

Competition, Consumer Trust & Consumer Choice Review Team – Draft Report

xxxxx 2016

Table of Contents

TABLE OF CONTENTS	2
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	3
BACKGROUND.....	4
THE CCT REVIEW TEAM’S FINDINGS AND DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS	7
Safeguards and Trust	7
Competition and Consumer Choice	11
Application and Evaluation Process of the New gTLD Program.....	18
CONCLUSION	21
LIST OF APPENDICES	22
Appendix A – Methodology.....	23
Appendix B – Surveys and Studies.....	26
Appendix C – Terms of Reference and Work Plan	29
Appendix D – Project Plan.....	30
Appendix E – Participation Summary	31
Appendix F – Glossary	32

Executive Summary

Convened under section 9.3 of the Affirmation of Commitments, the community-led Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice Review Team (referred to as the CCT-RT) is responsible for evaluating 1) how the new gTLD Program has promoted competition, consumer trust and consumer choice; 2) the effectiveness of the application and evaluation processes; 3) the effectiveness of safeguards put in place to mitigate issues involved in the expansion of the domain name space. The CCT-RT's **scope** includes reviewing the implementation of policy recommendations from the launch of the program through delegation and on to general availability. To conduct the evaluation, Review Team Members were asked to review data derived from processes related to the program, as well as broader inputs on marketplace indicators and consumer trends and feedback from the community.

TBP

CCT-RT Recommendations

The CCT-RT has analyzed both quantitative and qualitative data to produce draft recommendations for public comment.

Category: Competition & Consumer Choice

Category: Safeguards & Trust

Category: Application & Evaluation Process

Background

The Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice Review Team (CCT-RT) was convened under the [Affirmation of Commitments](#) section 9.3¹. The AOC prescribes that “when new gTLDs (whether in ASCII or other language character sets) have been in operation for one year, ICANN will organize a review that will examine the extent to which the introduction or expansion of gTLDs has promoted competition, consumer trust and consumer choice, as well as effectiveness of (a) the application and evaluation process, and (b) safeguards put in place to mitigate issues involved in the introduction or expansion. The CCT-RT was assembled in January 2016 and comprises 17 volunteer subject matter experts who represent the diversity of the global Internet stakeholders (see composition [here](#)).

In addition, to ensure a common understanding of the terms associated with the review - consumer, competition, consumer trust and consumer choice – the Review resolved to adopted recommendations to guide its work:

Consumer: Generally refers to a natural person, acting primarily for personal, family or household purposes and may, depending on the context, include businesses and government agencies as well. For the purposes of this review, consumers generally fall into two categories: (i) Internet Users and other market participants who make use of domains through DNS resolution, such as by navigating to a URL or sending an e-mail; and (ii) Registrants (and potential registrants).

Consumer trust: The confidence Consumers have in the function, reliability, safety, security, and authenticity of the domain name system. This includes (i) trust in the consistency of name resolution; (ii) confidence by Internet users that they can safely navigate to a domain name to find and safely use the site they intend to reach; (iii) *confidence that a TLD registry operator is fulfilling the Registry’s stated purpose; and (iv) confidence by a Registrant in a domain’s registration process and life cycle.*

Consumer choice: The range of meaningful options arising from new entrants and innovations over incumbent offerings available to Consumers for domain names (including in their preferred languages and scripts.)

Competition: The rivalry between two or more parties in the domain name ecosystem (including but not limited to registries, registrars, resellers, registry service providers and registrants) acting independently to secure the business of a third party by offering innovative products and services and or the most favorable terms.

Relevant Market: For the purpose of this review, the CCTRT shall consider the competitive effects, costs, and benefits of the introduction of new gTLDs on the international domain name market place, which also includes legacy gTLDs and ccTLDs. Furthermore, the team may explore the impact of the new gTLD program on *the broader “internet identity” (social media, WIX, etc.) market. However, competitive*

¹ The Affirmation of Commitments, signed on 30 September 2009 between ICANN and the U.S. Department of Commerce (the “AoC”) calls for periodic review of four key ICANN objectives: (a) ensure that decisions made related to the global technical coordination of the DNS are made in the public interest and are accountable and transparent; (b) preserve the security, stability and resiliency of the DNS; (c) promote competition, consumer trust, and consumer choice in the DNS marketplace; and (d) facilitate international participation in DNS technical coordination.

dynamics in the domain name ecosystem unrelated to the introduction of new gTLDs are not in the scope of this review. The review team may break down the overall market by sector or region for its review and recommendations.

Producing recommendations that are as data and fact driven as possible is fundamental: the CCT-RT has devised its report to have findings supported by data received prior to and throughout the process.

A number of initiatives were taken prior to the CCT-RT's launch to inform the Review Team's work (refer to appendix B for details):

- ⦿ The ICANN Board formed an Implementation Advisory Group for Competition, Consumer Trust & Consumer Choice (IAG-CCT) in September 2013 to review 70 metrics recommended by a GNSO-ALAC working group in December 2012. The IAG-CCT was tasked to make recommendations to the review team based on an evaluation of the feasibility, utility and cost-effectiveness of each of the proposed metrics. In September 2014, the IAG-CCT submitted its [final recommendations](#) to the ICANN Board, which [adopted](#) them in February 2015. The recommendations included the collection of 66 metrics related to competition, consumer trust and consumer choice. ICANN staff has been continuously gathering and publishing data related to most of these metrics on the ICANN [website](#).
- ⦿ The IAG-CCT made the recommendation to commission a survey of Internet users and registrants, to gauge their sense of trust and choice, and an economic study on gTLD pricing and marketplace. Both studies were commissioned, as recommended by the IAG-CCT (refer to appendix B for more information) and were crucial sources for the Review Team in building its draft recommendations.
- ⦿ The AoC mandates an examination of the effectiveness of the application and evaluation processes used in the 2012 round of gTLD applications, including ICANN's implementation of the policy recommendations made for the New gTLD Program. To help inform the CCT-RT, staff compiled and published the [Program Implementation Review report](#) to provide staff perspective on the execution of the New gTLD Program, as well as incorporating feedback from stakeholders including applicants, service providers and other community members.
- ⦿ Per its mandate, the Review Team is to assess the effectiveness of safeguards enacted to mitigate abuse. To inform the CCT-RT's work, ICANN collaborated with the ICANN community to generate a report on [New gTLD Program Safeguards Against DNS Abuse](#) that explores methods for measuring the effectiveness of safeguards to mitigate Domain Name System (DNS) abuse that were implemented as part of the New gTLD Program, as well as a report on [Rights Protection Mechanism Review](#), focused on key protection mechanisms such as the Trademark Clearinghouse, the Uniform Rapid Suspension System and Post-Delegation Dispute Resolution.

To supplement the existing data, the CCT-RT requested additional surveys and studies to further inform its work – see appendix B for details.

The CCT Review Team's Findings and Draft Recommendations

Safeguards and Trust

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

WORK AREAS

1. DNS ABUSE

Has the new gTLD program put mechanisms in place to improve trustworthiness in the DNS?

- ⊙ Sub-questions
- ⊙ Findings
- ⊙ Research undertaken
- ⊙ Causes
- ⊙ Priority to address
- ⊙ Recommendation
- ⊙ Metrics
 - Analysis of recommendation implementation
 - Assessment of recommendation effectiveness and metrics
 - Priority to address
 - Relevant annexes and appendices

Did the new safeguards mitigate DNS abuse?

- ⊙ Sub-questions
- ⊙ Findings
- ⊙ Research undertaken
- ⊙ Causes
- ⊙ Priority to address

-
- ⊙ Recommendation
 - ⊙ Metrics
 - Analysis of recommendation implementation
 - Assessment of recommendation effectiveness and metrics
 - Priority to address
 - Relevant annexes and appendices

2. IMPACT OF SAFEGUARDS & PUBLIC INTEREST COMMITMENTS (PICS)

Has the new gTLD program put sufficient mechanisms in place to mitigate risks to the trustworthiness of the DNS?

- ⊙ Sub-questions
- ⊙ Findings
- ⊙ Research undertaken
- ⊙ Causes
- ⊙ Priority to address
- ⊙ Recommendation
- ⊙ Metrics
 - Analysis of recommendation implementation
 - Assessment of recommendation effectiveness and metrics
 - Priority to address
 - Relevant annexes and appendices

Have these efforts had an impact on perception of the DNS?

- ⊙ Sub-questions
- ⊙ Findings
- ⊙ Research undertaken
- ⊙ Causes
- ⊙ Priority to address
- ⊙ Recommendation
- ⊙ Metrics
 - Analysis of recommendation implementation

-
- Assessment of recommendation effectiveness and metrics
 - Priority to address
 - Relevant annexes and appendices

Have the safeguards been fully implemented?

- ⊙ Sub-questions
- ⊙ Findings
- ⊙ Research undertaken
- ⊙ Causes
- ⊙ Priority to address
- ⊙ Recommendation
- ⊙ Metrics
 - Analysis of recommendation implementation
 - Assessment of recommendation effectiveness and metrics
 - Priority to address
 - Relevant annexes and appendices

Have new gTLD operators complied with the safeguards?

- ⊙ Sub-questions
- ⊙ Findings
- ⊙ Research undertaken
- ⊙ Causes
- ⊙ Priority to address
- ⊙ Recommendation
- ⊙ Metrics
 - Analysis of recommendation implementation
 - Assessment of recommendation effectiveness and metrics
 - Priority to address
 - Relevant annexes and appendices

3. RIGHTS PROTECTION MECHANISMS

Did the Rights Protection Mechanisms mitigate the risks involved with the expansion of the New gTLD Program?

- ⊙ Sub-questions
- ⊙ Findings
- ⊙ Research undertaken
- ⊙ Causes
- ⊙ Priority to address
- ⊙ Recommendation
- ⊙ Metrics
 - Analysis of recommendation implementation
 - Assessment of recommendation effectiveness and metrics
 - Priority to address
 - Relevant annexes and appendices

4. CONSUMER/END-USER BEHAVIOR

To what extent are consumers aware of New gTLDs?

- ⊙ Sub-questions
- ⊙ Findings
- ⊙ Research undertaken
- ⊙ Causes
- ⊙ Priority to address
- ⊙ Recommendation
- ⊙ Metrics
 - Analysis of recommendation implementation
 - Assessment of recommendation effectiveness and metrics
 - Priority to address
 - Relevant annexes and appendices

Do consumers trust New gTLDs?

- ⊙ Sub-questions
- ⊙ Findings
- ⊙ Research undertaken

-
- ⊙ Causes
 - ⊙ Priority to address
 - ⊙ Recommendation
 - ⊙ Metrics
 - Analysis of recommendation implementation
 - Assessment of recommendation effectiveness and metrics
 - Priority to address
 - Relevant annexes and appendices

Competition and Consumer Choice

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

WORK AREAS

1. BASIC MARKET SHARE CALCULATIONS

- ⊙ High-level question
- ⊙ Sub-questions
- ⊙ Findings
- ⊙ Research undertaken
- ⊙ Causes
- ⊙ Priority to address
- ⊙ Recommendation
- ⊙ Metrics
 - Analysis of recommendation implementation
 - Assessment of recommendation effectiveness and metrics
 - Priority to address
 - Relevant annexes and appendices

2. CONCENTRATION RATIOS

- ⊙ High-level question
- ⊙ Sub-questions
- ⊙ Findings

-
- ⊙ Research undertaken
 - ⊙ Causes
 - ⊙ Priority to address
 - ⊙ Recommendation
 - ⊙ Metrics
 - Analysis of recommendation implementation
 - Assessment of recommendation effectiveness and metrics
 - Priority to address
 - Relevant annexes and appendices

3. PRICE ANALYSIS

- ⊙ High-level question
- ⊙ Sub-questions
- ⊙ Findings
- ⊙ Research undertaken
- ⊙ Causes
- ⊙ Priority to address
- ⊙ Recommendation
- ⊙ Metrics
 - Analysis of recommendation implementation
 - Assessment of recommendation effectiveness and metrics
 - Priority to address
 - Relevant annexes and appendices

4. REGISTRAR COMPETITION WITHIN REGISTRIES

- ⊙ High-level question
- ⊙ Sub-questions
- ⊙ Findings
- ⊙ Research undertaken
- ⊙ Causes
- ⊙ Priority to address
- ⊙ Recommendation
- ⊙ Metrics

-
- Analysis of recommendation implementation
 - Assessment of recommendation effectiveness and metrics
 - Priority to address
 - Relevant annexes and appendices

5. REGISTRY POLICIES

- ⊙ High-level question
- ⊙ Sub-questions
- ⊙ Findings
- ⊙ Research undertaken
- ⊙ Causes
- ⊙ Priority to address
- ⊙ Recommendation
- ⊙ Metrics
 - Analysis of recommendation implementation
 - Assessment of recommendation effectiveness and metrics
 - Priority to address
 - Relevant annexes and appendices

6. REGISTRATIONS IN NEW GTLDS AVAILABLE IN .COM

- ⊙ High-level question
- ⊙ Sub-questions
- ⊙ Findings
- ⊙ Research undertaken
- ⊙ Causes
- ⊙ Priority to address
- ⊙ Recommendation
- ⊙ Metrics
 - Analysis of recommendation implementation
 - Assessment of recommendation effectiveness and metrics
 - Priority to address
 - Relevant annexes and appendices

7. URS VS. UDRP

- ⊙ High-level question
- ⊙ Sub-questions
- ⊙ Findings
- ⊙ Research undertaken
- ⊙ Causes
- ⊙ Priority to address
- ⊙ Recommendation
- ⊙ Metrics
 - Analysis of recommendation implementation
 - Assessment of recommendation effectiveness and metrics
 - Priority to address
 - Relevant annexes and appendices

8. USE OF BRAND TLDS

- ⊙ High-level question
- ⊙ Sub-questions
- ⊙ Findings
- ⊙ Research undertaken
- ⊙ Causes
- ⊙ Priority to address
- ⊙ Recommendation
- ⊙ Metrics
 - Analysis of recommendation implementation
 - Assessment of recommendation effectiveness and metrics
 - Priority to address
 - Relevant annexes and appendices

9. USE OF BRAND TLDS

- ⊙ High-level question
- ⊙ Sub-questions
- ⊙ Findings

-
- ⊙ Research undertaken
 - ⊙ Causes
 - ⊙ Priority to address
 - ⊙ Recommendation
 - ⊙ Metrics
 - Analysis of recommendation implementation
 - Assessment of recommendation effectiveness and metrics
 - Priority to address
 - Relevant annexes and appendices

10. USE OF BRAND TLDS

- ⊙ High-level question
- ⊙ Sub-questions
- ⊙ Findings
- ⊙ Research undertaken
- ⊙ Causes
- ⊙ Priority to address
- ⊙ Recommendation
- ⊙ Metrics
 - Analysis of recommendation implementation
 - Assessment of recommendation effectiveness and metrics
 - Priority to address
 - Relevant annexes and appendices

11. SIZE DISTRIBUTION OF TLDS

- ⊙ High-level question
- ⊙ Sub-questions
- ⊙ Findings
- ⊙ Research undertaken
- ⊙ Causes
- ⊙ Priority to address
- ⊙ Recommendation
- ⊙ Metrics

-
- Analysis of recommendation implementation
 - Assessment of recommendation effectiveness and metrics
 - Priority to address
 - Relevant annexes and appendices

12. BENEFITS VS. CONFUSION TO END USERS

- ⊙ High-level question
- ⊙ Sub-questions
- ⊙ Findings
- ⊙ Research undertaken
- ⊙ Causes
- ⊙ Priority to address
- ⊙ Recommendation
- ⊙ Metrics
 - Analysis of recommendation implementation
 - Assessment of recommendation effectiveness and metrics
 - Priority to address
 - Relevant annexes and appendices

13. TRADEMARKS

- ⊙ High-level question
- ⊙ Sub-questions
- ⊙ Findings
- ⊙ Research undertaken
- ⊙ Causes
- ⊙ Priority to address
- ⊙ Recommendation
- ⊙ Metrics
 - Analysis of recommendation implementation
 - Assessment of recommendation effectiveness and metrics
 - Priority to address
 - Relevant annexes and appendices

14. INDUSTRY PRACTICES

- ⊙ High-level question
- ⊙ Sub-questions
- ⊙ Findings
- ⊙ Research undertaken
- ⊙ Causes
- ⊙ Priority to address
- ⊙ Recommendation
- ⊙ Metrics
 - Analysis of recommendation implementation
 - Assessment of recommendation effectiveness and metrics
 - Priority to address
 - Relevant annexes and appendices

15. DUPLICATE NAME SUMMARY

- ⊙ High-level question
- ⊙ Sub-questions
- ⊙ Findings
- ⊙ Research undertaken
- ⊙ Causes
- ⊙ Priority to address
- ⊙ Recommendation
- ⊙ Metrics
 - Analysis of recommendation implementation
 - Assessment of recommendation effectiveness and metrics
 - Priority to address
 - Relevant annexes and appendices

Application and Evaluation Process of the New gTLD Program

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

WORK AREAS

1. ADDRESSING NEEDS OF UNDERSERVED MARKETS

- ⊙ High-level question
- ⊙ Sub-questions
- ⊙ Findings
- ⊙ Research undertaken
- ⊙ Causes
- ⊙ Priority to address
- ⊙ Recommendation
- ⊙ Metrics
 - Analysis of recommendation implementation
 - Assessment of recommendation effectiveness and metrics
 - Priority to address
 - Relevant annexes and appendices

2. PROVIDING EQUAL OPPORTUNITY FOR PARTICIPATION IN THE PROGRAM

- ⊙ High-level question
- ⊙ Sub-questions
- ⊙ Findings
- ⊙ Research undertaken
- ⊙ Causes
- ⊙ Priority to address
- ⊙ Recommendation
- ⊙ Metrics
 - Analysis of recommendation implementation
 - Assessment of recommendation effectiveness and metrics
 - Priority to address
 - Relevant annexes and appendices

3. PREVENTING DELEGATIONS THAT WOULD BE CONFUSING OR HARMFUL

- ⊙ High-level question
- ⊙ Sub-questions
- ⊙ Findings
- ⊙ Research undertaken
- ⊙ Causes
- ⊙ Priority to address
- ⊙ Recommendation
- ⊙ Metrics
 - Analysis of recommendation implementation
 - Assessment of recommendation effectiveness and metrics
 - Priority to address
 - Relevant annexes and appendices

4. ALLOWING SPECIFIC COMMUNITIES TO BE SERVED BY A RELEVANT TLD

- ⊙ High-level question
- ⊙ Sub-questions
- ⊙ Findings
- ⊙ Research undertaken
- ⊙ Causes
- ⊙ Priority to address
- ⊙ Recommendation
- ⊙ Metrics
 - Analysis of recommendation implementation
 - Assessment of recommendation effectiveness and metrics
 - Priority to address
 - Relevant annexes and appendices

5. EFFECTIVENESS OF THE STRING CONTENTIOUS PROCESS

- ⊙ High-level question
- ⊙ Sub-questions
- ⊙ Findings

-
- ⊙ Research undertaken
 - ⊙ Causes
 - ⊙ Priority to address
 - ⊙ Recommendation
 - ⊙ Metrics
 - Analysis of recommendation implementation
 - Assessment of recommendation effectiveness and metrics
 - Priority to address
 - Relevant annexes and appendices

6. SIMPLIFYING THE PROCESS

- ⊙ High-level question
- ⊙ Sub-questions
- ⊙ Findings
- ⊙ Research undertaken
- ⊙ Causes
- ⊙ Priority to address
- ⊙ Recommendation
- ⊙ Metrics
 - Analysis of recommendation implementation
 - Assessment of recommendation effectiveness and metrics
 - Priority to address
 - Relevant annexes and appendices

Conclusion

List of Appendices

- ⦿ Appendix A – Methodology
- ⦿ Appendix B – Surveys and Studies
- ⦿ Appendix C – Terms of Reference and Work Plan
- ⦿ Appendix D – Project Plan
- ⦿ Appendix E – Participation Summary
- ⦿ Appendix F – Glossary

Appendix A – Methodology

Founding Documents

The CCT-RT elaborated Terms of Reference and a Work Plan to guide its work. The two founding documents were adopted in March 2016. The Terms of Reference set the stage for the Review Team's mandate, include detailed definitions of key concepts, outline the deliverables and establish ground rules pertaining to the process, engagement and tools used to conduct work. The Work Plan identifies milestones and deliverables in the CCT-RT's lifecycle, lists data elements to be considered and establishes timelines. Refer to [Appendix C](#) for more details.

In addition, staff has been maintaining a work plan to help the Review Team visualize next steps and keep track of the timeframes. See [Appendix D](#) for more information.

The CCT-RT adopted a [conflict of interest policy](#) in March 2016. All members' declarations were submitted in accordance with the conflict of interest policy and made [public](#) on the CCT-RT wiki.

Modus Operandi

The CCT-RT conducts its work on publicly archived [mailing-lists](#). Its meetings and conference calls are open to silent observers. Observers are also welcome to subscribe to mailing-lists with viewing rights only. Activities of the Review Team are documented on a public [wiki space](#).

The CCT-RT operates in a consensus fashion.

Subteams

Its mandate being threefold, the CCT-RT decided to conduct its work through three sub teams: 1) Competition and Consumer Choice; 2) Safeguards and Consumer Trust; 3) the Application and Evaluation Process of the New gTLD Program.

- The Competition and Consumer Choice subteam – led by Jordyn Buchanan – was tasked with reviewing the available data on competition and consumer choice, requesting additional data or other resources that may assist in their review, and reporting to the larger CCT Review Team on their findings and recommendations. The group follow the work of Analysis Group, which conducted an ICANN commissioned economic study on the competitive effects of the New gTLD Program on the domain name marketplace. The Competition & Consumer Choice subteam conducted work on a dedicated mailing-list and calls.
- The Safeguards and Trust subteam – led by Laureen Kapin and Andrew Bagley – was created to explore two key areas of the review as outlined in section 9.3 of the Affirmation of Commitments: 1) consumer trust; 2) effectiveness of safeguards put in place to mitigate issues involved in the introduction or expansion. The Competition & Consumer Choice subteam conducted work on a dedicated mailing-list and calls.
- Although the Application and Evaluation Process of the New gTLD Program is considered a subteam, it assembles the full Review Team. Application and Evaluation Process related discussions were held on plenary calls. The task force – led by Jonathan Zuck – focused its activities around three tracks: 1) successful applicants:

determining the challenges successful applicants faced, the support they received and an assessment of the impact of the GAC early warnings on the process; 2) unsuccessful applicants - comprehending causes of failure and the support received; 3) missing applicants - with an emphasis set on the developing world, establishing grounds for not submitting an application.

Template

Building on readings and discussions, the CCT-RT teased out sets of high-level questions to be addressed and developed a list of discussion papers. To ensure consistency in the subteams' work leading to draft recommendations, the CCT-RT adopted a template that framed the drafting effort. Refer to list of annexes. The CCT-RT made a point of honor to base its recommendations on fact-based findings.

Consensus

The Draft Report and Recommendations were developed in a bottom-up, multistakeholder approach. The Draft Report was circulated for review and comment by the CCT-RT on xxx. The first reading took place during the xxx plenary meeting and the final on xxx. Following the final reading, the Draft Report was sent to the CCT-RT for a 24-hour period to relay any additional edits.

The Draft Report is the outcome of extensive work by the CCT-RT conducted over the xxx months, and is the result of xxx calls or meetings, and more than xxx email messages. It represents a careful consideration of the data received and a diligent attention to the input received.

Consultations and outreach efforts

An outreach plan was elaborated to ensure that the CCT-RT work was being considered by the entire ICANN community in an adequate and timely fashion.

The CCT-RT sought input and confirmations from the global multistakeholder community throughout the development of its Draft Report. Consultation was conducted through the following channels (but not limited to):

- Engagement sessions at ICANN meetings, e.g. the CCT-RT sought input on its interim recommendations at ICANN57;
- Updates to Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees through membership representation
- webinars

In addition, the CCT-RT posted blogs, communiqués and videos to document its progress and establish resources for further engagement.

The CCT-RT has an avenue of feedback through which any community member may contact the CCT-RT to share input or ask questions. Any submission to the list input-to-cctr@icann.org is publicly archived.

in light of the synergies between the CCT-RT and New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP WG mandates, regular coordination calls were held between leadership of both groups to ensure no significant overlap occurs and to complement each other's work. The CCT-RT

notably invited the PDP WG to provide input on the applicant survey questions prior to its launch and sought input on interim recommendations.

In addition, the CCT-RT sought input from the ICANN Board and staff on implementability of its recommendations. **xxxx**

Budget Management

Further to an exchange held with ICANN CFO – Xavier Calvez – the CCT-RT appointed Jonathan Zuck – CCT-RT Chair – as the assigned budget manager in an effort to be fiscally responsible and accountable for its budget management. The budget manager works with ICANN staff to meet the budget restrictions in place.

Appendix B – Surveys and Studies

A number of surveys and studies were commissioned prior to the launch of the CCT-RT to inform its work:

- An Implementation Advisory Group was convened by the ICANN Board in 2013 to examine a series of potential metrics that were proposed by the Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO) and the At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC). This team, referred to as the IAG-CCT, evaluated the feasibility, utility and cost-effectiveness of adopting several recommended metrics produced by these two groups and issued a set of [66 metrics](#), which the ICANN Board adopted for the CCT-RT to consider. ICANN has been collecting data on many of these [metrics](#).
- The IAG-CCT determined that a subset of the metrics was best evaluated using a consumer and registrant survey. Conducted by Nielsen, the [Phase 2 Global Consumer Research Survey results](#) were released in June 2016. The study measured Internet users' current attitudes about the gTLD landscape and domain name system (DNS), as well as changes in these consumers' attitudes from the phase 1 [study](#) that was conducted in 2015. Internet users were asked about aspects of consumer awareness, consumer choice, experience and trust. The consumer survey's respondents included a representative sample of Internet users from all five ICANN regions and was conducted in each sampled country's relevant language. A summary of key findings is available in the [announcement](#). Similarly, Nielsen conducted a global domain name registrant survey, which targeted those who have at least one registered domain name. Survey participants were questioned about their awareness of new gTLDs, as well as their perceived sense of choice, experience and trust related to the current gTLD landscape. [Phase one results](#) were issued in September 2015. The CCT-RT received [phase 2 final findings in September 2016](#). Highlights of the survey results can be found at [xxx](#).
- A second subset of IAG-CCT metrics aims to measure competition in the new gTLD space based on an analysis of pricing data and other, non-price-related indicia. ICANN engaged the Analysis Group to conduct an economic study which has two primary aims: gauge the pricing practices for domains in new gTLDs against those in the legacy space; and provide a qualitative analysis of other non-price competition indicators, like technical or other business innovations. [Phase 1 study results](#) were delivered in September 2015. [Results of the phase 2 economic study, which were delivered in September 2016, revealed xxxx](#). CCT-RT members were given the opportunity to provide feedback to Analysis Group prior to phase 2 commencement.
- To help the CCT-RT assess the effectiveness of the New gTLD Program's application and evaluation processes, as well as safeguards put in place to mitigate abuse, ICANN collaborated with the community to generate the following reports: 1) The [Revised Program Implementation Review Report](#) published in January 2016 examines the effectiveness and efficiency of ICANN's implementation of the New gTLD Program from the staff perspective; 2) The [Revised Report on New gTLD Program Safeguards Against DNS Abuse](#) explores methods for measuring the

effectiveness of safeguards to mitigate Domain Name System (DNS) abuse that were implemented as part of the New gTLD Program. It outlines which activities may constitute DNS abuse and provides a preliminary literature review examining rates of abuse in new gTLDs and the DNS as a whole; 3) The [Revised Report: Rights Protection Mechanism Review](#) evaluates data on key protection mechanisms such as the Trademark Clearinghouse, the Uniform Rapid Suspension System and Post-Delegation Dispute Resolution. The interaction between Rights Protection Mechanisms and other elements of the New gTLD Program are also considered.

To supplement the existing data, the CCT-RT requested additional surveys and studies to further inform its work:

- The Competition & Consumer Choice subteam requested from Analysis Group and ICANN staff additional data points on pricing and registration analyses to help answer research questions on the effectiveness of new gTLDs expansion in promoting price competition among gTLD operators as well as among registrars and resellers.
- The Competition & Consumer Choice subteam sought legacy gTLD parking data to complement the new gTLD parking data available on nldstats.com. The parking data allowed the subteam to carve out a more accurate picture of registrations in each registry, by removing those registration numbers which do not reflect “active” registrations. On a separate note, the Competition & Consumer Choice obtained ccTLD registration data from CENTR and Zooknic.
- A Request for Proposals was issued in early August 2016, at the request of the Safeguards & Trust subteam, to conduct a study examining rates of malicious and abusive behavior in the global DNS. The study will help measure effectiveness of the safeguards that were built into the Program to mitigate rates of abusive, malicious and criminal activity in new gTLDs. The study commenced in October 2016, with final results presented to the CCT-RT in March 2017. An interim report will be published in January 2017. Regular updates and findings, however, were delivered to the CCT-RT throughout the study.
- At its third face-to-face meeting in June 2016, the CCT-RT requested that an applicant survey be commissioned. In addition to addressing topics pertaining to competition, consumer choice and trust, the survey was also tasked with reviewing the effectiveness of the application and evaluation process of the New gTLD Program. The CCT-RT sought answers to gain a better understanding of applicants’ views on the application process among those who completed the process, are actively in progress, and those who withdrew their applications. Results indicated xxx
- To help inform its assessment of the application and evaluation process, the CCT-RT requested that AMGlobal research and conduct interviews with firms, organizations and other institutions that did not apply for new gTLDs, but who may have been considered good candidates for the program as cohorts of similar entities that did apply from the developed world. The purpose of this research is to obtain a deeper understanding of consumer awareness of the New gTLD Program, as well as why more firms from the developing world did not apply to the Program.

In addition, the CCT-RT has identified a survey commissioned by the International Trademark Association (INTA) as a helpful source. The survey assembles information from INTA corporate members, non-INTA corporate and IP-owners on the costs incurred by their clients related to the expansion of the TLD space.

The research efforts commissioned for the CCT-RT will also help inform the work of the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP-WG². The PDP-WG expects to feed from the Review Team's recommendations and findings to build and support its conclusions.

² The New gTLD Subsequent Procedures's mandate is to consider and analyze issues discussed in the Final Issue Report on New gTLD Subsequent Procedures to determine whether changes or adjustments to the existing policy recommendations in the Final Report on the Introduction of New Generic Top-Level Domains are needed. The outcome of the PDP may lead to (i) amending or overriding existing policy principles, recommendations, and implementation guidelines; (ii) developing new policy recommendations, and/or (iii) supplementing or developing new implementation.

Appendix C – Terms of Reference and Work Plan

Include a copy of

<https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/58727379/CCTRToRDRAFTv6.docx?version=1&modificationDate=1458753019639&api=v2> and
<https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/58727379/DRAFT%20workplan%20v2.docx?version=1&modificationDate=1458753091697&api=v2>

Appendix D – Project Plan

Include copy of up-to-date plan

Appendix E – Participation Summary

TBP

Appendix F – Glossary

Affirmation of Commitments Reviews

The [Affirmation of Commitments](#) contains specific provisions for periodic review of four key ICANN objectives. These reviews provide a mechanism to assess and report on ICANN's progress toward fundamental organizational objectives; they are: 1) Ensuring accountability, transparency and the interests of global Internet users; 2) Preserving security, stability and resiliency of the DNS; 3) Promoting competition, consumer trust and consumer choice; and 4) WHOIS policy.

ccTLD — Country Code Top Level Domain

Two letter domains, such as .uk (United Kingdom), .de (Germany) and .jp (Japan) (for example), are called country code top level domains (ccTLDs) and correspond to a country, territory, or other geographic location. The rules and policies for registering domain names in the ccTLDs vary significantly and ccTLD registries limit use of the ccTLD to citizens of the corresponding country.

Some ICANN-accredited registrars provide registration services in the ccTLDs in addition to registering names in .biz, .com, .info, .name, .net and .org, however, ICANN does not specifically accredit registrars to provide ccTLD registration services.

For more information regarding registering names in ccTLDs, including a complete database of designated ccTLDs and managers, please refer to <http://www.iana.org/cctld/cctld.htm>.

DNS — Domain Name System

The Domain Name System (DNS) helps users to find their way around the Internet. Every computer on the Internet has a unique address – just like a telephone number – which is a rather complicated string of numbers. It is called its "IP address" (IP stands for "Internet Protocol"). IP Addresses are hard to remember. The DNS makes using the Internet easier by allowing a familiar string of letters (the "domain name") to be used instead of the arcane IP address. So instead of typing 207.151.159.3, you can type www.internic.net. It is a "mnemonic" device that makes addresses easier to remember.

gTLD — Generic Top Level Domain

Most TLDs with three or more characters are referred to as "generic" TLDs, or "gTLDs". They can be subdivided into two types, "sponsored" TLDs (sTLDs) and "unsponsored TLDs (uTLDs), as described in more detail below.

In the 1980s, seven gTLDs (.com, .edu, .gov, .int, .mil, .net, and .org) were created. Domain names may be registered in three of these (.com, .net, and .org) without restriction; the other four have limited purposes.

Over the next twelve years, various discussions occurred concerning additional gTLDs, leading to the selection in November 2000 of seven new TLDs for introduction. These were introduced in 2001 and 2002. Four of the new TLDs (.biz, .info, .name, and .pro) are unsponsored. The other three new TLDs (.aero, .coop, and .museum) are sponsored.

Generally speaking, an unsponsored TLD operates under policies established by the global Internet community directly through the ICANN process, while a sponsored TLD is a specialized TLD that has a sponsor representing the narrower community that is most affected by the TLD. The sponsor thus carries out delegated policy-formulation responsibilities over many matters concerning the TLD.

A Sponsor is an organization to which is delegated some defined ongoing policy-formulation authority regarding the manner in which a particular sponsored TLD is operated. The sponsored TLD has a Charter, which defines the purpose for which the sponsored TLD has been created and will be operated. The Sponsor is responsible for developing policies on the delegated topics so that the TLD is operated for the benefit of a defined group of stakeholders, known as the Sponsored TLD Community, that are most directly interested in the operation of the TLD. The Sponsor also is responsible for selecting the registry operator and to varying degrees for establishing the roles played by registrars and their relationship with the registry operator. The Sponsor must exercise its delegated authority according to fairness standards and in a manner that is representative of the Sponsored TLD Community.

IDNs — Internationalized Domain Names

IDNs are domain names that include characters used in the local representation of languages that are not written with the twenty-six letters of the basic Latin alphabet "a-z". An IDN can contain Latin letters with diacritical marks, as required by many European languages, or may consist of characters from non-Latin scripts such as Arabic or Chinese. Many languages also use other types of digits than the European "0-9". The basic Latin alphabet together with the European-Arabic digits are, for the purpose of domain names, termed "ASCII characters" (ASCII = American Standard Code for Information Interchange). These are also included in the broader range of "Unicode characters" that provides the basis for IDNs.

The "hostname rule" requires that all domain names of the type under consideration here are stored in the DNS using only the ASCII characters listed above, with the one further addition of the hyphen "-". The Unicode form of an IDN therefore requires special encoding before it is entered into the DNS.

The following terminology is used when distinguishing between these forms:

A domain name consists of a series of "labels" (separated by "dots"). The ASCII form of an IDN label is termed an "A-label". All operations defined in the DNS protocol use A-labels exclusively. The Unicode form, which a user expects to be displayed, is termed a "U-label". The difference may be illustrated with the Hindi word for "test" — परीका — appearing here as a U-label would (in the Devanagari script). A special form of "ASCII compatible encoding" (abbreviated ACE) is applied to this to produce the corresponding A-label: xn — 11b5bs1di.

A domain name that only includes ASCII letters, digits, and hyphens is termed an "LDH label". Although the definitions of A-labels and LDH-labels overlap, a name consisting exclusively of LDH labels, such as "icann.org" is not an IDN.

PDP — Policy Development Process

A set of formal steps, as defined in the ICANN bylaws, to guide the initiation, internal and external review, timing and approval of policies needed to coordinate the global Internet's system of unique identifiers.

TLD — Top-level Domain

TLDs are the names at the top of the DNS naming hierarchy. They appear in domain names as the string of letters following the last (rightmost) ".", such as "net" in "www.example.net". The administrator for a TLD controls what second-level names are recognized in that TLD. The administrators of the "root domain" or "root zone" control what TLDs are recognized by the DNS. Commonly used TLDs include .com, .net, .edu, .jp, .de, etc.

UDRP — Uniform Dispute Resolution Policy

All ICANN-accredited registrars follow a uniform dispute resolution policy. Under that policy, disputes over entitlement to a domain-name registration are ordinarily resolved by court litigation between the parties claiming rights to the registration. Once the courts rule who is entitled to the registration, the registrar will implement that ruling. In disputes arising from registrations allegedly made abusively (such as "cybersquatting" and cyberpiracy"), the uniform policy provides an expedited administrative procedure to allow the dispute to be resolved without the cost and delays often encountered in court litigation. In these cases, you can invoke the administrative procedure by filing a complaint with one of the [dispute-resolution service providers](#).

For more details on the UDRP, see [the ICANN UDRP page](#) and the [FAQs](#).