RESPONSES FROM THE ANALYSIS GROUP (AG) TO ADDITIONAL FOLLOW UP QUESTIONS FROM THE RPM WORKING GROUP
Compiled by ICANN Staff (27 July 2017)

A. New Responses to Questions sent on 5 June 2017 (Questions provided by John McElwaine)

1. **With respect to the Claims Service data referenced on page 7 of the Report, did this data include or identify the name of the registrar that provided the Claims Notices?**

   - AG: These data do not provide the registrar name, but there is a numeric registrar ID code. ICANN's website (https://www.iana.org/assignments/registrar-ids/registrar-ids.xhtml[iana.org]) can be used to match the registrar ID to the registrar's name.

2. **Why were there duplicate records in this Claims Service data?**

   - AG: It is unclear why there were duplicate records. We asked IBM, and they were not sure, but we or the WG could follow-up with IBM to further probe on this point.

3. **How did IBM know that many registrars downloaded records from the TMDB? And why could these download attempts not be accounted for?**

   - AG: This is a hypothesis on the part of IBM, and not something that they know as a fact. The idea is that registrars may send "registration requests" to the TMDB to determine what words are registered in the TMDB.

4. **Who were the two registrars that averaged more than 20 download attempts referenced on page 7 of the Report?**

   - Note from ICANN Staff: We are not able to provide this information as it has been anonymized so as not to compromise confidentiality; in addition, we cannot be absolutely certain as to whether the large download sizes by these two registrars were associated with actual domain registration attempts or not.

5. **What does the reference to "individual" being a "Trademark Holder" in Table 1 on page 8 represent?**

   - AG: The column 'Trademark Holder' in Table 1 corresponds to the 'Trademark Holder Organization' in the Deloitte trademark database. The trademark holder of the mark 'cloud' is a single individual so his organization is recorded in the database as 'Individual'.

6. **Did you ask registrars what their abandonment rate was for .COM domain name registration attempts?**

   - AG: We did not explicitly ask for the abandonment rate associated with .COM. We did however ask for registration data related to all TLDs offered by registrars, so that would include .COM for registrars that offer registrations in .COM.

7. Why could you not observe the registration abandonment rate for registrations that are attempted outside of the Claims Service period?

- AG: The registration data available to us through IBM was only available during the Claims Service period, as that is the period of time during which the Claims Service notices are sent. In order to observe registration and abandonment activity outside of the Claims Service period, we would need registrars to provide data on all registration attempts, showing the attempted domain name and whether the registration was completed or not. We did not receive sufficient data from registrars to conduct this analysis.

B. Responses Received to Questions from Working Group Members from Conference Call with AG on 5 April 2017

1. **On page 9 of the Revised Report, it says the median TMs registered in the TMCH was 1. Can we get more detail in buckets? (e.g. # that registered 2-5, 6-10, 11-50, 51-100, etc.)** (question from George Kirikos)

   - AG will provide these details pursuant to its updated Statement of Work with ICANN.

2. **On page 9 of the Revised Report, the top 10 most popular strings (e.g. SMART, FOREX, HOTEL, etc) were listed. Can we get the top 500?** (question from George Kirikos)

   - AG will provide these details pursuant to its updated Statement of Work with ICANN.

3. **The Revised Report indicates in several areas that conclusions could not be reached because various parties failed to respond to requests from Analysis Group for additional data. It would be great to receive additional context from Analysis Group on the specific requests it made, to whom, and any reasons given for failure to respond or provide the requested data.** (question from Phil Marano)

i. Registration attempt and abandonment rates outside the Claims Service Period
   - Our data request was sent to a sample of registrars that offer registrations in the most popular new TLDs.
   - We requested data on all new gTLD domain registration attempts: the attempted domain name (e.g., Domain.newTLD), the date of the registration attempt, and indication for whether a Claims Service notification was sent, and an indication of whether the registration was completed.
   - We received data from one registrar.

ii. Commercial Watch Services and Global Blocking Programs data
   - To understand how these services interact with TMCH services, we would want to see which trademark holders are enrolled in commercial services, what services they use, how much they pay, and how this seems to affect their use of TMCH services (e.g., does it reduce their probability of making Sunrise registrations?).
   - We did not request this information from commercial watch services or registries offering global blocking programs.

iii. Sunrise registration price data

- Our data request was sent to a sample of registries who had shared general availability and (in some cases) Sunrise pricing data with us for AG's New gTLD reports.
- We requested data on Sunrise and general availability registration pricing.
- We did not receive enough responses to generate a meaningful sample of pricing data to conduct a comparison of Sunrise prices and general availability prices.

4. **If the registration application was abandoned, Analysis Group could not see the DOMAIN applied for, so there's no way of tracing duplicate pings, etc.?** (question from Michael Graham)

- That is correct. If no registration was made, it is possible that multiple abandoned attempts were made to register the same domain.

5. **Do we know if a user who got a Claims Notice and abandoned their attempt to register then subsequently decided later to go back and register the domain despite the Claims Notice?** (question from Kristine Dorrain)

- We cannot trace potential registrants in the data (for example, we do not have ISP addresses), so we're not able to identify return applicants.

6. **Are there data on abandonment of registrations where there is no Claims Notice (e.g. legacy TLDs)? Do we have any data on abandonment during the same periods for those starting the registration process but not receiving a Claims Notice?** (question from Griffin Barnett)

- Data on abandonment outside of the Claims Period would be ideal (as listed above in the response to question #3), however we were not able to collect this data. We requested registration attempt and abandonment data from registrars, however, we only received data from one registrar. We do not have information on registration activity for legacy TLDs, but legacy TLD registration activity may not be a good comparable for registration activity in new gTLDs, since domains in legacy TLDs may have a different value to registrants than new gTLD domains. Legacy TLDs were also available at a different time than new gTLDs, and it is possible that registrant behavior has changed over time.