
HYDERABAD – gTLD Marketplace Health Index Advisory Panel Working Session
Tuesday, November 08, 2016 – 09:00 to 10:30 IST
ICANN57 | Hyderabad, India

AMY BIVINS: ICANN 57, November 8, 2016, 9:00 a.m. to 10:30 a.m. Hall 6, gTLD Marketplace Health Index Advisory Panel Open Session.

MUKESH CHULANI: Good morning, everyone. Welcome to a packed house. We'll get going shortly. This is our first working meeting with the Advisory Panel covering the gTLD Marketplace Health Index. My name is Mukesh Chulani. I am Registrar Services Senior Manager at ICANN, and joining me is Amy Bivins who is also working on this project.

So without further ado, I'd like to cover our agenda for the session. Could you advance the slide, Amy?

We plan to cover six things as part of today's working session. Briefly just welcoming everybody and maybe introduce the members of the Advisory Panel. I'm new to the ICANN community so I've seen your names on the chats and your comments but I haven't really matched the name to a face for

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.

many of you, so that would be nice to just go around the Advisory Panel and introduce ourselves.

We'll go briefly through our planned meeting calendar – how we're going to tackle this. Then go through to discussion items we had planned. So first one, as we mentioned during the last call on 26 October, we were going to discuss the inclusion or exclusion of ccTLD data. We had a wonderful session yesterday that already gave us some inputs on thinking in that respect, and we'd like to continue that today.

And then our second item is to actually look at the draft definition for categories that we've put together for robust competition, stable, and trusted, and then just go through it and rip it apart.

Then the next step will be to discuss what we do subsequently, and then we'll take questions and comments for go forward.

Sounds okay?

I guess, Rubens, I know you from a previous session. I guess, would you mind kicking off and just introducing to the rest of the panel?

RUBENS KUHL:

Rubens Kuhl, NIC.br.

GABE FRIED: Gabe Fried, Hilco Streambank.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Jonathan Zuck from ACT | The App Association and the CCT Review.

JIM PRENDERGAST: And metrics man as well. My name is Jim Prendergast with The Galway Strategy Group.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Olivier Crepin-Leblond, European At-Large Organization.

MASON COLE: Mason Cole with Donuts.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Steve DelBianco with NetChoice and the Business Constituency.

MUKESH CHULANI: Thank you, gentlemen. I know you all know each other, but thank you for your patience. I've listed your names now.

The first thing I wanted to cover was where we are in terms of the proposed timeline. We presented this timeline in our last session, and we're in the phase of discussing our overall goals and scope. We're essentially trying to go back and see whether the scope of this project should include ccTLD data as well as take a look at the draft category metrics which we've used to release the beta, whether we should rip that apart and to what extent we should rip that apart.

We did decide during the last session – I don't think there was a firm decision – but I think there were a lot of people that indicated preference to have monthly calls. If there aren't any objections to that, we would then plan for our next session on the first week of December. Again, if there are no objections to that.

If there isn't, I can send a Doodle poll after ICANN57 to just ascertain your timing. Is there any feedback on the timing?

Okay. I guess we'll proceed. And if schedule changes, whatever, we can adjust that. Okay.

So you've seen this slide, prior. This was our kick-off point from the last Advisory Panel session. The goal which is boxed in there is kind of locked in. That goal is the goal. It's to “support the evolution of the domain name marketplace to be robust, stable,

and trusted.” So that one we can’t touch, but everything underneath that we can.

Our plan was – of course, Steve –

STEVE DELBIANCO: I’m not suggesting we do touch it, but what do you use in your mind as the process of stuff that’s untouchable with respect to a top-down?

MUKESH CHULANI: That’s the only thing we can’t touch.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Because this is what management said it would be?

MUKESH CHULANI: Because that’s tied to ICANN’s strategic goals until 2020.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Got it.

MUKESH CHULANI: So if we touch that, I don’t know what the process is.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Okay. I didn't mean to put you on the spot. But that's the only thing you say is untouchable.

MUKESH CHULANI: Yes.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you.

MUKESH CHULANI: That's the only thing that's untouchable.

Gabe?

GABE FRIED: I just want to clarify it. So the goal refers to the domain name marketplace, but the overall header is gTLD and possibly now also ccTLD. They're not unrelated, obviously, but the TLD marketplace is a marketplace in and of it – it's an entirely separate economic marketplace versus the marketplace for domains. So I want to make sure that if I'm going to be helpful – maybe I won't but, and maybe the answer to this question won't impact whether or not I can be helpful here – but I want to make sure I understand what the goal really is.

MUKESH CHULANI: Thank you for that question. The first iteration of the beta report was limited to gTLD data, partly because that was the data we had within our four walls. Subsequent to that, when we released the report to the public, we got a lot of feedback that perhaps limiting it to gTLD might not be the best situation and that we ought to consider an expansion of the scope. So that's what we're opening here – to what extent we expand the scope. Do we keep it at gTLD or do we not?

STEVE DELBIANCO: You said earlier in the introduction that you thought yesterday's session was a wonderful session. I thought what was wonderful about yesterday's session is that it was unanimous support that ccs have to be included because when a registrant or a user is deciding to choose what to register or to visit, ccs are in that population.

MUKESH CHULANI: That's noted, yeah. Thank you, Steve.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Got it. And the other is the word "index." That's one of the reasons I asked you about it being untouchable, is the word "index" is in that goal. And another wonderful thing about yesterday's meeting was universal agreement that we're not

even building an index. We're building a repository of individual metrics – Cyrus called them bricks; that's fine by me – and we'll have a lot of discussion on how many more bricks need to be on that wall. But in no case will there ever be a single composite index.

MUKESH CHULANI: Correct.

STEVE DELBIANCO: So is it okay to ignore the word “index” without changing it? I don't think you're making a change when you say “domain name marketplace.” Gabe's exactly right. We really did have significant support to say that that includes cs. But can we just ignore the word “index”?

MUKESH CHULANI: If you wish to ignore it for now, you could ignore it for yourself for now until the Panel decides to strike it out. I note what you mentioned. There was a lot of feedback yesterday on that. I've actually put that into #4 – “Others.”

I think of course it's not just semantics. It determines the framework we use, whether we call this an index or not. I take your point there.

STEVE DELBIANCO: It changes the expectation.

MUKESH CHULANI: Yes. [Inaudible].

STEVE DELBIANCO: If you end up telling us that it's okay to ignore – since we can't change the words. Management came down with them – if we can ignore the words, let's just get it on the record – if we can ignore the word index it means we're not going to do an index and we can all relax on that.

The question that Jay Daley brought up yesterday is, can we also ignore the word “health”? Do you remember that discussion yesterday? I'm not even sure where we ended up on that.

MUKESH CHULANI: Thank you, Steve. I don't have any firm direction now on what we can or cannot do. I think this is the place where we discuss what we wish to do, and then we can discuss that internally and with the Advisory Panel. We are using your brain trust to help us move forward. We're not going to make random decisions. This is the place for such discussion. And then once we have firm

indication on what is the way to proceed, we would take that accordingly.

But I can't make an arbitrary decision at this point.

Yes, please.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

I guess it's one of those things where everybody might end up saying the same thing. But I think we definitely need to include ccTLDs in the analysis to look at the domain name marketplace and probably need to include it in two different ways. One is the growing number of ccTLDs behaving and marketed like gTLDs – the .tv type of example, .co and things like that. And then also I think that to really understand the domain name market, you need to have some regional analysis of ccTLDs that are dominant in their markets.

Like the recent Latin America report that just came out is really intriguing because there are certain areas where the ccTLDs are really strong and represent registrations comparable with those in the gTLD space, and there are other countries where they're not.

Brazil and Colombia are strong and Peru and other places are not, and I think we're going to find instances like that around the

world. It's definitely in Germany and in the UK, it's a complete substitute for the gTLDs – the country code domains.

There's restricteds, unrestricteds, and then the ones that are – in fact, Jordyn has that Google's got a list of the one that their search engine treats as though they're generics that's kind of interesting. So I think we need to include all that.

MUKESH CHULANI:

Thank you, Jonathan. We have Rubens on queue.

RUBENS KUHL:

Thank you. Although what you say is kind of like obvious, I'd like to still point out that we should only include ccTLD data where relevant, applicable, and available. Because ICANN can't compel ccTLD registries to offer any data they don't want to refer to ICANN. Some business models in ccTLD are different from the gTLDs like monolithic ccTLDs where the registry operator sells directly and not through registrars. We have some metrics that are about registrars which are not applicable. Would like us to at least consider these three words: relevant, applicable, and available. It's kind of obvious, but I still think we should not forget.

I'd just like to include a comment that end up not being read I think in the previous session, is that we have lots of ccTLD data

from the regional TLD organizations of ccTLDs like CENTR in Europe, AFTLD, APTLD, and LACTLD. The only two ccTLDs not covered by these organizations are the ones from North America because there is no North America Regional ccTLD Organization. But besides .us and .ca, everything else you can get from those regional organizations.

MUKESH CHULANI: Thank you, Rubens. We also have – is Olivier still in queue? Olivier?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much. I totally agree with what Rubens has just said. When you mentioned should we include the ccTLD, I thought, “Well, perhaps they’re entirely different markets than the gTLDs,” but then of course each gTLD has also its own market. It’s just I guess the whole thing is not exact science, what we’re going to do.

So I would say that there would probably be some data that would be unavailable for some ccTLDs but if you look at the actual magnitude, the number of registrations under these, I guess we can’t really treat the ccTLD with 5,000 registrations in the same way as we can treat one with 5 million registrations, but the data for the 5 million registrations is probably more

likely to be available because of its very profile. So I'm all for having ccTLDs included as well.

MUKESH CHULANI:

Olivier and Rubens make a very interesting point, and actually what we've teed up initially thinking as a precursor to our discussion – but it turns out it's not a precursor – is we've got two gentlemen on remote dialing in. On one end we have Andy Simpson from Verisign who, if you recall from our last call was going to talk about the yea side – the inclusion of cc – and then on the other end we have Ivan Rasskazov who's CFO and Director for Bus Dev from Intelium who was going to talk about the nay side – why we should not.

Before we tee up those two sides, I think we have a couple more people on queue. We have Jim and then we will have Gabe after.

JIM PRENDERGAST:

Sure. One other thing I think I don't know if it fits in here or not. I'll throw it out there and maybe we can park it and then decide. In talking about the ccTLDs competing with generics from a marketing and sales of domains, there's another whole end where they are competing with generics in the sense on the backend registry services provider market. We just saw that .ca I believe is now the backend for a generic in the 2012 new gTLD

round. There were several applicants that used ccTLD providers as their backend for their generic applications as well.

I don't know if it fits neatly in here or if it doesn't, but I want to raise it and have you guys park it and then we can discuss it and other folks can weigh in on that as well.

MUKESH CHULANI: Thank you, Jim. Gabe.

GABE FRIED: I want to back up to the prior comment I think Steve made. With respect to the word "index," it would be very helpful I think in the context of yesterday's discussion about bricks if we just think of them as indices – that there may be a whole bunch of indices – how much competition in a particular category, what is the financial health of the participants, etc. etc. And put those bricks out there if somebody wants to, obviously, create their own roll-up metric out of that they can.

That's the first comment. The second is that I certainly support the inclusion of all of the TLDs – the ccTLDs, etc. I think what I'm hearing from the other participants here is, when one goes and looks at health indices and performance metrics of those marketplaces, one just needs to be aware of the fact that some of these are open to registration to anybody. Others are more

restrictive in terms of who they'll allow to register. And others have some hybrid approach.

I think it's important – and I'd like to also as a concept to put in the parking lot – it's important to understand what the Registry Agreements look like with respect to who can acquire a domain on a particular registry because I think that that's where you find the difference and the distinction among TLDs to be most important from a marketplace participant's perspective. So when I go to register a domain as a registrant, I am beholden to those agreements which vary by TLD. As a consumer that is how I make my decision in the marketplace, and that's not a trivial concept. So I'd like to make sure that we have comparison of Registry Agreements in as one of the indices generally.

I think that is all I had to say. Thanks.

MUKESH CHULANI: Thank you, Gabe. Shall we switch to – you have it on. Andy, are you on the line?

ANDY SIMPSON: Yes, I'm on the line.

MUKESH CHULANI: Wonderful. We'll turn it over to Andy Simpson who's Principle Data Scientist at Verisign for his view on this.

ANDY SIMPSON: Great. Thanks, Mukesh and everybody who's in attendance today. Sorry I wasn't able to make the event, but I wanted to pick up on the challenge that Mukesh left us at the end of the last Advisory Panel call. He asked if anyone felt as though there were significant data sources that we could consider when we want to evaluate the ccTLD market, that we go ahead and bring that forward for evaluation when we consider discussing it.

This is as much about the data that's available to characterize the marketplace as it is about whether or not it should be included. Mostly trying to do a survey to make sure that we're all on the same page in terms of where we can start. I think that there's a lot of analysis that's been done by others, and I want to acknowledge especially the work that's done by CENTR and the LACTLD groups as well. The recent report that I know Jonathan was just mentioning coming out of the Latin America region characterizing their DNS usage, all of this did a tremendous job to set a baseline framework for the way that the ccTLDs are playing in the market today.

I wanted to build on that for the purpose of this Health Index and characterize the type of data that's out there. And so

starting from what we have in the CENTR and Verisign reports, we did analysis as to which TLDs are publicly disclosing data. And looking at just the largest ccTLDs, we found that if you consider the baseline of that market being 138 million, which is what CENTR reported at the end of Q3 2016, 77% of those names – that 138 million – is discoverable through at least biannual public reporting. And I'll give examples of that here in a few minutes as well.

I also wanted to dig a little bit into some of the ways that different markets in particular regions and countries are going to bias both the gTLDs and ccTLDs and put some fact and figures and numbers behind that as well.

That's just the overview in terms of what I was going to walk through really quickly. We can go ahead and advance to the next slide.

These are mostly just exemplary slides here that show the quarterly reports that are coming out of both Verisign and CENTR on a quarterly basis. This first one here is actually the CENTR report on slide #4. I don't know if it's advanced in the room?

Sorry. There we go. Next slide. There we go. Great. Thank you.

This is the CENTR report. You can see that they're characterizing the entire domain marketplace here with the 325 million domains down on the bottom right. They're breaking out the ccTLDs and specifically the IDN ccTLD market as well which has been an area of expansion while there have been natural language ccTLD equivalents being added to the root., the legacy gTLDs and the new gTLDs. They break out those four components of the marketplace and assign the overall growth rate and total size of each of those spaces.

The Verisign report on the next slide is simply enumerating the top 10 while also calling out the total base size. The total number here is 149 million at the end of Q2, and we can move on to the next slide from here as well.

To get into the backend in terms of what's actually behind where these data sources come from, I actually went to see where can we get more granular information. And this is what we have on the following slide which talks about data sources for ccTLDs.

This is an alphabetical list over the next three slides which call out different TLDs that represent, I believe we caught this at just around 1.25 million domains, and said the disclosure frequency with which they come out. On slide #7, we've got .at is going through a monthly disclosures versus .ca which has two

different types of disclosures. They do a daily overall zone size, whereas they do an annual report which digs into much more detail about the growth of their base.

I think the surprising thing even for me as I went about collecting this list – which took about a half a day to put together – was the granularity with which a lot of these registries are now reporting. I think a lot of that speaks to the way that many of the ccTLDs are governed as something that is ultimately a part of a government organization where it's being run on behalf of these governments and they're obligated to provide statistics back about usage and the way that their constituents are benefiting from what is effectively in many situations a public service that these ccTLDs are made available to the markets that they serve.

We can scroll through the rest of these. I think the links are there for anybody else who wants to consider doing aggregation on this. I can say that I stopped at this point generating the list, but there's 47 TLDs there and if we go on to slide #10. Going deeper over the last couple days as I've had additional time, I'm well over 60 TLDs that are doing public disclosure. But even at this 47 number, 21 of those – and that's a significant number – are actually disclosing statistics on a daily basis. In some situations that's just a base size – the total base size – but in many others they go far beyond that to say how many gross adds did they

experience today? How many deletes are they experiencing right now?

In some of them – for example, .fr, .nu, .se, just as a couple of examples – they’re disclosing their entire base. They’re making that something that is available to be accessed by the general public. Just the same as the gTLD zone would be for the purpose of research, whether that be for security or other research based activities, the data is publicly available for anyone to look at.

Others like .nz, and .de, are providing not just data but actually portals to go in and query different aspects of the data sets that they’ve amassed about the usage, about the growth, and the utilization across different regions within their own base.

I think that the sheer magnitude of data that’s actually available on the ccTLD space is actually quite large. I wanted to make sure that we’re all at least aware that it’s out there. I know that it’s not necessarily consistent from one zone to the next, but at the same time still there is a lot of data similar to what we’re trying to pull into the domain marketplace Health Index right now that we can easily get for the cc Space.

I will say that there are additional TLDs, either through I didn’t get down to the bottom of the list or other mechanisms that we could be used. At ICANN56 there was a paper disclosing additional methodologies which could be used to discover zone

sizes based off the [ANSAC] Protocol that they're using for signing.

Just moving on quickly here as I try to just cover the highlights on to slide #12. I wanted to call special attention to some of the research that CENTR had done in their report because I think that they've done a lot of work to look at the way that their individual marketplaces experience and utilize the national ccTLD for the country that they are based in versus other options.

They've found that across the European market that they studied, that on average the national ccTLD was in 51% of their registrants bases. I think that that's an interesting number because it is 51% – that's about half – but even in markets where we traditionally think that the ccTLDs have significant share, there are a lot of additional TLDs playing in those markets, whether it be a foreign ccTLD – which represents close to 9% of the market – or whether you're looking at the legacy gTLDs or the new gTLDs making up close to 40% of that market as well.

I can say that analyzing these reports that CENTR has disclosed on a quarterly basis, we see that these trends are actually fairly consistent.

I'm going to go on to the next slide here which is a visualization that we created or I put together. This is yet another aggregation

of public data. Many of you – and I’ve seen it referenced in other reports as well – note that Alexa publishes the top 500 domains by country. Through the various data collection methodologies that they use, they’re looking at traffic coming out of specific countries and they are publishing the top domains in use. Through actually pulling that down and characterizing the top 100 of those by market, we can say what percentage of the top 100 are in use or are in [the] national ccTLD. I think the most important thing that I wanted to draw from this is really to illustrate the diversity of ways that individual countries are engaging with their ccTLDs.

I think others have certainly talked about the fact that in some countries they prefer their ccTLD. You can see on the left here Greece has 64% of their top 100 domains being .gr domain names all the way to on the right hand side here which is – you can’t see it because I couldn’t squeeze all the labels on there – but .us – none of the top 100 domain names in the United States is a .us domain name.

For those of us who are familiar with that market, that’s not surprising. But just seeing that every country has their own mix and bias in terms of what their end users experience and expect when they engage with the domain marketplace, it’s not consistent from one country to the next.

When we go on to the summary here at least of the market distinctiveness, there are a couple things I want to call attention to. One is definitely the disproportional relevance that gTLDs and ccTLDs have in individual markets. From my perspective, that's a rationale that they both have to be included in any marketplace assessment. I want to be clear that if you end up excluding them, you're going to disproportionately impact your analysis of the markets where they may be more relevant than the markets where they aren't as relevant. In order to be more fair, it works better to include the entire domain marketplace regardless of the regulatory distinction that we assign to them whether they be generic or ccTLD.

I think others have referenced this data here at the bottom as well, which Google has enumerated the TLDs that they're currently exempting from geotargeting. Google in many situations actually prefers a local ccTLD to help end users find local content. They've enumerated that these TLDs listed out here – .ad, .as., bz, .cc, .cd, .co – all of these are TLDs where they found that the use is more generic than localized in nature, so they exempt them from automatic local prioritization. And the reference there for anybody who's curious about it is included as well.

That's pretty much what we were trying to walk through today. Just to drive home the point that the ccTLDs are – and [I'm] on

the final slide, on slide #16 here – ccTLDs really are a significant component of the domain name marketplace, and as a result of that they really should be included in the Health Assessment of the domain marketplace. End users experience basically them almost in a seamless environment in many situations. Whether the data is challenging to get or not, we still need to consider including them so that we’re fairly characterizing each of the markets that we’re trying to profile.

MUKESH CHULANI: Thank you, Andy.

ANDY SIMPSON: Thank you for the time.

MUKESH CHULANI: We had Olivier. You had raised your hand.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Thanks very much. Actually, what Andy was saying in the second part of his presentation is what I wanted to point out. I’m entirely aligned with what was just said now.

MUKESH CHULANI: Okay. Great. We have the contrary perspective now. We'll call Ivan Rasskazov to provide input into his viewpoints.

Ivan, you're on the line.

IVAN RASSKAZOV: Can everyone hear me?

MUKESH CHULANI: You're on, Ivan.

IVAN RASSKAZOV: Excellent. I did want to make one thing clear. When I say I'm against including ccTLDs, I don't mean to say that I would not wish to see them, but as somebody pointed out, it is important for this data to be both relevant and reliable. One area of concern for us is that ICANN can definitely regulate and has a lot of mandate over gTLDs but not ccTLDs. The ccTLDs can exclude certain data, they can decide what they can provide, what they may not provide, and we see that a lot in WHOIS information, the ability to [pick] how domains are registered.

I think [this is a] very important aspect because some TLDs could be dominated by a very concentrated [number of] registrars [and registrants [inaudible] the TLD itself [inaudible] and it may not be information you can get very easily from the ccTLD.

MUKESH CHULANI: Ivan, sorry – could you speak closer to your phone speaker? We’re losing every other word or every third word.

IVAN RASSKAZOV: Is this clearer?

MUKESH CHULANI: Yes. Better.

IVAN RASSKAZOV: As I was saying, it is very important for ccTLDs who do not always have a very consistent source of data and some of this data is very relevant to determining the health of the TLD. Some ccTLDs have very specific mandates. They may enforce geographical registration requirements, they may prohibit domain sales, and that also [feeds] in terms of how the TLDs develop, how it’s used.

[That] comes up if we do choose to exclude some ccTLDs but include others, there is a chance you could be hurting some of the ccTLDs that are excluded.

My understanding of the index and how it came to be, it’s important to really focus those market barometers on this health of the domain marketplace. Our concern is that if we

make it very complex and reliant on some of the data that's difficult to get, it may lose some of its effectiveness. And [as you may know] some ccTLDs mention they compete with [gTLDs]. But we have to factor out part of the registration that's driven by the country code versus [inaudible] TLDs.

My proposition would simply be to move a little bit slower [inaudible] can [inaudible] get and verify, and then add over time to make sure that the index is [inaudible].

MUKESH CHULANI: Thank you, Ivan.

Jonathan?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks. I guess I have a number of different questions, and one of these comes back to Steve's initial intervention which is one of the other words that's floating around here is "health." Figuring out what we mean by that I think will help inform us as to what needs to be included and not included.

I think it's without question that the ccTLDs are part of the domain name marketplace. So when we're trying to figure out what health means, is it the number of providers? This is what

some of the complexity is if we're going to try to classify that, and that's what starts to make it sound like an index again.

The point is, we want to be well informed about the domain name marketplace, and so any sort of data analysis tools that are in front of us will allow us to selectively include or exclude things. I know that in the CCT we are making decisions to run calculations on different permutations of market definitions. So I think where there's data available, we need to be collecting it.

I think ICANN, we're suffering from the other problem. The point at which ICANN has too much data for the community to use – we'll say “uncle” but we're not quite there yet. I think collecting the data that's relevant makes the most sense.

The other issue is that I realize that ccTLDs aren't all created equal, but that presupposes that gTLDs are some kind of a homogeneous group as well and they all have completely different registration requirements and things like that. So I think you can't preclude them just because they're not all the same because all TLDs have unique characteristics and it may be that we'll need to come up with a set of characteristics, tag them so the data analysis is easier based on those characteristics. Whether they have restricted registrations or not, etc. will apply both in gTLDs and ccTLDs.

I think more is more when it comes to what is essentially a data collection exercise if I understood where we ended up yesterday.

MUKESH CHULANI: Thank you, Jonathan.

Rubens?

RUBENS KUHL: Just to support what Jonathan just said and give some examples. We have gTLDs that are restricted by geography, like .nyc and .rio. We have gTLDs that are restricted by vertical like .bank. We have gTLDs that are restricted by posture like .tickets. So we have restricted gTLDs all over.

The fact that some ccTLDs are restricted is just a fact of life. Some TLDs are restricted. Some TLDs are unrestricted. That's how it is.

MUKESH CHULANI: Thank you. Gabe, do you mind if we take Jordyn first? Go ahead, please.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Thanks. Jordyn Buchanan with Google. As Jonathan and Rubens have expressed, I think this discussion is quite obvious. The

distinction between gTLDs and ccTLDs is largely a construct that ICANN cares about and no one else does. There's a contractual difference, but consumers certainly don't care. That's quite clear from the data that has been presented here is that often consumers prefer ccTLDs to gTLDs and this varies quite a bit from market to market.

Obviously, the contractual difference means that sometimes it's going to be harder to collect data on ccTLDs and sometimes we're going to have imperfect data on ccTLDs. That's also true for gTLDs. One thing we've learned through the ccTLD process is that very often we wish that we had slightly different data than we actually are able to get our hands on, but that doesn't mean we stop trying just because we can't get it perfect.

So I think certainly to the extent that we understand that consumers view ccTLDs as substitutes to gTLDs on a regular basis, they have to be considered as part of the same market at least in many cases.

One of the challenges we've had in the CCT as well is to decide what the definition of "market" is and we basically decided there's not one size fits all. It's going to depend quite a bit on context, and that will be the case here as well. Without the data you can't even have those conversations.

As Jonathan said, more is more. We have to get our hands on this wherever we can. Obviously, maybe we don't need to put disproportionate effort into collecting the data for ccTLDs as a first pass. We would want to do some sort of cost-benefit analysis to each piece of data that we might gather. But we certainly wouldn't want to start as a beginning principle that we just don't want that data because these people happen not to have the same sorts of contracts with ICANN as the gTLDs do.

MUKESH CHULANI: Thank you.

Gabe?

GABE FRIED: I think there's a consensus building here that the customer, the end registrant, views these all pretty much the same way that you would view seats on an airplane. There are some that are worth paying a lot of money for and having some exclusivity, there are some where you feel like it's generic and substitutable, but at the end of the day you get one and obviously some customers get more than one. If it's not too much of a diversion, I think it's important actually to include .brand here for the simple reason that if I'm a large corporation making an investment in my Internet presence by acquiring my .brand

around which I'm going to stake my territory on the Internet, that is a customer in the marketplace for domains who's exercising yet an additional preference.

It may not be meaningful in terms of the total volume, but I don't think we should ignore it. I do agree that there's a lot of data available out there already. I think the consensus that's building here is, make sure that you are making apples to apples comparisons when you are trying to create these health indicators.

Among, for example, TLDs that have a high application barrier, whether that's geography or vertical or something. What are the relevant health metrics versus the ones with a low application barrier?

MUKESH CHULANI: Thank you, Gabe.

Jim, you've been on the queue for a while.

JIM PRENDERGAST: Sure. Thanks. I appreciate and understand the concerns about the lack of data coming from ccTLDs and, as Jordyn pointed out, even not having the data that you want from gTLDs. I think that's important but that's important if we decided that this is

“an index” as opposed to a repository. If it’s an index, it has the ICANN seal of approval on it. And if we are missing data, then that creates problems. And I don’t think this question has been settled yet. I think Steve touched on it earlier.

If it is just a repository where others are able to come and take the data and do their own reports and analysis and make their assessments, and this group and ICANN is choosing not to make an assessment, then I think the lack of data is just a fact and those who are doing the analysis, probably there’s some responsibility on them to indicate that maybe it’s not a full set of data.

MUKESH CHULANI:

Thank you, Jim.

A question on the floor.

KATHY KLEIMAN:

A comment, if that’s okay. Kathy Kleiman, Non-Commercial. I hate to disagree with Gabe. I always do. And I apologize. I came into this meeting late. But as a representative of registrants in the Non-Commercial community – just one representative, but – I don’t think there is a consensus that gTLDs are interchangeable with ccTLDs. I think ccTLDs are very different from gTLDs, and as

a registrant I know I have very different legal rights in ccTLDs versus gTLDs.

I would suggest that we need some data before we come to that conclusion, and I support the gathering of data across gTLDs and ccTLDs. But before we decide that they're completely interchangeable, I would suggest we might need some more data. Thank you.

MUKESH CHULANI:

Thank you.

Gabe?

GABE FRIED:

I'll take the bait. You may have missed this earlier. One of the comments that I made in the opening part of this meeting was that – and it reflected on a conversation that I had had with you the other day – that the contracts are different and the agreements are different, and if you want to look at the universe of attributes that go into a domain, there are these categories.

There are high barriers to entry like some of the verticals like .bank and .pharmacy. There's low barriers to entry like .com but obviously less availability. And then you have also what are the various registrant rights and contractual agreements that one

has to get into. And there may be ways of categorizing them in more general buckets.

They're not all alike but maybe this is an exercise I think for us to undertake, which is to say what are the five or six or three or eight or whatever it is, various types of registrant agreements that one finds when one is out in the marketplace trying to acquire a domain name, and then which TLDs fall into which of those buckets, and then how do we measure for example the health of those by agreement type? Which is I think what you're indicating.

I think the consensus here is get all the data you can get, and then we'll figure out over time how it is that we want to analyze it to understand whether or not the overall marketplace is behaving in a more or less healthy way.

KATHY KLEIMAN:

Again with apologies since I haven't been following this discussion closely, but I will from here on in. Until a few years ago, ccTLDs and gTLDs were pretty different. Now we're beginning to see the impact of the new gTLDs, but we're just beginning to see them. Again, before we draw any conclusions on this, I don't know what the implication would be that gTLDs and ccTLDs are interchangeable, but I just wouldn't want to see

that conclusion coming out before – let’s do what we need to do to gather the data without drawing the conclusions yet.

[MASON COLE]: Kathy, real quick. One example that popped into my head on this that you may want to think about is a registrant living in Germany. You know that .de has been dominant for a long time, but if I’m a Berliner now I have the opportunity to register a .berlin or a .koln.

KATHY KLEIMAN: And trust me, your rights under those two are very different. They are.

[MASON COLE]: Yeah, right’s different, but choice and opportunity are right there.

KATHY KLEIMAN: And we have yet to see what the impact is of the fact that .de religiously protects the privacy say of its registrants, and .berlin doesn’t.

[MASON COLE]: Right.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I don't know where the queue is. Again, I feel like we're all in violent agreement that we need to collect the data. We don't need to make some final decision that in every case they're substitutes. It's more that in many cases, users consider them substitutes in terms of their usability, and probably in many cases they're unaware of the differences in the rights that they have in them.

One of the things we're looking at in the CCT Review is actually trying to look at differences in policies between new gTLDs and legacy TLDs, etc. So that's another way to code them and another way to look at types of non-price competition that might exist between them, but that just becomes another form of competition. And there isn't a uniformity of rights among ccTLDs just as there isn't a uniformity of rights among gTLDs. So it's not like you could code one, one way or one, the other. It's going to be a mix.

Again, I think we're all sort of saying the same thing, which is collect the data and then we'll run different permutations on it along the way. So it's not about ICANN concluding anything.

MUKESH CHULANI: We'll have Olivier. Olivier's waiting on the queue, so we'll have Olivier get in [on it first].

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, thank you. Kathy, did I hear you say that registrants know the difference between a ccTLD and a gTLD?

KATHY KLEIMAN: Are there any ccTLDs in the room to speak for how well the registrants actually do understand the services that they're providing?

I know registrants who are violently supportive of their country codes. So yeah, they do know the difference.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, well because the data we have from our At-Large Structures, and you wouldn't believe the number of times we receive questions from our At-Large Structures where they have registrants at a national level – so under ccTLDs – where they find the pricing is wrong or they had some kind of a problem and they ask us to say, "Oh, but why isn't ICANN doing about this?" They have no idea of the difference between a ccTLD and a gTLD, and specifically when it comes down to their rights. They

have no idea either. You mentioned the case of .de having better privacy than some of the generics, and it's one of these things that only a small subset of registrants will know about, but the majority won't.

KATHY KLEIMAN: I'd love to hear a ccTLD confirm that or the ccNSO. But that's good data. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Why does this distinction matter? I understand why it might matter to a registrant, but that's just a form of non-price competition from the standpoint of the user. It doesn't mean they aren't competing with each other in the market. It just means it's another form of competition between them. But it means they're still in the same market.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Jonathan, you've studied this a lot more closely than I have, obviously, and you're working on it extensively. I'm just saying that if I'm hearing a conclusion from this group that there's a consensus that gTLDs and ccTLDs are interchangeable, I object. It just doesn't make sense to me. Intuitively, it does not make sense because I've watched the difference. I'd love to see the ccTLDs in the room. I don't think they'd confirm what you just

said. I don't know, but whenever we draw the term and call something consensus it tends to have secondary uses in policy making.

I like the idea. Let's gather the data and then see what it tells us. I don't think [inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK: Alright so maybe we don't need to have – the implications for this exercise is whether or not they're part of the same market.

KATHY KLEIMAN: They are part of the same market.

JONATHAN ZUCK: And they are. And I think that's all that we're really trying to determine. So I think you're reading too much into interchangeability. When we talk about they're functional substitutes, it means that the user has an option of going one or the other and that there's a number of different reasons they might choose one or the other. That's the interchangeability, not that everybody's policies are identical.

KATHY KLEIMAN: And that they're not completely interchangeable.

Anyway, I'll keep listening. Thank you.

MUKESH CHULANI: Rubens, you're on the queue.

RUBENS KUHL: One of the ccTLDs in the room. What we usually see, at least in Brazil, is that users think of .br domains as the ones they know. They are from Brazil or have some kind of local presence, and the other domains are the other domains that can come from anywhere. They usually don't know that they have different rights and different [ease] of use in these domains, but they intuitively know that there is something that they might have recourse if something goes wrong. That's something we usually see with local users.

MUKESH CHULANI: Gabe?

GABE FRIED: I want to make a very simple analogy. The marketplace is no different than a marketplace for breakfast foods. If you define the market as "What is it that I'm going to eat at this particular first meal of the day?" it's the entire universe of foods. If you want to start looking at price, temperature, some measure of

healthfulness, a measure of sweet, a measure of salty, or whatever – all of the non-price attributes – and then all of the other attributes that go along with it, you just have to make sure that you know what you’re measuring.

I think Kathy’s point, which I think Jonathan packaged up nicely, is you have a lot of other attributes, and so part of the data collection mandate for us as a group is to understand, what are the attributes? And we’ll get into a discussion about contractual attributes that are not price, they’re not related to the applicant’s standard or qualification. In some of these, it’s a non-price attribute which is privacy protection. So we can use privacy protection as a measure to say, how are they doing based on that attribute versus how are they doing for example based on price? Price is an attribute as well.

I won’t use the word “consensus,” but I think we’re in agreement that there’s a lot of different types of data and characteristics and features of domains available under these various TLDs, all of which are, to Jonathan’s point, substitutes for one another to some extent or another. If you are looking for a particular thing on the Internet, you need a domain name. So they serve that highest function, and then below that they have a bunch of different attributes.

MUKESH CHULANI: Thank you. Are there any further comments on this topic? Shall we move to the next?

Can you move one slide ahead?

The next thing we had set out to do is to actually take a look at the category definitions for each of those three attributes: robust competition, stable, trusted. These category definitions were what were used in order to select the metrics. The metrics don't come until you know what you're measuring, and this is what we sought to measure.

Everything there with an asterisk was not included in the data. I just wanted to reiterate that. Once again, just to say it again, everything in the beta report was included pretty much as a function of having that data in-house within ICANN. I just have to say that again. But it is not the end goal. The end goal is to have a robust, reliable, recurring, rigorous, set of data irrespective of where it's based. But the beta report took a first step and, as convenience, used ICANN internal data.

I just wanted to present this definition to the Advisory Panel and get your views on what should stay, what should go. Rip it apart gentlemen, ladies.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I'm not sure what you're asking. Would we in some instances not want you to collect that other data? Is that the question?

MUKESH CHULANI: No, it is essentially the data was collected to match this definition. Where data was within ICANN, we collected it. Where data was external to ICANN at that moment, we were not able to put it in the beta report.

So now the task at hand is to revisit the definition – in this case this is for “Robust competition,” Jonathan. So we're looking at the definition.

JONATHAN ZUCK: So look at these five portions of the definition and see if they make sense as a definition?

MUKESH CHULANI: Exactly. And if they make sense, they stay. In our later exercise, we'll decide whether the metrics selected stay or go. But for now let's just see whether the definition should stay and what should be changed, if anything.

So when we define “robust competition,” we say that it means diversity exists in the choice of a service provider in terms of their geography, the scripts they offer, their service model, and

the languages they offer. We also say that that means the commercial marketplace is thriving, that there's growth in new and across all gTLDs. The marketplace is open to new players. The marketplace is perceived to be fair. We don't have a metric for that goal yet. The marketplace is not dependent on one or a small number of players. We don't have a metric for that definition yet.

We have Mason on the queue. Mason?

MASON COLE: Thank you. I just had a question on 1C. When you say "service model," can you go into more about what that means?

MUKESH CHULANI: Mason, if I recall correctly, this referred to tracking of resellers. So beyond just registrars and registries, to actually go down and track diversity in terms of resellers in the market. Obviously, that's not data we have within ICANN at the moment, and that's not included in the beta report. That was mentioned in the public comment as an area that we ought to consider, so that's why it's there. But we open it to the Advisory Panel for your advice. That's one of the items.

MASON COLE: Okay. Just to follow up on that. Is it contemplated then that it would be number of resellers or TLDs offered by resellers or volume of registration by reseller? Have we gotten that far in our thinking?

MUKESH CHULANI: No we haven't, Mason. It has been identified as an area which would indicate whether there is or is not robust competition, but we haven't gotten down to the level of what metrics ought to be collected, whether they ought to be collected, what should be collected, and whether that's even available or not.

MASON COLE: Okay. I think that's it for now. Thank you.

MUKESH CHULANI: Mason, sorry – this is actually why we're opening it all to the Advisory Panel, for exactly for the type of questions you're beginning to ask.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I assume that “players” in this case is the multiple categories – registry service providers, registries, registrars – and in every one of those cases, that's what you mean by “players.” You're

thinking about each of them for each of those categories of people in the supply chain basically.

MUKESH CHULANI: Yes. It is a supply chain question. It is, what is the extent of the supply chain we wish to cover? Do we wish to go even through a backend provider? Do they wish to go through registrar reseller? [Inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK: So you're asking that question?

MUKESH CHULANI: It is a question.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I was asking whether it was assumed in the way it was presented. I think, again, the answer there is yes. I think that you've got different categories of players, and you could have competition in one area and not in another if this is a measure of competition. So you're going to want to track all the aspects of the supply chain probably.

MUKESH CHULANI: Thank you for your feedback, Jonathan.

We have Olivier followed by Steve.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. When you mentioned service model, I think you just mentioned here that it was the actual structure by which the domain names are sold – registry, registrar, etc. I’m not seeing anywhere the type of service offering. Some TLDs would be marketed as high value or high quality TLDs, others would be a buck a domain, and I think that these cover different markets between the ones that go for the domains that are not expensive and the people that have a budget for actually having a premium domain. I know it’s a complex thing to perhaps analyze, but I do think that there’s a difference between the two because one has to see if you look at the overall market if every single segment of type of purchaser could be covered.

MUKESH CHULANI: Olivier, I just wanted to clarify – are you referring in this case to pricing thresholds?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Correct.

MUKESH CHULANI: Thank you for that.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Three to four years ago when we participated in developing the initial metrics for the Consumer Trust, Consumer Choice, and Competition, we looked carefully from a standpoint of an actual or potential registrant. The diversity and choices that they would see were less a function of where the registrar was based but instead were a function of could they find registrar websites that speak to them in their own languages and scripts. So we almost always used language and script together – rather than separate as you’ve done here – since there are some languages represented in the Latin script even though they’re not English language. But there are many languages that are far more effectively presented to a local customer in both their own language and their own script.

This is strictly from a consumer called a registrant – because consumers can be registrants or users – from the registrant’s perspective, they’re considering obtaining a domain name. So they’re a potential registrant. They would visit registrar websites in their own language and script. Geography might or might not even be relevant to that. It might be coincidental. It could be that an England-based registrar has a website that’s got multiple flags for different languages and script.

So that has achieved the geographical diversity from the perspective of a registrant wanting to see in her own language and script – in Hindi – what it is that’s available to her. Somewhere along the line, she’ll look at choices like, “Do they offer services like privacy and proxy?” Those are all part of the diversity because if it turned out the only Hindi script registrar website doesn’t carry any IDN script TLDs, they’ll have a limited set of choices. If it doesn’t have multiple opportunities to pick registrars – some who offer Privacy and Proxy and some who don’t – then we haven’t given them a lot of choices either.

So much of the relevance of what you’ve come up with is determined by the perspective. Everything we started in the CCT said, “Consumers are actual and potential registrants and users.” And those are ultimately the community ICANN is designed to serve. We serve them through registrars and registries and through the contracts and agreements we have with them. But ultimately put yourself in the shoes of that Indian consumer, potential registrant, and what she can see on the Internet. For them, we have to start looking at a different set of diversity than mere contractual models, and it matters a lot less whether the registrar happens to be incorporated in her own country.

MUKESH CHULANI: So, Steve, just to clarify. Are you indicating that perhaps tracking robust competition necessitates going beyond just tracking registrars, registries, resellers down to the level of consumers and users? Is that something that you think ought to be considered? Is that a good idea?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you. I'm returning to the distinction that the CCT Team picked up from the Affirmation of Commitments which was written in 2009, in that consumer choice and competition are completely separate. The consumers' choices may or may not have anything to do with the metrics you're using for competition since the choice the consumer has among multiple registrars offering different languages, scripts, models, and services, is not the same as looking at it from the standpoint of a competition authority saying, "Do we have multiple registrars competing to serve that customer?"

Choice and competition are different, and you can only look at them when you've achieved the perspective of an actual or potential registrant or user.

MUKESH CHULANI: Thank you, Steve.

Gabe, you're on queue, and Mason is after.

GABE FRIED:

Two comments. One is that at least with respect to the functional nodes in the supply chain, there are some pretty easy to deploy metrics that economists use to assess indications of concentration on one end and competition on the other. I think that the question will be whether or not we can get real data to actually assess. It's basically just a metric based on market share by participant.

I think those are useful. They are very robust over time, and they will be good guideposts to be able to say whether or not over the course of a one- or two- or three- or four-year period things are becoming more concentrated or less concentrated, which presumably is a proxy for competitive.

The second thing is – and this is to respond to Steve's comment about language and script – I think we'll have to have some mechanism to weight, to the extent that we can get the registrant data in reasonably good form over time, to start weighting things based on per capita penetration, incomes, etc. The free market economist in me says, "Well, if it makes sense to put up a Hindi version of my registrar website to go and improve search engine recognition in local language and to attract, customers I will do it." That being said, it is a good indicator of

the extent to which the registrars are pushing and penetrating and trying to achieve market share in new territories.

I think it's a good idea. I think we just have to understand what it is we're actually trying to measure there.

MUKESH CHULANI: Steve, your reaction.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks, Gabe. The key distinction – I agree with everything you said, but at the end I want to see whether you would agree – that the choice available to that potential registrant who prefers to use Hindi script and language has nothing to do with where the registrar is incorporated. Nothing at all.

So looking at things from where they are incorporated misses the entire point. It was the interesting industry promotion perspective that the prior CEO imparted upon this organization that it was important that they be based locally, and yet that has no relevance to whether or not that language and script is available as a choice. You're nodding. That's good.

GABE FRIED: I agree. I think that's a measure of something else.

MUKESH CHULANI: Thank you. On queue, Mason and then Rubens.

MASON COLE: Thanks. I just wanted to voice support for Steve’s point of view and Gabe’s as well. I think if we were looking at a geographic indicator based on where a provider is physically based or otherwise incorporated, we’d be measuring an operational geographic diversity metric of some kind. I agree with Steve. I think it’s more important to recognize where the potential users are coming from and where they’re being reached and whether or not service providers are expanding their offerings to do that.

RUBENS KUHL: Alongside those lines, it would be interesting to add payment methods to this diversity because that is critical for someone in a country to use a specific service provider is to have a payment method that they can use. Financial system is not always interoperable. Different from the U.S. and Europe. It’s not that people that have credit cards everywhere. So that’s something that affects whether one can choose a provider or not.

MUKESH CHULANI: Olivier, you were on queue.. Thank you, Rubens, for your feedback.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Rubens said what I was going to say.

MUKESH CHULANI: Any other input on this particular category definition?

Okay. So shall we move on to the next category definition just to get your feedback on it?

KATHY KLEIMAN: May I make a quick comment? Again, I'm just going to reflect back what I'm hearing as a newcomer in the room, which is that where the registrar is located doesn't matter, and I'm not sure where they're incorporated matters. I agree with Steve. But where they're located probably does to the extent that Africa – we've been monitoring Africa for years in terms of registrars. I don't know the current count, but when they got to four we were cheering.

Because it matters. Because registrars tend to do outreach to their communities, especially outside the – I don't know about the United States – but in other countries the registrars are very engaged with their communities, and it means something to the region and country as well that they have registrars.

I just want to say that historically we've been marking milestones, again, of registrars in Africa. Why? We could sit down and talk about it, but I can tell you we've been doing it and we've been doing it very consciously. So before we drop that, I just want to share with you it is a milestone we've been marking. And people do care and regions do care, and when it was only one or two in Africa, there was a real sense of we had to do something more there.

In terms of currencies and outreach and stuff like that, there is a sense that registrars work with their communities and do outreach and offer local languages, offer local currencies, many offer IDNs now. I'm not sure how it's all tracking, but I wouldn't drop the tracking.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Kathy, I would agree. You don't drop the tracking of where they are located, where their employees are, but – I hope you'll agree – that is nowhere near sufficient to measure whether we are serving and how broadly we are serving the residents of the African continent because they have the choice available, depending on language and script they choose to use, to use registrar websites that are not incorporated in Africa but offer maybe the payment mechanisms, the Privacy and Proxy, which I thought is a point you would jump all over. It's so important that

they have a choice of privacy and services and hosting services, and all that will come from any registrar that is willing to serve that market, take payments from that market, and take registrants from that market.

So we'll agree, let's by all means track where a registrar is incorporated. If it's available, let's even track where their employees are. If we were thinking that we're promoting the industry in outreach and economic development, let's track all that. But it won't be sufficient to really measure whether a potential registrant is facing the choices that she wants to have before she picks up a domain name.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Agreed. But before we go to that local perspective, again, before we drop the local perspective in terms of the global we keep both. I'd love to see some ccTLDs here. Thanks.

MUKESH CHULANI: Gabe.

GABE FRIED: At the risk of being redundant, registrars on a continent is a metric – physically on a continent – it is something that you can measure, it's something you can count, and it's something you

can watch changing over time. It's easy. Availability of language, a little bit harder to gather. It changes a little bit over time. Availability of currency and payment mechanism, harder to gather. It changes over time, etc. Nobody's saying we have to pick one and exclude the others. Just to make sure that, if I can speak for the rest of the group, I think that's what we're saying.

STEVE DELBIANCO:

Gabe, real quickly. Changes over time I know means disqualifies. Rather it qualifies why data is important to gather. So you added that twice to your list, and I'm not sure why. It's obvious that things change over time, otherwise we would only do a metric once and never again. These metrics are meant to be recurring, and the change over time in how many registrars are in Africa or how many registrars offer Hindi script and language, that's the whole point.

So changes over time is a good thing. The relative hardness of getting the data, I'm with you on that. Certain things you can train a crawler to pick up the state of incorporation for every accredited registrar. That's easy. You have to run a crawler that will visit every registrar website – and we're up to a few thousand – and try to discover which languages they offer. I'm not sure a crawler can do that. That may require paying someone to check all the registrar websites and seeing which

languages and scripts they offer, and it's harder still to do the crawl and figure out which payment methods they accept.

I'm agreeing with you there, but that is obtainable but it's relatively harder and changes over time doesn't disqualify a metric.

GABE FRIED: My only point was, they're all valuable things to measure. It's not that we're choosing one.

MUKESH CHULANI: Rubens?

RUBENS KUHL: It was mentioned that Africa had a low number of registrars. Africa had a low number of ICANN-accredited registrars – UniForum, ZACR in South Africa – had lots of registrars for .za. You can compare for instance to Brazil where the .br registries has more than 100 accredited registrars when there is currently only two ICANN-accredited registrars, and by this time next year we'll probably only have one ICANN-accredited registrar for a 200 million people country.

That's more often an indication of the inefficiency of the ICANN contractual framework. So it's different from the efficiency of

the domain industry as a whole. It's more of an issue for the gTLD contractual framework in these regions.

MUKESH CHULANI:

Thanks for the input, Rubens.

There is a question from a remote – question or a comment – from a remote participant?

AMY BIVINS:

We have a few comments in the chat. There's a comment from John McCormack from HosterStats, and it says, "ICANN-accredited registrars are generally mature market entrants. There are often hundreds or thousands of hosters in a market before this happens."

There's a second comment also from John. "Most hosters outsource their gTLD ops to registrars either in country or outside of the country."

A third comment from John. "Web development is now commoditized, so web developers tend to register domains for their clients."

We have a comment from Ivan. "The other question is, how frequently will this index be updated? This may help decide what is practical to include."

MUKESH CHULANI: Thank you for the feedback and the question, to the individuals in the chat room.

Ivan, to your last point. That's actually a specific item to be discussed at a later date, how often we publish this report. That's part of the things that's already been noted. Thank you for that.

Gentlemen, we have ten minutes left until the end of the session. I think we've made excellent progress. I will skip directly to our next steps and our action items.

Obviously, we'll have to continue to further discuss the category definitions. If any of the Advisory Panel do want to provide feedback once again on the ccTLD question, please do feel free to do that. I think we've made excellent progress on that matter during this session.

So in terms of our next steps – Amy, could you switch the slide? There you go.

As staff, we will update the tracking document to incorporate all the inputs we've received and we will circulate that to the Advisory Panel. We request that you do review the tracking document and that'll inform our subsequent discussions.

For the next conference call, as I already mentioned, we'd like to finalize discussions on the ccTLD inclusion/exclusion. We've got a lot of things to crystallize into that tracking document. Hopefully, our next call we can actually finalize that discussion and also continue to talk about the category definitions.

As ICANN staff, we will circulate the Doodle poll for our next conference call to solicit your participation. And then we will also generate a summary of input thus far, and we will provide that to you way prior to the session and look forward to receiving any feedback on that.

So I'm not sure if you believe we are ready to update the definitions for robust competition. I don't think we are yet. I think we have a lot more discussions to do there. Would you agree, members of the Advisory Panel? Should we right now take a stab at updating the definitions for robust competition, or I think that might still be premature? It's a question.

Mason?

MASON COLE:

Thanks, Mukesh. Just a clarification question. Do you mean everything that was on that slide we just finished discussing, or just Item #1 with the sub definitions?

MUKESH CHULANI: Just Item #1.

MASON COLE: Okay.

MUKESH CHULANI: Or should we wait until we go through everything and then just revise the definitions at one go?

MASON COLE: However you guys want to handle it I think is fine, but I know I had some other input on those other potential definitions and I'd like an opportunity to provide that. So since public comments were received and processed, has the document been updated to reflect public comment input?

MUKESH CHULANI: If you refer to the second round of public comments, then they have.

MASON COLE: Yes. Okay. Thank you. May I follow up on that? If you go back to that previous slide, there's an item on there about the marketplace being perceived as fair, and that's probably I think it was #4. That's probably the one where I have the most angst

about it because I think it's terribly subjective and very difficult to define. I think if you surveyed anyone, they would have a reason to say that there's unfairness in the marketplace. And I'm afraid that that category can be very easily gamed, and as a registry I'm particularly concerned it could be very easily gamed to make a registry or other contracted parties look bad. And that's an avenue for who knows what.

I'm very concerned about that. Are we going to discuss the remaining categories in our next meeting or on the next call?

MUKESH CHULANI: I think we're nowhere near done with this, Mason.

MASON COLE: Okay. Alright. Thank you.

MUKESH CHULANI: Are there any further questions or any violent objections about our next plans?

Okay. Wonderful. So I think we are ending six minutes early, and I think the session is adjourned. Thank you very much for all your contributions.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]