

Vertical Integration PDP Working Group Objective 5 Survey

1. Please provide your name		2. Affiliation	
#	Response	#	
1	avri doria - take two	1	ncsg - but speaking only for myself
2	Rahman Khan John	2	None
3	Eric Brunner-Williams	3	CORE Internet Council of Registrars
4	Amadeu Abril i Abril	4	CORE Internet Council of Registrars
5	Antony Van Couvering	5	Minds + Machines
6	Kristina Rosette	6	Covington & Burling LLP
7	Ron Andruff	7	Business Constituency
8	Statton Hammock	8	Network Solutions
9	Steve Pinkos	9	independent
10	richard tindal	10	individual/ TLD applicant
11	Jeffrey Eckhaus	11	RsG
12	Jothan Frakes	12	Top Level Domain Holdings, LLC Registrar
13	Jon Nevett	13	Domain Dimensions, LLC
14	Mike Rodenbaugh	14	Rodenbaugh Law
15	Jacob Williams	15	Interlink/UrbanBrain (Registrar Stakeholder Group)
16	Faisal Shah	16	Individual
17	Roberto Gaetano	17	Individual
18	Anonymous	18	
19	Paul Diaz	19	Registrar
20	Stéphane Van Gelder	20	RrSG
21	Jarkko Ruuska	21	CBUC (Nokia)
22	Berry Cobb	22	CBUC
23	Thomas Barrett	23	encirca
24	Ching Chiao	24	DotAsia
25	Tero Mustala	25	Nokia Siemens Networks
26	Milton Mueller	26	Syracuse University NCSG
27	Alan Greenberg	27	ALAC
28	Brian Cute	28	RySG and Afiliis
29	Jeff Neuman	29	Neustar (but this answer is provided in my capacity as a WG member and has not been approved by NS)
30	Krista Papac	30	Iron Mountain and member of Registrar Stakeholder Group
31	Kathy Kleiman	31	PIR

Please rank the following choices with regard to the treatment of Objective 5 in order of preference (nr 1 = most preferred option, nr 3 = least preferred option)			
	1	2	3
Amend Objective 5 as follows: "Using all information that has been collected by ICANN to date, determine how (a) Internet users in general and (b) registrants of domain names, and (c) the retail and wholesale markets for domain names are effected by changes to the current restrictions and/or practices concerning registry-registrar separation and equivalent non-discriminatory access".	9 (33 %)	7 (26 %)	11 (41 %)
Delete Objective 5 altogether	15 (54 %)	4 (14 %)	9 (32 %)
None of the above	7 (26 %)	13 (48 %)	7 (26 %)

4. If you wish (and especially if you feel that "none of the above" is your top-ranked choice regarding Objective 5), please provide alternative proposals for the group to consider.

#	Response
1	amend 5 to include: replace all information that has been collected by ICANN to date to all available information, whether collected by ICANN or contributed by experts, and add a sentence to the end. While this process should begin early in the process of responding to the other objectives, it does not need to be completed in order for other objectives to be completed and recommendations sent to the Council related to the introduction of new gTLDs.
2	Distinguish between community and standard issues and objectives, and develop policy for each. Similarly, for price-capped, and uncapped standard issues and objective, and develop policy for each.
3	focus on providing a policy, with choices and differences for the different situations instead of focusing on futile exercises wrt drafting the questions.
4	I have a strong preference AGAINST deleting objective 5 and would not have ranked it all except I am required to do so. The WG members need to take into account the fact that the Council's approval of the Charter was dependent on there being AN objective 5. If the WG seeks to delete it, the Council may well either (a) reject that alternative; or (b) reject the entire charter.
5	Not sure how we would determine the effect on "Internet users in general", so if we would need to remove this line, but would prefer to remove completely
6	change "are effected" to "are likely to be affected"

7	Obj #5 can be accomplished with well thought out use cases and would not require the extensive study that other claim. Establish the use case and then define benefit/harm for Ry, Rr, Registrant, and Consumers/Users. I envision about 10 or so use cases that would be analyzed and I feel we have more than enough experience and education to fill in the blanks.
8	Assess impact on the same three groups of whatever recommendations come out of the PDP.
9	With respect to the 'effects analysis' in proposed Objective #5, sufficient analysis of the competitive and economic effects on Internet users, wholesale, retail and consumer segments would require expertise, resources and time that would push the timeline of the WG past the targeted June 2010 deliverable date. As such, we do not support proposed Objective #5 under these circumstances. However, the lack of an analytical basis for Vertical Integration proposals from the PDP Working Group would raise questions about the viability of these proposals. Accordingly, proposals for Vertical Integration that deviate significantly from the current regime must, at a minimum, identify potential competitive effects and consumer harm and articulate adequate safeguards and mechanisms to address these effects and harms.
10	I cannot rank the options. At this point objective 5 may or may not be relevant. If the group decides on a solution that does not change things dramatically (ie status quo with some limited exceptions), then it doesn't matter what objective 5 states. If there are changes proposed, however, then the research on the markets must be done, but we do not believe this group has the expertise to do that analysis alone AND such analysis cannot be limited to only the information collected already by icann. There must be true economic and market analysis and cannot be restricted by the little if any diligence ICANN has done to date.
11	With respect to the "effects analysis" in proposed Objective #5, sufficient analysis of the competitive and economic effects on Internet users, wholesale, retail and consumer segments would require expertise, resources and time that would push the timeline of the WG past the targeted June 2010 deliverable date. As such, we do not support proposed Objective #5 under these circumstances. However, the lack of an analytical basis for Vertical Integration proposals from the PDP Working Group would raise questions about the viability of these proposals. Accordingly, proposals for Vertical Integration that deviate significantly from the current regime must, at a minimum, identify potential competitive effects and consumer harm and articulate adequate safeguards and mechanisms to address these effects and harms.