

**I C A N N**

**COMMUNITY FORUM**

**58**

**COPENHAGEN**

11-16 March 2017





**Competition,  
Consumer Trust and  
Consumer Choice  
(CCTRT) Review**

# CCTRT DRAFT REPORT

Evaluate how  
New gTLD Program has  
promoted Competition,  
Consumer Trust and  
Consumer Choice

Evaluate Effectiveness  
of Application and  
Evaluation Processes

Evaluate  
Effectiveness of  
Safeguards

## CCT Goals

- Perform data driven assessment of the New gTLD Program
- Inform policy related to the entry of new gTLDs

# DRAFT REPORT

- **Initial Conclusions**
  - Improvement in Competition, Consumer Choice and Adoption of Safeguards
  - Data collection needed to identify any significant negative consequence
- **Save the date**
  - Webinar for clarifying questions & input (Date to be confirmed)
- **Help us shape our final report through the Public Comment Period**
  - **Close date:** 27 April 2016
  - **Link:** <https://www.icann.org/public-comments/cct-rt-draft-report-2017-03-07-en>
  - **Email Address:** [comments-cct-rt-draft-report-07mar17@icann.org](mailto:comments-cct-rt-draft-report-07mar17@icann.org)

# KEY FINDINGS

## *On balance, the expansion of the DNS marketplace:*

- Has demonstrated increased Competition & Consumer Choice
- Is somewhat successful in mitigating its impact on Consumer Trust and Rights (particularly trademark) protection

## *Caveats:*

- New gTLD Program should be regarded only as a “good start”
- A number of policy issues should be addressed before any further expansion of gTLDs
- New gTLDs are still quite new
- Incomplete data limited a more complete analysis

# DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS & TIMELINES

| Category        | Timeline   | # (/50) |
|-----------------|--|---------|
| Prerequisite    | Must be implemented prior to launch of subsequent procedures | 18      |
| High priority   | Within 18 months of final report                             | 16      |
| Medium priority | Within 36 months of final report                             | 8       |
| Low priority    | Prior to start of next CCT                                   | 8       |

# DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS SNAPSHOT

| TOPIC                              | #             |
|------------------------------------|---------------|
| Data Analysis                      | 1<br>(0-1)    |
| Competition                        | 7<br>(2-8)    |
| Consumer Choice                    | 4<br>(9-12)   |
| Consumer Trust                     | 4<br>(13-16)  |
| Safeguards                         | 26<br>(17-42) |
| Application and Evaluation Process | 8<br>(42-50)  |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                       | <b>50</b>     |

# Next Steps

Mar



- Draft Report Published for Public Comment
- DNS Abuse Preliminary Report
- INTA Survey
- Parking Data

May

- Face-to-Face Meeting
- May 25: Public Comment Close Date

Jun



- DNS abuse study Final Report
- Face-to-Face Meeting

Jul

- Final Report to Board

2017



A world map where the continents are defined by a complex network of white nodes and connecting lines, set against a dark blue background. The nodes vary in size and are densely packed in some areas, creating a digital or network-like appearance of the globe.

**Questions?**

# Share your views



Send us a comment at [comments-cct-rt-draft-report-07mar17@icann.org](mailto:comments-cct-rt-draft-report-07mar17@icann.org)



Schedule a conference call together



Follow our wiki at <http://cct.wiki> for more information!

The image features a world map where the continents are defined by a complex network of white dots and thin white lines. The dots represent nodes, and the lines represent connections between them, creating a mesh-like structure. The background is a solid, vibrant orange color. The text "Thank you" is centered on the left side of the map.

**Thank you**

The image features a dark blue background with a white network of nodes and lines that forms a world map. The nodes are small circles of varying sizes, and the lines are thin, connecting the nodes to represent a global network or data flow. The map is centered and occupies most of the frame.

# Appendices

# DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS SNAPSHOT

| TOPIC                                 | #             | TIMELINE  |           |          |          | TO ICANN<br>ORG | TO GNSO PDP WGs |           |          | TO<br>NEXT<br>CCT | TO GAC   |
|---------------------------------------|---------------|-----------|-----------|----------|----------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------|----------|-------------------|----------|
|                                       |               | P         | H         | M        | L        |                 | PDP<br>WG       | SubP      | RPM      |                   |          |
|                                       |               |           |           |          |          |                 |                 |           |          |                   |          |
| Data Analysis                         | 1<br>(0-1)    | 0         | 1         | 0        | 0        | 1               | 0               | 0         | 0        | 0                 | 0        |
| Competition                           | 7<br>(2-8)    | 2         | 1         | 1        | 3        | 7               | 0               | 0         | 0        | 0                 | 0        |
| Consumer Choice                       | 4<br>(9-12)   | 2         | 0         | 1        | 1        | 3               | 0               | 1         | 1        | 1                 | 0        |
| Consumer Trust                        | 4<br>(13-16)  | 3         | 0         | 0        | 1        | 3               | 0               | 1         | 0        | 1                 | 0        |
| Safeguards                            | 26<br>(17-42) | 4         | 14        | 6        | 2        | 22              | 4               | 2         | 2        | 7                 | 0        |
| Application and<br>Evaluation Process | 8<br>(42-50)  | 7         | 0         | 0        | 1        | 3               | 0               | 6         | 0        | 0                 | 1        |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                          | <b>50</b>     | <b>18</b> | <b>16</b> | <b>8</b> | <b>8</b> | <b>39</b>       | <b>4</b>        | <b>10</b> | <b>3</b> | <b>9</b>          | <b>1</b> |

# DATA COLLECTION DRAFT RECS.

| Rec # |   |
|-------|---|
| 1     | <p>Formalize &amp; promote ongoing data collection-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Initiative to facilitate quantitative analysis of market &amp; policy implementation<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•Dedicated Data Scientist</li></ul></li></ul> |

# COMPETITION DRAFT RECS.

| Rec #    |  |
|----------|--|
| <b>2</b> | Regularly collect wholesale pricing for legal gTLD (legacy and new gTLD) registries (confidentially)   |
| <b>3</b> | Regularly transactional pricing for gTLD marketplace from registries (confidentially)  |
| <b>4</b> | Collect retail pricing for marketplace & develop capability to analyse data  |
| <b>5</b> | Collect parking data, track parking rates at a TLD & identify trends   |
| <b>6</b> | Collect parking data -<br>Engage with secondary market community market  |
| <b>7</b> | Collect TLD sales at a country level   |
| <b>8</b> | Create/support/partner with entities that collect TLD sales data at a country level<br>Enhance cooperation (standardization of research, methodology), to obtain comparable data |

# CONSUMER CHOICE DRAFT RECS.

| Rec #     |  |
|-----------|--|
| <b>9</b>  | Conduct periodic survey of registrants - collect registrant trends   |
| <b>10</b> | Consider if defensive registrations can be reduced for brands registering a large number of domains  |
| <b>11</b> | Consumer/end-user/ registrant surveys to explore benefits of expanded number, availability & specificity of new gTLDs, such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Contributions to choice from geo TLDs, specific sector TLDs and IDN TLDs</li><li>• Confusion</li><li>• Geographic distribution of registrants/availability of registrar services</li></ul> |
| <b>12</b> | More strictly regulate collection of personal data by registries   |



# CONSUMER TRUST DRAFT RECS.

| Rec #     |  |
|-----------|--|
| <b>13</b> | Conduct study on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Which new gTLDs have been visited most</li><li>• Reasons users visit to certain new gTLDs</li><li>• What factors matter</li><li>• How users behaviors explain howthey trust new gTLDs</li></ul>                    |
| <b>14</b> | Incentivize registries to meet user expectations regarding: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Relationship of content of a gTLD to its name</li><li>• Registration restrictions based upon implied trust</li><li>• Safety and security of users' information</li></ul> |
| <b>15</b> | Repeat portions of global surveys to look for increase in familiarity with at new gTLDs, visitation & perceived trustworthiness  |

# CONSUMER TRUST DRAFT RECS.

| Rec #     |   |
|-----------|---|
| <b>16</b> | <p>Commission Study on impact of restrictions on who can buy new gTLD domains:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Compare trust levels with varying degrees of registration restrictions</li><li>• Correlations between DNS abuse and presence/absence of reg. restrictions</li><li>• Costs and benefits of registration restrictions</li><li>• How to enforce reg. restrictions</li></ul> |

# SAFEGUARDS DRAFT RECS.

| Rec #     |  |
|-----------|--|
| <b>17</b> | Assess whether: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Significant % of WHOIS complaints relate to accuracy of identity of registrant</li><li>• Difference in behavior between new/legacy gTLDs</li></ul> |
| <b>18</b> | Accuracy data should be considered by upcoming WHOIS RT  |
| <b>19</b> | Repeat data collection comparing abuse rates in domains under new vs. legacy Registry/Registrar Agreements   |
| <b>20</b> | Next CCTRT to review proposed Registry Operator Framework and assess if clear/effective to mitigate  |
| <b>21</b> | Assess whether abuse reporting mechanisms led to more focused efforts to combat abuse  |
| <b>22</b> | Assess if more efforts are needed to publicize contact points where abuse/illegal behavior complaints should go  |

# SAFEGUARDS DRAFT RECS.

| Rec #        |   |
|--------------|---|
| <b>23</b>    | Provide detailed information on the subject matter of Compliance complaints: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• type of law violation</li><li>• relates to protection of sensitive information?</li></ul>  |
| <b>24</b>    | Initiate stakeholder consultations on what constitutes reasonable and appropriate security measures commensurate with offering of services  |
| <b>25-30</b> | Study aspects of highly regulated new gTLDs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Steps registry operators take to establish relationships with relevant gov/industry</li><li>• # of complaints received by registrants from regulatory bodies and standard practices to respond</li><li>• Sample websites to see if contact information to file complaints is easy to find</li><li>• Enforcement of restrictions on necessary credentials by auditing registrars &amp; resellers</li><li>• # of complaints by seeking info from ICANN Contractual Compliance and registrars/resellers of highly regulated domains</li><li>• Compare rates of abuse among those highly regulated gTLDs that voluntarily agreed to verify/validate credentials vs, those that don't</li></ul> |

# SAFEGUARDS DRAFT RECS.

| Rec #     |   |
|-----------|---|
| <b>31</b> | Examine ICANN Compliance complaints for a registry operator's failure to comply w/ safeguards on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• inherent governmental functions</li><li>• cyberbullying</li></ul> |
| <b>32</b> | Survey on enforcement by registries of cyberbullying safeguards   |
| <b>33</b> | Collect data on subjective/objective trustworthiness of new gTLDs with reg. restrictions on registration vs. those w/ few or none   |
| <b>34</b> | Repeat/refine DNS Abuse Study to determine if the presence of additional reg. restrictions correlate to decreases in abuse in new gTLDs vs. new gTLDs w/o reg. restrictions, and as compared to legacies    |
| <b>35</b> | Collect data on cost/benefits of implementing reg. restrictions, including impact on compliance costs, costs for registries, registrars & registrants   |
| <b>36</b> | Seek public comment on impact of new gTLD reg. restrictions on competition, including whether restrictions create undue preferences   |

# SAFEGUARDS DRAFT RECS.

| Rec #     |   |
|-----------|---|
| <b>37</b> | Improve accessibility of voluntary PICs by maintaining a publicly accessible database   |
| <b>38</b> | Future gTLD applicants to state goals of each voluntary PIC   |
| <b>39</b> | Require all voluntary PICs to be submitted during application process so that GAC has sufficient opportunity to meet deadlines for community/limited public interest objections |
| <b>40</b> | A full impact study on impact the impact of new gTLDs on the cost/effort required to protect trademarks and repeat regularly to see the evolution                               |
| <b>41</b> | Full review URS and consider how to interoperate with the UDRP  |
| <b>42</b> | Fully review TMCH and its scope to provide data to make recommendations & allow an effective policy review  |

# APPLICATION & EVALUATION PROCESS DRAFT RECS.

| Rec #     |   |
|-----------|---|
| <b>43</b> | Set objectives for applications from the global South, establish clear measurable goals, and define “Global South”  |
| <b>44</b> | Expand and improve outreach into Global South   |
| <b>45</b> | ICANN to coordinate the pro bono assistance program   |
| <b>46</b> | Revisit Applicant Financial Support Program, and try to further reduce overall cost of application, including additional subsidies & dedicated support for underserved communities              |
| <b>47</b> | GAC consensus advice to Board regarding gTLDs to be clearly enunciated, actionable & accompanied by a rationale. ICANN to provide template & Applicant Guidebook to clarify process & timelines |
| <b>48</b> | Review procedures & objectives for community-based applications. Reflect amendments revised AGB   |

# APPLICATION & EVALUATION PROCESS DRAFT RECS.

| Rec #     |  |
|-----------|--|
| <b>49</b> | <p>Consider new policies to avoid potential for inconsistent results in string confusion objections. Consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Determine through initial string similarity review process that singular/plural versions of the same gTLD string should not be delegated</li><li>• Avoid disparities in similar disputes by ensuring that all similar cases of plural/ singular strings are examined by same expert panelist</li><li>• Introduce a post dispute resolution panel review mechanism</li></ul> |
| <b>50</b> | <p>Review results of dispute resolutions on all objections prior to the next CCT review</p>  |