

1. For how many TLDs did you apply?

- a. 1-5
- b. 6-10
- c. 10-20
- d. 20-50
- e. 50-100
- f. 100+

2. What is the current status of your application(s)? (select all that apply)

- a. Active: Proceeding toward delegation
- b. Active: Engaged in a Dispute Resolution Procedure
- c. Delegated
- d. Withdrawn
- e. Other (TEXT BOX)

3. How would you describe your primary business?

- a. Registrar
- b. Registry
- c. Community organization
- d. Government agency
- e. Corporate brand
- f. Other (TEXT BOX)

4. How would you describe the TLDs for which you applied?

- a. Generic
- b. Brand
- c. IDN
- d. Community
- e. Other (TEXT BOX)

5. Why did you apply for a new gTLD?

- a. Open text box

6. How did you hear about the program? (select all that apply)

- a. I learned about it as an active participant in the ICANN community
- b. Professional counsel told me about it
- c. Word of mouth

Commented [1]: Comment from Carlos: "it is a very interesting questionnaire, and also very long. I would suggest some editing at least in the sequence of the questions, both overall and the sequence under single questions, to make it more user friendly."

Commented [2]: Agreed that this is long. Nielsen proposed a 15-minute survey with 7 other-specifies (questions that include finite responses or a possibility to fill in an "other" text box) as well as 7 open-ended questions. This is a substantial amount of writing we are requesting of respondents and Nielsen is concerned about the quality of the responses we may receive.

Commented [3]: From Stan: 1. Should we ask whether the applicant previously operated a registry? I know that the number is small but it might be interesting to document whether the applicant was an incumbent.
2. For question 3, should we add backend provider as a category?

Commented [4]: A couple of points to consider: The more questions we add regarding who the respondent represents, the longer the questionnaire becomes. As we know quite a lot about those who will be responding to the survey, Nielsen can build in the "demographics" of the respondent population into the back-end, such that we know how many respondents represented IDNs, brands, used back-end providers, etc. Are there any additional categories for which we'd want to sort the data?

Formatted: Indent: Hanging: 0.25", Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style, Outline numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: a, b, c, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.75" + Indent at: 0.5"

Commented [5]: Rather than leaving an open-end, suggest tightening by providing a finite list of options. We can add to this list: Terminated, Will not proceed

Commented [6]: Suggest including "Consultancy" and/or "Law firm"

- d. I saw/heard an advertisement for the program
- e. I was advised to apply
- f. Another entity that manage my domain names suggested it
- g. I was waiting for an application window to open
- h. Other (TEXT BOX)

Commented [7]: Comment from Gao: "Could we add a text box to enable them to say who had advised them to apply?"

7. Prior to applying for a new gTLD, how did you participate in the ICANN community? (select all that apply)

- a. I am a contracted party with ICANN
- b. I regularly attended ICANN meetings
- c. I submitted public comments on policy issues
- d. I participated in a Policy Development Process
- e. I was a member of a Supporting Organization (SO) or an Advisory Committee (AC)
- f. I did not actively participate in the ICANN community
- g. Other (TEXT BOX)

Commented [8]: Consider removing this option

8. Did you use a consulting service or other outside firm to submit your application?

- a. Yes
 - i. If YES, with what portions of the application did the consulting firm assist in preparing? (select all that apply)
 - 1. Financial
 - 2. Technical
 - 3. General application assistance
 - 4. Other (TEXT BOX)
- b. No
- c. I represent a consulting firm that helped applicants with their applications

9. Did your application receive GAC advice?

- a. Yes
 - i. If YES, how did you respond to the entity that issued the advice?
 - ↳ Open text box
 - ii. If YES, what impact did the GAC advice have on your application?
 - ↳ Open text box
- b. No

Commented [9]: Lauren's suggested edit: If YES, how did you respond to that advice. Lauren's comment: "I don't think entities responded directly to the GAC."

Commented [10]: I'd also suggest deleting this question as it seems the more relevant question is ii. below it.

10. Did your application receive a GAC Early Warning? Does not GAC Early Warning come BEFORE Gac Advce? if yes, the I would invert the sequence of #9 and #10

- a. Yes

Commented [11]: Same suggestion from PDP WG.

- i. If YES, how did you respond to the entity that issued the early warning?
 - 1. Open text box
 - ii. If YES, what impact did the GAC early warning have on your application?
 - 1. Open text box
- b. No

11. Did your application receive GAC advice?

a. Yes

i. If YES, how did you respond to the entity that issued the advice?

1. Open text box

ii. If YES, what impact did the GAC advice have on your application?

1. Open text box

b. No

12. Did you incorporate voluntary Public Interest Commitments (PICs) into your application?

a. No

b. Yes. If so, why? Please briefly summarize the nature and objectives of the PICs included in your application, including why you incorporated them, your goal in including these PICs, and whether that goal has been accomplished to date. (TEXT)

3

Volunteer PICS questions (suggested by Drew)

Why did you incorporate a voluntary Public Interest Commitment into your application?

What was your goal with the voluntary Public Interest Commitment?

Was this goal accomplished?

How do you ensure compliance with the provisions of your voluntary Public Interest Commitment?

132. What are the biggest challenges you faced during the application and evaluation process?

a. Open text box

143. Of those challenges, which were unexpected and why?

a. Open text box

154.

Commented [12]: Lauren's suggested edit: "If YES, how did you respond to the early warning?"

Commented [13]: Doesn't the question below regarding impact incorporate the "how did you

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial, 11 pt

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial, 11 pt

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial, 11 pt

Commented [14]: Lauren's suggested edit: If YES. ...

Commented [15]: I'd also suggest deleting this ...

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial, 11 pt

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial, 11 pt

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial, 11 pt

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial, 11 pt

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial, 11 pt

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial, 11 pt

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial, 11 pt

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial, 11 pt

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial, 11 pt

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial, 11 pt

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial, 11 pt

Commented [16]: Lauren's suggest edit: "

Commented [17]: Lauren's suggested edit: "Do you

Commented [18]: Carlos agrees with Drew's

Commented [19]: Comment from Fabro: "I was

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Font: Bold

Commented [20]: These questions may be combine

Commented [21]: Could this also be incorporated in

Formatted: Indent: First line: 0"

Commented [22]: Could we combine these into a

Commented [23]: Lauren's suggested edit: "1. Do

Do you believe releasing new gTLDs in rounds is an effective means of adding new gTLDs to the DNS? Why or why not? Do you support another means?
Please explain if so.

165. Overall, how would you rate your satisfaction with the application process?
a. (SCALE OF MOST-TO-LEAST SATISFIED)

176. Overall, how would you rate your satisfaction with the application evaluation process?
a. (SCALE OF MOST-TO-LEAST SATISFIED)

187. Overall, how would you rate your satisfaction with the transition to delegation process? (DO NOT ASK OF WITHDRAWN APPLICANTS)
a. (SCALE OF MOST-TO-LEAST SATISFIED)

WITHDRAWN APPLICANTS, SAME AS ABOVE, BUT ADD:

1. Why did you withdraw your application?

- a. Cost
- b. Technical requirements
- c. Contention process
- d. The marketplace for new gTLDs no longer seemed attractive
- e. Other (TEXT BOX)

2. At what point in the process did you withdraw your application?

- a. Evaluation
- b. Contracting
- c. PDT
- d. Other (TEXT BOX)

19

Volunteer PICS questions (suggested by Drew)

~~Why did you incorporate a voluntary Public Interest Commitment into your application?~~

~~What was your goal with the voluntary Public Interest Commitment?~~

~~Was this goal accomplished?~~

~~How do you ensure compliance with the provisions of your voluntary Public Interest Commitment?~~

TO ALL APPLICANTS:

Do you want your answers to remain anonymous?

Commented [24]: Laureen's suggested edit: "Do you believe releasing new gTLDs in sequenced rounds is an effective means of adding new gTLDs to the DNS? " and comment "Folks may not understand this terminology."

Commented [25]: Suggestion from PDP WG: Would you apply for a new gTLD again under the same AGB?

Commented [26]: Lauren's suggested edit: "Do you think sufficient support was available to applicants to complete the application process?"

Commented [27]: Carlos agrees with Drew's suggested language

Commented [28]: Comment from Fabro: "I was reviewing some PICS of gTLDs in Brazil, and one question we could add is How they process the PICS requirements/criteria. One of the cases I reviewed uses a council board member, and the process is really slow and subjective, the other used algorithms.

Eventually it is essential to know for matters of trust how they set up the reviewing process of PICS.

Just one idea. all the rest is fine by me."

Commented [29]: These questions may be combined into a single open-ended question and seem to be covered by Q12 above. See edits to Q12.

- a. Yes
- b. No, you may include my identity (FILL IN TITLE, FIRM, ETC.)

Would you be willing to participate in a telephone interview to provide more details

- a. Yes (contact information box)
- b. No

Formatted: Indent: Hanging: 0.25", Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style, Outline numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: a, b, c, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 1.75" + Indent at: 1"