

2017-12-08 Sub Team for Data

The call for the Review of all Rights Protection Mechanisms (RPMs) **Sub Team for Data** is scheduled for **Friday, 08 December at 17:30 UTC** for 60 minute duration.

09:30 PST, 12:30 EST, 17:30 London, 18:30 CET

For other times: <https://tinyurl.com/yb9rb8od>



PROPOSED AGENDA

1. Review agenda/SOIs
2. Discussion of the Word Doc (with bifurcation of data questions and anecdotal questions)
3. Timing of future meetings
4. AOB

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Word Document: [RPMs Data Request Table \(Data & Anecdotal Questions\) - 01 December 2017](#)

Google Document: [RPMs Data Request Table \(Data & Anecdotal Questions\)](#)



RECORDINGS

[Mp3](#)

[AC Recording](#)

[Transcript](#)



PARTICIPATION

[Attendance & AC Chat](#)

Apologies: Susan Payne



Notes/ Action Items

Action Items:

- Staff will prepare a redline revised Google document based on the proposed edits below.
- Staff will send a message to the list asking whether 1730 UTC will work for 15 December and whether to have a call on 22 December.

Proposed Edits, Section 3, Survey of TM & Brand Owners, start on page 14 in the Google doc (https://docs.google.com/document/d/1EUXC03ccuYhRMa_X4hDCPrq88KkF6qBRkL6sCcNutoI/edit?usp=sharing), Charter question #2:

Page 14:

- Data question, fourth bullet, page 14 -- ask "Which ones?"

Page 15:

- Anecdotal question, page 14/Data question, first bullet, page 15: Delete the sub-bullet and merge the question with the first bullet of page 15, as follows: "Did price impact your ability to seek Sunrise Period registration?" and sub-bullet "If so, how did it affect your decision?"
- Data question, second bullet, page 15: Change to "What was the price you paid?" instead of "If you remember the price please indicate what it was."
- Data question, third bullet, page 15: Delete the question and sub-bullet.

Notes:

3. Survey of TM & Brand Owners: Purpose and scope: obtain feedback on Sunrise Charter questions #2, #4, and #5.

Question #2:

-- Revise the anecdotal question to be a single question: "In the gTLDs in which you decided not to seek Sunrise Period registration due to the fact that the price was unfair or premium."

- or -

-- Don't talk about "unfair" or "premium" since that makes it a leading, or not neutral, question.

-- How the brand is responding to a particular component -- good follow up would be, "what did you do afterwards, did you wait until general availability" (depends on the question).

-- The initial question and the follow up should be open ended to be more neutral.

-- Agree with not including "unfair"; could just ask "why?" In some way we might want the survey provider to use its own expertise. Try to find out what you did when you couldn't participate due to cost, premium pricing, etc.

-- These are just guidance for the survey provider -- not the actual survey questions.

-- Swap the columns? May be premature to decide at this point.

-- We may want to note that we had some discussion with respect to the order of the questions and we would ask them to be thoughtful about that.

-- Sub-bullet to the third bullet on page 14 in the last column: "If so how many" add "if not, why?" The follow up question would be more anecdotal. Add an asterisk to the survey provider that we want to get as much empirical information as possible, but also give the opportunity for anecdotal follow-on questions.

-- 4th bullet, page 14 -- asking "Which ones?" might be helpful.

-- Pages 14-15 -- trying to get at the question of whether the high cost/price a factor. Survey provider could gather the questions together.

-- Merge anecdotal question on page 14 with data question, first bullet, page 20. Don't ask though in what gTLDs, but ask how -- take up one level to focus on how, why, and what did you do.

-- First bullet on page 15: Could be "how did price impact your ability to seek Sunrise Period registration?" Might amend to include "if so, how did it affect your decision?"

-- Second bullet, page 15: Change to "What was the price you paid?" instead of "If you remember the price please indicate what it was."

-- Give some kind of option in the design (as a note to the provider) to enable people to choose an option to provide more information. But, a follow up call greatly increases price. Instead, the idea is to build in an entirely separate additional option for respondents to provide specific information if they wish. Not necessarily a full other survey, though. But need to build it into the pricing if feasible.

-- Should allow the option of "I'm not answering the question" and still have the ability to go on.

-- Think of companies that wear all of the hats. As we are starting to think about what the RFP looks like, give some thought up front to off ramps or followup phone surveys. From staff: We are very aware of the cost constraints based on feedback from Lori and our colleagues who have supported the various CCT and TMCH reviews, so we will explore if there are any cost-effective ways of allowing willing respondents to be contacted if they wish to provide more specific details about pricing.

-- Third bullet, page 15: Leery about asking this question -- if we do ask it we should move it to the anecdotal column. Support deleting the question.