**Safeguards and Trust (PLEASE SEND COMMENTS TO LAUREEN BY WORD DOCUMENT)**

**Chapter VI  Consumer Trust**

**Background.**

The review team ~~We~~ sought to determine the extent to which the increase in the number ~~expansion~~ of gTLDs has promoted consumer trust.[1] As with our findings about competition and consumer choice issues, we are still in the early stages of the N~~n~~ew gTLD P~~p~~rogram and hence our data reflect~~s~~ an early look~~,~~ rather than a long-term assessment of the program. In order to examine the impact of the new gTLD program on consumer trust, among other issues, ICANN commissioned A.C. Nielsen to survey global online consumer end-~~-~~users (consumer end-users) and global domain name registrants (registrants).[2] Two surveys of each group were taken approximately one year apart between 2015 and 2016. These surveys ~~were~~ aimed ~~broadly~~ at assessing the current Top-level Domain landscape, as well as ~~to~~ measuring~~e~~ factors such as consumer awareness, experience, choice, and trust in~~wit~~h

**Commented [1]:** Stan: replace with "The Review Team"

[1] For the purposes of our review, we recognized that "consumers" (typically, a natural person, acting primarily for personal, family or household purposes) 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), which~~. and~~ may, depending on the context, include individuals, businesses, and government agencies~~ as well~~.

[2] To avoid confusion between the CCTRT's definition of "consumer" and the narrower segment of internet users surveyed in ICANN's Global Consumer Surveys, we refer to the latter group as "consumer end-users."

new TLDs and the domain name system in general.  Reports on the results of the  consumer end-users survey ~~results from the consumer segment~~ were published in April –2015 and June 2016,[3] and reports on the results of the registrant surveys were published in September 2015 and August 2016.[4] Nielsen directed its "consumer" survey ~~to~~at global internet users ~~consumer end users~~ who spent more than five hours per week on the internet and its "registrant" survey ~~to~~ at the primary decision makers that registered a domain name.[5]  Based on th~~is~~ese data, we identified two primary factors relevant to the public's trust of gTLDs: familiarity and security. The concept of "familiarity" includes the awareness and reputation of the gTLD~~,~~. The concept of "security" includes concerns about DNS abuse and expectations about restrictions concerning who can register a domain name ~~on who could register~~ within a particular gTLD.

---

[3] ~~**[Cite and link to ICANN Global Consumer Nielsen Consumer Studies]**~~

[4] See: ~~Nielsen,~~ *ICANN Global Consumer Survey Wave 1*, May 2015, http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/reviews/cct/global-consumer-survey-29may15-en.pdf and ~~Nielsen,~~ *ICANN Global Consumer Survey Wave 2*, June 2016, http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/reviews/cct/phase2-global-consumer-survey-23jun16-en.pdf. ~~Nielsen,~~ *ICANN Global Registrant Survey Wave ~~Phase~~ 1*, September 2015, https://newgtlds.icann.org/en/reviews/cct/registrant-survey-faqs-25sep15-en. and ~~Nielsen,~~ *ICANN Global Registrant Survey ~~Phase~~ Wave 2*, October 2016, https://newgtlds.icann.org/en/reviews/cct/global-registrant-survey-15sep16-en.pdf.~~[Cite and link to Nielsen Registrant Studies]~~ **Accepting Eleeza's suggestion: Please ensure citations consistently refer to ICANN Global Consumer and Registrant Surveys, Wave 1 and Wave 2**

[5] *See* ICANN Global Consumer Survey Wave ~~Phase~~ 2 ~~Consumer Survey~~ at p.3 and ICANN Global ~~Phase 2~~ Registrant Survey Wave 2 at p. 4.



**Commented [2]:** Stan: replace with "concerning who can register within a"

**Formatted:** Font:

**Formatted:** Font: Italic

**Formatted:** Font:

**Field Code Changed**

**Formatted:** Hyperlink, Font: (Default) Arial, 10 pt, No underline, Font color: Black

**Formatted:** Font: 10 pt

**Formatted:** Font: Italic

**Formatted:** Font: Italic

**Formatted:** Font: 10 pt

**Formatted:** Font: Italic

**Formatted:** Font: Italic

**Formatted:** Font: 10 pt

**Formatted:** Font:

**Formatted:** Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt, Not Bold

**Formatted:** Font: Bold, Highlight

**Formatted:** Highlight

**Formatted:** Font: Bold

Typically, awareness is the most basic knowledge of a d~~D~~omain name extension. Familiarity can be considered a higher level of awareness; more knowledge and understanding about a particular domain name extension. In addition to providing data on aspects of awareness of gTLDs, the global consumer end-~~-~~user and registrant surveys ~~Nielsen studies~~ also asked consumers about the level of ~~-~~their trust ~~of~~in new gTLDs as compared to that of ~~-~~legacy gTLDs and their comfort levels with providing certain types of sensitive information to new gTLDs as compared to legacy gTLDs. The following discussion ~~section~~ sets forth the most pertinent findings from those studies.

**Awareness and Visitation.**

In terms of awareness, the logical pred~~e~~ede~~o~~cessor to familiarity, Nielsen ~~we find~~ found that ~~-~~consumer end-user "total awareness" of new gTLDs increased from 46% to 52% between 2015 and 2016~~16~~.[6] ~~-~~Total awareness of new gTLDs by registrants was higher than awareness for ~~-~~consumer~~s~~ end-users and remained stable (showing no statistically significant change between ~~66% in~~ 2015 (66%) and ~~64% in~~ 2016 (64%).[7] Interestingly, ~~-~~consumer end-user and registrant awareness of any ~~of~~ new gTLDs

**Commented [3]:** Consider referring to them as the "global consumer and registrant surveys," as most readers will likely be unfamiliar with the "Nielsen surveys."

**Commented [4]:** Stan: replace with "surveys"

**Commented [5]:** Stan: include "the level of"

**Commented [6]:** Stan: include "that of"

**Commented [7]:** Stan: include "as"

**Commented [8]:** Stan: replace with "predecessor"?

**Commented [9]:** Stan's comment: "Statistically significant?

[6] ~~Nielsen~~, ~~Phase~~Wave 2 ICANN Global Consumer Research, p. ~~8,~~ 42 (for "consistent" gTLDs listed in both 2015 and 2016 surveys). Statistical significance test results in the ICANN Global studies are reported at a 95% confidence interval.

[7] ~~Nielsen~~, ~~Phase~~Wave 2, ICANN Global Registrant Survey p. 1~~1~~2.

specified in the survey was ~~relatively~~ higher in the Asian, African, and South American regions~~,~~ than it was in North America and Europe.[8] As one might expect, total awareness of new gTLDs is lower than ~~lags behind~~ that of legacy gTLDs,~~;~~ which have total ~~-~~ consumer end-user and registrant awareness levels of 98% or more in both ~~between~~ 2015 and 2016.[9]

~~Moving from awareness to actual visitation rates, we~~ Nielsen also found that consumer end-users do not visit new gTLDs as often as they do ~~much as~~ legacy gTLDs. Comparing visiting (?)~~ation~~ rates between highly known legacy gTLDs (.com, .net, .org) and specified new gTLDs (.email, .photography, .link, .guru, .realtor, .club, .xyz), the data showed that, in 2015, 71% of consumer end-users visited a legacy gTLDs in the "high" category vs. 15% of consumer end-users that visited~~ing~~ specified new gTLDs (.email, .photography, .link, .guru, .realtor, .club)~~-~~.[10] In 2016, an even higher percentage of consumer end-users reported visiting these same legacy gTLDs (81%), while the number of consumer end-users visiting the specified new gTLDs was ~~ticked~~ down slightly (12%), although the differences was not statistically significant (?).[11] When additional new gTLDs were added to the survey

**Commented [10]:** Stan's comment: "Are regions the same as jurisdictions

**Commented [11]:** Stan: replace with "often as they do"

**Commented [12]:** Stan: replace with "that visited"

**Commented [13]:** Stan: replace with "was"

---

[8] ~~Nielsen~~, ~~Phase~~Wave 2 ICANN Global Consumer Research, p.42; ~~Nielsen~~, ~~Phase~~Wave 2, ICANN Global Registrant Survey p. 42.

[9] ~~Nielsen~~, ~~Phase~~Wave 2 ICANN Global Consumer Research, p. 8; ~~Nielsen~~, ~~Phase~~Wave 2, ICANN Global Registrant Survey p. 12.

[10] ~~Nielsen, Phase~~Wave 2, ICANN Global Consumer Research Study p.7.

[11] ~~Nielsen, Phase~~Wave 2, ICANN Global Consumer Research Study p.7~~.~~. Note: these are averages of regional responses. Statistical significance of regional results in 2015 and 2016 can be found on p. 15 for legacy gTLD visitation and pp. 46-47 for new gTLD visitation.

questions in 2016 (.news, online, .website, .site, .space, .pics, .top), the ~~visitation~~reported visiting rate ~~reported~~ rose to ~~was~~ 15%, although the differences was not statistically significant (?).[12] Generally speaking, the average visit~~ation~~ing rates for new gTLDs were closest to the ~~visitation~~ rates reported for legacy gTLDs in the moderately known categories (.info, .biz), 22% in 2015 and 27% in 2016.[13]

**Commented [14]:** Stan's comment: "Statistically significant"

**Expectations about Relationship of gTLD Name to Websites Using that gTLD**

The ~~Nielsen~~ Nielsen surveys indicated that the public~~'s expectations about~~expected a connection between the name of a gTLD and the websites associated with that gTLD. Fifty-five ~~55%~~percent of consumer end-users surveyed expected "a very clear relationship" between domain names and websites registered under those domain names.[14] HOW IS "RELATIOSHIP" DEFINED? In addition, ~~Related to this issue,~~ 79% of consumer end-users also expect ~~requirements~~ that the actual use of the domain name ~~is~~to be consistent with the meaning of the gTLD.[15] HOW IS "MEANING" DEFINED? This issue relates to another question posed in the surveys~~by Nielsen~~: Why websites have different extensions? A majority of registrants believed that websites have different

**Commented [15]:** Stan: replace with "that"

**Commented [16]:** Stan's comment: "final users?"

**Commented [17]:** Stan: remove the sentence

**Commented [18]:** Stan's comment: "final users?"

[12] ~~Nielsen, Phase~~Wave 2, ICANN Global Consumer Research Study p.7.
[13] ~~Nielsen, Phase~~Wave 2, ICANN Global Consumer Research Study p.7.
[14] ~~Nielsen, Phase~~Wave 2, ICANN Global Consumer Research Study p.9, 50.
[15] ~~Nielsen, Phase~~Wave 2, ICANN Global Consumer Research Study p.27 (question related to legacy gTLDs).

extensions to “properly identify the purpose or owner or to give an indication of content or function.”[16] ARE THERE SIMILAR DEFINITIONS FOR THE TERMS USED EARLIER?

Nevertheless, when asked about how much attention consumer end-users pay to a domain extension, the survey reported ~~equivocal results across all regions.[17] For example,~~ that ~~overall,~~ 29% reported “they don’t pay much attention,” 34% only visit sites with “familiar” domains, and 37% base their visitation upon search engine results.[18] This finding is consistent with another reported result, that ~~:~~ the public’s preferred way of finding a website is via search engines.[19] The consumer end-user survey indicated that in 2016, 67% of consumer end-users preferred to use a search engine to find a website as compared to 20% that indicated that they preferred to type the domain name directly into a browser.[20] Registrants also reported a preference for using search engines to find websites and also identified~~y~~ search engines as the leading method that they use to find out more information about gTLDs.[21]

**Commented [19]:** Stan's comment: "final users?"

**Commented [20]:** Stan: replace with ","

**Commented [21]:** Stan: insert "other"

---

[16] ~~Nielsen,~~ Wave 2, ICANN Global Registrant Survey p. 25-26
~~[17] Nielsen, PhaseWave 2, ICANN Global Consumer Research Study p.54.~~
[18] ~~Nielsen, Phase~~Wave 2, ICANN Global Consumer Research Study p.54.
[19] ~~Nielsen, Phase~~Wave 2, ICANN Global Consumer Research Study p.77.
[20] ~~Nielsen, Phase~~Wave 2, ICANN Global Consumer Research Study p.77.
[21] ~~Nielsen, Phase~~Wave 2, ICANN Global Registrant Research Study p.102, 32.

When asked what makes domain extensions trustworthy, consumer end-users reported that reputation and familiarity played key roles.[22] DEFINE “REPUTATION” AND “FAMILIARITY” In the related topic of why consumer end-users visit gTLDs, Nielsen found ~~we find~~ that consumer end-users choose to visit sites based upon relevance of the gTLD to the information they seek. Consumer end-users also tend to visit sites with which they are already familiar.[23] Interestingly, registrants may presume familiarity *and trust* of certain domains based on the name (such as a reference to a prominent city) regardless of whether the gTLD has actually been delegated to ?.[24] Conversely, the public may experience significant discomfort visiting sites with unfamiliar gTLDs.[25] When deciding whether to visit a website with an unfamiliar gTLD, consumer end-users look to usage (their own prior usage or the popularity of the website), site appeal or interest, and reputation (good reviews, recommendation, etc.).[26]

**Commented [22]:** Stan's comment: "Popularity is related to the "Network effects' discussed in the competition section"

---

[22] ~~Nielsen, Phase~~Wave 2, ICANN Global Consumer Research Study p.19-20. *See also* pp.56-57: What makes an unfamiliar domain extension feel trustworthy? Relevance and appeal of information are significant factors; 2016 NCC Group Trust in the Internet Survey at p. 5 https://whodoyou.trust/globalassets/trust-in-the-internet-survey-2016-discussion-paper.pdf ~~[insert link]~~ (over 50% of those surveyed identify the following as a factor that would increase their confidence in new domains: “Brand/company clearly communicates the steps to take to secure your personal information within the website.“ We note that it appears this study was commissioned by an entity that has a business interest in marketing both cyber- security products and the .trust domain.

**Formatted:** Highlight

**Formatted:** Highlight

[23] ~~Nielsen, Phase~~Wave 1, ICANN Global Consumer Research Study p.8, 18, 36.

[24] ~~Nielsen, Phase~~Wave 2, ICANN Global Registrant Survey p. 38~~9~~.

[25] *See e.g.,* 2016 NCC Group Trust in the Internet Survey at p.3 https://whodoyou.trust/globalassets/trust-in-the-internet-survey-2016-discussion-paper.pdf~~[insert link~~]. (in 2016: 52% of those surveyed reported feeling “not very or not at all comfortable” visiting websites with new domains).

[26] ~~Nielsen, Phase~~Wave 2, ICANN Global Consumer ~~Registrant~~ Survey p.38.

**Public Trusts Legacy gTLDs more than New gTLDs.**

The survey data show~~s~~ that both consumer end-users and registrants trust new gTLDs ~~significantly~~ less than they do legacy gTLDs. In both 2015 and 2016, consumer end-users reported trusting specified new gTLDs approximately only half as much as specified legacy gTLDs. (IS THE DIFFERENCE STATISTICALLY SIGNIFICANT? [27] For example, in 2015, consumer end-users found 90% of specified legacy gTLDs to be very/or somewhat trustworthy but only 49% of specified new gTLDs were found to be very/somewhat trustworthy.[28] ~~-~~Results were similar in 2016, with consumer end-users reporting that 91% found specified legacy gTLDs to be very/somewhat trustworthy~~,~~ ~~while~~whereas ~~-~~45% foundind new gTLDs to be very/somewhat trustworthy. When Nielsen added certain specified new gTLDs to ?, the percentage of what? rose to 52% for the added new gTLDs.[29] When surveyed about specific new gTLDs, ~~the~~ consumer end-user responses varied depending upon the particular gTLD and the consumer's region.[30] For example, approximately half the consumer end-users surveyed reported high levels of trust for .news, .photography, .email, and

Commented [23]: Stan's comment: "Statistically?"

Commented [24]: (Stan's comment)

Commented [25]: (Stan's comment)

Commented [26]: (Stan's comment)

---

[27] ~~Nielsen, Phase~~Wave 1, ICANN Global Consumer Research Study p. 9, 40; 2016: ~~Nielsen, Phase~~Wave 2, ICANN Global Consumer Research Study p. 9. Note the following figures are based on averages of regional responses. Statistical significance for changes in trustworthiness from 2015 to 2016 for selected gTLDs can be found on p. 55 of the Wave 2 Study.

[28] ~~Nielsen, Phase~~Wave 1, ICANN Global Consumer Research Study p. 9, 40. Specified legacy gTLDs: .com, .net, .org; specified new gTLDs: .email, .photography, .link, .guru, .realtor, .club; .xyz.

[29] ~~Nielsen, Phase~~Wave 2, ICANN Global Consumer Research Study p. 9. Added new gTLDs (.news, online, .website, .site, .space, .pics, .top).

[30] ~~Nielsen, Phase~~Wave 2, ICANN Global Consumer Research Study p. 55

.realtor with .news seen as the most trustworthy across all regions.[31] When asked similar questions about specified legacy gTLDs, over 70% of consumer end-users ~~-~~across all regions rated .com, .org, and .net as very/somewhat trustworthy.[32]

Compared to consumer end-users, registrants consistently report higher levels of trust for specified gTLDs but still report lower levels of trust for new gTLDs when compared to legacy gTLDs.[33] Registrants associate the term "trustworthy" with legacy gTLDs more than they do with new gTLDs. For example, in 2015, 83% of registrants associated the term "trustworthy" with legacy gTLDs compared to a rate of 58% for new gTLDs.[34] In 2016, 79% of registrants viewed legacy gTLDs as "trustworthy" compared to 60% for new gTLDs.[35] STATISTICALLY SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES?

This ~~trend of~~ increase in the ~~higher~~ rates of trust ~~for~~of new gTLDs by registrants is also reflected in data regarding individual new gTLDs. For example, for the most trusted new gTLD surveyed over both waves~~phases~~ -- .email-- 68% of registrants viewed this domain as "somewhat/very trustworthy" as compared to approximately 62% of consumer end-users.[36] Moreover, over 58% of

**Commented [27]:** Stan: "Why is this comparison relevant?"

[31] ~~Nielsen, Phase~~Wave 2, ICANN Global Consumer Research Study p. 55
[32] ~~Nielsen, Phase~~Wave 2, ICANN Global Consumer Research Study p.18.
[33] ~~Nielsen Phase~~Wave 2, ICANN Global Registrant Survey p.64; compare trustworthiness percentages for legacy gTLDs reported on p. 27 to legacy gTLDs p.66.
[34] ~~Nielsen Phase~~Wave 2, ICANN Global Registrant Survey pp.27 and 66; compare trustworthiness percentages.
[35] ~~Nielsen Phase~~Wave 2, ICANN Global Registrant Survey pp.27 and 66; compare trustworthiness percentages.
[36] ~~Nielsen Phase~~Wave 2, ICANN Global Registrant Survey p.64.

registrants associated the term “trustworthy” with a specified list of new gTLDs between 2015 and 2016.[37] THIS STATEMENT IS **NOT** ABOUT THE TREND.

**Consumer Behavior that Indicates Trust**

In addition to surveying the public about their subjective views on trust, Nielsen ~~data wereas~~ also gathered data about behavior that could indicate trust, such as willingness to provide sensitive information to websites associated with new gTLDs. To a certain extent, these results were ~~reflected a~~ similar to differences between consumer end-~~-~~user’s trust of new gTLDs ~~compared~~ ~~to~~and legacy gTLDs. For example, ~~-~~when asked whether they felt “very/somewhat comfortable” providing financial information to websites in ~~the~~ .com ~~legacy gTLDs~~, 62% of consumer end-users responded affirmatively compared to with only 36~~2~~% when asked this same question regarding new gTLDs.[38] WHICH NEW GTLDS? ALL? SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE? Results for other types of personal information, showed lower comfort levels when ~~final~~ consumer end-~~-~~users were asked about providing sensitive information to new, versus legacy, ~~new~~ gTLDs.[39] In fact, consumer end-users tended to respond that they were “not very

**Commented [28]:** (Stan's comment)

**Commented [29]:** Stan: "Statitically?"

---

[37] ~~Nielsen Phase~~Wave 2, ICANN Global Registrant Survey p.66.
[38] ~~Nielsen, Phase~~Wave 2, ICANN Global Consumer Research Study p.90.
[39] ~~Nielsen, Phase~~Wave 2, ICANN Global Consumer Research Study p.90

comfortable" with providing sensitive information to new gTLDs.[40] Related to these findings, another survey on trust in the internet reflected the public's increasing concerns regarding stolen credit card/financial information; online security; protection and security of credit card and personal information.[41] DID THE NCC GROUP ASK OTHER QUESTIONS SIMILAR TO THOSE POSED BY NIELSEN?

**Registration Restrictions Contribute to Trust**

The ICANN Global ~~Nielsen~~ surveys IS THIS THE NIELSEN SURVEY? IF SO, WE SHOULD SAY SO. THE SURVEY WAS DONE **FOR** ICANN, NOT **BY** ICANN. indicated that the public expects certain restrictions about who can purchase domain names and trusts that these ~~any~~ restrictions will be enforced.[42] The survey results also indicated that the presence of such restrictions contributed to consumer trust.[43] These results applied to all gTLDs and the percentage of the consumer end-users who reported that restrictions contributed to consumer trust increased from 56% in 2015 to 70% in 2016.[44] SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE? For

[40] ~~Nielsen, Phase~~Wave 2, ICANN Global Consumer Research Study p.90.
[41] 2016 NCC Group Trust in the Internet Survey at p.2 **[insert link]**
[42] ~~Nielsen, Phase~~Wave 2, ICANN Global Consumer Research Study p.9, 13, 26-27, 65; Nielsen, ~~Phase~~Wave 2, ICANN Global Registrant Survey p. 14, 18, 30, 68.
[43] ~~Nielsen, Phase~~Wave 1, ICANN Global Consumer Research Study p.9, 26; Nielsen, ~~Phase~~Wave 2, ICANN Global Consumer Research Study p.9, 13, 26,
[44] ~~Nielsen, Phase~~Wave 2, ICANN Global Consumer Research Study p.9

example, the consumer end-user surveys indicated that over 70% of those surveyed not only expected entities that offer to register domain~~s~~ names to take precautions about who gets a ~~domain~~ name. ~~, t~~They also expected some screening of individuals or companies who register for certain special domain names.[45] DEFINE "SPECIAL" Moreover, over 80% of consumer end-users expected the enforcement of restrictions such as ~~1)~~ requiring validation that person/company registering site meets intended parameters and requiring validated credentials related to the gTLD.[46]

Focusing on new gTLDs, an increasing percentage of consumer end-users (73%) expected at least some level of restriction on registrations in ~~the purchase of~~ specified new gTLDs.[47] WHICH? Registrants also favored restrictions but were~~are~~ generally more opposed to restrictions than were consumer end-users.[48] However, when put in context of validating certain characteristics that are in keeping with the intended or implied use of the gTLD (such as a contractor's license for .builder), three out of four

**Commented [30]:** (Stan's comment)

**Commented [31]:** (Stan's comment)

**Commented [32]:** (Stan's comment)

[45] ~~Nielsen, Phase~~Wave 1, ICANN Global Consumer Research Study p.49.
[46] ~~Nielsen, Phase~~Wave 2, ICANN Global Consumer Research Study p.27.
[47] ~~Nielsen, Phase~~Wave 2, ICANN Global Consumer Research Study p. 9 (up from 67% in 2015).
[48] ~~Nielsen, Phase~~Wave 2, ICANN Global Registrant Survey p.67.

registrants ? ~~surveyed reports~~ approved~~al~~ of such restrictions.[49] For context, both consumer end-users and registrants also ~~believe that? there are~~expected ~~registration~~ restrictions on registrations in legacy gTLDs.[50]

**Consumer Trust in the Domain Name System Overall Since the Introduction of New gTLDs.**

Wave ~~Phase~~ 1 of the Global ~~Nielsen~~ S~~s~~urvey found that about half of consumer end-users trusted the Domain Name industry just as much as they did other tech industries (Internet Service Providers, software companies, computer/hardware companies, e-commerce, and web-based marketing companies) and the rest are more inclined to trust it ~~more as opposed to less~~.[51] HOW MUCH MORE? Consumer end-users in Africa, Asia, and South America had higher levels of trust than consumer end users in~~, more so than the~~ other regions~~, say they trust the dDomain nName industry more comparatively~~.[52] Reputation was the factor cited most as the reason some consumer end-users trusted the DNS more than they did other tech industries; it was also cited as the reason some consumer end-~~-~~users ~~consumers~~ trusted the DNS less than other industries.[53] DEFINE “REPUTATION”.

Commented [33]: (Stan's comment)
Commented [34]: (Stan's comment)
Commented [35]: (Stan's comment)
Commented [36]: (Stan's comment)
Commented [37]: (Stan's comment)
Commented [38]: (Stan's comment)
Commented [39]: (Stan's comment)

---

[49] ~~Nielsen, Phase~~Wave 2, ICANN Global Registrant Survey p.14.
[50] ~~Nielsen, Phase~~Wave 2, ICANN Global Consumer Research Study p.9, Nielsen, ~~Phase~~Wave 2, ICANN Global Registrant Survey p.29.
[51] ~~Nielsen, Phase~~Wave 1, ICANN Global Consumer Research Study at p. 50.
[52] ~~Nielsen, Phase~~Wave 1, ICANN Global Consumer Research Study at p. 50.
[53] ~~Nielsen, Phase~~Wave ~~1~~2, ICANN Global Consumer Research Study at p. 66.

Wave ~~Phase~~ 2 of the survey found that trust levels had at least ? remained the same since 2015.[54] The global total seemed to improve against all of the 5 reference industries, wave over wave, by an average of just over 4 percentage points.[55] SIGNIFICANT? At this point, with only a year between the two reports on a nascent market, it ~~'~~is not possible to conclude with certainty that these levels had in fact improved. The survey of registrants found positive results similar to those found in the consumer segment when it comes to trust in the domain name industry relative to other industries.[56] General reputation and self-interest drive trust.[57] Registrants expected the industry to adhere to practices that protect their~~its~~ own interests and commonly note security protocols, as well as just a general positive reputation, ~~-~~as factors that promote trust.[58] Those who trust less cite poor security and regulations, as well as general reputational issues like a lack of transparency regarding business practices.[59]

**Commented [40]:** (Stan's comment)

**Commented [41]:** (Stan's comment)

[54] ~~Nielsen, Phase~~Wave 2, ICANN Global Consumer Research at p. 63-64.
[55] ~~Nielsen, Phase~~Wave 2, ICANN Global Consumer Research at p. 63-64.
[56] ~~Nielsen, Phase~~Wave 1, ICANN Global Registrant Survey at p. 67. More so than other regions, in Asia registrants say they hold comparatively higher trust in the Domain Name industry. *Id.*
[57] ~~Nielsen, Phase~~Wave 2 Registrant Report, p. 77,79.
[58] ~~Nielsen, Phase~~Wave 2 Registrant Report, p. 77,79.
[59] ~~Phase~~Wave 2 Registrant Report, p. 77, 81-82.

## Conclusions

~~From a big picture perspective, t~~The global consumer end~~-~~-user and registrant ~~Nielsen~~ surveys indicate that the release of ~~new~~ hundreds of new gTLDs does not appear to have had a negative impact on overall trust in the DNS~~ overall~~. Looking at~~new~~ trust of new gTLDs specifically, the survey ~~we~~ found ~~find~~ that while consumer end-users do not trust new gTLDs nearly as much as they do legacy gTLDs, the trust levels appear to be stable over both waves~~phases~~ of the Global ~~Nielsen s~~Surveys ~~studies~~ with registrants reporting slightly higher trust levels than consumer end-users. Finally, a majority of ~~?~~ both registrants and consumer end-users ~~link~~ expected gTLD registration restrictions, trust that such restrictions will be enforced, and associate such restrictions with an increase in trustworthiness.

**Formatted:** Indent: First line: 0.5"

**Commented [42]:** (Stan's comment)

**Commented [43]:** (Stan's comment)

**Commented [44]:** (Stan's comment)

**Commented [45]:** (Stan's comment)

**Commented [46]:** (Stan's comment)

**Commented [47]:** (Stan's comment)

**Commented [48]:** (Stan's comment)

## RECOMMENDATIONS:

Recommendation:

Rationale/Related findings:

To: ICANN organization/Subsequent Procedures PDP WG/SOs/ACs/community/Future review teams/etc.

Must be completed prior to subsequent rounds: Y/N

Consensus within team: Y/N

1. Given the findings about the relationship between trust and familiarity and the reasons why the public visits websites associated with gTLDs, we recommend that ~~the subsequent procedures PDP working group and~~ ICANN conduct a study to identify a) ~~staff assess~~ why user ~~the public~~ visit~~s~~ certain gTLDs more than others; b) what factors matter most to users ~~the public~~ in determining which~~hat~~ gTLDs to visit; and c) which new gTLDs have been visited most and least often by ~~the public~~ users and the reasons for the high and low visitation rates. Such a study could provide guidance for future applicants ~~how to~~ in their selection of new gTLDs ~~that are relevant to what the public seeks information about~~. We recommend conducting such a study as soon as possible so that ICANN can ~~could~~ release preliminary results of such a study to inform the public and potential applicants in any future rounds. We think that such a study would be helpful but not required before future rounds.

**Recommendation:** Conduct a study to identify a) why users ~~the public~~ visit~~s~~ certain gTLDs more than they do others; b) what factors matter most to users ~~the public~~ in determining which ~~what~~ gTLDs to visit; and c) which new gTLDs have been visited most and least often by the public and the reasons for the high and low visitation rates.

Formatted: Font: Bold

**Rationale/Related findings:** ~~ICANN's G~~global surveys conducted for ICANN show a relationship between trust and familiarity regarding gTLDs and also provides data on why the public visits websites associated with gTLDs. Further study on the topic of why the public chooses to visit websites associated with some gTLDs more than others could provide useful information to future applicants for new gTLDs.

**To:** ICANN organization

**Must be completed prior to subsequent rounds:** No but it would be quite helpful to provide this data to the public as soon as feasible because future applicants may find this information useful as they determine what gTLDs to pursue in future rounds.

**Consensus within team:** Y/N

~~1.~~ 2. ~~This effort would likely require further research. Nevertheless, such research could inform gTLD selection for potential subsequent rounds.~~

Given the findings on the public's expectations about registration restrictions, and the findings that such restrictions contribute to consumer trust, the subsequent procedures PDP working group should consider how to create incentives ~~whether additional restrictions on who can~~ register names in ~~purchase~~ ~~gTLDs should be part of~~to encourage gTLD registries

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5", No bullets or numbering

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

**Commented [49]:** This recommendation seems to ask ICANN to do a survey of demand for content to help determine which new gTLDs should be selected in a future round. This recommendation flies in the face of the GNSO policy recommendation which called for the market, and not ICANN, to determine which strings might be applied for. To the extent that the recommendation calls for ICANN to assess which content ("information") users might seek, it would require ICANN to exceed its mission as described in the new bylaws.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5", Don't add space between paragraphs of the same style, No bullets or numbering to ~~standard ICANN contracts to ensure that~~ meet user expectations ~~are met~~ regarding: a)~~.~~ the relationship of the content of a gTLD its ~~to~~ name ~~of gTLD;~~ b)~~.~~ restrictions ~~on~~as who can register ~~purchase~~ domains in certain gTLDs based upon implied messages of trust conveyed by their names ~~of gTLDs~~ (particularly in sensitive or regulated industries); and c)~~.~~ the safety and security of sensitive information (especially health and financial information).

**Recommendation:** ~~c~~Create incentives to encourage gTLD registries to meet user expectations regarding: a. the relationship of content of a gTLD to its name ~~of gTLD~~; b. restrictions as to ~~on~~ who can ~~purchase~~register a domain name ~~domains~~ in certain gTLDs based upon implied messages of trust conveyed by its name~~s~~ of gTLDs (particularly in sensitive or regulated industries); and c. the safety and security of sensitive information (especially health and financial information).

**Rationale/Related findings:** ICANN's global surveys contain data that indicate~~s~~ that users associate ~~the public expects~~ registration restrictions with higher levels of ~~that such restrictions contribute to~~ consumer trust. As a result, ~~Given these expectations,~~ it would be useful for ICANN to explore how to best encourage registries to meet public expectations. IS IT THAT THERE SHOULD BE MORE RESTRICTIONS OR GREATER LIKELIHOOD THAT RESTRICTIONS ARE MEANINGFUL?

**To:** Subsequent Procedures PDP

**Formatted:** Font: Bold
**Formatted:** Font: Not Bold
**Formatted:** Font: Not Bold
**Formatted:** Font: Not Bold
**Formatted:** Font: Not Bold
**Formatted:** Font: Not Bold
**Formatted:** Font: Not Bold
**Formatted:** Font: Bold
**Formatted:** Font: Not Bold
**Formatted:** Font: Not Bold
**Formatted:** Font: Bold

**Must be completed prior to subsequent rounds:** Yes because these incentives could be implemented as part of the application process.

~~2.~~ **Consensus within team:** Y/N

**Further Review:**

1. **Recommendation:** ICANN should ~~R~~repeat selected parts of Global ~~Nielsen~~ surveys ~~tudy~~ (for consumer end-user and registrant surveys, in addition to necessary baseline and questions, repeat 700, 800, 900, and 1100 series survey questions and questions 775, 1000, 1036, 1050, 155 and 1060) to look for increase in familiarity with new gTLDs; visitation of new gTLDs; perceived trustworthiness of new gTLDs.

**Rationale:** Future review teams can compare these results to prior data to assess whether there is has been an increase in familiarity and trust of new gTLDs.

**Must be completed prior to subsequent rounds:** No.

**Consensus within team:** Y/N

~~1.~~

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5", No bullets or numbering

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5", No bullets or numbering

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Font: Bold

~~2.~~ **Recommendation:** ICANN should commission a study to ~~C~~collect data on the impact of ~~registration~~ restrictions on who can buy domains within certain new gTLDs (registration restrictions) to a) compare consumer trust levels between new gTLDs with varying degrees of registration restrictions~~.~~; b) determine whether

~~3. Collect data on whether~~ there are correlations between DNS abuse and presence or absence of registration restrictions; c) assess ~~.~~the TWO SEPARATE QUESTIONS:~~-~~ARE RESTRICTIONS ENFORCED AND WHAT DETERMINES WHETHER THEY ARE BELIEVED BY USERS.

2. ~~Collect data on~~ costs and benefits of registration restrictions.

**Rationale:** Future PDPs and review teams can use th~~is~~ese data to inform future policy decisions regarding new gTLDs, especially as it relates to the issue of whether restrictions should be encouraged or included within the standard provisions included in ICANN new gTLD contracts.

**Must be completed prior to subsequent rounds:** No.

~~4.~~ **Consensus within team:** Y/N

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5", No bullets or numbering