

---

JEREMY ROSNER:

I'm a partner at Greenberg Quinlan Rosner Research, which is headquartered in Washington. I'm actually talking to you from Moldova, which gives you a sense of the global nature of our work. I'm joined on the call from Washington by Kristi Lowe and Brian Paler from my team.

I head up all our work on international projects for corporations, campaigns, governance, advocacy issue campaigns outside the U.S. and really appreciate the invitation to talk to you about these issues. And I'll go through a short presentation and you can interrupt and I'm glad to answer any question, along with Kristi and Brian.

This is of particular interest to us, so we appreciate the inquiry, because we've been working on issues linked to ICANN since 2000, when we did a big study for the Markle Foundation about attitudes towards Internet governance, back when nobody even knew what the Internet was, much less Internet governance.

We've been looking at these questions of trust and Internet governance and domain names and the rest for quite a long time, and glad to share our thoughts with this.

The short answer to your question, Jonathan, is yes. It's worth doing. It's doable. And if you want a data-driven answer about how the gTLD initiative is affecting attitudes towards the Internet, then that's the best way to do it – is do a baseline survey now and then see how attitudes change in a year.

---

*Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.*

---

But let me give you the long answer, which is in this deck. So I'm going to flip through. Hopefully I can figure out how to scroll. Okay, there we go.

So let me just introduce who we are as a firm. We do opinion research for companies and candidates in governance and issue campaigns all over the world. We've worked in over 90 countries. We've pioneered a lot of things about how to make sure we are accurate on methodology, because – especially in campaigns – we live or die on whether we're accurate and we have an actual result on election day that measures how accurate we are, and so we've established a reputation on that.

We do extensive work with corporations, executives, consumers, lots of Fortune 1,000 firms all over the world. As part of this work, we have partnerships with research firms all over the world. I'll get into – that's a big part of pulling off something like this, because in each country, you're basically working with a different local research firm, who actually has the people who conduct the interviews in that language.

And we've got particular expertise on this set of issues. We've worked for Verisign. We've worked for Microsoft. We've worked for Cisco. We did the [inaudible] with the Markle Foundation. These are issues we have spent a lot of time.

And a lot of the work we do – just to give you a sense of the experience that I'll be speaking from, a lot of the things we do for these companies are specifically on cross-national research of the kind you're looking at.

So Verisign was focus groups with IT professionals and influencers all over the world. Microsoft was in-depth interviews with IT decision

---

makers and influencers in some 16 geographies. Cisco was business decision makers and IT decision makers in 15 countries.

BP, for a decade, we did their international study of reputation, which was setting down a baseline, and then for a decade, measuring how the reputation changed after they rebranded as Beyond Petroleum, with very complicated cross-national measures of reputation, combining qualitative and quantitative studies.

So this is what we do a lot of the time, are these kinds of the studies. And they do work is sort of the bottom line – or they can work.

We also have spent a lot of time on issues that are very hard for the public to understand. And part of the challenge you will have on this – and I know you know this – is a lot of concepts are not things that people naturally think about. They can tell you if they had a hard time accessing the site, but they don't think a lot about Internet governance or whether the international marketplace is more competitive because you have more top-level domain names.

And so we've worked on grappling with issues like Net neutrality or GMO crops or the new Affordable Care Act, Obamacare. Early on in the process, when people don't really know what these things are and trying to do research that will be credible and accurate, even though some of the concepts are unfamiliar.

In some ways, that's what you face in this expansion in domain names. To some extent, people can say, "What if it's not .com, it's .bank?" But they haven't seen it yet, so you're testing something they're not familiar with yet.

---

Let me offer a few comments. And again, we just mean to be a resource on this, we're not proposing anything. Just want to raise the kind of issues we would think through if we were going to do a study like this, or if we were grappling with this.

We've seen some of the documents you have. We know you already have thought through some of the kinds of metrics you might track, because one of the first questions here, if you're going to do a baseline, what's it a baseline of? What are you asking?

And we thought the questions you were asking were good. We thought they looked useful. We thought there might be some additional metrics that came to our minds, things about awareness and favorability of some of the new domains – either that have already gone online or that are about to go online.

Changing level of trust, the whole domain naming system, user confusion of finding information recently online, perceptions about fairness or openness in the entire Internet system as it relates to commerce and daily living and metrics to track a lead opinion of the new system – and I'll talk more about a lead opinion in a second.

I think one of the questions is, "Do you have the right set of questions?" Another one that's occurred to us that might be useful. I think, beyond metrics on a study like this – metrics are important, they're useful, and you can collect them. I think there's some pieces of information that we would think of as more narrative, that we would in a study like this be tempted to collect either quantitatively or qualitatively, to try to get a

---

sense of the context in people's minds that surrounds the kind of metric questions.

How do Internet users adapt when there are dramatically new systems? How fast do they adapt? How quickly do they forget the old ways? How does the Internet navigation experience change? Is littering a concern, or do people value complexity? How does security concerns affect this. If it's BankOfAmerica.bank and it's a scam, are they more worried about that or are they more drawn to having more choices? What things provide reassurance? What are the techniques that work best for consumers to learn about these new things and be educated?

And I know that you and ICANN study all of these things quite deeply. But I guess the point is, in addition to the metrics, it helps to have some slightly more open-ended qualitative, narrative questions that help you figure out what the drivetrain is and what the connective tissue is and how the changes they're seeing with more TLDs are affecting their feelings and their attitudes.

Part of the reason for this is if you do a baseline now – or let's say you did a baseline two years ago, and then you do the follow-up study now, you might see big changes in numbers, but how do you tell if it's being driven by the gTLD initiative versus the theft of identities at Target?

There's a lot of other data points out there and stimulus that might be driving the changes, and so the qualitative can help to figure out, "Yeah, these numbers changed and they changed because of what's going on on the domain names. And also, here's what we can do about it."

---

I think as you think about doing this kind of research, a second group of things that would come to us is who you're surveying. We get the sense from the materials we've seen, you're thinking of surveying consumers and we think that makes a lot of sense. Within consumers, you might think about some subsamples that would be particularly important that you could get by doing an oversample, doing a disproportionately large set of interviews with some of these people – very heavy Internet users, because they have more usage; older, less tech-savvy users, people more likely to be confused; users in non-Latin script countries, because part of this is going to be expansion of gTLDs with non-Latin script.

And then, we also, as I mentioned before, our instinct, very strongly, is that opinion formation related to tech issues and Internet issues is different than some other issues. If you're talking about Social Security in the United States or healthcare, people form their own impressions and opinions very much by direct experience. But on tech, there's a disproportionate influence of experts, mavens.

And so, then, it's pretty important we think to understand these intermediaries – the tech opinion leaders, those both for and against proliferation domain names; business leaders, folks at Coke who are having to purchase 100 extra site names to make sure that Coke owns all – coke.drink and coke.whatever. Governments and the people in governments who are dealing with this change. The journalists who write for Wired and all those sorts of folks, they have a big impact on this and you can pick up a lot of insights about how opinions are likely to change based on how the experts are reacting.

---

A fourth set of questions is about where you interview. You'll have a better sense of this than we would. Our thinking was – I'm sure you've got a much more refined sense – developed world, developing world, major places. These are all places you can do opinion research of the kind that you're looking at. And almost any place, you can do it. I mean, there's special challenges and I'll talk to some of them. But it's very doable to do. These are the sort of places that we've included in the cross-national studies we talked about before.

And let me just run through four categories of issues that if I were in your shoes, I'd be wanting to think about and that from our experience, we think about. Kristi and Brian should jump in with points on this. And again, this isn't exhaustive. And again, the simple answer is, "Yes, you can do this. I think you should do it. It's doable. It's useful. You can have credible, valid responses." But there's a lot of detail to think through.

So let me just note the details in four areas quickly on designing the sample, on ensuring consistent methodology, on adapting global culture, and on design the questionnaire.

So first of all, on a survey, you've got to think through what mode you're going to use, whether it's a face-to-face survey or a phone survey or a web survey. Phone is probably the best in most places. You have to worry if you're really doing developing countries, where they don't have enough phone penetration to get good results. Web is certainly easier.

And certainly, talking about Internet consumers, you can reach most of them. But it has problems if your goal is to have really representative information for the full population, because web surveys are not

---

statistically accurate in most circumstances, if they are the kind where people can self-select to participate. Obviously, if you're in a country that has low Internet penetration, that's an added problem.

There are a whole bunch of things on all the modes in designing a sample that are sort of Surveys 101. But you obviously want to think about your sample size, to make sure that you have statistical significance on the kinds of changes you expect. And not just for the total populations, but for probably some subgroups.

So you have to design the sample big enough so that the subgroup of heavy Internet users or Internet users at all, that you have statistical significance at that level. You have to ensure that you have quotas, so that that the survey is statistically representative of the geography of the country. You have to think through how you define your sample. Are you doing it based on—if it's face-to-face, is it [inaudible] tracked or precinct. If it's by phone, are you doing cluster sampling on the phone calls? These are all things.

It's pretty technical, but they all are important. How you're picking which respondent to talk to, once you get someone on the phone or once they answer the door and there's a whole bunch of [inaudible] methods, quality control. How many callbacks you have to make sure that the phone call—I really called the person.

As I said, oversamples. If there's some population like younger Internet users who you want to know what they think, you may have to do an extra numbers of Interviews disproportionate to their incidence in population.



---

And then if you're doing qualitative – and it sounds like you're mostly talking about quantitative, but we really think qualitative can help fill in some of the connective tissue.

There are all sorts of things, especially focus groups. Whether you do groups of people who are all different and sort of random or groups of people who are all homogenous (same age, gender, socioeconomic status). We prefer the latter, people speak more openly. If you do a group of old people and young people, the old people can dominate. Although on Internet issues, it can be exactly the opposite. The old people may feel cowed.

Making sure that these people aren't from all the same factory or neighborhood, that they're not all people who have gone to a million focus groups.

If you're doing in-depth interviews like a journalist from Wired or a government official or the guy at Coke who has to purchase the domain names, there's a lot of things you can do to get people like that to participate. Honorarium, offering to share a summary of the results, all sorts of things to increase the incidence of their participation.

Second batch of things is on ensuring consistent methodology. Back about 15 years ago on the 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Geneva Conventions, we did a huge international study for the International Committee of the Red Cross, including in the war zone – so about how people felt about the rules of war. We learned a lot about training firms to have implementation of the survey so that the results really are comparable across countries.

---

You've got to sweat details like when you read people a list of options, do you randomize the options? Do you rotate the options? Read them backwards one time, forward the other ways?

You've got to do translation into all the local languages and dialects that the responder can answer to, and sweat through the issues of really highest-level quality level translation and checking the back translation.

You've got to make sure that the methodology that you're using to work in less-developed countries—we're just doing a project now in Malawi, where you can't ask someone to rate something on the scale from one to ten or one from one hundred because most people aren't numerate enough to answer that.

A third set of things which is related, which is adapting to local culture. You've got to figure out who the local companies are you're going to work with. And it makes a huge difference, because some of them have shoddy methodology and bad phone calling operations and some of them are very good. So you have to really know how to pick your local partners in each country.

You have to be sensitive to local holidays and different workweeks. And the Islamic workweek is different than the Christian workweek, and so that you're calling people on a comparable number of weekend and workday days, because that affects responses.

You have to be sensitive to who's making the calls, in the cultural context. You have to be sensitive to language nuances. We just did a project when I was over at Microsoft and it was global. And in the asking a question about whether people were impressed by certain things, we

---

learned that there was no word for “impress” in Japanese, and so we had to search with our local partners there and find a suitable replacement word, which was something like “excite” rather than “impress.”

Numbers are wonderful, because numbers are the same in any culture, but the words that get you to the numbers really can be quite different in different countries, and even on the most basic concepts – “Do you approve or disapprove?” – getting the words that are just right so that it’s comparable across countries is important.

And then last on designing the questionnaire, again, a lot of this is Survey 101, but there are big issues on order bias and constructing it so that you’re not biasing the responses and not changing the order from the baseline to the final survey, because that can change the results of that, any underlying change in attitudes.

I think one thing that’s really important that we’ve learned in the political context – what you’ll find is on a lot of these issues, people just say, “I don’t know,” because a lot of the concepts you’re pursuing are very familiar to you but a little abstract to a lot of consumers.

One of the things we’ve learned – and we do this in all our political surveys – is when we ask people who they’re going to vote for, significant portions in every survey everywhere in the world say they don’t know, they’re undecided.

We found that if you just add a follow-up question: “Well, I know you say you’re undecided, but if you had to decide today, what would you say? Who would you vote for?”

---

And that can be important on the kind of attitudinal questions you're asking about trust and domain names and how people feel about these changes. That pushing people when they say they don't know can reduce the incidences of don't knows and get you more-refined measures of people's feelings.

I think a really important thing for you is to think backwards, from the end of the results back to the questionnaire. You're going to want not just metrics, but you'll, I assume, be doing some analyses to try to figure out how much the changes in top-level domain names are driving the changes in trust and attitudes and user experience, probably using segmentation, regression.

So you want to design your questions to facilitate regression [inaudible]. You want to think upfront about what are going to be the dependent, independent variables. A four-punch question – very, somewhat, a little, not at all – which is not a continuous variable is not as useful in regressions as a one to ten continuous variable. Little things like that, but that can make a lot of difference in terms of how well you're able to show causality later on.

You have to be really careful if you're doing a baseline and tracking survey to make sure that basically nothing changes. That the language, the way you're doing the calling, the order of questions are all consistent, wave on wave, so you're comparing apples to apples.

There's a lot we do that goes beyond tracking, whether it's in politics or corporations. We ask metrics about what people think, but then we also

---

try to model the debate people might hear. And so you can imagine the arguments, pro and con, on proliferation of gTLDs.

And we think it's pretty interesting and pretty useful late in a questionnaire to say, "Let me ask you something else. Some people say this proliferation of gTLDs will increase choice and foster more competition and consumer power in the marketplace. Other people say it opens the door to security problems and will just confuse people and it's not necessary. Which comes closer to your own view?" That can be useful, to give you a sense of how opinions are likely to develop as time goes on, because it gives people's underlying receptivity to the argument.

And the other thing, which we do in politics in a lot, is if you're putting out arguments and not just testing existing attitudes, it's useful to test attitudes towards something like the whole fact that ICANN is adding all these top-level domain names. Run people through a bunch of questions, arguments pro and con, and then ask them what we call a revote, which is seeing if there's been a shift in opinion, which doesn't scientifically predict how people will move as they hear the debate, but it gives you a pretty good idea that they started anti but end up pro once they hear about it. That means that this is an issue on which hearing more may well work in your favor. Other debates we test, there's no movement at all because people know a lot about it and they just don't move.

Again, I went through this very quickly. But these are all the kinds of design issues, methodology issues, implementation issues, questions of

---

choices of audience, and all those things that we would look at a lot if we were doing this kind of study.

And then, the deck that we sent you has our bios, just so you know who we are and I'll be happy to answer any questions.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks a lot, Jeremy. Really appreciate the presentation. I guess I want to address a couple of things. One of things that groups like this within ICANN need to manage all the time is the scope creep.

We just want to make sure that we remind ourselves that we were asked to come up with potential metrics to measure to deltas in consumer trust by the Board. And there will be a review team at the end that sort of makes an assessment about whether that's happened.

So we just want to make sure that the qualitative things we do are designed, as you say, to improve the regression analysis for causality and not just other things that it would be good to know and probably would need to filter that out.

But I'll open it up for questions. If people, raise your hand if you have question for Jeremy, but I will say on the outset that some of the questions we have that were raised is if we were trying to make this worldwide – whatever that means – how might we choose countries to be regional representatives? [inaudible] to get somebody in every country.

And I guess some people have raised this issue about causality. So delving into that particular issue and what it is that would help with

---

causality, I think, is something this group would like to hear more about it.

And then cost and timing, because unfortunately, the program is already starting. So what this group has to do is make a decision about whether to recommend to the Board that a baseline survey happens, and so its feasibility and its cost will certainly be variables that have to be taken into consideration, like the cost in making the recommendation to the Board.

Why don't we let Ron and Nathalie ask their questions, just in case it affects the order in which you're going to answer to them. Ron, why don't you go ahead?

RON ANDRUFF:

Thank you, Chair. Good afternoon, Jeremy. Excellent presentation. Thank you very much for that. I think that, for my part, you answered a number of questions that were these big areas of, "Could we do this or not?" And it certainly seems that it's possible. You're doing it already.

I think the other thing that I found interesting about your comments is that the challenge is our content is not things people think about. So yes, this is a piece of research that is going to be very nuanced, so I was happy to hear that you have at least an understanding of ICANN, where many people do not. So that's very helpful in terms of giving us the information that works for us.

There were two things that I wanted to ask you. One is: you made a comment – it was on one of your slides – it was called "Is littering the

---

Web a concern?" If you could explain a little bit about "littering the Web," what that means exactly, in the context of what we're doing.

And then the second question I had for you is just a quick follow-up on the consumers. You're correct in that we would be looking to find out from end users, the people who use the Internet on a broad basis, just individuals and of course the corporations or IT and tech guys in the first instance.

So I'm wondering, how do you find these consumers? This seems to me to be the finding the needle in the haystack. And I just wondered if you might share a few words on that.

So the first one is "littering the web," and the second question about consumers. Please. Thank you.

JEREMY ROSNER:

Sure. "Littering the web," we were just trying to anticipate the sort of things that people who don't like the proliferation might say, that it used to be "I went to BankOfAmerica.com and now there's BankOfAmerica.bank and BankOfAmerica.mortgage," and we were trying to use the kind of pejorative language that people on each side—the loaded language that people might say on each side of the debate to try to get a sense of the kind of questions you would get to how people feel about the experience of having more gTLDs.

We don't mean that we would use that language in a survey. We were using it causally as a way of indicating that we would want to test



---

whether they're on this side or that side of the possible reactions to the proliferation of gTLDs.

On consumers, I'm not sure I understand the question. Finding consumers is much easier than finding the experts. We'd want to figure out how you think of consumers. But if you're talking all consumers, it's almost the whole adult population and maybe even some people under-adult. Age cutoff would be a question.

If you're just talking about consumers who are online, that's easy enough to find as well. There's a very standard set of questions for figuring out who's online.

That's not too hard. That's going to be a very large share when you're doing random-dial calling. It's going to be a very large share of the people who pick up the phone and you can use the first two questions to screen for things like Internet usage and whether they are a consumer, however you're defining them. Tell me if that didn't answer your question on that.

RON ANDRUFF:

No, that was it, Jeremy. Thank you. That was the question I was asking and I'm grateful to hear that that's the easy part of the project, not the difficult part. That was what I was looking for.

JEREMY ROSNER:

No, that's the real easy part. I mean, it's much harder if you're trying to find some of these subpopulations of experts on various things –

---

either as part of your survey or for qualitative one-on-one interviews. That's also doable, but that's obviously a much harder thing.

In terms of cost, opinion research is moderately expensive. It's not as expensive as [space ex] and landing something on the moon, but it's surveys cost in the range of – depending how big they are and how complicated they are – tend to range from \$50,000 to \$100,000 a pop, depending on the country and the length of the survey and a million other things and the amount of analysis being done by the people doing it for you.

And so if you're doing over a dozen countries, this is a \$1 million every time you do one of these cross-national surveys, or 20 countries. That's just a sort of very rough range.

If you're going to do a baseline and check in again later, that's a very, very general number. That's just to give you an order of magnitude.

Microsoft or BP, that's the sort of range of budgets they were working with. BP did this annual test of their reputation and it's all over the world. It was a project that every year they spent more than \$1 million on. I think that how quick you can do it —yes?

JONATHAN ZUCK:

I'm sorry to interrupt you. If we wanted to do two surveys, essentially – a before and an after – are you suggesting that we might be at \$1 million apiece? Because I have a belief that that might be tougher to sell internally.

---

So I guess if you could make part and parcel your question ways that we might get to some valuable data and find some efficiencies. Like I said, I spoke with Anna about using certain countries as representatives of their regions or something like that. [inaudible] clarify what you mean by those numbers.

JEREMY ROSNER:

I'm erring on the big side a little bit here, but it all depends on the number of countries and the length of the survey, really.

If you decide to pick one country from each continent and so you've got a half-dozen countries rather than 20, that's going to hold down the cost. And if you really only do 20 or 30 questions, including the demographic questions you have to ask – which are probably over a dozen, right there. So if you're really got a very, very few substantive questions, these things all are production costs of people sitting and making calls. It's very simple.

It really does depend on all those things. But surveys are expensive – credible ones. You can do online surveys with Survey Monkey that are incredibly cheap and give you nothing that is taken seriously by anyone who is concerned about scientific accuracy.

In terms of quick you can do it, I think the good news is very quickly. We've dealt with companies or organizations who face some immediate crisis and needed to find things out very quickly. We can literally field a survey in a couple weeks.

---

I suspect that the buying constraint for you will be not us – or whoever you get to do it – it's not going to be the people doing the survey so much as ICANN, which is a large organization, has to have review, which is proper, but will have to have many kinds of review. It's not like just one person who can order this and sign off on it.

But it can be done very quickly. I mean, it only takes a couple weeks of calling to field a survey like this, at most. In the U.S., it's usually done in two or three nights. And of course, you need some days upfront to get agreement on the questionnaire and you need some days at the back to process the numbers.

But the doing of the survey itself is pretty quick. The hard, long part is getting approval of the project and getting agreement on what's going to be asked and how. When you have a big organization with a lot of stakeholders that has a lot of people who have to sign on to the content of the survey, that's usually what chews up the time.

But I think you could. If there's a decision to do this, you could do it soon enough that you would get baseline numbers, given that not so many of the new gTLDs have gone online. I think that's not so much a problem. It's probably less of a problem than cost.

And then on the issue of causality, Jonathan, you brought up. Surveys don't totally prove causality, but regression analysis can help a lot. Certainly, if you find if that there's been a major change in trust in domain names where people have no perception that there are more domain names out there, that would tend to tell you that this is not being caused. But on the other hand, if there are a significant number of

---

people who are aware of the change in gTLDs, then you have an independent variable that you can see how strongly it drives the change in trust.

If that controlled, independent correlation and variation is very high, it doesn't prove causation. But it certainly, as in any regression analysis, gives you a pretty good clue.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Nathalie, you want to go ahead?

NATHALIE COUPET: Sure. Hello, Jeremy. I have a question regarding the [inaudible] are going to contact potential users, especially those they're not on the Internet yet.

And since you [inaudible] document, it was mentioned that sometimes there's [inaudible] countries and that you need to contact about 10,000 to 50,000 [inaudible] results. How would contact these potential users?

JEREMY ROSNER: I'm having a little trouble, Nathalie, hearing your question. Let me see if I understand. You're asking in places where you cannot contact them by phone?

---

NATHALIE COUPET: No. Regarding potential users, how are you going to contact these people who are not on the Internet and then [inaudible], it would be how would you contact people when in a country there is a very low penetration with phone lines?

JEREMY ROSNER: Ah, I see. Okay. So if you're talking about a country that has low Internet penetration – maybe 20% – if you make the decision that you only care about, that you're confining the scope of this study to people who are on the Internet, then it's just a matter of numbers.

If you want 1,000 completed interviews, then you're going to need to contact five times as many people as in a country where virtually 100% of the people are on the Internet.

That raises the cost. It requires more interviews where you start the process, but in the second question where you ask them, "Do you have access to the Internet?" and they say, "No." And then you say, "Well, thank you for your time," and you hang up.

It's the same if we're doing a study of registered voters in the United States. That is a smaller number than all adults, and so you have to go through more calls that you initiate at the beginning in order to find the required number of people who fit the criteria of being registered voters.

The good news is the people who don't qualify you learn that in the first 15 seconds of the call, so you don't have to go through a whole call. So

---

the cost is not so much. It's not five times as great, because those calls are very short, but it adds to the cost.

And if it's a country where there's not only low Internet penetration but very low phone incidence, then you really have to think about a door-to-door survey. We do that. Probably most of our surveys outside of the United States are done door-to-door rather than by phone. I'm in Moldova now. When we do surveys here, it's door-to-door. That's more time-consuming.

Most of the countries where you need to go door-to-door, labor costs are lower, and so even though there's more labor involved, the costs are not necessarily a lot higher. But it does add to the time. Instead of fielding a survey in three days, it's often two or three weeks and there are logistical issues about getting access to remote places.

I think, mostly, you're going to be looking at places that have sufficient phone penetration. Most of the countries, if you're trying to get an accurate picture of Internet users and Internet consumers around the world, then naturally, the numbers will naturally drive you to places that have higher [inaudible], especially if you're including cell phones, mobile phones, as well as landlines. Did that answer your question, Nathalie?

NATHALIE COUPET:

Yes, it does. Thank you very much.

A second question: since we're about to establish a baseline, I was wondering what was the impact of the Snowden crisis would have on such a baseline?

---

On numbers we would get, would there be a possibility to mitigate the Snowden effect [inaudible] Snowden crisis on these numbers?

Or would it be possible to distinguish between more objective numbers and numbers that are from people who have heard about Snowden and are afraid of whatever [inaudible]?

JEREMY ROSNER:

Well, that's a great question. This gets to the issues of causation, which are very difficult.

In any survey on almost any issue there's always a lot going on that could be affecting the numbers, and you never know exactly which possible causes are responsible for which attitudes.

The Snowden story could affect some things on this issue. I think, as I said, the Target identity theft, particularly in the United States, could affect attitudes. There's some other things I think that could affect attitudes in specific countries.

You can never really decide how much that's driving attitudes. I would be lying if I told you that there is a scientifically accepted or valid way to adjust the numbers to compensate for something like that.

And so part of the problem is, as I said before, that at any point in time, now and a year from now, there's just lots of things going on in the world and in each of these societies that can affect these kinds of attitudes. Just the state of the economy can have big effects on how much people trust different institutions. So economic changes can have an enormous effect.



---

And it might be that those things are driving changes in attitude on trust toward the Internet and the domain name system 99%, and the change in the domain name system and naming protocols and the proliferation of gTLDs is only responsible for 0.05%. You can't know, but you can do some regression analyses.

NATHALIE COUPET: Hello?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Jeremy? Did we lose Jeremy?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It certainly looks like it, yep.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Sorry, guys. I know you have a couple of questions.

KRISTI LOWE: Hey, Jonathan. We'll try to get them back.

RON ANDRUFF: It looks like he's typing something into the chat, Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay.

RON ANDRUFF: So, Jeremy has said that Kristi could speak or someone else could speak. I'm just wondering if there's any further questions we might want ask, Jonathan, of those individuals from the GQR team?

KRISTI LOWE: And real quick, he's just asking if your system can call him back.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Both those things are true.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: I just wanted to comment on what somebody else said in terms of finding the needle in the haystack. I find the methodologies described by Greenberg very interesting. But in our particular case, at least outside the United States, the chances of finding somebody in the streets or on the end of the phone who knows anything at all about the new gTLDs is rather low.

Somebody said something about finding the needle in the haystack. I seriously wonder first about the efficiency of a baseline study where maybe 90% of the calls will draw a blank.

And the other hand, whether the remaining responses can remotely be considered statistically significant when compared subsequently with the follow-up study, bearing in mind that it's only worth doing the

---

baseline study if, in effect, you have committed to do the follow-up study later.

Finally, Greenberg, you must understand that you are here as an ad hoc advisor to the working group, and as such, have almost certainly disqualified yourselves from actually conducting the study, because of privileged information.

That being said, Ron, I maintain certain reservations I've had about this. I know some of our colleagues have expressed similar concerns, especially in view of the potential price of the baseline study.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Christopher. I think that we want to get some of those questions answered, for sure, and then we'll have our own conversation about trying to weigh of the benefits of it and things like that. We need to have that conversation separately.

I think the one thing that jumps out at me, though – while Jeremy's getting back on the line – is that it's not trust in the new gTLD program that we're tasked with trying to understand. It's the effect of the new gTLD program on trust.

So a baseline survey that would happen initially would just be about how much people trust the DNS now and whether they think that they'll easily get where they're going to go or they think they'll be redirected.

I think that there's ways to deal with what people's feelings about the DNS are currently that don't have anything to do with the new gTLD program or being aware of it.

---

And instead later, when the people have become aware of it and it's had a chance to percolate a little, see if those same questions get answered differently.

And then I think the only mention of the new gTLD program is to help identify what some of the causality might be for the change in those answers.

I think that was Jeremy's point, which hopefully he can agree with or not agree with when he comes back on.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: But ICANN has a number of other tools to improve trust.

JONATHAN ZUCK: This isn't a tool [inaudible]

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: [inaudible]compliance with the registry-registrar agreement, or like reinforcing privacy in WHOIS.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: That's right.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: The things that ICANN can do for trust, which don't involve a survey.

---

JONATHAN ZUCK: And a survey isn't designed to improve trust. We're just trying to measure. Part of advising an evaluation team, we're not evangelists for particular policies on this call. But let's hold these conversations until we're done with the GQR people, if we can.

Is Jeremy back on the line? Margie, do you have something you want to add?

MARGIE MILAM: Is Jeremy back on the line?

KRISTI LOWE: Not sure if you all were to connect him back or not. Doesn't look like he's back on yet, though.

JEREMY ROSNER: Hi, I'm back.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Oh, okay. Good. Okay. So Jeremy, you're back. Excellent. Nathalie, were you able to get your questions answered sufficiently?

NATHALIE COUPET: Yes, thank you very much.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. And Margie, did you have a question for Jeremy?

MARGIE MILAM: Yeah, just a couple of things I wanted to follow up on. I'm hearing an echo. Is anyone else hearing an echo?

JONTHAN ZUCK: Yes.

RON ANDRUFF: You have to turn off and [inaudible] mute their speakers.

MARGIE MILAM: Right. I don't have my speakers on. I think it might have been Jeremy. I see he's the last one that joined the call.

I couple things I wanted to point out. One, I think Christopher made a statement about there being some sort of privilege. I just want to clarify that I don't see that as being the case. If there were an RFP that were to be issued on this, I don't see why the Greenberg firm couldn't participate as well as any other firm. This isn't that kind of relationship where they'd be precluded from providing a response, should they be interested.

Actually the reason I raised my hand was prior to that comment. As staff, we've also been looking at these issues and also talked to another survey firm and I think you've raised a lot of the issues that we've also heard.

---

One of the suggestions we had, and I wanted to get your thoughts on this, was whether there'd be an alternative way of perhaps getting the sentiment about the consumer views, like for example, doing some sort of sentiment analysis by looking at articles and online social media to see what people think about the domain names system and whether that might be effective in addressing some of these questions.

I'm just curious whether, Jeremy, you guys have experience with that or any thought on whether that kind of analysis is helpful.

JEREMY ROSNER:

Thanks. We do things like that – online analytics, tracking sentiment, discussion of different concepts online. I think can be very useful. I don't think that's very recognized as a scientifically reliable measure of sentiment. I think that gives you some impressions of—when we're advising a candidate, we'll look very hard. “When you said this, then attention to your website spiked and your fundraising went up” and things like that.

But I would think that would be a very hard methodology to defend as the metric you're using, because it's subject to a lot of interpretation. It's not a random sample. All sorts of reasons that make it much less scientific than any random sample survey.

To go back to the point Christopher was making, I think it's very important to clarify the impact of not having a lot of people out there who are familiar with the gTLD proliferation or even the domain name system.

---

There are any number of things that we conduct interviews about where people have attitudes even though they may not know anything at all about the various policy regimes that have influenced those attitudes. People's attitudes can still be valid without—I think if this was an effort to just measure attitudes toward the gTLD initiative, then you couldn't possibly do a general public or general consumer survey, because as Christopher said, you would find a very low number of people who have meaningful information or attitudes about that.

But my impression is that you're trying to track metrics about trust of consumers in the Internet and Internet domain naming system, which everybody who's online pretty much has a valid attitude about. Everyone's typed in .com or .net or .edu, and so they know what that's talking about. They don't have to understand the policy to have an attitude.

And then it's a matter of seeing if there are indicators about their awareness of some of these new domain names that correlate. They don't have to know anything about the initiative. They don't have to know anything about ICANN. They don't have to know anything about the architecture of the Internet in order to answer these.

So it's very true that it's an area where the underlying policy is understood by an extraordinarily low number of people, but you can still find attitudes.

And the same is true on any number of things – healthcare policy, national regulatory policy. Those are all cases where people have valid attitudes about the end result and no meaningful knowledge at all



---

about the regulations and the architectures that produced the system that they have trust or lack of trust in.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's great Jeremy, thank you. Does anybody else have—oh, Ron, go ahead.

RON ANDRUFF: Thank you, Chair. A quick question about the [inaudible] – mute my phone.

So Jeremy, what I wanted to ask you was the question about you mentioned about the second survey being exactly the same as the first survey, if I understand. So it means that, effectively, we would be calling the same respondent. Does that then bring down the cost on the second survey, by chance? Thank you.

KRISTI LOWE: We lost Jeremy again. I don't know if you want to try to get him back.

RON ANDRUFF: Kristi, could you answer that? Just give us a sense is all I'm looking for. Thank you.

KRISTI LOWE: We wouldn't be calling the exact same people. What we would be doing when we go back to those for the second survey is interviewing the

---

same universe. So it's not the exact same person, but it's the same universe. Does that make sense? So the costs are no different.

RON ANDRUFF: No, that's what I was looking to find. Yeah, we're fact finding.

KRISTI LOWE: Let me actually step back. I do think a tracking survey, the costs would go down because we wouldn't be writing a new questionnaire, and so we'd be using the same questionnaire. So let me correct that, I do think the costs would go down for that. The fielding costs wouldn't go down but the labor to write the questionnaire would.

RON ANDRUFF: Thank you very much.

JEREMY ROSNER: I'm back.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Are there any other questions for Jeremy or his team? Okay. Thank you, guys. I really appreciate you coming on the call. And we probably have to talk amongst ourselves about what you shared with us and try come up with a recommendation to the Board with respect to the survey. I'll certainly keep you guys in the loop as to how this conversation progresses.

JEREMY ROSNER: Good. So, again, we view ourselves as just a sounding board, a resource on this. Feel free to reach out to us if there are further questions. We appreciate the opportunity to share our experiences with you on this.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks a lot. We really appreciate your time.

JEREMY ROSNER: Okay. Take care.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks. Okay. So we need to be as focused as we can. Because I think that our number one initial objective right now has got to be to determine what, if any, interim recommendation we're making to the Board in terms of baseline data that needs to be collected.

So the survey is one of those things, and we need to sort of reach consensus within the group as to whether or not we recommend to the Board that a baseline survey be fielded. And if it does, then obviously some kind of subset of folks that need to work with the board or staff to pick a firm, select questions and things like that. But I think our job is simply to decide whether or not it feels important enough to do. It is expensive, and so we need to make a decision about that sooner rather than later and make a recommendation.

---

And then Karen is going to make a presentation based on staff feedback about which of our metrics touch on data sources that would be difficult to obtain a year from now, historical data that we might need to launch the collection of that data. And even then, only the stuff which we would need Board resolution to do because it would be very time-consuming or it would cause an expense.

I think that, again, that's part and parcel to this interim recommendation to the Board. And we need to make our entire conversation about an interim recommendation to the Board and try very hard to keep out other things that we can discuss after we make such a recommendation.

Does anybody have any questions about that in terms of the agenda? Do people agree that that's what our goal [set] is? I'm not trying to be a steamroller. I'm just trying to get to some clarity. Ron, go ahead.

RON ANDRUFF:

I appreciate what you're saying, Chair. I just wondered what are you thinking about in terms of timing? Do you want to have our recommendation to the Board prior to Singapore. Is that how you're thinking? Or are you thinking that's two weeks? Just to get a sense of the time that you're thinking about, please. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

I'm not the boss of us in that sense, but I guess given the nature of our circumstance, which is that this program is starting and will arguably begin to have an effect on consumer trust – if it will, one way or another

---

– very soon, I would love for a recommendation to be in front of the Board in time for Singapore for sure.

I'm open to hearing what other people feel about that, but that would be my feeling, is if there are baseline data sets that we need to collect. So it's a go/no-go on recommending a survey, and then we almost have a harder job, because the metrics that would in fact require baseline data collection take place now, we need to decide whether they're metrics that we think we're going to keep. We need to prioritize those metrics, as well, in order to make that recommendation to begin collecting that data.

But yeah, I'd be inclined to be aggressive and try to get something done in time for the meeting. Evan?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Thanks. Mainly, I just want to support what you were just saying. Based what we just heard in the presentation, given the time it's going to take to craft the survey, given the time it's going to get the Board around to making a decision on it, even if we were to act today, it would take months, literally, for this to roll out.

And sort of every day that goes on is another day that it becomes less of a baseline and more like a, "Well, we're already into the program."

I definitely support your need for expediency. Based on what we just heard, I really think that the need for that is even more than I thought coming into this call. Thanks.

---

JONATHAN ZUCK: Nathalie?

NATHALIE COUPET: I just wanted to say that [inaudible] make a decision [inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK: We can't hear you. Could you please try again? Sorry.

NATHALIE COUPET: Hello, can you hear me? Can you hear me?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes.

NATHALIE COUPET: Okay. I thought it seemed like an easy decision. It seems like, as Evan was pointing out, that not having any baseline is really, really incredible. Even though this will probably cost a lot of money and probably take longer than we expect maybe, I think it's very, very important we have a baseline study. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Alright, thank you. Any other comments sort of on our agenda? Because I think we sort of agree what we need to get done and we agree for the need for expedience.

---

And Evan, we would just have to select a subcommittee to really push and work with the staff to make this not take months to do, because it shouldn't need to do that. I've been in the corporate world and we can get a survey fielded if we make it a priority. We definitely need to make a decision about it sooner rather than later.

Before running to Karen, I don't know the best way to handle this conversation. Let me open up for very brief observations by people as to whether or not they have an opinion on whether or not we should recommend that a baseline survey take place. So your observations, and then after your observations, we'll do a little vote and see where we are on those.

So does anybody have any observations to make about whether or not we should recommend to the Board that a baseline survey take place? Okay. Oh, Ron, go ahead.

RON ANDRUFF:

Thank you, Chair. Just checking this off. I think what we're hearing on this call is that most people are in agreement so that you might just want to go to the check mark for a thumbs up or the X for thumbs down to get just a quick poll of those who are on the call.

But certainly, I would support a baseline study. I don't think ICANN can afford not to do this. We've invested huge amounts of money as an institution in the process of bringing together a rollout for a new top-level domains that is intended to go on forever. The idea of a round [inaudible], we've had them in the past, should never happen again. This is supposed to be an open-ended system.

---

And I think we have a fiduciary responsibility almost for ICANN to take a baseline survey right now to understand where are we before this program begins, because absent that, the next time that people will talk about doing a survey, they'll say, "Well, we should have done it right from the beginning but now at least we've got a baseline."

So let's get a baseline is rolling out. I don't see why you wouldn't make a recommendation to the Board to do so. Too much, money, too much effort has been expended on this program not to spend whatever is required on a baseline study and a follow-up for next year. That's my opinion. Thank you.

I see that Jonathan had to step away from the phones. He'd mentioned this to me earlier. I'll just handle the queue. Christopher, if you'd like to please speak, and then any others.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: I agree with the desirability of a baseline study. But everything that we've heard to date suggests that the conditions are not suitable for realistic and significant survey to be conducted worldwide. It would have to be broken down almost country-wide.

You guys are spending a lot of money on developing the new gTLD program. Looking at it from the outside, it looks very much as if this baseline survey is an afterthought, and I think it's too late. It's too late, it's too expensive. And although in an idea world it would be desirable, what we've seen to date is that it's very likely to be a waste of money.



---

So I'm definitely on the skeptical side of this, particularly as you've all heard from my submissions to the list that there are other, much more important competition-related metrics which are urgently necessary in order to guarantee at least the maintenance of the existing level of consumer confidence in the DNS.

So I think we need to turn our attention away from these expensive and hypothetical studies and look at the real responsibilities of ICANN for competition and fair play in the market.

RON ANDRUFF:

Thank you, Christopher. I see that Rudi has made a note in the comment, in the chat channel also, that the price conditions are indeed at a very high level.

I think we all agree that when we're talking seven figures, that's a big number. It may be less, as was noted. It may be more. But we have to get the hard numbers on this rather than soft numbers.

I think it put the representative on the spot a little bit saying, "What's the cost of this?" It's hard to know these things until you see them. The old expression, "How long is a piece of string?" I don't know until I see it. So this is something similar, but [inaudible]. Oh, you're back on.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

[inaudible] about what countries should be used of representatives of their regions, for example?

---

RON ANDRUFF: I did not get a chance to do the vote yet, Jon, just so you know. I put the control back to you, please.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. I wasn't trying to take control. On the cost thing, a part of it's going to boil down to the politics inside ICANN, about whether or not we can identify a set of countries that we think are reasonably representative of the regions they're in so that we can only do the survey in a subset of the countries, obviously. And that'll be part of – my guess is a largely political exercise, unfortunately, inside of ICANN.

And to Evan's point, probably the thing that will burn the most of our time is actually trying to limit the size and scope of the survey through representative populations. Evan, you have another point?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Yes, thanks. One was to address what was Christopher was saying, and that is that this is not a zero sum game. The collection of the survey doesn't have to be at expense of the valid points that Christopher wants to make.

So I guess my own concern is that it's not an either/or. Yes, we need to measure the competition issues that won't be addressed by the survey, but that doesn't negate the need of the survey. It's not a zero sum. We need to do both.

And as far as the cost issues are concerned, am I just making an assumption that this is going to be a competitive bid that can have a fairly accelerated timeline but at least we can have a couple of different

---

survey companies give their approaches to this, which believe that it could be done well with representative surveys that could extrapolate reasonable results.

Here we are talking about competition. I think the least thing we could do is have some kind of a competitive process that allows couple of different survey companies with different methodologies perhaps to come back to us and give us what might be some innovative cost-cutting ways that will still give us the results we need. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Rudi?

RUDI VANSNICK:

Thank you, Chair. I agree with Evan, especially on the last point he brought up. There should be additional bid on this in order to see what is the best proposal we can have.

On the other hand, thinking about a breakdown, I was just thinking about having a breakdown in countries where there is a new gTLD around. I think that would allow us to trigger if efforts were done in that country to get the message through that there are new gTLDs popping up, and probably have some outside where there is no gTLD announced to see what the reaction is.

It is a difficult issue. Anyhow, I agree. We need to do this recommendation to the Board as soon as possible.

---

JONATHAN ZUCK: Larisa?

LARISA GURNICK: Hi. I just wanted to point out that there are certain procurement practices and recommendations that ICANN has in place for an expenditure that's generally greater than \$150,000.

[RFP] process is required. Actually, it's recommended for anything greater \$50,000. So I think what we're talking about will definitely fall into that range.

And then depending on the magnitude of the expenditure, if it goes beyond \$150,000, there would be a broad solicitation in addition to the RFP.

So there's certain elements like that to keep in mind. And of course, Board approval is required for expenditures greater than half-a-million.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Of course. Margie, did you have your hand up or you put it down?

MARGIE MILAM: Well, I did have it. Larisa covered mostly what I wanted to say. But also, too, I just want to focus on the timeline, right?

So, Evan, while you made suggestions about trying to solicit feedback, you're looking at a pretty short timeline here, if you want to get a baseline that's going to be meaningful.

---

I assume you would want to go to the Board fairly quickly, and then once the Board decides, there would be an RFP. That typically takes 30 days. And then selection of the vendor and then the starting of the work. There's still, even moving quickly, a lot of time to keep in mind as you're thinking about the recommendations here.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Great. Okay. So I'm going to go ahead and just take a poll here. Everyone please raise your hand, online, if you believe we should recommend to the Board that a baseline survey be fielded or attempted.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Might want checkmarks rather than raised hands.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Oh, either one, I guess. Yeah, sorry, checkmarks. I apologize. So, Phil, are you a checkmark or did you have a question?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I'll vote myself.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Well, some on the call cannot agree as they don't have probably their Adobe opened.

---

JONATHAN ZUCK: Don't have their what?

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: If they are not on the Adobe, they cannot raise or agree.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I think everybody that's on the Adobe is on this time around. If there's someone that's not on the Adobe, then please speak up.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Jonathan, sorry. I have a hard stop at the bottom of the half-hour.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Me, too. Okay. So I think we're going to make a recommendation. So as far as actually offering to that, we'll start to deal with that in e-mail.

Now, for the rest of this, we've reached the end of our time, unfortunately. I want to ask if folks are able to do a call next week instead of waiting two weeks, so we can get a recommendation done before the 28<sup>th</sup> of February.

So if everybody would clear their votes and now just put a checkmark if you feel like you can get on a call next week, instead of waiting two weeks [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Can staff check on that line, so we can hear each other, please?

JONATHAN ZUCK: [inaudible] people's votes [inaudible] call next week. I'm going to request that staff do a Doodle and try to get a call done in this time frame here. So we can go through Karen's report and then with the intention of doing a recommendation to the Board by the 28<sup>th</sup> of February. Okay? Does that make sense to everyone?

RON ANDRUFF: That sounds good, Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. I know this is taking a long time and I apologize for that. But it's a big program we're trying to evaluate, and we will get to all these issues, including Christopher's proposed additional metrics with respect to competition. I did a brief response in the e-mail. But we're going to get all those things. I just want to get to this baseline data as quickly as possible. And as we now know, "as quickly as possible" is February 28.

So we'll send around a Doodle, and we will we be focused just on the rest of these metrics that would require early collection of data, and from that formulate a recommendation to the Board that we would present to them by the 28<sup>th</sup> of February.

Alright. Thanks everyone so much for being on the call and for your ongoing participation.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPT]**