

---

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:

Okay, hopefully no one is hearing music. Just my voice. We'll try again. Thank you, everyone. Good morning. Welcome. I hope you all had a good evening.

As I mentioned, we have Dave Dickinson here from Nielsen. We are going to talk about the upcoming Phase Two Consumer Survey. The Registrant Survey will come later this year, but I think maybe Dave will touch a little bit on the preparations for that as well.

The draft of the survey you've seen so far, as we've said, is for consumers. It's really focused on Internet users. Just to provide a little context, I think we've mentioned before, the survey was commissioned as a result of a recommendation from the Implementation Advisory Group that was working on this review. In 2014, they made a recommendation to commission the survey as soon as possible to capture consumer's opinions before new gTLDs really permeated the market. The idea was to get a sense of choice and trust in the domain name system prior to new gTLDs really taking hold.

That brought us to Nielsen. We conducted an RFP, and we contracted with Nielsen to do the first phase survey. We are doing a similar survey a year later to measure any differences in opinions, changes in attitudes over time. The survey that you saw is largely built off of what was fielded a year ago in order to really allow for some comparison points, with some additions and changes to reflect the fact that there are more new gTLDs in the root and so on and so forth.

I think with that, I can let Dave take over.

---

*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.*

---

DAVID DICKINSON: I think I can get close enough to this one. Thanks, everyone. Let's see...to advance the slide. First question.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: The slide's not showing up here.

DAVID DICKINSON: One second, please. Okay. Alright, you should be seeing the background slide now. As was just stated, this was the second year of a program that was designed to assess the current TLD landscape and to measure factors, such as consumer awareness, experience, choice, and trust with the new TLDs and contrast those with more of what we term the "legacy" gTLDs and the system in general.

We interview two different groups. We interview consumers, and that's what this study is. In that, there's a small naturally-occurring representation of registrants, but it's not designed to be interviewing the registrants. We have a separate study that will be fielded in the summer that screens for people who have registered one or more domain names before.

It's a multi-wave program. This is the second wave. It was designed to track changes. I bring that up because as we go through and look at changes here, there may be things that in hindsight we wish we might have done differently, but we want to keep them the same for comparability. Then we can look at other ways to enhance that or change that. So that will be something that we talk about.

---

The need for comparability, I would say, if this is the endpoint – which I believe it is, this is the second wave and it's the last wave – comparability then becomes paramount because if we change it, we lose that tracking. If this were to be a longer term program, I would say, "Get it right now. Make those changes. Give up some tracking comparability this time for the future." But I think this is designed to be the last of it, so I'm putting a little more weight on the comparability and consistency.

We will be presenting these results, or plan to, in June. What we want to do today is go through the remaining comments that were in the survey, talk about how we can address those changes. There are some areas where I think we need to have some discussion, so we'll go through and do that. Then, hopefully, we can move on to field.

I'll start there at the little icon over on the right-hand side. We're already a little past the date that we fielded this last year, so we do want to get it in the field as quickly as possible. A few weeks, a month isn't going to make a huge difference in comparability, but we do want to get as close to that same fielding point as possible, so we want to move through.

The other thing I'll point out while I'm on the right-hand side of the page is the survey averaged just over 25 minutes last year. It was intended to be a 15-minute survey, so we stretched that. That's long from a respondent experience. There are suggestions in here to add things. I think if we're going to add stuff, we need to look at removing some stuff. It shouldn't be any longer. Compliance is not the right word,

---

but willingness to keep participating and data quality starts dropping dramatically after about 20 minutes.

Who we interviewed, over on the left-hand side of the slide, there were adults 18+. There's a question of why didn't we interview people younger than 18, and this is where I'll step aside and say, "Unfortunately, nobody who was involved with the original design of this survey at Nielsen is still at Nielsen. I wasn't there, so I don't know why we didn't. We could add some, and we'll get to that point in the survey. We'll talk about that.

They had to spend a minimum of five hours per week on the Internet. There's a question about that we'll talk about. The countries and the quota systems were designed to represent about 75% of the global online population, Internet users. That's how we drew that. The sample sizes vary by country, and I thought I'd throw this up here.

There's a question about what's the statistical power. This is not exactly statistical power but a general confidence interval. You can see the sort of confidence intervals we have from the smaller countries, such as I think Nigeria is one of the smaller ones, is 100. Actually, they're a little bit bigger than that, but up to China it's 1,100. You can see the confidence interval around the in-country results, but also we don't tend to look at the in-country results very much. Just for a few questions, we're mostly looking at it regionally. So the countries within each region are proxies for the region in general.

There's a total of 24 countries in here. It's translated, and people have the option of 18 different languages.

---

Before we get into the question itself, there was a comment and I thought it was just easier to deal with here. There are the city gTLDs. We had a question in there that had a few of them, but there wasn't one for every country. The suggestion was, "Why can't we have one for every country?" That's a good idea. We can cycle it around so whatever country they're in, they'll see that one. The problem is, I couldn't find some for every country. The ones that are in light text on the slide, those are the ones that I found reference to as either existing or coming soon. The bolded ones, or the red on my slide, are the ones that I couldn't find anything for those countries and so I made suggestions of what we might use.

I would say we would want to just get agreement that we're fine (1) with sticking things in there that don't actually exist already. We don't see a methodological problem for that but want to make sure there are no other concerns around that. And (2) does anyone have any issues with the specific ones the I selected? I think they're pretty straightforward. The two I have concerns about probably are Canada. I saw that Toronto was looking at .to as a...that's a no?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible] wouldn't be allowed.

DAVID DICKINSON: Okay. So the news article I saw was not accurate – on all sorts of topics. Okay, so in case you couldn't hear it, .to would not be allowed, so we just do .toronto perhaps.

---

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

DAVID DICKINSON: Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: But is it also the right one to ask for?

DAVID DICKINSON: Yes, I was going to say that's the other one I had an issue. Not the spelling. Mexico City, that just seemed to create some complications with other ways or with the length of it and the country and those sorts of things. So I picked a city other than Mexico City for that. But that's just a suggestion. We can put anything in there that you guys feel more comfortable with.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I would have the same comment about Argentina. Cordoba is interesting, but...

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Make sure to identify yourself.

---

MEGAN RICHARDS: Yes. Excuse me. It's Megan Richards speaking for the record. But that's just a question. Are we looking at the amount people actually [use this]? Cordoba is a nice city, but it's not the biggest city in Argentina. I'm not sure how much traffic there is to it. And same for Guadalajara in Mexico.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

MEGAN RICHARDS: Yes, but it's not...

DAVID DICKINSON: They're just intended to be used as examples for an in-country city. Mexico City and Buenos Aires were longer. For some reason when I was doing this, I just thought it would be nicer to have a shorter name.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Trying to predict – what's the question we're asking of people? Whether they would use it?

DAVID DICKINSON: The context is just – it comes up in a couple of places. We ask them how they feel about those. How likely they would be to visit. We ask them awareness of those city-level TLDs.

---

JONATHAN ZUCK: So we could be looking at false positives if we're making cities up.

DAVID DICKINSON: That's correct.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

JONATHAN ZUCK: It is.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Maybe you check about Guangdong. I don't think it's a city. It's a province. Guangdong in China.

DAVID DICKINSON: I think the – I'll have to check. I thought the prefect had the same name. Okay, we can fix that.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Go ahead.

FABRO STIEBEL: I think I was one of those who suggested to add this. I did because I was looking at Brazil, and Brazilians were looking [asking], "We need to join .nyc or something like that." It's better if you use the local context. I



---

think we do have an issue here with the countries that we don't have. But then if I understand, we have two questions, and the last one is if you are aware of those. That last one is a problem if we ask something unknown.

The results we have for awareness of these have rated pretty low, so I would say it's not a major issue if you ask for countries for TLDs that don't exist, although there is an issue. A suggestion would be to go with these suggestions rather than going for .nyc for everyone.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:

I actually think it's totally fine to include the made-up city codes. I think you guys should be able to easily distinguish between responses where people are responding to real TLDs versus made-up ones, so if we actually see a difference, we'll be able to determine that.

Secondly, I'm actually intrigued on the awareness question to see what people say in response to nonexistent TLDs. If you get similar response rates to that as to things that really exist, that may tell us something about the data on awareness around some of the new TLDs in any case.

DAVID DICKINSON:

One comment I will make to frontload what we'll expect to see. When you have false entries that seem reasonable, you'll get a relatively high level of false positives. I think this will be probably most useful when we look at some of those other questions other than awareness. What's their perception of these city-level codes?

---

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Can I read a comment from Kaili Kan? He's online. It's pertinent to this discussion. He says – I don't know if you're on Adobe Connect – but it says, "Only if a country is highly urbanized. You should not only sample cities but should also include the countryside."

DAVID DICKINSON: We already do have a question that has the country code in there. That's here. We have that for every country in the survey, so that's covered. It's the cities where I think the way it currently is – we can look at it when we get to that question – is they were sort of a subset of popular ones or ones that were in existence previously: .berlin, .nyc, there was another one. We wanted to expand that so there was an option for every country.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I'm sorry. He clarified. He meant the rural area, more like the region as opposed to the country itself.

DAVID DICKINSON: Oh, okay. Well, I guess it's, to what end? It adds length, and we're trying to keep it manageable. These questions are already getting to be a pretty long list for people to sort through. What do we learn differently from the region versus the city? Yes, there's an urban/rural divide in most places, so we could hypothesize that there would be greater affinity if I'm in a rural area with the region. But if it's not my region? We start going down a rabbit hole of complexity that I'm not sure gives us anything additional, given the limited real estate in the survey.

---

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

DAVID DICKINSON: Yes. I avoided Barcelona for Spain because there are some issues there.

FABRO STIEBEL: I think Cordoba should work, but if you want to use .bsas, which is how they call Buenos Aires, might be an option. But I think .cordoba is okay.

DAVID DICKINSON: Alright. I think that was my last slide, so do we want to pull up the survey? Sorry. It was a very short break. I took a nap during it. How about the rest of you? There we go.

Some of these will be very easy. I'm just going to acknowledge them we will bold and capitalize "week," so that's very easy.

The next comment though is, yes, we had a discussion actually about this, about how do you define using the Internet. Is five hours a large amount or a small amount?

There are a few other comments in here, but just on that issue, where we came down again, we said, "Let's keep it consistent just because we want to have as much comparability from one study to the other." So we put this threshold of five hours to try and make it very broad, but if somebody is using it an hour a month – again, I wasn't here – but I guess the decision was that' not a significant usage.

---

Again, this is one of those where we thought about defining it, defining the specific behaviors that fall into using the Internet, but we said, “Let’s just keep it consistent so our population base is comparable from wave to wave.”

“Why limit it to 18+?” Here is one where we could expand it to include younger people. That doesn’t affect comparability because we can screen them out when we’re doing the tracking. It does reduce your comparable sample size within some of the smaller geographies. Whereas, you might have 100 in a country right now, you may only wind up with 86, so it does reduce it a little bit. Since we’re analyzing on the regional level, probably not a huge thing and it would give you a glimpse into perceptions from younger people. So that’s really just a policy choice here whether we want to broaden it.

I believe, and I’m pretty sure I have some Nielsen colleagues on the phone, but – I’m sorry, I was just looking at a note there – I think we can go in most countries down to age 13 or 14 without requiring parental permission. I might suggest we go to something like 15 or 13 if we want to broaden it. Then I would put a maximum on it just to prevent the situation where we might get all of a sudden 50% of our sample in a country from kids.

So the question to the team is really, do you see value in getting that voice of the younger audience?

JORDYN BUCHANAN:

I think I put this question. I certainly think it would be interesting. We often talk about younger people being more adaptable to new

---

technologies, so it seems like it would be interesting to see if we do see a difference in this population.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I tend to agree, but I think you should be client about the domestic limitations on age. Some are 15, some are 16. But I'm sure you'll take that into consideration.

DAVID DICKINSON: Yes. We'll make sure that we're following SMR guidelines. Okay, so I think then we'll resolve to go ahead and take it down to the SMR guideline or, say, 15 years of age. Yes. Thank you.

"How are these numbers determined?" They are rough approximations. They were derived from an analysis of the online population. They are rough approximations of the weight of each of these countries and their contribution to the online population. When I say "rough," I mean we rounded it off to 100 instead of making it an exact number, those sorts of things. That decision or that weighting was created a year ago. It may have changed slightly but not a huge amount, so it's best to just keep it the same for weighting.

Two issues on Question 605, which is where we're capturing some of the convenient sample of registrants is what I'll call it. First, the comment was, "Can we define this better?" We actually improved the definition over what it was last time and am fine with defining it further.

However, the other thing I'll suggest is since we have an entire registrant study and we're looking to create some room to potentially

---

add some questions here, we might just jettison the registrant questions. It will only affect the length for those people who did register, but every little bit helps.

I don't think we used this. It was interesting, but I don't think we used it to a great degree over what we actually got out of the registrant study. There are half a dozen questions, maybe not quite that many, for registrants. We could just drop them all and just save that for the registrants' study. I'm seeing heads nod around the room here, so okay.

It's so archaic to use paper. I'll tell you how bad it was. I had to print this document three times because I kept messing up. I haven't printed anything in so long, which just made me feel all the more bad about wasting trees.

There's a suggestion on 615 about adding "political group." I think that's a good idea. We'll do that. I might say "political group/entity," something like that.

Roll back up. Just for your information. Here's 701. This is where we are introducing the typology for what we call in the survey extensions and country-level. It's not a question here, but you can see the country-level stuff that we do. Alright, go on down.

So the question, it's important to add .eu. Fine to do that for those countries. This is where we will be adding that longer list and making it specific to each country.

It says it "does not include certain legacy gTLDs." The reasoning is it was designed – again, I wasn't there – but I am pretty sure it was designed

---

to be representative and not exhaustive. Just trying to keep things manageable for the respondent.

Yes, 705. To be quite honest, it's not feasible to try and match browsing data for the participants in this survey with their self-reported browsing data. It would be a lovely thing to be able to do, but you really have to have some sort of instrumented version, and it's just not going to happen. Nielsen has tried it in other venues, and the response rates are extremely low.

Obviously, there are other ways of getting browsing data, but we're assuming this was linked to these specific individuals and, unfortunately, just practically it's not feasible at this point in time.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:

I put this question in. I actually did not intend for this to be linked to the same respondents. I think the self-reported information, I don't care. What I want to know is what do people actually do. I know that Nielsen has actual browsing data at least – I don't know in every market – but certainly in the U.S.

DAVID DICKINSON:

Yes.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:

I would be much more interested to see what people's actual behavior is as opposed to what they're self-reporting. I don't care if it's the same population as long as it's comparable people.

DAVID DICKINSON: Well, yes, that makes it a lot easier. We can certainly. I'll check in on what the requirements are, but we can certainly look at just general traffic navigation and browsing data.

MEGAN RICHARDS: I had asked you to add .eu I think to this one as well. I've lost my notes because I did put them on paper.

DAVID DICKINSON: Yes. We will make the lists consistent if it's a similar line of questioning.

MEGAN RICHARDS: Great. It's the same principle.

DAVID DICKINSON: Yes, exactly.

MEGAN RICHARDS: If you're in the U.K., well...

DAVID DICKINSON: Maybe yes, maybe no.

MEGAN RICHARDS: If you're in Germany, you're just as likely to use .eu as .de. Thanks a lot.

---



ELEEZA AGOPIAN:

I just wanted to add on the traffic and people's actual behavior Jordyn brought up that one of the suggested metrics that we've put on hold for discussion in this group was looking at traffic data and traffic patterns across TLDs. So that's something that we considered with the Implementation Advisory Group and put it off until the Review Team came together because that data obviously exists but it comes with, in some cases, substantial cost. So we wanted to talk that over with the Review Team to see what types of traffic data you might want to see. So that's something additional we may be able to acquire.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:

I just think I can't imagine self-reported browsing. People don't pay that much attention to which domains are showing up in the URL bar. It just seems like if we have access to authoritative data on what people are actually doing, it just seems vastly more informative than asking them what they think they do.

What they think they do is another interesting question, but it doesn't tell us what's actually happening. It would be interesting, back to the discussion with [Xavier] yesterday, it would be good to understand what the costs look like and make sure we're responsible with it. But that just seems like much more useful data for understanding people's actual behavior.

---

DAVID DICKINSON:

Yes. That noise was the sound of my head nodding. I agree with that. I do think out of the survey, we get some useful – or interesting might be the best word – information out of these, such as we saw the whole finding that a lot of things were based off of perceived familiarity. Whether something seemed familiar to them affected a lot of their attitudinals around those gTLDs. I think that's really what we're measuring here is not truly awareness but perceived familiarity. We get some interesting stuff from it, but I don't expect it to correlate perfectly with actual behavior for the reasons that were stated.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

I guess the only caveat to Jordyn's comment is that part of what we're trying to determine is consumer trust and that perception becomes a critical part of that. Whether they actually go to those sites or not is in some ways immaterial to whether or not they believe they would feel comfortable doing so or something. The traffic data is, I think, interesting for another reason, but remember the core reason for the survey was to try and figure out a way to ask people whether they trusted the DNS.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:

Sure. But this also gets to a point that Laureen makes further down. It's not that interesting to ask people whether they trust something. It's interesting to ask them what they're actually doing. This is seeing what they actually do. They could tell you they don't trust it, but then if they actually go to them all the time, then...

---

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right. But if they're unconscious, as you described, about what they're doing, then it doesn't get to the same notion of "the fact that I believe I go to .berlin, whether I do or not, means more than whether or not I go because I'm going via a search engine or something," doesn't it?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Well, it means something different, I think.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes. I guess so.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I'm not saying we should get rid of this question. I'm saying we have to supplement this question, especially where we have the data, with seeing what people actually do.

JAMIE HEDLUND: I hate to say this, but I kind of agree with Jonathan. There are two different things here. There's awareness, which does go to trust and familiarity, obviously. And then there's actual use. The traffic data would actually talk about use, whereas the responses on a survey would give us data on awareness and familiarity apart from whether or not they actually do use it, which I think is useful.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: There's also one of the things we are trying to get is the relative velocity within which the new gTLDs get accepted.

---

DAVID DICKINSON: Okay, so “can we add the internationalized ccTLDs where regionally relevant?” We’ll be doing that more in the new section. As opposed to here, we’ll be applying that to where we’re testing the new gTLDs. But, yes, as we’ve discussed, we’ll do that.

Alright, the next one is about Question 710: “How likely are you to visit websites?” The probe was: “What does this help determine?” Is it actionable? That kind of stuff. We didn’t find this data to be very useful. I don’t think that people really navigate with intent, and it’s not used to filter anything. So I would be fine with dropping this question. I think it’s low value and it’s just one more hoop that we make people jump through that’s a little bit conceptually difficult. What we saw is that if they were familiar with it or they thought they were familiar with it, they planned to go again.

JONATHAN ZUCK: The example that would be interesting, but it just might not be statistically significant is something like a .bank where I might make an affirmative choice to go to the site because of the TLD and because I’ve heard now through advertising or something that it’s safer. I’m less likely to be phished by going there. I don’t know how many examples there are like that and how much it’s reasonable to even assume that people have heard of them at this point.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It’s not on the list.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right. It's not on the list now. But I'm wondering – that would be the only value of that question. That would probably be the only reason for someone to answer that question affirmatively.

DAVID DICKINSON: Let me make sure I've got it correctly. There's a hypothesis that people might be more accepting or have greater level of trust, whatever you want to say, if it's a financial-related thing and it's a .bank-related domain or it's a health-related thing and it's a .pharmacy or .hospital-related TLD. Is that the hypothesis?

JONATHAN ZUCK: [inaudible] Here you're looking at legacy, I guess. Somehow my screen got expanded and I can't see the question, only the comment. One hypothesis is that people trust .com for example more just because they're more aware of it. The other hypothesis is that people will have a greater degree of trust because having the word there creates some validation. They'll assume that everybody in .photography is a photographer or something like that, but more so in the case of something potentially well-advertised or evangelized in the new gTLD space like .bank or something where presumably there will be a huge advertising campaign that says, "Trust .bank. Don't click on the link unless it says .bank," something like that where that explicit behavior will in fact be encouraged, I guess.

---

JORDYN BUCHANAN: So, Jonathan, I think that's a totally reasonable hypothesis about something that doesn't exist today. Like .bank hasn't done that yet. I do think as we get further down the survey there are the trust areas. I agree with what Lauren said down there that we need to look at use cases there, and that's probably the way to draw this out to see: "In this specific situation, would you behave like this?"

JONATHAN ZUCK: There may not be anything yet.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Right. It might have to be hypothetical again. But I think this particular, if we're worried the survey is too long, this question doesn't seem to add very much. I'd certainly be in favor of dropping it.

DAVID TAYLOR: Just to swim the other way on this one because someone has to, obviously, I think where you've got the country code you may be looking for certain content. You may go to Google.fr because you'll get different content than if you go to Google.com, so I think that may have some importance.

But also I think what's interesting is, yes, you'd go to .com because that's what everybody knows, but then these are old new gTLDs next to it. So I think there's a certain aspect there where I wonder whether you'd go to a .mobi because you're on your mobile phone. Would that actually be something which has worked. So you kind of see whether these old new gTLDs have actually done anything different or whether

---

they are redundant compared to everything else. There's an advantage. If you have to get rid of something, this might be one of the highest target to get rid of.

DAVID DICKINSON: I think what I would hypothesize is that dynamic probably hasn't changed a whole lot in the last year, so we have this data from the last time around, unless we're thinking that those long-term things have changed in the past year.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Dump it.

DAVID DICKINSON: The sword has...

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Moving on.

DAVID DICKINSON: So 719 is a question that I think we would still keep in. What might make them visit websites with a domain name extension you have not seen before? I might suggest that we move this a little bit later in the survey. That won't affect it. "Was it triggered only by those people who said they were aware but hadn't visited them, that sort of thing?"

---

No, it wasn't. Actually, the screening for this question when I reviewed it seemed a little bit odd to me. I think we'll keep the question but we'll move it to where we're at the front of where we start talking about new gTLDs and just ask it as a general probe and see what we get there. It's open-ended, so it's not really that valuable for tracking anyway. We want to get it contextual.

Let's see. "Why do we include the 2000-round TLDs in previous questions but not here?" For the trustworthy question, I think if I had to put myself in the shoes of the questionnaire writer back then it was just to keep it shorter and more manageable. Since this is a rating question, they have to go through each one rather than just pick from a list. So they probably truncated the list.

I think there probably is some value. If you guys feel it's important, there's probably some value in keeping the list the same, but it does make the task a little bit harder for the respondent. But I would keep them the same. I wouldn't add any beyond that.

Then the next question, which is more overarching, is the use of the term "trustworthy." I have two reactions here. One, I do think trustworthy at a general level, do people feel it's trustworthy – yes the specifics of what makes it trustworthy or exactly what I feel trustworthy is is going to vary – but as a general measure for tracking purposes, it's fine. We want to see if the newer gTLDs increased in trust level as they become more prevalent.

Now as it was mentioned earlier, would we get different results if we specified use cases?



---

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

DAVID DICKINSON: I'm sorry. Say again? Yes. We definitely would. I've seen that in research. Nielsen has seen that in research. My own experience from doing a project not too long ago, small sample size, qualitative, but was big difference between people's level of concern about health care versus financial. Much more concern about finance than health in the U.S. Yes. There were groans.

So adding some use cases I think could help expand our understanding of what trustworthiness is for these. It greatly adds to the complexity. So happy to do it, but we need to look at ways to maybe further economize in other areas. So it's how much do you value?

I would keep this question as-is though because it's going to be the only thing we have that's comparable on this topic.

LAUREEN KAPIN: I'm the person who suggested that. I have no objection to the question, but I do think it's important that we measure the behavior for the very reason you stated that people are inclined to say, "Oh, yes, I trust it, but I'm not going to give my credit card number to it." So it's just a much more objective, useful additional bit of information. I understand that we're going to have weigh some things, and maybe we can talk about it more specifically at some point about what would be a realistic way to move forward.

DAVID DICKINSON: Yes. I'm [sensitive] to that, and what I would suggest we do is rather than try and measure it as a relative aspect of one TLD against another, I would frame a question later on when we're more into the trust section about behavior. Because it varies by use case, but it also varies by individual. There are some people who won't put anything personal out there, won't even have a Facebook page, and there are some people who feel, "I don't care."

JORDYN BUCHANAN: As I've alluded to earlier, I agree strongly with Laureen on the overall point here. I do think we're going to be in a little bit of a conundrum as we think about the survey and the desire for comparability versus the desire for useful data for the purposes of the review.

I think what we probably want to do is figure out a relatively small set of questions where we think comparability is really important and we expect there might have been changes over the past year. Because it's a relatively limited period of time as well. And then use the rest of the space that we have available in terms of the number of questions so we can ask people to make sure we're getting at the right questions to give us the data that we think we really need in order to make decisions as a Review Team.

Unfortunately, that's a little bit more of a complex exercise than we're going to get through today, but something that we've proposed internally as a Review Team is get a small number of us to work directly with Nielsen to try to hone this.

---

Maybe today we can get through a run-through and understand the high-level issues, and then a few of us can maybe work directly with you and figure out how to make those tradeoffs because I think we are going to totally understand the point that we want comparability, totally understand the point we can't ask 7,000 questions, therefore we probably need to focus where we're getting comparability and jettison some of the other stuff in favor of the questions that we really need to get to.

DAVID DICKINSON:

And just to make it a little more complex, I'll throw out the option if we're going to have an ongoing discussion about this. There is also the option of being willing to trade off some statistical reliability for flexibility. You could split the sample, have half the people answer questions that we want comparability on but we're willing to trade off analysis down at the country level or something like that. Just look at it from [roll ups] and ask the other half a new question that we don't need to have asked of everyone but we want to get a finger in the wind kind of thing. So that's a possibility we can discuss.

So 727, "what was it that made it more trustworthy?" There was America suggestion to tie this to behavior. I think we've got a number of questions we're trying to add later in the survey that try and get at some of the behavioral elements. So hopefully, we could do that at that point rather than here. We didn't get hugely valuable stuff out of here, but we did get some interesting things here and I think it would be nice to keep this as an open-end comparable from one wave to the other.

---

753, there was just a question why we were making this transition at this point in time. Again, trying to channel the efforts of the previous writer, I would guess that they felt it was more specific here. Some of the earlier stuff was more generally about navigating to websites, and the language was a little less specific. Here is where we started to drill down into the topic of gTLDs specifically. I think they just felt that it was a point in the study to take a break, focus them in on something.

The next question, 755, there was a question about the word “extreme.” “Not sure how this will be interpreted or defined.” We batted around the question. How this is used is this is where we created our word clouds and contrasted the perceptions of the existing gTLDs with the new gTLDs to see where the differences – were introducing perceptions that there were too many or it was confusing or those sorts of things?

I went and looked at this data and, while there are variations by country, they’re systematic. They’re not linked. The rank ordering of the words tends to be the same by and large from country to country. In one country, Nigeria for example, they tended to say all of these except “confusing” described. They were higher selection, whereas in the U.S. more variation. You see those sort of typical response patterns, but there weren’t any interpreted, it didn’t appear to be there were any significant differences in interpretation. I judged that because the patterns tended to be the same.

From my point of view, “extreme,” I don’t know how it would be specifically interpreted, but I would just keep it the same so we have the same set of adjectives to look at.

---

What we saw from this last time is that there weren't really overwhelming negative perceptions of either the existing or the new ones, but there was an elevation of some of the more negative ones for the new ones and we want to see if the [tails] down.

DAVID TAYLOR: I was just going to say there are not many negative comments in there though, are there, of the 15?

DAVID DICKINSON: "Confusing," "overwhelming."

DAVID TAYLOR: That's about it, isn't it?

DAVID DICKINSON: Yes. "Unconventional," you could say that's good or bad. And "technical" you could say is good or bad. Yes, but I agree.

DAVID TAYLOR: It's more positive.

DAVID DICKINSON: Yes. 765, there was a comment about not sure "that the average Joe or Jane will understand 'purchasing.'" This is not a question that we will get rid of just because we're dropping the registrant data. We still want to get the general population's viewpoint about this. I tend to agree

---

with you. This was one of the areas when I was presenting the results last year where people kept saying, “What do you mean by restrictions?” Those sorts of things.

What we have elected to do is keep the question for comparability, but this is where we’ve added follow-on questions to try and get better data about the level of acceptance of different types of restrictions. That’s lower on this page, Question 767. We gave examples of some restrictions and asked them whether they thought those were appropriate.

The comment here was maybe .builder is not restrictive enough. My thought here is we could either change it to a more restrictive one, or we could have two. If we thought that there was going to be a meaningful difference, we could add a response option that would be something finance or health care related, .bank or .pharmacy or something like that. I think, yes, .pharmacy was one of the suggestions in here. I mean, yes, you wouldn’t want to navigate to a .pharmacy site and see somebody selling life insurance or funeral plans, those sorts of things.

Okay, so I think then, unless I see heads nodding the other direction, we’ll add a fourth option in here that will be .pharmacy. We’ll work up some language for that.

Okay, so question 800 is where we present them with a list of newer gTLDs and we start asking them questions about it. The first comment is what we’ve already talked about. Here we will add a country-specific city-level, real or anticipated.

---

Ad about including the internationalized ccTLDs, I think that's a similar question. We can add. China gets a couple of extra responses here, a couple of internationalized – they show up as Chinese characters in the survey – internationalized gTLDs. If there's a desire to add some of those in other countries, we can do that because it's only affecting the people in those countries so we're not making the list just exponentially longer for everyone.

The other question was, how did we get at this list? Our understanding is a year ago they looked at the ones that had gotten the largest number of registrations, and that's how we picked. We have then supplemented the list with all that had 100,000 or more registrations as of a couple of weeks ago, I think was the data I had gotten. So we've made the list longer.

This is where, again, we had this discussion last year. What we're not necessarily looking for here is parity with .com. We're looking for uptake, something that's going to indicate that the affinity model is working.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:

I think the number of registrations is maybe not the right metric for a filter here. I look at .science, for example. That has a lot of registrations because they've been selling it really cheaply. I have never seen a .science URL in use anywhere in the wild, whereas several of these other ones I have because people actually use those because they paid money to get them.

---

So we may want to look at what of the new TLDs are most common in Alexa, 10,000 or something. Just where are there actual sites as opposed to where there are registrations, I think would be a more useful metric to see how people are perceiving these.

MEGAN RICHARDS: I had asked also that for .berlin, you send that to the European Union. You can add Turkey as well. I think it's unusual to ask only in Germany for .berlin. It's not quite like .london, obviously, but if it has traction, it will be far beyond Germany [in principle].

DAVID DICKINSON: You say that's not true of .london or .paris?

MEGAN RICHARDS: Well, you didn't ask for .paris? You asked for .london and you asked .london only if you're in Italy, Turkey, Spain, Poland, U.K., France, and Germany, which I think is perfectly legitimate. But for .berlin – .ovh you can ask only in Germany – but .berlin I think would have greater traction [most of Europe].

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

MEGAN RICHARDS: Exactly. So my argument only was that you could ask that question to all those in Europe, plus Turkey if you want. You can [inaudible]. It will give



---

you a good comparison too between the differences between .london and .berlin, and it doesn't change the question. It's just [down to audience].

DAVID DICKINSON: It's reasonable, except I'm wading through now that we've got a city-specific code, a ccTLD for each country in Europe, then if we apply that rule to .madrid, .rome, everything, then everyone in the EU all of a sudden has a significantly longer list. It's going to be a list of...

MEGAN RICHARDS: That's not what you're asking according to this. You're asking only .berlin and [inaudible].

DAVID DICKINSON: Yes, but we're making a modification. We agreed to make a modification that we'd have a city code for every country. That was the list that we looked at [inaudible].

MEGAN RICHARDS: Ah, for the...

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: So now .london will only show in the U.K., .berlin will only show in Germany, .madrid will show in Spain.

---

MEGAN RICHARDS: Oh, okay. Since you're changing that, then that's fine. We don't want to discriminate. [inaudible]. Good.

DAVID DICKINSON: Okay, 805, we've already talked about it. It's the browsing data.

812, this is one of the new questions we answered to give an experiential thing to test if the structure changes the intent to visit. The question was, are we planning to translate these? We had an internal discussion. What we suggested that we do is keep four English language versions and then add a translated version as a fifth option. That way, we're consistently testing the structure but also then testing a localization as factors in getting them to change their willingness or affecting their likelihood to go. That's what we suggested.

The second comment there is keeping the same structure as .com. Agreed. That's fine. We'll modify that. I'm not seeing any concerns about that, so we'll move on.

There was a suggestion about an additional use case sort of thing: "Imagine you were looking for something in Berlin." What we did here, the first question was sort of topical information search. The second one was purchase or commerce related. We could add a third question that would be travel. We could talk about it as travel or cultural related type thing. Same structure, but just frame it the way it's suggested there and just add that question. Again, we think this is a valuable area to explore to get some better data, and so we're fine with adding that one question in there.

---

831, we can do that. We'll just make that country specific, which example. What we did here is we gave them a generalized set of examples. We'll just make it specific.

JONATHAN ZUCK: You asked the conditional, "If you were applying to register a domain, would you...?" Is the actual question about whether they are going to? Did that get removed earlier with registrants?

DAVID DICKINSON: Yes. Oh, you're right. Sorry. I didn't catch that. Yes. This question is now gone because we decided to get rid of all the registrant questions. We'll ask this in the registrants' survey.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I guess a question for the group: Is it worth having one question in there that gets a sense of percentage of consumers that are registrants?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

JONATHAN ZUCK: Oh, as part of the screening on the other one we did it?

DAVID DICKINSON: Yes.

---

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay.

DAVID DICKINSON: Yes. We can track how many people get cut from the [inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right. Okay, thank you.

DAVID DICKINSON: And we have it from last time as well, so it probably hasn't changed too [inaudible].

Again on the issue, we would like to keep the question as-is for comparability. We're adding some questions. We will update this list, however, to match the same changes we made in the earlier list with Question 805. So the list will change, but the structure is the same. We'll keep the general question about asking them their perception of trustworthiness.

Question 848, this question is now gone. It was only asked of people who had registered and, again, we'll have that in the registrants' survey.

855, a repeat of the same question, but we're going to leave it as is.

First thing, we will update this list to match Question 805 so it will be consistent there. "It seems weird that we don't have a TLD that registrants might strongly associate with restriction." I'm jumping back

---

to that list just to see if that has changed. Unless the Alexa analysis changes that...

[JORDYN BUCHANAN]: I think [definitionally] you would expect a smaller number of registrations in restricted TLDs than in non-restricted TLDs. Like the .pharmacy example is maybe another [inaudible]. I don't know. Choose one that actually exists that you might expect people to expect restrictions on.

DAVID DICKINSON: Yes. I guess what we can do is we can update this list to mirror the other changes and then supplement it a little further with .bank and .pharmacy.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

DAVID DICKINSON: Correct.

JAMIE HEDLUND: I'm not sure that .bank has been delegated. I don't know anything about .pharmacy. Does that matter?

DAVID DICKINSON: For the purposes of this survey, not really. The only way it would matter is if somebody said – and it's inconsequential really – if somebody said,

---

“Oh, I’ve never heard of .pharmacy. Let me see if I can find one.” They are online when they do this, but it’s inconsequential.

We’ll come back and talk about the comment on 910, I think. No. I take it back. We’ll go ahead and talk about it here. This is in the section where we were talking earlier. I think we’ll add a generalized question about their comfort level in different use scenarios – for general navigation, providing some form of personal information, and then providing health information, those sorts of things – and see what their general level of comfort is to that. We’ll work on that. I don’t have a specific structure for that yet, but we’ll add something here.

Frankly, on the next comment about what’s the difference between a couple of these options, I have a hard time saying what the differences are myself. I think I can interpret what was intended to be there, but if I have to stretch to do it, the respondent’s not going to parse that out very well. So this would be a question where the data was not particularly useful last time around. Either we say, “We don’t really need this question,” or we change the response options to something that’s going to be useful.

The other question – “give consumer what they’re thinking” – the question was: “Did that mean registrants?” I think the intent was consumer protection, but it’s not clear. None of these are good response options. If we fix the options, then in general does this question have any real value? You say, “Yes”? Okay. So what we’ll do is if there are any specific suggestions, I’m happy to hear them. Otherwise, we’ll draft up a new set of response options and put those out for quick approval.

---

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I do think if we're going to have a small group that works with you guys that it would be good to understand what we're looking to understand in this question. So we probably ought to just pitch something to you in terms of at least what types of behaviors we're trying to understand.

DAVID DICKINSON: That's wonderful from my standpoint. I just know sometimes it's easier if I throw out a strawman and people react to it, so either way. But if you can get something to me expeditiously, to use a big word, I'd be happy.

DAVID TAYLOR: I was just wondering that because if we're seeking to measure trust and also, I suppose, expectations of consumers, I wonder whether we could put in some examples of, "If you go to mayor.london, what do you expect to see? If you go to whistler.ski, what do you expect to see? If you go to bordeaux.wine, what do you expect to see?" Examples like that, and even then I don't know whether we can go to barclays.bank. "Do you expect to see Barclays there?" Or whether we should actually name banks and brands. And .film. "What would you see at .film if you went to jamesbond.film or ebay.film?" Would you expect that. There might be something we fish out there from examples.

DAVID DICKINSON: What you're proposing is a series of open-ended questions, which would be great to hear but would add substantially to the length and also the complexity because we have to manually code the responses to

---

those. I don't know if something like, "Would you be more likely to visit jamesbond.com versus jamesbond.film?" You could get predilection, but getting the whys is going to be out of scope of the survey at this point unless we can find other ways to really cut it, even though that would be great information to have.

I try never to sell additional research, but if you wanted to, you could cull some people from the results and add a short follow-on, just a small subset of people. You would give them an extra incentive, and you could get some soundbites from them, written or there are ways to gather them audio as well. Or you could do a focus group. But I think you could just, streaming people out of this survey, you could do a little follow-on research to get them.

Something like that where you're trying to elucidate the quality of the responses and the sorts of themes that come up, you don't need the sample sizes that we have here. You just need a small subset of the people you talked to. And so, based on their responses, we could stream some people out, give them an extra incentive, and have them do a little follow-on.

CARLOS RAÚL GUTIERREZ: This is a question for the group. Now that we are in this segment of registrants and trusting the registrants – and, again, it's only a question – shouldn't we ask the people if they trust the way they're going to handle their personal data in the registration? I don't want to mention the words WHOIS behind it.



---

DAVID DICKINSON: Yes. I wrote that down as one of the potential response options. I think that's a good thing.

So the next question, 915...

[JORDYN BUCHANAN]: [I'll just step in.] Just for clarity, I thought we were dropping everything about registrants from this.

DAVID DICKINSON: Well, we're dropping all the questions that are specifically about people who have registered. This question is about the consumer's perception that the entities that register are taking precautions to protect [PCI], those sorts of things. It's a gray area. It overlaps. Some of the original things were intended to be going down the line of, "If I register (I'll use a new one) a .pharmacy, that it is somebody who is legitimately involved in the pharmaceutical business in some way." It was that sort of thing. It wasn't so much about...

JONATHAN ZUCK: [inaudible] I'm asking somebody who isn't or doesn't plan to register a domain how they feel about the people that register them? In other words, about registrants or about registrars? I guess that's the question I'm asking. In other words, how do I feel about the people that buy domains? Is that what you mean? Is that the question?

---

DAVID DICKINSON: Well, no. It's a very good point. We're asking a question that's perception of the registrars, essentially. The entities that who do the...

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. That's what I thought.

DAVID DICKINSON: So if we get that in the registrants' survey, do we care what the larger population thinks about that? In some areas we might because there's a general perception that the trustworthiness of the sites cascades from that process.

JONATHAN ZUCK: If they haven't engaged in the process. I guess I have a related question that might affect this, which is: What was the length of the registrants' survey? Do we have more flexibility there? Because I'm wondering if what might come up in some of these conversations is that we ask a few additional questions for the people that say no on the registrants' survey to get at why. I know that some folks in ALAC are interested about other forms of online identity: Facebook, things like that. "Do you have one of those instead? How do you feel about registrars?" That may be a reason that somebody doesn't do it.

Can you have a set of questions that you ask a different branch off of a qualifying question that's a much shorter branch, I guess is what I mean? I guess that wouldn't add to the length of the survey because it would be a different group of people. The people that said they aren't

---

or aren't planning to be registrants, getting at why, there might be a few questions there, and that might be a place for this.

DAVID DICKINSON:

Yes. So regarding the length of the registrants' survey, I don't have that data with me. I'm going to guess it wasn't that much different, but some of the changes here – I suspect it was a little bit shorter, and some of the changes we're making here won't be impactful there. I'm going to say that we probably do have flexibility. I'll validate that, but we probably do have flexibility in that survey to delve on some of these issues.

This specific question now that I think about it in the context of your question, I think this is much more of a registrant question. The next question is sort of more the consumer opinion.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

It could also be reasoned you're not a registrant.

DAVID DICKINSON:

Exactly.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

But it's more for that survey.

---

DAVID DICKINSON: Exactly. Well, except now keep in mind, in that survey the people who get in it are people who have registered. So if I don't trust the industry...

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's the question I'm asking. So let me ask that question again. The question you're asking about who gets in it, is it possible to ask a few questions of the people who ordinarily wouldn't get in it?

DAVID DICKINSON: Yes.

JONATHAN ZUCK: You could have a separate branch like that.

DAVID DICKINSON: Yes. If somebody disqualifies, they haven't ever registered, we could ask a follow-on question that is: "Why haven't you? No need, Don't trust the industry, etc." And a couple of questions, there would be a slight incremental cost to do that, but it's minor given that it's only a few questions and there's a little bit of data processing.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: There's a comment in the chat from Kaili, and I just wanted to read it out loud. He said, "I expect the end users would care more about the website's trustworthiness instead of the domain names and their awareness. Thus, asking questions about trusting a gTLD name would be

---

hard to answer for most end users, especially individual end users.” I think it’s getting back to that use case question.

DAVID DICKINSON:

Yes. And how do we, within the myriad of .com websites, how do we judge which ones have implicit trustworthiness versus others? I think that’s a bigger task than what we can do here. While I think there’s validity to the comment, I think what we’re looking for here is just: “Does the extension seem to have a significant impact on these perceptions?” And if the answer is “no,” that’s the answer. It would be an interesting thing to figure out people – I have ten search results, which one do I consider to be more trustworthy, if any?

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Whichever one Google ranks higher, I think, is the answer to that.

DAVID DICKINSON:

Question 915, there were a couple of comments. “Country specific examples for Internet service providers.” I’m not sure who put that in. So we’re thinking about whoever provides your Internet connection or something like that. We can generalize the language a little bit. That’s not an issue.

I think this is a question that we would like to keep as much similar as possible because there was a nice piece of data that came out of here that this industry did fare much better than the other entities in this question, and we would want to make sure that hasn’t changed at all, unless we don’t care. Unless we say, “It’s probably going to be the same

---

answer,” then let’s ask something different. But my bias would be to keep it.

Then there was a suggestion about adding which registrar they recognized most. That would be, I think if we were going to add that, it would be for the registrants’ survey as opposed to this survey. Also, I would be concerned it might be a political issue, but I’ll leave that to you guys. I’m the outsider.

1005, agreed. Good suggestion. We’ll do it. Same for 1020. So we’ll add an example of a URL shortener. I’ll create a bit.ly address and use that, and we’ll add a sample QR code. I’ll figure out which one to stick in there. One of my boarding passes or something like that.

So 1035, we actually expanded this list somewhat from the last time. The question is use cases and different ways of going at it. Definitely agree that it likely varies based on use case. So it’s just the overall complexity of trying to parse out all those different use cases.

If there were a couple of key use cases – such as information search, shopping, financial information, health information – I could turn this into a matrix question potentially and get at that at a high level to see if they think that one of these ways... I would expect app probably scores higher for bank than just generally. That sort of thing. I’m seeing some heads nod around that. I’ll see what I can do there.

I think it would be interesting to – well, I have two responses here. This is Question 1040. “How often do you remember the address so you can type it in?” I struggle with this question because am I remembering the address if I have it bookmarked? If it’s on my Favorites Bar? How often

---

is this really? I'm not sure exactly what we're really trying to get at here. we can add questions, but it's length. Just that length issue. And I'm not sure that this question is valuable enough to add a follow-on question.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Do you mean address as in numeric address or the domain name?

DAVID DICKINSON: I think they mean the URL, yes.

WAUDO SIGANGA: URL? Okay.

DAVID DICKINSON: Yes. If anyone remembers the numeric address, I'd be very impressed.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I think it would be worthwhile to leave it. [inaudible] discussion yesterday about whether people actually type and whether people actually remember that it's [stans.com] or [stans.biz] or whatever and whether if you switched to .biz from .com or .mobi or .bank, whatever, people would actually pick that up. I think it would be valuable to leave it.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I agree with what you're saying. I don't think we're going to get that from this question. I do think we may want to think about whether we

---

want to get data from user studies or something like that. It would be interesting to give someone a domain like bigshot.photography, tell them that name or show it to them and then see what they actually type into their browser. I think that would actually be really interesting to see. I don't think how often you remember the name of the website that you're going to go to is really going to tell us that particular bit of behavior.

Also I would be surprised, I guess, if this is changing over time as well, so I think last year – I actually really like the idea of the matrix from the previous question. I think if we have a few use cases, that will actually get to the segmentation that's proposed here as well. Like if banking is there versus a more casual site. Maybe people do remember the URL more often in some key sites like that but not with random restaurant you want to go to or something.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

Well, I think it's also [inaudible] do you actually validate that it's the actual address. There's a social bias to say, "Oh, of course, I do that," but the actual behavior is probably much lower than that. I type the first three letters and hit enter.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

Yes. The autofill blurs the distinction between guessing and searching, is the problem. I think it's a valid hypothesis that this enormous expansion of TLDs will lead to less guessing, but the actual act of guessing versus searching has become identical.



---

JORDYN BUCHANAN: The only way I think we would figure this out is to do user studies as opposed to a user survey. That's a much more intensive exercise, and we couldn't do nearly as many people, but it still may be we'd want to work with ICANN to do. Ask people to do tasks and see what they actually do.

DAVID DICKINSON: One thing we could do, I'll throw this out. My bias is to just get rid of the question, but we could structure the question along the lines of, "Think about a website that's important to you, you visit regularly. How do you navigate there? I bookmark it, I start typing and let autofill, I type the entire name," maybe there's another behavior I haven't thought of.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Use a search engine.

DAVID DICKINSON: Use a search engine. Yes. Enter a general term into a search engine, those sorts of things. And see what they say they do for those things. But again, how accurate is that behavior actually going to be, and don't we know already that things that are important to them they're going to have some sort of mechanism, bookmarking or autocomplete or something, to do it anyway? So I'm not sure that it really gives us anything we don't know.

---

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

DAVID DICKINSON: Do you want your mic up? There's a sidebar discussion going on.

JONATHAN ZUCK: It sounds like the consensus might be to drop the question. Eleeza, as a separate thing, as we come up with these brainstorm ideas for additional research exercises, it's probably worth making note to bring them up with the trust team when that happens. So a side note of user testing in one case, and what was the other thing that we discussed today already? Another type of – oh, and getting browsing data was the other thing that you're already aware of.

DAVID DICKINSON: A comment on 1045 was, "Is this redundant?" The intent here was to get self-reported change in behavior. "Am I doing something different than I was three years ago?" We're making that earlier question a matrix question. I don't want to repeat a full matrix for this. It would have to be generalized if we keep it.

I will also hypothesize. We didn't see a lot of change. The little bit of change we saw was as expected, and I strongly believe that it was underreporting actual change. So I'm not sure that this question is really giving you anything other than people's perception of the rate of change in their own behavior, which is of minimal value in my point of view. Drop it? Okay.

---

Question 1100, there's a suggestion to simplify these. I looked at these. Didn't readily see a way to simplify them without the potential of being misleading. This is a tracking question, so I would suggest we just leave them the same.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:

I just wanted to add, these were definitions we came up with, with the Implementation Advisory Group with the small group that we worked with to vet the first instance of this survey. So that's where these definitions came from.

DAVID DICKINSON:

The next was 1111. General comment about the value of this information. What we learned last time was basically that it was law enforcement's, all of these tended to be law enforcement's responsibility rather than ICANN's responsibility. I don't have a hypothesis that that's going to have changed much.

So, again, we're adding a number of questions. Unless people see value in replicating that result, I would go ahead and drop this, especially since people are online. If they don't know who ICANN is, they can go look it up. The innate response versus the learned response is potentially different for this question. So I think it may overinflate a little bit the ICANN responses that we did get, and generally we did see that it was overwhelmingly seen to be criminal activity and that those entities in one form or another should take on the responsibility.

---

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I think law enforcement is often involved in these problems, but there's also a lot of industry activity and self-regulation that happens here that's just not reflected here at all. I don't know if people know that or not. Also, I don't know what we would do with this information.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Start doing it.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Certainly on the cybersecurity front, I would imagine that we're not going to change the strategy based on what people think here. So this doesn't seem like a useful question to me.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

DAVID DICKINSON: Great. It's gone.

The next one was 1125. "How scared...?" "Scared seems like a charged word." It probably was selected to measure fear. It's a popular meme that scary things happen on the Internet. Some people could say you should be afraid, so we wanted to measure that.

We got some interesting stuff out of this that the more exposure I had actually to some of these behaviors, the less afraid I was of them. I've actually seen that in the real world with IT directors who, once they've had a spear phishing attack in their organization, they seem to be even

---

less concerned about it because they get inured to it or they have overcome it. Those sorts of things.

So, yes, scared is a charged word, but I would leave it there for that information and just see whether we're seeing any directional trends in the level of fear.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

DAVID DICKINSON: Yes, 775. We could amend this list specifically for national-based. I think that was probably the intent of some of these categorizations. But we can expand this list if there's a feeling that something is missing.

Again, with all of these I would ask how valuable the information was to you. I am trying to remember the results from this. I think primarily it was, or that was very high response, was contact the website owner, which I thought was potentially naïve.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: More and more countries have incident response centers. I don't know if they are geared to the final users or more geared to protecting against denial of service attacks and things like that. I don't know what the awareness is of the people of these national centers that combine police and judiciary and government IT people, etc.

---

DAVID DICKINSON: Well, I have to imagine that cross-jurisdictional groups like that are probably not very well-known outside of the industry. We could certainly add it as an option.

Alright, we're down into the closing things here. We've got some things in the demographics for each country. "Why is illiterate here in India?" Since it's online, if they're illiterate, I'm not sure how they're completing the survey. So it probably just was a stock response, so get rid of it.

I think the next one is in Brazil. So 1507 about education classifications within Brazil. A comment that this was incorrect or outdated. Our team is going back to the Nielsen standards group to make sure that they haven't updated this, but whoever made this comment, would love to get the classification that you think is current so that we can contrast that with whatever Nielsen has.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Sorry, but isn't your "nenhum" the same as your illiterate in the other one? In Question 1507.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

DAVID DICKINSON: Oh, sorry. Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

DAVID DICKINSON: Good. Didn't realize that was in everywhere. I thought that was just India.

The next one we don't need to – we can change the currency designation there.

So that's it. So I think the action steps at this point are, obviously, for me to go through and clean up this version based on what we've talked about here.

I think there was the offer to give me a strawman on whatever question that was. A set of response options for – I can find it again, and I'll do that. But if I don't have that by the time I've cleaned that up, I'll just send a strawman of my own down. Actually, no, I think we got rid of that question after we had that discussion, now that I think about that. So I'll validate that.

And then one more pass through with a look toward, as it was suggested, anything else that's really considered to be critical for tracking and if there's anything else we can possibly drop out because we are going to be adding a fair amount. And then get it into the field as quickly as possible.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I know Karen wants to talk. Two questions. One is about, is there data significance to time of year or something like that, that the survey is fielded? That's why you said you wanted to be close to the time last year? I ask that in context because the group had talked about trying to

---

---

convene again fairly quickly to really nail down if there was anything else that they wanted to try and get out of this, and I don't know if we've resolved all those questions or if we still want to do that. So that's my question to the group. What are the parameters on your concerns about the timing?

DAVID DICKINSON:

Avoiding any major holiday periods. Chinese New Year has passed now, so we avoided that. We're still basically in wintertime, so I would say as long as we get it out by early March, I'm pretty confident. Once you get into springtime, people's activity patterns start to change. Probably not going to have a huge impact, but I would still, especially as people are increasingly ubiquitous all-the-time Internet citizens, but the sooner we can do it, the better. If we can get it out by early March, that would be good.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

This is a question, then, for the group. After the discussion today, is there still an interest in trying to create a sub-team to make further modifications or add additional questions based on the conversation today? And if so, can we turn around that internal conversation within the next week, basically? How do people feel? I guess just raise your hand if you think that there ought to be further kibitzing from within the team.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:

[inaudible]



---

JONATHAN ZUCK: He's already planning to do that, but I think if we want to have proactive input and not reactive input, we need to form a group to work in parallel with whatever he's doing in order to get it done in a reasonable timeframe. There are enough people that raised their hand that I guess we will try very, very quickly to do another pass at this and converse about potential additions or something like that and get those to you as well.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: And are those hands the members who would like to be on that small working group? Could you raise your hands again? Sorry.

JONATHAN ZUCK: If you're willing to be on that group.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I see Carlos, David, Jordyn – maybe, maybe not – Jordyn, Jonathan, Lauren, Waudo. That's it. Megan, did I see your hand or no?

MEGAN RICHARDS: No. [inaudible]

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Okay.

---

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes. It's like that Far Side cartoon with the rifle scope and the bear's pointing to the other bear.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: So we'll include this small group in correspondence with David.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay, great. Karen, go ahead. Sorry.

KAREN LENTZ: Thanks, Jonathan. This is just to re-raise something that Kaili had suggested in the chat a while ago a few questions up. Maybe this is something that the small group could do. His suggestion was to look at the definition that we have of consumer trust in the terms of reference and track the questionnaire against each of those elements and how it accounts for all of the elements of consumer trust that we agreed on.

JONATHAN ZUCK: We'll take that into the sub-team.

CARLTON SAMUELS: A couple of the questions that were asked and which we're going to refine actually went down to the trust issue. So when those are complete, we'll have a better sense of whether or not we hit the mark. So I would wait until those are refined.

---

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Anything else today? Alright, thanks for joining us.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: We had a break scheduled for after Dave's presentation, but we finished early. So extra-long break? A 15-minute break perhaps?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: People might still want a break, but I would keep it to the same length.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: We'll probably need the time [inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK: One of the things we want to do is go over Jordyn's categorization of the sub-teams for the first part of the review. The application process part of the review, and then have everybody sign up for what part of that they're willing to read the reports on. We need to identify whatever additional resources will be part of that. I think we then hit pause on that based on Stan's suggestion yesterday, but at least identify those things and then jump into the sub-team work that we're going to do in the other areas. Let's do that right after the break.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Okay. So let's meet back at 10:30 and talk about that, and then at 10:45 we have our next briefing with three more staff members coming in.

---

JONATHAN ZUCK: Perfect. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I think we have everyone now.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I put the categories from Jordyn's e-mail into the notes section of the Adobe Connect room.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Alright, great. Alright, so we have everybody here? Sorry. Welcome back, everyone. This is Jonathan Zuck, your Light Night CCT DJ.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Late Night.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Now we're going to be taking callers. We're going to be taking callers to find out who is interested in different aspects of the review.

---

LAUREEN KAPIN: Jonathan, I long to hear [inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK: This is Lauren from Washington, DC. What is your CCT review request?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

JONATHAN ZUCK: Exactly. Okay, this doesn't need to be a long, drawn-out thing. What is the easiest thing? Just have people raise their hands or something like that maybe? It's in the notes section right here. I need to scroll down to it. Everybody saw the work that Jordyn did last night after dinner. So let's first thank Jordyn for doing his homework. Thank you very much. I think the attempt there was to kind of normalize the number of pages that you would be reading out of the 200-page report. Let's just go through them one-by-one and find out who wants to do which ones.

The first one was Section 1 (Application Processing) and Section 5 (Transition to Delegation). Who is interested in that team?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I have Carlton and Carlos.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, anyone else for that?

---

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Also, Kaili, Calvin, and Drew, you can either raise your hands or type into the chat which group you'd like to join.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Then the second one is just Section 2 (Application Evaluation). That's a big one, so who is interested in that?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Fabro's all alone?

JONATHAN ZUCK: They're in the notes section. They're in the notes section of the Adobe Connect.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Carlton, you too?

JONATHAN ZUCK: You need to scroll down to the bottom maybe.

FABRO STIEBEL: If there is still time, I would like to volunteer for the [inaudible] sub-team group as well.

---

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Yes, I'll add you to that. And Kaili just noted that he wants to join the competition sub-team. Kaili, we're focused on the Application Evaluation process. There are these four sections in the notes pod that we're going through that Jordyn divided up based on the Program Implementation Report. So if there is a particular section of these four that you're interested in, please pick one or two or three or four.

JONATHAN ZUCK: This is the section of the review we all said we would do together, so you will end up on one of these teams. So I just thought I'd put that out there if you want to revise your answer about the first two sections.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

JONATHAN ZUCK: Together. That's right. So we're dividing up for a part of it, but everybody is participating because it's kind of our...

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

JONATHAN ZUCK: Exactly.

---

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: So for letter (B), which is Section 2 (Application Evaluation) I have Fabro and Carlton. Anyone else?

JONATHAN ZUCK: So Carlton signed up twice.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Oh, I'm sorry. Calvin and Stan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's 100 pages of reading.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [He's already read it though.]

JONATHAN ZUCK: Alright, so then the next section is Section 3 (Objection Procedures) and Section 4 (Contention Resolution).

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I'm going to volunteer someone.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]



---

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Don't worry. It's [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Oh, we've got [inaudible] since we have to be on one.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: So I have Jamie, David, Megan, Dejan, Laureen, and Waudo.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. And then the next section is Section 6 (Applicant Support), Section 7 (Continuing Operations Instrument, and Section 8 (Program Management). So there really isn't a thematic through-line there. I think it was just combination of page counts.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

JONATHAN ZUCK: So who would like to volunteer for that group? I mean, Applicant Support, obviously something that's important to a lot of folks. Okay, so we have Gao. I'm happy to be one whichever one has the least number of people, so I can be on that one as well.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: And Drew volunteered too because it looks lonely.

---

JONATHAN ZUCK: Exactly. Thank you, Drew. So now, Eleeza, you need to out the people that haven't volunteered.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

JONATHAN ZUCK: Well, no. There are a couple that only have two.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Well, A and D only have three. Do you have a preference between A and D, Jordyn?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Who else besides Jordyn? Which one did Jamie sign up for? Because I remember him asserting yesterday, "I'm a part of this team." I remember that very distinctly.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Jamie volunteered for C.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Do you care either way, Jordyn?

---

JONATHAN ZUCK: So A or D? Application Processing.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I'll be on A.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Okay. Hang on a second. Kaili goes to B, and Jordyn goes to A.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Excellent. And we have everyone. So then the other question was about the other resources in addition to just this report for each of these. The two things that were raised yesterday, one was the Ombudsman's report. Remind me what that contained and which of these sections it applies to.

MEGAN RICHARDS: Well, the Ombudsman did a report – well, he's done all sorts of reports, of course – but he did one in particular on the process and procedures for the community applications, and he found that there were a number of procedures that could be improved in a future round. He didn't find that there was a miscarriage of justice, which [inaudible] anyway, but there were a number of areas that could be improved.

And the GAC has discussed this. Now somewhere, and I don't have it in my access here, but somewhere I have a copy of the Ombudsman's report and he came to speak to the GAC about it. You remember that

---

perhaps. So that's something that I think as a background for the community applications could be very useful to have a look at.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's one of our verticals, right? So should we just get a couple of people to focus on that document rather than having everybody read it?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

MEGAN RICHARDS: It's an Ombudsman's Own Initiative Report. That's how he [inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK: Is that all it is though? Is it just about C? That's the question I was asking.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I think it's CPE, but I could be wrong.

MEGAN RICHARDS: Yes. It is.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, then Group C is reading that. Then the other thing that Jordyn brought up yesterday as well, which is the reconsideration requests

---

might be informative here as well. Is it a possible exercise to divide those up based on these sections?

JAMIE HEDLUND: I had a maybe first pass that we could ask staff to do, which is to create a short summary of each reconsideration request related to the gTLD program and characterize what the nature of the objection was. Then we could look and see which buckets we thought they related to.

JONATHAN ZUCK: And Jamie has volunteered.

JAMIE HEDLUND: No.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Oh, sorry.

JAMIE HEDLUND: Two things. One, that's a ton of work because there are a lot of reconsideration requests. Number two, reconsideration requests are getting reformed as part of the CCWG-Accountability proposal. So I wonder to what extent going through all of those in detail will be really helpful.

---

JONATHAN ZUCK:

I think the idea wasn't to assess the process of reconsideration but to use that as a way to identify areas here that people expressed concerns about just to add to the list. So there might be some cursory way to just determine which of them are applicable to this exercise and then let people in those sections actually be the ones to read those actual reconsiderations as opposed to a comprehensive summary like we do with public comments or something. Jordyn, go ahead and elaborate.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:

Yes. I think, Jamie, the idea is not that we want staff to necessarily have to go back and revisit each of the reconsideration requests, but hopefully there's someone who worked on them or remembers them and could just write a sentence saying, "This was about these people didn't like the results of their [CPE] request" or whatever the nature of the objection is.

Like Jonathan said, the idea is not that – I think in most cases – I mean, I've read a lot of the reconsideration requests, and I think generally that they were well decided. I think the idea is not that we're trying to go back and second guess the reconsideration requests. It's that we want to understand where the pain points where.

Often, people have complained about things that the staff or the Board behaved entirely appropriately but it's because of maybe a flaw or a perceived deficiency in the guidebook or the policy, and that's exactly what we want to identify.

---

CARLOS RAÚL GUTIERREZ: Before we go that far, Jordyn, I think we have to check if the reconsideration requests were accepted or not because the typical response is that they are not accepted. So I would say to any reconsideration that was accepted, we should analyze what you are suggesting. Or you want to analyze all of them?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: No, but that's my whole point. Right. In many of these cases, the staff did exactly what they should have done under the policy, and people complained anyway. But it's useful for us to understand what people were complaining about because that might imply there should be a different policy. That's what we're trying to figure out.

JAMIE HEDLUND: So you just want a one-sentence summary of the issue, and then you have an analysis. It's says, "47 people filed reconsideration requests of CPE," for example.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Right. Then the CPE group could go and read those.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: The team members might then go to the ones that were categorized in a certain way and look at them, is the point.

---

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: So we'll take it back and figure out how to manage that, but it sounds like it shouldn't be as hard as what we initially thought.

JONATHAN ZUCK: The public comment may [inaudible] the CCWG.

DAVID TAYLOR: Just wondering, [inaudible] the reconsideration requests, could we do the same on CEP and IRPs? Again, very high level. Because I think just to look at reconsideration requests in isolation might not be so worthwhile. CEP, yes.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Okay, yes. We'll come back with doable...

JONATHAN ZUCK: Perfect. Thank you. So my only other question – sorry?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

JONATHAN ZUCK: I will. The only thing I want to ask briefly is those were the two resources I remember from yesterday that people thought might be useful to this particular exercise. Are there others that anyone can think of before we leave this topic? Which we're going to do shortly.



---

Okay, great. To summarize, Carlton, we've divided into little sub-teams on this portion of the review based on taking these sections. It's going to be the responsibility of those teams to go read that section or sections of the Implementation Review and to read it with attention to the vertical concerns that we came up with at the end of the day yesterday.

So again, I guess any other housekeeping things, if there was some modification you wanted to see to that document, because I know you all went back after dinner and read through it. But anyway, those were the list of concerns, our verticals I'm calling them, that you want to apply to the sections of the report. Then as we identify reconsideration requests, you may be reading those again with that same perspective or that same prism. Those who signed up for C will also be looking at the Ombudsman report, again looking through the prism of that document we created last thing yesterday.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Microphone.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Sorry, to the Chair. What I was mentioning to the Chair is that the list of concerns, the verticals, we will finalize because I think there were still some little things that we were looking at, no? Additional details.

---

JONATHAN ZUCK: We had no open questions other than, are there things that you would like to see changed? We didn't have open discussion topics.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Okay.

JONATHAN ZUCK: So it can still be a living document. If you think of things as you're going through, it's not set in stone but it's meant to be kind of a guideline and a prism through which to do this other reading.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Okay.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That we can easily roll things together in a standardized way so that we can then take the whole vertical and look across these processes to see how they did.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Stan, go ahead.

---

STANLEY BESEN: Is your sense the product of this is a report to the larger group, or is it a written document? What's the output supposed to be of these activities?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes.

STANLEY BESEN: Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes. It is my sense that this will be, I mean, it can begin in chicken scratch form, outline form, etc. But the idea is that it's going to end up being a portion of our review that will be a written document. As we discussed yesterday, we probably want to structure that document around the verticals more so than around these sections.

So figuring out how best to combine them together and maybe a drafting exercise that gets designed differently because we may have someone take the issue of underserved communities, for example, and be the person that drafts the roll up of the comments that are created by these groups. So I wouldn't over-wordsmith them in the near term but just make them sufficiently detailed that we know what the findings were. Then we'll look at how best to draft that portion of the report which may, again, be a totally different draft [as it's] taking a series of reports. Okay?

---

Alright, great. Thanks. We're going to pause on this and head into the registry agreements and startup compliance with Krista. Krista, Maguy, Allen, welcome.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:

Just to give a little intro to what we're hoping to accomplish. Yesterday we had briefings for you on the history of the program and then the application evaluation process with the discussion about the program implementation report. We wanted to pick up on that thread and provide a little more insight into what happens when you are now a contracted party with ICANN.

We have Allen, Krista, Maguy, and also from Maguy's team, Jennifer, who are here to give you some more insight, some briefing details on how they work with registries and so on and so forth. They're each going to speak for a few minutes, but we're also going to have plenty of time for questions and discussion. So I'll let Allen go first.

ALLEN GROGAN:

Hi. I think I know most people in the room, but for those of you who don't know me, I'm Allen Grogan and I've worn a couple of different hats while I've been at ICANN. I was in charge of the contracting process for the new gTLD agreements during the time that most of them were signed up. I've since taken over the Compliance Department, so I'm no longer part of the legal department.

I'm going to talk briefly about Specification 11 and Specification 13 and the history and evolution of them. I know Eleeza panicked when she

---

saw the number of slides I had. I assured her that I would barrel through this in about ten minutes. So I'm going to do a real quick overview without going into a lot of detail. I provided the slides in case you want more detail.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Allen, just a second. I just want to one moment say that there are folks in the room that have zero history with ICANN, so when you get to an acronym or something like that, it's worth just spelling it out.

ALLEN GROGAN: Yes. Okay, I will try to do that. Specification 11 is called the Public Interest Commitment specification, sometimes referred to as PIC or PICs. I'm going to briefly describe the history and evolution of it because I think that's useful if you haven't been part of this process to understand how it arose.

The GAC Toronto Communique advised ICANN that statements and commitments and objectives that were set forth in the applications submitted by registry operator applicants somehow needed to be transformed into binding contractual commitments. There was nothing in the Applicant Guidebook or the initial draft of the registry agreement that would have accomplished that.

In early 2013, ICANN proposed the addition of Specification 11, and at that time there were basically two additional requirements added to Spec 11. One was a requirement that new gTLD registries only use registrars that were signatories to the 2013 Registry Accreditation

---

Agreement (RAA). Then the other one was to say, “If you want to make voluntary commitments over and above what is part of the standard registry agreement, let us know what those are and those will become binding and enforceable commitments that are part of the agreement.

Those fell into, broadly speaking, two subcategories. One was, “Tell us if there are things that you stated in your application that you are willing to make as binding contractual commitments.” The other was to say, “Even if you didn’t state it in your application, are there things that you want to voluntarily commit to over and above what’s part of the standard agreement?” Next slide.

Then in response to the Beijing Communique, Specification 11 was expanded to include additional commitments that apply to all strings. I’m not going to go through these in detail. They’re listed here, or you can read Specification 11. But a number of provisions that wound up in various parts of Specification 11 over time are pass through requirements. The registry operator must include in its agreement with the registrar a requirement that the registrar include in its agreement with the registrant certain commitments on the part of a registrant.

One of those was a pass through requirement that prohibits registrants from engaging in certain kinds of illegal and abusive behavior that’s listed here. One requirement was that registry operators need to conduct periodic technical analysis to assess whether domains in the gTLD are being used to perpetuate security threats. And one was a broad statement that the gTLD be operated in a transparent manner consistent with general principles of openness and non-discrimination

---

by establishing, publishing, and adhering to clear registration policies.  
Next slide.

The GAC also advised that for strings representing generic terms, exclusive registry access should serve a public interest goal. There's a long, convoluted history on this where we went out and asked applicants to describe how they were serving the public interest. In the interim, we adopted a provision in Spec 11 that simply said, "If a registry operator was operating a generic string, they could not limit registrations exclusively to a single person or entity or that person or entity's affiliate." So we simply said, "You can't have exclusive registry access if you're operating a gTLD that's a generic term," and we've never really addressed the question of whether you could do that if you served a public interest goal. Next slide.

Then the GAC also advised that additional specific safeguards should apply to strings that it identified as sensitive strings linked to regulated or professional sectors, and those are sometimes referred to as Category 1 strings. So there were special requirements, again, a lot of these in the form of pass through requirements.

So registrars are required to commit to comply with applicable laws. Registrants who collect and maintain sensitive health and financial data have to implement reasonable and appropriate security measures commensurate with their offering those services, and registry operators need to proactively create a clear pathway for establishing a working relationship with relevant regulatory bodies. Next slide.

---

Registrants need to provide up-to-date administrative contact information for notification of complaints or reports of registration abuse. Registrants need to represent that they possess any necessary authorizations, credentials, or licenses for participation in the sector that's associated with the registry TLD string. Registry operators need to consult with the relevant national supervisory authorities regarding the authenticity of those licenses or credentials if a complaint is received. And registrants need to report any material changes to the validity of those licenses or authorizations. Next slide.

Then there were certain specific strings that were deemed to pose risks of cyberbullying or harassment. For .wtf, .sucks, .fail, and .gripe, there was a specific additional requirement added to Specification 11 saying that they needed to include a provision to address those issues. Next slide.

Then for other specific strings that were deemed to create the possibility of confusion that they might be affiliated with governments because they are uniquely governmental functions, a specific provision was added so that the registrant had to represent if their .army, .navy, .airforce – that they not misrepresent that they're somehow affiliated with or sponsored by or endorsed by the government's military forces if that sponsorship or endorsement doesn't exist. If they are sponsored or endorsed by the U.S. Army or Airforce, they can say that. But if they're not, they can't misrepresent that.

Then we came up with PICDRP. And taking your comment to heart about trying to not confuse people who aren't familiar with all the acronyms we use, that's a Public Interest Commitment Dispute



---

Resolution Procedure (PICDRP), which provides a mechanism for impacted parties to complain to ICANN if they believe someone is not complying with the PIC. There are two paths that can be followed. One would be the Compliance Department could take that up as a compliance matter and/or we could refer that to an independent panel for resolution. Those could both be done, or either one of those could be pursued. Next.

Specification 13. Specification 13 applies only to brand owners, trademark owners. This was different. This didn't arise out of GAC advice. This arose because a kind of self-formed group within the ICANN community called the Brand Registry Group approached us back at, I think initially, at ICANN 46 – that was before my time here – and continued those discussions for several meetings and said, “The nature of some of these brand owners who want to apply for a TLD that represents a brand name is such that we're not going to have a large number of registrants. Registrants may only consist of the brand owner itself or maybe the brand owner itself and a few affiliated entities. We don't intend to open this up to hundreds of thousands or registrants. We think a number of the safeguards that are built into the New gTLD Agreement are really intended to apply to TLDs where there are a large number of registrants. We think those are unnecessary and burdensome if I'm going to be the only registrant or myself and five subsidiaries are going to be the only registrants.”

Then they also asked for the protection of their intellectual property rights in the trademark that, following any termination or expiration of a brand registry agreement, we not immediately re-delegate that TLD to somebody else because that could create confusion. If I have a brand

---

name .microsoft or something and I give it up, they didn't want us to delegate .microsoft to somebody else without some sunset provision. Next slide.

There were three changes basically imposed by Specification 13. One was an exemption from the Code of Conduct, and you can read the Code of Conduct which is in Specification 9, I believe. But that's mostly safeguards around registrants. The other is that registry operators generally are supposed to allow non-discriminatory access to registry services by any authorized registrar who signed the 2013 RAA. They said, "If I'm only going to be registering names to myself and a few affiliated entities or trademark licensees, why do I need to open this up to 100 registrars?" So we said, "Fine. You can limit the number of authorized registrars to as few as three."

Then in the sunset provision, we agreed that we would not delegate the TLD to a successor registry operator for two years without their consent unless we reasonably determine that transitioning operation of the TLD is necessary to protect the public interest. So we do have the right to delegate it to somebody else if we think there's a valid reason that's necessary to protect the public interest, but otherwise we wouldn't do that for a minimum period of the two years.

By the way, even without Specification 13, there's a general provision elsewhere in the agreement that says, "Following expiration or termination of any TLD agreement, we will take into account the registry operator's intellectual property rights in deciding whether to re-delegate it to somebody else." So we probably would have taken this

---

into account anyway, but for the brand owners who qualify, we agreed to this specific provision. Next slide.

To qualify for Specification 13 for these brand registry requirements, it's not automatic. You have to submit an application to us and be approved. Your TLD must be identical to the text of a registered trademark, so it can't be a variation on it. It must be an exact match. It has to have been recorded with the Trademark Clearinghouse. It has to be used by the registry operator or an affiliate in the ordinary course of business in connection with the goods or services that are specified in that trademark application.

It has to have been issued prior to the filing of the TLD application with ICANN. The reason for that is we wanted to avoid gaming. We didn't want somebody who had a generic term to apply for a TLD and then go to a jurisdiction where you could actually get a registered trademark on the generic term and say, "I'm a brand owner. I qualify for Spec 13."

It has to be used continuously throughout the term. It can't begin with a period or dot. It has to be used in connection with goods or services unrelated to the provision of gTLD registry services. So if you have a trademark for automobiles or computers or software, you qualify as a brand, but not if you're trying to protect a brand that's core to the registry business. Next slide.

Only registry operator, its affiliates, or trademark licensees can be registrants. The TLD can't be a generic string. And as part of the evaluation process, you have to provide us with a complete copy of that trademark registration so we don't need to go search for it. Next slide.

---

That's it in terms of my presentation. I don't know if you want to do questions now or let Krista and Maguy do their presentations and then take questions at the end.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I think given some folks' unfamiliarity, it would be better to break it up and do the questions as we go. Megan, do you want to go ahead?

MEGAN RICHARDS: Yes. Thanks. That was very useful. It's always useful to refresh our memories, especially those of us who are over 25.

Can you just go back to one of your previous – that's it. The next one. Because I can't remember the details. Yes, exactly. I wanted to ask you if you could give us an example of a brand TLD that – where did I see it now? Yes. That's it. You said that it has to be used in the ordinary course of business, but it can't be related to registry services. Can you give us an example of something that would be a brand that's related to registry services, just so I can have an idea?

ALLEN GROGAN: Sure. If I started Grogan Registry Services and my business was providing registry services and I got a trademark in "Grogan" for that purpose, then I don't qualify as a brand TLD. I need to use "Grogan" for some other goods or services unrelated to the provision or registry services.

---

DAVID TAYLOR: Allen, on Spec 11, has there ever been a brand that successfully, or has anyone successfully argued, that their exclusive TLD is in the public interest?

ALLEN GROGAN: We never had to reach that question because we put a provision in Spec 13 that simply said if you were generic you didn't qualify for it. We did, and Krista can correct me if I'm wrong here, we did go out to all of the applicants and ask them, if they were generic, "Can you please explain how you believe you serve a public interest goal," and we did get responses back from a number of them.

But in the interim, we just put in this placeholder provision that said we're simply not going to grant a Spec 11 to somebody who is generic, and we've never tackled the issue of what level of justification you would need to establish in terms of serving a public interest goal to get a Spec 11. The vast majority of applicants who had applied for generic strings said, "We don't intend to operate in an exclusive manner," and that solved the problem.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I'm sorry. I just don't even remember this, but one of the things was a minimum of three registrars as part of Spec 13. Is zero also a reasonable number? If it's one or more, it has to be at least three.

ALLEN GROGAN: That was part of the negotiations, and I think we had gone out for public comment with a proposal that they could have as few as one and there

---

were objections to that. So we ended up saying, “No. You must open it up to at least three.”

JONATHAN ZUCK: So there has to be a registrar involved. So even .facebook that wanted to automatically give domains would have to go through a registrar.

CARLTON SAMUELS: We had a lot of kerfuffle about this. The three accredited registrars, and they must be accredited to 2013 RAA. that was a minimum of three, and they must be accredited on the 2013 RAA.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Let me maybe ask a clarifying question because my interpretation of the agreement is different than Carlton’s. I think it’s a maximum of three, not a minimum of three. Because some brands use more than one registrar in order to manage their portfolio. I think that’s the intent of the three. Krista’s nodding.

KRISTA PAPAC: Yes, for the people who can’t hear my head shaking. Yes. The Spec 13 actually says “will designate no more than three accredited registrars.” But they still are required to use registrars to register names, so that would mean you need at least one registrar in order to register names, but no more than three.

---

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Separately from that, Krista, there's a provision in the registry agreement that allows a registry operator to self-allocate up to 100 TLDs for the purpose of the promotion of the TLD. But if you want to use it for anything else or have more than 100 names, then you need to use an accredited registrar.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: My mistake, and I apologize.

DAVID TAYLOR: I've forgotten what my question was now. Change requests. For the brands, we've been talking about brands, and this happens obviously quite a lot where brands take over other brands. If you've got, for instance, .google to take an example here and they get taken over by Apple and they decide they want to change .google to .google, they'd have to file a change request. Have you had any of those? And it's a serious question just on the basis for the future rounds and how we're going to deal with this in the future because it's bound to happen, this situation. How is that going to be dealt with, and have you actually had to deal with that yet?

KRISTA PAPAC: You're asking about the top-level then? Can they change that? I don't know even if Karen wants to tackle this. You currently cannot change the string. I'm sure I know people have asked for it over time, but we've never allowed that. You get the string that you have and you stay with that. Now whether that's impacted by future rounds, which I think

---

somebody else mentioned or there's some other thing that comes into play, remains to be seen. But currently, they cannot change the string at the top level.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

I think in addition to that, one consideration in an acquisition merger context or whatever would be the successor entity would still have to meet the Spec 13 requirements. So they would still have to be actively using the brand and so forth. And if they didn't, they would lose Spec 13 for that. Sometimes in a merger acquisition, somebody changes their branding, ceases to use – HP no longer uses Compaq or something – and in that case, had they gotten a Spec 13 for Compaq, they wouldn't qualify for it anymore.

DAVID TAYLOR:

Thanks. Just following up on that. It's the thought of it was more whether it's an issue which you've had the requests from brands where there has been that situation. Because, obviously, it may be a brand which becomes defunct. So the question is, can they exchange it for their new brand in some way? And whether they've just made requests and you've said, "No. You can't do that. It's not permitted." So it's really whether it was a problem that was live or whether it's a problem that actually you've hardly had any queries from brands about.

KRISTA PAPAC:

Just to respond to that. I know. I'm sorry. I think this lady would like to get in the queue. Just to be clear, we've had people request a change of



---

strings. I haven't paid attention specifically whether it's a brand or not a brand, but there have certainly been requests over the years to do that. To just kind of correct, there hasn't been a process or that's not been something that we've been able to do so far.

MEGAN RICHARDS: Yes. Thanks very much. Just a simple last question. Well, not last. I'm curious about the number of PICDRPs, dispute resolutions, have been held.

ALLEN GROGAN: The answer is, so far, zero. Maguy can speak to this. On our website, we have a place where you can submit a PIC complaint. We've had several people submit PIC complaints, but when we've looked at those we've determined they don't really fit within that category. Somebody just found their way to that web page and submitted a complaint there and when we looked at it, we realized it was not really a complaint about a failure to comply with public interest commitments. And we've never convened a PICDRP panel to look at anything.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I guess for just the benefit of some folks in the room about Spec 11, is it possible to spend a few minutes providing some context around that? Because in some instances, people volunteered to take on these things, to overcome objections. What's some of the context for that for folks who don't have the history here for the commitments that people actually made? I guess it's the non-application commitments maybe is

---

what that rather innocuous sounding category. Maybe spell that out a little bit for folks who weren't here.

KRISTA PAPAC: I'm not sure I understand what you're asking for, Jonathan. The context around why people would do that?

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's exactly right. On the face of it, why would I agree to put anything into a contract and make it binding if I didn't have to? As a layman, that whole thing seems absurd to me. That's the question I'm asking on behalf of folks who weren't here.

KRISTA PAPAC: Thanks. I have a feeling that people might be saying that more than once. "Why would I want to do that?" So sure. I think, Allen, you might have touched on it a little bit, but just to maybe say it a little bit differently.

Allen made a point earlier that the Applicant Guidebook and the applications themselves, there wasn't necessarily information in there that said that every single thing you put in your application is going to be contractually binding. The applications were submitted by applicants. They provided all kinds of information, some of it technical, some of it operational, some of it related to different things they wanted to do with the TLD.

---

That being said, the Governmental Advisory Committee had once – I need to go back and validate my timing – but I think it was after the applications became public, the Governmental Advisory Committee was asking that applicants commit to whatever was in their applications, and it was after they had been submitted.

So the compromise that came out of that was that applicants could, if they wanted to, volunteer to commit to some or all of the things in their applications or they could make additional commitments that they might want to make.

We wouldn't speculate. I think just logic says that the reason some of them did, the Governmental Advisory Committee at that time also was expressing concern over certain strings, over certain applications. Should there be a .bank or not, as one example. So the opportunity to make these voluntary public interest commitments, I think some applicants saw as any opportunity to make the Governmental Advisory Committee or help them feel a little bit better about some of those things.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:

Just one other piece of context. In parallel to this process, the GAC in some cases had issued what's called an early warning advisory to some applicants. So some applicants were on notice that the government had some intent to scrutinize their applications, and so that may have influenced their thinking on this topic.

---

CARLTON SAMUELS:

Add a little color to it. It came out of the early warnings. I was on the ALAC at the time, and there were some interesting conversations that went on about what this meant. We thought the public interest commitment should be binding, and some of us believed that therefore we would have these specifications. We support the specifications.

I didn't. I actually am on record saying that they weren't worth a warm bucket of spit, and that is still my position. If you're going to make something voluntary and then you're going to come back and tell me that I have to have it binding in agreement and then you're going to check me on that, well, what is the interest that I would have in doing that? I didn't see it that way, and I still don't see it as relevant.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Again, the nature of this review is we're trying to get down a level from a high-level discussion of this. So the color commentary is, I think, really critical here. And it is, in fact, completely illogical that anybody would voluntarily sign up for something to be binding if it didn't need to be. So unless there was some marked differentiation component to it or it was the result of early warning to overcome a potential objection, I think we need to really bring that discussion to the surface for it to be valuable. Because saying that there are things I mentioned in there, people might want to make them binding, it doesn't pass the [inaudible] test. Go ahead.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:

One thing that I haven't mentioned until now, but now seems like a great time to mention it is the Registry Stakeholder Group has convened

---

a group of registries that are interested in making themselves available to the CCT-RT if we have questions about their operations or anything. I think they would help us. It may be this would be the sort of question we would want to take to them. Google registry did not enter into any voluntary PIC, so I couldn't tell you why someone would do it because we did not. But many other registry operators chose to do this, and so we could probably consult with [inaudible] people and ask them why they did it.

ALLEN GROGAN:

I was just going to say, which I think you already hit on, I can't speculate as to what the motivation was because we just asked them to submit PICs and not explain why. But I think there are registry operators who decided to include PICs because they felt for marketing and promotional purposes it was a good thing to do. They weren't subject to GAC Advice. They hadn't received early warnings. But they thought there was some competitive advantage to being able to say, "We're applying these additional safeguards, and we don't want to put that in our registration policies that could change over time. We actually want to make this a binding commitment," and advertise that. That's speculation on my part.

KRISTA PAPAC:

Just one more thing. The voluntary PICs were published, and they're on our website. Going back to Jordyn's point, there's certainly the stakeholder group, but also you can see who all of the applicants at the time were that submitted voluntary PICs if you did want to try and

---

consult with some of those. There are, I think, about 500. I'm working from memory again. And about 300 of them came from Donuts, so there's 1 plus another couple hundred if you guys wanted to take a look at that or reach out to those folks.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Do we know how many of them did have early warnings?

KRISTA PAPAC: Not off the top of my head, no.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Great. Stan, thanks.

STANLEY BESEN: Did you say that things that applicants said they would do with their applications then might have chosen not to do afterwards and that has been okay?

KRISTA PAPAC: No, I didn't say that. I said that members of the community, or different groups in the community, were asking for them, after they submitted the application, to be contractually bound to everything in the application and that the solution for that was that they could volunteer to become contractually bound to things in the application that maybe wouldn't normally be part of the registry agreement.

---

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: But some things they said in their application they would do, they might now not be bound to do?

KRISTA PAPAC: That is possible, yes.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: There is a representation of warranty in the contract that says something along the lines of, "When I sign this contract, everything I said in the application is true," but that doesn't persist. It's not an ongoing obligation beyond the initial representation.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I was raising it because I thought you might be puzzled. I'm trying to actually [inaudible] this conversation for people who are new to this whole process. So it's one of the things we should look at separately as motivation. I didn't know if we had any statistics about it. I'll stop trying to be a proxy for anyone. Is there anybody that has additional questions?

Alright. So let's move on to the next presentation, I guess. Thank you.

KRISTA PAPAC: Now that you're familiar with my voice. I am the Director of Registry Services and Engagement. Basically, there's a team of us, and our responsibilities I'm going to talk about a little bit. What I'll first do is

---

explain to you who our team is and what we do, what our core areas of responsibility are. Then the team asked me to talk a little bit about some of the key themes that we've seen.

Just in general, our team works to support the registry operators and the different, we call them services, that they need to have in place in order to be in compliance with their contract. The Registry Services team is responsible for all of that. So we really are dealing with them post-contracting, post-delegation, post-application process and supporting them in their ongoing operations.

Once I tell you a little bit about the team, I'll just talk a little bit about some of the key themes we've seen so far with the new gTLD registry operators. I'll talk a little bit about where we tend to get involved to help out and then maybe touch on some of the bigger areas of challenge that we've seen as we've gone along.

First of all, the team, we have two roles with one goal. Engagement Manager is one of the hats that members of the registry team wear. Really what that means is they're responsible for the relationship with the applicants – only there are not that many left anymore, they're mostly registry operators now – and the registry operators. That relationship between them and ICANN.

Then they have a Service Manager hat. The contract itself between ICANN and the registries has a whole bunch of things in it that registries have to do. I'll give you some examples in a few minutes. Most of those things or many of those things need to be supposed by, for instance, a dispute resolution procedure and providers to handle those disputes. Or



---

some sort of published process for how you apply for something or request something or make changes to your contract, etc. So those are what we call services.

We've been trying, ICANN as we've been scaling the organization, trying to create common terminology that you find in non-oversight body businesses, regular businesses. So we look at them, we call these services.

The team, overall our goal is to work with the registries to make sure they understand their contract, that they can do the things that they need to do. This ultimately helps to ensure a more secure and stable Internet.

Oh, this isn't very easy to see in here. Sorry about that, folks.

The two areas of responsibility, just to give you some examples. First, on the right side of the screen, the relationship management. Again, we're the primary interface with the registry operators. Oh, thank you. Much better. We make sure that we understand what their needs are and how to help them be successful and make sure that those get articulated back into cross-functional teams and things that go on inside of ICANN the company.

We keep them informed on what's going on, or we at least try, and communicate relevant developments to them or let them know about things that are going on that might impact them. Again, we coordinate with other departments inside of ICANN to deal with things that might affect applicants and registries and other relevant global stakeholders.

---

On the Service Manager side, we design, implement, and maintain the various registry products and services. That can include implementing ICANN consensus policies that relate either mostly or completely to registry operators.

Identifying service needs. As things change, and they certainly have over the past three years, sometimes there are new things that have to be built to support requests from registry operators or services that they want to implement.

We define the business requirements. We administer related public comment periods, coordinate cross-functional teams, and develop briefing papers for executive management and the Board.

Just to give you an idea of the registry service areas, we've basically created eight different buckets of core areas of services. The big squares in the middle of the screen are the buckets. The print that's either above or below the bucket is just an example of a service that would fall into that bucket.

Under Contracting, RA renewal management is something we would call a service.

Under Registry Onboarding, establishing launch programs. So there are certain things that the registries have to do at startup before they can become generally available to the public, and we call those their launch programs.

Dispute Resolution Procedures, Uniform Rapid Suspension (URS) is one example. We already talked about the Public Interest Commitments

---

Dispute Resolution Procedure (PICDRP) is another example that would fall in our Dispute Resolution bucket.

Registry Agreement Administration, Evaluation Services, and you guys can see the rest on the screen. It just gives you an idea of some of the services. I think in Registry we have something like – I'm trying to remember, I've lost count – I think it is about 35-ish services that fall into these buckets.

The team itself, they're assigned accounts based on geography, and they they're assigned services. So they're a primary or a secondary manager for some portion of the 35 services.

Then the next slide is just to give you an idea of where everybody is. We have the Registry Team is based out of all three ICANN hubs. We have a couple people in Asia-Pacific. These are their smiling faces. Some people in Europe and then a team here in Los Angeles, of which Dennis Chang is in the room.

That's just about the team and what we do. As far as key themes go that we've seen throughout the startup of these new registry operators, I'd say the most common theme that we've seen is – and I don't have slides for this. I'm just going to talk now. But the most common theme that we've seen is just kind of a general lack of understanding. It has to do with this is new for everybody, including ICANN.

We have a Registry Agreement. It's one thing to write a contract, and it's a completely different thing to actually live the contract. As people start becoming contracted and going through different things they have to do, you start to run into the practical challenges of doing those things

---

and what does that really mean and how does that really happen and how do you translate that into tasks as opposed to just contractual legal language.

The lack of understanding is not just registry operators. It's even us just trying to figure out how we bridge that gap between execution and theory.

Some of the places where we've seen challenges is in the startup processes themselves, about some of the language in the Registry Agreement.

Even one silly example, but like all contracts, we have a provision in there on how do we give you legal notice that we're doing something. The wording is probably one of the few sections that probably wasn't, I don't recall, being very highly debated of all the sections that were debated. I think it was just kind of a carryover from previous agreements.

When you read the way it's written, it's really hard to scale. That language works really well for 20 or 18 registries; it doesn't work so well for 1,200. For instance, it has a provision that we'll send something by courier or e-mail and then snail mail. Courier works great for 18. It doesn't work so well for 1,200. There are things like that, that you come across in there and try to figure out how do we – the Registry Agreement says what it says. So that is our governing terminology. But how do we make the work from a scalability perspective as well?

Then really one of the other big common things just in general lack of understanding was how do the registries work with ICANN. Everybody

---

was used to living in this application world where the interaction with ICANN was very different from how registry operators, contracted parties, prior to the new gTLD round had interacted with ICANN. So there were a whole bunch of new players who only knew how to interact with us as an applicant, and they didn't understand how to interact with us as a contracted party. So really just building up that relationship with them and even getting documentation out to them to explain to them how to do certain things was one of the things that we had to work fast and hard to get to.

In general, the places where the Registry Services Team has been called in to help and has been helping for the past few years is really in communication. So this general lack of understanding, misunderstanding between us and registries, the gap has been largely filled by some form of communication. It started, I think, at the very beginning with just regular engagement with the stakeholder group, which of course is not comprised of all registry operators, but it was just a starting point.

We built out the team and started having them have proactive engagements with applicants and registries just to help open up the dialogue. Then as [it] progressed, the team has become an escalation point for registries and applicants. If they're trying to get something done here with ICANN, they're trying to get a question answered and they don't feel like they're getting what they need, they can always escalate it to a dedicated account person from the registry team who can help them figure out how to get what they need.

---

We also have been, as I just mentioned a minute ago, working to create more external documentation that we publish. There are some processes that have been around for a long time that registries have been using – like registries before this round were using – that knew very well how to use them but it wasn't really clear from our published documentation for somebody who was brand new to this ecosystem, "How do I get this done with ICANN?" We've been supplementing what has been published with instructional guides and things like that.

Then lastly, we've done some training, or what we called the Roadshow, where we went out to three different regions of the world, invited the registries to come join us, and we just worked through. We had a bunch of workshops on the contract itself and on the different services that they may need to use and how to use them, how to go through startup, how to request a change to a service in their contract, etc.

Then finally, just on the topic of some of the bigger challenges, I think the thing that we've seen as one of the biggest challenges related to this ongoing operations of these registries is that some of the tools that are used, some of the services that are used, were developed a long time ago. They were developed, again, when we had a much smaller pool of registry operators, 18. The environment was very different.

When you bring a whole bunch of new players into this, they have different idea. They want to do things that they've come up with, and they're reading the contract and it says, "If you want to make some changes," (and I'm going to give you guys an example in a minute), "here's the process you follow." But again, the process was developed a

---

long time ago and doesn't maybe scale or doesn't work in the new environment.

One of the areas that we have this, so in the contract the registry operators have registry services that they provide, what we call registry services. There's a consensus policy out there called the Registry Services Evaluation Policy (RSEP).

It basically says that if a registry wants to change or add a new service, and there's a specific definition that's articulated there, that they need to come work with ICANN on that first. ICANN will evaluate the service to make sure that there are no significant security, stability, or competition issues. Then there's a process you go through. Then assuming that there are no issues with those three areas, work with the registry to allow that service to be implemented. Implementation almost always means you have to amend the contract to say, "You can now do this thing."

The RSEP policy itself was finalized in 2006. Again, it was a much smaller world back then, and it's just very different. I mean, just the physical world has changed a lot since 2006. Some of the services that we've seen that have been challenged, sometimes the services they want to add are specific to the business model that they have.

For instance, a registry might be targeting a very specific audience and before you can get a domain name in that gTLD, the registry might want to verify that you actually fit in that specific group that they're targeting. The way that you do that is through some sort of registrant verification or validation service.

---

Depending on how they implement it, it needs to go through the RSEP or it doesn't. It creates this bit of a struggle because sometimes the registry, they feel like they've already covered this somewhere and why do they need to go through the RSEP.

Also, sometimes the registries want to implement a service, an idea that they've thought of. They want to be first to market with it. But the RSEP process, it's ICANN, so it's very public. If you think about it, they have a new business idea, they come to us, we publish it, everybody gets to look at it, and then eventually after some period of time, assuming it passes RSEP and it gets the contract amendment, they eventually get to implement it. So it creates a bit of a challenge for them, making it difficult for them to innovate or be first to market is what we hear from them.

Sometimes there are also challenges where the service they want to implement interacts in a funny way with other parts of the contract. One of the things we've seen there is registries wanting to implement third-level domain registrations.

My last name is Papac. My middle name is Leigh. My first name is Krista. If I wanted Krista.Leigh.Papac instead of Krista.Papac, the Krista.Leigh.Papac is a third-level domain. There's really no language in our contract about that, and it does fit under the definition of a registry service in the consensus policy.

But looking at how does that request interact with other provisions in the contract, for instance, things like sunrise and trademark claims. If they're going to register third-level domain names or offer them, do



---

those need to go through a sunrise and a claims period? What if they do fourth-level? Do those go through sunrise and claims? What about fifth, sixth, seventh, eighth?

There are all of these unique challenges that we're seeing now spring up, figuring out how to abide by our consensus policies and our contract and make sure that all of the other things that are in our remit and Bylaws are being honored also.

Then finally, the challenge here is that doing some of these things takes time and, again, you have the companies that want to go implement a new service and they're trying to work through the processes with us and it's causing them a lot of time to get some of those things done.

Just to go back to the registrant validation or verification thing, some think that, "I've created a space that is supposed to only for certain types of registrants. I didn't have this service in my contract when I signed it. I need to add it now." Some registries are thinking of this as, "I'm creating a trusted space that is about that subject matter, but I can't make it trusted yet because I have to go through all these processes with ICANN first." That creates an interesting dynamic and it is, again, one of the more challenging things that we're still working through with registries. That's it.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:

Are there questions now? We also have Maguy who is going to give her presentation.

---

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thanks. Just a quick question. The ccTLDs are excluded from the registry service, is that correct? Or is it that some are in and some are out? I always get confused about who is in and who is out.

KRISTA PAPAC: Sure. Thanks. Yes. ICANN just has oversight over the gTLD space. So ccTLDs sometimes ask us for something, not like in the context of a contract, but they might have a question. We're always happy to help, but we don't have oversight over them.

CARLOS RAÚL GUTIERREZ: How many requests for these new services have you seen from the new registries, or do you publish these numbers or can they be found somewhere?

KRISTA PAPAC: Thanks, Carlos. All of the requests are published. There is an initial discussion with ICANN that is not published, and we do a completeness check before we publish them. But once the request is considered complete, meaning it has everything it needs, we publish them on our website. I'm happy to point you there.

To your point about how many, it's not that easy truthfully to weed through them. But I can tell you that, again I'm working from my memory, but I think we're getting about 75 a year right now, where with used to get 5 a year. Keeping in mind that of those 75, many of them are from multiple gTLDs. So they'll submit one request for all of

---

their TLDs. One could be for 100 TLDs. It's definitely a much bigger number than it used to be.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:

There's also, I believe, there's some set of registries that included additional services in their application, and you guys added those services to their contracts at contracting time. Is that correct?

KRISTA PAPAC:

Sort of, yes. There's a section in the application that asks for any additional registry services, and this is actually one of the areas that was really confusing. Some people didn't actually put the registry services in the registry services section. They put them somewhere else in the application. What we did at contracting is for a couple of, I think, really good reasons, we went through every application and tried to find what looked like registry services as best we could and put them into the draft contracts that we gave them. But then we asked them to please review and make sure it had everything that they wanted.

In some cases, people didn't realize that something was a registry service or I don't know if people didn't look closely at their contracts we asked them to review, but there are instances where you might have had a registry service in your application, it didn't make it into your registry agreement, so it would need to be added through the RSEP later on.

---

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Sure. I'm just saying to Carlos' point, there's some set of new services that were added after contracting, and then there's some set that you guys evaluated and included in the initial contract as well, which wouldn't show up as RSEPs.

KRISTA PAPAC: Correct. I'm sorry. Yes. Thank you. Great point. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Krista, is there a notable difference in the number of registries that are using third parties to actually implement their registry services? And has that affected the way that you're interacting? I don't know if my assumption is correct or not, but I think it is that there are a lot more folks that are contracting with someone to actually run the backend of their registry. Is that higher propensity, given there is one, something that has made it more or less complex to work with the registries, answer their questions and stuff?

KRISTA PAPAC: Thanks, Jonathan. Yes. A lot of the registries have outsourced the delivery of registry services basically to some sort of backend technical provider or registry services provider is another term we use. It would be interesting to actually look at the math on that. I think prior to this round, many of the existing TLDs actually were outsourcing as well, so the percentages might not be too far off. But because the scale is so much bigger, I think it does make a big difference. And there are more

---

registry service providers now than there were prior to this round. So there are more of them. There are certainly more registries.

It does make – I don't know if complicated is the right word – it makes the interactions more challenging because we define how we communicate and who we communicate with, but it's still a little bit challenged because sometimes you've got a business person who is technically the registry operator at some big company who is not familiar with this industry. They've outsourced the backend to somebody who is very familiar with this industry.

But we communicate with our contracted party. We don't have a contract with the backend. So we're communicating with someone who doesn't understand that they need to go communicate with their vendor. So those are some of the confusing things that we've struggled with a little bit. It hasn't complicated things. It's just a matter, I think, more of just trying to get people to understand. And really for ICANN, and we've been working on this, to find additional mechanisms for making sure communications get to the right people so they can act.

DAVID TAYLOR:

Thanks, Krista. You mentioned, which was interesting, the unique challenges of third-level domains, so the Krista.Leigh.Papac, which is a perfect example, and whether certain registry services should apply, etc. I was just thinking that, obviously, you've got the issue as well where the URS could or could not apply, and even UDRP, in a situation where you may want Google.Leigh.Papac. Sorry to always pick on Jordyn as I have to do here, and what you do with that issue or those

---

sort of registrations. Have you had internal thoughts about that with the URS, for instance?

KRISTA PAPAC: Yes. Thanks, David. That falls in the same – I just named off a couple, but URS would be one of them as well.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Any other questions? [inaudible] would like to leave the rest of the time for Maguy to make her presentation. Go ahead, Maguy.

MAGUY SERAD: Good morning, everyone. I'm looking around the table. I know and have had the opportunity to work with many of you. It's good to see you. My role, I'm the VP in Contractual Compliance. I report to Allen. I've asked Jennifer to join me also today to make sure we address any questions you have in the registry space because she oversees the registry area in Compliance.

You had asked Compliance to come and share (Next slide, please.) to come and share with you what preparation efforts did we undertake to be able to work within so many new players but also to enforce the contract. But also to share with you some themes and activities that we work on. Next slide, please.

From preparation for the new gTLDs, it's an exercise we conducted in 2012. Basically, we looked at and assessed our organization. As you hear us speak of staffing, systems, processes, and also knowledge and

---

application of the contractual obligations. We rolled out, many of you have heard me speak and present whether at GNSO Council or different stakeholder group meetings.

But we did in order for us to prepare for the new-G world, as we refer to it, is we went and first started with the contract. We started with the contract before even the contract was signed. Compliance is involved internally and works within our internal organization – legal department, registry services – and we collaborate and review and provide our input. So we started the process very early in the game. That process assisted us in laying out what needs to happen. What is the level of complexity? What are the areas of compliance we need to focus on?

We started building all the documents that relate to it and focused on the systems. The old systems did not address registry complaints. It was mostly focused on registrars. So we focused on the staffing. Let me start with that one.

The staffing, we generated and we assessed our model. What are the skillsets? What are the staffing models? I'm looking at Carlton. He has heard me talk to that for ALAC in a previous life. When Fadi came onboard and made that announcement of the Istanbul and Singapore hubs, we were the first to go in there besides the regional VPs. We had already brought on staff in Singapore and in Istanbul to represent Compliance in the hubs. Staff who is local. Staff who is knowledgeable. And we started the training in preparation for this.

---

We also centralized our system and added several we refer to them as complaint types, just an internal referral. But it's really the different provisions that we need to be working with but allow the outside world to also submit complaint forms to us about either noncompliance or alleged noncompliance.

We also use the same central system for our internal teams. For example, if there is – let's just pick on Finance – if for some reason an invoice or fees are not paid, Finance goes through their normal process. Then if no actions are taken, they escalate by submitting a complaint to Compliance and informing the contracted party that an escalation has been sent to Compliance. I use this as the most simple example.

A more complicated example of the consolidated system is also the interaction we have with the GDD team where it's referred to as technical services. Technical services has different automations and tools to identify exceptions. Those exceptions get logged into our system and it allows us to work through the exceptions and address the noncompliance issues.

This has been a very valuable approach because it does impact everything that we do with the community, and you will see me talk to that, how it gets to the metrics.

We have enhanced the process and standardized it because, again, the Registry Agreement has different obligations. For example, the turnaround time, it's very unique in certain provisions, whereas in others it's open. But if you don't have a standardized approach, you can never really come to closure on any compliance issues if you do not



---

institutionalize an operational approach in addition to the contractual obligations.

Last but not least, I'm looking at Jonathan. We're going to celebrate our fifth anniversary, Jonathan and I. April 3<sup>rd</sup> is when I joined ICANN, and I met Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: [inaudible] celebrate [inaudible].

MAGUY SERAD: Additional metrics. You can only imagine the level of increased metrics we have put in place, but we also continue to improve on those metrics. We have not finished our journey. This is ongoing.

Preparation for the new-G. what does that mean? It's not just preparation from staffing, processes, systems, and tools, but also as you know and you have observed, a lot of the newcomers, the new TLDs, are existing operators.

We had a process in the past that we do compliance checks for contract renewals in the old world. Well, guess what? The new world brought contract signing and contract assignments in addition to whatever combination of change a contract can bring you. So we expanded the contractual compliance check to include those additional services.

Before a contract signing occurs, you've heard us speak to it at the updates at the ICANN meetings, before a TLD is delegated, we perform a contractual compliance check to find out (1) if they are in the existing

---

world, how are they behaving, and (2) if they are in the existing world and have an affiliation with other areas – whether it's registrars or registries.

We look at a compliance check not just focusing on the TLD but all-inclusive, and we provide that input into either the contract process or the process where it's led by the registrar services or registries for contract renewals.

Compliance ramped up the proactive monitoring efforts. We still do some monitoring efforts manually, but we also have like you heard me say earlier with technical services they have automated a lot of those.

Some of the manual efforts we do are as simple as publication of abuse contact data. We just go on the website. Are they fulfilling the obligations of publishing that information?

We also have updated and developed and rolled out what we call a new Registry Agreement Audit program. This audit program now has concluded two full audit phases, and we are in the third round. All this information is published, so I'm not going to dive into the details of the audit. But before we launch any audit, we communicate and we publish it at the ICANN meetings and on our website.

The bullet that really critical to improving the transparency and accountability is this bullet here. ICANN and Contractual Compliance publishes all the notices. This what we refer to as enforcement notices. We publish any and all outreach updates, including the presentations that accompany them.

---

We publish and we used to do monthly newsletters. This was in the early phases when we were introducing a lot of changes and there were changes on a monthly basis. Now we've pulled back to what we call quarterly updates, but we also have a Compliance annual report in addition to the reports that are published on a 13-month rolling basis that can be found and a monthly dashboard.

All this data is fed from our centralized system. So transparency begins from there, and it leads into the metrics that are visible to everyone.

Continuous improvement. It's an ongoing effort for our department. It doesn't stop. We receive a lot of feedback, whether it's from the community about additional metrics or opportunities for improvement and reporting, from our contracted parties to help bring more clarity, or even from our own staff to help improve and process and [inaudible].  
Next slide, please.

The next two slides I'm providing for you here are just to give you an idea also. Contractual Compliance, as you heard me say, isn't just when a contract is signed. Contractual Compliance is a full circle. You heard me speak about the initial phases of the contract and the applications, but we also contribute heavily and collaborate with the working groups and the policy department.

We work on – this is the list. It's not all-inclusive. It's just a list of a few items of efforts underway today that we answer questions to, we provide data to, or we provide input into policies that are in development. Again, it's informational. We [inaudible] take any questions on that. Next slide, please.

---

One of the things I thought would be relevant for this audience because it was also asked what are the trends or issues that Compliance has seen since the launch. I heard earlier the question asked about the service providers. If I may just [inaudible] for a minute here.

When we conducted the audits, it's nice to say, "I want to audit all 800+ TLDs." Well, that's not doable. You have to put forth a strategy that handles and addresses what we call low-hanging fruit.

In this example, the service providers as you were talking to earlier, there were many new introduced into this model. In addition, the model has exploded. I mean, there are hundreds of TLDs out there. So one of the areas we selected an audit strategy on is let's identify who are the service providers and how many registry operators are they servicing.

That was what we call a low-hanging fruit because if a potential noncompliance is identified, there is a possibility that issue can be addressed and it will trickle down to many other areas. So that's an approach.

As Krista spoke earlier, our contractual obligations and communications are directly with the registry operator. So when we are working, we work directly with the contracted parties.

This list here on this slide is the most common compliance issues. Many of you are familiar that Contractual Compliance has put forth a process way back when I first started, not only to bring consistency, efficiency, and effectiveness into our work, but also to allow the transparency and the reporting back to the community.

---

This process consists of what we call informal resolution and a formal resolution. The informal resolution process is where many of those compliance issues listed above here on this slide have been addressed. It allows us to collaborate directly with the contracted parties and address those issues.

Informal resolution process, if it's not followed and there is no collaboration or no response or it's incomplete, if and when that happens can lead to what we call an enforcement, which will be a notice of breach that's going to be published on the website and publicly made aware. We report on the entire process in aggregate form and in specificity as it relates to the enforcement aspect of it.

With this, I'm going to stop presenting. I hope – please take a look at the link provided to you in the presentation. In addition to what the support team, Eleeza, Karen, and [Anna] have provided you, in the CCT workspace on the metrics, this link will take you to the Compliance page where many more metrics are provided. Thank you.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: It is our lunchtime, but I think we should take a few minutes for questions at least.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Sure, if there are questions, please.

---

MEGAN RICHARDS: I have what Jordyn and many others will think is a really dumb question. But you identified something called the DNS abuse review. Is that something that is of potential interest to us in the context of our work?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Yes. I can answer that. That's a stream of work that is a report that's being produced that I think will be of most interest to the safeguards and trust sub-team, but that is something that is being produced for this group to review.

JONATHAN ZUCK: This might just be a lot of information for folks to absorb, I guess. We'll probably be circling back with you as we try to, particularly that trust sub-team I think will want to circle back with you. But everybody should know that Compliance is doing a lot of the work to supply a lot of the metrics that we'll be using that were identified by the [IAG]. So we're very thankful to the work you've done to begin to collect metrics.

Because the other thing that I remember from five years ago when I met Maguy was that the incident tracking was a folder in Outlook. That's what she inherited. So the fact that we're talking about metrics right now is very exciting. So thank you.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I'm going to very briefly go through where these metrics are that we have published online that Maguy referred to that our team has been collecting.

---

JAMIE HEDLUND: After lunch?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: After lunch. I would never stand between Jamie and lunch.

MAGUY SERAD: May I say one word? We welcome feedback, please. We welcome feedback with ideas. Don't just say, "This stinks. It doesn't work." What is it you're looking for? What is it you expect? Help us define it. We cannot claim to have the answers. Don't tell me, "I want you to measure this." What does "this" mean?

Because we are truly a global organization. We heard about that earlier from Allen and from Krista. I have a hard time understanding myself, and I speak three languages (so if I slip languages). Everybody has a different expectation in metrics, so please, our ask of the CCT team, when you take a look at this, let us know what is expected. Define it. What does a term mean when you're asking for it? And we'll do our best to work with you and define it further and provide you the data.

Thank you for this opportunity, and bon appétit.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: When should we reconvene? At 1:00?

---

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Okay. So Kaili, Calvin, and Drew, we're taking a break for lunch. We'll be back on at 1:00 PM our time, which is about 55 minutes from now.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**