Initial-report poll Edit

Default Report | + Add Report

Response Summary

Show this Page Only

PAGE: DEMOGRAPHICS

1. Your name   Download

	Response Count
💬 Show replies	37
answered question	37
skipped question	0

Show this Page Only

PAGE: PROPOSALS

2. BRU1 Please review the BRU1 proposal at this URL before answering the question: http://bit.ly/91obhc   Create Chart   Download

		Response Percent	Response Count
I'm in favor of this proposal		18.8%	6
I can live with this proposal		12.5%	4
I oppose this proposal		**56.3%**	**18**
No opinion		12.5%	4
	answered question		32
	skipped question		5

3. BRU2 Please review the BRU2 proposal at this URL before answering the question: http://bit.ly/9lp5mi   Create Chart   Download

	Response Count
answered question	31
skipped question	6

3. BRU2 Please review the BRU2 proposal at this URL before answering the question: http://bit.ly/9lp5mi

		Response Percent	Response Count
I'm in favor of this proposal		19.4%	6
I can live with this proposal		25.8%	8
I oppose this proposal		**48.4%**	**15**
No opinion		6.5%	2
	answered question		31
	skipped question		6

4. IPC Please review the IPC proposal at this URL before answering the question: http://bit.ly/9AB7du

		Response Percent	Response Count
I'm in favor of this proposal		0.0%	0
I can live with this proposal		12.5%	4
I oppose this proposal		**71.9%**	**23**
No opinion		15.6%	5
	answered question		32
	skipped question		5

5. DAGv4 Please review the DAGv4 proposal at this URL before answering the question: http://bit.ly/aWaloV

		Response Percent	Response Count
I'm in favor of this proposal		0.0%	0
I can live with this proposal		28.1%	9
I oppose this proposal		**65.6%**	**21**
No opinion		6.3%	2
	answered question		32
	skipped question		5

6. RACK+ Please review the RACK+ proposal at this URL before answering the question: http://bit.ly/cqXGMt

		Response Percent	Response Count
I'm in favor of this proposal		25.0%	8
I can live with this proposal		6.3%	2
I oppose this proposal		**62.5%**	**20**
No opinion		6.3%	2
		answered question	32
		skipped question	5

7. JN2+ Please review the JN2+ proposal at this URL before answering the question: http://bit.ly/dcMfDm

		Response Percent	Response Count
I'm in favor of this proposal		30.3%	10
I can live with this proposal		27.3%	9
I oppose this proposal		**36.4%**	**12**
No opinion		6.1%	2
		answered question	33
		skipped question	4

8. CAM Please review the CAM proposal at this URL before answering the question: http://bit.ly/aQy3hN

		Response Percent	Response Count
I'm in favor of this proposal		6.3%	2
I can live with this proposal		31.3%	10
I oppose this proposal		**59.4%**	**19**
No opinion		3.1%	1
		answered question	32
		skipped question	5

9. Free Trade Please review the Free Trade proposal at this URL before answering the question: http://bit.ly/d5221G

		Response Percent	Response Count
I'm in favor of this proposal		**45.5%**	**15**
I can live with this proposal		9.1%	3
I oppose this proposal		42.4%	14
No opinion		3.0%	1
	answered question		33
	skipped question		4

Show this Page Only

PAGE: DRAFTING-GROUP PROPOSALS

10. Exceptions Please review the Exceptions proposal at this URL before answering the question: http://bit.ly/bEDGTL

		Response Percent	Response Count
I'm in favor of this proposal		27.3%	9
I can live with this proposal		**42.4%**	**14**
I oppose this proposal		12.1%	4
No opinion		18.2%	6
	answered question		33
	skipped question		4

11. Compliance Please review the Compliance proposal at this URL before answering the question: http://bit.ly/bdQXic

		Response Percent	Response Count
I'm in favor of this proposal		24.2%	8
I can live with this proposal		**48.5%**	**16**
I oppose this proposal		9.1%	3
	answered question		33
	skipped question		4

11. Compliance Please review the Compliance proposal at this URL before answering the question: http://bit.ly/bdQXic   Create Chart   Download

No opinion		18.2%	6
		answered question	**33**
		skipped question	**4**

12. SRSU Please review the SRSU proposal at this URL before answering the question: http://bit.ly/aMlkgl   Create Chart   Download

		Response Percent	Response Count
I'm in favor of this proposal		21.2%	7
I can live with this proposal		**33.3%**	**11**
I oppose this proposal		24.2%	8
No opinion		21.2%	7
		answered question	**33**
		skipped question	**4**

Show this Page Only

PAGE: ATOMS -- CROSS-TLD

13. BRU1 1. LIMITS SHOULD APPLY ACROSS ALL TLDS. There was strong   Create Chart   Download
consensus that rules and limits should apply across all TLDs, regardless of the TLD offered by the registry or registrar in question. For example, BRU1 does not believe the .COM registry operator should be allowed to own more than 15% of, or control, a registrar offering TLDs other than .COM. BRU1 opposes any exception that would allow a registrar to own >15% of a registry if that registrar promised not to offer its registry's TLD (or vice versa). In this respect, BRU1 supports the Nairobi Board/ DAG 4 provision that places restrictions across all TLDs. The basis for this position is the strong belief that making such an exception would be close to allowing 100% cross-ownership in the same TLD. Also, it reflects a belief that ICANN staff are not resourced or trained to properly control the many and varied gaming scenarios affiliated registrars could employ to promote or sell the names in their registry's TLD (or attempt to damage the names of another registry's TLD). **In BRU1's view it would not just be a matter of trying to identify and monitor all the varied registrar and reseller operations owned by the registrar's parent company. There would also be myriad bundling, cross-marketing and promotional methods by which the affiliated registrar could circumvent the safeguard. BRU1 believes this is why existing contracts effectively limit cross ownership of registries and registrars at 15% -- regardless of the TLDs they offer.

	Response Percent	Response Count
answered question		**33**
skipped question		**4**

	Response Percent	Response Count
I'm in favor of this proposal	21.2%	7
I can live with this proposal	9.1%	3
I oppose this proposal	**54.5%**	**18**
No opinion	15.2%	5
	answered question	33
	skipped question	4

14. BRU2 1. LIMITS DO NOT APPLY ACROSS TLDS A registry operator or
registry services provider that does not distribute its own TLD should not be restricted from acting as a registrar in other TLDs. An existing registrar should not be prohibited from becoming a new TLD registry just because it sells other TLDs. The potential harms of registry sharing data with an affiliated reseller or friendly registrar can be addressed via contract and ICANN compliance and enforcement mechanisms, provided resources and commitment are present. The benefit of new entrants, including existing registrars, outweighs the potential harms from cross-ownership if no self-distribution is permitted.

	Response Percent	Response Count
I'm in favor of this proposal	33.3%	11
I can live with this proposal	18.2%	6
I oppose this proposal	**36.4%**	**12**
No opinion	12.1%	4
	answered question	33
	skipped question	4

15. CAM3 1. LIMITS ACROSS TLDS The CAM model seeks to break away
from ICANN's current one-size fits all distribution model, and to provide a framework that can both scale going forward and provide room for innovative new distribution models that are very different from those of existing TLDs' registry operators Limits across TLDs depend on the particular details of the application. The CAM baseline modeled after the ICANN Board resolution in Nairobi prohibits registrars from owning registries. However, if granted a waiver/exemption through the Competition/Consumer Evaluation Standing Panel (CESP), limits/restrictions would not apply.

	Response Percent	Response Count
I'm in favor of this proposal	9.1%	3
I can live with this proposal	36.4%	12
I oppose this proposal	**45.5%**	**15**
	answered question	33
	skipped question	4

15. CAM3 1. LIMITS ACROSS TLDS The CAM model seeks to break away Create Chart   Download
from ICANN's current one-size fits all distribution model, and to provide a framework that can both scale going forward and provide room for innovative new distribution models that are very different from those of existing TLDs' registry operators Limits across TLDs depend on the particular details of the application. The CAM baseline modeled after the ICANN Board resolution in Nairobi prohibits registrars from owning registries. However, if granted a waiver/exemption through the Competition/Consumer Evaluation Standing Panel (CESP), limits/restrictions would not apply.

No opinion		9.1%	3

	answered question	**33**
	skipped question	**4**

16. FreeTrade 1. LIMITS DO NOT APPLY ACROSS TLDS In the Free Trade Create Chart   Download
model for the coming round, there are no limits to Cross Ownership (CO) & Functional Control for new TLDs that distribute domains with equivalent access. The issues discussed around this concept have very little to do with percent ownership and more to do with the abuse and harms of having integrated control of data. Setting random percent ownership limits does nothing to mitigate harms and abuse. Such abuse examples are Discrimination, Insider trading, Domain registration abuse, Domain tasting, Front-running, Predatory pricing, Account lock-ins, Transfer-out pricing, reduced product variety. No harms have been shown to have occurred unmanageably to date, in any namespace, due to lack of VI/CO restrictions. Any alleged harms, if any, occur roughly equally across DNS, regardless of any such restrictions, if any. Whether the Registry (Ry) operates in self distribution model or a co-distribution model with "equal access" to all ICANN- accredited registrars, the concept of market power is essential when conducting the risk analysis and policy development of allowable models. In the new TLD space, and indeed the existing gTLDs (perhaps other than .com/net/org), there is no justification for any restrictions on vertical integration, cross-ownership, or the requirement of any or equal access to registrars. On the other hand, there is much likely benefit from avoiding or eliminating those restrictions. All other models foster the demand for exceptions in addition to the issue of harms and abuse. Therefore no such restrictions or requirements should be imposed upon new TLD registry operators. Of course, registrars will continue to be widely used by consumers to register new gTLD domains, to that extent the registrars must be ICANN-accredited to offer gTLD names. Registries who sell direct must also agree to the RAA and pay registrar fees to ICANN. Registrars will still be able sell most new gTLDs and charge fees based on their business model, but the ability to buy direct from a registry is certainly in consumer best interests to keep registration fees lower. ICANN assumes that the new TLD launch is in consumers' best interest, in order to expand consumer choice among domain names and in order to encourage DNS innovation, so it is logical that ICANN should enable new entrants to the gTLD market as much as possible. Thus the ability for new registries to sell direct, and to control their own distribution channel outside of ICANN's traditional model, is certainly in consumer's best interests.

		Response Percent	Response Count
I'm in favor of this proposal		**42.4%**	**14**
I can live with this proposal		15.2%	5
I oppose this proposal		33.3%	11
No opinion		9.1%	3

	answered question	**33**
	skipped question	**4**

Show this Page Only

17. BRU1 2. NO CONTROL REGARDLESS OF OWNERSHIP PERCENTAGE. Create Chart   Download
There can be no control (as defined by DAG 4 – essentially the ability to direct policy) between a registrar and a registry, or between a registry and a registrar, regardless of cross ownership percentages.

		Response Percent	Response Count
I'm in favor of this proposal		25.0%	8
I can live with this proposal		9.4%	3
I oppose this proposal		**53.1%**	**17**
No opinion		12.5%	4
		answered question	32
		skipped question	5

18. BRU2 2. CONTROL/OWNERSHIP Cross-ownership up to 100% is Create Chart   Download
permitted provided there is no distribution of own TLD. An existing registrar should be permitted to become a new TLD registry and own up to 100% provided they don't act as their own registrar. Separation of functionality and no self-distribution make restrictions on cross-ownership unnecessary provided ICANN enforces contracts.

		Response Percent	Response Count
I'm in favor of this proposal		30.3%	10
I can live with this proposal		21.2%	7
I oppose this proposal		**36.4%**	**12**
No opinion		12.1%	4
		answered question	33
		skipped question	4

19. CAM3 2. CONTROL/OWNERSHIP Any request by a Registry or Registrar, whether in the initial application or post delegation, seeking to acquire any ownership interest in an Registrar of Registry would be subject to a multi-step process. This process would apply to new gTLD applicants as well as existing Registrars and Registries seeking an ownership interest in a different type of Registration Authority. For new gTLD application this process would be part of the initial and extended review process. For gTLDs that have already been delegated, the process would resemble the current Registry Service Technical Evaluation Panel (RSTEP) process. Control/Ownership limits depends on the particular details of the application. The CAM baseline modeled after the ICANN Board resolution in Nairobi prohibits cross ownership/control. However, if granted a waiver/exemption through the Competition/Consumer Evaluation Standing Panel (CESP), control/ownership would be permitted provided that appropriate compliance safeguards specifically outlined in the proposal are incorporated.

	Response Percent	Response Count
I'm in favor of this proposal	12.1%	4
I can live with this proposal	27.3%	9
I oppose this proposal	**51.5%**	**17**
No opinion	9.1%	3