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Executive Summary

An exercise to gather industry data on registry operations was undertaken as part of the ongoing implementation of the evaluation criteria and procedures for the New gTLD Program. This took the form of a study including analysis of public industry information and data collected through a survey of existing registry operators. The study was performed by KPMG on ICANN’s behalf from June through September 2009, with the objective of identifying benchmarks based on registry financial and operational data, as a reference point for the review of new gTLD applications.

The survey was comprised of 7 gTLD and 6 ccTLD participants, representing 10 countries. While the survey was not designed to contain a statistically significant sample, it does represent a cross-section of operators in terms of size, outsourcing, business models, and time in operation.

Some of the findings include:

- Respondents overwhelmingly tended to favor open source database and server operating systems.
- The survey highlighted that the technical footprint is generally less difficult to correctly plan and project than estimating the size of the registry, which historically has proven to be more difficult for operators. This supports the current emphasis on continuity planning and registrant protection in the evaluation criteria.
- For the new gTLDs for which data was publicly available through the ICANN website, actual level of registrations has been significantly lower than original expectations. This indicates that the evaluation process should take into account the degree of thought and preparation evidenced in an application, and the flexibility of the applicant to increase or decrease deployment of resources to manage differences from projected targets, more so than the likelihood of achieving a planned size.
- The growth curve for all TLDs introduced since 2001 has varied significantly across both pace of growth and absolute growth. While recognizing that there is no typical growth pattern, there seems to be a strong correlation between their relative first month registration volumes and the ultimate peak volume for the most recently observed peak. This could indicate that the evaluation process should take into account the applicant’s mitigation of up-front risk and the flexibility to meet cash needs in the start-up phases of operation.
- The majority of respondents indicated that they had greater levels of reserve funds today than upon commencement of operations, when 90% responded they had less than one year of capital expenses and operating costs held in reserve.
- Although there are a variety of viable operating models, large registries were able to convert their larger scale into a significant cost advantage over smaller registries. This was evident across multiple cost dimensions. As a result of the sharp contrast in cost effectiveness, survey
respondents appeared to cluster around two distinct operating models: large registries that tended to run their operations in-house, and small registries that outsourced significant portions of their operations. Many of the benchmarked data points collected showed significant contrast along these two operating models.

This study will be provided as a reference for the independent technical and financial evaluators as part of the onboarding process. The benchmark data is to be used as a common reference point rather than a scoring metric. For example, an application that deviated widely from the industry norm could indicate the need for additional inquiry to determine the soundness of the applicant’s proposed approach; it would not necessarily result in failure of the application.

As an additional benefit, the information contained in this study is likely to be helpful to potential applicants in noting common trends and issues.

**Background and Objectives**

A key goal for the evaluation process is to establish criteria that are as objective and measurable as possible, in line with the GNSO’s policy advice (“There must be a clear and pre-published application process using objective and measurable criteria.”). In developing a robust evaluation process, ICANN continues to work through the challenge of creating criteria that are measurable, meaningful (i.e., indicative of the applicant’s capabilities and not easily manipulated), and also flexible enough to facilitate a diverse applicant pool.

Particularly in the financial area, the criteria have required heavy reliance on the judgment of a “person with registry experience,” tending to create a more subjective evaluation process offering less predictability for applicants and for the community in general.

This study was undertaken to contribute to the ongoing development of criteria and procedures for the evaluation process. The primary objective of the exercise was to identify benchmarks based on registry financial and operational data, as a common reference point relevant to the review of new gTLD applications.

**Methodology**

The study took place from June to September of 2009 and consisted of the following activities:

- Review of the existing Evaluation Criteria as included in the draft Applicant Guidebook, and identification of financial and operational metrics to be benchmarked through the survey. This included demographic, financial, technical, and operational data.
- Design of a questionnaire to address the metrics identified.
- Contact with a sample of existing gTLD and ccTLD operators to seek their input to development of the questionnaire and incorporation of this feedback.
• Execution of the survey among the existing gTLD and ccTLD registries willing to participate, and following up as appropriate.
• Analysis of previous gTLD applications and other publicly available data on registry operations.
• Summary and presentation of the findings. Areas covered in the report are:
  o Survey demographics
  o Registry growth
  o Staffing models and costs
  o Outsourcing models and operating costs
  o Technical and network architecture
  o Reserves
  o Capital expenditures
  o Continuity planning

 Participation in the study was voluntary. All gTLD registry operators were approached regarding participation in the study, of which 7 participated. A random sample of 20 ccTLD registry operators was also approached regarding participation, of which 6 participated. A total of 13 registry operators provided data for the study.

 The study was conducted entirely by KPMG as a third party on behalf of ICANN. KPMG presented data only on an aggregated basis, and individual registry data was not accessible by other participants, ICANN staff, or ICANN Board directors.

 Demographics and sample size

 It should be noted that the group of participants in this study represents a very small sample size (38% of all gTLDs, 3% of all ccTLDs, and approximately 5% of all TLDs). The gTLD space is unique in that the total population of 16 gTLDs is quite small overall. ccTLD registry data was incorporated to round out the sample and create a broader context for registry operations. The sample represents a cross-section of operators in terms of size, outsourcing, business models, and time in operation.

 However, the study was not designed as a formal exercise founded on statistical reliability tests, and caution is due when extrapolating or drawing conclusions based on the data reported here.

 Applicability

 This study will be provided as a reference for the independent technical and financial evaluators as part of the onboarding process. The benchmark data is to be used as a common reference point rather than a scoring metric. There are no adjustments to scoring being made on the basis of this data.

 One of the goals of the New gTLD Program is to encourage innovation and diversity in the gTLD space. Thus, there is no presumption that an application that does not conform to the “typical” model in a particular area would be rejected on that basis. Rather, this divergence would highlight a need for deeper inquiry into the rationale and circumstances specific to that application. The key task for ICANN is to ensure the approach proposed in the application does not harm the security or stability of the DNS,

As an additional benefit, the information contained in this study is likely to be helpful to potential applicants in noting common trends and issues.

**Participants**

Participants were offered the option of maintaining their confidentiality or including their name and company description in the report. The following participants have chosen to disclose their involvement:

- **Canadian Internet Registration Authority (CIRA) / Autorité canadienne pour les enregistrements Internet (ACEI)**

- **CZ.NIC, z.s.p.o**

  CZ.NIC, interest association of legal entities, was founded by leading providers of Internet services in 1998. The association currently has 66 members. The key activities of the association include operation of the domain name registry for the .CZ domain and the 0.2.4.e164.arpa (ENUM) domain, operation of the CZ top-level domain and public education in the area of domain names. The association is now intensively working on development of the ENUM system, extension and improvements of the domain administration system and support of new technologies and projects beneficial to the Internet infrastructure in the Czech Republic. CZ.NIC is a member of the EURid association, managing the European domain – EU, and other similarly oriented organizations (CENTR, ccNSO etc.).

- **Fundació puntCAT**

  Fundació puntCAT is a non profit that has as foundational aim the development and promotion of information society in Catalan. It is the entity that promoted the bid for a top level domain for Catalan language and culture, and manages the Registry for that domain. .cat is the first and only domain for a language, and currently there are over 40.000 .cat domain names.

- **Internet NZ**

- **Internet Users Society – Niue**

- **Neustar**

  Neustar, Inc. (NYSE: NSR) provides market-leading and innovative services that enable trusted communication across networks, applications, and enterprises around the world. Neustar Domain Name Registry Services operates the global registry for .BIZ and .US; in addition, it provides back-end registry services for .CO, .TEL and .TRAVEL,
gateway services to country code top level domains, internationalized domain names (IDNs), and full registry services to new top level domains. Neustar’s registry is connected to more than 250 domain name registrars worldwide. For more information, visit www.neustar.biz and www.neustarregistry.biz.

- **Public Interest Registry**

  As one of the original domains, .ORG has been shaped by the global community as the place to express ideas, knowledge, and cause on the Internet. Whether individual with an idea to share, a small club organizing and motivating your members, or a large company conducting educational and marketing campaigns - the .ORG domain name communicates trust, credibility, and community interest.

  Since January of 2003, the Public Interest Registry assumed responsibility for operating .ORG and maintaining the authoritative database of all .ORG domain names.

- **SIDN**

  SIDN. More than the company behind .nl

  As the registry for .nl, the Netherlands’ top level domain, SIDN is responsible for the registration and performance of more than 3.7 million .nl domain names and thus for the traceability of millions of websites and mailboxes. With a highly trained team of more than fifty people and global cutting-edge technology, we play a vital role in the Netherlands’ e-business community. We are also closely involved in the development of influential new technologies, such as ENUM, which brings together the worlds of telephony and the internet.

ICANN gratefully acknowledges all study participants for their contributions to this report.
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gTLD registry size and population

Median and average size of gTLDs in the market, in number of registrations

- **Average = 7.2m**
- **Median = 231k**

% of total registrations covered by gTLD registries in order of size ranking

- **0.25m registrations**

For purposes of the survey, “large” registries are defined as those that fall above the median, and “small” registries as those that fall below the median.

**Note:** .net and .com’s number of registrations are off scale for illustration purposes.

**Source:** ICANN website
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Survey Demographics

DATA COLLECTION PROCESS

June 2009
- 14 gTLD and 20 randomly selected ccTLD operators were contacted with respect to their willingness to participate

July 2009
- Initial draft of surveys were designed
- Surveys distributed to participants for them to comment on the questionnaire

August 2009
- Feedback on survey design was collected from participants and incorporated
- Surveys sent out for completion

September 2009
- Survey responses collected from participants
- Data analyzed, interpreted and followed-up where necessary

Recruitment of Survey Respondents

Source: Survey respondents
Survey Demographics (2)

Organizational type which best describes the entity, as percentage of respondents

![Bar chart showing organizational type distribution.]

- Profit: 31%
- Not-for-profit: 62%
- Governmental: 0%
- Other: 15%

Note: More than one answer was possible.
Source: Survey respondents

First year of registry operations, as percentage of respondents

- 2002 onwards: 50%
- Before 2002: 50%

Note: More than one answer was possible.
Source: Survey respondents

Type of entity in terms of registry operations, as percentage of respondents

- Responsible for registry operations: 77%
- Operations as shown in IANA record: 31%
- Outsources registry operations to another party: 31%
- Provides outsourced registry operations to other parties: 54%
- Contracted party with ICANN for the registry: 0%

Note: More than one answer was possible.
Source: Survey respondents
Average size of registry, in number of registrations

![Bar chart showing registrations at different time points](chart1.png)

- 1 yr after start of operations: 512,506
- 2 yrs after start of operations: 622,003
- Today: 1,815,159
- 1 year from today: 1,944,078

Source: Survey respondents

Average size of registry, segmented by size of registry

![Line chart showing segmented registry sizes](chart2.png)

- Segment 1: large registries with > 0.25m registrations
- Segment 2: small registries with < 0.25m registrations

Source: Survey respondents
Percentage of respondents that outsourced the following activities, segmented by size of registry

- Network and Infrastructure Operations (including NOC)
- Systems Design & Development
- Registry Administration
- Customer Support
- Compliance (including technical and contractual compliance)
- Information Security
- Other
- Finance
- Human Resources

Note: More than one answer was possible.
Source: Survey respondents
Respondent population by size and level of outsourcing

“Large” (>250 thousand)
- 38% of registry

“Small” (<250 thousand)
- 8% of registry

Outsourcing of operations
- Low (“in-house”)
- High (“outsourced”)
- 23% of high outsourcing
- 31% of high outsourcing

Note: Respondents were categorized as “outsourced” if they indicated that they outsourced one or more of network and infrastructure, systems design and development, and/or registry administration.

Source: Survey respondents
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New gTLD Registry Growth

Volume of registrations: .mobi, .biz, .info

Volume of registrations: .travel, .tel, .asia, .name

Volume of registrations: .jobs, .cat, .pro

Volume of registrations: .museum, .coop, .aero

Note: Only includes gTLDs that commenced operations from 2001.
Source: ICANN website
Registry Growth (2)

Average volume of registrations for new gTLDs (introduced since 2001, over the first 36 months) relative to their most recently observed peak registration level

Note: Includes only new gTLDs introduced since 2001 that have been operational for longer than 36 months.
Source: ICANN website
Correlation between first month and most recently observed peak registrations for gTLDs operating for more than 36 months that commenced operation after May 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>.aero</th>
<th>.biz</th>
<th>.cat</th>
<th>.coop</th>
<th>.info</th>
<th>.jobs</th>
<th>.mobi</th>
<th>museum</th>
<th>.name</th>
<th>.pro</th>
<th>.travel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Month 1</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>669,905</td>
<td>1,220</td>
<td>5,712</td>
<td>736,863</td>
<td>4,883</td>
<td>1,585</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>67,609</td>
<td>1,072</td>
<td>17,932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most recently observed peak</td>
<td>6,707</td>
<td>2,086,460</td>
<td>38,410</td>
<td>7,992</td>
<td>5,311,015</td>
<td>15,741</td>
<td>964,115</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>296,428</td>
<td>43,719</td>
<td>214,719</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R² = 0.8

Source: Registry data via ICANN website

Volume of month 1 registrations relative to most recently observed peak

Source: ICANN website
Registry Growth (4)

Actual volumes vs. projected volumes – per publicly available data

Registration volumes of new gTLDs introduced since 2001 relative to their projections (as stated in their applications, where publicly available)

![Graph showing actual vs. projected volumes for Year 1 and Year 4 with percentage differences]

Note: As per source below, only includes 7 gTLDs where the projected volume of registrations was publicly available

Source: ICANN website, publicly available original gTLD applications, evaluator reports, Q&A notes.
Registry Growth (5)

Actual volumes vs. projected volumes – per survey respondents

Performance against initial registry size and growth assumptions, as percentage of respondents

- Not met: 18%
- Met: 36%
- Exceeded: 46%

Performance against initial registry size and growth assumptions, segmented by type of TLD

- gTLD
  - Not met: 25%
  - Exceeded: 50%
  - Met: 25%

- ccTLD
  - Not met: 25%
  - Exceeded: 43%
  - Met: 57%

Source: Survey respondents
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Staffing models

Average total headcount of registry, on a Full-Time Equivalent or “FTE” basis

Average total headcount of registry, segmented by level of outsourcing, on an “FTE” basis

Source: Survey respondents
Staffing models (2)

Average number of registrations per FTE, segmented by size of registry

Source: Survey respondents

Average number of registrations per FTE, segmented by level of outsourcing

Source: Survey respondents
Staffing Models (3)

Average ratio of technical headcount relative to all other headcount

1.37 1.34

1 year after start of operations  Today

Average ratio of technical headcount relative to all other headcount, segmented by size of registry and by level of outsourcing

More technical FTEs

Segment 1: large registries with > 0.25m registrations
Segment 2: small registries with < 0.25m registrations
Segment 1: in-house
Segment 2: outsourced

1.55 1.58 0.94 0.92 1.55 1.93 1.25 1.00

Technical headcount / other headcount

Source: Survey respondents
Staffing Models (4)

Type of staffing arrangement as of today, as average percentage of total FTEs

Source: Survey respondents
Staffing Models (5) – FTE costs

Estimated average annual cost of functions directly related to headcount

- **Technical headcount cost**
- **Other headcount cost**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Segment 1: not outsourced</th>
<th>Segment 2: outsourced</th>
<th>Other headcount cost</th>
<th>Technical headcount cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 year after start of operations</td>
<td>2.38 0.63 1.75</td>
<td>3.13 1.18 1.95</td>
<td>3.77 1.41 2.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Today</td>
<td>2.38 0.63 1.75</td>
<td>3.13 1.18 1.95</td>
<td>3.77 1.41 2.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 year from today</td>
<td>2.38 0.63 1.75</td>
<td>3.13 1.18 1.95</td>
<td>3.77 1.41 2.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Figures reported as local currency

**Source:** Survey respondents; OANDA for exchange rates, where applicable.

Estimated average annual cost of functions directly related to headcount, segmented by level of outsourcing and size of registry

- **Segmented by Outsourcing**
  - Segment 1: not outsourced
  - Segment 2: outsourced

- **Segmented by Size**
  - Segment 1: large registries with > 0.25m registrations
  - Segment 2: small registries with < 0.25m registrations

**Source:** Survey respondents; OANDA for exchange rates, where applicable.
Staffing Models (6) – FTE costs

Estimated average annual cost per 100k registrations of functions directly related to headcount

- US$m per 100k registrations p.a.
- 1 year after start of operations
- Today
- 1 year from today
- Other headcount cost
- Technical headcount cost

Source: Survey respondents; OANDA for exchange rates, where applicable.

Estimated average annual cost per 100k registrations of functions directly related to headcount, segmented by level of outsourcing and size of registry

- US$m per 100k registrations p.a.
- 1 year after start of operations
- Today
- 1 year from today
- Other headcount cost
- Technical headcount cost

Source: Survey respondents; OANDA for exchange rates, where applicable.
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Operating Costs

Estimated average annual cost of operating activities as of today

- DNSSEC: 3%
- Data security and data escrow: 7%
- Registrar billing and accounting: 11%
- Whois service: 7%
- Maintenance of name servers and DNS for registered domain names: 29%
- Shared registry system: 43%
- Source: Survey respondents

Estimated average annual cost of operating activities as of today, segmented by size of registry

- Total - $2.17m
  - Segment 1: large registries with > 0.25m registrations
    - DNSSEC: 0.05
    - IDN registrations: 0.19
    - Data security and data escrow: 0.20
    - Registrar billing and accounting: 0.64
    - Whois service: 0.88
    - Maintenance of name servers and DNS for registered domain names: 0.15
  - Segment 2: small registries with < 0.25m registrations
    - DNSSEC: 0.06
    - IDN registrations: 0.19
    - Data security and data escrow: 0.20
    - Registrar billing and accounting: 0.64
    - Whois service: 0.88
    - Maintenance of name servers and DNS for registered domain names: 0.15

Source: Survey respondents
Operating Costs (2)

Estimated average annual cost per 100k registrations of operating activities as of today, segmented by size of registry

- Total - $1.5m
  - Segment 1: large registries with > 0.25m registrations
    - DNSSEC: $17.5k
    - IDN registrations: $72.1k
    - Data security and data escrow: $112.0k
    - Registrar billing and accounting: $611.9k
    - Maintenance of name servers and DNS for registered domain names: $423.7k
  - Segment 2: small registries with < 0.25m registrations
    - Whois service: $181.8k
    - Shared registry system: $138.6k

Note: Other Segment 1 categories are each less than $10k per 100k registrations.
Source: Survey respondents
Operating Costs (3)
Actual costs vs. projected costs

Performance against initial cost projections for running the registry, as percentage of respondents

- Over-estimated: 18%
- Relatively accurate: 55%
- Under-estimated: 27%

Source: Survey respondents

Performance against initial cost projections for running the registry, segmented by type of TLD

- gTLD:
  - Over-estimated: 25%
  - Under-estimated: 50%
  - Relatively accurate: 25%

- ccTLD:
  - Over-estimated: 14%
  - Under-estimated: 14%
  - Relatively accurate: 71%

Source: Survey respondents
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DNS server software used, as percentage of respondents

- BIND: 100%
- NSD: 62%
- UltraDNS: 23%
- Other: 8%

Note: More than one answer was possible.
Source: Survey respondents
**Technical and Network Architecture (2)**

**IPv6 support within key DNS infrastructure**

Elements of DNS infrastructure that support IPv6, as percentage of respondents

- Shared registry system and DNS server software
- Listing of AAAA glue records for domain registrations
- Some / all name servers
- Public facing services (such as registry web site, email)

If the DNS infrastructure (including server software and O/S) does not support IPv6, does the registry intend to support it within the next two years?

- Yes: 100%
- No: 0%

Note: More than one answer was possible.
Source: Survey respondents

Note: Applicable to one respondent only.
Source: Survey respondents
If the registry does not support DNSSEC, does it intend to support it within the next two years?

- Yes: 62%
- No: 13%
- Depends: 25%

Note: Applicable to majority of respondents.
Source: Survey respondents
Technical and Network Architecture (4)

EPP server throughput

EPP server throughput, averaged over respondent group relative to peak capacity

Range in EPP server throughput, as provided by respondent group

Source: Survey respondents
Technical and Network Architecture (5)

System Components

Average number of system components in use

![Graph showing average number of system components in use](image)

Source: Survey respondents

Average number of system components in use per 100k registrations, segmented by size of registry

![Graph showing average number of system components per 100k registrations](image)

Source: Survey respondents
Database and Server Operating Systems

Database used, as percentage of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Database</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MySQL</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oracle</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PostgreSQL</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Server operating system used, as a percentage of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operating System</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Linux</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solaris</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: More than one answer was possible; “Other” category is comprised of Sybase, and Red Hat.
Source: Survey respondents
Response times

**Average response time for the following registry services**

- Shared registry system (EPP): 250 milli-sec
- DNS service: 29 milli-sec
- Whois service: 169 milli-sec

**Range in response time for the following registry services, as provided by respondent group**

- Shared registry system (EPP): max 1,000, ave 250, min 30
- DNS service: max 80, ave 29
- Whois service: max 500, ave 169

Source: Survey respondents
Average percentage uptime for the past three months for the following registry services

- Shared registry system (EPP): 99.68%
- DNS service: 99.89%
- Whois service: 99.63%

Source: Survey respondents
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Reserves

Level of cash reserve in place, relative to total annual capital expenditure and operating costs, as percentage of respondents

Percentage of survey respondents with:
- Greater than 3 years reserve
- Between 1 and 3 years reserve
- Less than 1 year reserve

Source: Survey respondents
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Average annual level of capital expenditure, segmented by size of registry

- Segment 1: large registries with > 0.25m registrations: US$6.61m p.a.
- Segment 2: small registries with < 0.25m registrations: US$0.69m p.a.

First year of registry operations vs. Today

Average annual level of capital expenditure, segmented by level of outsourcing

- Segment 1: in-house:
  - Today: US$0.93m p.a.
  - First year of registry operations: US$0.55m p.a.
- Segment 2: outsourced:
  - Segment 2: outsourced: US$0.57m p.a.
  - Today: US$0.55m p.a.

Source: Survey respondents
Average annual level of capital expenditure per 100k registrations, segmented by level of outsourcing

- Segment 1: in-house
  - First year of registry operations: 0.31 US$ per 100k registrations
  - Today: 0.06 US$ per 100k registrations

- Segment 2: outsourced
  - First year of registry operations: 4.67 US$ per 100k registrations
  - Today: 1.64 US$ per 100k registrations

Source: Survey respondents

Average annual level of capital expenditure per 100k registrations, segmented by size of registry

- Segment 1: large registries with > 0.25m registrations
  - First year of registry operations: 0.23 US$ per 100k registrations
  - Today: 0.07 US$ per 100k registrations

- Segment 2: small registries with < 0.25m registrations
  - First year of registry operations: 6.22 US$ per 100k registrations
  - Today: 2.42 US$ per 100k registrations

Source: Survey respondents
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Continuity Planning and Failover Testing

Is a detailed registry continuity plan in place?

- Yes: 92%
- No: 8%

Frequency with which the registry continuity plan is reviewed or refreshed

- Annually: 73%
- Bi-annually: 9%
- Quarterly: 0%
- Other: 18%

Source: Survey respondents
Has a transition services provider been identified and contractually engaged?

- Yes: 27%
- No: 73%

Elements that are part of the arrangement with transition service providers, where they have been contracted, as percentage of respondents:

- Registry services: 100%
- Maintenance of name servers and DNS for registered domain names: 100%
- Other items: 100%

Source: Survey respondents

Note: Applicable to three respondents.
Source: Survey respondents
Is a failover testing plan in place?

- **Yes**: 83%
- **No**: 17%

Frequency with which the failover testing plan is regularly tested

- **Never**: 0%
- **Annually or more frequently**: 78%
- **Less frequently than annually**: 22%

Source: Survey respondents
Contents

– Registry Population
– Survey Demographics
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– Staffing Models and Costs
– Operating Costs
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– Reserves
– Capital Expenditure
– Continuity Planning

– Other

• Other miscellaneous survey data collected from respondents
Average daily number of renewals received

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Average Daily Renewals / Day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 year after start</td>
<td>436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 years after start</td>
<td>821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Today</td>
<td>1,697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 year from today (projected)</td>
<td>2,281</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average daily number of renewals received per 100k registrations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Renewals per 100k registrations / day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 year after start</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 years after start</td>
<td>336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Today</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 year from today (projected)</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey respondents
Deletions

Average daily number of cancellations / deletions received per 100k registrations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Cancellations / Day</th>
<th>Cancellations per 100k registrations / day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 yr after start of operations</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 yrs after start of operations</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Today</td>
<td>748</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 year from today (projected)</td>
<td>942</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey respondents
Whois queries

Average daily number of Whois queries received

- 1 year after start of operations: 293,544
- 2 years after start of operations: 385,215
- Today: 523,118
- 1 year from today: 693,857

Source: Survey respondents
Are the registry’s financial statements currently audited?

- Yes: 92%
- No: 8%

Source: Survey respondents
Core registry locations

Average number of core registry locations, segmented by size of registry (includes primary and secondary sites, excludes name servers)

Segment 1: large registries with > 0.25m registrations
2.4 core registry locations

Segment 2: small registries with < 0.25m registrations
2.0 core registry locations

Source: Survey respondents
Size of core registry database

Average size of core registry databases, segmented by size of registry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GB</th>
<th>Segment 1: large registries with &gt; 0.25m registrations</th>
<th>Segment 2: small registries with &lt; 0.25m registrations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>438</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average size of core registry databases per 100k registrations, segmented by size of registry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GB / 100k registrations</th>
<th>Segment 1: large registries with &gt; 0.25m registrations</th>
<th>Segment 2: small registries with &lt; 0.25m registrations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey respondents
DNS server locations

Average number of separate locations for DNS servers, segmented by size of registry

- Segment 1: large registries with > 0.25m registrations
  - min 5
  - max 17
  - ave 17

- Segment 2: small registries with < 0.25m registrations
  - min 5
  - max 8
  - ave 8

Range in number of separate locations for DNS servers, segmented by size of registry

- Segment 1: large registries with > 0.25m registrations
  - min 4
  - max 12
  - ave 8

- Segment 2: small registries with < 0.25m registrations
  - min 5
  - max 17
  - ave 17

Source: Survey respondents
### REGISTRY OPERATIONS - PEER GROUP SURVEY

**Instructions:**
Please complete the survey below, in excel, by SEPTEMBER 4, 2009, save it, and email the completed form back to Alexander Nouel at anouel@kpmg.com.

ICANN has asked KPMG not to share individual responses with ICANN staff or other survey participants. Results, on an anonymized and aggregated basis will be published. Please indicate below whether you would like to be acknowledged as a participant, and if you do whether you would like to include your corporate logo and a brief paragraph describing your services.

When opening the excel file please choose "Enable Macros" when prompted, in order to use the check boxes.

If you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact Barak Ravid (tel: +1 415 963 5548, barakravid@kpmg.com) or Alexander Nouel (tel: +1 213 955 8309, anouel@kpmg.com).

Many thanks

### Organization Name

### Primary Contact Name

### Primary Contact Title

### Primary Contact Phone Number

### Primary Contact Email Address

Would you like to be acknowledged as a survey participant? (yes/no)

If yes, would you like to have your corporate logo incorporated into the published report? (yes/no)

If yes, will you be separately sending a brief paragraph to include as a description of your services? (yes/no)

#### A. Introduction / Background

**A.1.** What is the name of your entity?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**A.2.** Which TLD’s do you operate?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TLD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**A.3.** Please check the organizational type which best describes your entity:

- [ ] Profit
- [ ] Not-for-Profit
- [ ] Other (please provide detail): 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**A.4.** Please provide any additional narrative you feel is appropriate to clarify your legal and organizational structure:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Narrative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**A.5.** Please check the responses that match your activity (check as many as apply):

- [ ] I am the responsible party for registry operations as shown in the IANA record for the TLD
- [ ] I outsource my registry operations to another party
- [ ] I provide outsourced registry operations to other parties - If yes, to how many?
- [ ] I am the contracted party with ICANN for the registry

**A.6.** In which year did you, as an entity, commence operation of the registry?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Registry 1</th>
<th>Registry 2</th>
<th>Registry 3</th>
<th>Registry 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**A.7.** How big is your TLD (in number of registrations)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Registry 1</th>
<th>Registry 2</th>
<th>Registry 3</th>
<th>Registry 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### (May 30 update)

**A.8.** What is the relevant applicant guidebook questions?

**A.9.** Please complete the survey below, in excel, by SEPTEMBER 4, 2009, save it, and email the completed form back to Alexander Nouel at anouel@kpmg.com.

I am the responsible party for registry operations as shown in the IANA record for the TLD

I outsource my registry operations to another party

I provide outsourced registry operations to other parties - If yes, to how many?

I am the contracted party with ICANN for the registry

If you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact Barak Ravid (tel: +1 415 963 5548, barakravid@kpmg.com) or Alexander Nouel (tel: +1 213 955 8309, anouel@kpmg.com).

Please complete the survey below, in excel, by SEPTEMBER 4, 2009, save it, and email the completed form back to Alexander Nouel at anouel@kpmg.com.

Many thanks

### Organization Name

### Primary Contact Name

### Primary Contact Title

### Primary Contact Phone Number

### Primary Contact Email Address

Would you like to be acknowledged as a survey participant? (yes/no)

If yes, would you like to have your corporate logo incorporated into the published report? (yes/no)

If yes, will you be separately sending a brief paragraph to include as a description of your services? (yes/no)

#### A. Introduction / Background

**A.1.** What is the name of your entity?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**A.2.** Which TLD’s do you operate?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TLD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**A.3.** Please check the organizational type which best describes your entity:

- [ ] Profit
- [ ] Not-for-Profit
- [ ] Other (please provide detail): 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**A.4.** Please provide any additional narrative you feel is appropriate to clarify your legal and organizational structure:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Narrative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**A.5.** Please check the responses that match your activity (check as many as apply):

- [ ] I am the responsible party for registry operations as shown in the IANA record for the TLD
- [ ] I outsource my registry operations to another party
- [ ] I provide outsourced registry operations to other parties - If yes, to how many?
- [ ] I am the contracted party with ICANN for the registry

**A.6.** In which year did you, as an entity, commence operation of the registry?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Registry 1</th>
<th>Registry 2</th>
<th>Registry 3</th>
<th>Registry 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**A.7.** How big is your TLD (in number of registrations)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Registry 1</th>
<th>Registry 2</th>
<th>Registry 3</th>
<th>Registry 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.A. What is your total headcount number (on Full Time Equivalent "FTE" basis):

Today: 
As of 1 year after commencement of operations: 
As of 2 years after commencement of operations: 
Best-estimate as to 1 year from today: 

6.B. Please provide any narrative you feel appropriate to clarify/explain any parts of your organization, which you either specifically included or excluded in the above headcount number:

7. Please provide headcount number (on Full Time Equivalent "FTE" basis) for the following activities as of today:

Note: Please consider that the total broken down in this question should ideally match the response to Question 6.A. above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technical Headcount</th>
<th>FTE's</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Network and Infrastructure Operations (including NOC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems Design and Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registry Administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance (including technical, and contract compliance)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Security</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB-TOTAL TECHNICAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Headcount</th>
<th>FTE's</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marketing (including PR &amp; Communication)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales (if applicable)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB-TOTAL OTHER</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Please provide headcount number (on FTE basis) for the following activities as of 1 year after commencement of operations:

Note: Please consider that the total broken down in this question should ideally match the response to Question 6.A. above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technical Headcount</th>
<th>FTE's</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Network and Infrastructure Operations (including NOC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems Design and Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registry Administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance (including technical, and contract compliance)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Security</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB-TOTAL TECHNICAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Headcount</th>
<th>FTE's</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marketing (including PR &amp; Communication)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales (if applicable)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB-TOTAL OTHER</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Please check the areas, if any, which are outsourced:

Technical:
- Network and Infrastructure Operations (including NOC)
- Systems Design and Development
- Registry Administration
- Customer Support
- Compliance (including technical, and contract compliance)
- Information Security
- Other

Other:
- Marketing (including PR & Communication)
- General
- Finance
- Sales (if applicable)
- Administrative
- Other
- HR

10. For the total headcount number listed in Question 6.A. above (as of today), please provide an estimate as to % of FTE's who are 1) Full-time Employed, 2) Part-time employed, 3) Consultants/Other Short-term roles, 4) Volunteer, and 5) Otherwise:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% that are full-time employed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% that are part-time employed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% that are consulting/short-term</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% that are volunteer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Total should add to 100%
11. For each of the functions listed in Question 7, please provide an estimated range for the annual cost (please state which currency you are using)
Note: Where a breakdown is not possible, please provide the sub-total or total. Please break down in as much detail as possible, even if incomplete

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Currency Used</th>
<th>Today</th>
<th>1 year after commencement of operations</th>
<th>1 year from today</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technical Headcount</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network and Infrastructure Operations (including NOC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems Design and Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registry Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance (including technical, and contract compliance)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Security</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUB-TOTAL TECHNICAL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Headcount</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing (including PR &amp; Communication)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales (if applicable)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUB-TOTAL OTHER</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. For each of the functions listed in Question 7, please provide your best current estimate as to whether you expect FTE’s to increase, stay the same, or decrease over the next 12 months:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technical Headcount</th>
<th>Increase</th>
<th>Same</th>
<th>Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Network and Infrastructure Operations (including NOC)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems Design and Development</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registry Administration</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Support</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance (including technical, and contract compliance)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Security</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUB-TOTAL TECHNICAL</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Headcount</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing (including PR &amp; Communication)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales (if applicable)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUB-TOTAL OTHER</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Which DNS Server Software do you use? (i.e. software which resolves and publishes DNS names and establishes name servers etc.) Please include the version details (i.e. BIND 9.x instead of just BIND):
- e.g. BIND, ANS, NSD, tinydns, PowerDNS, MS DNS, Simple DNS Plus, Other

14. Please provide a brief narrative as to which software you use for managing your registry platform (used for zone file generation and management)
Areas of interest include extent and use of the following
- Open source
- In-house development
- Synchronous or a-synchronous
- Type of communication: EPP, XML, e-mail, web-interface
- One system for multiple TLD’s or several instances for multiple TLD’s
- Combined services for multiple TLD’s (e.g. only one registrar database or one billing address)
### C. Reserves

15.A. Please provide a brief narrative to describe your policy objectives for maintaining adequate financial reserves (i.e., which measures do you consider) and whether you typically meet those objectives:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Currency Used</th>
<th>Maintenance of Name Servers and DNS for registered domain names</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shared Registry system</td>
<td>Whois Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registrar billing and accounting</td>
<td>Data security and data escrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDN Registrations (if applicable)</td>
<td>DNSSEC (if applicable)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15.B. When expressed relative to your total annual capital expenditure and operating costs, do you currently have cash reserve / funding in place equivalent to:

- [ ] Less than 1 years of capital expenditure and operating costs
- [ ] Between 1-3 years of capital expenditure and operating costs
- [ ] Greater than 3 years of capital expenditure and operating costs

### D. Network Architecture

18. Please check whether the following elements of your DNS infrastructure support IPv6 and provide a brief narrative, if appropriate, to clarify:

- Shared Registry system and DNS Server Software (Bind Version 9.x etc) support publication of IPv6 address records (AAAA):
- Listing of AAAA glue records for domain registrations supported:
- Some/All name servers are accessible over IPv6:
- Public facing services (such as registry web site, email) are accessible over IPv6:

19. If your DNS infrastructure (including server software and O/S) does not support IPv6, do you intend to support it within the next 2 years?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

Please provide a brief narrative, if appropriate, to clarify:
20. If you do not support DNSSEC, do you intend to support it within the next 2 years? Use this space to clarify if appropriate.

| Yes | No |

21. Please describe the number of core registry locations including primary and secondary sites: (this question refers to the core registry locations only. Name Servers are covered in Question 26)

| Number of Core Registry Locations |

22. What is your EPP server throughput in terms of maximum domain name registrations/second?

| Average | Peak over the last 12 months | Maximum capacity |

23. Please provide the number of the following system components in use, both as of today, and 1 year after the date of commencement of operations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Today</th>
<th>1 year after commencement of operations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Servers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Databases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24. Which database and Server OS do you use?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Database and Server OS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oracle/Solaris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MySQL/Linux</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please provide detail)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25. Please provide the size of your core registry databases (in GB):

| Size of Core Registry Databases (in GB) |

26. How many separate locations do you have for your DNS servers?

| Number of Separate Locations for DNS Servers |

27. A. Do you have a detailed registry continuity plan in place?

| Yes | No |

27. B. If you responded “Yes” to Question 27.A, has a transition services provider been identified and contractually engaged?

| Yes : | No : |

28. How often do you review / refresh the plan?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Review / Refreshing the Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please provide detail)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bi-annually</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
29. If you responded "Yes" to Question 27.B, please check whether the following elements are part of your arrangement with your transition services provider:
- Registry Services: ☐
- Maintenance of name servers and DNS for registered domain names: ☐
- Other items: ☐

30.A. Do you have a failover testing plan in place?
- Yes ☐ No ☐

30.B. If you responded "Yes" to Question 30.A., how regularly do you test it?
- Annually or more frequently ☐
- Less frequently than annually ☐
- Never ☐

H. Monitoring and Fault Escalation
31. Please describe the tools currently used for monitoring critical registry operations and systems:

32. Please provide the current (past 3 months) % uptime for the following registry services:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shared Registry System (EPP)</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNS Service</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whois Service</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I. Registry Size and Operations
Questions 33-37 need only be completed if you have not already previously made this information available to ICANN through regular reporting

33. On average, what volume of renewals (in actual number of renewals) do you receive on a daily basis?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Registry 1</th>
<th>Registry 2*</th>
<th>Registry 3*</th>
<th>Registry 4*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Today:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As of 1 year after commencement of operations:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As of 2 years after commencement of operations:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best-estimate as to 1 year from today:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = if relevant
34. On average, what volume of cancellations / deletions do you receive on a daily basis?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Registry 1</th>
<th>Registry 2*</th>
<th>Registry 3*</th>
<th>Registry 4*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Today:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As of 1 year after commencement of operations:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As of 2 years after commencement of operations:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best-estimate as to 1 year from today:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = if relevant

35. On average, what volume of Whois queries do you receive on a daily basis?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Registry 1</th>
<th>Registry 2*</th>
<th>Registry 3*</th>
<th>Registry 4*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Today:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As of 1 year after commencement of operations:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As of 2 years after commencement of operations:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best-estimate as to 1 year from today:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = if relevant

36. What is the average response time for the following registry services?

- Shared Registry System (EPP): 
- DNS Service: 
- Whois Service: 

37. Please describe your pricing model (with respect to prices from new registrations, renewals, cancellations, and any volume discounts and promotions):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Registry 1</th>
<th>Registry 2*</th>
<th>Registry 3*</th>
<th>Registry 4*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Today:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As of 1 year after commencement of operations:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As of 2 years after commencement of operations:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best-estimate as to 1 year from today:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

38. Looking back at your initial registry size and growth assumptions (prior to actually commencing registry operations), were the

- Met?
- Exceeded?
- Not met?

39. Please describe the key factors (or challenges), that you did not anticipate, or that proved erroneous when thinking about actual registry growth versus your planned growth:

40. Looking back at your initial cost projections for running the registry (prior to establishing the registry), were they

- Relatively accurate (in comparison to the actual size of registry)?
- Under-estimated?
- Over-estimated?
41. If costs were initially either under- or over-estimated, what were the main drivers of the incorrect forecast (e.g., not enough labor, over-estimated costs involved, did not anticipate marketing requirements, etc)?

42. A. Are your financial statements currently audited?

☐ Yes ☐ No

42. B. If you responded “No” to Question 42.A, please describe what form of financials you produce, the frequency with which you produce them (e.g., monthly, annually, etc), and the level of detail involved:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annually</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

43. What is your current annual level of capital expenditure? (please state which currency you are using)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Currency Used</th>
<th>Current Level of Capital Expenditure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

44. What was your level of capital expenditure during the first year of registry operations? (please state which currency you are using)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Currency Used</th>
<th>Current Level of Capital Expenditure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>