Translations: If translations will be provided please indicate the languages below:										

Report of Public Comments

Title:	How Do We Raise Global Awareness of New gTLDs?

Publication Date:	29 August 2011
Prepared By:	Lynn Lipinski

<table>
<tr><td colspan="2">Comment Period:</td><td colspan="2">Important Information Links</td></tr>
<tr><td>Open Date:</td><td>24 June 2011</td><td colspan="2">Announcement</td></tr>
<tr><td>Close Date:</td><td>15 July 2011</td><td colspan="2">Public Comment Box</td></tr>
<tr><td>Time (UTC):</td><td>23:59</td><td colspan="2">View Comments Submitted</td></tr>
<tr><td>Staff Contact:</td><td>Michele Jourdan</td><td>Email:</td><td>michele.jourdan@icann.org</td></tr>
</table>

Section I: General Overview and Next Steps

On 20 June 2011, ICANN's Board of Directors approved a plan to dramatically increase the number of generic top-level domains. As part of the program, the Board specified a minimum of four months spent raising global awareness of the new opportunity prior to the application window opening on 12 January 2012. Staff developed a working draft of a Communications Plan and posted it for public comment on 24 June 2011. Staff will now consider the comments received and decide on next steps, which may result in a revision of the draft Plan.

Section II: Contributors

When the comment period closed, 18 submissions had been posted to the Forum. The contributors, both individuals and organizations/groups, are listed below in chronological order by posting date with initials noted. To the extent that quotations are used Section III, the citations will reference the contributor's initials.

Organizations and Groups:

Name	Submitted by	Initials
Internet Society Hong Kong	Edmon Chung	ISOC HK
Intellectual Property Constituency of the GNSO	Steven Metalitz	IPC
Andalucia.com	Chris Chaplow	CC
Coalition Against Domain Name Abuse	Elizabeth Cummings	CADNA
International Trademark Association Internet Committee	Claudio Digangi	INTA
Secura GMBH	Hans Peter Oswald	SGMBH

Registries Stakeholder Group (RySG)	David W. Maher	RySG

Individuals:

Name	Affiliation (if provided)	Initials
Naveed Haq		NH
Paul Foody		PF
Gurjeewan V. Singh	เกมส์.com	GVS
Barbara Koster	4U Systems	BK
Manuel Espinoza	Wabbsters Inc.	ME
Danny Younger		DY
Gurjeewan Sachavirawongse		GS
Michele Neylon	Blacknight Solutions	MN

Section III: Summary of Comments

General Disclaimer: This section is intended to broadly and comprehensively summarize the comments submitted to this Forum, but not to address every specific position stated by each contributor. Staff recommends that readers interested in specific aspects of any of the summarized comments, or the full context of others, refer directly to the specific contributions at the link referenced above (View Comments Submitted).

Leveraging the ICANN Community
Five respondents (MN, SGMBH, CC, NH, and ISOC HK) expressed the value of leveraging the ICANN community in raising awareness. MN stated "an obvious way to communicate cost-effectively would be to leverage ICANN's existing relationships with registrars, ALAC, ISOC and others." NH stated that "face-to-face meetings" and "events" were more effective than online tools in getting the message to corporate executives, government officials and others in developing countries, and that the ICANN Fellows should be deployed for this purpose. SGMBH stressed the importance for "resellers and registrars to create events" locally to get media coverage, and offered to create such an event in September 2011, in addition to one already planned in Munich by another organization.

Messaging and Neutrality vs. Advocacy
Various aspects of messaging drew several comments.

RySG expressed concerns about the clarity of the distinction between the Sponsored and Community-Based TLD models to potential applicants.

While CADNA "does support ICANN's efforts to raise awareness," the group expressed concerns that the plan crossed the line into advocacy and was not neutral or educational enough. Instead of using unproven claims that new gTLDs will create new business opportunities and will not impact Internet stability, ICANN should be emphasizing that applying is an expensive, time-intensive process and is not for everyone. ISOC HK noted that the theme 'What will be the next big .thing? You name it!' seems to be directly encouraging everyone to invest in their own TLD, which is what ICANN said it

would not do. INTA recommended that the key message, 'New gTLDs are a platform for innovation' should be "toned down to reflect a potential for innovation only," citing the 3 December 2010 economic study. DY recommended that staff include in key messages a warning to the general public about misleading pre-registration schemes.

INTA expressed concern that the plan's key messages left out "obligations that accompany operation of a new gTLD, such as the requirement to comply with various measures designed to protect consumers from confusion as to the affiliation or approval of any domain name by recognized trademark owners." INTA also stated that ICANN's plan seems "to pigeonhole trademark rights protection mechanisms as a topic of interest only to trademark attorneys," when potential applicants and end-users of new gTLDs should be informed of these as well.

INTA also stated that ICANN should not use as key messages the statements that the New gTLD Program was developed in a transparent, inclusive and thorough way or that strong efforts were made to address concerns of all parties because they are "debatable statements that many stakeholders do not agree with" and deal with the development of the program.

Budget
Noting that a $750,000 budget seems "alarmingly low" for a global campaign, CADNA asks ICANN to release further information on the final budget and plans to spend it. Questions about the exact budget amount and plans to spend it were also raised by ISOC HK, CC and IPC.

Other Specific Suggestions
Both GS and GVS expressed support for "skipping the communications period" and "fast-tracking" the introduction of IDN gTLDs such as .com and .net by existing operators.

PF asked that ICANN "send an email to every existing domain registrant advising them of ICANN's new gTLD plans."

CC "believes that the communications plan should be as international as possible and focus on areas and languages where the knowledge and understanding of the gTLD program is currently low." CC also asked that a "cross check should be carried out to see how the plan aligns with the latest ICANN strategic plan and that RFP vendors be made aware of [it]."

ISOC HK recommended that less emphasis be placed on advertising and more on road shows, events, education and public relations oriented approaches. Regarding target audiences, ISOC HK stated that communities and Internet users should not be left out of the plan.

Three respondents offered specific services by their organizations. ISOC HK expressed interest in being a supplier for the road show events, particularly in Hong Kong and greater China. ME offered to send a PDF to every corporate entity in the world in exchange for a waived application fee; and BK offered the use of a non-ICANN second-level domain in promotional efforts.

Questions Raised

The IPC asked 12 multi-layered questions (summarized below):

1. What metrics will be used to measure success?
2. Why does the communications plan continue beyond the closing of the new gTLD application window?
3. In light of comments by Board members and others about the need to prioritize potential IDN applications, why is this priority not reflected in the communications plan?
4. How is neutrality defined and how will it be ensured through the communications plan?
5. If investors are among the target audiences, will communications to them be vetted for compliance with applicable security laws and how will neutrality be maintained?
6. Why target entities that already plan to apply?
7. Will ICANN expend resources promoting new gTLDs after they are delegated and introduced into the root?
8. How will ICANN partner with IPC and its members to reach right holders and trademark attorneys?
9. Why target "registries/registrars," as they already are aware?
10. Wouldn't any resources devoted to manufacturers of routing hardware be better spent on reaching IDN communities and other underserved audiences?
11. What is meant by the metric listed as "applications received"?
12. How much will be budgeted for the Communications Plan?

Supplier Selection

ISOC HK asked for more information on how ICANN will select suppliers in a manner consistent with its mandate for outreach and to support competition.

Section IV: Analysis of Comments

> *General Disclaimer: This section is intended to provide an analysis and evaluation of the comments received along with explanations regarding the basis for any recommendations provided within the analysis.*

Leveraging the ICANN Community

As stated within the Goal, leveraging the ICANN community is a core component of the Communications Plan, and multilingual materials are being prepared for use by community members within their regions and industry groups to raise awareness of new gTLDs. Community members with recommendations for events or other opportunities for promoting awareness of new gTLDs are encouraged to contact Michele Jourdan (michele.jourdan@icann.org) at least one month before the event, and to provide the event date, time, location and information on sponsoring organizations and the expected audience.

Messaging and "Neutrality" vs. Advocacy

Several comments addressed the wording, content and overall intent of messaging. It is ICANN's goal to ensure that all materials are balanced in their presentation of the opportunities presented by new gTLDs. ICANN takes no position on whether someone should apply. All the materials stress that

interested parties should consider the benefits and the risks.

The comments received suggest that "neutrality" can be interpreted in different ways. Some of the calls for neutrality seem to define it as a call for ICANN to take a negative stance on the potential of new gTLDs.

ICANN's goal is to inform parties so they can make informed decisions on whether to apply; it is not ICANN's goal to generate applications. The awareness-raising campaign should be upbeat in tone to attract attention in a highly competitive media environment and to reflect the style that audiences are accustomed to. This is not a question of content, but of style. The content will, as noted above, remain neutral.

As communications materials are finalized, they will be vetted internally to ensure that the messages are and remain objective, clear and accurate.

Budget
The plan is balanced between purchased communications opportunities and those made available to ICANN without fee through its community members, outreach, and the generation of written materials. In addition ICANN will use existing events and community support to expand its reach.

A global awareness-raising campaign is expensive. In an environment of scarce resources, the budget represents a balance between what seems reasonable for raising awareness, and ICANN's overall operations budget and status as a non-profit. We are evaluating event opportunities and available media buying opportunities to determine the best way to spend the limited funds. Once the plan is determined, we will monitor results on an ongoing basis.

Other Specific Suggestions
Suggestions to skip the communications period and fast-track the introduction of IDN gTLDs such as .com and .net are noted, but they are not supported by the community's consensus policy, which mandates a communications period of at least four months. However, communicating about the availability of internationalized domain names (IDNs) through the New gTLD Program is a top priority.

The points regarding the international scope of the program, the performance of a cross-check between this plan and the latest ICANN strategic plan, and that less emphasis should be placed on advertising and more on road shows and events are noted. Organizations and individuals interested in providing marketing and communications services to ICANN should submit detailed proposals as soon as possible to Michele Jourdan, Manager of New gTLD Communications (michele.jourdan@icann.org), for evaluation. A call was issued in August to the community for event recommendations.

Questions Raised
The questions raised have been answered in very broad terms within this document.

Success will be measured regularly through a variety of metrics to determine campaign reach and effectiveness. Metrics include: web traffic statistics, including page views and site activity, paid

advertising impressions, number of events and attendees, feedback surveys, social media activity, and media coverage. All tools will be tracked, measured and analyzed regularly and adjusted as appropriate.

A number of questions concerned the prioritization of target audiences and the allocation of time and resources to be spent on each. ICANN's goal in developing the communications plan was to be as broad and inclusive as possible when defining target audiences. This broad approach is intended to enable the campaign to be dynamic and flexible in order to take advantage of opportunities as they arise. As mentioned previously, the specific allocation of budget and resources will be determined as all opportunities within the campaign time period are evaluated for reach, cost, timing and effectiveness.

ICANN staff welcomes discussion and recommendations from stakeholders. Members of the ICANN community with specific ideas are encouraged to contact Michele Jourdan as noted above.

Regarding audiences, the plan does not target those who already plan to apply or registrars and registries, which are already aware of new gTLDs. Since the goal is awareness raising, the target audience initially is *potential* applicants who lie outside of ICANN's traditional sphere of reach and influence.

We note the calls for materials to educate end users, which certainly is important. Some of our current efforts will naturally reach them. As we progress through the communications process on new gTLDs, however, the primary focus during the first phase is on raising awareness of potential applicants.

Supplier Selection
ICANN's selection of vendors is guided by the Procurement Guidelines as updated in June 2010. ICANN will shortly identify the service providers selected to evaluate applications. They were selected from those responding to previous public calls for independent partners to perform this work.