
JORDYN BUCHANAN: This will give us a cool sound, we just see a little dot. Alright, looks like the recording has begun, so let's go ahead and start. This is the competition and consumer choice subteam call of the CCT review. April 10th 2018. Thanks everyone for joining. Before we get started, I'll just ask, I guess there's no way for people to be on this without showing up in the Zoom meeting. I guess we have everyone on the call. Then, does anyone have an update to their statement of interest? No. OK. I think, in terms of agenda today, we'll just do a quick review of action items, to see where we are. Then, we also, we have new data from the substitution analysis discussion, the project we were talking about on our last call. Just to look and see what the behavior in terms of buying the dot com versus alternatives look like. So, that's run through that real quick. In terms of action items, Jean-Baptiste, do we have a list of those somewhere that's presentable, or? I think I can do it by memory otherwise.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Sure, I am more than happy to have a quick look at those. Can you hear me?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah. Do you have the list?

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.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yeah, so on the recondition size, based on Kelly's suggestion you had decided [inaudible] registrations. [inaudible] 4.3 of the report and the review team had to review your edits and send question if they be.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Let's pause there really quick. I also have some, Maureen sent me back channel of one more suggestion on recommendation 5. I asked a question to her and I haven't got a response back, but it should be pretty easy to consolidate that, so let's assume that we will have that for discussion next week, a revised recommendation 5. Parking discussion in general.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Sorry Jordyn, when you say next week you mean for subteam call or plenary call?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I would say just take it to the... I don't think there is anything controversial, so it probably can be finalized on a plenary call, assuming there is enough content for a plenary call.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: OK, that's next week then, not tomorrow.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Is there a call tomorrow?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: I didn't receive any confirmation from anyone.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: That's fine. I don't have it on my calendar so I assumed there isn't one. Let's assume next week.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: OK. Then the next on is, the [inaudible] condition 11, 13, 16, and 33. So you had to discuss with [inaudible] consolidated recommendation.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: That is not complete either, but that's harder than I thought it was going to be, but it's in flight. I think we could pine on that in a plenary too.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: OK. Let me just check if there were any other. Apart from the one for the substitution and [inaudible] two attached to you.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I think we also had for Waudo.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: We have for Waudo on recommendation 9 to come up with an updated version based on public comments received and because the two

versions that he shared were the same. The one that was shared before him. We was expecting an update on that. Waudu is on the call.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:

Waudu, I had sent. One of the actions from last time was to find some of the... because Inter just said that we didn't have any justification for saying that some people had claimed defence of registration was going to be a much bigger problem. I had sent Waudu and the list a couple of quotes from before the new gTLD program launched claiming that it was going to cost hundreds of millions, or billions of dollars in defence of registrations. Waudu, I don't know if you got that and it's helpful to incorporate into the recommendation 9.

WAUDO SIGANGA:

Sorry, I didn't get that. Hi. I didn't get what you were saying. Please repeat.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:

On our last call for recommendation 9, I think we discussed making 2 changes.

WAUDO SIGANGA:

Yes, I remember.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: You were going to make changes to include an acknowledgement that defence of registrations were just like not valuable and a dead weight cost.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Yes yes.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I was going to send... we were also going to add something to substantiate the claim that the costs were lower than had been claimed before the program. So I sent out an email last week with some quotes from before the program started with people claiming that it was going to cost hundreds of millions, or two billion dollars, I think in one case on defence of registration costs.

WAUDO SIGANGA: OK. I will have to look at that. I haven't seen what you sent. I have a look out for it. We can use that as the citation or the reference for the statement. I look out for that. Sorry, I don't prepare any version of recommendation 9 for this meeting. I will do that afterwards.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I will forward that to you again Waudo, after the meeting.

WAUDO SIGANGA: If you can, yes. It will make it easier.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Perfect, then do you think we can also plan on reviewing that next week?

WAUDO SIGANGA: Yes, thank you.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Great.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Just for clarification, do you mean the subteam call or plenary call?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Probably a plenary call again. I think all of these are relatively [inaudible]. I hope what we're doing is finalizing all of these on the plenary call since the edits will be cosmetic, basically. OK. I think that's all the... are there any other outstanding action items for the subteam?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: No.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: OK. Great. Then let's jump into our new data set. Brian do you want to introduce what we've received over the last... what I received I think last week and sent out to the list yesterday.

BRIAN AITCHISON: Yeah sure Jordyn. I mean nothing really exciting, they're just updated versions to the most recent date, which I believe will be March 2018 of the [inaudible] spreadsheet. The big shot photography dot com, versus big shot dot photography type [inaudible]. Updated version of that. I haven't had a chance to look at it or compare it with the previous versions, so it's all yours.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Alright, thanks Brian. This is just the exact same methodology as used previously, but more recent data.

BRIAN AITCHISON: Correct, yeah. The exact same.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: OK. We can take a look and see whether this has any impact on the results. Let's look again. Jean-Baptiste can you show us, let me take a look and see which one... I think it's registrations not in com. OK and maybe this is not the right one. Hold on, sorry I am trying to look at the other one real quick. Sorry, we can look at both of these, just to see the recent data. The registrations not in dot com, this shows us to what extent people have registered the exact same string. If I register big shots dot photography, could I have registered big shots dot com instead. Is that right? I think this is right. Then so, Jean-Baptiste can you sort that by the column D? Just to see what the percentages look like. I guess I will do the same on mine. Maybe we should filter by... this is SLD

plus gTLD as available, so this is not the exact match. I was like these seem too high. OK, if we look at like photography is this list. It looks like 59% of the names in photography, if you could have registered big shots photography dot com, even though big shots dot photography was available 59% of the time. The low end of this, something like cars, only 28% of the time could you have registered big shot cars dot com, if you registered big shots dot cars. Actually capital is only 30%. Where is XYZ in this list, 99.984%. This is the one if I sum all of column C divided by all of column P. Sorry this is boring everyone, just a second, we can see if this tells us anything different than before. OK, so overall 91.3%, if we sum up all of C and divide it by all of P it is 91.2% which is remarkably close to the 92% that we had last time. That hasn't really changed. Then, it may be worth looking, then per our discussion last time though, we may want to point there's a pretty high variance across terms that make sense. XYZ is nonsense, no one would ever pen that to a normal string that shows up. I don't think there's a lot new here, but based on this conversation I think we could just refresh the data and add some discussion to the substitution analysis paper. I think Jonathan, I think that must be what I said I was going to do last time, we'll just add some discussion to this to the substitutional analysis, or to the other spot. Jonathan, what is your question on chat, I don't quite understand.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Sorry, it wasn't a question I was just commenting. I think the brands are like XYZ probably.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Oh, yeah probably. It depends, you can imagine like car names, Acura, you could have like whatever.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I love my Acura dot com.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: [inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's true.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: It's probably a lot of the brands will have the same thing. Although like for example, I saw SNCF which I see here at the top of the list, is they're using very heavily in their marketing campaigns, like oui dot SNCF, which is exciting to see, but that would be a totally valid oui dot SNCF dot FR seems like a totally reasonable domain name. I don't know it is variable. You probably want to exclude the brands Brian, sorry that's a good question. Would it be hard to overlay this with which of these have spec 13 or whatever it is for brands.

BRIAN AITCHISON: Jordyn, it shouldn't be too hard I think, what we could probably do is what we did for the DNS abuse study and just filter out the open TLDs. There's always a differentiation there, so we could work that out.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: If we could do that, that would be a helpful pass. Then we would be comparing things where people are actually making more normal choices.

BRIAN AITCHISON: I'll work on that, it shouldn't take too long to get that. Either this week, or early next week.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: OK, great. Thanks, that's a helpful suggestion Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I guess the bottom line is that it probably is not that changed.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: It looks like the total numbers haven't changed. It's worth pointing out that there are some nonsense ones versus not and then we can say... It's true in some of the ones.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Even at 50% that feels like a significant number. They do make sense, we don't need the 90%.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: That's right. Like in the dot photography case, right, like more than half of the people chose something that would totally make sense in dot com.

JONATHAN ZUCK: With the period it is longer. Not by much but it is still.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah. I think it's worth refreshing this. OK. Any other thoughts or suggestions about this data set? No, OK. We will take a look at this, add some language, wait for the revision from Brian. I will work on some language in the meantime and make some general points we can plug in numbers. Thanks for giving us a little data project again Brian. Alright, then I think that takes us to the end of our agenda, unless anyone else has any other items. Sounds like we will see each other again on a plenary call next week.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Jordyn? Do you want to include the substitution analysis paper as well on the plenary call? Or you want discuss that again on the subteam call next week?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Ask me again on Friday. I don't think we want a subteam call next week, but depending upon how final the... if Brian gets data this week then we will probably have time to finalize the substitution analysis and bring it to the plenary call, otherwise we might just want to wait a week.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: OK, thank you.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Alright. I think that's it. Thanks everyone for joining and we'll talk again on the plenary next week.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Thank you Jordyn, and if I can just remind attendees today if you can answer the short call in email that was sent before this meeting, that will be great. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]