
JONATHAN ZUCK:

Okay, children. Playtime is over. Time to come back inside.

Welcome, everyone, to the second CCT Review Team face-to-face. It's good that we've got some extra faces, so we're very excited about that.

In line with that, why don't we go around the table quickly and identify yourselves for the record, since we're not logged into Adobe Connect in this particular case – the meeting is, but we aren't individually, so that's all. You can if you want to if you have trouble reading the screen, which might be the case for all of us back here. I just mean there's no natural roll call that's taking place.

Why don't we just start with Alice? Let's go around the room and say hello and if you've got any update to your statement of interest.

ALICE JANSEN:

Alice Jansen, ICANN staff.

MARGIE MILAM:

Margie Milam, ICANN staff.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:

Eleeza Agopian, ICANN staff.

BRIAN AITCHISON:

Brian Aitchison, ICANN staff.

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.

DREW BAGLEY: Drew Bagley, Secure Domain Foundation.

CALVIN BROWNE: Calvin Browne, DNSP [inaudible].

JAMIE HEDLUND: Jamie Hedlund, ICANN staff.

KAREN LENTZ: Karen Lentz, ICANN staff.

DAVID TAYLOR: David Taylor, GNSO, IPC, [inaudible] something.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Add a few more letters.

MEGAN RICHARDS: Megan Richards – no letters – European Commission.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Jordyn Buchanan, GNSO, some stuff, Google.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Jonathan Zuck from ACT: The App Association.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Lauren Kapin from the U.S. Federal Trade Commission.

BRENDA BREWER: Brenda Brewer, ICANN staff.

FABRO STEIBEL: Fabro Steibel, ITS Rio.

DEJAN DJUKIC: Dejan Djukic, Serbian ccTLD.

KAILI KAN: Kaili Kan from ALAC.

STAN BESEN: Stan Besen.

CARLOS GUTIERREZ: Carlos Guitierrez, GNSO, Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Good morning. Waudo Siganga, GNSO [inaudible] BC.

DAVE DICKINSON: And I'm Dave Dickinson with Nielsen.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Excellent. Thanks, and welcome, everyone. Is there anybody that's remote?

PAMELA SMITH: Pamela Smith, ICANN staff.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thank you. Is there anybody that's on remotely?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: No, we don't have anyone on remote.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, thanks. Let's dive right in. The first thing that we haven't talked about is, with great anticipation, the Phase II end-user survey that Nielsen has just completed. So, take it away, Dave.

DAVE DICKINSON: All right, thanks. Let me just arrange my coffee cup here to get it out of the way. Okay.

I'm going to skip over that. Just as a refresher for everyone, this was a program, a research effort, designed to support the New gTLD Program, which obviously was created for our enhanced competition and consumer choice. Let's wait until we get the slides up on the... One moment, please.

I was having such a good time listening to myself talk I didn't even notice they weren't up there. That's it. Yeah. Okay. And if you could jump ahead to slide three, please. There we go.

The research endeavors to measure factors such as consumer awareness, experience, choice, and trust with the new gTLDs, as well as looking at the current gTLD landscape and also looks at some issues around trust and perceptions of the domain name system in general.

There are two phases of the research; one with consumers and one with registrants. This is the consumer section. The registrant section will be going into the field in a few weeks, and we'll have that data in the fall.

Next slide. Just a brief recap of the methodology. There's a lot on this slide. Key things: we talked to a total of 5,452 people in 24 countries, from all the regions. It was translated into the local language of preference when necessary.

Perhaps the most important thing here was that we added a component this year to interview some teenagers, age 15 to 17, so that we could look at that group and see if there are any major trend differences within that population.

I'll make a general comment. As we went through to prep for this year's survey, there were some places where we decided trending wasn't the most important thing. We wanted to get better answers or delve into some things in different ways, so some questions that you'll see here today are trended, and others are basically fresh topics for this survey.

Skip ahead the two slides, please. All right. Just a high level look at the findings. We'll go through the executive summary first. To start off, what do people think the domain system is there for? At a high level, they recognize it's to provide structure. When asked, about 20%, about 1 in 5, say they're not sure why it's there. But those that do have an

answer, if they focus on some sort of classification, classifying by type of business, the purpose of the site – the location comes up very prominently there – or to give some indication around the content, what they're supposed to find when they get there. Those are the common themes.

Now, this is an open-ended question. So people give their response, and somebody reads it and classifies it into these groups. We asked a similar question about the new gTLDs: why were they created? We tend to see similar sorts of things. They were to expand or further that core functionality of the domain system, if you will.

Typical examples here: to give it better structure by assigning companies into fields of activity – oh, and another key theme was to meet demand. There's a strong sense that maybe there wasn't enough to go around. So more companies then create because of demand on the Internet sites. You can improve that. There's also a mention about credibility. That's a theme that perks through. But in general, it's an extension of the original purpose: to make it more useable or make it more available to people.

Next slide. This is an eye test. I apologize for that. General trends: among what we call the legacy gTLDs, there continues to be upward movement in awareness. We categorize these into three tiers, if you remember. We have the high tier, which is .com, .net, and .org. We pull those out because those have substantially higher awareness and visitation numbers than others, so they occupy a unique place.

Then there's what we call the moderate group, which is .info and .biz, and then the low group, which are .mobi, .pro, .tel, .asia, and .coop. You

can see that the general primacy of those has stayed the same, but there's a general trend up in reported awareness and a general trend up in reported visitation. The one exception on visitation there is the geographically-targeted TLDs. I'll go ahead say I'm always skeptical when I see two numbers that are exactly the same. I'm going to double check those, but I believe they're correct.

For the new gTLDs, we see a similar sort of pattern, just not as much movement. We had a set of new gTLDs that were consistent between the surveys. You can see those were .email, .photography, .link, .guru, .realtor, .club, and .xyz. We see a slight pickup in awareness for those. Then we added a new set of new gTLDs. We look at traffic and registrations. That group as a whole pop in at 20% average awareness, so higher among the new ones that we added in this year than the reference set.

We had an expanded list of what we call geographically-targeted. We always had the ccTLDs and some IDNs in the survey, but this year we also added city name gTLDs. Where those didn't exist for some countries, we made one up, just to see if people would recognize it so they could talk about whether not they would visit it. That was basically the purpose. So those crop up a little bit higher.

Visitation, though? For the existing ones, the ones that were consistent between both ways, reported visitation actually dropped a little bit. Again, the new set of gTLDs premiere at a slightly higher level of visitation and also with a slight decrease in reported visitation for the geographically-targeted gTLDs. So it's small movement. These are large

sample sizes, so small movement can still be statistically significant, but not particularly substantive.

There are strong regional differences here, however. We see the visitation and awareness rates for the new gTLDs significantly stronger outside of North America and Europe. So North America is generally the weakest, then Europe, and then – it depends on exactly what you're looking at – the other three regions will generally have much higher awareness and visitation, and, overall, a generally more favorable profile to the reaction to those as you look across the questions.

Let me clarify – it's not that there's an unfavorable reaction anywhere. It's just higher acceptance, higher levels of response.

Next slide. So that was average awareness. We also like to look at total awareness. Was I aware of any of the ones in the set? Part of the reason, like this measure, is that we may have some of the new gTLDs that we don't expect to necessarily get very widespread appeal, but we want to know, across the set: am I aware of any of them? Are we making an impact?

You'll see the little flag up there. I apologize. We decided to compute some numbers for this on Friday, and we're still checking on some of those. I think they were defined a little bit off. So these numbers are close but not perfect.

But generally what you'll see for the legacy gTLDs is – was I aware of any of them? – is that all of those numbers have increased. For the people in the room, I'm just going to get up and point because this is a tough chart. Here's last wave. Here's current wave. Last wave. Current wave.

You can see the colored numbers consistently increase over the gray numbers. So the colored numbers consistently increase over the gray numbers. That's showing that the overall combined awareness of those continues to improve.

We see a similar sort of thing for the new gTLDs. The total of them increases. Here's the problem. As we add things, this number is going to pick up, so I want to make sure that we're also looking at that on a consistent basis.

The next two columns there are the ones that were consistent between waves, and we can still see increased total awareness for those. So I may not be getting an extremely high average, but people are becoming aware of at least one of those.

So on both awareness measures, we're seeing continued increase.

Yeah? Absolutely.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

And I'll remind everyone, when you speak, to use your name, because it's being recorded. I know that one of the theories in the first phase of the survey was that high recognition of something like .email actually had to do with just high recognition of the word and might not have had to do with actually recognizing that it was a new TLD. So that's one that hasn't even gone into the market for another unrelated reason, right? But it's still part of this calculation, right?

DAVE DICKINSON:

Correct.

JONATHAN ZUCK: So for ones aren't even in the DNS, I wonder if it makes sense to control for that somehow – I don't know – rather than have .email bring up the numbers.

DAVE DICKINSON: Right. Yeah. .email isn't necessarily one of the top ones, but it's up there. Your point is – good memory – quite correct. We see the same pattern here, that when you look at people's responses for why things seem trustworthy, a lot of times it's just a sense of familiarity or interpretability, and we see that as well. Of the new gTLDs that were added. .news is the highest one. I suspect a lot of that is again that "sounds like something that I probably am aware of" as opposed to specifically aware.

We can cut these into any sub-segment. If there's groups here that are in market and we want to look at just those, we can do that for you, certainly. Yeah?

MEGAN RICHARDS: [Momentary] question.

DAVE DICKINSON: Yes, please.

MEGAN RICHARDS: This is only awareness. It's not necessarily use. Isn't that correct?

DAVE DICKINSON:

And it's all self-reported. We ask them if they visited, but it's self-reported. We've had discussions before: self-reported versus actual measured is going to be different.

Okay. Next slide, please. Trust. We asked them in general how trustworthy they feel it is, just as a very broad question. We see basically flat levels, no big differences there and a little bit of a drop for the new gTLDs that were consistent between waves. That fits the general – small movements there. But in general, things are pretty stable. That's how we would characterize that.

We spent more time in this survey asking about what sort of restrictions they would expect or how those would be enforced. The percentage of consumers who say that registering of domain names should be unrestricted has gone down. We gave them three options: strict restrictions, some restrictions, or no restrictions. The percent who said no has decreased, and the other categories have increased. Strict has come up a fair amount.

That's true for both new and old gTLDs, so we saw that as a general dynamic in this wave. You can see that they're increases of nine points, ten points – those sorts of things.

We also asked them what the impact of restrictions are. 70% said that they increase their trust levels, which is up substantially from a year ago. That's a big jump. 70% now are saying that those kinds of restrictions "increase my sense of trust with them" versus 56% a year ago. So that's a big jump.

When we asked a question about whether or not there should be a relationship, essentially, between what the gTLD communicates and the registered domain, you can see that 55% say there should be a very clear – and we gave them examples here – relationship. 25% say some relationship. Only 15% say it really doesn't matter or they don't expect any strong relationship there.

Yeah?

MEGAN RICHARDS: Sorry. Another question. You seem to imply that trust is increasing and developing more and more over time, but you have under "New gTLD Consistent from 49 to 45." That's a drop.

DAVE DICKINSON: Yeah.

MEGAN RICHARDS: And the same with ccTLDs. There's a very slight drop. That's probably not statistically significant.

DAVE DICKINSON: Correct.

MEGAN RICHARDS: So it's only where the restrictions are introduced that there's an increase in trust?

DAVE DICKINSON: No. The trust question was asked before we got into any of the restriction questions, so it was just a general perception. And, yeah, that one does dip down if you look broadly across or you cut the numbers a little bit finer. Our general takeaway is that it's pretty stable. We're not seeing that indicated an increase in distrust. It's just some variation, I think.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah. Usually when we hear about these things on T.V., we hear about a plus or minus error-type of thing. Is that applicable here to this as well, that that plus or minus is bigger than the difference?

DAVE DICKINSON: Yeah. If you're looking between regions here, because of the sample sizes, you're looking at, in a lot of cases, a couple of percentage points being statistically significant. That number will vary depending on – they never report to this level of degree in the new stories – the total sample size and the size of the sub-segments that you're looking at within. It's also dependent on the strength of the answer; is it very definitive versus is it sort of a 50/50 answer.

So I can't give you a perfect answer, but in the way they would report it in a poll, for a total sample size of over 5,000, you have a plus or minus or around a percentage point. It's very reliable.

CARLOS GUTIERREZ: Thank you. Can you expand a little bit on the relationship or the reflection of the domain name? Because we are expecting to be as

generic as possible, like .xyz, or .link, or .guru, which are not specific. You said you used some examples. Some are very clear because they're a segment – .photography and so on – but others are really generic, and that's would I expect. Thank you.

DAVE DICKINSON:

Yeah. We did not ask them if there was a difference between something that was generic, like .xyz, and something that was specific. That wasn't the focus of this question. If I remember the question specifically here, for example, if it was .bank, it had to be a financial institution or it could be something like river.bank. We're talking about flood control. So we gave them: how strictly should it be associated? We gave them a couple of examples on this question as I recall so as to not steer them down one path.

It came up that there's this intent. And if you go back to that first slide, what people are saying this whole system is there to create a structure, to classify, to give them something to hang their interpretation around to a lot of degrees. So it's not surprising that, when they get asked a direct question like this, they'd have strong agreement with it because their unaided perception of what the whole system is for fits with that, to give it some structure.

Okay. Next slide, please. We beefed up the section on behavior. What's their behavior and how does trust impact their behavior. We have a number of things, and, again, all of this we have in detail later in this report.

Trust of the domain name industry. We measure that relative to several other technology-related industry types. It continues to be the highest and has actually improved a bit. So, positive news there.

In general, we ask them about how comfortable they are doing things online through a number of different ways. With their online activities, their comfort levels are quite high. Most tend to report being at least – sorry, there's a typo there – being somewhat comfortable doing a wide range of activities.

The lowest comfort level was putting personal information about friends, families, and activities out on social media. That's what people were the most concerned about. Entering their e-mail into something very high level is at the other end, for example.

Here you can see that that data is not sized over in the bottom right. In doing any info search, 92% have somewhat or high comfort levels. Doing banking, 76%. Social media, 63%. That was the lowest.

I know there is a Pew research study that was released not long ago about increased discomfort in people being more concerned about a variety of things. We don't see a great indication of that here. We see still pretty high levels.

On the bottom left, that's the trust in the domain name industry. It's up four points, which is significant. Why? The top quote there: we asked them why do they have trust, and they basically said, well, it's in their business. They have to protect it, or they don't have a reason to be, basically. So they understand that there's motivated self-interest for the industry to police itself, if you will.

When we asked them to associate words with the domain name industry, you see very large trustworthy, informative, positive things. We can talk about this when we get there. There's a slight uptick in the maybe less positive things, like confusing or technical. You can interpret technical either way as a good thing or a bad thing. Those both ticked up a little bit, but the overwhelming sense is still very positive associations there.

People don't report that they're limiting their behavior. Those levels have actually gone down a little bit on some metrics. However, the comfort level is lower for the new gTLDs. It's higher than the legacy gTLDs, and it's highest for the ccTLDs. Those geographically localized TLDs have very strong trust levels.

MEGAN RICHARDS: Sorry. Can you just repeat that? So on the scale of trust, [inaudible] or comfort level, as you call it, it goes from legacy to new to ccTLDs? Is that right?

DAVE DICKINSON: ccTLDs, legacy – very close. New gTLDs – down with a significant drop.

MEGAN RICHARDS: Okay. Yeah. So we just went in the opposite direction.

DAVE DICKINSON: Yeah. Sorry.

MEGAN RICHARDS: The principle is the same. Thank you.

DAVE DICKINSON: Yeah. They're less familiar to people. They're newer. Despite reported visitations, which may be higher than actual, a lot of people haven't said, "I've never been to one of those sites." And familiarity or previous use is a big factor in why they trust sites. It's self-reported. So it makes sense that the new gTLDs would be up at that level. Yeah.

Okay. Last slide in the Executive Summary. We looked at teens across all of these. Teens got asked the same question set. Overall, they're more similar than dissimilar. If you live with a teenager, you may find that hard to believe. But overall, we see them more close than different, and we do go into a recap of every statistically significant difference we found down later in the deck.

The awareness tips a little bit towards new gTLDs. There's a little bit lower reported visitation rate for some of the legacy gTLDs among teens. We're talking percentage points here. Not big differences, but a slight trend towards that. So of .net or .biz, teens have a lower awareness and visitation, .biz being the most affected. There's a 12-point drop in awareness and a 9-point drop in visitation for that one.

Trust levels are also lower for .net, .org, .pro., and .coop by about four percentage points. But when we look at the new gTLD, in general there tends to be higher reported awareness of those among the teens.

No surprise: they use apps more. They're more likely to go to a resource like an online encyclopedia than to just do a straight Internet search. So they're a little bit more into that ecosystem as opposed to just a raw

search. They're more likely to use their smartphones – six points higher than the adults. They see value in using their apps to get to where they want to go on the Internet, to use QR codes and URL shorteners and those sorts of things. All of that behavior is a little bit higher among the teens.

Perhaps as a result, they're a little more likely – eight percentage points – to say they don't really pay attention to the domain extension.

They're less likely to expect restrictions and enforcement, so they aren't as strong on that "should there be restrictions?" measure and they're also not as strong on expecting that anyone is going to enforce it. We'll let you draw your conclusions about teenagers.

Also, their comfort levels tend to be a bit lower, especially with online banking. I have a hypothesis that they're just not as experienced with online banking there. You're 17 or 16. You're probably not doing a ton of that.

The exception, of course, is social media, where they are much more comfortable doing stuff on social media than the adults were. So on what we might call personal business-related things, they tend to drop down a little bit. On social media, they come up.

Those are the major points of differentiation between the teens and the adults. Yeah.

Okay. Do you want to just keep walking through the entire body? There's 108 slides, of which we have covered twelve.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

We were tasked with the very difficult process of determining whether or not the New gTLD Program had enhanced consumer trust. Way back when, there was a group whose job it was to try to come up with what the measures for that might be so that some kind of [crazy] quantitative analysis could happen.

In certain instances, there's proxies for trust. In other words, for these reasons, people ought to trust the DNS more than they do, but it's not an actual measure of whether they do. So the idea came up to do a survey because it was the only way to actually find out how they really felt as opposed to how normatively they should respond to different characteristics of the DNS.

I just wonder if taking a step back as opposed to a step further in – do we find that maybe there wasn't enough time that passed? Because my feeling from it is that we can't, on the basis of these survey results, answer that broad question in a definitive way. We may be able to delve into some of the regional areas and things like that, but it's difficult to suggest that the New gTLD Program itself had an impact on overall trust in a significant way.

DAVE DICKINSON:

Right. One of the hypotheses that you threw out there is that there hasn't been enough time. Well, when we look at the legacy gTLDs, we see, again, that there are different classes of those. There's the big three, and then there are some that are very low. They've been in the market for a long time. Time hasn't necessarily changed anything for those.

There are new ones that have come out that have surpassed those already, even if they aren't in the market yet, as you pointed out earlier, which says that this whole familiarity and interpretability, which goes back to people's core premise for why the whole system exists, when that's supported it seems like there's low barriers to picking those up. There may not be motivation, or they may not get exposed to them. Increasingly, we see exposing people to them is difficult, as they use these alternate measures of navigation. But there's nothing here that really says that there's a bad perception about them.

My consistent caveat is that some of the new gTLDs are probably never going to get – “never” is a long word. It's going to be very difficult in any reasonable time frame for them to get to the same levels of awareness as those top three legacy ones, and that's probably not the intent for them, either.

We have a series of questions in here where we actually gave them: “Okay. You're going to online and go shopping. You're going online to do” – I can't remember; just to get some information about something. We gave them three scenarios, and we gave them similar domain names; one a .com, one a new gTLD – there was another one, which I'm blanking on at the minute – and then one that was translated into their local language and using the country code TLD.

What we saw is, consistently in a scenario like that, .com and the translated country code one are very similar to each other in comfort levels, and they're very high. The other ones are lower.

So people aren't as comfortable in that artificial situation with the new gTLDs, but they're not uncomfortable. They just don't have the high

levels of comfort, and that's consistent, basically, regardless of what their online activity is.

So can we definitely say that the new system has enhanced trust? No. There's nothing that says that it's damaging trust, however. And I might also have to go back and say that the premise of that is that they're not necessarily looking for these to enhance trust. They're looking for these things to help improve their ability to find their way around in the online world. We do seem to be seeing some movement there.

So that would be my high level off-the-cuff.

JAMIE HEDLUND:

Hi. Quick question, teeing off from what you just said. It sounds like there's an almost 100% correlation between trust and familiarity, and I just wanted to see if there is any way – and maybe that's wrong, so challenge that if it is – of teasing out how much a lower level of trust that a respondent conveys is due to lack of familiarity versus perception of something bad associated with either that particular gTLD or gTLDs in general?

DAVE DICKINSON:

Yeah. We have an open-ended question. We could jump ahead and look at some of the results for it. We said, "What makes something untrustworthy?" So to your point, there's perceived familiarity or interpretability, and then there's also what I'll call actual familiarity: "I've been to that site before. That's a site I've used before." Then there's face validity. The site looks normal. It's got a security badge on it – some of those sorts of things.

What makes it untrustworthy? We'd got to the table, but a lot of it was just the inverse. "There's something funky about it," or, "I had a bad experience before."

Do you want to jump to that table and look at that real quick?

[MEGAN RICHARDS]: And when we do that – oh, drat. I've forgotten now what I was going to say as well. Ah, yes. It's related to the trust aspect as well because it's one thing to trust an information source – and you talked about that earlier – and it's another thing to trust a financial site, for example. But you didn't distinguish between those aspects. The trust is a generalized trust. If you get the wrong information, it's a pity, but it's not potentially damaging, whereas if your bank account is hacked, it's much more damaging.

DAVE DICKINSON: Absolutely.

[MEGAN RICHARDS]: You didn't distinguish between those two. Those are not just two [inaudible], but those different levels of trust and the nature of the activity.

DAVE DICKINSON: We asked a very general question on trust, which has been pointed out. It's "beauty is in the eye of the beholder" in what exactly people interpret from that. But we've kept the same for trending purposes, to

see overall what my warm fuzzy is about the system, and that's gone up.

We do ask what people are afraid of might happen. What you just reported is exactly what we see. The stolen credentials is the thing that people worry the most about. Spam is what they've experienced the most of, but that doesn't create a lot of fear. It's just a hassle.

Then we looked at these new questions about how comfortable they are plugging in their e-mail, entering in their healthcare information, and entering in their financial information. It's more of a general measure of what their comfort level is doing each of those things. Again, we see some variation regional by that, but we didn't break that down by specific gTLD.

Did that answer your question? Yeah. Okay.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Kaili?

KAILI KAN:

Yeah. I just heard that the teenagers you showed they have more apps and wikis and are less reliant on gTLDs. Well, is that the overall general trend for the domain industry, the domain name industry will be gradually going downhill? Or because the teens are doing that, then ten years later, could that be the mainstream?

DAVE DICKINSON:

There's definitely a trend here that alternative ways of getting to a destination on the Internet are being used, some more significantly than the others. I'm a little fuzzy on recalling on the data from this section, but we also asked them: what's the safest? What's the quickest? What's the easiest way? We see some variations in perceptions about when it's easiest just to do a search versus using an app. So there's some variations around that.

So I don't think it's as clear cut, but there's generally a slow trend towards paying less attention to the extension to the gTLD and using these alternate measures of navigation. But it's slow. It's not anything that's happening rapidly. Even for the teens, I think, the reported 9%, if I recall correctly, were paying less attention to the gTLD itself but the majority weren't in that camp.

KAILI KAN:

Just one more word on that question. Yes, just it happens for myself, I remember I cannot recall the last time I typed in a domain name. I don't know about others, but does that say something? And also I should point out for teenagers, it seems to be even more so. So does the domain name just gradually losing its importance?

JONATHAN ZUCK:

I think that's an interesting hypothesis. I'm not sure that we have sufficient data to support it, but I mean, the counter to that, obviously, I think, and Dave, you can back me up on this, is that among many, there's this feeling that the purpose of the DNS is the organization of the Internet.

And so the degree to which that organization is increasing, it may, in fact, give us a more hierarchical search rather than an open-ended search or something, so that there could be counter-trends associated with just the fact that the system was flooded with new TLDs.

It then makes it tougher for me to remember them, but as I get to know them, I might go to .photos, for example, to look for photos rather than doing a photo search on Google, or Bing, or something like that, right? Or I might even go to a .gallery or something.

That's the thing. It's easy to form hypotheses about what it is that might make people trust the system more or less. And so the fact that, at least among adults, there's this desire, an increased desire, for more restrictive association between the content of the website and the name of the website, the following question is do they perceive that that's the case? Right?

I mean, we now know that, okay, they prefer one, but do they perceive that, does something like that bank make them feel more secure as a result? Some restrictions like that, I could hypothetically say, would increase people's trust because I know that if I go to this type of extension, I'm going to get this type of business or something like that. But I feel like we have the first half of the question in some cases and the second half in the other. And it's tough to get the direct association.

I'll go to Carlton first and then Jordan.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Thank you, Jonathan. Going back to the question of this perception that teenagers are using alternate means to get to the Internet, was there any differences in geographic information?

DAVE DICKINSON: Yeah. Unfortunately, the team sample was fairly small so we mostly have to look at it at the total, compare global total. There's a few things that we can do on a regional level and I remember a couple of things popping up that they were a little bit different in Asia. But unfortunately, we didn't do a lot of analysis on that just because of the sample size. We wanted to get a read, but we had a limited amount we could do. Yeah.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: Thank you, Jonathan. I don't know if I got the feeling that you had a neutral position or a negative position. Jonathan, I got a very positive sense of what Dave just told us, this higher specificity, better organized and this task orientation and so on. So I took it as a very positive trend. So my suggestion is to accept Dave's idea to go straight for the [on] trustee charts or the cases where the opposite is happening to see if the general trend is overshadowed by these negative ones or not because my feeling of the first half-hour was very positive. I was starting to feel very good about the new gTLDs.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Just for clarity, Carlos, I guess I came away feeling largely neutral about it. It's tough to put my finger on what the big inclusion is to draw. But let me go to Jordan next.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Like you, Jonathan, I'm struggling a little bit what to interpret this. Picking up on your point about people wanting restrictions, I noted I think the chart said people wanted restrictions on the legacy TLDs as well, presumably including even the ones that are well-known like com and net, which is just mostly confusing to me because I feel like those are in such wide use and in such a broad pattern of, obviously, not restricted to anything in particular that the fact that people would desire that just seems confusing to me. And it's hard to take that desire and then sort of generalize it on to the new gTLD program as well.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It could be the second level that they're referring to.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah. It could be.

DAVE DICKINSON: Yeah. I mean, there's restrictions in terms of is there consistency between the purpose of the website and the gTLD. And then there's restrictions in terms of verifying that it's a valid company, a valid entity, some of those sorts of things. Yeah. And we asked both.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Sure. But that certainly doesn't exist either like gTLDs.

DAVE DICKINSON: Again, this is what the unwatched masses of Internet users out there feel. Sorry to use that term, all you Internet users out there.

JONATHAN ZUCK: This is a recorded session.

DAVE DICKINSON: And that kind of goes back to a point that was made earlier. Right now, they don't have the depth of experience with the new gTLDs to know whether to trust or not, but they trust the industry in general. It seems interpretable. So you've got a favorable situation right now. If you did something, you did something. If something happened that caused great consternation, you can derail that.

But without that, generally, having looked at adoptions of things over the years, there's really nothing standing in the way and, potentially, is you fulfill the ability to give them what they're looking for, which is a sense of organization, a sense of logical nature to things, that that can further improve. And, as you said, that could change some of the dynamics that we're seeing. It could be that I set up my search engine to always look for .photography sites or .gallery sites first, prioritize my results.

CARLTON SAMUELS:

Thank you, David, because that's what I thought you were going. Jonathan, I think it's the [floor] for [use] segmentation. You said you start off like you do a general search and then when you start seeing where you want to go, you then go directly to photo or the area that you want to retrieve information from. So I think it would be interesting to see how this develops in terms of segmentation. And it starts with use, first of all, and then after a while, it then just kind of cements itself and it keeps moving.

So that's an interesting one, I think, to keep track of because I also believe that it ties in fairly closely with the differences in navigation tools. You're using apps, you're using QR codes, and so on. Those are tied very, very directly to specific areas. And that may be what is emerging, I think.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Carlton. It's definitely a hotly competed market segment right now which we call vertical search. Right? And so, am I more likely to go to Expedia to look for flights than I am to go to Google to look for flights, for example? Right? And yet, I can search for flights on Google. But do I take some comfort in "this is all I do here"?

And so one of the things that was most, we talk about innovation in the DNS. It's a word that gets thrown out a lot, right? But where I saw something that seemed to have a high potential was with .museum. Right? But integrated into that TLD was the mechanism through which you found museums of interest to you. And there was like a cataloging

functionality that was built into the TLD itself. And I just wondered if other things might go that way or something. But this is very hypothetical.

Again, it's just tough to – and I didn't see anything negative either, Carlos – so I think that and the trust in the industry itself is positive. It's interesting. Drew is proposing a study, for example, to study DNS abuse. And we may find that DNS abuse is much higher in new TLDs than it is in the old ones, which would suggest that the normative proxies for trust are going to be a mismatch to the actual feelings of trust that people have, that there's such a link between awareness and trust that we may see reflected here a lack of awareness more so than an informed trust in a system because the facts may say you shouldn't. But then again, Trump may get elected President, right? So the normative gets thrown on the window very quickly in a lot of circumstances, I guess.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [Inaudible] recording that.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Thank you, Jonathan, for clarifying that. What I think is fascinating is that this new structure or this better segmentation is helping to clarify what we are doing. I mean, we are not just searching. We're shopping, we're looking for information, we're banking, we are doing so under the assumption that they're spending more time on the Internet or doing more things on the Internet. I think this shows a trend forward that people like it, that there is more choice or more options to target what you are doing beyond just searching for pure information. So that's the

message I got from this part of the session and I think it's very interesting. And I would love to see if there is a problem in these areas where a negative trust is being created. I would love to jump to those charts.

DAVE DICKINSON:

Yeah. So if we could jump to Slide 38, just a general thing I'll say also is that this is a situation in which if I do have a significant level of distrust, what is my recourse? I mean, it's a little bit like saying I'm not going to use fossil fuels anymore. As much as we'd like to do that – apologies to anyone in the fossil fuel industry – then, I have limited alternatives. So there's no reason.

Right now, what I think we're seeing here is there's no big reason for me not to trust. I think the industry is self-motivated. It works well. It's providing me something that I expect, which is a structure which makes me feel good without being presented with a reality that's different than that, people aren't thinking about this a lot. They've probably thought about this more doing this survey than they have in any day in their life in the last, you know, a long time. So it's not something that people are going to be questioning because there's no motivating factor here for them to question it.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Yeah. To Jordyn's point, the DNS isn't providing us structure now, right? I mean, that's what so funny. [inaudible] right. It may suggest how we should market in the future or something. Just before you continue on, I left Stan out. And that is a good idea. Let's do the cards up on the end

that if you want to speak and then I'll be able to remember and not leave anyone out. So Stan, go ahead quickly.

STAN BESEN:

I want to suggest two hypotheses. I don't think necessarily ones for this committee but they sort of come up in the context of this discussion and it's probably not enough time to pass the test. These are testable hypotheses.

One is as the number of domains proliferates, will people use search engines more than they did in the past for Internet search? That seems to be a testable hypothesis.

Second, to the extent that they remain guessers – that's not me or Kaili, but there are people who guess domains – the hypothesis that I would propose is if I'm a registrant and I want to be found in a world where there are 1,200 domains rather than 20, I want to be registered on more than one domain. That is, I could increase the probability that you will find me if I'm on .photog and .camera and .cameras, etc. So another hypothesis would be that as the number of domains has proliferated, we will see more registration, multiple registrations, by the same entity. I'm not sure that has to do with trust, but it's a relevant issue in this context.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

Yeah, exactly.

STAN BESEN: Well, I'm not sure it is about trust. But I think these are both testable hypotheses, not for this committee.

DAVE DICKINSON: The second one, we will get a little bit of information about because we have a question in the registrant survey which hasn't gone to field yet, about whether they've read – we expanded the questions about registration of multiple domains and what their motivations were for that. And I will make sure that we have, just to make it easier to find me as one of those options, but I know self-protection. I want to have every extension possible so nobody else can mimic me, that kind of thing. Yeah.

STAN BESEN: It's not necessarily about defensive. It's also about just being found.

DAVE DICKINSON: No, I understand. That's what I was saying.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Laureen and then Megan. And then we'll try to go to the slide.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Just building a little on Jordyn and Jonathan's previous [inaudible], I'm struck by the fact that we've been tasked with what you say is this very challenging mission of assessing consumer trust in light of the New gTLD Program and we have these survey responses where, as Jamie

points out, familiarity seems to be a driving factor which, of course, has, is distinct from trust, really. Just because you're familiar with something, you may be familiar with a very unpleasant situation. That doesn't necessarily mean you're going to trust it more.

Yet, in the DNS, we're seeing that people are using that as a proxy. And I'm just struck by the challenge here. We're asking people these questions and you're pointing out that the information that we're getting back is, I won't say "suspect" because that's the wrong word, but when we're giving people domains that aren't even in the root and they're saying, "Oh yeah, I trust e-mail," and they can't even get at e-mail.

It just, I think, really points to the challenge of our situation which is why I really like the study that Drew is proposing and I'm thinking maybe this is the sort of inquiries we want to be making, which is we understand that people's perceptions aren't necessarily the most reliable here.

But there are certain objective things we can measure. For example, we can look at the levels of abuse in the new gTLDs versus the legacy gTLDs and know that things are still very early and this is just a snapshot. But I do like that supplementing focus where we're going to be looking at things that are factual in nature because it acts as a counterweight to, I think, the reality that perceptions are unreliable. People may say they trust things, but when you drill down to it, it may not have much of a factual basis. It just may be a subjective impression. So I just add these as reflections.

DAVE DICKINSON: Yeah. The way I would underscore that is that I think these are valid and reliable measures of what people believe. What people believe does not always reflect, it reflects their reality, not an objective reality.

JONATHAN ZUCK: So part of what we may need to do as we go through this is modify our intentions to ask whether or not we have done what we can to deserve the public trust which is a different issue, in a sense, to whether or not we achieved it. Megan, go ahead.

MEGAN RICHARDS: Yeah. Thanks. Just to add to what has been said by Stan and Laureen, we're not only looking at consumer trust. We're also looking at consumer choice and competition. And so the last hypothesis that Stan presented, which he said is not for this committee, I think, in fact, is for this committee because it gives you also a very good assessment of competition and consumer choice because if you find a registrant has gone on, I don't know, 20 different domains, then use of those should also give you a proxy for trust, reliability, choice, competition, etc. You should be able to look at a lot of other things too. So I was just proposing that your idea was a good one also for the committee, not to be exclusive.

STAN BESEN: I accept your amendment. I would just add – and I think it’s a general point – which is we’re handicapped by the fact that not enough time has passed for these trends to be fully realized.

MEGAN RICHARDS: Can I come back on that one? I agree entirely about the new gTLDs. And that’s what we’re supposed to be focusing on. But we should be able to test – and I’m not suggesting we spend a lot of time, money or resources on it – but we should be able to look at some other areas like the ccTLDs and the old legacy TLDs to have an estimate of what should or could potentially happen in the future – shouldn’t we? – to extrapolate out. I don’t want to take us off-track.

DAVE DICKINSON: No, that’s not off-track. We actually discussed that a little bit when we talked about the first wave a year ago in that some of the new gTLDs are entering, if you will, at levels higher than some of the legacy gTLDs. And again, our hypothesis then – and I think it’s still valid – is that if it seems familiar, if it’s interpretable, and that may be a better word, if I can look at it and it says, it conveys something to me, then I’m more likely to trust it because it fits this pattern of what’s the structure.

I’ll use an example. You go into a coffee shop. It can be small, medium, large or venti, grande, something, which once I go into Starbucks for a lot, I know what those mean. But I have to figure that out as opposed to something that’s prima fascia, I know what that, or I think I know what that means. The reality is a small in Shop A can be different than a small in Shop B. It’s still an arbitrary.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [Inaudible] intermediate.

DAVE DICKINSON: Yeah. Exactly. But the dynamic we're seeing here, I think, is that a lot of these things, I get what the point is and it fits with what my expectation is of the whole system so I'm okay.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [Inaudible]

DAVE DICKINSON: Okay. And it's interesting, it's showing up differently up there, but just to display it. This was why they might visit a website where the extension was one they didn't recognize, so what would get them to feel comfortable, basically.

Some sort of usage up there, that it's a popular website, something they've used before or related to something they've used before, comments along that. So this is, again, an open-ended question. Somebody reads these and categorizes these. So there's breakdowns of additional detail. So when you see net, that means it's a roll-up of all of the categories related to popularity usage.

Then the actual appeal of the site, which I think is interesting because you have to get there. So you're actually going there. You're going there and then deciding whether or not. So is it interesting? I might go there

out of curiosity. Those were the top things underneath there. Does it appear to have content, information, that I'm looking for? That's next.

Is it from a brand or associated with an entity that I recognize? So that gives them some sense of security as well. So those are the why you'd go there.

And if you go to the next slide, we have some example verbatims for each of these categories. So which, usage of the website is pretty generic. But when I have no other choice but visit and use the websites, I feel like exploring. A lot of people have used it. It may not have been viewed. Some of those kinds of comments – it looks good, it's unique, it's interesting , just out of curiosity, content. These aren't particularly great, open-end. But if it's a reliable or recognized brand that's backing them, if the website brand is famous or trustworthy that's a new domain name for a familiar brand. So there are lots of things like that that can give people some reinforcement.

You go to the next slide. Why would they avoid this? And some of this is, again, just sort of fear-based. I'm worried about viruses, there's something that tells me that it's not safe, if I've been there before and had a bad experience or heard about bad experiences, a negative brand image, doesn't seem legitimate, then content and site appeal.

And if we go to the next slide, you can see. So if my computer security software alerts me of a risk, if it doesn't have a badge on it, just if it's something I haven't actively used before, if it's not familiar. There was somewhere here about moral. Oh yeah, user content. Immoral content, reports about its users without consent, damages, those sorts of things.

If it's not relevant to me and a very long one there on the end about because it looks questionable being a URL, if the title of the website does not look right to me in a variety of ways.

So they're looking at two sides of a similar set of cues. Is there something formal that's triggering them like a security software or is there just something that gives them a bad feeling, the way it looks, the name, the brand association, those sorts of things. That's what they have to go on. It's not a lot.

And a lot of these things, again, you have to get to the site before you can assess it.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Just a connection with this particular slide. How are you expecting the user to be getting onto that domain, by typing in the address?

DAVE DICKINSON: In this case, we weren't specific about that. We do ask, in a different part of the survey, how they navigate. And search engines, as I recall, are the top.

WAUDO SIGANGA: Yeah. I'm asking like that because a lot of users, actually, navigate using sites, search engines. And in those cases, sometimes the user doesn't actually see the domain extension.

DAVE DICKINSON: If you go to – sorry, bear with me one second – Slide 77. There you go. In general, what is your preferred way of finding websites now? Globally, 67% say “Use a search engine” which is up statistically, significantly, three points, not a huge substantive, but an upward trend. Typing the domain name directly into the browser dropping by three percentage points, 200%, using an app or used a QR code. You can see our QR code is a little stronger than in Asia.

JONATHAN ZUCK: What was the [inaudible] reasons for using a QR code? I’m just curious about this because one of the open questions in this group was raised by the ALAC which was an increased use in QR codes might represent a decrease in trust. And I’m not sure that I always bought that correlation, but I’m curious if there’s anything in the slide about why people use QR codes that keys in to trust at all or is it just convenient?

DAVE DICKINSON: So if you go back two slides.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Is that where it was?

DAVE DICKINSON : Okay, so here is the use of QR, or experience with QR codes. Net over here on the left-hand side, the global average. Use of them has increased globally about 6 percentage points. You can see over here, I use them frequently as 12%, 37%, I use them, but not frequently and

41% say I've used them but never heard of them. Ten percent say, "I've never heard of them." That's dropped so people are more familiar, globally, with them.

If you go to the next slide, why we use them. Pretty stable responses on a global basis. They're convenient, they save time, it's the latest thing, the smattering of other responses. Why not use them? Never needed to, never heard of them, don't like them, don't trust them. Statistically, a significant increase but two points from 10 to 12. That's what I would say – it's not a substantive change, but with the sample size this large, it is statistically significant. It's unlikely to be a chance increase. But those are, to your point, those are the minor reasons. Mostly, it's just ennui. They don't care.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

The folks on the [inaudible]. It's obviously going to take us some time to digest all of this, but do people have additional questions for – Eleeza, go ahead.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:

I was just going to suggest, maybe you can go through this, the key takeaway slides to go through the high level points from each of the sections. That might be a helpful way to go through the bulk of your findings.

DAVE DICKINSON:

Good point. Okay. So that takes us back. The first one is on Slide 13. So the report, while you're clicking back to 13, the report is organized into

chapters, if you will. And at the front of each chapter, we have got a summarization of some of the key things that we saw going on in there. So rather than going through each slide, we'll just kind of say what's the key stuff within each section.

All right. So for the legacy gTLDs, they maintain their strong position. We see the same pattern that those .com, .org, .net, have strong awareness while the other ones are less well-known, but it's increasing.

Country gTLDs also stayed very strong. Most have brought awareness and are seen as trustworthy by nine in ten of the people who are aware of them. While trust and related behaviors are stable, expectations for restrictions increase. We're not seeing any increase in distrust about the legacies, but there is a growing expectation that there should be at least some restrictions on who can register those domain names. The percentage of those who said no restrictions whatsoever went down 8.5 points.

Still seeing, as we talked about, that the sense of familiarity breeds trust, if it's recognizable, well-known, being from groups, agency or place of origin that inspires trust, so that halo effect of who's behind it that gives me some trust.

The purpose, again, is to convey the intent of why, what's this about. Overall, the domain name system, the perceptions are largely positive. So that's the legacy gTLD section.

And the next one is Slide 35. So the new gTLDs. Awareness slowly improving, visitation not so much. The average increase in awareness is two percentage points for the ones that were consistent between the

waves. But as we've talked about, some of these we may not have the expectation that they're going to get to the 90% awareness kind of level. That may or may not be the case.

They're gaining awareness more quickly outside of North America and Europe. We've talked about that. We've talked about that there are meaningful relationships and enforcement is expected around those, that there will be an alignment between what the interpreted purpose of the new gTLD is and what that registered site is doing.

So the next point is about this thing where I told you we gave them options and how likely they would be to visit each of these. The new gTLD options that were presented aren't at the level of .com or of the translated and country code domain, but they're doing relatively well and they're acceptable to the majority. That's probably the way to say it. The vast majority feel that they would go there without concern.

And familiarity is the issue more than trust. I'm not necessarily distrustful of them; I just haven't heard of them. I don't know them. They're a new thing. And anytime you get people, and especially when they're being cognitive about it as they are in the survey, getting them to do something new and different, that takes them some time to adjust.

The next one is 62.

JONATHAN ZUCK: [inaudible] go ahead.

DAVE DICKINSON: Yeah.

KAILI KAN: Just back to the new gTLDs because here it says that new gTLDs gain awareness more quickly outside of North America and Europe. Yes, well, if I'm in America, let's say it's also reported that 53% of the new gTLDs are registered in China. However, it's also everybody in China as well as elsewhere believe in well over 90% of the new gTLDs registered in China is purely for speculation because over the last few years, the government is tightening control. They would just not approve the new gTLDs to be resolved by the system, by the Internet.

Okay. So, well, I just wonder with that background, I just wonder as far as you say gain awareness outside, what are you referring to? And especially with this China issue involved, to what extent would that conclusion be sort of valid? Thank you. Or is it modified?

DAVE DICKINSON: Well, you could jump to slide 42. Yeah, 42. So this is looking by region and the top row there is for the new gTLDs that were consistent in both waves. Remember we added some, but the ones that were consistent, you can see awareness of at least one of them went from 46% in 2015 to 52% on a global average. In the U.S., I mean in North America – apologies, Canada – 29% to 38%, so significant increase but much lower. Over in Asia, 53% to 58%; Africa, 48% to 52% and South America was 54% to 59%. So in those regions, the reported awareness of at least one of those domains was higher, significantly higher, in those regions than in North America or Europe. And then when you get down into this

table, you'll see some of these have an NA for the last wave and those are the new ones. So you can see .news was the one that, globally, came in at the highest level, slightly above .email.

KAILI KAN: Yeah. It's just, well, of course, you have examples to say, validate that kind of conclusion. But considering there are, like, about 1,000 gTLDs are already registered, do we have some kind of statistics over, say, the 900-1,000?

DAVE DICKINSON: No. No. We picked the ones that were most likely to have some level of recognizability either based on registrations or I believe we looked at both registration and visitation rates. Yeah.

KAILI KAN: Okay. But does that also imply that we can easily find comfort examples to disvalidate this kind of conclusion that more awareness outside of North America and Europe?

DAVE DICKINSON: So if we could say, I think, if I understand what you're asking, if we could validate awareness of all new gTLDs, even those that are only registered for speculation reasons, would that metric be different, would show the same regional differences. Is that what you're asking?

KAILI KAN: Well, yeah. To an extent, that is correct. But also is the [inaudible] well over half of new gTLDs are for speculation, so I wouldn't consider them to be aware at all.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That speculation is done by a few people. It's not going to be reflected.

KAILI KAN: Yes.

JONATHAN ZUCK: So the actual registrations are not what they're measuring. They just asked people if they were aware. And so speculation probably wouldn't have an effect on the awareness of the general public.

DAVE DICKINSON: The only way I –

JONATHAN ZUCK: The fact that this actual registration happens is probably only know by a very small number of people.

DAVE DICKINSON: Unless it was a popular meme in the news in the country that there was all this speculation going on. That could then increase people's general awareness of the New gTLD Program, which would likely increase their sensitivity to saying they were familiar with ones that we did present to

them. You'd have to have a lot of news press going on for that to happen.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I'm going to jump the queue again. Is there a correlation? Because another thing that happens outside of the U.S. and Europe is the IDNs. Were you able to carve down to find out whether there was a correlation between the increase in IDNs and awareness in the area that would benefit from them because they use other alphabets?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible] registrants.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I just perceive that. Yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

JONATHAN ZUCK: Right, exactly.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: This is about end user. When you do the registrant, it will be interesting to see what the differences between, in the same question for IDNs, which is outside of Europe and North America, and what the registrants say about this question [inaudible]. I think that would help you to zero

in on the speculative intent better when they do the registrant survey.
That's what I think.

DAVE DICKINSON: Yeah. We do have a few IDNs in some of the questions. I believe they're all Chinese. I'm sorry. Say it again, please.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible].

DAVE DICKINSON: Well, we have the city. We have Moscow. Yeah. I'm pretty sure. We have [Wang]. I can't remember the revised names. We can look it up here. Those actually haven't shifted very much. In fact, in some cases, they've weakened in the metrics. It's only a small set of four of them, and only in one country, so I'm not sure we can draw broad conclusions there.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: A couple of quick points to intersect Kaili's thoughts about speculation versus the awareness topic. First, it's worth noting that the total number of registrations has increased significantly over the past year in the new TLDs. So even if you discount 50% of those, I think there's still then a pretty big net increase in total registrations, even of non-speculative registrations. Those could also drive awareness. The fact that 50% are not being used doesn't mean that the other 50% don't have any bearing on people's awareness.

Secondly, I think it sort of doesn't matter. People are aware or they're not aware, regardless of how registrants are using the names, whether they're speculating, whether they're using them for awesome purposes or terrible purposes. We'll dig in the registrant survey into what registrants are doing, but this is just purely looking at whether end users are perceiving that these things exist and they're trustworthy or whatever they are.

DAVE DICKINSON:

Exactly. It's purely public perception of the system.

KAILI KAN:

Again, Jordyn, I agree with you. Also, I wanted to say 53% were registrations in China. In China, it's recognized well over 90% are for speculation. Then that leads to we may look into the other 40%. What kind of percentage in that 40-something percent is for speculation? For example, I remember in our group e-mail, we discussed that a lot of registrations are concentrated in tiny countries, like [inaudible]. They definitely are not domestic and local. I imagine a lot could be for speculation, as well. That means we're not only looking at [inaudible] percent for speculation, which could well be 80% or 90%. If that is the case, we face a problem. That's what I think of. Thank you.

WAUDO SIGANGA:

I'm just intrigued by the figures on the table. For example, if we look at domain like .news, we say that its awareness in North America is only 22%. In Africa, it's higher at 39%. I wonder how that correlates with the

actual registrations. I would expect the registrations are much, much higher in North America. Pardon? Visitations? I would expect the consumers to be registering if they're aware of the gTLD.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: No. They're using visitations. I think it's more visitations you'd be interested in, Waudo.

DAVE DICKINSON: You're saying that there might be a .news site that's registered out of the U.S., but it's largely targeting the African continent.

STAN BESEN: Just a couple of numbers. This is from NDLD Stats. According to them, parked domains, 74.56% of the total new gTLD domains are parked. It's just the registrants. There's something they call no record. DNS does not respond with a record for domain. That's 65%. It's a big number. It's not a number that we can easily ignore.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: What does no record mean?

STAN BESEN: No record says DNS does not respond with an A record for domain. Maybe you guys know what that means.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Okay.

STAN BESEN: Not being [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It's not resolving to an IP address. However, for example, like .email, you might have MX records, which are different, which allow that to be used for e-mail, as opposed to an interactive service of some sort. You have to dig in a little bit more. I would expect in .email, the number of no records would be very high by this definition, but that's not necessarily a bad thing. It just means they're being used for e-mail, as opposed to websites.

DAVE DICKINSON: Okay, should we resume?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah.

DAVE DICKINSON: 63. The domain name system in general, trust levels are up, as we talked about. The global total has improved against all five of the reference industries that we compare the domain name industry to. Just

about four percentage points on average, so wave over wave. Significant, and that's a good increase. Africa and South America are the most stable. They only showed improvement against the ISPs as a category. Everything else was more stable there.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

DAVE DICKINSON: Yeah, and that could be a global thing. In general, trust is highest relative to the ISP, so it is a global thing.

Trust in enforcement. That says reinforcement. It should say enforcement of restrictions is relatively strong. Globally, seven in ten say that that they have a high to moderate level of trust that any restrictions that are out there will actually get enforced. There is an expectation. The world you're living in is they expect that there should be some level of restrictions, and that those will be followed through on. You have to understand that that's the public perception you're operating in.

71. In terms of navigating, how do people like to reach websites? It's not changed appreciably. For general navigation purposes, we see a gradual trend toward mobile devices, especially outside of North America and Europe, but beyond that, the dominant method for locating a web resource is the search engine. We looked at that table earlier. Little change there.

Use of QR codes is up slightly, but the overall frequency of use is still very low. It's 12% globally for frequent use.

There are different pathways to get where you want to go, depending on the situation. If we look at specific activities versus general information seeking, we see differences in behavior. Apps, for example, are seen as being the safest when people are looking to access personal information, and often they're seen as easier, as well. Bookmarked sites, on the other hand, are seen as the fastest way to get there for any purpose. Information, shopping, it doesn't matter. That's the fastest.

Depending on the context you give people, safe, easy, fast, what modality they use or the perception about the modalities changes.

There are some regional differences for navigation. The value of apps is consistently seen to be higher in Africa than in other regions. North Americans are most likely to feel that safety is found by typing the name into the browser, and Europe is most likely to default to search engines or just to say that they're unsure which method is safest, fastest, easiest. The highest levels of [ensure].

The next one would be 88. This is about Internet abuse and cybercrime. Reported levels of fear are pretty stable. We altered the question here. Last time, we just said aware. This time, we asked about familiarity. The numbers come down because people are more likely to say "I've heard of it" than to say they're familiar with it. Overall, the general patterns suggest that there's a good deal of stability there.

As we talked about, social media is the biggest perceived risk. They are less comfortable providing personal information into a site that is using

a new gTLD, compared to .com or a country code TLD. Comfort levels are much lower for the new gTLDs, and it's lowest in Europe and the U.S., highest in Asia.

Bad behavior. People still, when we ask them whose responsibility it is to mitigate these abusive behaviors, they talk about some branch of law enforcement: consumer protection agency, federal police, local police, etc. Those sorts of things. ICANN is mentioned, but it's 10% to 12% globally, I think was the [inaudible], if I remember correctly.

When we asked people what they've done to protect themselves, it hasn't changed very much. In fact, phishing, for example, people are actually saying they've done less to protect themselves from phishing. Nothing suggesting that there's this massive motivation to change behavior or adopt new things.

As last time, antivirus software is the number one thing people do for any cybercrime, regardless of what it is. It's probably expected to be doing more than it actually does.

The last section, we don't have overall, but it's the teen section, which we gave an overview of earlier on. Why don't you go ahead and jump, if you would, quickly to slide 105?

JONATHAN ZUCK:

[inaudible] the last slide. Kaili?

KAILI KAN: Your last slides show that little change has happened on the consumers protecting themselves. I'm just wondering if that has something to do with Internet literacy because not only on the DNS system or Internet, people's behavior changes slowly, overall speaking, regardless of whatever field. It just has to be changed according by generations. Within younger generation who grew up together with the Internet, they are much more literate, and I believe they will be much more aware of protecting themselves, rather than the old ladies, no?

Sorry, public recording, right? Sorry. I didn't mean that. Sorry about that.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: That was my point.

LAUREEN KAPIN: I just wanted to quickly respond, not about the old lady comment because of course, I am youthful and vibrant, but just in terms of protective measures. My take on it is that there's a problem with people's awareness of how to protect themselves across the generations.

Particularly for teens, their whole conception of privacy and what should be kept private and online behavior is very, very different than people of other ages. There isn't, generally speaking, the same value of privacy, and there certainly isn't the same awareness of what information is safe to be put out there on social media, for example, than there is in other generations. I just would say I wouldn't make that

conclusion that just because the younger folks are more comfortable and use the Internet more, that they're necessarily behaving more safely. In fact, in certain regards, quite the opposite.

DAVID TAYLOR: Thanks, Jonathan. If you could go back to that slide, the summary one with the consumers. You just went past it, I think.

DAVE DICKINSON: It was 88.

DAVID TAYLOR: There's a bit with the consumers being less comfortable providing personal information on a new gTLD, as opposed to the .coms and the ccTLDs. I was just interested there with the acceptance being higher in Asia. In the Asian market, people are more comfortable doing it. Do you have any reason for that? Was there any indication as to why?

DAVE DICKINSON: Other than just the general stronger showing that the new gTLDs have in Asia, there's higher reported levels of familiarity, higher comfort levels in general, those sorts of things. I'm not an expert on Internet usage. Our Asian sample is going to be heavily weighted by China. It's more countries than that [heavily]. I'm not an expert on what might be going on internally there. A greater sense of protection, perhaps, but that's all I've got.

DAVID TAYLOR: Thanks. I was just trying to tie it in with the point before about the Chinese registrations. There's so many coming from China, and it's speculation. I'm trying to tie in the speculation with the [inaudible]

DAVE DICKINSON: Yeah. My guess is, if anything, it would be influenced by larger trends than speculation in the [GLT], which is going to have fairly limited awareness or impact. You look at the adoption of technology in the Chinese middle class and the rapid rise of consumerism and electronics. Probably, it's just general overall adoption of that sort of stuff.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Trust in the great firewall. Calvin?

CALVIN BROWNE: It could just be that the speculators are following the market that they see. They've got their market assessed, and they're following their market.

DAVE DICKINSON: This is perhaps more of a curiosity. You're saying that potentially, they're looking at the size of the market and the potential there, and so registering domain names there, the new ones, because they provide an opportunity that they can't get because .com is chock-a-block elsewhere? Is that what you're saying?

CALVIN BROWNE: Maybe even more, additionally. Because they see that it's succeeding in their part of the world, they're speculating, so it's a self-reinforcing type thing.

DAVE DICKINSON: If you want to go ahead to slide 89. When we say it's higher, here's comfort levels with different activities. Searching for information up at the top, 55% globally, very comfortable. You can see North America, 66%. That drops down a little bit in Asia, but come down here. Shopping online, that's a little bit higher in Asia. Banking is fairly flat across there. Then down here is the social media, where you can see there's more concern about that in the Americas than there is in the rest of the world.

The next slide, just because these were new questions. Inputting an e-mail address into a ccTLD, a .com, or a new gTLD. You can see the relative comfort levels of doing each of these activities. They decrease in general terms as you go from top to bottom, but consistently, the new gTLD is lower. The examples given, a new gTLD like .club or .bank. Those were the examples given there.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Another slide you might want to go through, Dave, is 33. I think they might be interested in those findings, as well.

DAVE DICKINSON:

Go ahead and get it there. Okay.

We stripped out almost all of the registrant questions from this survey to just focus on consumer issues and save the registration questions for that dedicated survey. But we did leave this one in, which was if they were going to purchase or register a gTLD, what would impact them? We see having a well-known extension dropped significantly globally, 16 percentage points.

Sorry, I forgot about this. The drops are less relevant because we added some options here. Last year, we're seeing some drops in pricing in well-known in favor of, "It's relevant to my needs," 32%, and "It's close to the one that I wanted that is available. The one I wanted isn't available, so this is close to that." Those were new options that were added, and so they came up.

We should take those arrows off, actually. The trending on this is off because we gave them more options, but it clarified the relevancy issue. Again, a reflection of what they're looking at the whole system to do. Go ahead, Stan.

STAN BESEN:

I was actually puzzled when I saw this slide in the middle of everything else and wondered why it was there. Now you've explained it, but you think that the people you surveyed have well thought out responses to this question? After all, they were chosen as consumers. Many of them are probably likely never to register a domain because they're users. How much weight should be we put on this?

DAVE DICKINSON: I think it will be much more telling from the registrant survey. Basically I would take away the familiarity issue that we've talked about and seen throughout, or the perceived relevance or interpretability plays when they think about their own motivations for doing that. It underscores that dynamic. Beyond that, there wasn't a great deal of context to that, and they weren't registrants. So I would wait for the registrant survey.

JONATHAN ZUCK: [inaudible] 180 slides.

DAVE DICKINSON: No, no, only 108, but we can give you the data tables if you'd like, though.

JONATHAN ZUCK: You mentioned a Pew Research study that came out recently. I don't know if everybody in the room is familiar with it. I'm not. You said you thought that your findings were somewhat inconsistent with theirs. I'm wondering if you have some sense of why that might be, and what the primary difference was because they drew some conclusions about trust that were different. Can you delve into that a little bit?

MEGAN RICHARDS: Excuse me, before you answer that, if you don't mind me jumping in, in the papers that we got, was it not from the DNA, the Domain Name

Association? There was also a survey on similar – Of course, I have it somewhere, but not in the papers I brought here. Just if you can add that.

JONATHAN ZUCK: If you're familiar with it, yeah.

DAVE DICKINSON: I'm not familiar with that. At least, if I saw it, it didn't stick with me. What I should do is I should go back and see if I can resurrect where I saw the Pew study. It was within the last month. At the time, my perception was that it wasn't wave over wave, so it was self-reported behavioral changes.

They were making a deal about lack of perceived safety for things like online banking and whatnot. Depending on how you ask that question, you can get very different responses. What we looked at here was wave over wave. Were there shifts in these things? We didn't see any dynamic at all. Personally, of course, it's our study, I would put more credence in that, but I don't mean to demean the Pew. They do a good job.

What I will do is I will go back and resurrect, see if I can that and give you some more specifics.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Great. One last question about the methodology. You showed us the slide, and I confess that I glazed over it. What was the experience of

someone taking this? These were online in most cases? I'm curious because if they were, then a certain amount of literacy involved in taking the survey in the first place. I guess I'm just curious. What was it like for an end user taking this survey? How did this come about? How were they chosen? That kind of thing.

DAVE DICKINSON:

Several responses to that. It was administered online globally because we were looking for Internet users. They had to have a minimal requirement to spend at least five hours a week using the Internet. That was the bar of entry to get in. There are companies out there that maintain panels of people who they can invite to surveys, and that's what this utilized globally.

What the experience was like is this was a very long survey. I would expect for some folks, it was a bit onerous. If anything, what happens with long surveys is you tend to get drop out after a certain point. There would be some people who were less compliant who stopped taking the survey partway through. I don't have the details on how many people dropped out, but given the length, I know it happened. Does that answer your question?

JONATHAN ZUCK:

And we dropped those. They didn't end up counting if they did that.

DAVE DICKINSON:

No. You had to get all the way through. You had to do the entire march to get to the parade grounds.

JONATHAN ZUCK: And do they get a gift card or something for doing it?

DAVE DICKINSON: Yeah, every panel has some sort of incentive system that people get an incentive for –

JONATHAN ZUCK: Completing the survey.

DAVE DICKINSON: Yeah. Some people criticize panels as they may not be accurate representations of who you think they are, but in this case, we're just looking for Internet users, so I would say that's not really a significant consideration.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Pew?

DAVE DICKINSON: Oh, did Pew do it? I don't know. I would have to go back and look.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Any other questions? I'm sure there will be more as we try to delve in [inaudible].

DAVE DICKINSON: That's what we're here for.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Dave, thanks for your presentation. Thanks for coming to meet with us.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Hey, folks, let's try to reconvene if we can.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, everyone. One of the upsides of having our face-to-face here in Washington is the possible celebrity appearances that can happen at the meeting. Our first celebrity appearance is Secretary Strickling, who has served on both the first two Accountability and Transparency Review Teams, so has some real in-the-trenches experience with the whole review team exercise and whose team also is responsible for the affirmation of commitments, the agreement signed between ICANN and the U.S. government that brought these types of reviews about. It should be very enlightening, and thanks so much for joining us.

LAWRENCE STRICKLING: Thanks for having me, Jonathan. Also, Fiona Alexander is here, who is also a veteran of those first two ATRTs. Fiona did most of the heavy negotiations in 2009 on the affirmation of commitments, so we can get back and talk about what that means, as well.

I'm not here to make any news, although if you can do the math, 90 days is almost up. We won't be talking about that today. We'll save that for later.

First off, I want to thank all of you for your participation on the review team. It's a lot of work. What makes for a good review team is everybody understanding the need to pull on the oar in the same direction and everybody understanding the need to be making tangible, physical contributions. I'm talking about writing. It gets to be very difficult at the end to pull all this together, but the teams that I've been on have succeeded largely because the work was distributed and everybody took responsibility for delivering work product and then engaging with everyone else on that product as we worked our way through it.

You also have Carlos here, who was a veteran of the second ATRT, so he can certainly pass along his thoughts and his experiences from how that worked. Thank you for your service on that.

This, of course, is the last of the four review teams that will actually be organized, largely because it was tied to the introduction of the New gTLD Program, which at the time the affirmation was signed, was still not a sure thing. It was still in doubt. It was still being debated at that point in time as to whether or not it would go forward. I think what we felt at the time was that it would be very important for something that had such a massive impact on ICANN and on the root zone to come back and do an assessment of how it worked after you had enough experience to be making judgments.

I think the AoC triggered the review team to start after the new gTLDs had been in operation for a year. I guess we're probably a little past that, but I think you're still at a good point to be assessing this program, recognizing that a lot of the economic impacts and a lot of the major impacts on structure and business models and stuff may still be in development.

We don't know where all that is going to come up. I think it's a good time to be looking at this and starting to assess trends and seeing what difference any of this makes. People have gone through a tremendous amount of activity, tremendous amount of exertion over the last several years, both people who are trying to understand how to do this, as well as people who are seeing the business opportunity. It's an important thing to make an assessment of at this point in time.

I do hope that based on the terms of the AoC, you are able to take a look at the different aspects of the program that I think ought to be evaluated. I know you've broken down into three subgroups. I'm not quite sure exactly how you've divided up all the work, but for me, I think it's important at this point in time to do something of a market evaluation. What's actually happened out there with these new TLDs being introduced? What's been the market uptake of these?

I realize this data may be hard to get, but hopefully people will be willing to find a way to share information. There are ways to do it, to have it collected by neutral parties so that there's no concern about sharing of competitive information by parties. It would be nice to find a way to collect some of this information. I'm really interested to

understand what's happened to pricing as a result of this, and I hope you all have an opportunity to make some judgments on that.

I think what's particularly exciting about all this is what new business models has this enabled for people? We've understood all along that people could use new gTLDs perhaps as a way to protect intellectual property in a new and unique way. I'm sure there have been many other creative ideas that people have put into place in terms of how to take advantage of these opportunities in terms of creating new business models for existing brick and mortar businesses, for new online businesses, whatever. This is an opportunity to provide some evaluation of that.

At the time this program was initiated, there was a tremendous amount of handwringing by existing companies about how much they would have to engage in defensive registrations. I think that's an important thing to be assessing at this point in time, too. What has happened in that regard? There were predictions being made of companies having to spend millions of dollars to register their trademarks defensively across all these new TLDs.

I don't have a sense that that, in fact, has happened, but that's an important fact. I think it would be good to get some information on.

I hope all of this is in your mix of things that you are going to take up. I hope you all are able to generate an interesting, fact-based, metrics-based – I know Jonathan likes metrics – report for the community at the end of your term. What is your plan for when you'll finish up?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks for the question, Secretary Strickling. For the record... Can we stop the recording? No.

LAWRENCE STRICKLING: I just want to know when to look for the report. That's all.

JONATHAN ZUCK: We're hoping to have some preliminary findings out for public comments by the end of the year, and then probably try to go final in the spring, if we can. Obviously, part of the difficulty of this has to do with the fact that we're trying to engage in some outside research and things.

For example, one of the things that we did, I don't know if you remember this, but we had a work group followed by an implementation advisory group that came up with data that should be collected leading up to the New gTLD Program so we would have some data to review.

As part of that, we had two economic studies to show a baseline and a delta, and then four surveys, end users and registrants, both before and after the year passed, as well. We just got a review of the second end user survey this morning so that we could compare the one a year ago to the one. The one on registrants, for example, we won't see until the fall. So there are some things that are a little bit out of our control, but we're hoping to have some preliminary report by the end of the year.

LAWRENCE STRICKLING: Good. One thing that occurred to both of the ATRTs – and Alice, of course, remembers this, having lived through it – was that under the AoC, I think the ATRT was supposed to complete its work within a year. I can't remember. Does that apply to all of the groups, or just the ATRT? Do you remember?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: It's not expressly written, but I would say that it does.

LAWRENCE STRICKLING: Okay. I'll tell you, you got to September and October, and there was a lot of hand wringing about, "We're going to need more time." To Brian Cude's credit as Chair of both of those teams, he kept people's feet to the fire, and we finished them up both on time. So it can be done, but there will be a natural tendency to feel like you're overwhelmed and you can't get it done. But it's important to the community to finish these things up on a time frame. It should go without saying that these teams have always been important since they were conceived in the AoC, but assuming we move into an environment where we go through this transition, people are going to be watching these things. There are still skeptics out there as to whether or not this community can truly govern itself or not, not that we in the U.S. government have done much of that directly anyway, but there's still that perception there.

This is your opportunity to step up and show people, again, how on a day-to-day basis, the stakeholder community is able to do these things in a competent, timely, thorough way. I encourage you all to stick to your schedule.

FIONA ALEXANDER:

The scope of the review team, at least [in] the affirmation, is pretty broad. It has a lot of things, and when you're the first group to look at an issue, there's a tendency to feel like you have to do everything. I think the accountability group had the same challenge and ultimately decided in the first go round to look at key issues and in the second go round, look at others. I would say there's naturally going to be some things that you guys are looking at that are not going to be able to be finished in this time frame of a year, or even a year and a half. I don't think that's a bad thing. It's okay to acknowledge that, but do as much as you can and say why it's not ripe.

What I would say is it's really important to stick to these time frames because you can always take more time. You can always take more time to do a better job, and then this becomes too lengthy and not actually an effective feedback mechanism. Again, the key exercise here is to review ICANN's execution of tasks. It's not to become a new ICANN policymaking process. It's not to duplicate other policy processes at ICANN. It's to review the execution of what's been done by ICANN and the community.

LAWRENCE STRICKLING:

With that, maybe we should just have a discussion. I would be happy to respond to any questions, comments people have.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I'll go first. One of the interesting aspects of this review – and this is going to speak just to what Fiona just said about the nature of the reviews – is that it's tied to a particular program. Many of the others, in a way, operate in parallel to the day-to-day business of ICANN so that while everything else that ICANN is doing is going on, attempts to improve accountability and transparency are happening in parallel. In this particular case, there is real interest in new TLDs, what are being referred to as subsequent procedures because we have a kind of a swear job for anybody that mentions the word "round" on our review team. So what's a little different about this is trying to determine the degree to which we should try to be critical path to that what might be considered an ongoing process within ICANN rather than being a parallel stream the way that some of the other reviews have been. I don't know. [If you have some thoughts about that].

LAWRENCE STRICKLING: I'm not sure I understood the question.

FIONA ALEXANDER: I think it's just hard, right? So the issue is that for Whois and other things like that there is also existing work ongoing but you could look at a discrete project. The timing of this exercise, obviously the GNSO Subsequent Procedures has already started and in the best of all worlds perhaps that would have waited until you guys finished your review, but that's not the world that you're in I guess. So I think you've got to figure out a way to maybe thread the needle a bit. But it's really important for the construct of these review teams that they actually become reviews

and not attempts to new policy processes. Because if that's the case, then the whole construct of these community reviews changes in other ways and that isn't what it was supposed to be.

So I don't know that there is a simple answer for you, but it's important to stay true to the integrity of the review process exercise.

KAILI KAN:

I understand the importance of the time frame and time urgency of the critical path and so forth. But also my understanding is that there are [for] engineering issues, problems, time frame always. However, for our task I believe there are issues that do not have standard answers or standard approaches. So some are more of a research or new approaches we've found. So my understanding even for the U.S. government as well as [TOC] there are sometimes researches or reviews the conclusion for example for [FDI] for conclusion is that the result is inconclusive. And that itself is a very good enough conclusion to conclude it's inconclusive. So personally, I'm more afraid of concluding the wrong thing rather than conclude it is inconclusive. So I think that is [to be] prudent and careful, at least not mislead anything. Thank you.

LAWRENCE STRICKLING:

And even beyond that, ideally this group should operate by consensus. And I think to the credit of the ATRTs you did have consensus recommendations. So there may well be issues on which the group can't just come to a consensus and that provides an outcome not different from what you were just talking about where the group was unable to reach a conclusion because of a lack of consensus , just as you might not

be able to reach a conclusion because of lack of technical information. I don't think that by itself presents a problem, but what is useful in those situations is at least to present the issue and present the various perspectives that people had on it leading up to the conclusion of no conclusion.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

First of all, I so appreciate you both being here and, Larry, you had mentioned specific things we're really interested in looking for in terms of what I'll say is the competition bucket. You talked about market uptake and pricing and new business models. I'm curious what you're really looking forward to seeing on the consumer trust side of the equation.

LAWRENCE STRICKLING:

With the Federal Trade commission at the helm, I guess I'm not too worried about that one.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

I wouldn't take that answer at the deposition, but I guess I'll need to take it here.

MEGAN RICHARDS:

I think Larry has more or less answered what I was going to say. I was going to suggest that because of the timing, because of the nature of what we're looking at, it's by definition going to be too early to draw conclusive solutions, but I think one thing that we can do – and this goes

also to what Fiona said – we can identify what needs to be looked at in future policy reviews or what areas have to be addressed in more detail etc., etc. I think that even doing that is useful for the community. I don't necessarily expect a solution or the answers to everything from this group.

LAWRENCE STRICKLING:

No, but I think it's perfectly appropriate to say this particular process... I mean I know that the issue of the experts was controversial throughout the application process. It would seem that this group might reach conclusions about "Did that work well, did it not work well?" But you don't have to redesign it, then that information though can be provided to the PDP and other people who are focused on how to do this in a second round – assuming there will be a second round – and let them take that information and utilize it as they do whatever redesign work they want to do for round two.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

And that's largely the conversations we've been having with the PDP. We have liaisons to that group, including Carlos and Carlton, that are both serving on the PDP and so we're trying to figure out the best way to work together and in some instances combine our efforts. Because the irony of that PDP starting when it did is that the first half of the PDP will be to conduct a review. And so that's part of what's funny about it.

I'd love to ask you a philosophical question. I apologize in advance if it's too abstract. It just had to do with the nature of the purpose of the New gTLD Program. In other words, we're discussing how we can't really

draw the most firm conclusions etc, but let's assume in a perfect world that we could and that we're able to conclude conclusively that the New gTLD Program had zero impact on competition, choice, or consumer trust. What, to you, would that say about the program? In other words, does that suggest that we don't – and this is very informal, so this is not an official statement or anything like that – but does that suggest we don't need more of them, that we should definitely try to find a way to make those things happen before we have more? Does that question make sense? In other words, what is the role of competition, trust, and choice in the motivation – at least from the USG's perspective – in having a gTLD program to begin with?

LAWRENCE STRICKLING:

I just can't accept your premise. This program, I think, definitely has had and will have effects on all three of those categories. How you tease that information out, how do you present it, how do you assess it? That's the challenge to this group. But I don't think you can possibly make a case that your zero impact is at all a likely or even theoretically possible outcome.

And then I think you just have to assess it. I don't think you have to limit the assessment of the benefits, the pluses of the program to those three categories, but you can certainly add other positive outcomes that people see from it. And then against that you have to assess have there been negatives? And it seems to me that if, in fact, this has not had a positive impact on trust, then it almost certainly must have had a negative impact on trust because there's no way it had no impact on trust.

I think people have to then sit down and look at this and say, at the end of the day, “Have we improved the Internet overall for folks or not?” But I do think that there’s no way you’re going to reach a conclusion that those three categories that were specified in the AoC were areas in which there was no impact.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ:

Thank you. Larry, two questions. The first one to what you just discussed with Jonathan, we have a strange case – we have this area that we call the “underserved” areas and when we think about competition in these areas, of course, there is lack of competition in terms of Internet access and service providers and so on, but it might be the case that in those countries particularly we have a dominant competitor which are the CCT of these. So it’s pretty similar to what we have in the telecom industry.

On the other hand, ICANN has a respectful distance to the ccTLDs. I agree with you, there will be an impact but I’m afraid that we have a black hole and some in the group are analyzing particularly these underserved areas when we come with these tools or with this strict concept of competition but we have a dominant provider – the ccTLD – and we cannot give any recommendation about that. So I hope we can deal with that, and any ideas on underserved areas would be helpful to this group.

My second question, if you allow, is what do you think about this automatic translation of the AoC reviews into the bylaws? People are panicking about how to schedule them and, as you just mentioned or

Fiona mentioned, there needs to be some relation with the PDPs and so on and does it make sense to continue pushing reviews – three and a half of them – on a yearly basis because that keeps this parallel system running crazy almost for the next four or five years. Do you think it's useful? Thank you.

LAWRENCE STRICKLING:

So on the last question, yes, we totally support incorporating this regular schedule of reviews in these areas into the bylaws. And of course it's now happened. They're in the bylaws. But we certainly recognized – and all of us who participated in the ATRT – understood that the three year cycle was tough. Because by the time you've completed the work, it then takes basically another year for ICANN to look at the report, accept the recommendations, and then actually put an implementation plan in place, so that you're barely getting the recommendations implemented by the time you need this organized yet the next team because these are on a three-year cycle before. So I think the bylaws moved it to a five-year cycle, I think? Yes. So that makes perfect sense to take a little bit longer.

I will say I was surprised about back in 2014 after we announced the transition, folks will remember we had just completed the ATRT in 2013. And frankly I had found the community's engagement in 2013 to be not as substantial as it had been the first year, 2010. Which makes sense, and one could have looked at 2013 and said, "Okay, people must be relatively comfortable with ICANN because the kinds of issues we dealt with in 2010 weren't coming up in 2013." But then 2014 we announced the transition and boom – everybody comes out of the woodwork

saying, “ICANN’s accountability needs to be dramatically shored up,” which led of course to the CCWG and the very significant proposals for community empowerment and such which are all now in front of us. But I was taken by the fact that we didn’t hear much of that in 2013 from the community and then the complete different approach that the community wanted to take in 2014 when it came up again in the context of transition planning.

And I think that is something that ICANN as an organization will have to guard against, which is you can’t let these things become so routinized that people don’t take them seriously. And so what happened in 2013 that people weren’t in raising the same issues as strongly as they did in 2014, and so as you go through these cycles there has to be some way to really nudge the community to take it seriously and participate fully because there was such a dramatic difference in the level of engagement in 2013. The year before, the CCWG gets organized. And that still surprises me as I think about it today and I do think it’s a cautionary note for ICANN to figure out once we embed these things in the bylaws and we have a routine, how do we avoid them becoming so routinized that nobody takes it seriously. And as a result of that, do we then overlook issues that are bubbling up, emerging in the organization, but for whatever reason aren’t being captured in the review team.

So hopefully with the process by which I think in the future it will be the SOs and ACs that will nominate directly to the review teams or nominate candidates directly. Maybe that will ensure that the issues that really bother people are the ones that are actually going to be taken up by the review team. So I do think that’s an important issue organizationally that people are going to have to think about as they go

through these cycles of reviews so that they just don't become rubber stamps or top-of-the-waves type reviews and analyses. Did I answer all of your questions?

I think again, as you're looking at the benefits of the program, the idea that people are using gTLDs to create communities of interest, whether it be at a city-wide level or a regional level. All of that could still play into the question of how does that match up against competing instead of competing against .com competing against a dominant country code. And so I think there is still interesting issues about how people are using these things in the face of a more dominant country code that apply the same way they would if you were looking at how do these apply to people facing a more dominant .com?

MARGIE MILAM:

I wanted to follow up on your prior point about engagement of the community. I'm responsible for managing now these reviews out of the new bylaws and I am worried about the very issue you raise – how do we get the community engaged in the issues that are so important to be addressed? We've got the SSR Review Team kicking off this month, and then we have the next Whois or Registration Directory Services kicking off a few months after that in October. Do you have any advice for us on how to approach it so that we do get the level of engagement, knowing that the community is so buried in all of the work that's going on in the various aspects?

LAWRENCE STRICKLING: I don't have any more transitions to announce, so I don't know. But it's definitely a tough question and, like I say, I was very surprised that we could go in an entire year in 2013 and have people for the most part not raising major concerns and then the dramatic shift that took place just a few months later after we announced the IANA transition. So I think smarter people than me are going to have to study that and try to understand that and understand the psychology of it as to what it was that all of a sudden brought everybody out of the woodwork in a way that we weren't able to do the year before.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I have a question but I don't want to usurp the interests and the rights of the other groups because I have a question on the transition – if you can just give us an overview. But I'm happy to leave it to the very end because there are lots of other questions I'm sure that are much more relevant to the review team first.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I will confess that I promised Larry that he wouldn't be asked questions about the transition.

LAWRENCE STRICKLING: You can try, but I said I'm not here to make news.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Well since there are no others, I was just going to ask if you can give us from your perspective how things are going and how you see the

hearings on the hill and all those other things that you probably will say you have no comment on. But I think it's interesting from our perspective.

LAWRENCE STRICKLING: No comment, but we're on schedule.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Any other questions from folks about intentions here. Yes, please.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE What's been you guys' take so far about the level of community engagement in your work? You asked the opposite, but how engaged do you think community stakeholders are in the review that you're doing now? Are they paying attention? Are they filing comments? Are you engaging with people? Are you finding it constructive? What do you guys think so far?

JONATHAN ZUCK: I welcome answers from everyone. My first take is that obviously we did an engagement session that was not well attended, but at the same time ICANN meetings are full of so many conflicts and things like that it's difficult to assess that. I know for example inside the IPC there is a subcommittee that's formed particularly to look at this. And so I don't know about other stakeholder groups, but the IPC in particular has formed a group to specifically quiz me and David about how things are going on a regular basis and there's regular calls for that. So I'd be

interested to hear if other folks... I do know that GAC asks for updates at least when they meet, ALAC recently requested an update that was part of a training session. So there is some interest expressed in that way. I don't know how that will translate to public comments. I think people will comment once there is a document out there, but it's hard to assess. But I [welcome] some other observations.

MEGAN RICHARDS:

Just to add to what Jonathan... From the GAC perspective, there's been quite an interest and we've had two sessions of telling the GAC where we are, what's happening. Jonathan is going to speak at the Helsinki meeting to the GAC to tell them what's going on. There's some GAC observers – I don't know if they're still on. Yes, there they are, a couple of them at least – on this call. And we have opened the review team to observers to listen and participate at any time and they can send in comments and observations, etc. They don't speak during the meeting. And we've always had observers as far as I know. So there's some interest, but quite frankly, I think it's still a bit early days for participants or observers to have any clear idea of where we're coming from. For the moment, it's machinery of government, I think of it, looking at where we're going and how far we're going.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ:

Thank you for the question, Fiona. Two things, I think when the Nielsen Report and the Analysis Group reports are out is a perfect opportunity to ask for comments and I would expect to have reactions because they

are very well documented. There is a lot of data and it would be very useful to publish them heavily.

The second is this relationship to the PDP on subsequent rounds. Of course, this one is a much bigger group, is a formal PDP and they are very interested but we have formalized in a way the information flows. We have joint Chairs conversations every two weeks and we have homogenized the work plans and have found the areas where there is overlap and areas where there is no overlap and so on. So I think this is a major communication with a big group of the community that is ongoing and we have to keep very alive. Thank you.

DREW BAGLEY:

Yes, I think as my colleagues have mentioned, we haven't had a lot of opportunity yet for lots of massive engagement from the community because we haven't produced a document yet. But anecdotally speaking, I think there's a lot of enthusiasm for what we're doing and the expectation that we would create that first round of baseline knowledge about the New gTLD Program, especially with regard to competition and with regard to consumer trust and the DNS abuse issues associated with that. So I think that there's definitely going to be a lot of interest in the draft report, and I expect then the feedback we would get would be a lot and we'll see whether it's good feedback or bad feedback or just helpful feedback then. But I think there is going to be a lot of interest.

JORDYN BUCHANAN:

I guess I'm a little less chipper than the other folks that have spoken so far. I think in a lot of ways it's been a struggle to get the engagement that we've needed in some areas. For example, getting data from registrars which they're not obliged to provide under their contracts with ICANN has been a complete exercise in futility it seems like. And I think that's largely because it's viewed as a burden without necessarily seeing the benefit at least to the registrar community – why would they provide this data that's potentially sensitive if they don't really get anything out of it? So I think we're going to have to do some work to demonstrate the value of this exercise, and hopefully that will make it easier next time around. But I think in some cases, we're going to have to do without the benefit of some level of community responsiveness.

I guess I would turn the question around a little bit, Fiona, and ask, how did you guys envision the community engagement working when the AoC was written? Because these review teams are not set up like the PDP process with a formal set of community engagement mechanisms developed around them. I guess each review team has sort of on its own figured out what the rules of engagement are in terms of community engagement – two funny uses of the word “engagement” there.

In any case, I wonder if you guys had a specific view as to what the role of the community should be other than obviously performing the membership of the review teams with regards to how they would proceed because it doesn't seem called out in the AoC and it doesn't seem well specified anywhere else either. It just sort of like happens. Certainly Larry has had a role in the ATRT reviews, but maybe those are good models therefore as a result.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I'll answer the first one [inaudible] if you wanted to speak. I think on the affirmation, the idea was to put together a broad construct. We weren't sure what was going to happen next, if this was going to work, until the details they worked out. And each of the four topics are very different, right? So maybe the way of engaging is different dependent on it.

For the Accountability group, though – and folks will maybe have forgotten this – but there used to not be a reply cycle in the ICANN comment process. It was just public comments, and that reply cycle actually is a recommendation of ATRT 1. So ATRT 1 really didn't look at this holistic engagement strategy and how you do that, so maybe there's something in there that's useful? But ATRT 1 and ATRT 2 adopted a sort of template of a hypothesis of a problem, asked for stakeholder feedback on is this really a problem, and then proposed a solution, asked for stakeholder feedback on the solution, and then that was the report. So it was a much more of a rule making exercise. I think every group has done it slightly differently, but I think that's what worked and I think that actually is what helped with the first round get people focused and engaged and then in the second round it didn't seem to work as well.

LAWRENCE STRICKLING: Yes, I think each group has to find its own way and you have to get creative in terms of engagement with the rest of the community. ATRT thought about this hard. Even at the outset with ATRT 1 I think even the question of all the meetings being open and anybody could attend and

everything was streamed. Decisions that the first ATRT had to take it when it got started and so it wasn't even obviously apparent to everybody that this was the way in terms of an Accountability and Transparency Review Team operating totally transparently, that still took discussion and a decision at the front end.

So I think people have to think about, what are our issues, how do we best get feedback – again, as I mentioned, the 2013/2014 experience on accountability I think is a good lesson for everybody to understand that you can't just assume the community is going to come back and respond to your issues. You have to find a way to bring these issues to them in a way that they understand how important it is that they provide feedback.

On the question of the participation of the registrars in getting data, I understand why this is hard to do. You're dealing with competitively sensitive information. I understand why companies are reluctant to do it, but again, there are ways to do it either by using third parties to go out and in effect collect the information by calling up companies and saying, "How much for this? What can I get?" Or finding some way – and maybe this is something that comes out of your team that becomes a recommendation to be implemented down the road – is finding a neutral third party/clearinghouse type who can collect this information and be able to report it in a way that doesn't disclose anything competitively sensitive to any individual registrar.

Because I get that. That's going to be a very sensitive issue for these folks. You have to respect that. But at the end of the day, my sense is from talking to some of you there's some really interesting things going

on pricing-wise out there and it would be really nice to find a way to capture some of that and be able to provide some analysis as to what's really happening out there.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Other questions – Stan. Go ahead.

STAN BESEN: [That's] the least of our problems. There are at least two sources of data, public sources, that list registrar prices for every new gTLD. There's some problems with them, the biggest problem being that the prices vary all over the place even for the same gTLD.

LAWRENCE STRICKLING: That's interesting.

STAN BESEN: That's very interesting. But it's not as if we don't have the data.

LAWRENCE STRICKLING: Okay, good. I didn't realize that.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: And though the [TRA] would know that.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

One of the things on an engagement standpoint is that there is definitely – as there is always inside ICANN – communities that kind of want the review to come out one way or another and I think that will come to the surface as well. The other issue is that some of the things are somewhat abstract. Like you mentioned defensive registrations, for example. So one of the things that the working group in the implementation of [inaudible] group tried to do was come up with proxy data points to figure out what might represent defensive registrations for example as it pointed to an existing site rather than being a new site. But obviously, empirically that's not always an indicator of a defensive registration.

So we come back to the notion of, should we survey people to actually find out what they spent and so we're in conversations with [inaudible] for example to actually have them ask their members what it is they turned out to spend on the New gTLD Program and how it compared to some of those projections. We'll have an interesting exercise to figure out how to evaluate the data when it comes back because probably communities were among those most concerned. And so it's a challenging exercise. So we are trying to find different ways to get out data and to get at that kind of information for sure.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:

I might just add, it's also conceptually not necessarily the job of this group to solve the problems but identify what the problems are and propose a solution. How the problem actually gets solved can be done in implementation of your recommendation. And that may help with the timing of your workload as well.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I think we're clear on that. We're not the PDP.

LAWRENCE STRICKLING: Thanks very much and good luck.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right, let's try to get started again. We're just waiting on –
It sounds like you want to share Megan's fate. I'm just saying.

All right, thanks everyone. I hope that you found the conversation with Larry interesting. One of the things that I think is an interesting segue from Larry's presentation, his experience with the ATRT reviews, was the need for sort of individual assignments and responsibility, that in order to get this done it's not going to be like a typical work group where we get to do a lot of the work on the calls by commenting on the work of a few. There's so much that needs to be done that we're going to need everybody's – there's more of an emphasis on homework, if you will, in a way than there is on calls. And because we are trying to do something with a new level of rigor than perhaps has been done before and there's such a research component to this, I think homework takes on an even more important capacity within our work. And so I appreciated what Larry had to say about that, that I think that is going to be critical to us getting through this as efficiently as we can whether it's on time or not.

I think we're going to talk about that a little bit more, but I think that what the teams are going to try to do is look at the questions that we asked when we got together in Los Angeles. If you remember, we did our brainstorming session there and we came up with a series of questions that the review teams would be attempting to answer. I think we'll try to come up with champions for those questions because that way you sort of have some ownership over a particular aspect of what we're trying to do as opposed to just being overwhelmed with all that we're trying to do, and a sense of individual responsibility for the answer to that question.

So we're going to try to frame the work that we do also from the context of that question. One of the things that Laureen has been doing in her subteam that I think is particularly effective is assigning resource materials to individuals to go and read and then come back and digest and report on within the subteam. But one of the observations that we had about that was that you don't want to review the document for its own sake. Whatever its motivations were for being created and the motivations of its authors are not necessarily ours. So we want to try to look through all these resources and the work we do through the prism of the questions we are trying to ask of those resources and of the research.

So that's where we're circling in on and I invite some conversation about this as a kind of a template for how we're going to treat the questions and therefore how we're going to treat our analysis of outside inputs, whether they're research reports etc again through that lens of the questions.

If you look up on the screen you can see the beginning of this template and it begins with an observation that we've made. And so sometimes that observation seems obvious, but more often than not hopefully that observation is a function of the data that we've seen. One of the observations that we made was that there wasn't the kind of take-up that we wanted from the underserved economies, for example. That's sort of a broad observation, and to break that down further we want to take the ideas that this group is very good at producing – the theories – and express them as hypotheses – here's why I think that might be happening – and put that out there as a hypothesis.

You can see here in the template we came up with a couple of different hypotheses, insufficient awareness of the program, and these are just things that I came up with off the top of my head so these are not in any way supported by data at this point. These are just examples. Insufficient funds to operate a registry. In other words, it wasn't about the application, it was more about the fact that I'm worried about how much it will cost me to run the registry over the long term. Insufficient confidence in the market for TLDs. In other words – I'm trying to remember who brought this up, it might have been Drew who brought this up at one point that part of the motivation may be that they didn't think that there was enough of a market to justify getting a new TLD.

Those are all possible explanations for why we saw insufficient take-up or hypotheses.

Next in the template is the research to support this. Sometimes that's an outside document that already exists, sometimes it's the data that we've been collecting as a part of our metrics exercise, and sometimes

it is the research that we are having conducted by the Analysis Group or as we continue, Drew has proposed a DNS abuse study. We're talking about a survey of application cohorts, trying to find the people that might have applied for a new gTLD but for some change to the program and trying to determine what that is. So those research tools are what are in that third column is the notion of what are the things that we're going to try to use to provide evidence for or against that hypothesis.

And then we will go from there to findings. This is the structure of our document as well. Our first phase, if you will, and probably our first attempt at public feedback to our process, is on initial findings. This is what we have found to be true and that's prior to what we think ought to be done about it, but just what we think our findings were. And so it's an observation together with the evidence behind a hypothesis that will represent our findings. What we're hoping is that along the way you can express your reports back on research using that same terminology and that same kind of framework because it's the one we'll eventually be using.

I'm the one who is responsible for reading such and such, a study that was produced to research and so the findings that I think we get out of this are they support or don't support the hypothesis that we were using this document to try and support.

And then finally, we'll look into recommendations for change and to the degree possible – and this is a little bit harder to capture in this particular graph – there may be a little miniature version within the recommendations of hypothesis and support. One example I'll raise is that Carlton, for example, raised on the last plenary call that one of the

reasons for lack of awareness in the Third World, of the developing world – I don't know what the best term is for us to use these underserved markets – is that there was lack of awareness was the wrong type of media, for example. Radio is a more effective means in certain parts of the world to get to people than some of the other methods that were used by the Outreach Team. So ideally, we would support that hypothesis with data as well because if we're embedding it in our recommendations we'd want to say, "Look, here is a study or studies that demonstrate that radio is a more effective way to get to this region and this region, and therefore in those regions going forward, we'd recommend an increased use of radio."

I would really love – and I think you're all with me on this – to express everything in as much of an evidentiary way as possible because then finally when we make a recommendation we're going to ultimately deliver as part of the recommendation the means by which we will measure the success of that recommendation as well. Here's the data we used to suggest that there was a problem in the first place and we anticipate that same type of data will be used to assess the success of the recommendations that we put out there, and so then having as much evidence as possible will help that.

And then finally, to this notion that again is another elephant in the room, if you will, associated with our review is the kind of critical path nature of our work. I think that we can all theorize as much as we want about what it ought to be, but as a practical matter, the extent to which we can be as explicit as possible about the recommendations we believe ought to be critical path as opposed to just saying all of them is the greater likelihood that they will affect the critical path to that.

If it's manageable, can be accomplished within a reasonable period of time as opposed to things that may take three years of PDPs to accomplish, and it'll be politically improbable that that time period will be allowed to pass without subsequent procedures. So the degree to which we can make our recommendation, prioritize them and discuss them as things we believe to be critical paths to new subsequent procedures, I think that's the degree to which we'll have greater success with that.

So that's the sort of template that kind of corresponds to the document we're trying to write, and therefore, we want to try to use as people report back on individual findings from their research. So that's where this is, and I just wanted to have a conversation about and to get people's feelings, make modifications and get buy-in for moving forward in that way. So hopefully, Stan, you won't say anything too controversial.

STAN BESEN: With all respect to the Chair –

JONATHAN ZUCK: We know what that really means.

STAN BESEN: With all due respect to the Chair, my suggestion is actually that we should unpack the column called research, because I think it actually involves a number of discrete tasks that we should think as separate. One of them is, what data do we need?

Second, what are the potential sources of the data? Some of the questions we want to ask, I think we will not have the data to analyze or we'll have imperfect data. We should be specific about that.

And finally, the question is, who's going to perform the research? We're talking about doing calculations. I assume the people around this table are not going to do the calculations, so I think we need to specify whether it's ICANN staff or outside consultants or somebody else to do that, so that actually covers a series of discrete tasks, and I think we have to be very specific about them if we are to get the work done.

KAILI KAN: Yes. First, I agree with this methodology. With this methodology going through a [inaudible].

STAN BESEN: [inaudible] methodology.

KAILI KAN: Whatever. This process will really lead to what we want. Okay, so first of all, let me also agree with Stan that the research column could be expanded, refined and whatever. In addition to what Stan has said, data person. While personally I'm less of a data person but I am more of a logic reasoning person. So in addition to the data that needs to be collected, I would also say that in the research part also we need logical reasoning and [inaudible] together, but research is the bulk part of the work to be done.

That's about it, but I think this is a good template, a good methodology that we need to follow to make sure that we do go along the right path and get to where we want to. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Kaili, and I guess I'd love to drill in a little bit to what you were saying, because my own personal bias, if you will, about the processes that have gone before this one inside of ICANN is that logic and reasoning have taken the place of research for findings and recommendation. In other words, we have a room full of very intelligent people that have all formed impressions about the topics that we have to discuss, and some of that's data-driven. They're very intelligent people, but those opinions end up finding their way into the document.

I know Stan's going to say that some part of this is going to have to be a narrative, but the degree possible, my feeling is that the logic portion of this is in the hypothesis column. That we're trying to use logic and reasoning to come up with our own ideas that explain the observations that we make, and we're therefore using research to try and prove – or if we can – that logic and reasoning. So I would love to just drill in a little bit to what you thought you meant by that, because I'm very cautious of the notion of replacing research with "logic and reasoning" because then it becomes very subjective.

KAILI KAN:

Well, just in response of that, I agree with you. In the hypothesis stage, there's a lot of that logical reasoning. However, once a hypothesis is established, then it needs to be proved right or wrong, and at that

stage, it could be proven by data. But to prove something by data, first it's costly, secondly, more than often it is much more [inaudible] and could be well inconclusive.

JONATHAN ZUCK: [inaudible].

KAILI KAN: Yes. So at this stage, I will say that logical reasoning also plays an important role. So I agree with you. As a hypothesis stage, yes, logical and reasoning, but also for the research stage, logical reasoning to be proved right or wrong. And I would say even with data collected – well, that analysis of the data needs logical reasoning to be based upon. That's my feeling. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, thanks. I just again renew my caution about that, because it's a perfect example as the survey revealed that end users trust the domain industry, but if you talk to anyone in the ITC, they would question the logic or reason of doing so. So you have people that already established in their mind what they believe to be what is reasonable, and people just talk about facts that they've absorbed. Laureen in the discussion earlier was talking about the teens, and the fact that they don't necessarily have this better sense of the tools to protect themselves than adults do.

I think that's really valuable to get that observation, but I want that observation to become a hypothesis before we write about it and then

go to try and prove it in some way. That's more what I'm getting at, is to try to – to the degree possible – do that research rather than just encode our own observations from the past that we don't really –aren't really aware of the biases that went into them or how we reached those conclusions, if that makes sense.

Sorry, Stan, are you in or out? You've up and down a little bit, so.

STAN BESEN:

I think I just want to restate what you said a moment ago. As you said, people have made statements, given impressions of things. I think in every one of those cases, we should say "Well, how would I go about testing whether that proposition is true?" And I regard that as the hypothesis testing portion of this, and then the next step is "Well, how would you go about testing it?" Hypotheses are not interesting unless they can be tested in some fashion. In fact, falsifiability is a critical element of research methodology.

And then there's the data question. I think in a lot of cases, we're going to be unable to test all of the hypotheses that we might imagine, because the data are not going to be available. But that's the way to proceed, so I don't think we're disagreeing with one another here, I think we want to not – we can't stop at someone's statement. We wouldn't say "How do I know whether that's true or not? How would I test it, and then how would I collect the data to find out whether it's right or not, and what are our findings?"

JORDYN BUCHANAN:

Jonathan, I just wanted to sort of strongly agree with your previous statement. I think the research and the data elements of our exercise are really critical, partly because they're lacking from so much of the other process, and partly because there are a lot of people with agendas on both sides of this topic already, and both sides have tons of logic and reasoning to substantiate their views, and arguments without the data are totally potentially valid. You can come up with a hypothesis, abstract it from data, and if you don't have the data it's not falsifiable, right? It's just like "Oh, I have a theory, this might be what happens."

And unless we're able to tie that to what actually does happen in the real world, I think it's all a bunch of talk with opinions that people have developed over the years, and often, people start with opinions and then come up with logic and reasoning to match their opinions. I think this exercise will be much more productive if we try to go where the data leads us as opposed to leading the way with just the logic and reasoning. Obviously, you have to apply logics and reasoning to the data, but we should start with the data, because that's the thing that's been missing in all the discussions to date.

MEGAN RICHARDS:

Well, how can I not agree with you? Logic and reasoning only has its place when it's based on fact and some data. I agree with everything that's been said, and we have to do this on the basis of facts and what we see, but I have another point, and that is – and I like your approach, first. I think the idea is very good, but are we not biting off more than we can chew here? If we're actually going to do a survey of applicants in each of these areas, will we ever be able to be finished on time? Well,

some people say it's a very bad outcome of every research article, but most research articles say this is a very interesting finding, more research is necessary.

Some scientists say that's a terrible conclusion, some say this is [inaudible]. My approach is that in some of these areas, we'll have to say we don't have the data yet, but data is necessary and we need another year to gather it, or this is for the next phase. This is something that's not going to stop at the end of this year, there's a subsequent phase, etc. So I think also identifying what needs to be done in other phases is also a good outcome of our work, so I'm just a bit concerned that we're going to try to do too much and not be able to achieve it. That's my only concern, but on everything else, I agree.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Well, that's why we discussed dropping consumer trust, I think.

MEGAN RICHARDS: [inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK: No, it's just an inside joke, sorry. And I appreciate that, and I guess a part of my comment back to Kaili is that I would prefer being inconclusive than being conclusive in an unsupported fashion. In other words, it would be better. But the other thing I guess in this specific – remember, this is just me spit balling examples into this, and I don't see those two as separate surveys of applicants. We're talking about doing a

survey of people that might have applied from the developing world, so they might just be different questions within that survey.

We're already planning to do that, and so it's just the question – is once we've defined those hypotheses, that'll help us figure out what the questions are we might want to ask them, so having done the homework of coming up with a hypothesis – and as Stan puts it, gaining an understanding of the data we need to – what do we need to do to support that hypothesis is the kind of thing that will then inform a survey or a study on DNS abuse, et cetera, which might again support or not support a number of hypotheses. So the answer is yes, I agree, but don't be intimidated by the way this particular one is filled out.

In many instances, it might be this single research project that is enlisted in all of these. Like this one great article that Laureen assigned to someone is actually meant to address three different hypotheses. The purpose of this is when people report back on it, to report back through the lens of the hypothesis that it was designed to address. So this process isn't meant to take on more than we want to take on, but just to do it in a structured way.

JAMIE HEDLUND: Thanks. First of all, I find this discussion richly ironic taking place here in DC, all this talk about facts and data, but I'm glad to be part of it.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible].

JAMIE HEDLUND:

This is all new to me, but just on the issue of the research column, if we're going to expand it, one thing maybe to consider is also what data do we have? Because we do have a ton of data, and to your point about some things where we may not have data, we have to defer, it might make sense to look at more closely what data we do have and driving hypotheses that we can test. That's it, thanks.

DREW BAGLEY:

Just to build off of what was said a few speakers ago, I just want to say we shouldn't sell ourselves short, in large part because of the fact that we're setting an enormous precedent. Our report will be released after the transition – assuming the transition takes place – and can really be used – not only can our data be used as a framework for future reviews, but even our model can be used and will be looked upon by future reviews, because there haven't been that many reviews total in the history of ICANN, so any review at this point is setting a precedent to a degree.

Because of that, we should definitely be completely data-driven, and then in instances in which we don't have the time to get the data or draw the conclusions, we should at least articulate a plan that a future review should do as one of our recommendations. And then to comment on the chart for research, I think that'd be great if we broke that into – as Jamie said – we broke that up maybe into – I guess maybe a couple of ways. Primary research and secondary research, as well as studies that have already been conducted and those we'd like to commission or search for.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Drew. That's exactly right. Just at a purely practical level, not only are we trying to be more data-driven, but we're also the first review team that's going to stay together, or at least some subset of us to stay together through implementation, which is different, and then I think this notion of continuous improvement, like the metrics for success of the recommendations is another piece that we're trying to set as a precedent, so there's a lot of work to be done there.

Brian, go ahead.

BRIAN AITCHISON:

I just wanted to respond to Stan's initial comment, and some of the comments that have been passed around here. First off, I'm also very supportive of this commitment to what is essentially the scientific method. It's going to serve us in the long run in terms of credibility, and just utility of the data. So just adding my two cents there, but also – and I think more importantly and perhaps more useful for us is in our Safeguards Team, we essentially have a matrix that unpacks this research column – of course, as it applies to the safeguards, and this is something we're going to review in our breakout session, but it may serve as a model for how we unpack this research column here.

It lists the kinds of things we want to test, possible ways to test it, whether a vendor would be useful, whether ICANN staff might have the data to do it, and also just to prioritize. In terms of the safeguards, there are some that don't really demand as much sort of rigorous analytical

focus as others, just because some are very difficult to impossible to measure.

That's something to consider. I just want to draw your attention to that, and I think it might serve as a useful model for that sort of next step in conducting the more specific research. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Brian. Carlos?

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: Thank you, Jonathan. I want to comment on two things from previous reviews that Larry mentioned. One is anecdotal. There was a big worry about overview or transparency of ICANN's finances. We spent hours discussing if it was important or not, and we spent even more hours drafting a letter to the governments if they thought finance was important. We sent the letter out, and nobody answered the letter.

And then they said, "Okay, finance is not important." Nobody answered the letter or very few governments answered the letter. And now we have a new bylaw where the community can block the budget of ICANN. So it was important.

So I really think we have to take very seriously the logic of the hypothesis. I agree with Kaili. We have to be very strict with the logic if the hypothesis has anything to do with competition, choice and trust. Not even safeguards, it's not in the title.

And second, Drew, I don't agree with your view that we're going to spend three months drafting and then send it out. We have to get feedback from the community all along and as soon as possible, even before the draft comes out. We have to get feedback on the structure of the document and not keep it separate three chapters and so on. The most important lesson from the ATRT 2 is we didn't have that amount of money, we didn't have that amount of data and we procrastinated on how to spend it and what data to collect, and we went out too late to let third parties make a review. It was in the summer, it was August, nobody would answer, the report of this third party came too late and so on.

So I think we have a big opportunity, we already have third party information and let's make the decision. If we're going to do some third party research, let's make the decision now. Please, thank you very much.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks for your comments, Carlos. I think it's been our objective to try and prioritize research questions at the top of our schedule for sure. It always proves harder than we think it will, and sometimes some of our findings may suggest further research, and so we'll have to figure that out, but I think we're trying to do what you're suggesting. Obviously, the disconnect between the ATRT and the CCWG has a lot of nuance that would be easy to go into, but I think that's still interesting. But I think we're going to prioritize research, and I think the one measure of success of this meeting, this face-to-face here in Washington DC will be if we have a comprehensive set of research projects. I think that's

probably our number one goal for the next day and a half, is to have that list complete. If I was to name one, I think that would probably be the right one.

I'll go to Margie first, because I don't know if your thing is related but –

MARGIE MILAM:

Yes, it relates to the template, and I guess the goals of the session. It sounds like I'm just repeating what you're all saying, is you want to be able to come out of this and feel success by identifying the additional research that needs to get done. One of the things I thought when we pulled this thing together was that it might be useful to start digging into some of these hypotheses where there is data, because as you know, there are a lot of places where we have data.

To answer your question as to how you want to spend your time, you want to spend your time focusing on data requests, or conversely, do you actually want to do some analysis? I think you'll feel better as a group if you start doing some analysis where you can, but I don't want to – obviously it's up to you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

I guess use your microphone, Megan, and then –

MEGAN RICHARDS:

[inaudible].

JONATHAN ZUCK:

That's adorable, Megan. And to Stan's observation, one of the things we need to do is figure out who's doing what as well, so one of the next documents we're going to look at is the staff of actually – it was primarily I think Pam and I think Eleeza went through all the resource recommendations that have come in e-mails and everything else. Every document we pointed to and tried to sort out what portions, what high level questions those documents apply to, for example, so we have a more comprehensive list there, but I've been bypassing Laureen, so go ahead.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

First of all, I want to reinforce what Margie said, which is that at least from the Safeguards Team, I think we're in danger of a data dump. We have a ton of data. Carlos, my next comment is going to be to you, so that's my subtle way of asking for your attention. I think that that is very good advice. We have a lot of resources, in fact, we just got even more resources with the Nielsen study. But Carlos, I had a question for you, because you just talked about the need for having public input all along the way, and of course, we have a formal opportunity for public input after our interim recommendations, but I think what I'm hearing you say is that there should be some more formal opportunities for input before that, and I'm wondering exactly how you see that happening. Are you asking for input on the results of the Nielsen study? Are you asking for input on the way we are proposing to be data driven? I'm just curious as to what your ask is there.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: I think we should share the results of Nielsen and analysis as soon as possible with that community, with our reading of what's important of those reports. Like send it out, say "Listen, we've got this report and we think A, B and C is very important, and C, D and E is inconclusive, and the rest you can forget." Because if we don't do it, they will come back and say, "Hey, listen, you didn't read slide number 83 of Nielsen and that was the most important one, and you didn't check it, you didn't test it and you didn't write anything about your report." This is the first thing I would strongly recommend, because we have a ton of analysis already in those reports.

The second one is to be very critical about the data we have. In our case, it's lots of papers. There are a lot of papers that are before the new gTLDs, so they don't speak about new gTLDs, and there are a lot of papers after the gTLDs but they don't talk about the gTLDs. We should discard them as soon as possible, insofar that some issues might be covered by the Security and Stability Review. I read four papers, and two of them are just purely technical papers that I guess belong to the other area of the review, two are very related to our task.

So by going as fast as possible and discarding the data and the hypotheses that are not related to our work, we can focus more on the deeper issues. That was the comment I wanted to do in the subgroup, to try to – but I think it's very important. Are we recording?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yes.

CARLOS RAUL GUTIERREZ: To be very explicit to the community about what we think is relevant, important and we're going to address, and send this message as soon as possible, so later on they won't come and say, "You missed it, you forgot that or we don't agree that is important, you should have put another issue covering our backs."

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Carlos, and I think those are good suggestions. I think there's a difference between a formal public comment period versus just being maybe summarized reporting, or something like that you're talking about, so that people don't have to dig through the transcript of the Safeguards Team to figure out what they found was important about the survey or something. The problem is it'll take someone to own responsibility for creating the three paragraphs or whatever it is that the team found to be important, so this is going to come back to this notion of individual responsibility that in order for that level of reporting to happen along the way, it's going to require some rigor, right?

There's no question, so we just need to be – everybody needs to be careful what they're voting for, because there's nobody to hand that off to, so we'll have to make sure that we're on top of it from that perspective. Eleeza, go ahead.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: I also don't want to take up too much more time, but as you go into your breakout sessions, we just wanted to point out this Google sheet that we have here before you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: [inaudible].

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Okay, do you want to talk about it?

JONATHAN ZUCK: [inaudible].

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Well, two things. One, I am endorsing Margie's suggestion that we do some analysis of what we have now, and make an interim kind of statement. That's the first thing.

Secondly, I'm also endorsing Carlos's suggestion that we communicate with the community – like on webinars and things like that – what we know. We extract it and we put it out there early, and there are several ways that we can do that. For example, you mentioned the ALAC webinar series that allow you to speak to various community members.

That's one way to do it.

And the other thing that I would want to suggest is that if we spend the time here, putting out some analyzed information to the community, I think it would be a big bonus for us going into any one of these other meetings that we are planning. I really do believe so.

The final thing is – maybe it's just me, but did you hear Larry Strickling just increase the mandate for this review team?

JONATHAN ZUCK:

No, I didn't hear him increase the mandate.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

Well, when you said to him that we're looking at competition, choice and trust and you said "Well, those are not the only questions that this team can answer," for example, and when he pushed back immediately by saying to you, "Well, you couldn't have a situation where you say there is zero trust that is related." I am interpreting that to mean that in his mind place, there is a larger overarching question that this reporting could actually provide some information on. That's my view of what he said. I perked up, because when he pushed back so sharply at you, I said

“Okay, what is he coming with?” And that what I heard, I just wanted to put that on the table.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

I just found that as a way to not address the questions directly, as a politic answer. But to get to your point and to Larry’s, I think that he sees it as our role to look at whether or not the advantages of the new gTLD program outweigh their disadvantages. That’s kind of the observation we’re trying to make, that here’s some good stuff that occurred, here’s some bad stuff that occurred, and on balance, did it make the world a better place or not is kind of what he was getting at, so I don’t know that he thought of anything in particular we ought to be adding to our analysis. I think that just as a general sense, he wasn’t placing too much of an emphasis on competition or trust or anything in particular, but more like did we feel like the advantages of the program outweighed the disadvantages?

My question actually harkened back to Bruce’s statements to us in Marrakech, which is that all things being equal, there should be new gTLDs. That was Bruce’s point. And we’ll never get to this point of exact neutrality, but Bruce’s thought was that all things being equal, it should just be open season and free to have new TLDs whenever you want them. So this analysis about advantages and disadvantages is about the fact that all things are never equal, and I think that was Larry’s fundamental point, is can we get to an idea, whether or not the advantages outweigh the disadvantages.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: And that's what I wanted to get at, that's why I used the word overarching view, because I think that's what he's pushing too. And I'm glad you made the connection to Bruce Duncan's remarks in Marrakech, because I think that's exactly what he's saying. I think he wants the broader question to be elevated in the report as opposed to competition, choice and trust. I think that's what he's actually alluding to, but I'm glad you made that connection.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I knew you were going to perk up, Jamie, the way you would phrase that, and the problem is that the moment we do that, we're going to be prioritizing things and I think that's where we're going to end up with a lot of interesting feedback from the community. In other words, I could make the case that improving trust was more important than improving competition, and therefore as a high level thing, the fact that there are more choices, just the fact that they haven't – and nobody's made use – availed themselves to them yet is less important than that they exist.

That, again, gets back to the old ways of "Here's my opinion," and so I think we're just going to want to be as cautious as possible about drawing very high level conclusions like that, that can be summarized in one line, because that'll be the area in which we're most vulnerable to criticism, I think. Stan, go ahead.

STAN BESEN: Economists usually make a distinction between positive economics and normative economics. Positive is what happened, and I think it's

important that we turn to that first. It's a separate issue, which is whether it was good or bad.

The second is likely to be far more controversial. I'm not sure we agree on it, but in fact, we should be able to try to answer the question: what happened? And that seems me that should be our initial focus.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Right, which is why I was trying to push Larry for the normative. In other words, is increased competition considered an innate good? Is choice – that was to get at that very question, because I would love for some outside authority to tell us how to suggest whether things are good or bad, so that our work can mostly be about the positive economics and less about the normative, because normative would just – we would fill in blanks in theory. Anyone else?

Okay, then I'm going to hand it back to Eleeza to talk about the next part of this, which is this very big project that Eleeza worked on together with Pam, and all the resources that we have that have been suggested thus far, etc. and kind of how they fit into the questions that we asked in LA so that this, again, can be a template for individual assignments. It's sort of an expansion of Laureen's work within the group for assigning resources. I'll hand it over to Eleeza.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:

Thank you, Jonathan. I'll do this quickly, because we're already over time into your subteam breakouts, but the first sheet that you see here – I've put the link for this Google sheet in the chat of the Adobe Connect

room. The first sheet you see here is sort of the translation of the template we had up there earlier, and we've sort of taken a crack at some of the hypotheses and research that we've heard so far to try to match up some of those.

If you go to the second sheet, which is actually Sheet 1, because we're working in French and English – cross-continent. What Pamela and I together did – Pamela did the yeoman's task of going through all of our e-mail lists and pulling up all of the recommended data sources that were published to the list either by staff or by all of you, as well as e-mails that came into the CCT input inbox, stuff that was exchanged on your subteam mailing lists and so on and so forth, and I went through – first we had 300, I got it down to 200. There was some repetition in there and some things that weren't necessarily data sources, so it's a pretty robust list. Some of it is data sources, datasets, research papers. Some of those articles that you found interesting, so that may point you to other data sources that are interesting.

What I did is I went, I looked at each link and kind of added summaries or whatever. If you scroll over to the right a little bit – it's hard to read in Google Sheets. If you download it into Excel, it's a little bit easier, because then you can put them in diagonal columns, but I mapped it to each of the high level research questions for each of the subteams, so for the application evaluation process, if you for example click on that cell J1, you can see up there the string contention process. That's one of your high level topics you're interested in.

If you [inaudible] all the Xes in that column, you'll see all of the data sources that I think are relevant to that topic when you get down to that

topic and discussing that topic per each question in each subteam. I was trying to find a good way of mapping that back to the first sheet under the research column, but I couldn't figure out a way of doing that without it getting really confusing and overwhelming and too much in one cell. It may be easier to do what Stan has suggested, where once we go through each hypothesis and say this is the research that needs to be done, this is the dataset we have that we can kind of connect it back to this sheet. I kind of wanted to see how those discussions went today and tomorrow before I got too much deeper into that, but I hope that you'll find this useful as you're going through your topics. It's kind of an easier way to sort through all that we have, and everything has a link to it, so you should be able to get to all of it.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thank you. This is an incredible document, so thank you to you and Pam for your work on it. Having it all in one place is incredibly useful, and being able to filter on what questions things apply to I think is really valuable as well.

Any other questions? So, everybody, please take a look at this document, and we'll make use of it I think in the subteams in terms of assignments and things like that. But the bottom line is when you're making a report on something, try to do it through the filter of the question that was being asked, the observation and the hypothesis around that observation. Okay?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Just to add, as I'm seeing new things pop up in the list, I'm trying to add it into this document, since it is a living document, so you may see new things pop up. I think we did, but I'll send [inaudible]. Sorry, we didn't, I'll send it right now.

STAN BESEN: I may have said this earlier. There have actually been a number of studies that addressed questions like the ones we're addressing here, and even though the data are old, we can learn something from the methodology. For example, there are some studies of the effect of the introduction of .biz, and I think we should not – you don't have to invent the wheel here, but there are places which we could look at what people have done before, and benefit from it. I tried in my [inaudible] project to indicate in places where in the past similar questions were asked and they appear in public reports, and we should kind of make use of that. Unfortunately, a lot of them are dated, but I think we can still learn something from them.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yes. The Safeguards and Trust group stays in this room, and then the other group goes in the forum room, which is across from here.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Actually, if you'll follow me.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]