

Implementation Advisory Group for Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice (IAG-CCT) – Draft Report: 29 January 2014

See

- [Agenda](#), [Recording](#), [Transcript](#), [Chat](#)
- Additional meeting information available on the [IAG-CCT wiki](#)

1. Identify data elements to be collected starting now, in order to provide benchmarks and trends for later analysis

- The group agreed again that very early on it is trying figure out what, if anything, needs to be dealt with earlier in the process rather than later so that the group can make interim recommendations to the Board for certain things.
- Steve Delbianco and Evan Leibovitch took a first look at the 70 recommendations and try to identify some important metrics that may need to be looked into early on.

2. Discuss "First Pass" input from staff (to be provided by Karen Lentz)

- Staff were asked to follow up on some historical data and report back to the group. For example, the kind of historical data that's maintained on registries and registrars and zone files.
- The first task in terms of the Staff input is to identify which of the 70 metrics need to be dealt with in an expedient matter.
- One metric of particular concern was 1.8: the relative incidents of registrar complaints that come into ICANN's Internet remit. Staff noted that in terms of compliance and collecting that data, some of the Internet data has unfolded into the present compliance statistics that date back to January 2012. There is older, but it will take some more manual work to pull that forward and review it for the types of complaints that are being reviewed.
- The group also expressed a concern regarding 1.11 and the suggestion that MarkMonitor be reached out to. Staff noted that it would be possible to do so, but that more discussions were needed before doing so.
- The group also expressed concern about item 1.13 and its need for expediency was highlighted. It is noted that ICANN does not maintain this data and so gathering it would be difficult.
- The group asked the Staff to confirm if in 1.14 to 1.19, if Staff could confirm that the data sources would retain date-stamped, historical records.

- It was noted that 1.16, 1.17, and 1.18 and 1.19 would require government help.
- It was noted regarding item 1.20 that it seems fairly straightforward in terms of having some data that exists. When looking at reviewing the New gTLDs in that sense, there's a little bit of interpretation that needs to be applied.
- Regarding item 1.22 it was noted that ICANN is keeping the originally submitted applications that came in in June of 2012.
- Regarding item 6.1, it was noted that talks could take some time as it engages government agencies. As such, it was suggested that engagement begin as soon as possible.
- There were other questions regarding timing and urgency for 8.1 and 9.1.

3. Discuss feasibility & usefulness of survey for consumer trust

- There were some doubts about the data sample to be taken by a survey.
- There were concerns about the feasibility of a global survey, the survey respondents, and the cost of the survey.
- It was decided that it would be best to do two surveys.
- The group decided the surveys should be undertaken and that work on them should begin immediately. The group also felt it was necessary for a professional company to complete the survey.

4. Other Business

- There was no other business.