HYDERABAD – New gTLD Program Reviews
Saturday, November 05, 2016 – 13:45 to 14:45 IST
ICANN57 | Hyderabad, India

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:	Hey, everyone. We'll get started in one or two more minutes. We're waiting for one more speaker.
	Hi, everyone. Thank you for joining us today. My name is Eleeza Agopian. I work in the Global Domains Division at ICANN. Today we're going to be speaking about the New gTLD Program Reviews, which is the title of this session. But really it should have also said, "And Related Activities," because there's lots of things going on with the New gTLD Program.
	All of these lovely people you see here on our panel today are going to tell you a little bit about that work.
	I wanted to start off by – can we go to the next slide, please – talking a little bit about some of the work that is underway. As you can see from this timeline, which we have very high up there – this is the projected timeline – there's a lot of different reviews and several different tracks of policy work going on in parallel in preparation for what may be the next round of new gTLDs.

One of the biggest ones is the CCT review. We have Jonathan Zuck, the Chair of the review team, with us today at my far right, who's going to speak about some of the research and other efforts to analyze the competition, trust, and choice effects of the program, as well as the application and evaluation process, and the safeguards that were built into the program.

Next to Jonathan is Jeff Neuman, who I think will soon by joined by his Co-Chair, Avri Doria, of the PDP Working Group. They're going to be talking about the policy work that's going in preparation for that round. The PDP group and the CCT Review have closely coordinated on their work, and I think they'll be talking a little bit about that and the overlaps there. They're interested in a lot of the same data sets that CCT Review Team is looking at, as well as the PDP Group. So I think they'll hopefully talk a little bit about that.

Next to those two gentlemen is Heather Forrest from the CWG on the Use of Country and Territory Names (UCTN). She'll talk about the progress that that group has made to date.

To my left is Kathy Kleiman from the RPM Review PDP. Did I get that right?

KATHY KLEIMAN: Yes.

EN

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: There's too many acronyms for me. I've only been with ICANN for two years. And she'll be talking about the policy work that that group has undertaken. They just started not too long about – just a few months ago – but I think they've made some progress. I think she'll be talking about how they're breaking up their work and the different rights protection mechanisms that they are all reviewing.

Next to her is Greg Rafert of Analysis Group, whose firm recently completed the Trademark Clearinghouse Review, which was commissioned at the request of the GAC. He'll talk about the findings of that study, which went through the public comment period and has closed. They're working on revising their report based on some input that came from the community. So he'll be talking about that. His review obviously is of great value to Kathy's team and to several other people on this table, so I think there's a lot of linkages.

Finally, next to Greg is Cristian Hesselman from SIDN, who's part of the team that is working on the Root Stability Study, which was just published. The draft report was just published on the 27th of October, I believe, which is open for public comment now. He'll talk about some of their early findings and what their next steps are.

ICANN|57
HYDERABAD
3-9 November 2016

So there's a lot to talk about. I've asked everyone to keep their milestones and progress updates to one slide, which is not easy, but they all successfully did it.

I think with that I'll turn it over to Jonathan and let him give his update.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Good afternoon. Thanks for showing up after lunch here. Here's my one slide – the title.

We are tasked with, at the CCT Review, looking at the degree to which the New gTLD Program enhanced competition, consumer choice, and consumer trust and to look at the effectiveness of the application and evaluation process and the effectiveness of the safeguards.

So as you might imagine, that's a lot for one slide. This entire ICANN meeting has been a very interesting exercise in reductionism, if you will, in terms of trying to report on some of these findings.

What we've tried to do in the review is be as evidence-based as possible. As a result, there's a number of studies on which we've based a lot of our findings as we're going along.

You see here in this slide that, even before the review team was formed, there was a previous implementation advisory group that commissioned a pair of studies. One was surveys from Nielsen and the other one was an economics study from Analysis Group – we've got Greg down at the end of the table – and those were divided into two parts, meant to be kind of a before and after look at a number of different topics.

The Nielsen surveys were designed particularly to look at end user and registrant preferences and trust in the DNS. We have published both the Phase 1 and Phase 2 versions of the end user and registrant surveys.

The most recently completed survey is the Phase 2 economic analysis, which is now currently open for public comment. So take a look at that.

We also had a study commissioned by AMGlobal that looked at the potential applicant pool in the global south because, obviously, we noticed that there was a paucity of applications from the global south. One of the ways to understand why was to ask folks that were similar in characteristics to the people that did apply from the global north why they didn't apply, did they know about the program, and, if so, why weren't they interested in participating.

There's a number of interesting results there about the confusion of the communication and a lot of misinformation that they had, but also trying to get a better understanding of business models for the New gTLD Program before they would take that leap.

We also currently have, ongoing, an applicant survey also fielded by Nielsen, where they're requesting that applicants share their experiences with the application and evaluation process. That survey is still open, so if you are an applicant or know one, please encourage them to look through their spam folder or wherever and find the invitation from Nielsen to participate in that survey, because of the 512 applicants, so far we have responses from 45. So that leads to some high-level conclusions, but not very well-parsed conclusions. As soon as you try to divide up 45, then you end up with too small a sample to draw conclusions.

We're also just about to put into a field a DNS abuse survey to get an understanding of whether or not there's an increase in DNS abuse in the new gTLDs.

So those are some studies that are worth looking at. The shortcut to get to our wiki is cct.wiki. Please check out our wiki page, where you can find all of these studies and ongoing transcripts for what we're doing.

To just talk a briefly about findings, I think the net results is that the findings aren't terribly dramatic, in a way. As Jordyn Buchanan of our Competition Sub-Team Chair says, "So far, so good," which means that we're enjoying some positive indicators of increased competition, decreased concentration, and increased choice.

One of the key statistics is that, of all of the gTLD growth over the past two-and-a-half years, half of it has been new gTLDs. So there's certainly an indication that people are making an affirmative choice with some frequency for the new gTLDs.

Concentration is still very high in that space but is decreasing. So, again, the trends seem to be going in the right direction in terms of competition and choice.

When looking at safeguards, it's similarly very difficult to tell what the effectiveness is of the safeguards just yet because the time has been so short. We looked at whether or not they've been implemented and whether they were described in a way that they seemed to be enforceable. The answer in most of those instances is yes. So, again, there's some positive indications for the trustworthiness of the DNS as a result of some of the safeguards put in place.

So, again, the trends seem to be positive, that there's an enhanced competition and choice, and there hasn't, at the very least, been an erosion of trust.

So that's about it, I think, for my few minutes here. The results are, as Jordyn puts it, "so far, so good." We welcome you to check out cct.wiki and look at things in more detail and get feedback to us and any questions that you may have at the end of this session. Thanks.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Jeff and Avri?

JEFF NEUMAN: Good afternoon. I'm Jeff Neuman. I'll start out with a couple comments, and then I'll turn it over to Avri. We seem to be working well as a tag team because Avri remembers all the things I forget and has some great points that I probably should have covered initially.

I think it's interesting because we're here talking about New gTLD Program reviews. In essence, one part of our work is doing review, but a key component of our work is actually looking ahead. There is a policy of the GNSO that was passed by unanimous consent in 2007, approved by the Board in 2008, that said that there will be a process for the introduction of new

gTLDs in a predictable manner. Obviously, out of that grew the 2012 round, but it has already been four years since the application period closed – four-and-half years now – and we still do not have another application window. So our work is trying to get this process moving.

We have about 130 active or listed-as-active members. There are an additional 30 or 40 observers of the group. So it is a fairly large group, although, as with many ICANN working groups, there's a core group of active participants. Even though we are now getting down to some good amount of detail, we always welcome the participation of anybody else that wants to join. So it's never too late to join, at least at this point.

The working group has a tremendous amount of subjects that we're looking at. We have divided, for the most part, those into a set of overarching issues – things like: should there be additional new gTLDs? How should it be done? Should it be in rounds or first-come-first-serve or some other manner? – and four work tracks that look into different areas in the New gTLD Program.

For example, there's a work track that's dedicated to the legal and regulatory aspects of the program. There's another work track that deals with general process and applicant support issues, etc. So we really have a lot of subjects that we're trying to cover.

An interesting note is that we are starting from a default position that unless we can find consensus within the community to change either the policy that exists or the Applicant Guidebook that was implemented – unless we can find a consensus that wants to change that – everything pretty much remains as is. So it's really important, especially in areas that we all feel need to change, that we work as a community very diligently to achieve that consensus.

We had already our first community comment period. We called it CC1. That had just closed a couple months ago. That was on overarching issues. Each of the work tracks are working now to contribute to a community comment #2, which should be out hopefully in January of 2017, which will provide another avenue for public input.

The last point I want to make is that, really, our work is dependent on a lot of efforts going on in the community. You saw that slide that was presented at the very beginning of all the different efforts that are underway.

So our mission really is to incorporate those findings and those reviews and lessons learned into our work, as well as what recommendations come out of Jonthan's CCT Review Team – Heather is going to talk in a minute about the use of country and territory names – the Nielsen studies, and the root stability study

EN

that just came out. All of the efforts that are underway, the rights protection mechanisms, are all going to feed into the work that we do.

So it's a large task but one that Avri and I are willing to take up and are having a good time. I really want to do – I should have done it the last time – a shout out to the eight work track Co-Chairs, some of which may be in the room, who really are doing a lot of work on this effort.

Avri, if you want to add…

AVRI DORIA: Very little to add. I guess in terms of doing reviews, the only reviews we have to do are the ones that nobody else does. We have to review all the reviews for how we're going to use them. There's also, other than these main reviews, the ones that are coming out of groups. For example, the GAC has several reviews that have been done about communities and other such.

So it isn't just these large institutional reviews that are being done by ICANN but all the little groups. So if you happen to be doing a review, send it to us.

But, basically, the only reviews that we have to do are the ones that no one else does. Then we have to more act on them than we do anything else. Thanks.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Thank you. Heather? And I should have mentioned that we'll have a Q&A at the end as well.

HEATHER FORREST: Thank you very much. My name is Heather Forrest. I'm here as one of the four Co-Chairs of the Cross-Community Working Group on the Use of Country and Territory Names as TLDs. I see Annabeth Lange in the background. She's another one of my fellow Co-Chairs. And, indeed, Carlos Raul Gutierrez up here up front is also a Co-Chair of the group.

Our group is in an interesting position in that some of the discussions that are happening between the Board and the GAC and the GNSO we think probably tangentially relate or directly relate to what we're doing.

Rather ironically, we've come to a view, after about two years of working together, that our group is not sufficient for what we've set out to do. The group was specifically asked whether it was feasible to develop a consistent, uniform framework regarding the use of country and territory names as top-level domains.

As you might imagine, we knew that was going to be a pretty big ask from the beginning. We had some fairly detailed discussions around the use of two-letter codes. Two-letter codes' use in the

country code domain space of course is long established within the ICANN community and within ICANN policy. So our discussions there were rather less complicated, I suppose.

As we moved away from, let's say, longstanding, established, traditional policy and into newer discussions around three-letter codes, we found that there really wasn't a way to rationalize the wide variety of views that were raised. I'll say that the group is jointly chartered by the ccNSO and the GNSO. We've had participants from the ALAC and occasionally participants from the GAC as well.

Bearing in mind some of the bigger-picture issues here, we realized that our very limited charter that looks only at country and territory names as we've defined them – and only at the top-level – doesn't really allow us to reach a determination as to whether or not a consistent, uniform framework is feasible.

With that in mind, as you see here on the slide, we've suspended our work at the point of three-letter codes. We haven't progressed to considering country and territory names in full. We're in the process of discussing a proposal – the link to which you at the bottom of the slide here – to actually wind up our work to enable to a much broader scope, a much broader community participation effort, bearing in mind that there are

several initiatives going on within the ICANN community that are covering this and overlapping topics.

We believe as a group that it would be very helpful if these were consolidated and an opportunity for the broadest possible community participation to be engaged in that discussion.

I encourage you to read our progress report. Largely what I've said now summarizes that. And I very much encourage you to read our draft interim report.

I wouldn't like you to walk away with the impression, with what you see on this slide and what I've said, that the group achieved nothing. In fact, the group has achieved a great deal and has managed to capture in a written record much of what has happened in this space in terms of policy development, why that has occurred, and how, essentially, we've gotten to where we are now. Given the very great complexity of these issues, that record alone is a very significant achievement that the working group has come to.

Before any other community group, be it the PDP or another cross-community working group or the GAC, engage in discussions around this, we'd like to think that written record would be a benefit and save other communities from reinventing the wheel. Thank you.

EN

KATHY KLEIMAN: Hi. I'm Kathy Kleiman. I'm one of the Co-Chairs of the working group with the very long title, "Review of All Rights Protection Mechanisms and all gTLDs PDP WG." In keeping with our long title, we're a very big group. We have 145 members and 108 observers.

Unfortunately, I have two wonderful Co-Chairs so that we can manage and balance this really, really large group. One is Phil Corwin, who's sitting next to me, and the other is J. Scott Evans, who can't join us in person but may be joining us remotely. If so, we'll encourage him to join us in this conversation as well.

So we have this very complicated slide. It gives an overview of what this policy development process working group is all about. What it's about in brief – I'm not going to necessarily follow exactly the words on the slide – is looking at the rights protection mechanisms that we've developed in ICANN since 1999.

The very first consensus policy was the UDRP (Uniform Dispute Resolution Policy), dealing with domain name disputes in gTLDs. We'll be looking that, but that's going to be Phase 2.

Phase 1 is the review of the rights protection mechanisms created for new gTLDs and put into the New gTLD Applicant

ICANN|57
HYDERABAD
3-9 November 2016

EN

Guidebook. Most of you know what these are. This is the Trademark Clearinghouse database and the use of the Trademark Clearinghouse database and the sunrise period [in] the trademark claims.

It's also the acronym, the Trademark PDDRP (Post-Delegation Dispute Resolution Policy), which is actually a policy that has never been used for revocation of an entire top-level domain for certain types of activity that, as the ICANN community, we've determined to be off-limits.

We started with the review of the post-delegation dispute policy. We're wrapping that up, and we're about a month into our six months on the Trademark Clearinghouse. If that's an area that's of interest, we urge you to join us.

We've been using the material from the Analysis Group and Greg, which is great. It's very good to have this material and to already have begun the studies. We're in the midst of data gathering efforts to learn more about the Trademark Clearinghouse database and how it's used.

I'm now on Work Status #3, but let me go back to #2 for our overall goal, which is really to recommend any improvements that the community might have to the rights protection mechanisms and to really see if they've achieved the appropriate balance and effectiveness. Are they working, and

are they working in the way that we intended them to work when the community created them?

We're the first to review it, and we're the first to review, for Phase 1, the new gTLD rights protection mechanisms. The recommendations that we work on, as Jeff and Avri noted, will feed into their work and subsequent procedures and go into the new Applicant Guidebook.

#4. What you can expect at ICANN 57 is that we're going to have an open working group meeting on Monday the 7th at 11 AM local time. We're going to be working on completing our review of the post-delegation dispute resolution process and talking about some of the key questions we'll be working on for the Trademark Clearinghouse.

If all goes well, we'll be wrapping up our initial recommendations on Phase 1 on the new rights protection mechanisms by late 2017. Where the UDRP will go, we're not sure. We could be here for the rest of our lives on that review.

Let me encourage Phil to comment as well, and J. Scott if you're with us by phone.

PHIL CORWIN: Thanks. Phil Corwin here. Happy to report that the three Co-Chairs have been working very well together on this.

To add just a bit of detail, the Trademark Clearinghouse, which is a validated database, we're reviewing that. But after that, we'll be looking at the two RPMs that depend on Clearinghouse registration, which is the sunrise registration, the opportunity for mark holders to register early, and the new TLDs and the Trademark claims notice, which is generated when a registrant attempts to register a term which is an exact match to something that's in the Clearinghouse.

We are encountering some difficulties, as some of the other working groups are, with finding adequate data. For example, the Analysis Group's study they did found that a rather astounding 94% of registration attempts that triggered a claims notice were abandoned and never went through to registration.

It's very difficult to go beyond that and determine whether that's because all those potential registrants were would-be infringers or whether it was a lot of people who said, "Oh my God. I'm going to need to hire a trademark lawyer to figure out whether it's okay for me to finish this registration. It's not worth it."

So we are trying to find other sources for that data registration, and registrars are the prime target. But one of our recommendations will be on, when there are subsequent rounds, building in the data gathering into the program so that any future reviews don't have this problem.

Beyond that, the last thing we'll be looking at in Phase 1 is uniform rapid suspension, which is a nice segue into the UDRP because URS is intended to be in there as a supplement to the UDRP.

Finally, we are tasked with recommending, for the ones that are relevant, which, if any, of the new TLD RPMs should become consensus policy and apply to legacy TLDs. Some of them wouldn't make sense; for example, sunrise registration you're not going to look at for legacy TLDs. But we are tasked with that.

So we're moving forward pretty much on schedule, and we have a great deal of work ahead of us. Thank you.

GREG RAFERT: Well, I can see why I'm sitting the left of you two right now. That was a nice segue into our work. I'm Greg Rafert. I'm an economist and vice president at Analysis Group, which is a private economic firm in the U.S.

I guess I'd be remiss to not note that this work is coauthored with Katja Seim, who's a professor at the Wharton School of Business, and Jerry Liu, who has affiliations with the Stanford and University of San Francisco law schools.

We were commissioned by ICANN to undertake an independent review of the TMCH services based on a recommendation by the

GAC in May of 2011 that a thorough review should be taken of these services.

I guess I should note that the purpose of our work is not to develop policy recommendations per se, but to take an agnostic view and assess the strengths and weaknesses of the TMCH. Then that can be used in some of the processes I think you've heard already about.

For our review, we really took a data-driven approach. So our review is based on a rigorous analysis of TMCH and third-party data sources. We've supplemented that with interviews and surveys of a variety of stakeholders and members of the ICANN community.

Our review focused on three specific parts of the TMCH, some of which you've already heard a little bit about. In particular, we look at the matching criteria. We look at the claims service itself, and then the sunrise services.

Going into just a little bit more detail in terms of what we were looking at, with respect to the matching criteria, one of the questions that we wanted to answer was the extent to which it made sense or not to expand the current set of matching criteria, and, if so, what that might look like.

Just as an example, one of the things we looked at among many in the report was the extent to which plural and other fat-finger typos should potentially be included in any changes to the matching criteria.

With respect to the claim service, there were a couple things we were looking at. The first was to get a sense for the extent to which the claim service period should be extended beyond the current 90-day period.

We also wanted to get a sense for – this was already brought up – to what extent claim service notifications that are viewed by registrants when they're thinking about making a registration lead to individuals not making a registration and why they did so.

Finally, with respect the sunrise services component of the TMCH, here we wanted to get a sense for: what would trademark holders view of these services? Were they valuable? If not, why? What changes should be made?

Finally, getting to some of the text on this slide now, our report was published in late July of 2016. We received a large number of, I thought, really thoughtful comments from the community. If you haven't had a chance to look at the report, please do. I think, although the public comment period has officially ended,

we would be pleased to get any additional feedback that people either in the room or online might have.

The goal is to finish the report by the end of Q1 of 2017. As part of this, and based on some of the public comments that we already received, we're working on collecting additional data from registries and registrars to flesh out some of our analyses in a little bit more detail. We're also making some more, I guess, qualitative edits to the report to clarify certain analyses and to respond to some of the other comments that we received.

So I think our hope is that the community and everyone else who's working so hard finds this report to be useful and informing the next steps with respect to the TMCH.

I will end. Thank you.

CRISTIAN HESSELMAN: Hi, everyone. My name is Christian Hesselman. I'm with SIDN, the registry for the .nl TLD. We've been studying the stability of the root, the effects of the New gTLD Program on the stability of the root. This is a joint consortium effort together with NLnet Labs and TNO, so it's a Dutch consortium.

The work was commissioned by ICANN in late 2015, and the conclusion that we arrived it in our draft report – you can read it on the slide – is that we have not been able to observe a

degradation of the security and stability of the root DNS system as a result of the new gTLDs being delegated. Currently, there is about 1,100 gTLDs that have been delegated. As you can see there, we have seen no observable effect.

We arrived at this conclusion after looking at large amounts of historic data and in-depth analysis of those data. We used various data sources, such as DNS-OARC. We used root server data, and we also used RIPE Atlas for active measurements and probing of the root server system. So we took a historic perspective and looked at all the data that we could find since the first gTLD was delegated back in October of 2013.

In terms of technical content, I'm going to refer everyone to the workshop that we're going to be holding on Tuesday, November 8th, in Hall 6 at 2:00, where we will be providing more details on the work that we carried out.

As Eleeza already said, we're currently in public comment phase, so we're collecting feedback from the community starting with that workshop on the Tuesday. Our plan is to deliver the final report, incorporating the community's feedback, by April 2017. Thank you.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Thank you, Cristian. Thank you to all of you. I think that was really interesting and helpful. Although I think we've heard a lot of similar updates throughout the week, it's nice to see them all consolidated.

I wanted to pose a few questions to the group because there are so many linkages between all of the different efforts underway, and then I think we'll open it up to the audience. I think we have at least one question on the remote participation.

I thought we could start, Jonathan, Jeff, and Avri, by you speaking a little about the coordination you've done so far and how you see that moving forward because the CCT Review – Jonathan is very polite – is getting closer to the end of their work and getting ready to deliver at least some early recommendations by the end of this year. I wondered if maybe, Jonathan, you could speak about that, or, Jeff and Avri, you can talk about how you anticipate taking those into consideration.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sure. Thanks, Eleeza. We realized very early on that there was considerable overlap in our objectives between the CCT Review Team and the PDP on Subsequent Procedures because it would be very difficult for the PDP on Subsequent Procedures to come up with subsequent procedures absent doing some kind of review. So there was a review component, as Jeff mentioned, to

their track. But as Avri mentioned, they're trying to get as much input that they can from existing reviews and then filling in the gaps.

What we've tried to do in our coordination is help them understand where the gaps were from the standpoint of our work, and they've tried to set some expectations about things they hoped to see from us. With some of them, we've dashed their hopes. Others we hope to deliver. So it was back-and-forth coordination in terms of trying to get that kind of information. We're hoping that this applicant survey, for example, will have a lot of cross-application.

We've been trying to coordinate on a semi-regular basis to manage expectations and manage timelines and things like that and when they'll hear from us on various things. We have also been adding things that we're working on as a result of that coordination as well. So there's been a lot of back and forth.

JEFF NEUMAN: I agree with everything that Jonathan has said. There's some expertise in the CCT Review Team that we just don't have in our PDP group, so we certainly strongly encouraged the CCT Review Team to take on certain aspects, as he just mentioned, that they're better equipped to handle.

Like Jonathan said, we have calls every few weeks, or we try to, and we coordinate, and we're really looking forward to receiving that final report and then hopefully getting Jonathan and others on the review team to then participate in our PDP.

AVRI DORIA: The only thing I'd add to that is that, indeed, we already have a lot of people are crossover. In fact, one of the coordinations that we find on many of these groups is that many people are in several of them and bring that cross-fertilization naturally. But we don't necessarily focus on a topic that another group focuses on, so having the formal coordination helps.

Other than that, it's waiting for the reports and then integrating the content of that report into the work we're doing.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Maybe I could pose a similar question to our [RPM] colleagues on how you see your efforts overlapping with these other groups, and how you consider those as you move toward your recommendations and your consensus.

[PHIL CORWIN]: Well, we understand that we're joined at the hip with the Subsequent Procedures Working Group. We have been

coordinating. The Co-Chairs have been speaking on a regular basis to inform each other on our progress and coordinate efforts. To the extent that the CCT RT review unearths information about views on the effectiveness of the RPMS, we'll take that into consideration, too. So we understand that we're one part of a larger whole and need to be aware of the big picture.

Anything to add, Kathy?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Two groups that we were unable to have us join us today are the two GAC working groups that are particularly on this area: the one on underserved regions and the one that's focused on geographic names. Heather, you talked about consolidating the work of lots of different community groups. You said the GAC has been involved in your work as well. Maybe you could talk a little bit more about how you see all of those things coming together.

HEATHER FORREST: This is Heather Forrest, and I want it to be acknowledged that I've been given the most difficult question, not of the day but of the week. To the extent that you have any hope that I have a solution to this problem, I will warn you now: you'll leave the room very, very, very disappointed, indeed.

EN

I think this topic and others challenge us as a community as to how we want to deal with these sorts of difficult topics that run together and cut across the SO and AC interests so deeply and so vastly, if you like.

I think one of the things that we need to do is reflect, when we're chartering new initiatives, upon the potential overlaps and try to anticipate those. I think that probably could have been done better by the GNSO and the ccNSO when they charted the Cross-Community Working Group on the use of country and territory names as TLDs.

While, yes, we knew that the issue was going to be of interest across the SOs and ACs, I suppose we didn't anticipate the possibility of separate initiatives. I think that one of the things that we need to improve on as a community is not running things in parallel streams, to the extent that we have initiatives that overlap even in part, not necessarily overlap in full.

I'm speaking from a personal perspective here. Perhaps to the extent that we can think about the possibility or potential of conflicting outcomes, I think many of the problems that we're discussing this week that are at the forefront of our mind are the result of separate tracks of work that deal with overlapping questions that then lead to conflicting outcomes.

We know in advance – we're all bright people – when there's a possibly of a conflict. We can't necessary predict it with certainty, but we know that there's a possibility.

Something that I think subsequent procedures and RPMs and CCT have done rather well is they have implicitly and explicitly identified those places for potential overlap, and that's worked into their charters, let's say. They're working in a much more collaborative effort. That's a lesson that we need to learn going forward. I think there are particular challenges in dealing with the differences in the way that each of the SOs and ACs work. I won't say that this is just the difference between and AC and an SO because, indeed, we've discovered in the CWG on the Use of Country and Territory Names that the ccNSO and the GNSO work very differently. We're both SOs but we work very differently.

So some recognition of that needs to happen, but more importantly, I would say the lesson learned here is that, where there is a potential for a conflicting outcome, we need to avoid that at all costs, not get all the way down the road and say, "Now we're here. What do we do?" So to the extent that any of us are involved in initiatives in the broader community, where you look around you and you say, "I think there's another group out there that might come up with a decision, and that decision might differ from ours," that's a reason, in fact, to pause work and down tools and do something it before going any further.

EN

That's in fact exactly what the CWG on the Use of Country and Territory Names has done, is down tools, not in an unproductive way, I hope you'll agree. But we're very keen to be part of the solution and not part of the problem.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I thought that was a really good answer to a really hard question.

HEATHER FORREST: Thank you.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I will open it up to questions now but I wanted to share with you some of the many other sessions that are related to a lot of the work these folks are doing here, particularly a session that immediately follows this one in this room on the CCT research results. So we'll be hearing from all of the different vendors that have provided survey and study data sets to the CCT team, which we hope the community finds useful in a wider format as well, not just for this review.

With that, any questions from the audience? There's a microphone in the center aisle here. I do think we have a remote question.

ICANN|57
HYDERABAD
3-9 November 2016

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: We have a remote question from John McCormack of HosterStats. "Were the sample set for the Nielsen surveys too small and not geographically diverse? Also, a lot of new gTLD growth is heavily discounted or free domain names, and that kind of growth does not compare well to paid registrations. Will any future research take this difference into account?"

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks for your question. I'm not sure exactly which Nielsen survey you're referring to. Is it about the end user survey and registrant surveys? Or the one that's currently open, which is the applicant survey? Maybe while I'm answering the other question, you can clarify the first question in the chat.

As far as looking at the types of growth in the new gTLD space, that is something that we're delving into a little bit. Right now, nTLDStats reports that something like 65% of the new registrations are parked, and they have a pretty broad definition of "parked." The reality is that there's a lot of different variations on that. In some instances, it means, "I just haven't gotten around to getting the website built for it, so I'm just waiting," all the way to the other end of the spectrum, where the page is being used for some sort of malicious intent, or somewhere in the middle, just for speculation.

I think that the economists in our group would prefer to not pass judgment on reasons people are buying TLDs as long as it's not for a malicious intention. And we're not entirely convinced that the characteristics of the new sales are so different from those in legacy in terms of the amount of parked SLDs.

At this point, we are waiting on some additional data related to parked domains and trying to understand what the significance of that 65% number is. But it's our belief that research on this should be ongoing and that one of the primary recommendations from our review team to ICANN management will be the tracking on an ongoing basis of this data so that we can pay more attention to these trends.

Jordyn Buchanan is actually heading to the microphone, so he may want to give a partial answer to this questions as well.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I think, as Jonathan mentioned earlier, I chair the Competition and Consumer Choice sub-team of the CCT RT. I guess I just had more of a personal reaction as an individual just thinking about the question. I was a little confused by the notion that somehow we should discount registrations that are cheap because one of the general ways that we think about advantages to consumers of competition is that it reduces price to consumers. So if the net result of the program is that the consumers are getting better

prices, most people would view that as a good thing as opposed to a bad thing, I think.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yes. He clarified the question by saying, "End user and awareness."

JONATHAN ZUCK: Maybe we're drafting David up to answer that question. I think that what we discovered is that awareness is a tricky thing to understand and that familiarity sometimes equated to a perception of awareness among users. So I think what's most to be learned from these Nielsen surveys are behavioral characteristics and what affects their perceptions, rather than using the absolute numbers for awareness in the surveys that, again, are polluted by people's perceptions and familiarity with different aspects of the New gTLD Program, rather than their overt awareness.

Alan Greenberg yesterday said, "I have yet to see a single new TLD in the wild." And that certainly hasn't been my experience. But, certainly, people expressed awareness that they probably hadn't seen a new one yet, either.

EN

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:	Mr. McCormack also added one other thing. "nTLDStats' data is not accurate on parked. Usage in some new gTLDs is below 10%."
JONATHAN ZUCK:	In some. Is that what he said? Yeah, so the 65% that I quoted is an average, and there's some, like .science, where the parked rate is closer to 20%. There are some, in China in particular, where the parked rate is in the 90s. Those are some of the ones that he might be referring to. So the 65% is an average.
UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:	Thank you. I think we have another question in the remote, unless we have another question in the room.
	I'll just read it. This question is from [Rshod]. "My question is with respect to the draft report by CDAR. I want to know the source of the data through which the draft report was made."
[CRISTIAN HESSELMAN]:	Actually, that's in the report. We have an extensive chapter in the report – I think it's in the appendix – in which we describe all the data that we've used, including accuracy and that sort of thing. So we described all our data sources.

To give you a few examples, we use RSSAC002 data, which comes from the root server operators. We use RIPE Atlas data, which is a measurement system set up by RIPE that consists of, I think, around 9,000 probes across the globe that we use to probe the root server system. And we used – I forgot one; oh, right – the DNS-OARC data, which is a day in the life of the Internet, which is a snapshot of the root server traffic that's made every year. There are a few others, but the full-blown details are in the report.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Thank you. Any other questions?

THOMAS DE HAAN: Thomas De Haan from the Dutch rep in the GAC. Just a question to Jonathan about the statistic about the new gTLD growth because I think that's very interesting also for the GAC.

Did you also look at categories, brands versus geographic city versus others?

The second question is, are there any parameters which you used which are, let's say, more linked to the usage of the webpage? Because I think usage really – and not registration only – says something about the consumer usage also. Thank you.

EN

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks for your question. Obviously we'll be talking more tomorrow in the GAC meeting. And Greg may want to speak to this a little bit. There is some information at the tail-end of the report that breaks the new registrations down by some categories, but that particular statistic hasn't been broken out that way. But we can look at doing that.

Usage is a very difficult thing to figure out because the real switching cost, if you will, to a new TLD is not in registering a new string but in changing your business cards and the text on the side of your van and things like that. So when people start using it as their principle domain is indeed very interesting but also very difficult to measure. So we haven't had a lot of opportunity to understand that.

But, again, looking at these parked sites versus – are all indicators of things that are not in use currently for a variety of reasons. So we know that the number of those registrations that are used is roughly a third, I guess. Right? I don't know, Greg, if you want to add anything.

GREG RAFERT: Jonathan and I were actually just talking about his issue of breaking down growth by different types of TLDs before this

ICANN|57
HYDERABAD
3-9 November 2016

session. I think it's something that's touched on slightly in our report, but it's something that I think probably is worth looking into a little bit more, especially with respect to certain geographic regions. So I think it's a good idea.

[CRISTIAN HESSELMAN]: In terms of use, maybe the CDAR report also provides an indicator for use. We've been looking at the amount of DNS traffic on the DNS route coming from new gTLDs. If we look at all the valid queries out there – the queries to delegated TLDs – then the ratio for new gTLDs is 1.1%. So 1.1% of all traffic for delegated TLDs comes from new gTLDs.

If you look at all traffic on the DNS route, then it's 0.4%. It's not a breakdown per type, but it's an aggregated view.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Thank you. We have three more minutes. Any more questions?

I think that's it. Thank you all for joining us. If you'd like to stay for the research results session, it's in half-an-hour in this room. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]