just trying to make a cute point.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah. I think it's fine to acknowledge it and be like, "Oh, we did our math wrong." You made a good point. We did our math wrong. It doesn't matter. But, we take your point anyways. Then, we could also say for people that are getting that xyz, you're totally right. Those people would never have registered blah-blah-blahxyz.com. But, those people are actually the ones looking for a direct substitute for dot-com.

JONATHAN ZUCK:	That's right.
JORDYN BUCHANAN:	So, it's true that probably the majority, if we look at the top ten TLDs … It's hard to say. Without doing the analysis that Brian is suggesting which is actually going through TLD by TLD and trying to make the determination, we actually can't say what's driving the bulk of registrations because there's this big longtail of TLDs driving a bunch of registrations and maybe they're mostly the semantic ones. The top [few] are all the generic ones, but that would make sense because the generic ones … If you want to get a dot-photography, only photographers are going to want to get that, whereas anyone can register an xyz. So, it makes sense that xyz has a lot more registrations than dot-photography, but does the sum of 500 specialized TLDs add up to more than xyz? I literally have no clue.
JONATHAN ZUCK:	Yeah.
BRIAN AITCHISON:	Yeah, but it's good to sort of present that puzzle. Oh, here's the numbers we found. We can't quite figure this out. Save it for the next review team or some independent researcher. It's an interesting puzzle. We don't have the explanation.

EN

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, exactly. I don't know. I don't think there's anything more for ICANN to do. I guess the one thing I could possibly do, Brian, do you have any sense of if you wanted to regenerate these spreadsheets just to update the numbers? Would that be …

BRIAN AITCHISON: I think we could do that fairly quickly. I just need to talk to our technical services team who did it, but I'm thinking by next week – probably more like end of next week. I'd have to check with them and see what their workload is.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: If that's easy, I might say just do that. If we're going to touch the numbers again, we might as well get fresh ones.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Especially if we're going to correct our numbers.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, exactly. But, other than that, I don't think there's anything for ICANN to do. Then, Jonathan, I can take a stab at writing. Not until next week. Unfortunately, this week is crazy for me, but I can take a stab at writing some text around this.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. So, you hold the pen on the substitution analysis right now, then?

EN

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I guess so. The sooner you don't want to make any edits between now and next week.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah. I think the primary thing was just kind of rewriting something Brian wrote that felt misleading. But, if you're going to take a shot at that section, then I won't.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah. I can. I guess I would say feel free to make any edits you want between now and Friday or Sunday. Starting [inaudible] I'll take the pen and try to make some edits.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Alright. Sounds good.

BRIAN AITCHISON: And feel free to reject my insertion from that spreadsheet now that we've figured out our math is off. Or, please do. Okay. I'll get in touch with [inaudible] services today and see what they tell me. I'll let you know.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Alright. Sounds good. Thanks, Brian. Alright. We're at time. Any other topics? Otherwise, we'll wrap up.

BRIAN AITCHISON: Nope.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Alright. Thanks, everyone, for joining. This was a productive and enlightening discussion. We'll look for … I don't know if we're going to need a competition call next week because we probably won't have done much, but maybe in two weeks we'll have another one of these. I think maybe there will be a plenary call next week. I'm not sure.

WAUDO SIGANGA: There is a plenary tomorrow?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: No.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Consumer trust tomorrow.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Alright. Thanks, everyone. I will talk to you later.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]