

	Project	Data resources	Suggested by	Project Description	Notes	Questions	Assignee
1. Has the expansion of gTLDs been effective at promoting price competition between TLD operators?							
1.1	Compare pre- and post-prices by string in the after market	Sedo	Jonathan	Using the "Buy Now" price data from SEDO from just before the first delegation and now, compute the average price percentage delta for the the common (to both lists) strings	7/26 - Do we have data? Follow up with Jonathan	What do you plan to do with data? Will it be published in your report? May want to consider implications of publication and if Sedo or others are comfortable with a public release of their data.	JB, JZ and Eleeza to discuss with possible data providers
1.2	Compare pricing vs. single-string ROs and multi-string ROs	DNPrice.es, Analysis Group data sets	Jonathan	Using the most current wholesale price data, calculate average price by number of strings managed by registry	7/26 - Discuss with AG		See above
1.3	Basic market share calculations	ICANN Monthly Transaction Reports, Analysis Group pricing data, ntlidstats.com, CENTR and other ccTLD data sources (APTLD report)	Stan	Using the most current data calculate: agreed to use of ntlidstats.com data; these are benchmarks we will be setting? I agree with the importance of the 4 ratios in reaching conclusion Number of Registrants in New gTLDs/Number of Registrants in All gTLDs Number of Registrants in New gTLDs/Number of Registrants in All gTLDs + Number of Registrants in All ccTLDs Number of Registrants in New gTLDs/(Number of Registrants in New gTLDs + the Increase in the Number of Registrants in Legacy gTLDs Since Start of Entry of New gTLDs) Number of Registrants in New gTLDs/(Number of Registrants in New gTLDs + the Increase in the Number of Registrants in Legacy gTLDs Since Start of Entry of New gTLDs + the Increase in the Number of Registrants in ccTLDs Since Start of Entry of New gTLDs) Number of Registrants in New gTLDs/Number of Registrants in all ccTLDs Number of Registrants in New gTLDs/Number of registrations of all ccTLDs less the open ccTLDs Number of Registrants in New gTLDs/Number of registrations in all ccTLDs since start of new gTLD program Number of Registrants in New gTLDs/Number of registrations in all ccTLDs less the open ccTLDs since start of new gTLD program What is the proportion of new gTLD applicants who signed the RA but exceeded the 12-month deadline to go live? This can give an indication of the propensity for defensive applications	Also applicable to Q2: non-price competition 7/26 - Need ccTLD data 7/26 -- Eleeza sent ccTLD data to AG	Define what open ccTLDs are/which are included. Possible Google list which JB will share.	AG can include in Phase 2 report.
1.4	Basic registry market structure calculations	ICANN Monthly Transaction Reports, Analysis Group pricing data, ntlidstats.com	Stan	Using the most current registrant data calculate: 4-Firm and 8-Firm Concentration Ratios and HHIs for New gTLD Registries 4-Firm and 8-Firm Concentration Ratios and HHIs for All gTLD Registries 4-Firm and 8-Firm Concentration Ratios and HHIs for Registrars in New gTLD Registries 4-Firm and 8-Firm Concentration Ratios and HHIs for Registrars in All gTLD Registries 4-Firm and 8-Firm Concentration Ratios and HHIs for Backend Providers for New gTLD Registries 4-Firm and 8-Firm Concentration Ratios and HHIs for Backend Providers for All gTLD Registries	Also applicable to Q2: non-price competition		AG will do calculations and provide separate report for team.
1.5	gTLD registry price analysis	Analysis Group pricing data	Stan	Project 3 (gTLD Registry Price Analysis) Calculate: Percentage change in the price of each legacy gTLD registry price since start of entry of new gTLDs. Indicate whether the legacy gTLD is subject to a price cap and whether the price cap changed since start of entry of new gTLDs. Mean, median, top quartile, and bottom quartile prices of new gTLD Registries. Mean Price of new gTLD Registries – Mean Price of legacy gTLD Registries	Do same calculations for parked domains. 8/2: Waiting on email from Jordyn to ntlid stats for legacy gTLD parked domain info.		AG
1.6	Registry market segmentation analysis	Analysis Group market share calculations and pricing data	Stan	Update Analysis Group Table 12 with additional Registry Groups and additional Registries included in the Analysis Group groupings and calculate HHIs for each group. I would settle for the AG groupings, they appear adequate to make conclusions and their data is readily available in the AG report; generally it appears that there is no standard way of comin up with groupings Perform the same calculations as in (1) for language and geographic groups. Calculate: Correlation between average group price and group HHI.	Also applicable for segmentation		AG
Relevant CCT metrics See metrics under Domain Name Registrations (https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/cct-metrics-domain-name-registration-2016-06-27-en)							
2. Has the expansion of gTLDs been effective at promoting non-price competition between TLD operators?							

	Project	Data resources	Suggested by	Project Description	Notes	Questions	Assignee	
1. Has the expansion of gTLDs been effective at promoting price competition between TLD operators?								
	2.1 Projects that Depend on Responses to the Nielsen Registrant Survey	Nielsen registrant survey, see also metrics 2.9 (https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/cct-metrics-domain-name-registration-2016-06-27-en#2.9), 2.11 (https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/cct-metrics-domain-name-registration-2016-06-27-en#2.11), and 3.8 (https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/cct-metrics-domain-name-registration-2016-06-27-en#3.8)	Stan	What proportion of the registrants in the new gTLDs were previously registrants in a legacy gTLD but gave up their registrations when they registered in a new gTLD? This will provide some indication of the importance of switching costs. What proportion of the registrants in the new gTLDs had not previously been registrants in any gTLD? This will provide some indication of the extent to which the introduction of new gTLDs expanded the number of individual registrants. What proportion of the registrants in the new gTLDs are entities that continued to have registrations in legacy gTLDs? This will provide some indication of whether registrations in legacy and new gTLDs are complements as opposed to substitutes. What proportion of the registrants in the new gTLDs registered primarily: (a) for defensive reasons, i.e., they felt compelled to register in a new gTLD because they existed but obtained no benefits from doing so and what proportion registered primarily (b) for the benefits that they received, perhaps because doing so permitted them to reach users that would have otherwise been inaccessible? This will provide some indication of whether, on balance, the introduction of new gTLDs resulted in net costs or net benefits to registrants. What are the characteristics of the new gTLDs that attracted registrants primarily because of the benefits that they offered? This will provide some indication of the sources of the benefits that the new gTLDs provided, e.g., new allowable characters, service to a specific community, higher levels of security or customer service, ability to offer domain names to non-competing entities.	Also applicable to Q4 on segmentation		Nielsen	
	2.2 User-oriented (registration) policies: What is the range of policies by new gTLD? Easier vs. harder to register a name. Compare frequencies of registration policies?	CCT metrics 7.1-7.3 (https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/cct-metrics-registries-2016-06-27-en#7.1) and Ry policy research on CCT wiki (https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/58727390/New%20gTLD%20Registry%20Policies.xlsx?version=1&modificationDate=1468006824000&api=v2)	Eleeza	Snapshot in time of registration policies as those captured in metrics 7.1-7.3 (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/cct-metric-policy-accessibility-19feb16-en.xlsx) for the top 30 new gTLD registries by registration. Analyzing varying policies across 1,000+ registries is not likely to result in easily assessable or usable data, thus exploring differences in policies for a defined set of registries may be a more instructive exercise. For each policy that a registry may employ, indicate key words (i.e. use policy key words may include: jurisdiction limited, content defined, etc.)	ICANN has compiled a table of all policies for top 30 new gTLDs			
	2.3 Compliance rules: Which registries have specific compliance rules and what are the differences? (columns are TLDs and rows are the characteristics). What is the frequency with which the characteristic shows up?	(https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/59649228/Top%2030_GAC%20Category%201%20String_PICs.xlsx?version=1&modificationDate=1468407761000&api=v2)	Eleeza					
	2.4 Privacy: Which registries have specific privacy rules?		Eleeza					Dejan to help categorize policies and key characteristics, as well as the sample.
	2.5 Study on strings that were registered in new gTLDs when a registrant could have registered a name in a legacy	Donuts study	Jordyn	(see http://www.donuts.domains/donuts-media/blog/the-proof-is-in-the-data-not-coms-are-superior-to-legacy-domains) For each new TLD, what fraction of the SLDs in that TLD are also available in .COM such that SLDTLD.COM is available? (Can also do similar analysis for other TLDs than COM, i.e. relevant ccTLDs.)		Q from ICANN: Do you want data for a point in time or a period of time?	ICANN can provide this calculation for new gTLDs, but not for ccTLDs (no access to registration data.)	
	2.6 Dispute resolution policy: URS vs. UDRP – did the URS make the new gTLDs more competitively attractive?	CCT Metrics on UDRP	Dejan	Not covered by TMCH or safeguards team. Dejan, What sources/questions would we need to answer this issue? David T. will liaise w/the team. TMCH and URS are new Right Protection Mechanisms brought with new gTLDs. Did these two mechanisms make new gTLDs more attractive? In this case we are comparing in the first place new gTLDs with legacy gTLDs and in the second place new gTLDs with ccTLDs. Given that UDRP applies to all gTLDs, it should be compared with related ccTLDs Right Protection Mechanisms. Did UDRP make gTLDs more attractive than ccTLDs?	RPM Review Report (Section 3) has feedback from TMCH users, TMCH review also has some data on how easy it was to register marks and use the service. ICANN can provide summary of this qualitative feedback from survey. User feedback sessions from LA and Marrakech meetings, as well. 7/26 - Follow up with Dan	Do we want to ask INTA to add this topic to its survey? S&T team also interested in TMCH satisfaction. How do we coordinate both these requests?	TMCH Review, RPM Review report	
Relevant CCT metrics	See metrics referenced above in data resources, including, 2.9, 2.11, 3.8, 7.1-7.3, and UDRP-related metrics 1.9a, 1.9b and 1.10.							

	Project	Data resources	Suggested by	Project Description	Notes	Questions	Assignee
1. Has the expansion of gTLDs been effective at promoting price competition between TLD operators?							
3. Competition among registrars/resellers							
	3.1	Registrar competition within registries	Analysis Group pricing data, Monthly Transaction Reports	Stan	Calculate: (1) 4-Firm, 8-Firm, and HHIs among Registrars for each legacy and new gTLD. (2) Correlations between mean and median registrar markups and each measure of registrar concentration.		AG
	3.2				SEE STAN'S PROJECTS FROM TOPIC FOR REGISTRY MARKET SHARES/ETC AND APPLY TO REGISTRARS		AG
Relevant CCT metrics See registrar metrics: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/cct-metrics-registrars-2016-06-27-en							
4. Is segmentation/regulation valuable to consumers?							
	4.1	Same as project under Q2 on policies for each registry, characteristics by registry	How to scrape websites for policies applicable to registries. Note which ones have PICs, as well.	Eleeza	See 2.2-2.4 above.		Policies compiled in a table and provided to sub team
	4.2	Is greater regulation and segmentation more valuable to the consumer as a user and less to the registrant? And vice versa?	Nielsen survey data asks about registration restrictions	Megan			Nielsen
	4.3	Restrict TLDs: % of addressable market (compare to .com/.cat)		Jordyn	(future research problem; probably led by RT members)		
Relevant CCT metrics Registries metrics: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/cct-metrics-registries-2016-06-27-en and domain name registrations: https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/cct-metrics-domain-name-registration-2016-06-27-en							
5. Have benefits of choice exceeded costs?							
	5.1	Have brands switched to their brand TLD and moved away from using their legacy TLDs. How many brand TLDs are in use and what fraction of those are canonical?	Brand Registry Group	Jordyn	- Overall usage: try to get ntdstats or VeriSign to provide comparable usage data across entire set of TLDs - Brands: Can ask BRG; alternatively, manual review of Spec 13 TLDs that have SLDs other than NIC active		
	5.2	Frequency of brand/TM registration across new gTLDsTo what extent we seeTMs being registered in the new gTLDs.		No owner assigned - - Seems to be captured in TMCH review			
	5.3	Cost of defensive behaviors	INTA member survey	Eleeza/David Taylor	Following up with INTA on this.	Update: David, Eleeza and other ICANN staff spoke with INTA on 20 June about the contours of its survey. They are working on an RFP to circulate among survey vendors, and are open to discussing topics of the questionnaire with the review team.	
	5.4	How easy is it to register a domain name/one you're satisfied with?	Nielsen registrant survey				Nielsen
	5.5	Are there more registrations than in the past? What about multiple registrations of the same string?	CCT metrics 2.9 and 3.8 (https://www.icann.org/resources/reviews/cct/metrics)	Jordyn		7/26 - Jordyn to write project description	
	5.6	gTLD growth vs. ccTLD growth	CENTR, APTLD numbers, CCT metrics 2.6 (https://www.icann.org/resources/reviews/cct/metrics)	Jordyn	- Need historical data on ccTLD numbers; need to agree on canonical sources		

	Project	Data resources	Suggested by	Project Description	Notes	Questions	Assignee	
1. Has the expansion of gTLDs been effective at promoting price competition between TLD operators?								
	5.7	Is the TMCH reducing the cost of possible UDRP/URS cases. Is presence of the string in the TMCH an indicator of fewer trips to the UDRP/URS for TM holders? Or are there fewer transgressions as a result?	Expanding questions via INTA survey. Think this analysis will be done by the TMCH review and look at those results when available.	Revisit when TMCH review is complete			AG-TMCH Review	
	5.8	Percentage of registrations that are pointing to an identical old address, redirects to root domain, outgoing vs. incoming, compare to legacy strings	Nielsen registrant survey, other sources?	Jordyn		7/26 - Project description		
	5.9	Trademark registrations across gTLDs	TMCH review	Stan	1. Select sample of trademarks (see e.g., Kruger and VanCouvering (2010)) 2. Populate spreadsheet (Trademark, Registered in com? (y/n), Registrations in all legacy gTLDs, Registrations in all new gTLDs; 3. Calculate descriptive statistics, e.g., means, medians, frequency distributions	Can conduct this for marks registered in TMCH, using a sample of marks produced for TMCH review (25% of all marks in TMCH). For non-TMCH use a sample use AG's sample of US PTO trademarks not already in TMCH. This sample was also calculated for TMCH review. 8/4: Analysis Group will conduct these calculations using its TMCH sample of strings.	Related to project 5.2 above?	Analysis Group
Relevant CCT metrics 2.6, 2.9 and 3.8, as referenced above.								
6. Do consumers have expanded choice in regions/languages?								
	6.1	Registrant survey: do registrants in languages/regions view relevant TLDs as expanded choice?	Nielsen				Nielsen	
	6.2	Registrants/users per region/languages compared to new gTLDs launched;	DNA study, market segmentation exercises	Megan	here the idea was to cross-reference users according to region/language if that can be defined to see if the new gTLDs had created a new "market" for those users. So for example: say German users were using berlin.com in German and then migrated to .berlin in German once the latter came onstream. Is it possible to see a net reduction in users of berlin.com and a net increase in .berlin?	7/26 - Can Megan define?		
Relevant CCT metrics 2.6, 2.7, 2.11								