Recommendation 13

Recommendation	To	Prerequisite or Priority Level
Conduct a study to identify: (1) which new gTLDs have been visited most; (2) the reasons users identify to explain why they visited certain new gTLDs more than others; (3) what factors matter most to users in determining which gTLDs to visit and (4) how users' behaviors indicate to what extent they trust new gTLDs.	ICANN Org Future CCT	Prerequisite

Rationale/Related findings:

The two surveys (ICANN Global Consumer Surveys) undertaken first in 2015, and repeated in 2016 revealed the following in respect of consumer awareness and trust in new gTLDs:

- Consumer awareness of new gTLD is lower than awareness of legacy gTLDs – sometimes by a margin as much as 46%.
- Visitations to new gTLD sites were not as often as visits to the legacy gTLDs (approximate margins of around 56%), which was comparable to the lesser known legacy gTLDs.

Success Measures:

Indicators of Success in carrying out this recommendation would include the following:

- Increased global awareness of new gTLDs, thus reducing the gap between awareness of legacy gTLDs and that of new gTLDs.
- Increased instances of visitations to new gTLDs as awareness increases, also bridging the gap between legacy gTLD visitations and new gTLD visitations.
- Reported increased level of trust for new gTLDs, which is at least favorably comparable to that in legacy gTLDs.

- Correlations between the level of familiarity ad number of visitations as well as trust in particular gTLDs be they legacy or new gTLDs.

Details:
It is therefore important, for the ICANN Organisation and future CCT Review Team(s) to establish:
(1) which specific new gTLDs have the most visitations
(2) any reasons that users give to explain their choice to visit certain new gTLDs more than they do others;
(3) which specific factors drive consumers to determine and choose which gTLDs (both legacy and new gTLDs) to visit. (Factors that determine frequency and regularity of visitations to certain gTLDs);
(4) how users' behaviors indicate the extent to which they trust new gTLDs. For instance:
    a. Are more visitations a result of increased trust?
    b. Are less visitations a consequence of a lack of trust?
    c. Does awareness of a certain gTLD or lack thereof affect the trust placed upon it?

The premise of this recommendation, therefore, is that while several factors (such as familiarity, awareness, security and others mentioned in the report), were identified as key drivers to visitation of new gTLDs, it is important to interrogate this further to get more granular data. This would then guide the subsequent rounds of new gTLDs, to ensure that such factors are provided for and incorporated in policy documents and compliance contracts. Compliance department, for instance, could then use these as a basis for ensuring that applicants adhere to these factors as defined in the said documents.

It must be noted that this is not only important for trust within new gTLDs, but the effects of such data could ripple into other aspects of the Domain Name Industry as a whole. This is the basis on which this recommendation has been given its Prerequisite priority level. In essence, the data would establish, what drives Consumer end users and registrants' motivations for visitations?

Public Comment Feedback/Community Reactions

- 3 in favor
- 3 against

- 1 neutral

- 14 no indication of stance/silent

Total: 22 submissions.

Stakeholder Group/Commenter	Support/Against	Other notes
ALAC	Supported this recommendation.	
Registries Stakeholder Group (RySG)	• Supported the recommendation* itself, but not priority level. • Also suggested lack of trust indicators.	Questioned the priority level of pre-requisite.
Com Laude	Supported the recommendation, but not the priority level. Suggested that over and above the suggested items, there should be questions specific to Brand TLDs. [*Our response to this part: CCT Review Team welcomes this suggestion and agree that it would be interesting to look at factors specific to Brand TLDs. However, it is believed that the proposed general study might offer insights to Brand TLDs, and if they stand out, the results would show this.)*	Questioned the priority level of pre-requisite.
DomainMondo.com	This is a general comment. Perhaps the most specific part of this comment is where the Commenter expresses their lack of understanding of the components of "Consumer Trust"	
NCSG	They do not perceive it to be a prerequisite, not do they see the justification for such a study to be taken at the expense of ICANN organisation.	NCSG does not support the recommendation.

Stakeholder Group/Commenter	Support/Against	Other notes
ICANN Org	ICANN Organisation details the estimated resources that may be necessitated by the implementation of the recommendation, and calls the CCT Review Team to consider convergence of efforts with the gTLD Marketplace Index CCTRT: Have no outright disagreements with this suggestion. The idea is for the information to be gathered. We rely on ICANN Organisation for the modalities of how the recommendation can be implemented; the means and approaches are entirely within ICANN organization's prerogative in line with how best they see fit. That said, the implementation of this recommendation can thus be "posted" to the gTLD Marketplace Index.	
Neustar Inc.	Their comment questions the practicality of the recommendation as well as whether the benefits would justify the high costs.	Does not agree with the level of priority placed on the recommendation.

Concluding thoughts

In summary, there have been a few key recurring themes emanating from the Public comments:

- Reduce the level of priority for* the recommendation from being a pre-requisite.
- The perceived costs may outweigh the benefits.

- Implementation to be in convergence with metrics collected under the gTLD Marketplace Index
- Include the perceived indicators of lack of trust (to be carried over to the Recommendation 15)
- Define more articulately the components of consumer trust.
- Include questions specific to Brand TLDs.

<u>Prerequisite or Priority Level:</u>

In response to these themes, the CCTRT ***may concede*** to reducing the priority level to High Priority rather than prerequisite.