

Base: All Respondents

Q616. Country

16 Aug 2016
Table 1

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
NORTH AMERICA (NET)	266 35%	207 8%	473 14%	460 14%	207 100%	460 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	DGIKM	GIKM	GIKM	BHJLN	ADGKMBEGKACGKM	DHJLN								
US	204 27%	64 2%	268 8%	255 8%	64 31%	255 55%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	DGIKM	GIKM	GIKM	BHJLN	GWKMBEGKACGKM	EDHJLN								
CANADA	23 3%	80 3%	103 3%	105 3%	80 39%	105 23%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	GIKM	GIKM	GIKM	HJLN	FAGKMBEGKACGKM	DHJLN								
MEXICO	39 5%	63 2%	102 3%	100 3%	63 30%	100 22%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	DGIKM	GIKM	GIKM	HJLN	FAGKMBEGKACGKM	DHJLN								
EUROPE (NET)	114 15%	419 16%	533 16%	534 16%	-	-	-	-	419 100%	534 100%	-	-	-	-
	EGKM	EGKM	EGKM	FHLN					AEGKMBEGKACGKM	DFHLN				
ITALY	28 4%	26 1%	54 2%	50 1%	-	-	-	-	26 6%	50 9%	-	-	-	-
	DEGKM	M	GKM	FHLN					AEGKMBEGKACGKM	DFHLN				
TURKEY	5 1%	45 2%	50 1%	50 1%	-	-	-	-	45 11%	50 9%	-	-	-	-
	M	GKM	GKM	FHLN					AEGKMBEGKACGKM	DFHLN				
SPAIN	12 2%	38 1%	50 1%	50 1%	-	-	-	-	38 9%	50 9%	-	-	-	-
	GKM	GKM	GKM	FHLN					AEGKMBEGKACGKM	DFHLN				
POLAND	-	53 2%	53 2%	53 2%	-	-	-	-	53 13%	53 10%	-	-	-	-
		EGKM	GKM	AFHLN					AEGKMBEGKACGKM	DFHLN				
UK	26 3%	74 3%	100 3%	100 3%	-	-	-	-	74 18%	100 19%	-	-	-	-
	EGKM	EGKM	EGKM	FHLN					AEGKMBEGKACGKM	DFHLN				
FRANCE	26 3%	75 3%	101 3%	106 3%	-	-	-	-	75 18%	106 20%	-	-	-	-
	EGKM	EGKM	EGKM	FHLN					AEGKMBEGKACGKM	DFHLN				
GERMANY	17 2%	108 4%	125 4%	125 4%	-	-	-	-	108 26%	125 23%	-	-	-	-
	EGKM	EGKM	EGKM	AFHLN					AEGKMBEGKACGKM	DFHLN				
ASIA (NET)	196 25%	1341 52%	1537 46%	1539 46%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1341 100%	1539 100%
	EGIK	DEGIK	EGIK	AFHJL									AEGKMBEGKACGKM	DFHJL
CHINA	2 *	548 21%	550 16%	551 16%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	548 41%	551 36%
		DEGIK	EGIK	AFHJL									NAEGKMBEGKACGKM	DFHJL
VIETNAM	-	52 2%	52 2%	52 2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	52 4%	52 3%
		EGIK	GIK	AFHJL									AEGKMBEGKACGKM	DFHJL
PHILIPPINES	26 3%	76 3%	102 3%	101 3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	76 6%	101 7%
	EGIK	EGIK	EGIK	FHJL									AEGKMBEGKACGKM	DFHJL

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% nsk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Base: All Respondents

Q616. Country

16 Aug 2016
Table 1

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
JAPAN	-	176	176	176	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	176	176
	-	7%	5%	5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	13%	11%
		DEGIK	EGIK	AFHJL									AEGIKBEGIKCEGIK	DFHJL
SOUTH KOREA	32	69	101	101	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	69	101
	4%	3%	3%	3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5%	7%
	EGIK	EGIK	EGIK	FHJL									EGIKBEGIKCEGIK	DFHJL
RUSSIA	57	73	130	128	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	73	128
	7%	3%	4%	4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5%	8%
	DEGIK	EGIK	EGIK	BFHJL									EGIKBEGIKCEGIK	MDFHJL
INDIA	27	298	325	330	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	298	330
	4%	12%	10%	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	22%	21%
	EGIK	DEGIK	EGIK	AFHJL									AEGIKBEGIKCEGIK	DFHJL
INDONESIA	52	49	101	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	49	100
	7%	2%	3%	3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4%	6%
	DEGIKM	EGIK	EGIK	BFHJL									EGIKBEGIKCEGIK	MDFHJL
AFRICA (NET)	62	352	414	401	-	-	-	-	-	-	352	401	-	-
	8%	14%	12%	12%	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%	100%	-	-
	EGIM	EGIM	EGIM	AFHJN							AEGIMBEGIMCEGIM	DFHJN		
NIGERIA	17	190	207	200	-	-	-	-	-	-	190	200	-	-
	2%	7%	6%	6%	-	-	-	-	-	-	54%	50%	-	-
	EGIM	DEGIM	EGIM	AFHJN							AEGIMBEGIMCEGIM	DFHJN		
SOUTH AFRICA	19	82	101	101	-	-	-	-	-	-	82	101	-	-
	2%	3%	3%	3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	23%	25%	-	-
	EGIM	EGIM	EGIM	FHJN							AEGIMBEGIMCEGIM	DFHJN		
EGYPT	26	80	106	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	80	100	-	-
	3%	3%	3%	3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	23%	25%	-	-
	EGIM	EGIM	EGIM	FHJN							AEGIMBEGIMCEGIM	DFHJN		
SOUTH AMERICA (NET)	131	269	400	415	-	-	269	415	-	-	-	-	-	-
	17%	10%	12%	12%	-	-	100%	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-
	DEIKM	EIKM	EIKM	BFJLN			AEGIMBEGIMCEGIM	DFJLN						
COLOMBIA	61	64	125	125	-	-	64	125	-	-	-	-	-	-
	8%	2%	4%	4%	-	-	24%	30%	-	-	-	-	-	-
	DEIKM	EIKM	EIKM	BFJLN			AEGIMBEGIMCEGIM	DFJLN						
ARGENTINA	32	68	100	104	-	-	68	104	-	-	-	-	-	-
	4%	3%	3%	3%	-	-	25%	25%	-	-	-	-	-	-
	EIKM	EIKM	EIKM	FJLN			AEGIMBEGIMCEGIM	DFJLN						
BRAZIL	38	137	175	186	-	-	137	186	-	-	-	-	-	-
	5%	5%	5%	6%	-	-	51%	45%	-	-	-	-	-	-
	EIKM	EIKM	EIKM	FJLN			AEGIMBEGIMCEGIM	DFJLN						
Sigma	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q264. In which country or region do you currently reside?

Base: All Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
NORTH AMERICA (NET)	266 35%	207 8%	473 14%	460 14%	207 100%	460 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	DGIKM	GIKM	GIKM	BHJLN	AGIKMBGKMCGRM	DHJLN								
United States	204 27%	64 2%	268 8%	255 8%	64 31%	255 55%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	DGIKM	GIKM	GIKM	BHJLN	GKMBGKMCGRM	EDHJLN								
Canada	23 3%	80 3%	103 3%	105 3%	80 39%	105 23%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	GIKM	GIKM	GIKM	HJLN	FAGKMBGKMCGRM	DHJLN								
Mexico	39 5%	63 2%	102 3%	100 3%	63 30%	100 22%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	DGIKM	GIKM	GIKM	HJLN	FAGKMBGKMCGRM	DHJLN								
EUROPE (NET)	114 15%	419 16%	533 16%	534 16%	-	-	-	-	419 100%	534 100%	-	-	-	-
	EGKM	EGKM	EGKM	FHLN					AEGKMBEGKCEGRM	DFHLN				
Italy	28 4%	26 1%	54 2%	50 1%	-	-	-	-	26 6%	50 9%	-	-	-	-
	DEGKM	M	GKM	FHLN					AEGKMBEGKCEGRM	DFHLN				
Turkey	5 1%	45 2%	50 1%	50 1%	-	-	-	-	45 11%	50 9%	-	-	-	-
	M	GKM	GKM	FHLN					AEGKMBEGKCEGRM	DFHLN				
Spain	12 2%	38 1%	50 1%	50 1%	-	-	-	-	38 9%	50 9%	-	-	-	-
	GKM	GKM	GKM	FHLN					AEGKMBEGKCEGRM	DFHLN				
Poland	-	53 2%	53 2%	53 2%	-	-	-	-	53 13%	53 10%	-	-	-	-
	-	EGKM	GKM	AFHLN					AEGKMBEGKCEGRM	DFHLN				
United Kingdom	26 3%	74 3%	100 3%	100 3%	-	-	-	-	74 18%	100 19%	-	-	-	-
	EGKM	EGKM	EGKM	FHLN					AEGKMBEGKCEGRM	DFHLN				
France	26 3%	75 3%	101 3%	106 3%	-	-	-	-	75 18%	106 20%	-	-	-	-
	EGKM	EGKM	EGKM	FHLN					AEGKMBEGKCEGRM	DFHLN				
Germany	17 2%	108 4%	125 4%	125 4%	-	-	-	-	108 26%	125 23%	-	-	-	-
	EGKM	EGKM	EGKM	AFHLN					AEGKMBEGKCEGRM	DFHLN				
ASIA (NET)	196 25%	1341 52%	1537 46%	1539 46%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1341 100%	1539 100%
	EGIK	DEGIK	EGIK	AFHJL									AEGIKBEGIKCEGIK	DFHJL
China	2 *	548 21%	550 16%	551 16%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	548 41%	551 36%
	*	DEGIK	EGIK	AFHJL									NAEGIKBEGIKCEGIK	DFHJL
Vietnam	-	52 2%	52 2%	52 2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	52 4%	52 3%
	-	EGIK	GIK	AFHJL									AEGIKBEGIKCEGIK	DFHJL
Philippines	26 3%	76 3%	102 3%	101 3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	76 6%	101 7%
	EGIK	EGIK	EGIK	FHJL									AEGIKBEGIKCEGIK	DFHJL

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q264. In which country or region do you currently reside?

Base: All Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
Japan	-	176 7%	176 5%	176 5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	176 13%	176 11%
		DEGIK	EGIK	AFHJL									AEGIKBEGIKCEGK	DFHJL
South Korea	32 4%	69 3%	101 3%	101 3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	69 5%	101 7%
	EGIK	EGIK	EGIK	FHJL									EGIKBEGIKCEGK	DFHJL
Russian Federation	57 7%	73 3%	130 4%	128 4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	73 5%	128 8%
	DEGIK	EGIK	EGIK	BFHJL									EGIKBEGIKCEGK	MDFHJL
India	27 4%	298 12%	325 10%	330 10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	298 22%	330 21%
	EGIK	DEGIK	EGIK	AFHJL									AEGIKBEGIKCEGK	DFHJL
Indonesia	52 7%	49 2%	101 3%	100 3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	49 4%	100 6%
	DEGIKM	EGIK	EGIK	BFHJL									EGIKBEGIKCEGK	MDFHJL
AFRICA (NET)	62 8%	352 14%	414 12%	401 12%	-	-	-	-	-	-	352 100%	401 100%	-	-
	EGIM	EGIM	EGIM	AFHJN							AEGIMBEGIMCEGIM	DFHJN		
Nigeria	17 2%	190 7%	207 6%	200 6%	-	-	-	-	-	-	190 54%	200 50%	-	-
	EGIM	DEGIM	EGIM	AFHJN							AEGIMBEGIMCEGIM	DFHJN		
South Africa	19 2%	82 3%	101 3%	101 3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	82 23%	101 25%	-	-
	EGIM	EGIM	EGIM	FHJN							AEGIMBEGIMCEGIM	DFHJN		
Egypt	26 3%	80 3%	106 3%	100 3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	80 23%	100 25%	-	-
	EGIM	EGIM	EGIM	FHJN							AEGIMBEGIMCEGIM	DFHJN		
SOUTH AMERICA (NET)	131 17%	269 10%	400 12%	415 12%	-	-	269 100%	415 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-
	DEIKM	EIKM	EIKM	BFJLN			AEGIKMBEIKMCEIKM	DFJLN						
Colombia	61 8%	64 2%	125 4%	125 4%	-	-	64 24%	125 30%	-	-	-	-	-	-
	DEIKM	EIKM	EIKM	BFJLN			AEGIKMBEIKMCEIKM	DFJLN						
Argentina	32 4%	68 3%	100 3%	104 3%	-	-	68 25%	104 25%	-	-	-	-	-	-
	EIKM	EIKM	EIKM	FJLN			AEGIKMBEIKMCEIKM	DFJLN						
Brazil	38 5%	137 5%	175 5%	186 6%	-	-	137 51%	186 45%	-	-	-	-	-	-
	EIKM	EIKM	EIKM	FJLN			AEGIKMBEIKMCEIKM	DFJLN						
Sigma	769 100%	2588 100%	3357 100%	3349 100%	207 100%	460 100%	269 100%	415 100%	419 100%	534 100%	352 100%	401 100%	1341 100%	1539 100%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q268. I identify my gender as...?

16 Aug 2016
Table 3

Base: All Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
Male	619 80% DEGIM	1477 57% M	2096 62% DEGIM	1886 56% J	115 56% AKKCK	287 62% DJN	148 55% AKKCK	236 57% J	235 56% AKKCK	269 50% DFHNL	270 77% J	233 58% J	709 53% AKBKCK	861 56% J
Female	150 20% K	1111 43% K	1261 38% K	1459 44% ACF	92 44% AKKCK	173 38% AKKCK	121 45% AKKCK	177 43% AKKCK	184 44% AKKCK	264 49% DFHNL	82 23% J	168 42% K	632 47% AKBKCK	677 44% F
Other/refuse	-	-	-	4 * C	-	-	-	2 * D	-	1 *	-	-	-	1 *
Sigma	769 100%	2588 100%	3357 100%	3349 100%	207 100%	460 100%	269 100%	415 100%	419 100%	534 100%	352 100%	401 100%	1341 100%	1539 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q280. Respondent Age.

16 Aug 2016
Table 4

Base: All Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
18 - 19	3 *	50 2% M	53 2%	91 3% ABC	9 4% FAKMBKMCCKM	8 2%	10 4% AMBMCM	26 6% DFJLN	8 2% A	11 2%	5 1% AC	7 2% DFJN	18 1% A	39 3% M
20 - 24	35 5%	347 13%	382 11%	458 14% ACFJ	27 13% FA	24 5%	44 16% AC	86 21% DFJN	52 12% A	46 9% F	52 15% AC	78 19% DFJN	172 13% AC	224 15% FJ
25 - 29	94 12%	428 17% I	522 16%	607 18% ACFJ	27 13% I	44 10%	42 16%	83 20% FJ	53 13%	63 12% AEIBEICEI	74 21% AEIBEICEI	99 25% DFJ	232 17% AICI	318 21% MDFJ
30 - 34	118 15% GI	414 16% EGI	532 16% GI	610 18% BCF	23 11%	45 10%	27 10%	74 18% GF	47 11%	99 19% IF	77 22% AEGIBEGICEGI	82 20% F	240 18% EGIBEGICEGI	310 20% DF
35 - 39	114 15%	391 15% I	505 15%	463 14%	22 11%	51 11%	42 16%	50 12%	48 11%	62 12% EIEIEI	61 17% EIEIEI	56 14%	218 16% EIEIEI	244 16% DFJ
40 - 44	107 14% DEKM	264 10%	371 11% DK	302 9% L	16 8%	32 7%	27 10%	33 8%	54 13% KKK	61 11% DFL	26 7%	20 5%	141 11%	156 10% DFL
45 - 49	84 11% DK	240 9% DK	324 10% DK	237 7%	14 7%	35 8%	19 7%	20 5%	42 10% KKK	59 11% DHLN	20 6%	22 5%	145 11% NKBKK	101 7%
50 - 54	80 10% DKM	165 6% M	245 7% DKM	182 5% N	15 7%	34 7% N	22 8%	22 5% KMBKMKM	40 10% DLN	45 8% DLN	16 5%	17 4%	72 5%	64 4%
55 - 59	53 7% DKM	130 5% DKM	183 5% DKM	129 4% N	14 7% KKK	36 8% DHLN	23 9% HKMBKMCCKM	13 3% KMBKMKM	31 7% DHLN	33 6% DHLN	9 3%	11 3%	53 4% N	36 2%
60 - 64	42 5% DGKM	72 3% M	114 3% M	110 3% HLN	15 7% GKMBGKMGCKM	52 11% DHJLN	4 1%	5 1% GKMBGKMGCKM	19 5% HLN	23 4% HLN	6 2%	4 1%	28 2%	26 2%
65 and over	39 5% KM	87 3% M	126 4% KM	160 5% BCHLN	25 12% AGKMBGKMGCKM	99 22% EDHJLN	9 3% H	3 1% KMBKMCCKM	25 6% HLN	32 6% HLN	6 2%	5 1%	22 2%	21 1%
MEAN	42.1 DGKM	37.3 KM	38.4 DKM	36.8 HLN	41.8 GKMBGKMGCKM	48.1 EDHJLN	37.2 HKKK	32.7 GKMBGKMGCKM	40.4 DHLN	40.3 DHLN	34.4	32.9	36.3 NKKK	34.3 HL
STD. DEV.	12.54	12.49	12.67	13.19	16.99	16.62	13.04	10.88	13.66	13.41	10.70	10.31	11.21	10.83
STD. ERR.	0.45	0.25	0.22	0.23	1.18	0.78	0.79	0.53	0.67	0.58	0.57	0.51	0.31	0.28
MEDIAN	40	35	36	33	38	48	36	30	40	38	32	31	35	32
Sigma	769 100%	2588 100%	3357 100%	3349 100%	207 100%	460 100%	269 100%	415 100%	419 100%	534 100%	352 100%	401 100%	1341 100%	1539 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q605. Have you ever registered a domain name?

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
Yes	769 100%	2588 100%	3357 100%	3349 100%	207 100%	460 100%	269 100%	415 100%	419 100%	534 100%	352 100%	401 100%	1341 100%	1539 100%
No	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sigma	769 100%	2588 100%	3357 100%	3349 100%	207 100%	460 100%	269 100%	415 100%	419 100%	534 100%	352 100%	401 100%	1341 100%	1539 100%
Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N Overlap formulae used.														

Base: Has Registered A Domain Name

Q610. What was your role in the domain registration decision?

16 Aug 2016
Table 6

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
I was the primary decision maker	647 84% DEGK	1986 77% GK	2633 78% GK	2583 77% L	155 75% KKK	364 79% L	193 72% KKK	306 74% GK	334 80% GK	424 79% HL	212 60% K	276 69% K	1092 81% EGKBEGKCEGK	1213 79% DHL
It was a shared decision between myself and others	122 16% M	602 23% M	724 22% M	766 23% AN	52 25% AMMM	96 21% AIMBIMCIM	76 28% AIMBIMCIM	109 26% JN	85 20% JN	110 21% JN	140 40% JN	125 31% DFJN	249 19% JN	326 21% JN
I had no say in the decision	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sigma	769 100%	2588 100%	3357 100%	3349 100%	207 100%	460 100%	269 100%	415 100%	419 100%	534 100%	352 100%	401 100%	1341 100%	1539 100%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Base: Registered For Business Use

Q615. For what purpose(s) did you register a domain name?

16 Aug 2016
Table 7

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	-**	-**	-**	3349	-**	460	-**	415	-**	534	-**	401	-**	1539
Business use	-	-	-	1687 50% JN	-	262 57% DJN	-	212 51% J	-	228 43%	-	256 64% DFHJN	-	729 47%
Personal use, i.e. a blog, family site, clubs, volunteer/advocacy work, hobbies (e.g. photography, recipes), etc.	-	-	-	1987 59% FL	-	200 43%	-	254 61% FL	-	299 56% FL	-	197 49%	-	1037 67% DFHJL
For use by an educational institution/group	-	-	-	454 14% F	-	42 9%	-	57 14% F	-	66 12%	-	54 13% F	-	235 15% DF
Non-profit group	-	-	-	465 14% N	-	59 13%	-	68 16% N	-	88 16% N	-	58 14%	-	192 12%
Political group	-	-	-	122 4%	-	12 3%	-	15 4%	-	25 5% L	-	8 2%	-	62 4%
To park/save for future use or sale/speculation	-	-	-	374 11% FL	-	39 8%	-	48 12% L	-	73 14% DFL	-	21 5%	-	193 13% DFL
Other	-	-	-	165 5%	-	19 4%	-	24 6%	-	30 6%	-	18 4%	-	74 5%
Unsure	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sigma	-	-	-	5254 157%	-	633 138%	-	678 163%	-	809 151%	-	612 153%	-	2522 164%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Base: Has Registered A Domain Name

Q625. For which types of business(es) did you register a domain name?

16 Aug 2016
Table 8

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	-**	-**	-**	1687	-**	262	-**	212	-**	228	-**	256	-**	729
Small business with 9 or fewer employees	-	-	-	834 49% N	-	182 69% DJN	-	130 61% DN	-	128 56% DN	-	176 69% DJN	-	218 30%
Small business with 10 to 49 employees	-	-	-	357 21% F	-	40 15%	-	46 22%	-	42 18%	-	54 21%	-	175 24% DF
Business with 50 to 99 employees	-	-	-	256 15% F	-	13 5%	-	25 12% F	-	27 12% F	-	31 12% F	-	160 22% DFHJL
Business with 100 to 499 employees	-	-	-	272 16% FHL	-	17 6%	-	20 9%	-	34 15% FL	-	13 5%	-	188 26% DFHJL
Business with 500 or more employees	-	-	-	156 9% HL	-	16 6%	-	9 4%	-	16 7%	-	11 4%	-	104 14% DFHJL
Other	-	-	-	66 4% N	-	13 5% N	-	18 8% DJLN	-	9 4%	-	10 4%	-	16 2%
Sigma	-	-	-	1941 115%	-	281 107%	-	248 117%	-	256 112%	-	295 115%	-	861 118%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Base: Has Registered A Domain Name

Q635. How many total domains have you personally registered, including domains that may no longer be active?

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
1 - 5 (NET)	297 39%	2381 92% D	2678 80%	2945 88% AC	192 93% FAC	402 87%	247 92% AC	368 89%	393 94% JAC	474 89%	327 93% LAC	350 87%	1222 91% NAC	1351 88%
1	65 8%	1116 43% DM	1181 35%	1251 37% ALN	104 50% AMBMCM	225 49% DHJLN	124 46% HAMMCM	150 36% JAKMBKMKCM	216 52% DLN	221 41% DLN	153 43% LAC	127 32%	519 39% NAC	528 34%
2	87 11%	678 26%	765 23%	865 26% ACF	54 26% A	90 20%	70 26% A	111 27% F	103 25% A	141 26% F	99 28% AC	108 27% F	352 26% AC	415 27% F
3	56 7%	312 12%	368 11%	449 13% ACF	21 10% ACF	42 9%	33 12% A	48 12%	44 11%	66 12%	36 10%	67 17% KDFH	178 13% AC	226 15% DF
4	39 5%	142 5%	181 5%	163 5% N	8 4%	22 5%	10 4%	32 8% GDJN	16 4%	22 4%	26 7% III	26 6% N	82 6% N	61 4%
5	50 7% EI	133 5%	183 5% EI	217 6% BJ	5 2%	23 5%	10 4%	27 7%	14 3%	24 4%	13 4%	22 5%	91 7% EIKBEIKCEIK	121 8% DFJ
6 - 10	115 15% DEGIKM	128 5% I	243 7% EIK	220 7% B	7 3%	32 7%	15 6% III	26 6%	11 3%	28 5% I	12 3%	21 5% IKBIKIK	83 6%	113 7%
11 - 25	129 17% DEGIKM	48 2% DEGIKM	177 5% DEGIKM	102 3% B	2 1%	11 2%	3 1%	12 3%	11 3%	23 4%	8 2%	15 4%	24 2%	41 3%
26 OR MORE (NET)	228 30% DEGIKM	31 1% DEGIKM	259 8% DEGIKM	82 2% B	6 3% MBMM	15 3%	4 1%	9 2%	4 1%	9 2%	5 1%	15 4% KJ	12 1%	34 2% M
26 - 50	91 12% DEGIKM	10 * DEIKM	101 3% DEIKM	37 1% B	1 *	8 2%	3 1%	3 1%	1 *	4 1%	1 *	7 2%	4 *	15 1% M
51 or more	137 18% DEGIKM	21 1% DGIKM	158 5% DGIKM	45 1% GMBGMGM	5 2%	7 2%	1 *	6 1%	3 1%	5 1%	4 1%	8 2%	8 1%	19 1%
MEAN	41.7 DEGIKM	4.1	12.8 DEGIKM	5.4 B	4.8	6.3	4.6	5.7	3.4	4.1	4.6	7.2 J	4.1	5.1
STD. DEV.	84.83	20.41	47.09	23.23	18.81	31.15	30.71	28.06	15.84	10.64	23.27	28.98	18.46	20.34
STD. ERR.	3.06	0.40	0.81	0.40	1.31	1.45	1.87	1.38	0.77	0.46	1.24	1.45	0.50	0.52
MEDIAN	10	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	2
Sigma	769 100%	2588 100%	3357 100%	3349 100%	207 100%	460 100%	269 100%	415 100%	419 100%	534 100%	352 100%	401 100%	1341 100%	1539 100%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q640. Have you ever registered duplicate domain names?

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Base: Has Registered A Domain Name

Q642. Why did you register duplicate domain names?

16 Aug 2016
Table 11

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	-**	-**	-**	1206	-**	123	-**	132	-**	191	-**	98*	-**	662
To keep someone else from having a similar name	-	-	-	616 51%	-	64 52%	-	73 55%	-	106 55%	-	43 44%	-	330 50%
To help ensure my site gets found in searches	-	-	-	633 52% F	-	51 41%	-	78 59% F	-	96 50%	-	50 51%	-	358 54% F
For potential use or sale in the future	-	-	-	325 27%	-	30 24%	-	29 22%	-	58 30%	-	20 20%	-	188 28%
For use in different geographies	-	-	-	372 31% F	-	23 19%	-	36 27%	-	62 32% F	-	35 36% F	-	216 33% F
To protect my brand or organization name	-	-	-	617 51% J	-	73 59% J	-	63 48%	-	79 41%	-	52 53%	-	350 53% J
Other	-	-	-	18 1%	-	3 2%	-	5 4% DJN	-	1 1%	-	2 2%	-	7 1%
Sigma	-	-	-	2581 214%	-	244 198%	-	284 215%	-	402 210%	-	202 206%	-	1449 219%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Base: All Respondents

Q655. COUNTRY QUOTAS

16 Aug 2016
Table 18

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
NORTH AMERICA (NET)	266 35%	207 8%	473 14%	460 14%	207 100%	460 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	DGIKM	GIKM	GIKM	BHJLN	AGIKMBEGKMGCEGKM	DHJLN								
US	204 27%	64 2%	268 8%	255 8%	64 31%	255 55%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	DGIKM	GIKM	GIKM	BHJLN	GKMBEGKMGCEGKM	EDHJLN								
CANADA	23 3%	80 3%	103 3%	105 3%	80 39%	105 23%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	GIKM	GIKM	GIKM	HJLN	FAGIKMBEGKMGCEGKM	DHJLN								
MEXICO	39 5%	63 2%	102 3%	100 3%	63 30%	100 22%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	DGIKM	GIKM	GIKM	HJLN	FAGIKMBEGKMGCEGKM	DHJLN								
EUROPE (NET)	114 15%	419 16%	533 16%	534 16%	-	-	-	-	419 100%	534 100%	-	-	-	-
	EGKM	EGKM	EGKM	FHLN					AEGKMBEGKMGCEGKM	DFHLN				
ITALY	28 4%	26 1%	54 2%	50 1%	-	-	-	-	26 6%	50 9%	-	-	-	-
	DEGKM	M	GKM	FHLN					AEGKMBEGKMGCEGKM	DFHLN				
TURKEY	5 1%	45 2%	50 1%	50 1%	-	-	-	-	45 11%	50 9%	-	-	-	-
	M	GKM	GKM	FHLN					AEGKMBEGKMGCEGKM	DFHLN				
SPAIN	12 2%	38 1%	50 1%	50 1%	-	-	-	-	38 9%	50 9%	-	-	-	-
	GKM	GKM	GKM	FHLN					AEGKMBEGKMGCEGKM	DFHLN				
POLAND	-	53 2%	53 2%	53 2%	-	-	-	-	53 13%	53 10%	-	-	-	-
	-	EGKM	GKM	AFHLN					AEGKMBEGKMGCEGKM	DFHLN				
UNITED KINGDOM	26 3%	74 3%	100 3%	100 3%	-	-	-	-	74 18%	100 19%	-	-	-	-
	EGKM	EGKM	EGKM	FHLN					AEGKMBEGKMGCEGKM	DFHLN				
FRANCE	26 3%	75 3%	101 3%	106 3%	-	-	-	-	75 18%	106 20%	-	-	-	-
	EGKM	EGKM	EGKM	FHLN					AEGKMBEGKMGCEGKM	DFHLN				
GERMANY	17 2%	108 4%	125 4%	125 4%	-	-	-	-	108 26%	125 23%	-	-	-	-
	EGKM	EGKM	EGKM	AFHLN					AEGKMBEGKMGCEGKM	DFHLN				
ASIA (NET)	196 25%	1341 52%	1537 46%	1539 46%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1341 100%	1539 100%
	EGIK	DEGIK	EGIK	AFHJL									AEGKMBEGKMGCEGKM	DFHJL
CHINA	2 *	548 21%	550 16%	551 16%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	548 41%	551 36%
		DEGIK	EGIK	AFHJL									NAEGKMBEGKMGCEGKM	DFHJL
VIETNAM	-	52 2%	52 2%	52 2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	52 4%	52 3%
	-	EGIK	GIK	AFHJL									AEGKMBEGKMGCEGKM	DFHJL
PHILIPPINES	26 3%	76 3%	102 3%	101 3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	76 6%	101 7%
	EGIK	EGIK	EGIK	FHJL									AEGKMBEGKMGCEGKM	DFHJL

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Base: All Respondents

Q655. COUNTRY QUOTAS

16 Aug 2016
Table 18

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
JAPAN	-	176	176	176	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	176	176
	-	7%	5%	5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	13%	11%
		DEGIK	EGIK	AFHJL									AEGIKBEGIKCEGIK	DFHJL
SOUTH KOREA	32	69	101	101	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	69	101
	4%	3%	3%	3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5%	7%
	EGIK	EGIK	EGIK	FHJL									EGIKBEGIKCEGIK	DFHJL
RUSSIA	57	73	130	128	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	73	128
	7%	3%	4%	4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5%	8%
	DEGIK	EGIK	EGIK	BFHJL									EGIKBEGIKCEGIK	MDFHJL
INDIA	27	298	325	330	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	298	330
	4%	12%	10%	10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	22%	21%
	EGIK	DEGIK	EGIK	AFHJL									AEGIKBEGIKCEGIK	DFHJL
INDONESIA	52	49	101	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	49	100
	7%	2%	3%	3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4%	6%
	DEGIKM	EGIK	EGIK	BFHJL									EGIKBEGIKCEGIK	MDFHJL
AFRICA (NET)	62	352	414	401	-	-	-	-	-	-	352	401	-	-
	8%	14%	12%	12%	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%	100%	-	-
	EGIM	EGIM	EGIM	AFHJN							AEGIMBEGIMCEGIM	DFHJN		
NIGERIA	17	190	207	200	-	-	-	-	-	-	190	200	-	-
	2%	7%	6%	6%	-	-	-	-	-	-	54%	50%	-	-
	EGIM	DEGIM	EGIM	AFHJN							AEGIMBEGIMCEGIM	DFHJN		
SOUTH AFRICA	19	82	101	101	-	-	-	-	-	-	82	101	-	-
	2%	3%	3%	3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	23%	25%	-	-
	EGIM	EGIM	EGIM	FHJN							AEGIMBEGIMCEGIM	DFHJN		
EGYPT	26	80	106	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	80	100	-	-
	3%	3%	3%	3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	23%	25%	-	-
	EGIM	EGIM	EGIM	FHJN							AEGIMBEGIMCEGIM	DFHJN		
SOUTH AMERICA (NET)	131	269	400	415	-	-	269	415	-	-	-	-	-	-
	17%	10%	12%	12%	-	-	100%	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-
	DEIKM	EIKM	EIKM	BFJLN			AEGIMBEGIMCEGIM	DFJLN						
COLOMBIA	61	64	125	125	-	-	64	125	-	-	-	-	-	-
	8%	2%	4%	4%	-	-	24%	30%	-	-	-	-	-	-
	DEIKM	EIKM	EIKM	BFJLN			AEGIMBEGIMCEGIM	DFJLN						
ARGENTINA	32	68	100	104	-	-	68	104	-	-	-	-	-	-
	4%	3%	3%	3%	-	-	25%	25%	-	-	-	-	-	-
	EIKM	EIKM	EIKM	FJLN			AEGIMBEGIMCEGIM	DFJLN						
BRAZIL	38	137	175	186	-	-	137	186	-	-	-	-	-	-
	5%	5%	5%	6%	-	-	51%	45%	-	-	-	-	-	-
	EIKM	EIKM	EIKM	FJLN			AEGIMBEGIMCEGIM	DFJLN						
Sigma	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Base: All Qualified Respondents

Q700. Which of the following domain name extensions, if any, have you heard of?

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
					(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
.com	734 95% DEGIKM	2230 86% J	2964 88% DGIM	2844 85% J	185 89% J	410 89% DJN	227 84% J	365 88% J	354 84% J	388 73% GIMBGIMGIM	320 91% DJN	369 92% DJN	1144 85% J	1312 85% J
.net	709 92% DEGIKM	1973 76% DM	2682 80% DM	2301 69% J FGMBGMGM	175 85% J	345 75% DHJN	204 76% H	285 69% J	331 79% JMMM	321 60% J	283 80% MBMM	316 79% DHJN	980 73% N	1034 67% J
.org	709 92% DEGIKM	1810 70% DM	2519 75% DM	2168 65% N FGIMBGMCIM	179 86% J	337 73% DHJN	201 75% HMMM	276 67% N	323 77% JMBMM	336 63% GMBGMCGIM	289 82% DHJN	309 77% DHJN	818 61% J	910 59% J
.info	622 81% DEGIKM	1289 50% DM	1911 57% DGM	1437 43% J	111 54% F	184 40% J	126 47% J	172 41% JGMBGMGM	230 55% J	234 44% J	200 57% GMBGMGM	210 52% DFHJN	622 46% N	637 41% J
.biz	584 76% DEGIKM	972 38% GM	1556 46% DGM	1187 35% HN GMBGMGM	101 49% J	207 45% DHJN	54 20% J	91 22% JGMBGMGM	188 45% J	193 36% H GMBGMGM	175 50% J	193 48% DHJN	454 34% GGG	503 33% H
.mobi	403 52% DEGIKM	588 23% DGM	991 30% DEGIM	602 18% FHJ	40 19% GGG	66 14% H	32 12% J	38 9% J	82 20% JGGG	69 13% EGIMBEGIMCEGIM	153 43% DFHJN	156 39% NGGG	281 21% J	273 18% HJ
.asia	252 33% DEGIKM	388 15% DGK	640 19% DEGIK	409 12% FHJL	26 13% FGGG	30 7% J	15 6% J	15 4% J	51 12% GGG	51 10% H	35 10% GGG	31 8% H EGKIBEGKIGK	261 19% J	282 18% DFHJL
.tel	196 25% DEGIKM	400 15% DGK	596 18% DGK	407 12% H	30 14% J	47 10% J	29 11% J	30 7% JGKGKGK	73 17% J	65 12% H	33 9% J	37 9% NGKBGKGK	235 18% J	228 15% DFHL
.pro	183 24% DEGIKM	364 14% GK	547 16% DGK	431 13% FHL	24 12% GGG	35 8% H	17 6% J	18 4% GKGKGK	66 16% J	64 12% FHL	27 8% J	27 7% EGKBEGKIGK	230 17% J	287 19% DFHJL
.us	179 23% DEGIKM	46 2% GIKM	225 7% DEGIKM	129 4% BHJLN	46 22% GIKMBEGIKMCEGIM	129 28% DHJLN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
.coop	122 16% DEGKM	248 10% EK	370 11% DEK	314 9% FL	11 5% J	31 7% J	26 10% KKK	38 9% L	50 12% EKEKEK	50 9% L	15 4% J	16 4% EKBEKEK	146 11% J	179 12% DFL
.co	57 7% DEIKM	51 2% EIKM	108 3% EIKM	104 3% BFJLN	-	-	51 19% AEIKMBEGIKMCEGIM	104 25% DFJLN	-	-	-	-	-	-
.ru	53 7% DEGIKM	61 2% EGIK	114 3% EGIK	113 3% BFHJL	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	61 5% EGIKBEGIKGEGIK	113 7% MDFHJL
.id	48 6% DEGIKM	43 2% GIK	91 3% EGIK	77 2% FHJL	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	43 3% EGIKBEGIKGEGIK	77 5% MDFHJL
.mx	39 5% DEGIKM	57 2% GIKM	96 3% GIKM	83 2% HJLN	57 28% FAGIKMBEGIKMCEGIM	83 18% DHJLN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
.br	33 4% EIKM	111 4% EIKM	144 4% EIKM	141 4% FJLN	-	-	111 41% AEIKMBEGIKMCEGIM	141 34% DFJLN	-	-	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Base: All Qualified Respondents

Q700. Which of the following domain name extensions, if any, have you heard of?

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
.ar	29 4%	60 2%	89 3%	83 2%	-	-	60 22%	83 20%	-	-	-	-	-	-
	DEIKM	EIKM	EIKM	FJLN			AEGKMBEGKCEGKM	DFJLN						
.kr	28 4%	50 2%	78 2%	78 2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	50 4%	78 5%
	DEGIK	EGIK	EGIK	FHJL									EGIKBEGIKCEGIK	DFHJL
.it	28 4%	25 1%	53 2%	41 1%	-	-	-	-	25 6%	41 8%	-	-	-	-
	DEGKM	M	GKM	FHLN					EGKMBEGIKCEGKM	DFHLN				
.fr	26 3%	60 2%	86 3%	75 2%	-	-	-	-	60 14%	75 14%	-	-	-	-
	EGKM	EGKM	EGKM	FHLN					AEGKMBEGIKCEGKM	DFHLN				
.uk	25 3%	63 2%	88 3%	83 2%	-	-	-	-	63 15%	83 16%	-	-	-	-
	EGKM	EGKM	EGKM	FHLN					AEGKMBEGIKCEGKM	DFHLN				
.ca	23 3%	72 3%	95 3%	88 3%	72 35%	88 19%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	GIKM	GIKM	GIKM	HJLN	FAGKMBEGIKCEGKM	DHJLN								
.in	23 3%	232 9%	255 8%	231 7%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	232 17%	231 15%
	EGIK	DEGIK	EGIK	AFHJL									AEGIKBEGIKCEGIK	DFHJL
.ph	19 2%	59 2%	78 2%	63 2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	59 4%	63 4%
	EGIK	EGIK	EGIK	FHJL									AEGIKBEGIKCEGIK	DFHJL
.eg	18 2%	63 2%	81 2%	68 2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	63 18%	68 17%	-	-
	EGIM	EGIM	EGIM	FHJN							AEGIMBEGIKCEGIM	DFHJN		
.za	18 2%	76 3%	94 3%	86 3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	76 22%	86 21%	-	-
	EGIM	EGIM	EGIM	FHJN							AEGIMBEGIKCEGIM	DFHJN		
.de	17 2%	96 4%	113 3%	104 3%	-	-	-	-	96 23%	104 19%	-	-	-	-
	EGKM	EGKM	EGKM	FHLN					AEGKMBEGIKCEGKM	DFHLN				
.ng	15 2%	153 6%	168 5%	172 5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	153 43%	172 43%	-	-
	EGIM	EGIM	EGIM	AFHJN							AEGIMBEGIKCEGIM	DFHJN		
.es	12 2%	32 1%	44 1%	32 1%	-	-	-	-	32 8%	32 6%	-	-	-	-
	GKM	KM	KM	FHLN					AEGKMBEGIKCEGKM	DFHLN				
.tr	3 M	34 1%	37 1%	32 1%	-	-	-	-	34 8%	32 6%	-	-	-	-
		KM	KM	FHLN					AEGKMBEGIKCEGKM	DFHLN				
.cn	2 *	431 17%	433 13%	424 13%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	431 32%	424 28%
		DEGIK	EGIK	AFHJL									NAEGIKBEGIKCEGIK	DFHJL
.jp	-	160 6%	160 5%	135 4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	160 12%	135 9%
		DEGIK	EGIK	AFHJL									NAEGIKBEGIKCEGIK	DFHJL
.vn	-	39 2%	39 1%	48 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	39 3%	48 3%
		GK	IK	AFHJL									AEGIKBEGIKCEGIK	DFHJL

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Base: All Qualified Respondents

Q700. Which of the following domain name extensions, if any, have you heard of?

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
.pl	-	45 2%	45 1%	43 1%	-	-	-	-	45 11%	43 8%	-	-	-	-
		GKM	KM	AFHLN					ABDMBEGKCEGKM	DFHLN				
.eu	-	-	-	240 7%	-	-	-	-	-	240 45%	-	-	-	-
				ABCFHLN						IDFHLN				
I am not aware of any of these	6 1%	27 1%	33 1%	27 1%	-	5 1%	2 1%	1 *	4 1%	6 1%	6 2%	3 1%	15 1%	12 1%
Not Sure	-	4 *	4 *	-	-	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	3 *	-
		D	D											
TOTAL AWARENESS (NET)	763 99%	2557 99%	3320 99%	3322 99%	207 100%	455 99%	267 99%	414 100%	414 99%	528 99%	346 98%	398 99%	1323 99%	1527 99%
TOTAL CONSISTENT AWARENESS (NET)	763 99%	2557 99%	3320 99%	3316 99%	207 100%	455 99%	267 99%	414 100%	414 99%	522 98%	346 98%	398 99%	1323 99%	1527 99%
				J				J					J	
AWARENESS OF GLOBAL (NET)	755 98%	2483 96%	3238 96%	3154 94%	205 99%	444 97%	255 95%	395 95%	397 95%	464 87%	342 97%	392 98%	1284 96%	1459 95%
	DGIM	D	DI	J	FGIMBGMCGIM	DJ		J	J			DHJN		J
HIGH (.com .net .org) (NET)	754 98%	2407 93%	3161 94%	3081 92%	196 95%	437 95%	249 93%	392 94%	387 92%	440 82%	337 96%	386 96%	1238 92%	1426 93%
	DEGIKM		DM	J		DJ		DJ	J		MBMM	DJN		J
AWARENESS OF GEO-SPECIFIC CONSISTENT (NET)	695 90%	2119 82%	2814 84%	2533 76%	175 85%	300 65%	222 83%	328 79%	355 85%	410 77%	292 83%	326 81%	1075 80%	1169 76%
	DEGIKM	DM	DM	F	F			F	JMMM	F		DFN	N	F
AWARENESS OF GEO-SPECIFIC (NET)	695 90%	2119 82%	2814 84%	2547 76%	175 85%	300 65%	222 83%	328 79%	355 85%	424 79%	292 83%	326 81%	1075 80%	1169 76%
	DEGIKM	DM	DM	F	F			F	JMMM	DF		DFN	N	F
MODERATE (.info.biz) (NET)	662 86%	1486 57%	2148 64%	1718 51%	138 67%	251 55%	132 49%	194 47%	264 63%	271 51%	236 67%	256 64%	716 53%	746 48%
	DEGIKM	DGM	DGM	HN	FGIMBGMCGIM	HN		JGMBGMCGIM			GMBGMGM	DFHJN		
LOW (.mobi .pro .tel .asia .coop) (NET)	476 62%	1014 39%	1490 44%	1123 34%	74 36%	124 27%	75 28%	84 20%	149 36%	148 28%	173 49%	179 45%	543 40%	588 38%
	DEGIKM	DG	DEGIM	FHJ	F	H	H	JGGG	H	H	EGIMBEGIMEGIM	DFHJN	GGG	DFHJ
AWARENESS OF GEO-SPECIFIC ADDED (NET)	-	-	-	240 7%	-	-	-	-	-	240 45%	-	-	-	-
				ABCFHLN						IDFHLN				
High (Avg) (.com .net .org)	2.9 DM	2.5 DM	2.6 DM	2.4 N	2.8 N	2.5 DHJN	2.5 HMMM	2.4	2.6 JMBMM	2.4	2.6 MBMM	2.6 DHJN	2.4 N	2.3
Moderate (Avg) (.info.biz)	1.8 DEGIKM	1.5 G	1.6 DGM	1.5 H	1.5 GGG	1.6 H	1.4	1.4	1.6 GMBGMGM	1.6 H	1.6 GMBGMGM	1.6 H	1.5 GGG	1.5 H
Low (Avg) (.mobi .pro .tel .asia .coop)	2.4 DEGIKM	2.0 GK	2.1 DEGK	1.9 FHL	1.8	1.7	1.6	1.7	2.2 EGKBEGKEGK	2.0 FHL	1.5	1.5	2.1 EGKBEGKEGK	2.1 DFHL
Sigma	5215 678%	12412 480%	17627 525%	14900 445%	1057 511%	1997 434%	1155 429%	1657 399%	2108 503%	2427 454%	1828 519%	1993 497%	6264 467%	6826 444%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q630. In which of the following TLD(s) have you registered domain names?

Base: Heard Of Extensions

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
					(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3322	207	455	269	414	419	528	352	398	1341	1527
.com	716 93% DEGIKM	1697 66% I	2413 72% DIM	2259 68% BJ	137 66% III	347 76% EDJN	183 68% III	319 77% GDJN	178 42% 45%	238 45% EGIMBEGIM	265 75% EGIMBEGIM	299 75% DJN	934 70% IBII	1056 69% J
.net	398 52% DEGIKM	654 25% IK	1052 31% DEGIK	857 26% J	45 22% J	113 25% J	65 24% III	104 25% J	74 18% 17%	92 17% 19%	66 19% EGIKBEGIK	89 22% EGIKBEGIK	404 30% DFHJL	459 30% DFHJL
.org	336 44% DEGIKM	448 17% DGIM	784 23% DGIM	615 19% GIMBGIM	50 24% GIMBGIM	85 19% GIMBGIM	40 15% GIMBGIM	64 15% GIMBGIM	72 17% GIMBGIM	90 17% GIMBGIM	68 19% GIMBGIM	91 23% DHJ	218 16% DHJ	285 19% DHJ
.info	202 26% DEGIKM	228 9% EGK	430 13% DEGIKM	270 8% H	8 4% H	38 8% E	14 5% E	22 5% E	32 8% H	49 9% H	21 6% H	28 7% NEGIBEGIK	153 11% NEGIBEGIK	133 9% H
.biz	121 16% DEGIKM	127 5% G	248 7% DGKM	171 5% H	14 7% GGG	21 5% GGG	6 2% GGG	10 2% GGG	22 5% GGG	23 4% GGG	15 4% GGG	29 7% DH	70 5% GGG	88 6% H
.mobi	52 7% DGI	115 4% D	167 5% DG	72 2% H	7 3% H	6 1% H	6 2% H	2 H	13 3% H	11 2% H	21 6% GGG	16 4% DFH	68 5% NGGG	37 2% H
.ru	47 6% DEGIKM	52 2% EGIK	99 3% EGIK	102 3% BFHJL	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	52 4% EGIKBEGIK	102 7% MDFHJL
.us	47 6% DEGIKM	5 2% N	52 2% DGIM	13 2% N	5 2% GIMBEGIKM	13 3% DHJLN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
.co	44 6% DEIKM	20 1% M	64 2% EIKM	58 2% BFJLN	-	-	20 7% EIKMBEIKM	58 14% GDFJLN	-	-	-	-	-	-
.br	23 3% EIKM	76 3% EIKM	99 3% EIKM	95 3% FJLN	-	-	76 28% AEIKMBEIKM	95 23% DFJLN	-	-	-	-	-	-
.fr	22 3% DEGKM	36 1% KM	58 2% GKM	57 2% FHLN	-	-	-	-	36 9% AEIKMBEIKM	57 11% DFHLN	-	-	-	-
.mx	22 3% DGIKM	26 1% IM	48 1% GIKM	55 2% BHJLN	26 13% AGIKMBEGIKM	55 12% DHJLN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
.it	21 3% DEGKM	16 1% M	37 1% KM	32 1% FHLN	-	-	-	-	16 4% EGIKMBEIKM	32 6% DFHLN	-	-	-	-
.asia	21 3% DK	77 3% DK	98 3% DK	53 2% F	8 4% FGKGKGK	2 1% KKK	3 1% KKK	3 1% KKK	9 2% KKK	9 2% KKK	-	2 1% NGIKBEGIK	57 4% DFHL	37 2% DFHL
.ar	18 2% EIKM	33 1% IKM	51 2% IKM	56 2% FJLN	-	-	33 12% AEIKMBEIKM	56 14% DFJLN	-	-	-	-	-	-
.ca	18 2% GIKM	48 2% GIKM	66 2% GIKM	59 2% HJLN	48 23% FAGIKMBEGIKM	59 13% DHJLN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q630. In which of the following TLD(s) have you registered domain names?

Base: Heard Of Extensions

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3322	207	455	269	414	419	528	352	398	1341	1527
.pro	18 2% K	65 3% K	83 2% K	68 2% HL	5 2% KKK	5 1%	3 1% KKK	1 *	11 3% KKK	14 3% HL	-	3 1% GKBGKCGK	46 3% GKBGKCGK	46 3% DFHL
.de	17 2% EGKM	81 3% EGKM	98 3% EGKM	87 3% FHLN	-	-	-	-	81 19% AEGIMBEGIMCEGIM	87 16% DFHLN	-	-	-	-
.kr	17 2% DEGIK	34 1% IK	51 2% GIK	42 1% FHJL	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	34 3% EGIKBEGIMCEGIM	42 3% DFHJL
.uk	16 2% EGKM	41 2% GKM	57 2% GKM	54 2% FHLN	-	-	-	-	41 10% AEGIMBEGIMCEGIM	54 10% DFHLN	-	-	-	-
.id	15 2% EGIK	18 1% I	33 1% I	46 1% BFHJL	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	18 1% IKBIKIK	46 3% MDFHJL
.za	15 2% EGIM	51 2% EGIM	66 2% EGIM	63 2% FHJN	-	-	-	-	-	-	51 14% AEGIMBEGIMCEGIM	63 16% DFHJN	-	-
.tel	13 2% GIK	77 3% DK	90 3% K	66 2% AFHJL	4 2%	6 1%	10 4% HKKK	5 1%	9 2%	10 2%	2 1%	4 1% AKBKCK	52 4% AKBKCK	41 3% DL
.in	13 2% GIK	143 6% DEGIK	156 5% EGIK	146 4% AFHJL	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	143 11% AEGIMBEGIMCEGIM	146 10% DFHJL
.es	9 1% KM	17 1% M	26 1% M	21 1% N	-	-	-	-	17 4% AEGIMBEGIMCEGIM	21 4% DFHLN	-	-	-	-
.ng	8 1% IM	50 2% EGIM	58 2% GIM	62 2% FHJN	-	-	-	-	-	-	50 14% AEGIMBEGIMCEGIM	62 16% DFHJN	-	-
.coop	6 1% K	64 2% K	70 2% K	69 2% AL	4 2% KKK	7 2%	7 3% AKKK	5 1%	9 2% AKKK	9 2% L	1 *	1 *	43 3% AKBKCK	47 3% DHL
.ph	4 1% IK	32 1% IK	36 1% I	43 1% FHJL	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	32 2% AEGIMBEGIMCEGIM	43 3% DFHJL
.eg	3 * M	18 1% M	21 1% M	30 1% FJN	-	-	-	-	-	-	18 5% AEGIMBEGIMCEGIM	30 8% DFHJN	-	-
.tr	1 * M	11 * M	12 * M	15 * N	-	-	-	-	11 3% AEGIMBEGIMCEGIM	15 3% DFHLN	-	-	-	-
.cn	1 * DEGIK	265 10% DEGIK	266 8% EGIK	285 9% AFHJL	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	265 20% AEGIMBEGIMCEGIM	285 19% DFHJL
.jp	- - EGIK	89 3% EGIK	89 3% EGIK	97 3% AFHJL	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	89 7% AEGIMBEGIMCEGIM	97 6% DFHJL
.vn	- - IK	29 1% IK	29 1% IK	33 1% AFHJL	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	29 2% AEGIMBEGIMCEGIM	33 2% DFHJL

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q630. In which of the following TLD(s) have you registered domain names?

Base: Heard Of Extensions

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3322	207	455	269	414	419	528	352	398	1341	1527
.pl	-	38 1%	38 1%	37 1%	-	-	-	-	38 9%	37 7%	-	-	-	-
		GKM	KM	AFHLN					AEGKMBEGKMGKMM	DFHLN				
.eu	-	-	-	48 1%	-	-	-	-	-	48 9%	-	-	-	-
				ABCFHLN						IDFHLN				
Other	159 21%	56 2%	215 6%	75 2%	4 2%	10 2%	10 4%	11 3%	17 4%	19 4%	10 3%	11 3%	15 1%	24 2%
	DEGIKM	M	DEIKM	N			MMM		MBMM	DN	MMM			
TOTAL REGISTERED (NET)	769 100%	2588 100%	3357 100%	3322 100%	207 100%	455 100%	269 100%	414 100%	419 100%	528 100%	352 100%	398 100%	1341 100%	1527 100%
TOTAL REGISTERED CONSISTENT (NET)	769 100%	2588 100%	3357 100%	3313 100%	207 100%	455 100%	269 100%	414 100%	419 100%	519 98%	352 100%	398 100%	1341 100%	1527 100%
		D	D	J		J		J	J			J		DJ
REGISTERED GLOBAL (NET)	758 99%	2120 82%	2878 86%	2810 85%	175 85%	415 91%	222 83%	364 88%	278 66%	358 68%	312 89%	350 88%	1133 84%	1323 87%
	DEGIKM	I	I	BJ	III	EDJN	III	GDJ			GIBGIGI	DJ	IBII	DJ
REGISTERED GEO-SPECIFIC (NET)	381 50%	1229 47%	1610 48%	1606 48%	79 38%	127 28%	129 48%	209 50%	240 57%	321 61%	119 34%	155 39%	662 49%	794 52%
	EK	EK	EK	FL	F		EKEKEK	FL	AEGKMBEGKMGKMM	DFHLN		F	EKBEKEK	DFL
REGISTERED GEO-SPECIFIC CONSISTENT (NET)	381 50%	1229 47%	1610 48%	1588 48%	79 38%	127 28%	129 48%	209 50%	240 57%	303 57%	119 34%	155 39%	662 49%	794 52%
	EK	EK	EK	FL	F		EKEKEK	FL	AEGKMBEGKMGKMM	DFHLN		F	EKBEKEK	DFL
REGISTERED GEO-SPECIFIC ADDED (NET)	-	-	-	48 1%	-	-	-	-	-	48 9%	-	-	-	-
				ABCFHLN						IDFHLN				
Sigma	2423 315%	4837 187%	7260 216%	6212 187%	365 176%	767 169%	476 177%	755 182%	686 164%	915 173%	588 167%	728 183%	2722 203%	3047 200%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q795. Of the (...) domains you have registered, how many are in each of the following categories?

SUMMARY TABLE OF MEANS (INCLUDING 0)

Base: Registered More Than One Domain Name

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	..	..	..	2098	..	235	..	265	..	313	..	274	..	1011
Parked-registered and reserved for your use, but not in active service. The site displays a placeholder webpage like, "under development" or similar term	-	-	-	1.5	-	1.3	-	1.4	-	1.2	-	2.7 DN	-	1.3
Redirected to an active website-if you enter the URL, it redirects to another URL	-	-	-	1.4 N	-	1.4	-	1.9 N	-	1.3	-	2.3	-	1.0
Used for an active website	-	-	-	2.6	-	5.6 DN	-	2.3	-	1.9	-	2.4	-	2.2
Actively used for some purpose other than a website	-	-	-	0.9	-	0.8	-	1.0	-	0.6	-	1.3	-	0.9
Expired-no longer registered in your or your company's name	-	-	-	1.5	-	1.9 JL	-	1.5	-	1.0	-	1.2	-	1.5
Other	-	-	-	0.2	-	0.1	-	0.2	-	0.3	-	0.2	-	0.3

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q795. Of the (...) domains you have registered, how many are in each of the following categories?

SUMMARY TABLE OF MEANS (EXCLUDING 0)

Base: Registered More Than One Domain Name

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	..	..	..	2098	..	235	..	265	..	313	..	274	..	1011
Parked-registered and reserved for your use, but not in active service. The site displays a placeholder webpage like, "under development" or similar term	-	-	-	3.1	-	3.2	-	3.2	-	2.3	-	5.9 DN	-	2.5
Redirected to an active website-if you enter the URL, it redirects to another URL	-	-	-	3.5 N	-	4.3 N	-	4.8 N	-	2.9	-	6.7 DN	-	2.4
Used for an active website	-	-	-	3.5	-	7.9 DN	-	3.5	-	2.7	-	3.4	-	2.8
Actively used for some purpose other than a website	-	-	-	2.7 N	-	3.6	-	3.3	-	2.4	-	3.8 N	-	2.3
Expired-no longer registered in your or your company's name	-	-	-	3.8	-	3.8	-	3.1	-	2.7	-	2.8	-	4.7
Other	-	-	-	3.5	-	3.2	-	4.8	-	3.3	-	2.0	-	4.0

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q795_1. Of the (...) domains you have registered, how many are in each of the following categories?

1. Parked-registered and reserved for your use, but not in active service. The site displays a placeholder webpage like "under development" or similar term

Base: Registered More Than One Domain Name

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
					(E)		(G)		(I)		(K)		(M)	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	..	..	..	2098	..	235	..	265	..	313	..	274	..	1011
0	-	-	-	1103 53%	-	138 59% DJN	-	146 55%	-	154 49%	-	151 55%	-	514 51%
1 - 2	-	-	-	824 39% F	-	74 31%	-	100 38%	-	129 41% F	-	103 38%	-	418 41% F
3 - 5	-	-	-	105 5%	-	15 6%	-	10 4%	-	20 6%	-	9 3%	-	51 5%
6 or more	-	-	-	66 3%	-	8 3%	-	9 3%	-	10 3%	-	11 4%	-	28 3%
MEAN (INCLUDING 0)	-	-	-	1.5	-	1.3	-	1.4	-	1.2	-	2.7 DN	-	1.3
STD. DEV.	-	-	-	8.29	-	4.32	-	6.63	-	2.58	-	19.40	-	4.76
STD. ERR.	-	-	-	0.18	-	0.28	-	0.41	-	0.15	-	1.17	-	0.15
MEDIAN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
MEAN (EXCLUDING 0)	-	-	-	3.1	-	3.2	-	3.2	-	2.3	-	5.9 DN	-	2.5
STD. DEV.	-	-	-	11.84	-	6.28	-	9.62	-	3.25	-	28.69	-	6.55
STD. ERR.	-	-	-	0.38	-	0.64	-	0.88	-	0.26	-	2.59	-	0.29
MEDIAN	-	-	-	1	-	2	-	1	-	1	-	1	-	1
Sigma	-	-	-	2098 100%	-	235 100%	-	265 100%	-	313 100%	-	274 100%	-	1011 100%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q795_2. Of the (...) domains you have registered, how many are in each of the following categories?
2. Redirected to an active website-if you enter the URL, it redirects to another URL

Base: Registered More Than One Domain Name

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
					(E)		(G)		(I)		(K)		(M)	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	..	..	..	2098	..	235	..	265	..	313	..	274	..	1011
0	-	-	-	1253 60%	-	156 66% DJN	-	159 60%	-	175 56%	-	180 66% DJN	-	583 58%
1 - 2	-	-	-	691 33% FL	-	54 23%	-	90 34% FL	-	111 35% FL	-	69 25%	-	367 36% DFL
3 - 5	-	-	-	85 4%	-	15 6%	-	8 3%	-	12 4%	-	12 4%	-	38 4%
6 or more	-	-	-	69 3% N	-	10 4%	-	8 3%	-	15 5% N	-	13 5% N	-	23 2%
MEAN (INCLUDING 0)	-	-	-	1.4 N	-	1.4	-	1.9 N	-	1.3	-	2.3	-	1.0
STD. DEV.	-	-	-	9.09	-	6.02	-	11.94	-	4.86	-	19.12	-	4.38
STD. ERR.	-	-	-	0.20	-	0.39	-	0.73	-	0.27	-	1.16	-	0.14
MEDIAN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
MEAN (EXCLUDING 0)	-	-	-	3.5 N	-	4.3 N	-	4.8 N	-	2.9	-	6.7 DN	-	2.4
STD. DEV.	-	-	-	14.07	-	9.83	-	18.55	-	7.01	-	32.30	-	6.48
STD. ERR.	-	-	-	0.48	-	1.11	-	1.80	-	0.60	-	3.33	-	0.31
MEDIAN	-	-	-	1	-	2	-	1	-	1	-	1	-	1
Sigma	-	-	-	2098 100%	-	235 100%	-	265 100%	-	313 100%	-	274 100%	-	1011 100%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q795_3. Of the (...) domains you have registered, how many are in each of the following categories?

16 Aug 2016
Table 25

Base: Registered More Than One Domain Name

3. Used for an active website

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	..	..	..	2098	..	235	..	265	..	313	..	274	..	1011
0	-	-	-	559 27% N	-	66 28%	-	88 33% DN	-	100 32% DN	-	78 28% N	-	227 22%
1 - 2	-	-	-	1192 57% F	-	117 50%	-	141 53%	-	168 54%	-	147 54%	-	619 61% DFHJL
3 - 5	-	-	-	237 11%	-	34 14%	-	24 9%	-	30 10%	-	31 11%	-	118 12%
6 or more	-	-	-	110 5%	-	18 8%	-	12 5%	-	15 5%	-	18 7%	-	47 5%
MEAN (INCLUDING 0)	-	-	-	2.6	-	5.6 DN	-	2.3	-	1.9	-	2.4	-	2.2
STD. DEV.	-	-	-	14.10	-	36.22	-	9.07	-	4.29	-	7.39	-	8.02
STD. ERR.	-	-	-	0.31	-	2.36	-	0.56	-	0.24	-	0.45	-	0.25
MEDIAN	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	1	-	1	-	1	-	1
MEAN (EXCLUDING 0)	-	-	-	3.5	-	7.9 DN	-	3.5	-	2.7	-	3.4	-	2.8
STD. DEV.	-	-	-	16.36	-	42.55	-	10.92	-	4.97	-	8.56	-	9.01
STD. ERR.	-	-	-	0.42	-	3.27	-	0.82	-	0.34	-	0.61	-	0.32
MEDIAN	-	-	-	1	-	2	-	2	-	1	-	2	-	1
Sigma	-	-	-	2098 100%	-	235 100%	-	265 100%	-	313 100%	-	274 100%	-	1011 100%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q795_4. Of the (...) domains you have registered, how many are in each of the following categories?

16 Aug 2016
Table 26

Base: Registered More Than One Domain Name

4. Actively used for some purpose other than a website

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
					(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	-**	-**	-**	2098	-**	235	-**	265	-**	313	-**	274	-**	1011
0	-	-	-	1366 65% N	-	181 77% DLN	-	184 69% N	-	230 73% DN	-	181 66% N	-	590 58%
1 - 2	-	-	-	610 29% FJ	-	41 17%	-	66 25% F	-	66 21%	-	75 27% F	-	362 36% DFHJL
3 - 5	-	-	-	67 3%	-	4 2%	-	8 3%	-	11 4%	-	8 3%	-	36 4%
6 or more	-	-	-	55 3%	-	9 4%	-	7 3%	-	6 2%	-	10 4%	-	23 2%
MEAN (INCLUDING 0)	-	-	-	0.9	-	0.8	-	1.0	-	0.6	-	1.3	-	0.9
STD. DEV.	-	-	-	4.38	-	3.45	-	6.37	-	2.09	-	6.58	-	3.64
STD. ERR.	-	-	-	0.10	-	0.22	-	0.39	-	0.12	-	0.40	-	0.11
MEDIAN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
MEAN (EXCLUDING 0)	-	-	-	2.7 N	-	3.6	-	3.3	-	2.4	-	3.8 N	-	2.3
STD. DEV.	-	-	-	7.08	-	6.52	-	11.24	-	3.50	-	10.89	-	5.38
STD. ERR.	-	-	-	0.26	-	0.89	-	1.25	-	0.38	-	1.13	-	0.26
MEDIAN	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	1	-	1	-	1	-	1
Sigma	-	-	-	2098 100%	-	235 100%	-	265 100%	-	313 100%	-	274 100%	-	1011 100%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q795_5. Of the (...) domains you have registered, how many are in each of the following categories?

16 Aug 2016
Table 27

Base: Registered More Than One Domain Name

5. Expired-no longer registered in your or your company's name

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
					(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	..	..	..	2098	..	235	..	265	..	313	..	274	..	1011
0	-	-	-	1285 61% FH	-	115 49%	-	141 53%	-	194 62% FH	-	156 57%	-	679 67% DFHL
1 - 2	-	-	-	629 30% N	-	79 34% N	-	101 38% DJN	-	92 29%	-	87 32%	-	270 27%
3 - 5	-	-	-	109 5% N	-	22 9% DN	-	16 6%	-	16 5%	-	17 6%	-	38 4%
6 or more	-	-	-	75 4% N	-	19 8% DHJN	-	7 3%	-	11 4%	-	14 5% N	-	24 2%
MEAN (INCLUDING 0)	-	-	-	1.5	-	1.9 JL	-	1.5	-	1.0	-	1.2	-	1.5
STD. DEV.	-	-	-	9.37	-	5.00	-	6.56	-	2.70	-	3.12	-	12.66
STD. ERR.	-	-	-	0.20	-	0.33	-	0.40	-	0.15	-	0.19	-	0.40
MEDIAN	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
MEAN (EXCLUDING 0)	-	-	-	3.8	-	3.8	-	3.1	-	2.7	-	2.8	-	4.7
STD. DEV.	-	-	-	14.77	-	6.47	-	9.33	-	3.83	-	4.28	-	21.77
STD. ERR.	-	-	-	0.52	-	0.59	-	0.84	-	0.35	-	0.39	-	1.19
MEDIAN	-	-	-	1	-	2	-	2	-	1	-	1	-	1
Sigma	-	-	-	2098 100%	-	235 100%	-	265 100%	-	313 100%	-	274 100%	-	1011 100%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q795_6. Of the (...) domains you have registered, how many are in each of the following categories?

16 Aug 2016
Table 28

Base: Registered More Than One Domain Name

6. Other

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
					(E)		(G)		(I)		(K)		(M)	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	..	..	..	2098	..	235	..	265	..	313	..	274	..	1011
0	-	-	-	1957 93%	-	224 95%	-	252 95%	-	284 91%	-	250 91%	-	947 94%
1 - 2	-	-	-	98 5%	-	7 3%	-	9 3%	-	19 6%	-	20 7% DFHN	-	43 4%
3 - 5	-	-	-	22 1%	-	2 1%	-	2 1%	-	5 2%	-	2 1%	-	11 1%
6 or more	-	-	-	21 1%	-	2 1%	-	2 1%	-	5 2%	-	2 1%	-	10 1%
MEAN (INCLUDING 0)	-	-	-	0.2	-	0.1	-	0.2	-	0.3	-	0.2	-	0.3
STD. DEV.	-	-	-	1.69	-	0.92	-	2.27	-	1.37	-	0.97	-	1.89
STD. ERR.	-	-	-	0.04	-	0.06	-	0.14	-	0.08	-	0.06	-	0.06
MEDIAN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
MEAN (EXCLUDING 0)	-	-	-	3.5	-	3.2	-	4.8	-	3.3	-	2.0	-	4.0
STD. DEV.	-	-	-	5.58	-	3.03	-	9.42	-	3.25	-	2.68	-	6.49
STD. ERR.	-	-	-	0.47	-	0.91	-	2.61	-	0.60	-	0.55	-	0.81
MEDIAN	-	-	-	1	-	2	-	1	-	2	-	1	-	1
Sigma	-	-	-	2098 100%	-	235 100%	-	265 100%	-	313 100%	-	274 100%	-	1011 100%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q720. If you were setting up your own website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following domain name extensions?

16 Aug 2016
Table 29

SUMMARY TABLE OF TOP 2 BOX

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
.biz	194 25%	1058 41% DEGI	1252 37% EGI	1252 37% AFHJ	56 27%	113 25%	82 30%	103 25%	128 31% A	163 31% F AEGIBEGICEGI	168 48% F	181 45% DFHJ AEGIBEGICEGI	624 47% F	692 45% DFHJ
.com	717 93% DGIM	2243 87% DGI	2960 88% DGI	2701 81% HJ FGIGIGI	185 89% HJ	380 83% HJ	220 82% H	306 74%	330 79% J	390 73% LGIMBEGICGIM	328 93% J	344 86% DHJ NGIBGIGI	1180 88% DHJ	1281 83% DHJ
.info	294 38%	1339 52% DEGI	1633 49% E	1586 47% AF	81 39% F	139 30%	123 46% A	185 45% F	186 44% A	240 45% F AEGIBEGICEGI	195 55% F	205 51% F AEGIBEGICEGI	754 56% F	817 53% DFHJ
.mobi	148 19%	902 35% DEI	1050 31% EI	999 30% AFHJ	47 23% F	72 16%	81 30% AII	101 24% F	93 22%	137 26% F AEIEIEI	119 34% F	120 30% F NAEGIBEGICEGI	562 42% F	569 37% DFHJL
.net	511 66%	1837 71% DEGI	2348 70% DEGI	2231 67% FJ	132 64%	274 60%	171 64%	262 63% J	260 62%	301 56% AEGIEGIEGI	260 74% A	276 69% FJ AEGIBEGICEGI	1014 76% F	1118 73% DFHJ
.org	469 61% D	1602 62% D	2071 62% D	1888 56% FJ	124 60% F	212 46%	153 57%	217 52%	244 58% J	275 51% AEGIBEGICGIM	246 70% A	292 73% DFHJN	835 62% N	892 58% FJL
.tel	56 7%	827 32% DEIK	883 26% IK	932 28% AFHL	43 21% FA	66 14%	77 29% AIKIKIK	98 24% FL	88 21% A	135 25% FL	76 22% A	71 18% NAEGIBEGICEGI	543 40% A	562 37% DFHJL
.asia	59 8%	770 30% DEGIK	829 25% EIK	881 26% AFHJL	32 15% A	55 12%	65 24% AEKEKEK	76 18% FL	83 20% AKKK	113 21% FL	46 13% A	49 12% AEGIBEGICEGI	544 41% A	588 38% DFHJL
.pro	108 14%	848 33% EIK	956 28% IK	1031 31% ACFHL	48 23% A	93 20%	78 29% AKKK	101 24%	100 24% A	156 29% FL	68 19% A	80 20% AEGIBEGICEGI	554 41% A	601 39% DFHJL
.coop	48 6%	756 29% DEIK	804 24% K	885 26% ACFJL	39 19% FA	59 13%	75 28% AEIKEKEIK	99 24% FL	88 21% AKKK	121 23% FL	53 15% A	67 17% AEGIBEGICEGI	501 37% A	539 35% DFHJL
.cn	2 100%	473 86%	475 86%	485 88%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	473 86%	485 88%
.vn	-	49 94%	49 94%	43 83%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	49 94%	43 83%
.ph	25 96%	63 83%	88 86%	78 77%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	63 83%	78 77%
.jp	-	128 73%	128 73%	134 76%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	128 73%	134 76%
.kr	24 75%	56 81%	80 79%	80 79%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	56 81%	80 79%
.ru	56 98% DM	61 84%	117 90% M	114 89%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	61 84%	114 89%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q720. If you were setting up your own website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following domain name extensions?

16 Aug 2016
Table 29

SUMMARY TABLE OF TOP 2 BOX

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
.in	24 89%	260 87%	284 87%	274 83%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	260 87%	274 83%
.id	47 90%	43 88%	90 89%	88 88%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	43 88%	88 88%
.ng	14 82%	168 88%	182 88%	167 84%	-	-	-	-	-	-	168 88%	167 84%	-	-
.za	18 95%	68 83%	86 85%	84 83%	-	-	-	-	-	-	68 83%	84 83%	-	-
.eg	14 54%	63 79%	77 73%	77 77%	-	-	-	-	-	-	63 79% C	77 77%	-	-
.co	52 85% D	51 80%	103 82% D	88 70%	-	-	51 80%	88 70%	-	-	-	-	-	-
.ar	24 75%	58 85%	82 82%	82 79%	-	-	58 85%	82 79%	-	-	-	-	-	-
.br	32 84%	113 82% D	145 83% D	135 73%	-	-	113 82% H	135 73%	-	-	-	-	-	-
.it	24 86%	21 81%	45 83%	44 88%	-	-	-	-	21 81%	44 88%	-	-	-	-
.tr	1 20%	36 80%	37 74%	43 86%	-	-	-	-	36 80% C	43 86%	-	-	-	-
.es	12 100%	33 87%	45 90%	45 90%	-	-	-	-	33 87%	45 90%	-	-	-	-
.pl	-	48 91%	48 91%	45 85%	-	-	-	-	48 91%	45 85%	-	-	-	-
.uk	18 69%	57 77%	75 75%	82 82%	-	-	-	-	57 77%	82 82%	-	-	-	-
.fr	25 96%	58 77%	83 82% I	75 71%	-	-	-	-	58 77%	75 71%	-	-	-	-
.de	16 94%	98 91% D	114 91% D	101 81%	-	-	-	-	98 91% J	101 81%	-	-	-	-
.us	60 29%	20 31%	80 30%	73 29%	20 31%	73 29%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q720. If you were setting up your own website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following domain name extensions?

16 Aug 2016
Table 29

SUMMARY TABLE OF TOP 2 BOX

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
.ca	21 91%	67 84%	88 85%	87 83%	67 84%	87 83%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
.mx	33 85%	60 95% D	93 91% D	75 75%	60 95% FC	75 75%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
.eu	-	-	-	216 45%	-	-	-	-	-	216 45%	-	-	-	-
CONSIDERED ALL (NET)	749 97% DGI	2481 96% DGI	3230 96% DGI	3150 94% HJ	203 98% FGIGIGI	426 93%	251 93%	377 91%	393 94%	488 91%	344 98% GIGIGI	390 97% DFHJ	1290 96% GIGIGI	1469 95% DFHJ
CONSIDERED CONSISTENT (NET)	749 97% DGI	2481 96% DGI	3230 96% DGI	3150 94% HJ	203 98% FGIGIGI	426 93%	251 93%	377 91%	393 94%	488 91%	344 98% GIGIGI	390 97% DFHJ	1290 96% GIGIGI	1469 95% DFHJ
CONSIDERED GLOBAL (NET)	743 97% DGIM	2428 94% DGI	3171 94% DGI	3071 92% J	200 97% FGIGIGI	420 91% J	244 91%	372 90% J	373 89% J	449 84% GIBGICGI	341 97% GIBGICGI	386 96% DFHJ	1270 95% GIBGIGI	1444 94% DHJ
CONSIDERED GEO-SPECIFIC (NET)	542 70%	2152 83% DE	2694 80% DE	2619 78% AFH	147 71% F	235 51%	222 83% HAE	305 73% F	351 84% AEE	455 85% DFH	299 85% AEECE	328 82% FH	1133 84% AEECE	1296 84% DFH
CONSIDERED GEO-SPECIFIC CONSISTENT (NET)	542 70%	2152 83% DE	2694 80% DE	2599 78% AFH	147 71% F	235 51%	222 83% HAE	305 73% F	351 84% AEE	435 81% DFH	299 85% AEECE	328 82% DFH	1133 84% AEECE	1296 84% DFH
CONSIDERED GEO-SPECIFIC ADDED (NET)	-	-	-	216 6% ABCFHLN	-	-	-	-	-	216 40% IDFHLN	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q720. If you were setting up your own website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following domain name extensions?

16 Aug 2016
Table 30

SUMMARY TABLE OF BOTTOM 2 BOX

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
.biz	514 67% DGIKM	1198 46% M	1712 51% KM	1631 49% LN	137 66% GKMBGKMGCKM	287 62% DHLN	142 53% KMBKMCKM	225 54% DLN	243 58% KMBKMCKM	309 58% DLN	146 41% DLN	172 43% DLN	530 40% DLN	638 41% DLN
.com	37 5% K	215 8% KM	252 8% K	425 13% ABCLN	14 7% AKMBKMCKM	48 10% AKMBKMCKM	32 12% GDFLN	80 19% AEKMBEKMCKM	61 15% IDFLN	104 19% IDFLN	14 4% K	31 8% K	94 7% AKKK	162 11% M
.info	419 54% DGIKM	984 38% M	1403 42% KM	1371 41% BN	112 54% GKMBGKMGCKM	267 58% DHJLN	113 42% MMM	166 40% KMBKMCKM	195 47% KMBKMCKM	236 44% N	127 36% N	159 40% N	437 33% N	543 35% N
.mobi	552 72% DGIKM	1348 52% M	1900 57% KM	1863 56% BN	144 70% GKMBGKMGCKM	325 71% DHJLN	147 55% MMM	224 54% GKMBGKMGCKM	277 66% GKMBGKMGCKM	336 63% DHLN	178 51% DHLN	226 56% N	602 45% N	752 49% M
.net	228 30% DKM	550 21% M	778 23% KM	823 25% BLN	66 32% KMBKMCKM	150 33% DLN	73 27% KMBKMCKM	112 27% LN	125 30% KMBKMCKM	184 34% DHLN	61 17% DHLN	79 20% DHLN	225 17% DHLN	298 19% DHLN
.org	268 35% KM	768 30% KM	1036 31% KM	1148 34% BCL	78 38% KMBKMCKM	201 44% DHLN	87 32% KKK	153 37% L	147 35% KMBKMCKM	203 38% DLN	85 24% DLN	87 22% DLN	371 28% DLN	504 33% ML
.tel	637 83% DEGIKM	1391 54% M	2028 60% DM	1911 57% BN	146 71% GKMBGKMGCKM	329 72% DHJLN	151 56% MMM	233 56% N	277 66% GKMBGKMGCKM	335 63% DHN	208 59% MBMM	257 64% DHN	609 45% DHN	757 49% M
.asia	651 85% DEGIKM	1467 57% M	2118 63% DM	1986 59% BN	162 78% GKMBGKMGCKM	357 78% DHJLN	165 61% MMM	249 60% N	291 69% GMBGMCCKM	363 68% DHN	240 68% MBMCM	287 72% DHN	609 45% DHN	730 47% DHN
.pro	583 76% DEGIKM	1370 53% M	1953 58% DM	1817 54% N	143 69% GMBGMCCKM	299 65% DHN	150 56% MMM	225 54% N	269 64% GMBGMCCKM	319 60% DN	226 64% GMBGMCCKM	252 63% DHN	582 43% DHN	722 47% DHN
.coop	641 83% DEGIKM	1469 57% M	2110 63% DGM	1959 58% N	156 75% GKMBGKMGCKM	336 73% DHJN	152 57% MMM	227 55% GMBGMCKM	278 66% GMBGMCKM	346 65% DHN	231 66% GMBGMCKM	273 68% DHN	652 49% DHN	777 50% DHN
.cn	-	50 9%	50 9%	42 8%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	50 9%	42 8%
.vn	-	-	-	6 12% BC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6 12% M
.ph	1 4%	6 8%	7 7%	13 13%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6 8%	13 13%
.jp	-	32 18%	32 18%	30 17%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	32 18%	30 17%
.kr	7 22%	13 19%	20 20%	17 17%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	13 19%	17 17%
.ru	-	5 7%	5 4%	10 8% A	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5 7% A	10 8% A

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q720. If you were setting up your own website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following domain name extensions?

16 Aug 2016
Table 30

SUMMARY TABLE OF BOTTOM 2 BOX

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
.in	2 7%	30 10%	32 10%	40 12%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	30 10%	40 12%
.id	3 6%	4 8%	7 7%	10 10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4 8%	10 10%
.ng	3 18%	15 8%	18 9%	21 11%	-	-	-	-	-	-	15 8%	21 11%	-	-
.za	1 5%	8 10%	9 9%	8 8%	-	-	-	-	-	-	8 10%	8 8%	-	-
.eg	11 42%	15 19%	26 25% K	16 16%	-	-	-	-	-	-	15 19%	16 16%	-	-
.co	8 13%	9 14%	17 14%	31 25% C	-	-	9 14%	31 25%	-	-	-	-	-	-
.ar	7 22%	6 9%	13 13%	12 12%	-	-	6 9%	12 12%	-	-	-	-	-	-
.br	6 16%	18 13%	24 14%	39 21%	-	-	18 13%	39 21%	-	-	-	-	-	-
.it	4 14%	3 12%	7 13%	2 4%	-	-	-	-	3 12%	2 4%	-	-	-	-
.tr	4 80%	8 18%	12 24% I	5 10%	-	-	-	-	8 18%	5 10%	-	-	-	-
.es	-	1 3%	1 2%	2 4%	-	-	-	-	1 3%	2 4%	-	-	-	-
.pl	-	3 6%	3 6%	3 6%	-	-	-	-	3 6%	3 6%	-	-	-	-
.uk	5 19%	13 18%	18 18%	12 12%	-	-	-	-	13 18%	12 12%	-	-	-	-
.fr	1 4%	12 16%	13 13%	22 21%	-	-	-	-	12 16%	22 21%	-	-	-	-
.de	1 6%	7 6%	8 6%	16 13%	-	-	-	-	7 6%	16 13%	-	-	-	-
.us	138 68%	38 59%	176 66%	156 61%	38 59%	156 61%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q720. If you were setting up your own website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following domain name extensions?

16 Aug 2016
Table 30

SUMMARY TABLE OF BOTTOM 2 BOX

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
.ca	2 9%	12 15%	14 14%	11 10%	12 15%	11 10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
.mx	6 15%	3 5%	9 9% E	19 19% BC	3 5%	19 19% E	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
.eu	-	-	-	215 44%	-	-	-	-	-	215 44%	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q720_1. If you were setting up your own website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following domain name extensions?

16 Aug 2016
Table 31

1. .biz

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	194 25%	1058 41% DEGI	1252 37% EGI	1252 37% AFHJ	56 27%	113 25%	82 30%	103 25%	128 31% A	163 31% F	168 48% AEGIBEGICEGI	181 45% DFHJ	624 47% AEGIBEGICEGI	692 45% DFHJ
Very likely	72 9%	373 14% EGI	445 13% EGI	457 14% AFH	16 8%	36 8%	25 9%	25 6%	30 7%	68 13% IFH	75 21% AEGIBEGICEGI	83 21% DFHJN	227 17% AEGIBEGICEGI	245 16% DFH
Somewhat likely	122 16%	685 26% DEG	807 24% AFHJ	795 24% AFHJ	40 19%	77 17%	57 21% A	78 19%	98 23% JA	95 18% A	93 26% A	98 24% FJ	397 30% AEGIBEGICEGI	447 29% DFHJ
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	514 67%	1198 46% M	1712 51% KM	1631 49% LN	137 66% GKMBKMKCKM	287 62% DHLN	142 53% KMBKMKM	225 54% DLN	243 58% KMBKMKCKM	309 58% DLN	146 41% DLN	172 43% DLN	530 40% MM	638 41% MM
Somewhat unlikely	143 19%	554 21% K	697 21% K	705 21% AKMBKMKCKM	57 28%	103 22%	56 21%	76 18%	104 25% AKKCK	117 22%	55 16%	73 18%	282 21% KKK	336 22%
Very unlikely	371 48%	644 25% M	1015 30% DM	926 28% BN	80 39% KMBKMKCKM	184 40% DLN	86 32% MBMM	149 36% DLN	139 33% KMBKMKCKM	192 36% DLN	91 26% MM	99 25% N	248 18% N	302 20%
Not sure	61 8%	327 13% E	388 12% E	466 14% AC	14 7%	60 13% E	45 17% AEIKBEIKCEIK	87 21% DFJLN	46 11%	62 12%	38 11%	48 12% AEECE	184 14% AEECE	209 14%
Decline to Answer	-	5 *	5 *	-	-	-	-	-	2 *	-	-	-	3 *	-
Sigma	769 100%	2588 100%	3357 100%	3349 100%	207 100%	460 100%	269 100%	415 100%	419 100%	534 100%	352 100%	401 100%	1341 100%	1539 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/F/H/J/L/N - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q720_2. If you were setting up your own website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following domain name extensions?
2. .com

16 Aug 2016
Table 32

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	717 93% DGIM	2243 87% DGI	2960 88% DGI	2701 81% HJ	185 89% FGIGIGI	380 83% HJ	220 82% H	306 74% H	330 79% J	390 73% LGIMBGIMCGIM	328 93% DHJ	344 86% NGIBGIGI	1180 88% DHJ	1281 83% DHJ
Very likely	678 88% DEGIM	1789 69% DI	2467 73% DIM	2158 64% J	156 75% IMBIMIM	316 69% DJ	186 69% III	269 65% J	228 54% J	256 48% J	299 85% LEGIMBEGIMCEGIM	298 74% DHJN	920 69% III	1019 66% DJ
Somewhat likely	39 5% GK	454 18% GK	493 15% K	543 16% AHL	29 14% AKKK	64 14% H	34 13% A	37 9% AEGMBEGIMCEGIM	102 24% DFHNL	134 25% A	29 8% A	46 11% AGKBGKCGK	260 19% AKKK	262 17% HL
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	37 5% KM	215 8% KM	252 8% K	425 13% ABCLN	14 7% ABCLN	48 10% AKMBEKCKM	32 12% GDFLN	80 19% AEKMBEKCKM	61 15% IDFLN	104 19% IDFLN	14 4% K	31 8% AKKK	94 7% AKKK	162 11% M
Somewhat unlikely	7 1% K	111 4% K	118 4% ACF	159 5% ACF	8 4% A	10 2% A	12 4% A	15 4% AEKMBEKCKM	34 8% DFHNL	46 9% DFHNL	7 2% K	13 3% A	50 4% A	75 5% F
Very unlikely	30 4% KM	104 4% KM	134 4% K	266 8% ABCLN	6 3% ABCLN	38 8% ELN	20 7% AEKMBEKCKM	65 16% GDFJLN	27 6% KMBKMCKM	58 11% IDLN	7 2% K	18 4% K	44 3% A	87 6% M
Not sure	15 2% K	128 5% K	143 4% ABC	223 7% ABC	8 4% ABC	32 7% AKKK	17 6% AKKK	29 7% AKKCK	28 7% AKKCK	40 7% K	9 3% K	26 6% K	66 5% A	96 6% A
Decline to Answer	-	2 *	2 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 *	-	1 *	-
Sigma	769 100%	2588 100%	3357 100%	3349 100%	207 100%	460 100%	269 100%	415 100%	419 100%	534 100%	352 100%	401 100%	1341 100%	1539 100%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q720_3. If you were setting up your own website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following domain name extensions?
3. .info

16 Aug 2016
Table 33

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	294 38%	1339 52% DEGI	1633 49% E	1586 47% AF	81 39% F	139 30%	123 46% A	185 45% F	186 44% A	240 45% F AEGIEGICEGI	195 55%	205 51% F AEGIBEGICEGI	754 56%	817 53% DFHJ
Very likely	116 15%	528 20% EI	644 19% EI	629 19% AFH	24 12%	55 12%	52 19% EEE	61 15%	62 15%	96 18% F AEGIMBEGIMCEGIM	95 27%	84 21% FH AEIBEICEI	295 22% DFH	333 22%
Somewhat likely	178 23%	811 31% D	989 29%	957 29% AF	57 28% F	84 18%	71 26%	124 30% F	124 30% A	144 27% F	100 28%	121 30% F AGKBGKCGK	459 34%	484 31% DF
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	419 54% DGIKM	984 38% M	1403 42% KM	1371 41% BN GKMBGKMGCKM	112 54%	267 58% DHJLN	113 42% MMM	166 40% KMBKMCKM	195 47% N	236 44% N	127 36%	159 40%	437 33%	543 35%
Somewhat unlikely	150 20% K	492 19% K	642 19% K	598 18% KKK	45 22% KKK	82 18%	51 19% KKK	62 15% JKMBKMCKM	101 24%	94 18%	46 13%	68 17%	249 19% KKK	292 19%
Very unlikely	269 35% DGIKM	492 19% M	761 23% M	773 23% BN GKMBGKMGCKM	67 32%	185 40% DHJLN	62 23% MMM	104 25% N	94 22% MMM	142 27% DN MBMM	81 23% N	91 23% N	188 14%	251 16%
Not sure	56 7%	263 10%	319 10%	392 12% AC	14 7%	54 12%	33 12% AEEE	64 15% DJLN	38 9%	58 11%	30 9%	37 9%	148 11% AC	179 12%
Decline to Answer	-	2 *	2 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 *	-
Sigma	769 100%	2588 100%	3357 100%	3349 100%	207 100%	460 100%	269 100%	415 100%	419 100%	534 100%	352 100%	401 100%	1341 100%	1539 100%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q720_4. If you were setting up your own website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following domain name extensions?
4. .mobi

16 Aug 2016
Table 34

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	148 19%	902 35% DEI	1050 31% EI	999 30% AFHJ	47 23% F	72 16%	81 30% AIII	101 24% F	93 22%	137 26% F	119 34% AEIEIEI	120 30% F NAEGKBEGICEGIK	562 42% F	569 37% DFHJL
Very likely	47 6%	325 13% DI	372 11% I	336 10% AFH	18 9%	28 6%	28 10% HA	25 6%	29 7%	57 11% IFH	49 14% AIII	44 11% FH NAEGIBEGICEGI	201 15% F	182 12% DFH
Somewhat likely	101 13%	577 22% DEI	678 20% EI	663 20% AFJ	29 14%	44 10%	53 20% A	76 18% F	64 15%	80 15% F	70 20% A	76 19% F AEQKBEGICEGIK	361 27% F	387 25% DFHJL
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	552 72%	1348 52% M	1900 57% KM	1863 56% BN GKMBGKMGCKM	144 70% BN	325 71% DHJLN	147 55% MMM	224 54% GKMBGKMGCKM	277 66% DHLN	336 63% DHLN	178 51%	226 56% N	602 45% F	752 49% M
Somewhat unlikely	103 13%	598 23% K	701 21% K	712 21% AFH	47 23% FA	71 15%	60 22% A	72 17%	109 26% AKKCK	125 23% FHL	67 19% A	72 18% A	315 23% AC	372 24% DFHL
Very unlikely	449 58%	750 29% M	1199 36% M	1151 34% BN GKMBGKMGCKM	97 47% BN	254 55% EDHJLN	87 32% MMM	152 37% N GKMBGKMGCKM	168 40% DN	211 40% DN	111 32% MMM	154 38% KN	287 21% KN	380 25% M
Not sure	69 9%	336 13% E	405 12% E	487 15% ACJ	16 8%	63 14% E	41 15% AEEE	90 22% GDFJLN	49 12%	61 11%	55 16% AEECE	55 14%	175 13% AEEE	218 14%
Decline to Answer	-	2 *	2 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 *	-
Sigma	769 100%	2588 100%	3357 100%	3349 100%	207 100%	460 100%	269 100%	415 100%	419 100%	534 100%	352 100%	401 100%	1341 100%	1539 100%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q720_5. If you were setting up your own website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following domain name extensions?

16 Aug 2016
Table 35

5. .net

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	511 66%	1837 71% DEGI	2348 70% DEGI	2231 67% FJ	132 64%	274 60%	171 64%	262 63% J	260 62%	301 56% AEGIEGIEGI	260 74% AEGIEGIEGI	276 69% FJ AEGIBEGICEGI	1014 76% AEGIBEGICEGI	1118 73% DFHJ
Very likely	287 37% I	1040 40% DEI	1327 40% DEI	1237 37% FHJ	66 32%	136 30%	94 35%	131 32%	119 28%	148 28% AEGIBEGICEGI	164 47% AEGIBEGICEGI	161 40% FHJ AEGIBEGICEGI	597 45% AEGIBEGICEGI	661 43% DFHJ
Somewhat likely	224 29%	797 31%	1021 30%	994 30%	66 32%	138 30%	77 29%	131 32%	141 34%	153 29%	96 27%	115 29%	417 31%	457 30%
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	228 30% DKM	550 21% M	778 23% KM	823 25% BLN KMBKMCKM	66 32% DLN KMBKMCKM	150 33% DLN KMBKMCKM	73 27% LN KMBKMCKM	112 27% LN KMBKMCKM	125 30% DHLN	184 34% DHLN	61 17%	79 20%	225 17%	298 19%
Somewhat unlikely	111 14% DKM	290 11% M	401 12% KM	389 12% N	28 14%	57 12%	33 12%	46 11% KMBKMCKM	66 16% DFHLN	92 17%	30 9%	37 9%	133 10%	157 10%
Very unlikely	117 15% KM	260 10% M	377 11% M	434 13% BCN KMBKMCKM	38 18% DLN KMBKMCKM	93 20% DLN KMBKMCKM	40 15% LN KMBKMCKM	66 16% LN KMBKMCKM	59 14% DLN	92 17%	31 9%	42 10%	92 7%	141 9% M
Not sure	30 4%	198 8%	228 7%	295 9% AC	9 4%	36 8%	25 9% AEEE	41 10%	34 8% A	49 9%	30 9% A	46 11% DN	100 7% A	123 8%
Decline to Answer	-	3 D	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 A	-	2 A	-
Sigma	769 100%	2588 100%	3357 100%	3349 100%	207 100%	460 100%	269 100%	415 100%	419 100%	534 100%	352 100%	401 100%	1341 100%	1539 100%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/F/H/J/L/N - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q720_6. If you were setting up your own website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following domain name extensions?

16 Aug 2016
Table 36

6. .org

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	469 61% D	1602 62% D	2071 62% D	1888 56% FJ	124 60% F	212 46% F	153 57% J	217 52% J	244 58% J	275 51% AEGIMBEGIMCEGIM	246 70% DFHJN	292 73% N	835 62% N	892 58% FHJ
Very likely	248 32% DI	847 33% DI	1095 33% DI	956 29% F	67 32% FIII	99 22% F	91 34% HIII	110 27% J	103 25% J	140 26% AEGIMBEGIMCEGIM	155 44% DFHJN	174 43% NIII	431 32% NIII	433 28% F
Somewhat likely	221 29% G	755 29% G	976 29% G	932 28% G	57 28% G	113 25% G	62 23% G	107 26% JGKBGKCGK	141 34% JGKBGKCGK	135 25% JGKBGKCGK	91 26% JGKBGKCGK	118 29% GGG	404 30% GGG	459 30% DFJ
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	268 35% KM	768 30% KM	1036 31% KM	1148 34% BCL	78 38% KMBKMCKM	201 44% DHLN	87 32% KKK	153 37% L	147 35% KMBKMCKM	203 38% DLN	85 24% DLN	87 22% DLN	371 28% DLN	504 33% ML
Somewhat unlikely	96 12% K	383 15% K	479 14% K	523 16% AL	39 19% AKKK	75 16% L	36 13% L	57 14% L	78 19% AKBKCK	91 17% L	33 9% L	34 8% L	197 15% KKK	266 17% DL
Very unlikely	172 22% DIKM	385 15% M	557 17% M	625 19% BCLN	39 19% MMM	126 27% EDJLN	51 19% MBMM	96 23% DLN	69 16% DLN	112 21% LN	52 15% LN	53 13% LN	174 13% LN	238 15% LN
Not sure	32 4% E	214 8% E	246 7% E	313 9% ACL	5 2% ACL	47 10% EL	29 11% AEKEKCEK	45 11% L	28 7% EEE	56 10% IL	20 6% IL	22 5% AEIKBEIKCEIK	132 10% L	143 9% L
Decline to Answer	-	4 * D	4 * D	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 *	-	3 *	-
Sigma	769 100%	2588 100%	3357 100%	3349 100%	207 100%	460 100%	269 100%	415 100%	419 100%	534 100%	352 100%	401 100%	1341 100%	1539 100%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q720_7. If you were setting up your own website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following domain name extensions?
7. .tel

16 Aug 2016
Table 37

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	56 7%	827 32% DEIK	883 26% IK	932 28% AFHL	43 21% FA	66 14% A	77 29% AIKIKIK	98 24% FL	88 21% A	135 25% FL	76 22% A	71 18% NAEGKBEGKCEGK	543 40% DFHJL	562 37%
Very likely	23 3%	285 11% DEIK	308 9% E	303 9% AFHL	11 5% A	21 5% A	26 10% A	24 6% A	29 7% A	53 10% FHL	25 7% A	24 6% NAEGKBEGKCEGK	194 14% DFHL	181 12%
Somewhat likely	33 4%	542 21% DEIK	575 17% E	629 19% AFJL	32 15% FA	45 10% A	51 19% A	74 18% FL	59 14% A	82 15% F	51 14% A	47 12% AEIGKBEGKCEGK	349 26% DFHJL	381 25%
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	637 83%	1391 54% M	2028 60% DM	1911 57% BN	146 71% GKMBGKMGCKM	329 72% DHJLN	151 56% MMM	233 56% N	277 66% GKMBGKMGCKM	335 63% DHN	208 59% MBMM	257 64% DHN	609 45% M	757 49%
Somewhat unlikely	78 10%	599 23% K	677 20% E	718 21% AF	41 20% A	68 15% A	60 22% A	81 20% JAEKBKCEK	116 28% F	114 21% F	65 18% A	74 18% AKKCK	317 24% DFHL	381 25%
Very unlikely	559 73%	792 31% M	1351 40% DGM	1193 36% BN	105 51% GKMBGKMGCKM	261 57% DHJLN	91 34% MMM	152 37% N	161 38% MBMM	221 41% DN	143 41% MBMM	183 46% DHN	292 22% M	376 24%
Not sure	76 10%	366 14% E	442 13% E	506 15% ACJ	18 9% A	65 14% E	41 15% AEKE	84 20% DFJN	52 12% A	64 12% AEIMBEIMCEIM	68 19% A	73 18% J	187 14% AEKE	220 14%
Decline to Answer	-	4 + D	4 + D	-	-	-	-	-	2 + C	-	-	-	2 + A	-
Sigma	769 100%	2588 100%	3357 100%	3349 100%	207 100%	460 100%	269 100%	415 100%	419 100%	534 100%	352 100%	401 100%	1341 100%	1539 100%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q720_8. If you were setting up your own website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following domain name extensions?
8. .asia

16 Aug 2016
Table 38

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	59 8%	770 30% DEGIK	829 25% EIK	881 26% AFHJL	32 15% A	55 12% AEKEKEK	65 24% FL	76 18% AKKK	83 20% FL	113 21% FL	46 13% A	49 12% AEGKBEGKCEGIK	544 41% DFHJL	588 38%
Very likely	26 3%	275 11% DEIK	301 9% IK	277 8% AFHL	13 6% A	20 4% AIII	22 8% AIII	19 5% IFHL	19 5% IFHL	43 8% IFHL	17 5% A	13 3% NAEGKBEGKCEGIK	204 15% DFHJL	182 12%
Somewhat likely	33 4%	495 19% EIK	528 16% EK	604 18% ACFHJL	19 9% A	35 8% AEKEKEK	43 16% FL	57 14% AEKEKEK	64 15% FL	70 13% FL	29 8% A	36 9% AEGKBEGKCEGIK	340 25% DFHJL	406 26%
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	651 85%	1467 57% M	2118 63% DM	1986 59% BN	162 78% GIMBGMCGIM	357 78% DHJLN	165 61% MMM	249 60% N	291 69% GMBGMCGM	363 68% DHN	240 68% MBMCM	287 72% DHN	609 45% F	730 47%
Somewhat unlikely	62 8%	553 21% DK	615 18% AF	640 19% FA	37 18% FA	53 12% AKKK	59 22% F	68 16% AKKK	89 21% F	95 18% F	55 16% A	68 17% F	313 23% AKBKCK	356 23% DFHJL
Very unlikely	589 77%	914 35% M	1503 45% DM	1346 40% BN	125 60% GIMBGMCGIM	304 66% DHJLN	106 39% MMM	181 44% N	202 48% GMBGMCGM	268 50% DHN	185 53% GMBGMCGM	219 55% DHN	296 22% F	374 24%
Not sure	59 8%	349 13% E	408 12% E	482 14% ACFJ	13 6% A	48 10% AEKEKEK	39 14% GDFJLN	90 22% AEKEKEK	45 11% AEKEKEK	58 11% AEIMBEIMCEIM	66 19% AEIMBEIMCEIM	65 16% FJ	186 14% AEECE	221 14% FJ
Decline to Answer	-	2 *	2 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 *	-
Sigma	769 100%	2588 100%	3357 100%	3349 100%	207 100%	460 100%	269 100%	415 100%	419 100%	534 100%	352 100%	401 100%	1341 100%	1539 100%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q720_9. If you were setting up your own website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following domain name extensions?

16 Aug 2016
Table 39

9. .pro

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	108 14%	848 33% EIK	956 28% IK	1031 31% ACFHL	48 23% A	93 20%	78 29% AKKK	101 24%	100 24% A	156 29% FL	68 19% A	80 20% AEGKBEGKCEGK	554 41% DFHJL	601 39%
Very likely	36 5%	278 11% IK	314 9% K	332 10% AFHL	15 7% A	30 7%	27 10% AKKK	29 7%	32 8% A	70 13% IDFHL	18 5% A	27 7% NAEIKBEIKCEIK	186 14% DFHL	176 11%
Somewhat likely	72 9%	570 22% EIK	642 19% K	699 21% AFJL	33 16% A	63 14%	51 19% A	72 17%	68 16% A	86 16%	50 14% A	53 13% AEGKBEGKCEGK	368 27% DFHJL	425 28%
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	583 76%	1370 53% M	1953 58% DM	1817 54% N	143 69% GMBGMCGM	299 65% DHN	150 56% MMM	225 54% N	269 64% GMBGMCGM	319 60% DN	226 64% GMBGMCGM	252 63% DHN	582 43% A	722 47%
Somewhat unlikely	105 14%	606 23% D	711 21% AF	686 20% FA	49 24% A	64 14%	65 24% A	77 19% JAKMBKCKM	118 28% F	103 19% F	76 22% A	80 20% F	298 22% A	362 24% DFHJ
Very unlikely	478 62%	764 30% M	1242 37% DM	1131 34% BN	94 45% GIMBGIMCGM	235 51% DHLN	85 32% MMM	148 36% N	151 36% MBMM	216 40% DN	150 43% GMBGMCGM	172 43% DHN	284 21% A	360 23%
Not sure	78 10%	367 14% E	445 13% E	501 15% ACJ	16 8% A	68 15% E	41 15% AEEE	89 21% GDFJN	49 12% A	59 11% A	58 16% AEEE	69 17% J	203 15% AEECE	216 14%
Decline to Answer	-	3 *	3 *	-	-	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	2 *	-
Sigma	769 100%	2588 100%	3357 100%	3349 100%	207 100%	460 100%	269 100%	415 100%	419 100%	534 100%	352 100%	401 100%	1341 100%	1539 100%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q720_10. If you were setting up your own website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following domain name extensions?

16 Aug 2016
Table 40

10. .coop

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	48 6%	756 29% DEIK	804 24% K	885 26% ACFJL	39 19% FA	59 13% AEIKEIKEIK	75 28% FL	99 24% AKKK	88 21% FL	121 23% FL	53 15% A	67 17% AEGKBEGKCEGK	501 37% DFHJL	539 35%
Very likely	19 2%	269 10% DEK	288 9% EK	270 8% AFH	10 5% HAEKEKEK	20 4% HAEKEKEK	26 10% AKKK	22 5% AKKK	33 8% AKKK	43 8% F	15 4% F	23 6% NAEIKBEIKCEIK	185 14% DFHL	162 11%
Somewhat likely	29 4%	487 19% IK	516 15% K	615 18% ACFJL	29 14% FA	39 8% AKKK	49 18% AKKK	77 19% FL	55 13% A	78 15% F	38 11% A	44 11% AEIKBEIKCEIK	316 24% DFHJL	377 24%
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	641 83%	1469 57% M	2110 63% DGM	1959 58% N	156 75% GIMBGIMCGIM	336 73% DHJLN	152 57% MMM	227 55% GMBGMGM	278 66% GMBGMGM	346 65% DHN	231 66% GMBGMGM	273 68% DHN	652 49% DHN	777 50%
Somewhat unlikely	73 9%	596 23% DK	669 20% AF	692 21% FAKKK	51 25% FAKKK	75 16% DHJLN	61 23% A	74 18% JAKKCK	106 25% JAKKCK	102 19% A	60 17% A	74 18% AKKCK	318 24% DFHJL	367 24%
Very unlikely	568 74%	873 34% M	1441 43% DGM	1267 38% BN	105 51% GIMBGIMCGIM	261 57% DHJLN	91 34% MMM	153 37% N	172 41% MBMM	244 46% DHN	171 49% GIMBGIMCGIM	199 50% DHN	334 25% DHN	410 27%
Not sure	80 10% E	361 14% E	441 13% E	505 15% AC	12 6% AC	65 14% E	42 16% AEKEE	89 21% DFJLN	53 13% EEE	67 13% AEIMBEIMCEIM	68 19% AEIMBEIMCEIM	61 15% AEKEE	186 14% AEKEE	223 14%
Decline to Answer	-	2 *	2 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 *	-
Sigma	769 100%	2588 100%	3357 100%	3349 100%	207 100%	460 100%	269 100%	415 100%	419 100%	534 100%	352 100%	401 100%	1341 100%	1539 100%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q720_11. If you were setting up your own website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following domain name extensions?

16 Aug 2016
Table 41

11. .cn

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	2**	548	550	551	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	548	551
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	2 100%	473 86%	475 86%	485 88%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	473 86%	485 88%
Very likely	2 100%	323 59%	325 59%	329 60%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	323 59%	329 60%
Somewhat likely	-	150 27%	150 27%	156 28%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	150 27%	156 28%
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	-	50 9%	50 9%	42 8%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	50 9%	42 8%
Somewhat unlikely	-	27 5%	27 5%	22 4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	27 5%	22 4%
Very unlikely	-	23 4%	23 4%	20 4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	23 4%	20 4%
Not sure	-	24 4%	24 4%	24 4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	24 4%	24 4%
Decline to Answer	-	1 *	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 *	-
Sigma	2 100%	548 100%	550 100%	551 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	548 100%	551 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q720_12. If you were setting up your own website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following domain name extensions?

16 Aug 2016
Table 42

12. .vn

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	..**	52*	52*	52*	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	52*	52*
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	-	49 94%	49 94%	43 83%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	49 94%	43 83%
Very likely	-	32 62%	32 62%	35 67%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	32 62%	35 67%
Somewhat likely	-	17 33% D	17 33% D	8 15%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	17 33% N	8 15%
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	6 12% BC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6 12% M
Somewhat unlikely	-	-	-	2 4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 4%
Very unlikely	-	-	-	4 8% BC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4 8% M
Not sure	-	3 6%	3 6%	3 6%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3 6%	3 6%
Sigma	-	52 100%	52 100%	52 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	52 100%	52 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q720_13. If you were setting up your own website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following domain name extensions?

16 Aug 2016
Table 43

13. .ph

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	26**	76*	102	101	._**	._**	._**	._**	._**	._**	._**	._**	76*	101
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	25 96%	63 83%	88 86%	78 77%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	63 83%	78 77%
Very likely	17 65%	46 61%	63 62% D	46 46%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	46 61%	46 46%
Somewhat likely	8 31%	17 22%	25 25%	32 32%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	17 22%	32 32%
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	1 4%	6 8%	7 7%	13 13%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6 8%	13 13%
Somewhat unlikely	1 4%	4 5%	5 5%	3 3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4 5%	3 3%
Very unlikely	-	2 3%	2 2%	10 10% C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 3%	10 10%
Not sure	-	7 9%	7 7%	10 10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7 9%	10 10%
Sigma	26 100%	76 100%	102 100%	101 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	76 100%	101 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q720_14. If you were setting up your own website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following domain name extensions?

16 Aug 2016
Table 44

14. .jp

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	..	176	176	176	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	176	176
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	-	128 73%	128 73%	134 76%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	128 73%	134 76%
Very likely	-	78 44%	78 44%	89 51%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	78 44%	89 51%
Somewhat likely	-	50 28%	50 28%	45 26%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	50 28%	45 26%
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	-	32 18%	32 18%	30 17%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	32 18%	30 17%
Somewhat unlikely	-	20 11%	20 11%	14 8%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	20 11%	14 8%
Very unlikely	-	12 7%	12 7%	16 9%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	12 7%	16 9%
Not sure	-	16 9%	16 9%	12 7%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	16 9%	12 7%
Sigma	-	176 100%	176 100%	176 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	176 100%	176 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q720_15. If you were setting up your own website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following domain name extensions?

16 Aug 2016
Table 45

15. .kr

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	32*	69*	101	101	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	69*	101
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	24 75%	56 81%	80 79%	80 79%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	56 81%	80 79%
Very likely	18 56%	41 59%	59 58%	45 45%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	41 59%	45 45%
Somewhat likely	6 19%	15 22%	21 21%	35 35% C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15 22%	35 35%
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	7 22%	13 19%	20 20%	17 17%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	13 19%	17 17%
Somewhat unlikely	2 6%	9 13%	11 11%	10 10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9 13%	10 10%
Very unlikely	5 16%	4 6%	9 9%	7 7%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4 6%	7 7%
Not sure	1 3%	-	1 1%	4 4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4 4%
Sigma	32 100%	69 100%	101 100%	101 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	69 100%	101 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q720_16. If you were setting up your own website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following domain name extensions?

16 Aug 2016
Table 46

16. .ru

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	57*	73*	130	128	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	73*	128
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	56 98% DM	61 84%	117 90% M	114 89%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	61 84%	114 89%
Very likely	50 88%	55 75%	105 81%	104 81%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	55 75%	104 81%
Somewhat likely	6 11%	6 8%	12 9%	10 8%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6 8%	10 8%
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	-	5 7%	5 4%	10 8% A	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5 7% A	10 8%
Somewhat unlikely	-	4 5%	4 3%	2 2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4 5%	2 2%
Very unlikely	-	1 1%	1 1%	8 6% C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 1%	8 6%
Not sure	1 2%	7 10%	8 6%	4 3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7 10%	4 3%
Sigma	57 100%	73 100%	130 100%	128 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	73 100%	128 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q720_17. If you were setting up your own website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following domain name extensions?

16 Aug 2016
Table 47

17. .in

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	27**	298	325	330	._**	._**	._**	._**	._**	._**	._**	._**	298	330
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	24 89%	260 87%	284 87%	274 83%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	260 87%	274 83%
Very likely	17 63%	199 67%	216 66%	212 64%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	199 67%	212 64%
Somewhat likely	7 26%	61 20%	68 21%	62 19%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	61 20%	62 19%
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	2 7%	30 10%	32 10%	40 12%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	30 10%	40 12%
Somewhat unlikely	-	21 7%	21 6%	13 4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	21 7%	13 4%
Very unlikely	2 7%	9 3%	11 3%	27 8% BC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9 3%	27 8% M
Not sure	1 4%	8 3%	9 3%	16 5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8 3%	16 5%
Sigma	27 100%	298 100%	325 100%	330 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	298 100%	330 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q720_18. If you were setting up your own website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following domain name extensions?

16 Aug 2016
Table 48

18. .id

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	52*	49*	101	100	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	49*	100
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	47 90%	43 88%	90 89%	88 88%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	43 88%	88 88%
Very likely	35 67%	34 69%	69 68%	63 63%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	34 69%	63 63%
Somewhat likely	12 23%	9 18%	21 21%	25 25%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9 18%	25 25%
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	3 6%	4 8%	7 7%	10 10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4 8%	10 10%
Somewhat unlikely	-	4 8%	4 4%	4 4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4 8% A	4 4%
Very unlikely	3 6%	-	3 3%	6 6%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6 6%
Not sure	2 4%	2 4%	4 4%	2 2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 4%	2 2%
Sigma	52 100%	49 100%	101 100%	100 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	49 100%	100 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q720_19. If you were setting up your own website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following domain name extensions?

16 Aug 2016
Table 49

19. .ng

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	17**	190	207	200	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	190	200	..**	..**
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	14 82%	168 88%	182 88%	167 84%	-	-	-	-	-	-	168 88%	167 84%	-	-
Very likely	10 59%	128 67%	138 67%	120 60%	-	-	-	-	-	-	128 67%	120 60%	-	-
Somewhat likely	4 24%	40 21%	44 21%	47 24%	-	-	-	-	-	-	40 21%	47 24%	-	-
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	3 18%	15 8%	18 9%	21 11%	-	-	-	-	-	-	15 8%	21 11%	-	-
Somewhat unlikely	3 18%	8 4%	11 5% K	13 7%	-	-	-	-	-	-	8 4%	13 7%	-	-
Very unlikely	-	7 4%	7 3%	8 4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	7 4%	8 4%	-	-
Not sure	-	6 3%	6 3%	12 6%	-	-	-	-	-	-	6 3%	12 6%	-	-
Decline to Answer	-	1 1%	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 1%	-	-	-
Sigma	17 100%	190 100%	207 100%	200 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	190 100%	200 100%	-	-

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q720_20. If you were setting up your own website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following domain name extensions?

16 Aug 2016
Table 50

20. .za

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	19**	82*	101	101	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	82*	101	..**	..**
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	18 95%	68 83%	86 85%	84 83%	-	-	-	-	-	-	68 83%	84 83%	-	-
Very likely	17 89%	57 70%	74 73%	66 65%	-	-	-	-	-	-	57 70%	66 65%	-	-
Somewhat likely	1 5%	11 13%	12 12%	18 18%	-	-	-	-	-	-	11 13%	18 18%	-	-
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	1 5%	8 10%	9 9%	8 8%	-	-	-	-	-	-	8 10%	8 8%	-	-
Somewhat unlikely	-	3 4%	3 3%	4 4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	3 4%	4 4%	-	-
Very unlikely	1 5%	5 6%	6 6%	4 4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	5 6%	4 4%	-	-
Not sure	-	6 7%	6 6%	9 9%	-	-	-	-	-	-	6 7%	9 9%	-	-
Sigma	19 100%	82 100%	101 100%	101 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	82 100%	101 100%	-	-

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q720_21. If you were setting up your own website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following domain name extensions?

16 Aug 2016
Table 51

21. .eg

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	26**	80*	106	100	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	80*	100	..**	..**
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	14 54%	63 79%	77 73%	77 77%	-	-	-	-	-	-	63 79% C	77 77%	-	-
Very likely	9 35%	36 45%	45 42%	43 43%	-	-	-	-	-	-	36 45%	43 43%	-	-
Somewhat likely	5 19%	27 34%	32 30%	34 34%	-	-	-	-	-	-	27 34%	34 34%	-	-
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	11 42%	15 19%	26 25% K	16 16%	-	-	-	-	-	-	15 19%	16 16%	-	-
Somewhat unlikely	7 27%	7 9%	14 13% K	11 11%	-	-	-	-	-	-	7 9%	11 11%	-	-
Very unlikely	4 15%	8 10%	12 11%	5 5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	8 10%	5 5%	-	-
Not sure	1 4%	2 3%	3 3%	7 7%	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 3%	7 7%	-	-
Sigma	26 100%	80 100%	106 100%	100 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	80 100%	100 100%	-	-

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q720_22. If you were setting up your own website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following domain name extensions?

16 Aug 2016
Table 52

22. .co

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	61*	64*	125	125	-.**	-.**	64*	125	-.**	-.**	-.**	-.**	-.**	-.**
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	52 85% D	51 80%	103 82% D	88 70%	-	-	51 80%	88 70%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Very likely	42 69% D	40 63%	82 66% D	64 51%	-	-	40 63%	64 51%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Somewhat likely	10 16%	11 17%	21 17%	24 19%	-	-	11 17%	24 19%	-	-	-	-	-	-
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	8 13%	9 14%	17 14%	31 25% C	-	-	9 14%	31 25%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Somewhat unlikely	1 2%	-	1 1%	6 5%	-	-	-	6 5%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Very unlikely	7 11%	9 14%	16 13%	25 20%	-	-	9 14%	25 20%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Not sure	1 2%	4 6%	5 4%	6 5%	-	-	4 6%	6 5%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sigma	61 100%	64 100%	125 100%	125 100%	-	-	64 100%	125 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q720_23. If you were setting up your own website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following domain name extensions?

16 Aug 2016
Table 53

23. .ar

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	32*	68*	100	104	..**	..**	68*	104	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	24 75%	58 85%	82 82%	82 79%	-	-	58 85%	82 79%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Very likely	16 50%	47 69%	63 63%	65 63%	-	-	47 69%	65 63%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Somewhat likely	8 25%	11 16%	19 19%	17 16%	-	-	11 16%	17 16%	-	-	-	-	-	-
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	7 22%	6 9%	13 13%	12 12%	-	-	6 9%	12 12%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Somewhat unlikely	2 6%	4 6%	6 6%	2 2%	-	-	4 6%	2 2%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Very unlikely	5 16% G	2 3%	7 7% G	10 10%	-	-	2 3%	10 10%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Not sure	1 3%	4 6%	5 5%	10 10%	-	-	4 6%	10 10%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sigma	32 100%	68 100%	100 100%	104 100%	-	-	68 100%	104 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q720_24. If you were setting up your own website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following domain name extensions?

16 Aug 2016
Table 54

24. .br

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	38*	137	175	186	..**	..**	137	186	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	32 84%	113 82% D	145 83% D	135 73%	-	-	113 82% H	135 73%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Very likely	28 74%	94 69%	122 70%	117 63%	-	-	94 69%	117 63%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Somewhat likely	4 11%	19 14%	23 13%	18 10%	-	-	19 14%	18 10%	-	-	-	-	-	-
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	6 16%	18 13%	24 14%	39 21%	-	-	18 13%	39 21%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Somewhat unlikely	1 3%	6 4%	7 4%	6 3%	-	-	6 4%	6 3%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Very unlikely	5 13%	12 9%	17 10%	33 18% BC	-	-	12 9%	33 18% G	-	-	-	-	-	-
Not sure	-	6 4%	6 3%	12 6%	-	-	6 4%	12 6%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sigma	38 100%	137 100%	175 100%	186 100%	-	-	137 100%	186 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q720_25. If you were setting up your own website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following domain name extensions?

16 Aug 2016
Table 55

25. .it

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	28**	26**	54*	50*	..**	..**	..**	..**	26**	50*	..**	..**	..**	..**
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	24 86%	21 81%	45 83%	44 88%	-	-	-	-	21 81%	44 88%	-	-	-	-
Very likely	22 79%	13 50%	35 65%	31 62%	-	-	-	-	13 50%	31 62%	-	-	-	-
Somewhat likely	2 7%	8 31%	10 19%	13 26%	-	-	-	-	8 31%	13 26%	-	-	-	-
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	4 14%	3 12%	7 13%	2 4%	-	-	-	-	3 12%	2 4%	-	-	-	-
Somewhat unlikely	2 7%	2 8%	4 7%	1 2%	-	-	-	-	2 8%	1 2%	-	-	-	-
Very unlikely	2 7%	1 4%	3 6%	1 2%	-	-	-	-	1 4%	1 2%	-	-	-	-
Not sure	-	2 8%	2 4%	4 8%	-	-	-	-	2 8%	4 8%	-	-	-	-
Sigma	28 100%	26 100%	54 100%	50 100%	-	-	-	-	26 100%	50 100%	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q720_26. If you were setting up your own website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following domain name extensions?

16 Aug 2016
Table 56

26. .tr

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	5**	45*	50*	50*	..**	..**	..**	..**	45*	50*	..**	..**	..**	..**
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	1 20%	36 80%	37 74%	43 86%	-	-	-	-	36 80% C	43 86%	-	-	-	-
Very likely	1 20%	27 60%	28 56%	34 68%	-	-	-	-	27 60%	34 68%	-	-	-	-
Somewhat likely	-	9 20%	9 18%	9 18%	-	-	-	-	9 20%	9 18%	-	-	-	-
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	4 80%	8 18%	12 24%	5 10%	-	-	-	-	8 18%	5 10%	-	-	-	-
Somewhat unlikely	-	6 13%	6 12%	3 6%	-	-	-	-	6 13%	3 6%	-	-	-	-
Very unlikely	4 80%	2 4%	6 12%	2 4%	-	-	-	-	2 4%	2 4%	-	-	-	-
Not sure	-	1 2%	1 2%	2 4%	-	-	-	-	1 2%	2 4%	-	-	-	-
Sigma	5 100%	45 100%	50 100%	50 100%	-	-	-	-	45 100%	50 100%	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q720_27. If you were setting up your own website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following domain name extensions?

16 Aug 2016
Table 57

27. .es

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	12**	38*	50*	50*	..**	..**	..**	..**	38*	50*	..**	..**	..**	..**
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	12 100%	33 87%	45 90%	45 90%	-	-	-	-	33 87%	45 90%	-	-	-	-
Very likely	8 67%	23 61%	31 62%	29 58%	-	-	-	-	23 61%	29 58%	-	-	-	-
Somewhat likely	4 33%	10 26%	14 28%	16 32%	-	-	-	-	10 26%	16 32%	-	-	-	-
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	-	1 3%	1 2%	2 4%	-	-	-	-	1 3%	2 4%	-	-	-	-
Somewhat unlikely	-	-	-	1 2%	-	-	-	-	-	1 2%	-	-	-	-
Very unlikely	-	1 3%	1 2%	1 2%	-	-	-	-	1 3%	1 2%	-	-	-	-
Not sure	-	4 11%	4 8%	3 6%	-	-	-	-	4 11%	3 6%	-	-	-	-
Sigma	12 100%	38 100%	50 100%	50 100%	-	-	-	-	38 100%	50 100%	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q720_28. If you were setting up your own website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following domain name extensions?

16 Aug 2016
Table 58

28. .pl

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	..**	53*	53*	53*	..**	..**	..**	..**	53*	53*	..**	..**	..**	..**
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	-	48 91%	48 91%	45 85%	-	-	-	-	48 91%	45 85%	-	-	-	-
Very likely	-	37 70%	37 70%	36 68%	-	-	-	-	37 70%	36 68%	-	-	-	-
Somewhat likely	-	11 21%	11 21%	9 17%	-	-	-	-	11 21%	9 17%	-	-	-	-
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	-	3 6%	3 6%	3 6%	-	-	-	-	3 6%	3 6%	-	-	-	-
Somewhat unlikely	-	3 6%	3 6%	2 4%	-	-	-	-	3 6%	2 4%	-	-	-	-
Very unlikely	-	-	-	1 2%	-	-	-	-	-	1 2%	-	-	-	-
Not sure	-	2 4%	2 4%	5 9%	-	-	-	-	2 4%	5 9%	-	-	-	-
Sigma	-	53 100%	53 100%	53 100%	-	-	-	-	53 100%	53 100%	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q720_29. If you were setting up your own website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following domain name extensions?

16 Aug 2016
Table 59

29. .uk

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	26**	74*	100	100	..**	..**	..**	..**	74*	100	..**	..**	..**	..**
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	18 69%	57 77%	75 75%	82 82%	-	-	-	-	57 77%	82 82%	-	-	-	-
Very likely	14 54%	39 53%	53 53%	46 46%	-	-	-	-	39 53%	46 46%	-	-	-	-
Somewhat likely	4 15%	18 24%	22 22%	36 36% C	-	-	-	-	18 24%	36 36%	-	-	-	-
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	5 19%	13 18%	18 18%	12 12%	-	-	-	-	13 18%	12 12%	-	-	-	-
Somewhat unlikely	3 12%	9 12% D	12 12% D	2 2%	-	-	-	-	9 12% J	2 2%	-	-	-	-
Very unlikely	2 8%	4 5%	6 6%	10 10%	-	-	-	-	4 5%	10 10%	-	-	-	-
Not sure	3 12%	4 5%	7 7%	6 6%	-	-	-	-	4 5%	6 6%	-	-	-	-
Sigma	26 100%	74 100%	100 100%	100 100%	-	-	-	-	74 100%	100 100%	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q720_30. If you were setting up your own website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following domain name extensions?

16 Aug 2016
Table 60

30. .fr

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	26**	75*	101	106	._**	._**	._**	._**	75*	106	._**	._**	._**	._**
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	25 96%	58 77%	83 82% I	75 71%	-	-	-	-	58 77%	75 71%	-	-	-	-
Very likely	18 69%	47 63%	65 64%	55 52%	-	-	-	-	47 63%	55 52%	-	-	-	-
Somewhat likely	7 27%	11 15%	18 18%	20 19%	-	-	-	-	11 15%	20 19%	-	-	-	-
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	1 4%	12 16%	13 13%	22 21%	-	-	-	-	12 16%	22 21%	-	-	-	-
Somewhat unlikely	-	7 9%	7 7%	11 10%	-	-	-	-	7 9%	11 10%	-	-	-	-
Very unlikely	1 4%	5 7%	6 6%	11 10%	-	-	-	-	5 7%	11 10%	-	-	-	-
Not sure	-	5 7%	5 5%	9 8%	-	-	-	-	5 7%	9 8%	-	-	-	-
Sigma	26 100%	75 100%	101 100%	106 100%	-	-	-	-	75 100%	106 100%	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q720_31. If you were setting up your own website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following domain name extensions?

16 Aug 2016
Table 61

31. .de

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	17**	108	125	125	..**	..**	..**	..**	108	125	..**	..**	..**	..**
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	16 94%	98 91% D	114 91% D	101 81%	-	-	-	-	98 91% J	101 81%	-	-	-	-
Very likely	15 88%	77 71%	92 74% D	75 60%	-	-	-	-	77 71%	75 60%	-	-	-	-
Somewhat likely	1 6%	21 19%	22 18%	26 21%	-	-	-	-	21 19%	26 21%	-	-	-	-
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	1 6%	7 6%	8 6%	16 13%	-	-	-	-	7 6%	16 13%	-	-	-	-
Somewhat unlikely	-	5 5%	5 4%	5 4%	-	-	-	-	5 5%	5 4%	-	-	-	-
Very unlikely	1 6%	2 2%	3 2%	11 9% BC	-	-	-	-	2 2%	11 9% I	-	-	-	-
Not sure	-	3 3%	3 2%	8 6%	-	-	-	-	3 3%	8 6%	-	-	-	-
Sigma	17 100%	108 100%	125 100%	125 100%	-	-	-	-	108 100%	125 100%	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q720_32. If you were setting up your own website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following domain name extensions?

16 Aug 2016
Table 62

32. .us

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	204	64*	268	255	64*	255	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	60 29%	20 31%	80 30%	73 29%	20 31%	73 29%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Very likely	19 9%	8 13%	27 10%	21 8%	8 13%	21 8%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Somewhat likely	41 20%	12 19%	53 20%	52 20%	12 19%	52 20%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	138 68%	38 59%	176 66%	156 61%	38 59%	156 61%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Somewhat unlikely	49 24% D	8 13%	57 21% E	41 16%	8 13%	41 16%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Very unlikely	89 44%	30 47%	119 44%	115 45%	30 47%	115 45%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Not sure	6 3%	6 9%	12 4%	26 10% AC	6 9% AC	26 10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sigma	204 100%	64 100%	268 100%	255 100%	64 100%	255 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q720_33. If you were setting up your own website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following domain name extensions?

16 Aug 2016
Table 63

33. .ca

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	23**	80*	103	105	80*	105	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	21 91%	67 84%	88 85%	87 83%	67 84%	87 83%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Very likely	14 61%	60 75% D	74 72% D	58 55%	60 75% F	58 55%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Somewhat likely	7 30%	7 9%	14 14% E	29 28% BC	7 9%	29 28% E	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	2 9%	12 15%	14 14%	11 10%	12 15%	11 10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Somewhat unlikely	2 9%	4 5%	6 6%	5 5%	4 5%	5 5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Very unlikely	-	8 10%	8 8%	6 6%	8 10%	6 6%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Not sure	-	1 1%	1 1%	7 7% C	1 1%	7 7%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sigma	23 100%	80 100%	103 100%	105 100%	80 100%	105 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q720_34. If you were setting up your own website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following domain name extensions?

16 Aug 2016
Table 64

34. .mx

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	39*	63*	102	100	63*	100	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	33 85%	60 95% D	93 91% D	75 75%	60 95% FC	75 75%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Very likely	25 64%	47 75% D	72 71% D	57 57%	47 75% F	57 57%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Somewhat likely	8 21%	13 21%	21 21%	18 18%	13 21%	18 18%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	6 15%	3 5%	9 9% E	19 19% BC	3 5%	19 19% E	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Somewhat unlikely	1 3%	3 5%	4 4%	3 3%	3 5%	3 3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Very unlikely	5 13% E	-	5 5%	16 16% BC	-	16 16% E	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Not sure	-	-	-	6 6% BC	-	6 6% E	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sigma	39 100%	63 100%	102 100%	100 100%	63 100%	100 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q720_38. If you were setting up your own website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following domain name extensions?

16 Aug 2016
Table 65

38. .eu

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	..	..	..	484	..	..	..	..	..	484	..	..	..	..
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	216 45%	-	-	-	-	-	216 45%	-	-	-	-
Very likely	-	-	-	88 18%	-	-	-	-	-	88 18%	-	-	-	-
Somewhat likely	-	-	-	128 26%	-	-	-	-	-	128 26%	-	-	-	-
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	215 44%	-	-	-	-	-	215 44%	-	-	-	-
Somewhat unlikely	-	-	-	90 19%	-	-	-	-	-	90 19%	-	-	-	-
Very unlikely	-	-	-	125 26%	-	-	-	-	-	125 26%	-	-	-	-
Not sure	-	-	-	53 11%	-	-	-	-	-	53 11%	-	-	-	-
Sigma	-	-	-	484 100%	-	-	-	-	-	484 100%	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

q730. To the best of your knowledge, why do websites have different extensions?

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
Weighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
IDENTIFICATION (NET)	372 48% GIKM	951 37% M	1323 39% KM	1627 49% BCN	92 44% KMBKMKM	240 52% N	110 41% MMM	226 54% GDLN	165 39% IN	274 51% IN	121 34% K	188 47% K	463 35% M	699 45% M
CLASSIFICATION (SUB-NET)	234 30% EIKM	550 21% I	784 23% IK	993 30% BCJ	47 23% III	146 32% EJ	65 24% III	129 31% J	64 15% J	106 20% J	66 19% KJ	116 29% KJ	308 23% IBII	496 32% MDJ
To differentiate/Determine type of business/work/organization/fields	154 20% DGIKM	271 10% I	425 13% IM	482 14% BCJ	35 17% IMBIMIM	96 21% DHJN	37 14% IMIMIM	62 15% J	29 7% J	48 9% J	42 12% III	72 18% KDJN	128 10% J	204 13% MJ
To differentiate between other sites/domains	42 5% E	184 7% E	226 7% E	289 9% ABCF	7 3% E	23 5% E	22 8% EEE	40 10% F	22 5% F	36 7% F	17 5% F	29 7% AEIKBEIKCEIK	116 9% F	161 10% DFJ
To determine classification/status	17 2% K	39 2% K	56 2% BL	74 2% BL	4 2% BL	7 2% BL	4 1% BL	10 2% L	9 2% L	7 1% L	2 1% L	1 1% L	20 1% L	49 3% MDJL
To determine categories/groupings (Unspec)	16 2% I	58 2% I	74 2% I	173 5% ABCJ	3 1% I	25 5% E	4 1% G	21 5% G	2 1% G	17 3% I	5 1% I	15 4% K	44 3% IBICI	95 6% MDJ
Other classification mentions	21 3% DGIKM	19 1% D	40 1% DM	8 1% DM	1 1% DM	-	1 1% DM	2 1% DM	4 1% J	-	3 1% J	2 1% J	10 1% J	4 1% J
LOCATION (SUB-NET)	173 22% DM	450 17% M	623 19% M	637 19% N	59 29% GKMBGKMGCKM	102 22% N	54 20% MMM	104 25% DLN	120 29% AGKMBGKMGCKM	174 33% DFHLN	66 19% MMM	71 18% N	151 11% N	186 12% N
To indicate country/different countries	82 11% M	254 10% M	336 10% M	333 10% N	27 13% MMM	47 10% N	32 12% MMM	59 14% DLN	85 20% AGKMBGKMGCKM	110 21% DFHLN	37 11% MMM	31 8% N	73 5% N	86 6% N
To indicate location/area extensions	70 9% DM	150 6% M	220 7% M	235 7% N	28 14% GKMBGKMGCKM	50 11% DN	18 7% MMM	38 9% N	32 8% MMM	59 11% DN	26 7% MMM	33 8% N	46 3% N	55 4% N
To indicate region/different regions	26 3% DM	71 3% M	97 3% M	110 3% N	7 3% N	9 2% N	7 3% N	15 4% N	7 2% N	12 2% N	5 1% N	8 2% N	45 3% N	66 4% DFJL
Other location mentions	3 1% DM	1 1% M	4 1% M	1 1% N	-	-	-	1 1% D	-	-	1 1% N	-	-	-
TYPES OF EXTENSIONS (SUB-NET)	47 6% GIKM	53 2% M	100 3% IM	264 8% BCJN	12 6% GKMBGKMGCKM	60 13% EDJN	3 1% GDLN	45 11% GDLN	5 1% I	31 6% I	5 1% I	38 9% KJN	28 2% I	90 6% M
Profit Vs. Non profit	34 4% DGIKM	22 1% M	56 2% IM	94 3% BCN	9 4% GKMBGKMGCKM	29 6% DHJN	1 1% GDLN	13 3% G	2 1% I	11 2% I	2 1% I	13 3% K	8 1% I	28 2% M
Business/Commercial	24 3% GIKM	27 1% M	51 2% IM	172 5% ABCN	3 1% N	28 6% E	1 1% GDLN	30 7% GDLN	3 1% I	21 4% I	4 1% I	31 8% KDJN	16 1% I	62 4% M

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

q730. To the best of your knowledge, why do websites have different extensions?

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Weighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
Education extension	9 1% IKM	6 *	15 *	56 2% BCJN	2 1% IBII	22 5% EDJN	-	10 2% GJN	-	3 1% -	-	11 3% KJN	4 *	10 1%
Network	9 1% IKM	7 *	16 *	27 1% B	3 1% GKMBGKMCGRM	7 2% -	-	4 1% -	-	3 1% -	-	2 *	4 *	11 1%
Government extension	8 1% IM	7 *	15 *	71 2% ABCN	3 1% IKMBIKMCIKM	19 4% DJN	1 *	17 4% GDJN	-	8 1% I	-	11 3% KN	3 *	16 1% M
Other type of extensions mentions	12 2% KM	17 1%	29 1%	41 1% B	4 2% KBKK	7 2% -	1 *	4 1% -	3 1% -	3 1% -	-	4 1% -	9 1%	23 1% M
MISCELLANEOUS IDENTIFICATION (SUB-NET)	12 2%	35 1%	47 1%	102 3% ABCN	2 1% -	10 2% -	2 1% -	21 5% GDFN	4 1% -	16 3% I	7 2% -	21 5% KDFN	20 1%	34 2%
Due to language/different languages	7 1% DM	7 *	14 *	7 *	-	-	-	4 1% DFLN	4 1% MBMM	2 *	-	-	3 *	1 *
Form of identity/identification (Unspec.)	1 *	18 1%	19 1%	92 3% ABCN	1 *	10 2% -	2 1% -	17 4% GN	-	11 2% I	4 1% AIII	21 5% KDFJN	11 1% A	33 2% M
Other miscellaneous identification mentions	4 1% D	11 *	15 *	4 *	1 *	-	-	-	-	3 1% DN	3 1% -	-	7 1% N	1 *
CONTENT (NET)	244 32% DIM	728 28% DIM	972 29% DIM	756 23% J	74 36% FIMBIMCIM	98 21% J	85 32% IMIMIM	110 27% DJ	98 23% J	80 15% LIMBIMCIM	132 38% DFJN	113 28% -	339 25% -	355 23% J
Different purposes/content/features of website	202 26% D	635 25% DM	837 25% DM	685 20% J	56 27% F	85 18% J	78 29% IMIMIM	97 23% J	90 21% J	71 13% IMBIMCIM	107 30% DFJN	107 27% -	304 23% -	325 21% J
Based on the type of information they provide	33 4% DI	91 4% DIM	124 4% DIM	53 2% FAGMBGMCGRM	17 8% -	12 3% -	9 3% -	5 1% -	8 2% -	8 1% LIMBIMCIM	20 6% -	5 1% -	37 3% N	23 1%
Based on the type of service they provide	17 2% DM	37 1% DM	54 2% DM	23 1% N	5 2% -	3 1% -	4 1% -	8 2% DN	3 1% -	3 1% LIMBIMCIM	13 4% -	3 1% -	12 1% -	6 *
Other content mentions	5 1% D	15 1% D	20 1% D	3 *	1 *	-	1 *	1 *	2 *	-	4 1% L	-	7 1% -	2 *
SITE/STORAGE SIZE (NET)	150 20% DEGIKM	93 4% DM	243 7% DGIM	52 2% MM	11 5% MM	14 3% DJLN	8 3% -	6 1% -	16 4% J	5 1% LGMBGMM	24 7% -	3 1% -	34 3% -	24 2%
Ran out of space on the other domains/extensions	141 18% DEGIKM	68 3% DM	209 6% DGIM	46 1% MBMM	10 5% -	12 3% DJL	5 2% -	5 1% -	13 3% J	5 1% LGMBGMM	18 5% -	3 1% -	22 2% -	21 1%
Size of site	5 1% D	17 1% D	22 1% D	5 *	1 *	2 *	3 1% -	1 *	2 *	-	5 1% LMMM	-	6 *	2 *
Other site/storage size mentions	4 1% D	8 *	12 *	1 *	-	-	-	-	1 *	-	1 *	-	6 *	1 *

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

q730. To the best of your knowledge, why do websites have different extensions?

16 Aug 2016
Table 66

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
					(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Weighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
INCREASE TRAFFIC/ATTRACT CUSTOMERS (NET)	60 8% DG	164 6% DG	224 7% DG	97 3%	16 8% FGGG	14 3%	9 3%	10 2%	29 7% JGGG	10 2%	29 8% LGGG	17 4% J	81 6% N	46 3%
Attract a variety/different target audience(s)	23 3% D	50 2% D	73 2% D	27 1%	7 3% F	4 1%	4 1%	2 *	9 2% J	3 1%	6 2%	4 1%	24 2% N	14 1%
To attract customers/increase traffic	22 3% D	68 3% DM	90 3% DM	33 1%	6 3% F	4 1%	5 2%	7 2%	14 3% J	4 1% LMBMCM	16 5%	5 1%	27 2% N	13 1%
Popularity of site	7 1%	18 1%	25 1%	23 1%	1 *	3 1%	-	1 *	1 *	2 *	5 1%	5 1%	11 1%	12 1%
To make it easy to remember	4 1% D	14 1% D	18 1% D	5 *	1 *	1 *	-	-	3 1%	-	1 *	1 *	9 1% N	3 *
Other increase traffic/attract customers mentions	5 1%	16 1%	21 1%	11 *	1 *	2 *	-	-	2 *	1 *	1 *	2 *	12 1%	6 *
ACCESSIBILITY (NET)	37 5% EI	124 5% EI	161 5% EI	185 6% FJ	-	13 3% E	8 3% EIEIEI	18 4%	4 1%	15 3% I	21 6% EIEIEI	27 7% FJ	91 7% EGIBEGICEGI	112 7% DFHJ
To simplify search/easy to use	15 2% EI	26 1%	41 1%	96 3% BCF	-	6 1%	2 1%	11 3%	2 *	11 2% I	7 2% EEE	10 2%	15 1%	58 4% MDF
For easy/quick accessibility	15 2% DEI	35 1% I	50 1% I	36 1%	-	4 1%	4 1% III	2 *	-	3 1% EIMBEIMCEIM	12 3% DFHJN	13 3%	19 1% III	14 1%
Convenience	5 1%	53 2% DEGIK	58 2% GIK	39 1% FJ	-	-	-	2 *	-	-	-	1 *	53 4% NAEGKBEGICEGIK	36 2% DFHJL
Other accessibility mentions	4 1%	13 1%	17 1%	16 *	-	3 1%	2 1%	3 1%	2 *	1 *	3 1%	4 1%	6 *	5 *
DECISION MAKING (NET)	32 4% DIM	43 2% M	75 2% DM	44 1%	4 2%	8 2%	5 2%	7 2%	6 1%	4 1% LMBMM	12 3%	5 1%	16 1%	20 1%
Depends on/determined by the owner	29 4% DIM	37 1% M	66 2% DM	36 1%	4 2%	8 2%	5 2%	5 1%	5 1%	4 1% LIMBIMCIM	12 3%	5 1%	11 1%	14 1%
Other decision making mentions	3 *	6 *	9 *	8 *	-	-	-	2 *	1 *	-	-	-	5 *	6 *
SECURITY (NET)	14 2%	77 3% D	91 3% D	59 2% J	2 1%	5 1%	16 6% HAEIMBEIMCEIM	9 2%	8 2%	4 1%	15 4% AEEEE	16 4% DFJN	36 3% N	25 2%
Safety/Security reasons	10 1%	68 3% D	78 2% D	49 1% J	2 1%	4 1% HAEIMBEIMCEIM	15 6%	8 2%	7 2%	3 1%	13 4% A	11 3% DFJ	31 2%	23 1%
Other security mentions	4 1%	11 *	15 *	10 *	1 *	1 *	1 *	1 *	2 *	1 *	2 1%	5 1% DJN	5 *	2 *

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

q730. To the best of your knowledge, why do websites have different extensions?

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Weighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
SITE CHARACTERISTICS (NET)	12 2%	97 4% DI	109 3% DI	72 2%	4 2%	10 2%	10 4% HA	4 1%	7 2%	8 1%	16 5% AIII	13 3% H	60 4% NAIICI	37 2%
Reliability/Trustworthiness of website	6 1%	18 1%	24 1% D	12 *	1 *	1 *	3 1% H	-	1 *	1 *	5 1%	4 1% DH	8 1%	6 *
To be different/unique	4 1%	52 2% D	56 2% D	29 1%	2 1%	5 1%	3 1%	2 *	4 1%	2 *	8 2% A	6 1% NAIBICI	35 3% AC	14 1%
Other site characteristics mentions	2 *	28 1%	30 1%	34 1% A	1 *	4 1%	4 1% A	2 *	2 *	5 1%	3 1%	4 1%	18 1% AC	19 1%
TECHNOLOGY DRIVEN (NET)	9 1%	83 3% D	92 3%	79 2% A	7 3% A	6 1%	8 3% A	12 3%	12 3% A	12 2%	11 3% A	10 2%	45 3% A	39 3%
Different network/service providers	2 *	18 1% D	20 1%	10 *	3 1% AGGG	2 *	-	-	1 *	1 *	3 1%	4 1% DHN	11 1% N	3 *
Different servers	2 *	45 2%	47 1%	60 2% AF	3 1% A	3 1%	2 1%	11 3% F	10 2% A	11 2%	4 1%	6 1%	26 2% AC	29 2%
Other technology driven mentions	5 1%	23 1% D	28 1% D	11 *	1 *	1 *	6 2% HAIBIMCIM	1 *	1 *	-	4 1% L	-	11 1%	9 1% D
MISCELLANEOUS (NET)	114 15% DGIM	200 8%	314 9% IM	304 9% H	20 10%	61 13% DHJN	17 6%	19 5%	27 6%	47 9% H	38 11% IMBIMIM	47 12% HN	98 7%	130 8% H
To eliminate competitors registering same domain name	31 4% DGIM	44 2%	75 2% DM	40 1%	6 3% F	3 1%	3 1%	5 1%	5 1%	3 1%	9 3%	8 2% J	21 2%	21 1%
Costs/Different costs	18 2% D	41 2%	59 2% D	36 1%	3 1%	4 1%	5 2%	5 1%	7 2%	6 1%	7 2%	3 1%	19 1%	18 1%
To expand the registrable domain names	17 2% GKM	22 1%	39 1% ABCHN	141 4% H	4 2%	39 8% EDHJN	1 *	6 1%	3 1%	28 5% IHN	2 1%	21 5% KHN	12 1%	47 3% M
Rules/Regulations	9 1% DM	7 *	16 *	16 *	-	3 1%	-	-	1 *	2 *	1 *	2 *	5 *	9 1%
Specific website names	4 1%	7 *	11 *	12 *	-	3 1%	-	2 *	-	-	-	2 *	7 1% B	5 *
Other mentions	41 5% DIM	85 3% D	126 4% DM	67 2% H	8 4%	10 2% H	8 3% H	2 *	12 3%	8 1%	19 5% MBMM	12 3% H	38 3%	35 2% H
EXCLUSIVE (NET)	40 5%	537 21% DK	577 17% K	610 18% AL	36 17% AKKK	83 18% L	51 19% AKKK	73 18% L	126 30% AEDGMBEGKMCEDAM	148 28% DFHLN	35 10% A	37 9% NAKKCK	289 22% L	269 17% L
Illegible data	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Base: All Qualified Respondents

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Base: All Qualified Respondents

Q748. How would you describe your satisfaction with the types of common domain names we've mentioned so far?

16 Aug 2016
Table 67

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	667 87% G	2302 89% DG	2969 88% DG	2882 86% H	183 88% GGG	420 91% DHJN	219 81% H	298 72% GGG	365 87% GGG	445 83% H	322 91% AGGG	373 93% DHJN	1213 90% NAGBGCG	1346 87% DHJ
Very satisfied	376 49% DIM	1036 40% DIM	1412 42% DIM	1070 32% JN	92 44% IMIMIM	176 38% DHJN	126 47% HIMBIMIM	132 32% J	139 33% J	141 26% LEIMBEIMCEIM	187 53% DHJN	167 42% DHJN	492 37% N	454 29% N
Somewhat satisfied	291 38% DIM	1266 49% GK	1557 46% GK	1812 54% ABCH	91 44% GGG	244 53% EH	93 35% AEGKBEGKCEGK	166 40% AEGKBEGKCEGK	226 54% H	304 57% H	135 38% KH	206 51% AEGKBEGKCEGK	721 54% MDHL	892 58% MDHL
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	102 13% KM	281 11% M	383 11% KM	467 14% BCFLN	23 11% MMM	40 9% AEGKBEGKCEGK	50 19% AEGKBEGKCEGK	117 28% GDFJLN	53 13% KKK	89 17% FLN	28 8% FLN	28 7% FLN	127 9% FLN	193 13% MFL
Somewhat dissatisfied	42 5% K	153 6% K	195 6% K	268 8% ABCFL	8 4% MMM	17 4% AEGKBEGKCEGK	18 7% KKK	37 9% FL	32 8% KKK	64 12% IDFLN	10 3% FLN	11 3% KKK	85 6% KKK	139 9% MDFL
Very dissatisfied	60 8% M	128 5% M	188 6% M	199 6% N	15 7% MMM	23 5% AEGKBEGKCEGK	32 12% GDFJLN	80 19% GDFJLN	21 5% GDFJLN	25 5% GDFJLN	18 5% GDFJLN	17 4% GDFJLN	42 3% GDFJLN	54 4% GDFJLN
Not Sure	-	5 * D	5 * D	-	1 * D	-	-	-	1 * D	-	2 1% A	-	1 * D	-
Sigma	769 100%	2588 100%	3357 100%	3349 100%	207 100%	460 100%	269 100%	415 100%	419 100%	534 100%	352 100%	401 100%	1341 100%	1539 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Base: All Qualified Respondents

Q750. If you wanted more information about one of the current domain name extensions, where would you go?

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
An Internet search engine to find articles, posts or similar information	592 77%	2113 82% DG	2705 81% DG	2495 74% JN	175 85% FAGGG	348 76% J	204 76% J	326 79% DJN	329 79% J	359 67% AGIMBGIMCGIM	313 89% DFHJN	344 86% NAGGG	1092 81% J	1118 73% J
An Internet encyclopedia	203 26%	947 37% I	1150 34% ABCFJ	1369 41% FA	70 34% FA	110 24% J	86 32% GFJ	182 44% GFJ	130 31% F	176 33% F	119 34% A	161 40% FJ	542 40% AGIKBGIKCGIK	740 48% MDFJL
My Internet service provider	178 23%	1010 39% EIK	1188 35% EI	1461 44% ABCFJL	57 28% MBMM	122 27% AEIKEIKCEIK	113 42% MBMM	168 40% FL	127 30% A	207 39% IFL	112 32% A	121 30% AEIKBEIKCEIK	601 45% MDFHJL	843 55% MDFHJL
Other	152 20% DEGIKM	74 3% M	226 7% DIKM	111 3% N	12 6% MBMM	36 8% DJLN	14 5% MBMM	23 6% DN	18 4% MMM	19 4% N	12 3% MMM	15 4% N	18 1% KKK	18 1% L
Decline to Answer	-	1 *	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 *	-
Not sure	13 2% K	64 2% K	77 2% K	88 3% HLN	2 1% EDHJLN	30 7% EDHJLN	8 3% KKK	5 1% AEKMBEKICEKM	20 5% HLN	20 4% HLN	1 * HLN	2 * KKK	33 2% KKK	31 2% L
Sigma	1138 148%	4209 163%	5347 159%	5524 165%	316 153%	646 140%	425 158%	704 170%	624 149%	781 146%	557 158%	643 160%	2287 171%	2750 179%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q755. How well do each of the following adjectives describe common gTLDs such as .com, .org and .net?

SUMMARY TABLE OF TOP 2 BOX

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
Innovative	319 41%	1894 73% DEI	2213 66% ACFHJ	2285 68% ACFHJ	124 60% FA	237 52% HAEIEICEI	195 72% HAEIEICEI	264 64% F	267 64% A	330 62% F	289 82% AEGIMBEGICEGIM	308 77% DFHJ	1019 76% AEIBEICEI	1146 74% DFHJ
Cutting edge	312 41%	1795 69% DEGI	2107 63% EG	2091 62% AFH	110 53% FA	198 43% FA	148 55% A	197 47% AEEGEGEG	271 65% A	332 62% FH	267 76% LAEGIBEGICEGI	274 68% DFH	999 74% NAEGIBEGICEGI	1090 71% DFHJ
Extreme	183 24%	1415 55% DEGI	1598 48% I	1572 47% AFHJ	90 43% FA	156 34% FA	126 47% HAIII	133 32% A	163 39% A	189 35% A	240 68% LAEGIMBEGICEGIM	223 56% DFHJ	796 59% AEGIBEGICEGI	871 57% DFHJ
Trustworthy	551 72%	2148 83% DE	2699 80% AF	2652 79% AF	159 77% F	310 67% A	226 84% AEEE	340 82% FJ	336 80% A	406 76% F	320 91% LAEGIMBEGICEGIM	328 82% FJ	1107 83% AEECE	1268 82% DFJ
Unconventional	192 25%	1194 46% DE	1386 41% E	1365 41% AF	52 25% A	110 24% HAEIMBEGICEGIM	153 57% A	189 46% DF	179 43% AEEEE	219 41% F	162 46% AEEEE	162 40% F	648 48% NAEIBEICEI	685 45% DF
Practical	599 78%	2193 85% M	2792 83% A	2775 83% A	181 87% A	375 82% A	231 86% DFJN	364 88% A	345 82% A	434 81% LAIMBIMCIM	318 90% A	335 84% A	1118 83% A	1267 82% A
Technical	479 62%	2052 79% EI	2531 75% I	2611 78% ACFJ	151 73% A	313 68% A	232 86% A	337 81% FJ	299 71% A	387 72% A	294 84% AEIBEICEI	320 80% FJ	1076 80% AEIBEICEI	1254 81% DFJ
Confusing	121 16%	885 34% DEGK	1006 30% AHL	1034 31% AHL	52 25% A	146 32% H	72 27% A	90 22% A	127 30% A	163 31% H	99 28% A	104 26% NAEGIBEGICEGIM	535 40% A	531 35% DHL
Overwhelming	166 22%	1386 54% DEGI	1552 46% EGI	1549 46% AFHJ	68 33% A	141 31% A	98 36% HA	104 25% A	139 33% A	152 28% A	213 61% AEGIBEGICEGIM	223 56% DFHJ	868 65% NAEGIBEGICEGIM	929 60% DFHJ
Useful	622 81%	2269 88% M	2891 86% AJ	2889 86% AJ	184 89% A	385 84% A	237 88% A	367 88% FJ	356 85% A	439 82% A	333 95% LAEGIMBEGICEGIM	357 89% FJ	1159 86% A	1341 87% J
For people like me	495 64%	2100 81% D	2595 77% AF	2611 78% AF	172 83% FAC	331 72% A	222 83% AC	331 80% F	333 79% A	400 75% A	296 84% AC	325 81% FJ	1077 80% AC	1224 80% DFJ
Interesting	409 53%	2035 79% DE	2444 73% AFJ	2439 73% AFJ	150 72% FA	264 57% A	221 82% AEECE	321 77% DFJ	321 77% JA	364 68% F	296 84% AEIMBEGICEIM	318 79% DFJ	1047 78% AC	1172 76% DFJ
Exciting	238 31%	1665 64% DEI	1903 57% EI	1954 58% AFHJ	92 44% A	170 37% A	172 64% HAEIEICEI	208 50% F	206 49% A	266 50% F	270 77% AEGIMBEGICEGIM	287 72% DFHJ	925 69% AEIBEICEI	1023 66% DFHJ
Helpful	580 75%	2180 84% I	2760 82% AFJ	2775 83% AFJ	169 82% F	334 73% A	234 87% AIICI	356 86% FJ	335 80% A	420 79% F	311 88% AEIBEICEI	344 86% FJ	1131 84% AIICI	1321 86% DFJ
Informative	579 75%	2221 86% DIM	2800 83% AF	2753 82% AF	180 87% FA	348 76% A	236 88% AC	361 87% DFJN	346 83% A	434 81% F	328 93% LAEGIMBEGICEGIM	341 85% F	1131 84% A	1269 82% F

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q755. How well do each of the following adjectives describe common gTLDs such as .com, .org and .net?

SUMMARY TABLE OF BOTTOM 2 BOX

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
Innovative	450 59% DEGIKM	671 26% KM	1121 33% GKM	1064 32% BLN	80 39% GKMBGKMGKM	223 48% EDHJLN	73 27% KKK	151 36% GDLN	145 35% GKMBGKMGKM	204 38% DLN	61 17% K	93 23% K	312 23% KKK	393 26% KKK
Cutting edge	457 59% DEGIKM	764 30% KM	1221 36% KM	1258 38% BLN	94 45% IKMBIKMCIKM	262 57% EDJLN	118 44% IKMBIKMCIKM	218 53% GDJLN	139 33% KMKMKM	202 38% N	83 24% K	127 32% K	330 25% K	449 29% M
Extreme	586 76% DEGIKM	1142 44% KM	1728 51% KM	1777 53% BLN	113 55% KMBKMKM	304 66% EDLN	140 52% KMBKMKM	282 68% GDLN	245 58% KMBKMKM	345 65% DLN	112 32% K	178 44% K	532 40% KKK	668 43% M
Trustworthy	218 28% DGIKM	416 16% K	634 19% KM	697 21% BCN	45 22% KBKK	150 33% EDHJLN	41 15% KKK	75 18% K	75 18% KKK	128 24% IHLN	31 9% K	73 18% K	224 17% KKK	271 18% KKK
Unconventional	577 75% DGIKM	1363 53% GM	1940 58% GM	1984 59% BHN	153 74% GKMBGKMGCKM	350 76% DHJLN	114 42% G	226 54% G	229 55% GGG	315 59% GGG	189 54% GGG	239 60% GGG	678 51% GGG	854 55% M
Practical	170 22% DEGIKM	376 15% K	546 16% K	574 17% BH	25 12% EH	85 18% EH	38 14% K	51 12% K	67 16% KKK	100 19% H	33 9% K	66 16% K	213 16% KBKK	272 18% H
Technical	290 38% DEGIKM	513 20% G	803 24% GKM	738 22% BN	54 26% GKMBGKMGKM	147 32% DHLN	34 13% G	78 19% G	112 27% GKMBGKMGKM	147 28% DHLN	57 16% K	81 20% G	256 19% GGG	285 19% GGG
Confusing	648 84% DEGIKM	1671 65% M	2319 69% M	2315 69% BN	151 73% MBMM	314 68% MBMM	196 73% MBMM	325 78% DFJN	282 67% MMM	371 69% MBMM	252 72% MBMM	297 74% DN	790 59% DN	1008 65% M
Overwhelming	603 78% DEGIKM	1171 45% KM	1774 53% KM	1800 54% BLN	135 65% KMBKMKM	319 69% DLN	168 62% KMBKMKM	311 75% GDLN	270 64% KMBKMKM	382 72% IDLN	138 39% K	178 44% K	460 34% K	610 40% M
Useful	147 19% DEGIKM	299 12% K	446 13% K	460 14% B	22 11% KKK	75 16% HL	31 12% KKK	48 12% K	54 13% KKK	95 18% IDHLN	19 5% K	44 11% K	173 13% KBKK	198 13% KBKK
For people like me	274 36% DEGIKM	464 18% EGKM	738 22% BN	738 22% BN	34 16% EDHJLN	129 28% EDHJLN	45 17% K	84 20% K	78 19% K	134 25% ILN	55 16% K	76 19% K	252 19% K	315 20% K
Interesting	360 47% DEGIKM	530 20% K	890 27% GKM	910 27% BHLN	56 27% GKBGKGK	196 43% EDHJLN	47 17% K	94 23% K	89 21% KKK	170 32% IDHLN	54 15% K	83 21% K	284 21% KKK	367 24% KKK
Exciting	531 69% DEGIKM	898 35% KM	1429 43% GKM	1395 42% BLN	113 55% GKMBGKMGCKM	290 63% EDHJLN	95 35% KKK	207 50% GDLN	203 48% GKMBGKMGCKM	268 50% DLN	80 23% K	114 28% K	407 30% KKK	516 34% KKK
Helpful	189 25% DEGIKM	389 15% K	578 17% GKM	574 17% BN	37 18% KKK	126 27% EDHJLN	34 13% K	59 14% K	76 18% KKK	114 21% DHLN	40 11% K	57 14% K	202 15% K	218 14% K
Informative	190 25% DEGIKM	344 13% K	534 16% GK	596 18% BCH	26 13% KKK	112 24% EDHJLN	31 12% KKK	54 13% K	64 15% KKK	100 19% H	23 7% K	60 15% K	200 15% KBKK	270 18% H

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q755_1. How well do each of the following adjectives describe common gTLDs such as .com, .org and .net?

16 Aug 2016
Table 71

1. Innovative

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	319 41%	1894 73% DEI	2213 66%	2285 68% ACFHJ	124 60% FA	237 52%	195 72% HAEIEICEI	264 64% F	267 64% A	330 62% F	289 82% AEGIMBEGIMCEGIM	308 77% DFHJ	1019 76% AEIBEICEI	1146 74% DFHJ
Describes very well	113 15%	786 30% DEI	899 27% DEI	818 24% AFJ	43 21% FA	61 13%	84 31% HAEIEIEI	97 23% FJ	84 20% A	90 17% A	160 45% LAEGIMBEGIMCEGIM	132 33% DFHJ	415 31% AEIBEICEI	438 28% DFHJ
Describes somewhat well	206 27%	1108 43% K	1314 39%	1467 44% ACF	81 39% A	176 38%	111 41% A	167 40% AKKCK	183 44% AKKCK	240 45% F	129 37% A	176 44% K	604 45% AKBKCK	708 46% DFH
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	450 59%	671 26% KM	1121 33% GKM	1064 32% BLN	80 39% GKMBGKMGKM	223 48% EDHJLN	73 27% KKK	151 36% GDLN	145 35% GKMBGKMGKM	204 38% DLN	61 17% DLN	93 23% K	312 23% KKK	393 26% KKK
Does not describe very well	211 27% DGKM	508 20% K	719 21% KM	771 23% BLN	51 25% KKK	144 31% DHLN	48 18% GKMBGKMGKM	98 24% GKMBGKMGKM	108 26% DLN	143 27% DLN	47 13% DLN	74 18% K	254 19% KKK	312 20% KKK
Does not describe at all	239 31% DEGIKM	163 6% KM	402 12% DIKM	293 9% BLN	29 14% IKMBIKMIKM	79 17% DJLN	25 9% KMBKMKM	53 13% DLN	37 9% KMBKMKM	61 11% DLN	14 4% DLN	19 5% DLN	58 4% DLN	81 5% DLN
Not Sure	- -	23 1% D	23 1% D	- -	3 1% FA	- -	1 *	- -	7 2% JAC	- -	2 1% A	- -	10 1% NA	- -
Sigma	769 100%	2588 100%	3357 100%	3349 100%	207 100%	460 100%	269 100%	415 100%	419 100%	534 100%	352 100%	401 100%	1341 100%	1539 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q755_2. How well do each of the following adjectives describe common gTLDs such as .com, .org and .net?

16 Aug 2016
Table 72

2. Cutting edge

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	312 41%	1795 69% DEGI	2107 63% EG	2091 62% AFH	110 53% FA	198 43% 54	148 55% A	197 47% AEEGEGEG	271 65% A	332 62% FH	267 76% LAEGIBEGICEGI	274 68% DFH	999 74% NAEGIBEGICEGI	1090 71% DFHJ
Describes very well	116 15%	683 26% DEGI	799 24% DG	684 20% AFHJ	39 19% F	54 12% 54	50 19% 19	59 14% 14	91 22% JA	88 16% F	120 34% AEGIMBEGIMCEGIM	115 29% DFHJN	383 29% NAEGIBEGICEGI	368 24% DFHJ
Describes somewhat well	196 25%	1112 43% EG	1308 39% ACFH	1407 42% ACFH	71 34% A	144 31% 144	98 36% A	138 33% AEEEE	180 43% A	244 46% FH	147 42% A	159 40% F	616 46% AEGIBEGCEG	722 47% DFHL
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	457 59%	764 30% DEGIKM	1221 36% KM	1258 38% BLN	94 45% IKMBIKMCIKM	262 57% EDJLN	118 44% IKMBIKMCIKM	218 53% GDJLN	139 33% KMKMKM	202 38% N	83 24% K	127 32% K	330 25% K	449 29% M
Does not describe very well	216 28%	560 22% KM	776 23% KM	885 26% BCN	56 27% KMKMKM	149 32% DLN	85 32% IKMBIKMCIKM	134 32% DLN	96 23% KKK	143 27% N	55 16% MMM	90 22% N	268 20% NA	369 24% M
Does not describe at all	241 31%	204 8% DEGIKM	445 13% DKM	373 11% BN	38 18% IKMBIKMCIKM	113 25% DJLN	33 12% MBMM	84 20% GDJLN	43 10% MMM	59 11% N	28 8% MMM	37 9% N	62 5% NA	80 5% -
Not Sure	-	29 1% D	29 1% D	-	3 1% FA	-	3 1% HA	-	9 2% JAMBMCM	-	2 1% A	-	12 1% NA	-
Sigma	769 100%	2588 100%	3357 100%	3349 100%	207 100%	460 100%	269 100%	415 100%	419 100%	534 100%	352 100%	401 100%	1341 100%	1539 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q755_3. How well do each of the following adjectives describe common gTLDs such as .com, .org and .net?

16 Aug 2016
Table 73

3. Extreme

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	183 24%	1415 55% DEGI	1598 48% I	1572 47% AFHJ	90 43% FA	156 34% J	126 47% HAIII	133 32% J	163 39% A	189 35% LAEGIMBEGIMCEGIM	240 68% DFHJ	223 56% AEGIBEGICEGI	796 59% DFHJ	871 57% DFHJ
Describes very well	76 10%	508 20% DI	584 17% I	529 16% AHJ	34 16% AIII	60 13% J	43 16% HAIII	40 10% J	43 10% A	46 9% AEGIMBEGIMCEGIM	96 27% DFHJ	91 23% AGIBGICGI	292 22% AGIBGICGI	292 19% DFHJ
Describes somewhat well	107 14%	907 35% DEI	1014 30% I	1043 31% AFHJ	56 27% A	96 21% J	83 31% HA	93 22% J	120 29% A	143 27% F	144 41% LAEGIBEGICEGI	132 33% FHJ	504 38% AEGIBEGICEGI	579 38% DFHJ
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	586 76%	1142 44% DEGIKM	1728 51% KM	1777 53% BLN	113 55% KMBKMKM	304 66% EDLN	140 52% KMBKMKM	282 68% GDLN	245 58% KMBKMKM	345 65% DLN	112 32% DLN	178 44% K	532 40% KKK	668 43% M
Does not describe very well	176 23%	711 27% K	887 26% K	1010 30% ABCL	48 23% BN	123 27% AEKEKCEK	86 32% KMKMKM	156 38% DFLN	127 30% AKKK	184 34% DFLN	63 18% DLN	94 23% KN	387 29% AKKCK	453 29% L
Does not describe at all	410 53%	431 17% DEGIKM	841 25% DGKM	767 23% BN	65 31% GKMBGKMKCKM	181 39% EDHJLN	54 20% KMKMKM	126 30% GDLN	118 28% GKMBGKMKCKM	161 30% DLN	49 14% DLN	84 21% KN	145 11% NA	215 14% M
Decline to Answer	-	3 *	3 *	-	-	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	2 *	-
Not Sure	-	28 1% D	28 1% D	-	4 2% FAKKK	-	3 1% HAKKK	-	10 2% JAKMBKMKCKM	-	-	-	11 1% NA	-
Sigma	769 100%	2588 100%	3357 100%	3349 100%	207 100%	460 100%	269 100%	415 100%	419 100%	534 100%	352 100%	401 100%	1341 100%	1539 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q755_4. How well do each of the following adjectives describe common gTLDs such as .com, .org and .net?

16 Aug 2016
Table 74

4. Trustworthy

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	551 72%	2148 83% DE	2699 80%	2652 79% AF	159 77% F	310 67%	226 84% AEEEE	340 82% FJ	336 80% A	406 76% F LAEGBEGIMCEGIM	320 91%	328 82% FJ	1107 83% AEECE	1268 82% DFJ
Describes very well	282 37% DI	1021 39% DI	1303 39% DI	1069 32% FJ	78 38% FI	113 25% AEIMBEIMCEIM	127 47% DFJN	167 40% J	121 29% J	111 21% LAEIMBEIMCEIM	183 52%	162 40% DFJN	512 38% NIII	516 34% FJ
Describes somewhat well	269 35%	1127 44% G	1396 42%	1583 47% ABCFHL	81 39%	197 43%	99 37%	173 42%	215 51% AEGBMBEGIMCEGIM	295 55% DFHLN	137 39%	166 41% AGGCG	595 44% MFHL	752 49%
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	218 28% DGIKM	416 16% K	634 19% KM	697 21% BCN	45 22% KBKK	150 33% EDHJLN	41 15% KKK	75 18% KKK	75 18% IHLN	128 24% IHLN	31 9%	73 18% K	224 17% KKK	271 18%
Does not describe very well	102 13% K	312 12% K	414 12% K	498 15% BC	33 16% GKKGK	83 18% DN	24 9%	56 13% KKK	58 14% KKK	95 18% DN	18 5%	53 13% K	179 13% GKBGK	211 14%
Does not describe at all	116 15% DEGIKM	104 4% D	220 7% IKM	199 6% BN	12 6% EDHJLN	67 15% MBMM	17 6%	19 5%	17 4%	33 6% N	13 4%	20 5%	45 3%	60 4%
Not Sure	- -	24 1% D	24 1% D	-	3 1% FA	-	2 1% A	-	8 2% JAKMBKMKM	-	1 *	-	10 1% NA	-
Sigma	769 100%	2588 100%	3357 100%	3349 100%	207 100%	460 100%	269 100%	415 100%	419 100%	534 100%	352 100%	401 100%	1341 100%	1539 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q755_5. How well do each of the following adjectives describe common gTLDs such as .com, .org and .net?

16 Aug 2016
Table 75

5. Unconventional

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)	
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	192 25%	1194 46% DE	1386 41% E	1365 41% AF	52 25%	110 24%	153 57% HAEKMBEIKMCEIM	189 46% DF	179 43% AECE	219 41% F	162 46% AECE	162 40% F	648 48% NAEIBEICEI	685 45% DF
Describes very well	62 8%	390 15% DEI	452 13% DE	360 11% AF	13 6%	28 6%	60 22% AEKMBEIKMCEIM	68 16% DFJLN	44 11%	58 11% F	49 14% AECE	42 10% F	224 17% NAEIBEICEI	164 11% F
Describes somewhat well	130 17%	804 31% E	934 28% E	1005 30% ACF	39 19%	82 18%	93 35% AECE	121 29% F	135 32% AECE	161 30% F	113 32% AECE	120 30% F	424 32% AECE	521 34% DF
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	577 75%	1363 53% GM	1940 58% GM	1984 59% BHN	153 74% GKMBGKMKCGIM	350 76% DHJLN	114 42%	226 54% G	229 55% GGG	315 59%	189 54% GGG	239 60%	678 51% GGG	854 55% M
Does not describe very well	195 25%	856 33% G	1051 31% G	1200 36% ABC	78 38% AGGCG	164 36%	68 25%	140 34% G	127 30%	177 33%	111 32% A	144 36% AGBGCG	472 35% AGBGCG	575 37%
Does not describe at all	382 50%	507 20% M	889 26% DGM	784 23% BN	75 36% GKMBGKMKCGIM	186 40% DHJLN	46 17%	86 21% GMBGMGM	102 24% N	138 26% N	78 22% MMM	95 24% N	206 15% N	279 18% M
Decline to Answer	-	3 *	3 *	-	-	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	2 *	-
Not Sure	-	28 1% D	28 1% D	-	2 1% FA	-	2 1% A	-	10 2% JAKMBKMKCKM	-	1 *	-	13 1% NA	-
Sigma	769 100%	2588 100%	3357 100%	3349 100%	207 100%	460 100%	269 100%	415 100%	419 100%	534 100%	352 100%	401 100%	1341 100%	1539 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q755_6. How well do each of the following adjectives describe common gTLDs such as .com, .org and .net?

16 Aug 2016
Table 76

6. Practical

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	599 78%	2193 85% M	2792 83%	2775 83% A	181 87% A	375 82%	231 86% A	364 88% DFJN	345 82%	434 81%	318 90% LAIMBIMCIM	335 84%	1118 83% A	1267 82%
Describes very well	324 42% DIM	982 38% DIM	1306 39% DIM	1081 32% JN	81 39% AEIMBEIMCEIM	148 32% AEIMBEIMCEIM	133 49% DFJN	181 44% DFJN	139 33% J	144 27% LEIMBEIMCEIM	169 48% LEIMBEIMCEIM	152 38% DJN	460 34% N	456 30%
Describes somewhat well	275 36%	1211 47% G	1486 44% G	1694 51% ABCHL	100 48% AGGG	227 49%	98 36%	183 44% G	206 49% AGGCG	290 54% HL	149 42% A	183 46% AGKBGKCGK	658 49% AGKBGKCGK	811 53% DHL
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	170 22% DEGIKM	376 15% K	546 16% K	574 17% BH	25 12% EH	85 18% EH	38 14%	51 12% KKK	67 16% KKK	100 19% H	33 9% H	66 16% K	213 16% KBKK	272 18% H
Does not describe very well	74 10% K	284 11% K	358 11% K	427 13% ABCH	16 8% N	58 13% H	26 10%	34 8% KKK	53 13% KKK	76 14% H	21 6% H	43 11% K	168 13% AEKBEKCEK	216 14% DH
Does not describe at all	96 12% DEGIKM	92 4% D	188 6% D	147 4% N	9 4% N	27 6% N	12 4%	17 4% JAGBGCG	14 3% JAGBGCG	24 4%	12 3% JAGBGCG	23 6% JAGBGCG	45 3% NA	56 4%
Not Sure	- -	19 1% D	19 1% D	- -	1 * -	- -	- -	- -	7 2% JAGBGCG	- -	1 * -	- -	10 1% NA	- -
Sigma	769 100%	2588 100%	3357 100%	3349 100%	207 100%	460 100%	269 100%	415 100%	419 100%	534 100%	352 100%	401 100%	1341 100%	1539 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q755_7. How well do each of the following adjectives describe common gTLDs such as .com, .org and .net?

16 Aug 2016
Table 77

7. Technical

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	479 62%	2052 79% EI	2531 75% I	2611 78% ACFJ	151 73% A	313 68% AEIMBEIMCEIM	232 86% FJ	337 81% FJ	299 71% A	387 72% AEIBEICEI	294 84% FJ AEIEICEI	320 80% FJ AEIEICEI	1076 80% FJ AEIEICEI	1254 81% DFJ
Describes very well	202 26%	869 34% DEI	1071 32% DEI	972 29% FJ	50 24% FJ	108 23% AEIMBEIMCEIM	114 42% DFJN	154 37% DFJN	98 23% AEIMBEIMCEIM	112 21% LAEIMBEIMCEIM	154 44% DFJN NAEIEIEI	140 35% DFJN NAEIEIEI	453 34% NAEIEIEI	458 30% FJ
Describes somewhat well	277 36%	1183 46% K	1460 43% K	1639 49% ABCFH	101 49% AKKK	205 45% AKKK	118 44% A	183 44% AKKCK	201 48% AKKCK	275 51% FHL	140 40% FHL	180 45% AKKCK	623 46% AKKCK	796 52% MDFHL
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	290 38% DEGIKM	513 20% G	803 24% GKM	738 22% BN GKMBGKMGKM	54 26% DHLN	147 32% DHLN	34 13% DHLN	78 19% G GKMBGKMGKM	112 27% DHLN	147 28% DHLN	57 16% DHLN	81 20% GGG	256 19% GGG	285 19% GGG
Does not describe very well	150 20% DGKM	393 15% GK	543 16% GK	547 16% H GKKGK	40 19% DHLN	94 20% DHLN	24 9% DHLN	54 13% GKMBGKMGKM	84 20% DHLN	107 20% DHLN	40 11% DHLN	56 14% GGG	205 15% GGG	236 15% GGG
Does not describe at all	140 18% DEGIKM	120 5% M	260 8% DGKM	191 6% N	14 7% MMM	53 12% DHJLN	10 4% DHJLN	24 6% N MBMM	28 7% N MBMM	40 7% N	17 5% N	25 6% N	51 4% N	49 3% N
Not Sure	- -	23 1% D	23 1% D	- -	2 1% FA	- -	3 1% HA	- -	8 2% JAKMBKMGKM	- -	1 *	- -	9 1% NA	- -
Sigma	769 100%	2588 100%	3357 100%	3349 100%	207 100%	460 100%	269 100%	415 100%	419 100%	534 100%	352 100%	401 100%	1341 100%	1539 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q755_8. How well do each of the following adjectives describe common gTLDs such as .com, .org and .net?

16 Aug 2016
Table 78

8. Confusing

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
					(E)		(G)		(I)		(K)		(M)	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	121 16%	885 34% DEGK	1006 30%	1034 31% AHL	52 25% A	146 32% H	72 27% A	90 22%	127 30% A	163 31% H	99 28% A	104 26% NAEGKBEGKCEGK	535 40%	531 35% DHL
Describes very well	38 5%	272 11% DE	310 9% E	290 9% AH	11 5% EHJ	49 11% HAE	28 10% E	23 6%	40 10% A	37 7% A	29 8% A	39 10% H	164 12% NAEKBEKCEK	142 9% H
Describes somewhat well	83 11%	613 24% G	696 21%	744 22% AHL	41 20% A	97 21% A	44 16% A	67 16%	87 21% A	126 24% HL	70 20% A	65 16% AEGBEGKCEGK	371 28%	389 25% DHL
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	648 84%	1671 65% M	2319 69% M	2315 69% BN	151 73% MBMM	314 68%	196 73% MBMM	325 78% DFJN	282 67% MMM	371 69%	252 72% MBMM	297 74% DN	790 59%	1008 65% M
Does not describe very well	190 25%	882 34% K	1072 32%	1195 36% AC	71 34% A	155 34%	95 35% A	146 35%	153 37% AKKCK	187 35%	99 28%	130 32%	464 35% AKKCK	577 37% D
Does not describe at all	458 60% DEGIKM	789 30% M	1247 37% DIM	1120 33% BN	80 39% MBMM	159 35% N	101 38% MBMM	179 43% DFJN	129 31% MMM	184 34% N	153 43% IMBIMCIM	167 42% DFJN	326 24%	431 28% M
Decline to Answer	-	3 *	3 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3 *	-
Not Sure	-	29 1% D	29 1% D	-	4 2% FAKKK	-	1 *	-	10 2% JAGKMBEGKCEGK	-	1 *	-	13 1% NA	-
Sigma	769 100%	2588 100%	3357 100%	3349 100%	207 100%	460 100%	269 100%	415 100%	419 100%	534 100%	352 100%	401 100%	1341 100%	1539 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/F/H/J/L/N - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q755_9. How well do each of the following adjectives describe common gTLDs such as .com, .org and .net?

16 Aug 2016
Table 79

9. Overwhelming

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	166 22%	1386 54% DEGI	1552 46% EGI	1549 46% AFHJ	68 33% A	141 31%	98 36% HA	104 25%	139 33% A	152 28% AEGIBEGICEGI	213 61% AEGIBEGICEGI	223 56% DFHJ	868 65% NAEGIBEGICEGI	929 60% DFHJ
Describes very well	73 9%	516 20% DEGI	589 18% DEGI	502 15% AFHJ	17 8%	41 9%	31 12% H	27 7%	34 8%	41 8% AEGIBEGICEGI	93 26% AEGIBEGICEGI	85 21% DFHJ	341 25% NAEGIBEGICEGI	308 20% DFHJ
Describes somewhat well	93 12%	870 34% EGI	963 29% DEGI	1047 31% ACFHJ	51 25% A	100 22%	67 25% HA	77 19%	105 25% A	111 21% AEGIBEGICEGI	120 34% AEGIBEGICEGI	138 34% FHJ	527 39% NAEGIBEGICEGI	621 40% DFHJL
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	603 78% DEGIKM	1171 45% KM	1774 53% KM	1800 54% BLN	135 65% KMBKMCKM	319 69%	168 62% DLN	311 75% GDLN	270 64% KMBKMCKM	382 72% IDLN	138 39% IDLN	178 44%	460 34%	610 40% M
Does not describe very well	188 24%	711 27% M	899 27% ABCLN	1004 30% AKMKMKM	66 32% L	143 31% AKMKMKM	86 32% DLN	150 36% AKMBKMCKM	137 33% DFLN	200 37%	84 24%	96 24%	338 25%	415 27%
Does not describe at all	415 54% DEGIKM	460 18% M	875 26% DKM	796 24% BN	69 33% KMBKMCKM	176 38% DLN	82 30% KMBKMCKM	161 39% GDLN	133 32% KMBKMCKM	182 34% DLN	54 15% MMM	82 20% N	122 9%	195 13% M
Decline to Answer	-	2 *	2 *	-	-	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	1 *	-
Not Sure	-	29 1% D	29 1% D	-	4 2% FAKKK	-	3 1% HA	-	9 2% JAKMBKMCKM	-	1 *	-	12 1% NA	-
Sigma	769 100%	2588 100%	3357 100%	3349 100%	207 100%	460 100%	269 100%	415 100%	419 100%	534 100%	352 100%	401 100%	1341 100%	1539 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/F/H/J/L/N - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q755_10. How well do each of the following adjectives describe common gTLDs such as .com, .org and .net?

16 Aug 2016
Table 80

10. Useful

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	622 81%	2269 88% M	2891 86%	2889 86% AJ	184 89% A	385 84%	237 88% A	367 88% FJ	356 85%	439 82%	333 95% LAEGBEGIMCEGIM	357 89% FJ	1159 86% A	1341 87% J
Describes very well	336 44% DI	1145 44% DIM	1481 44% DIM	1265 38% FJ	92 44% FIIL	135 29% AIMBIMCIM	144 54% DFJN	195 47% DFJN	144 34% J	136 25% LAEIMBEIMCEIM	205 58% LAEIMBEIMCEIM	201 50% DFJN	560 42% III	598 39% FJ
Describes somewhat well	286 37% GK	1124 43% GK	1410 42% GK	1624 48% ABCHL	92 44% GGG	250 54% EDHLN	93 35% EDHLN	172 41% AGKMBGKMGCKM	212 51% AGKMBGKMGCKM	303 57% DHLN	128 36% DHLN	156 39% AGKMGKCGK	599 45% AGKMGKCGK	743 48% HL
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	147 19% DEGIKM	299 12% K	446 13% K	460 14% B	22 11% KKK	75 16% HL	31 12% KKK	48 12% KKK	54 13% IDHLN	95 18% IDHLN	19 5% IDHLN	44 11% K	173 13% KBKK	198 13% KBKK
Does not describe very well	70 9% K	230 9% K	300 9% K	343 10% L	14 7% L	47 10% L	24 9% KKK	35 8% KKK	41 10% KKK	71 13% DHL	12 3% DHL	26 6% KBKCK	139 10% KBKCK	164 11% L
Does not describe at all	77 10% DEGIKM	69 3% KM	146 4% KM	117 3% N	8 4% DHN	28 6% DHN	7 3% DHN	13 3% DHN	13 3% DHN	24 4% N	7 2% N	18 4% N	34 3% NA	34 2% NA
Not Sure	- -	20 1% D	20 1% D	- -	1 -	- -	1 -	- -	9 2% JAKMBGKMGCKM	- -	- -	- -	9 1% NA	- -
Sigma	769 100%	2588 100%	3357 100%	3349 100%	207 100%	460 100%	269 100%	415 100%	419 100%	534 100%	352 100%	401 100%	1341 100%	1539 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q755_11. How well do each of the following adjectives describe common gTLDs such as .com, .org and .net?

16 Aug 2016
Table 81

11. For people like me

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	495 64%	2100 81% D	2595 77%	2611 78% AF	172 83% FAC	331 72%	222 83% AC	331 80% F	333 79% A	400 75%	296 84% AC	325 81% FJ	1077 80% AC	1224 80% DFJ
Describes very well	253 33% I	912 35% DIM	1165 35% DI	985 29% FJ	62 30%	111 24%	120 45% HAEIMBEIMCEIM	142 34% DFJ	114 27% J	116 22%	170 48% LAEIMBEIMCEIM	156 39% DFJN	446 33% III	460 30% FJ
Describes somewhat well	242 31%	1188 46% GK	1430 43% K	1626 49% ABCL	110 53% AGKBGKCGK	220 48%	102 38%	189 46% G	219 52% AGKBGKCGK	284 53% DHL	126 36%	169 42% AGKBGKCGK	631 47% AGKBGKCGK	764 50% L
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	274 36% DEGIKM	464 18% EGKM	738 22% EGKM	738 22% BN	34 16% EDHLN	129 28%	45 17%	84 20%	78 19%	134 25% ILN	55 16%	76 19%	252 19%	315 20%
Does not describe very well	118 15% EG	344 13% E	462 14% E	519 15% BCH	19 9% EH	78 17%	27 10%	48 12%	51 12%	95 18% IH	40 11%	53 13% EGBEGCEG	207 15% EGBEGCEG	245 16% H
Does not describe at all	156 20% DEGIKM	120 5% M	276 8% DKM	219 7% BN	15 7% MMM	51 11% DJLN	18 7% MMM	36 9% N	27 6% MMM	39 7% N	15 4% A	23 6% A	45 3% A	70 5% A
Not Sure	- -	24 1% D	24 1% D	- -	1 *	- -	2 1% A	- -	8 2% JAKBKCK	- -	1 *	- -	12 1% NA	- -
Sigma	769 100%	2588 100%	3357 100%	3349 100%	207 100%	460 100%	269 100%	415 100%	419 100%	534 100%	352 100%	401 100%	1341 100%	1539 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q755_12. How well do each of the following adjectives describe common gTLDs such as .com, .org and .net?

16 Aug 2016
Table 82

12. Interesting

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia	
					(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539	
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	409 53%	2035 79% DE	2444 73% AFJ	2439 73% AFJ	150 72% FA	264 57% AEECE	221 82% DFJ	321 77% JA	321 77% JA	364 68% F	296 84% AEIMBEIMCEIM	318 79% DFJ	1047 78% AC	1172 76% DFJ	
Describes very well	159 21%	842 33% DEI	1001 30% DEI	834 25% AFJ	47 23% F	59 13% HAEIMBEIMCEIM	106 39% FJ	115 28% FJ	89 21% FJ	91 17% LAEIMBEIMCEIM	155 44% LAEIMBEIMCEIM	147 37% DFHJN	445 33% NAEIEICEI	422 27% DFJ	
Describes somewhat well	250 33%	1193 46% K	1443 43% K	1605 48% ACL	103 50% AKKCK	205 45% L	115 43% A	206 50% L	232 55% AGKMBGKMGK	273 51% FL	141 40% A	171 43% A	602 45% A	750 49% ML	
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	360 47% DEGIKM	530 20% K	890 27% GIKM	910 27% BHLN	56 27% GKBGKGK	196 43% EDHJLN	47 17% EDHJLN	94 23% KKK	89 21% KKK	170 32% IDHLN	54 15% IDHLN	83 21% IDHLN	284 21% KKK	367 24% KKK	
Does not describe very well	180 23% DGIKM	406 16% GK	586 17% GK	670 20% BCHL	38 18% GKGKGK	124 27% EDHJLN	30 11% EDHJLN	59 14% GKGKGK	71 17% GKGKGK	119 22% IHL	37 11% IHL	62 15% K	230 17% GKBGKGK	306 20% HL	
Does not describe at all	180 23% DEGIKM	124 5% D	304 9% DIKM	240 7% BN	18 9% IMBIMIM	72 16% EDHJLN	17 6% EDHJLN	35 8% N	18 4% N	51 10% IDLN	17 5% IDLN	21 5% IDLN	54 4% IDLN	61 4% IDLN	
Decline to Answer	-	2 *	2 *	-	-	-	-	-	2 *	-	-	-	-	-	
								MBMCM							
Not Sure	-	21 1% D	21 1% D	-	1 *	-	1 *	-	7 2% JABC	-	2 1% A	-	10 1% NA	-	
Sigma	769 100%	2588 100%	3357 100%	3349 100%	207 100%	460 100%	269 100%	415 100%	419 100%	534 100%	352 100%	401 100%	1341 100%	1539 100%	

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q755_13. How well do each of the following adjectives describe common gTLDs such as .com, .org and .net?

16 Aug 2016
Table 83

13. Exciting

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	238 31%	1665 64% DEI	1903 57% EI	1954 58% AFHJ	92 44% A	170 37% HAEIEICEI	172 64% HAEIEICEI	208 50% F	206 49% A	266 50% F	270 77% AEGIMBEGIMCEGIM	287 72% DFHJ	925 69% AEIBEICEI	1023 66% DFHJ
Describes very well	96 12%	664 26% DEI	760 23% DEI	606 18% AFHJ	25 12% AFHJ	42 9% HAEIEICEI	65 24% HAEIEICEI	57 14% F	61 15% J	54 10% L	138 39% LAEGBEGIMCEGIM	105 26% DFHJ	375 28% NAEIBEICEI	348 23% DFHJ
Describes somewhat well	142 18%	1001 39% DEI	1143 34% DEI	1348 40% ACF	67 32% A	128 28% ACF	107 40% AC	151 36% F	145 35% A	212 40% F	132 38% A	182 45% KDFH	550 41% AEIBEICEI	675 44% DFHJ
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	531 69% DEGIKM	898 35% KM	1429 43% GKM	1395 42% BLN	113 55% GKMBGKMGKMGK	290 63% EDHJLN	95 35% KKK	207 50% GDLN	203 48% GKMBGKMGKMGK	268 50% DLN	80 23% DLN	114 28% DLN	407 30% KKK	516 34% KKK
Does not describe very well	221 29% KM	633 24% K	854 25% K	893 27% LN	72 35% GKMBGKMGKMGK	150 33% DLN	63 23% KKK	137 33% GDLN	127 30% GKMBGKMGKMGK	154 29% L	53 15% L	74 18% L	318 24% KKK	378 25% L
Does not describe at all	310 40% DEGIKM	265 10% M	575 17% DGKM	502 15% BLN	41 20% GKMBGKMGKMGK	140 30% EDHJLN	32 12% MMM	70 17% LN	76 18% GKMBGKMGKMGK	114 21% DLN	27 8% DLN	40 10% DLN	89 7% NA	138 9% M
Decline to Answer	-	1 *	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	1 * C	-	-	-	-	-
Not Sure	-	24 1% D	24 1% D	-	2 1% FA	-	2 1% A	-	9 2% JAMBMC	-	2 1% A	-	9 1% NA	-
Sigma	769 100%	2588 100%	3357 100%	3349 100%	207 100%	460 100%	269 100%	415 100%	419 100%	534 100%	352 100%	401 100%	1341 100%	1539 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/F/H/J/L - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q755_14. How well do each of the following adjectives describe common gTLDs such as .com, .org and .net?

16 Aug 2016
Table 84

14. Helpful

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	580 75%	2180 84% I	2760 82%	2775 83% AFJ	169 82% F	334 73%	234 87% AIICI	356 86% FJ	335 80%	420 79% F AEIBEICEI	311 88%	344 86% FJ	1131 84% AIICI	1321 86% DFJ
Describes very well	292 38% DEI	1011 39% DEI	1303 39% DEI	1134 34% FJ	61 29%	112 24%	112 42% EIEIEI	172 41% DFJN	119 28% J	121 23% LAEGIMBEGIMCEGIM	200 57%	181 45% DFJN	519 39% EIEIEI	548 36% DFJ
Describes somewhat well	288 37%	1169 45% K	1457 43% K	1641 49% ABCHL	108 52% AKBKCK	222 48% L	122 45% AKKK	184 44% AKMBKMKCKM	216 52% DFHLN	299 56%	111 32%	163 41% K	612 46% AKKCK	773 50% MHL
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	189 25% DEGIKM	389 15% K	578 17% GKM	574 17% BN	37 18% KKK	126 27% EDHJLN	34 13%	59 14%	76 18% KKK	114 21% DHLN	40 11%	57 14%	202 15%	218 14%
Does not describe very well	85 11%	299 12%	384 11%	430 13% HN	23 11% EDHJLN	87 19%	25 9%	40 10%	58 14% KKK	84 16% DHLN	31 9%	42 10%	162 12%	177 12%
Does not describe at all	104 14% DEGIKM	90 3%	194 6% DKM	144 4% N KMBKMKM	14 7% DHLN	39 8%	9 3%	19 5% N	18 4%	30 6% N	9 3%	15 4%	40 3%	41 3%
Not Sure	- -	19 1% D	19 1% D	- -	1 *	- -	1 *	- -	8 2% JAKMBKMKCKM	- -	1 *	- -	8 1% NA	- -
Sigma	769 100%	2588 100%	3357 100%	3349 100%	207 100%	460 100%	269 100%	415 100%	419 100%	534 100%	352 100%	401 100%	1341 100%	1539 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q755_15. How well do each of the following adjectives describe common gTLDs such as .com, .org and .net?

16 Aug 2016
Table 85

15. Informative

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	579 75%	2221 86% DIM	2800 83%	2753 82% AF	180 87% FA	348 76%	236 88% AC	361 87% DFJN	346 83% F	434 81% F	328 93% LAEGIMBEGIMCEGIM	341 85% F	1131 84% A	1269 82% F
Describes very well	274 36% I	1051 41% DI	1325 39% DI	1136 34% FJ	77 37% FIII	118 26% AEIMBEGIMCEIM	126 47% DFJN	171 41% DFJN	119 28% J	120 22% J	200 57% AEGIMBEGIMCEGIM	204 51% DFHJN	529 39% NIII	523 34% FJ
Describes somewhat well	305 40%	1170 45% K	1475 44% K	1617 48% ABCL	103 50% AKKK	230 50% L	110 41% L	190 46% L	227 54% AGKMBGKMGCKM	314 59% DFHLN	128 36% L	137 34% L	602 45% AKKK	746 48% L
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	190 25% DEGIKM	344 13% K	534 16% GK	596 18% BCH	26 13% KKK	112 24% EDHJLN	31 12% KKK	54 13% KKK	64 15% KKK	100 19% H	23 7% H	60 15% K	200 15% KBKK	270 18% H
Does not describe very well	101 13% GK	263 10% K	364 11% K	446 13% BCHL	20 10% KKK	75 16% EDHL	20 7% KKK	40 10% KKK	46 11% KKK	75 14% H	12 3% H	40 10% K	165 12% GKBGKCGK	216 14% HL
Does not describe at all	89 12% DEGIKM	81 3% D	170 5% M	150 4% BN	6 3% EDHJN	37 8% EDHJN	11 4% A	14 3% JAKMBGKMGCKM	18 4% JAKMBGKMGCKM	25 5% JAKMBGKMGCKM	11 3% JAKMBGKMGCKM	20 5% JAKMBGKMGCKM	35 3% NA	54 4% NA
Not Sure	- -	23 1% D	23 1% D	- -	1 *	- -	2 1% A	- -	9 2% JAKMBGKMGCKM	- -	1 *	- -	10 1% NA	- -
Sigma	769 100%	2588 100%	3357 100%	3349 100%	207 100%	460 100%	269 100%	415 100%	419 100%	534 100%	352 100%	401 100%	1341 100%	1539 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q765. What are your expectations about placing restrictions on purchasing/registering a domain using each of the following gTLDs?

SUMMARY TABLE OF STRICT/SOME RESTRICTIONS

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
.com	219 28%	1475 57% EGI	1694 50% E	2119 63% ABCFHJ	89 43% A	255 55% E	123 46% A	220 53%	199 47% A	314 59% I	191 54% AEGEGEG	275 69% KDFHJ	873 65% AEGKBGKCEGK	1055 69% MDFHJ
.net	262 34%	1547 60% EGI	1809 54%	2163 65% ABCHJ	105 51% A	280 61% E	139 52% A	230 55%	211 50% A	300 56%	202 57% A	294 73% KDFHJ	890 66% AEGKBGKCEGK	1059 69% DFHJ
.info	300 39%	1643 63% I	1943 58%	2119 63% ACH	130 63% A	289 63% H	165 61% A	223 54%	232 55% A	327 61% H	209 59% A	251 63% H	907 68% AGKBGKCGIK	1029 67% DHJ
.org	446 58%	1733 67% I	2179 65% I	2417 72% ABCHJ	147 71% AIII	339 74% HJ	171 64%	255 61%	247 59%	349 65% I	224 64%	312 78% KDHJ	944 70% AGKBGKCGIK	1162 76% MDHJ
.cn	-	375 68%	375 68%	380 69%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	375 68% C	380 69%
.vn	-	35 67%	35 67%	43 83%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	35 67%	43 83%
.ph	21 81%	63 83%	84 82%	88 87%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	63 83%	88 87%
.jp	-	121 69%	121 69%	122 69%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	121 69%	122 69%
.kr	14 44%	50 72%	64 63%	67 66% A	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	50 72% AC	67 66%
.ru	19 33%	30 41%	49 38%	75 59% ABC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	30 41%	75 59% M
.in	12 44%	219 73%	231 71%	246 75%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	219 73% C	246 75%
.id	26 50%	25 51%	51 50%	53 53%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	25 51%	53 53%
.ng	7 41%	124 65%	131 63%	147 74% C	-	-	-	-	-	-	124 65% C	147 74%	-	-
.za	7 37%	43 52%	50 50%	78 77% BC	-	-	-	-	-	-	43 52%	78 77% K	-	-
.eg	20 77%	55 69%	75 71%	78 78%	-	-	-	-	-	-	55 69%	78 78%	-	-

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q765. What are your expectations about placing restrictions on purchasing/registering a domain using each of the following gTLDs?

SUMMARY TABLE OF STRICT/SOME RESTRICTIONS

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
.co	24 39%	35 55%	59 47%	74 59% A	-	-	35 55%	74 59%	-	-	-	-	-	-
.ar	10 31%	29 43%	39 39%	48 46%	-	-	29 43%	48 46%	-	-	-	-	-	-
.br	15 39%	73 53%	88 50%	111 60% A	-	-	73 53%	111 60%	-	-	-	-	-	-
.it	9 32%	9 35%	18 33%	28 56% C	-	-	-	-	9 35%	28 56%	-	-	-	-
.tr	3 60%	29 64%	32 64%	32 64%	-	-	-	-	29 64%	32 64%	-	-	-	-
.es	6 50%	17 45%	23 46%	27 54%	-	-	-	-	17 45%	27 54%	-	-	-	-
.pl	-	20 38%	20 38%	24 45%	-	-	-	-	20 38%	24 45%	-	-	-	-
.uk	14 54%	41 55%	55 55%	71 71% BC	-	-	-	-	41 55%	71 71% I	-	-	-	-
.fr	20 77%	33 44%	53 52% I	66 62% B	-	-	-	-	33 44%	66 62% I	-	-	-	-
.de	5 29%	57 53%	62 50%	63 50%	-	-	-	-	57 53%	63 50%	-	-	-	-
.us	122 60%	51 80%	173 65%	177 80% A	51 80% AC	177 69%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
.ca	15 65%	54 68%	69 67%	73 70%	54 68%	73 70%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
.mx	13 33%	29 46%	42 41%	63 63% ABC	29 46%	63 63% E	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
.eu	-	-	-	316 65%	-	-	-	-	-	316 65%	-	-	-	-
RESTRICTIONS TOTAL (NET)	515 67%	2077 80% GI	2592 77% I	2852 85% ABCHJ	173 84% AGIGICGI	386 84%	199 74% A	331 80%	285 68%	424 79% I	276 78% AIII	354 88% KHJ	1144 85% AGIKBGICGK	1357 88% MDFHJ
RESTRICTIONS CONSISTENT (NET)	515 67%	2077 80% GI	2592 77% I	2852 85% ABCHJ	173 84% AGIGICGI	386 84%	199 74% A	331 80%	285 68%	424 79% I	276 78% AIII	354 88% KHJ	1144 85% AGIKBGICGK	1357 88% MDFHJ

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q765. What are your expectations about placing restrictions on purchasing/registering a domain using each of the following gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 86

SUMMARY TABLE OF STRICT/SOME RESTRICTIONS

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
RESTRICTIONS GLOBAL (NET)	479 62%	2050 79% GI	2529 75% I	2809 84% ABCHJ	167 81% AIII	383 83% J	197 73% A	326 79%	281 67%	416 78% I	267 76% AIII	346 86% KHJ	1138 85% AGIKBGIKCGIK	1338 87% DFHJ
RESTRICTIONS GEO-SPECIFIC (NET)	382 50%	1617 62% GI	1999 60% GI	2297 69% ABCH	134 65% AGIGIGI	313 68% H	137 51%	233 56%	206 49%	374 70% IH	222 63% AGIGIGI	303 76% KDFHN	918 68% AGIBGICGI	1074 70% H
RESTRICTIONS GEO-SPECIFIC CONSISTENT (NET)	382 50%	1617 62% GI	1999 60% GI	2234 67% ABCHJ	134 65% AGIGIGI	313 68% HJ	137 51%	233 56%	206 49%	311 58% I	222 63% AGIGIGI	303 76% KDFHJN	918 68% AGIBGICGI	1074 70% DHJ
RESTRICTIONS GEO-SPECIFIC ADDED (NET)	-	-	-	316 9% ABCFHLN	-	-	-	-	-	316 59% IDFHLN	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q765. What are your expectations about placing restrictions on purchasing/registering a domain using each of the following gTLDs?

SUMMARY TABLE OF STRICT RESTRICTIONS

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
.com	65 8%	523 20% EGI	588 18% EI	786 23% ABCHJ	20 10%	97 21% EJ	41 15% A	71 17%	56 13% A	83 16%	79 22% AEGIEGICEGI	128 32% KDFHJN	327 24% AEGIBEGICEGI	407 26% DFHJ
.net	57 7%	429 17% I	486 14% I	625 19% ABCHJ	26 13% A	82 18% J	39 14% A	61 15%	44 11%	60 11%	60 17% AIII	98 24% KDFHJ	260 19% AEIBEICEI	324 21% DHJ
.info	67 9%	444 17%	511 15%	537 16% AJ	36 17% A	85 18% J	43 16% A	58 14%	60 14% A	57 11%	62 18% A	81 20% DHJ	243 18% AC	256 17% J
.org	186 24% I	620 24% I	806 24% I	925 28% BCJ	59 29% III	149 32% DJ	70 26% III	111 27% J	75 18%	101 19%	83 24%	133 33% KDHJN	333 25% III	431 28% J
.cn	-	114 21%	114 21%	126 23%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	114 21%	126 23%
.vn	-	16 31%	16 31%	19 37%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	16 31%	19 37%
.ph	8 31%	26 34%	34 33%	34 34%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	26 34%	34 34%
.jp	-	37 21%	37 21%	29 16%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	37 21%	29 16%
.kr	3 9%	11 16%	14 14%	21 21%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	11 16%	21 21%
.ru	3 5%	6 8%	9 7%	23 18% AC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6 8%	23 18%
.in	4 15%	108 36%	112 34%	106 32%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	108 36% C	106 32%
.id	15 29%	10 20%	25 25%	23 23%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10 20%	23 23%
.ng	3 18%	47 25%	50 24%	54 27%	-	-	-	-	-	-	47 25%	54 27%	-	-
.za	3 16%	16 20%	19 19%	27 27%	-	-	-	-	-	-	16 20%	27 27%	-	-
.eg	5 19%	16 20%	21 20%	26 26%	-	-	-	-	-	-	16 20%	26 26%	-	-

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q765. What are your expectations about placing restrictions on purchasing/registering a domain using each of the following gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 87

SUMMARY TABLE OF STRICT RESTRICTIONS

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
.co	6 10%	10 16%	16 13%	14 11%	-	-	10 16%	14 11%	-	-	-	-	-	-
.ar	2 6%	13 19% D	15 15%	9 9%	-	-	13 19% H	9 9%	-	-	-	-	-	-
.br	5 13%	20 15%	25 14%	40 22%	-	-	20 15%	40 22%	-	-	-	-	-	-
.it	1 4%	2 8%	3 6%	8 16%	-	-	-	-	2 8%	8 16%	-	-	-	-
.tr	2 40%	9 20%	11 22%	14 28%	-	-	-	-	9 20%	14 28%	-	-	-	-
.es	1 8%	1 3%	2 4%	4 8%	-	-	-	-	1 3%	4 8%	-	-	-	-
.pl	-	2 4%	2 4%	7 13%	-	-	-	-	2 4%	7 13%	-	-	-	-
.uk	3 12%	16 22%	19 19%	21 21%	-	-	-	-	16 22%	21 21%	-	-	-	-
.fr	6 23%	9 12%	15 15%	19 18%	-	-	-	-	9 12%	19 18%	-	-	-	-
.de	-	18 17%	18 14%	20 16%	-	-	-	-	18 17%	20 16%	-	-	-	-
.us	40 20%	20 31%	60 22%	75 29% A	20 31%	75 29%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
.ca	6 26%	15 19%	21 20%	30 29%	15 19%	30 29%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
.mx	2 5%	10 16%	12 12%	25 25% AC	10 16%	25 25%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
.eu	-	-	-	73 15%	-	-	-	-	-	73 15%	-	-	-	-
RESTRICTIONS TOTAL (NET)	241 31%	1063 41% GI	1304 39% I	1609 48% ABCJ	87 42% AIII	220 48% J	92 34% GJ	183 44% GJ	131 31%	200 37% I	155 44% AGIGICGI	221 55% KDFHJ	598 45% AGIBGICGI	785 51% MDHJ
RESTRICTIONS CONSISTENT (NET)	241 31%	1063 41% GI	1304 39% I	1598 48% ABCJ	87 42% AIII	220 48% J	92 34% GJ	183 44% GJ	131 31%	189 35% AGIGICGI	155 44% AGIGICGI	221 55% KDFHJ	598 45% AGIBGICGI	785 51% MDHJ

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q765. What are your expectations about placing restrictions on purchasing/registering a domain using each of the following gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 87

SUMMARY TABLE OF STRICT RESTRICTIONS

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
RESTRICTIONS GLOBAL (NET)	209 27%	987 38% I	1196 36% I	1481 44% ABCJ	77 37% AIII	197 43% J	90 33% GJ	173 42% GJ	118 28% I	169 32% AIII	135 38% AIII	202 50% KDFHJ	567 42% AGIBGICGI	740 48% MDFHJ
RESTRICTIONS GEO-SPECIFIC (NET)	118 15%	552 21% GI	670 20% I	806 24% ABCH	45 22% AIII	130 28% DH	43 16% I	63 15% I	57 14% I	125 23% IH	79 22% AGIGIGI	107 27% H	328 24% AGIBGICGI	381 25% H
RESTRICTIONS GEO-SPECIFIC CONSISTENT (NET)	118 15%	552 21% GI	670 20% I	774 23% ACHJ	45 22% AIII	130 28% DHJ	43 16% I	63 15% I	57 14% I	93 17% AGIGIGI	79 22% AGIGIGI	107 27% HJ	328 24% AGIBGICGI	381 25% DHJ
RESTRICTIONS GEO-SPECIFIC ADDED (NET)	-	-	-	73 2% ABCFHLN	-	-	-	-	-	73 14% IDFHLN	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q765. What are your expectations about placing restrictions on purchasing/registering a domain using each of the following gTLDs?

SUMMARY TABLE OF SOME RESTRICTIONS

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
.com	154 20%	952 37% GK	1106 33%	1333 40% ABCF	69 33% A	158 34%	82 30% A	149 36%	143 34% A	231 43% IFHL	112 32% A	147 37% AEGIKBEGIKCEGIK	546 41%	648 42% DFHL
.net	205 27%	1118 43% G	1323 39%	1538 46% ABCH	79 38% A	198 43%	100 37% A	169 41%	167 40% A	240 45%	142 40% A	196 49% KH AEGIKBEGIKCEGIK	630 47%	735 48% DH
.info	233 30%	1199 46% I	1432 43%	1582 47% ACHL	94 45% A	204 44%	122 45% A	165 40%	172 41% A	270 51% IHL	147 42% A	170 42% A	664 50% A	773 50% DFHL
.org	260 34%	1113 43%	1373 41%	1492 45% ACH	88 43% A	190 41% H	101 38%	144 35%	172 41% A	248 46% H	141 40% A	179 45% H	611 46% AGBGCG	731 47% DFH
.cn	-	261 48%	261 47%	254 46%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	261 48%	254 46%
.vn	-	19 37%	19 37%	24 46%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	19 37%	24 46%
.ph	13 50%	37 49%	50 49%	54 53%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	37 49%	54 53%
.jp	-	84 48%	84 48%	93 53%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	84 48%	93 53%
.kr	11 34%	39 57%	50 50%	46 46%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	39 57% AC	46 46%
.ru	16 28%	24 33%	40 31%	52 41%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	24 33%	52 41%
.in	8 30%	111 37%	119 37%	140 42%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	111 37%	140 42%
.id	11 21%	15 31%	26 26%	30 30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15 31%	30 30%
.ng	4 24%	77 41%	81 39%	93 47%	-	-	-	-	-	-	77 41%	93 47%	-	-
.za	4 21%	27 33%	31 31%	51 50% BC	-	-	-	-	-	-	27 33%	51 50% K	-	-
.eg	15 58%	39 49%	54 51%	52 52%	-	-	-	-	-	-	39 49%	52 52%	-	-

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q765. What are your expectations about placing restrictions on purchasing/registering a domain using each of the following gTLDs?

SUMMARY TABLE OF SOME RESTRICTIONS

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
.co	18 30%	25 39%	43 34%	60 48% AC	-	-	25 39%	60 48%	-	-	-	-	-	-
.ar	8 25%	16 24%	24 24%	39 38% C	-	-	16 24%	39 38%	-	-	-	-	-	-
.br	10 26%	53 39%	63 36%	71 38%	-	-	53 39%	71 38%	-	-	-	-	-	-
.it	8 29%	7 27%	15 28%	20 40%	-	-	-	-	7 27%	20 40%	-	-	-	-
.tr	1 20%	20 44%	21 42%	18 36%	-	-	-	-	20 44%	18 36%	-	-	-	-
.es	5 42%	16 42%	21 42%	23 46%	-	-	-	-	16 42%	23 46%	-	-	-	-
.pl	-	18 34%	18 34%	17 32%	-	-	-	-	18 34%	17 32%	-	-	-	-
.uk	11 42%	25 34%	36 36%	50 50% BC	-	-	-	-	25 34%	50 50% I	-	-	-	-
.fr	14 54%	24 32%	38 38% I	47 44%	-	-	-	-	24 32%	47 44%	-	-	-	-
.de	5 29%	39 36%	44 35%	43 34%	-	-	-	-	39 36%	43 34%	-	-	-	-
.us	82 40%	31 48%	113 42%	102 40%	31 48%	102 40%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
.ca	9 39%	39 49%	48 47%	43 41%	39 49%	43 41%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
.mx	11 28%	19 30%	30 29%	38 38%	19 30%	38 38%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
.eu	-	-	-	243 50%	-	-	-	-	-	243 50%	-	-	-	-
RESTRICTIONS TOTAL (NET)	447 58%	1834 71% GI	2281 68% GI	2555 76% ABCFH AGIGICGI	155 75%	328 71%	168 62%	294 71% G	255 61%	395 74% I	243 69% AIII	307 77% K AGIKBGICGK	1013 76% AGIKBGICGK	1231 80% MDFHJ
RESTRICTIONS CONSISTENT (NET)	447 58%	1834 71% GI	2281 68% GI	2551 76% ABCFH AGIGICGI	155 75%	328 71%	168 62%	294 71% G	255 61%	391 73% I	243 69% AIII	307 77% K AGIKBGICGK	1013 76% AGIKBGICGK	1231 80% MDFHJ

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q765. What are your expectations about placing restrictions on purchasing/registering a domain using each of the following gTLDs?

SUMMARY TABLE OF SOME RESTRICTIONS

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
RESTRICTIONS GLOBAL (NET)	402 52%	1777 69% GI	2179 65% I	2448 73% ABCFH	147 71% AGIGIGI	317 69% A	160 59% A	278 67% G	246 59% A	377 71% I	230 65% A	287 72% AGIKBGIKCGIK	994 74% DFHJL	1189 77%
RESTRICTIONS GEO-SPECIFIC (NET)	264 34%	1065 41% GI	1329 40% I	1538 46% ABCFH	89 43% A	183 40% A	94 35% A	170 41% A	149 36% IDFHLN	296 55% A	143 41% A	196 49% KDFHJ	590 44% AGIBGICGI	693 45% F
RESTRICTIONS GEO-SPECIFIC CONSISTENT (NET)	264 34%	1065 41% GI	1329 40% I	1460 44% AC	89 43% A	183 40% A	94 35% A	170 41% A	149 36% IDFHLN	218 41% A	143 41% A	196 49% KDFHJ	590 44% AGIBGICGI	693 45% F
RESTRICTIONS GEO-SPECIFIC ADDED (NET)	-	-	-	243 7% ABCFHLN	-	-	-	-	-	243 46% IDFHLN	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q765. What are your expectations about placing restrictions on purchasing/registering a domain using each of the following gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 89

SUMMARY TABLE OF NO RESTRICTIONS

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi-straits	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
					(E)		(G)		(I)		(K)		(M)	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
.com	550 72%	1083 42%	1633 49%	1230 37%	113 55%	205 45%	145 54%	195 47%	210 50%	220 41%	159 45%	126 31%	456 34%	484 31%
DEGIKM		DM	DM	LN	FKMBKMKM	DLN	KMBKMKM	DLN	JMBMM	DLN	LMMM			
.net	507 66%	1009 39%	1516 45%	1186 35%	97 47%	180 39%	128 48%	185 45%	197 47%	234 44%	148 42%	107 27%	439 33%	480 31%
DEGIKM		DM	DM	LN	MBMM	LN	MBMM	DLN	MBMM	DLN	LMMM			
.info	469 61%	913 35%	1382 41%	1230 37%	71 34%	171 37%	103 38%	192 46%	178 42%	207 39%	141 40%	150 37%	420 31%	510 33%
DEGIKM		M	DEM	N			MMM	GDFJLN	EMBEMEM	N	MBMM			
.org	323 42%	826 32%	1149 34%	932 28%	55 27%	121 26%	96 36%	160 39%	162 39%	185 35%	127 36%	89 22%	386 29%	377 24%
DEM		DM	DEM	LN			EMEMEM	DFLN	EMBEMCEM	DFLN	LEMEMEM		N	
.cn	2 100%	170 31%	172 31%	171 31%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	170 31%	171 31%
M														
.vn	-	17 33%	17 33%	9 17%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	17 33%	9 17%
.ph	5 19%	13 17%	18 18%	13 13%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	13 17%	13 13%
.jp	-	53 30%	53 30%	54 31%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	53 30%	54 31%
.kr	18 56%	17 25%	35 35%	34 34%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	17 25%	34 34%
DM			M											
.ru	38 67%	43 59%	81 62%	53 41%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	43 59%	53 41%
D		D	D										N	
.in	15 56%	76 26%	91 28%	84 25%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	76 26%	84 25%
M														
.id	26 50%	24 49%	50 50%	47 47%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	24 49%	47 47%
.ng	10 59%	66 35%	76 37%	53 27%	-	-	-	-	-	-	66 35%	53 27%	-	-
DK			DK											
.za	12 63%	39 48%	51 50%	23 23%	-	-	-	-	-	-	39 48%	23 23%	-	-
D		D	D								L			
.eg	6 23%	24 30%	30 28%	22 22%	-	-	-	-	-	-	24 30%	22 22%	-	-

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q765. What are your expectations about placing restrictions on purchasing/registering a domain using each of the following gTLDs?

SUMMARY TABLE OF NO RESTRICTIONS

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
.co	37 61% D	29 45%	66 53%	51 41%	-	-	29 45%	41%	-	-	-	-	-	-
.ar	22 69%	39 57%	61 61%	56 54%	-	-	39 57%	56 54%	-	-	-	-	-	-
.br	23 61% D	63 46%	86 49%	75 40%	-	-	63 46%	75 40%	-	-	-	-	-	-
.it	19 68%	16 62%	35 65% D	22 44%	-	-	-	-	16 62%	22 44%	-	-	-	-
.tr	2 40%	15 33%	17 34%	18 36%	-	-	-	-	15 33%	18 36%	-	-	-	-
.es	6 50%	19 50%	25 50%	23 46%	-	-	-	-	19 50%	23 46%	-	-	-	-
.pl	-	32 60%	32 60%	29 55%	-	-	-	-	32 60%	29 55%	-	-	-	-
.uk	12 46%	32 43%	44 44% D	29 29%	-	-	-	-	32 43%	29 29%	-	-	-	-
.fr	6 23%	38 51%	44 44%	40 38%	-	-	-	-	38 51% C	40 38%	-	-	-	-
.de	12 71%	50 46%	62 50%	62 50%	-	-	-	-	50 46%	62 50%	-	-	-	-
.us	82 40% DE	9 14%	91 34% E	78 31% B	9 14%	78 31% E	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
.ca	8 35%	25 31%	33 32%	32 30%	25 31%	32 30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
.mx	26 67% D	33 52%	59 58% D	37 37%	33 52%	37 37%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
.eu	-	-	-	168 35%	-	-	-	-	-	168 35%	-	-	-	-
RESTRICTIONS TOTAL (NET)	614 80% DEGIKM	1544 60% M	2158 64% DM	1988 59% N	139 67% MBMM	283 62% LN	174 65% MMM	299 72% GDFJLN	266 63% MMM	338 63% DLN	221 63% LMMM	220 55%	744 55%	848 55%
RESTRICTIONS CONSISTENT (NET)	614 80% DEGIKM	1544 60% M	2158 64% DM	1980 59% N	139 67% MBMM	283 62% LN	174 65% MMM	299 72% GDFJLN	266 63% MMM	330 62% LN	221 63% LMMM	220 55%	744 55%	848 55%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q765. What are your expectations about placing restrictions on purchasing/registering a domain using each of the following gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 89

SUMMARY TABLE OF NO RESTRICTIONS

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
RESTRICTIONS GLOBAL (NET)	607	1503	2110	1909	137	276	170	293	256	318	214	212	726	810
	79%	58%	63%	57%	66%	60%	63%	71%	61%	60%	61%	53%	54%	53%
	DEGIKM	M	DM	N	MBMM	LN	MMM	GDFJLN	MMM	LN	LMMM			
RESTRICTIONS GEO-SPECIFIC (NET)	387	942	1329	1141	67	147	131	182	202	249	129	98	413	465
	50%	36%	40%	34%	32%	32%	49%	44%	48%	47%	37%	24%	31%	30%
	DEKM	M	DEM	LN		L	EKMBEKMCEKM	DFLN	EKMBEKMCEKM	DFLN	LMMM			L
RESTRICTIONS GEO-SPECIFIC CONSISTENT (NET)	387	942	1329	1115	67	147	131	182	202	223	129	98	413	465
	50%	36%	40%	33%	32%	32%	49%	44%	48%	42%	37%	24%	31%	30%
	DEKM	DM	DEM	LN		L	EKMBEKMCEKM	DFLN	EKMBEKMCEKM	DFLN	LMMM			L
RESTRICTIONS GEO-SPECIFIC ADDED (NET)	-	-	-	168	-	-	-	-	-	168	-	-	-	-
				5%						31%				
				ABCFHLN						IDFHLN				

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q765_1. What are your expectations about placing restrictions on purchasing/registering a domain using each of the following gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 90

1. .com

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
STRICT/SOME RESTRICTIONS (NET)	219 28%	1475 57% EGI	1694 50% E	2119 63% ABCFHJ	89 43% A	255 55% E	123 46% A	220 53% A	199 47% A	314 59% I	191 54% AEGEGEG	275 69% KDFHJ	873 65% AEGIBEGICEGIK	1055 69% MDFHJ
Strict purchase restrictions should be required	65 8%	523 20% EGI	588 18% EI	786 23% ABCHJ	20 10% A	97 21% EJ	41 15% A	71 17% A	56 13% A	83 16% AEGIEGICEGI	79 22% KDFHJN	128 32% AEGIBEGICEGI	327 24% AEGIBEGICEGI	407 26% DFHJ
Some purchase restrictions should be required	154 20%	952 37% GK	1106 33% ABCF	1333 40% ABCF	69 33% A	158 34% A	82 30% A	149 36% A	143 34% A	231 43% IFHL	112 32% A	147 37% AEGIBEGICEGIK	546 41% AEGIBEGICEGIK	648 42% DFHL
No purchase restrictions should be required	550 72% DEGIKM	1083 42% DM	1633 49% DM	1230 37% LN	113 55% FKMBKMKM	205 45% DLN	145 54% KMBKMKM	195 47% DLN	210 50% JMBMM	220 41% DLN	159 45% LMMM	126 31% A	456 34% A	484 31% A
Not Sure	-	26 1% D	26 1% D	-	5 2% FAGKMBEGKMGKGM	-	-	-	10 2% JAGKMBEGKMGKGM	-	1 *	-	10 1% NA	-
Decline to Answer	-	4 * D	4 * D	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	1 *	-	2 *	-
Sigma	769 100%	2588 100%	3357 100%	3349 100%	207 100%	460 100%	269 100%	415 100%	419 100%	534 100%	352 100%	401 100%	1341 100%	1539 100%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q765_2. What are your expectations about placing restrictions on purchasing/registering a domain using each of the following gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 91

2. .net

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
STRICT/SOME RESTRICTIONS (NET)	262 34%	1547 60% EGI	1809 54%	2163 65% ABCHJ	105 51% A	280 61% E	139 52% A	230 55%	211 50% A	300 56%	202 57% A	294 73% KDFHJ	890 66% AEGIKBEGIKCEGK	1059 69% DFHJ
Strict purchase restrictions should be required	57 7%	429 17% I	486 14% I	625 19% ABCHJ	26 13% A	82 18% J	39 14% A	61 15%	44 11%	60 11%	60 17% AIII	98 24% KDFHJ	260 19% AEIBEICEI	324 21% DHJ
Some purchase restrictions should be required	205 27%	1118 43% G	1323 39%	1538 46% ABCH	79 38% A	198 43%	100 37% A	169 41%	167 40% A	240 45%	142 40% A	196 49% KH	630 47% AEGIKBEGIKCEGK	735 48% DH
No purchase restrictions should be required	507 66% DEGIKM	1009 39% DM	1516 45% DM	1186 35% LN	97 47% MBMM	180 39% LN	128 48% MBMM	185 45% DLN	197 47% MBMM	234 44% DLN	148 42% LMMM	107 27% A	439 33%	480 31%
Not Sure	-	30 1% DM	30 1% D	-	5 2% FAMMCM	-	2 1% A	-	11 3% JAKMBKMKCM	-	-	-	10 1% NA	-
Decline to Answer	-	2 *	2 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 *	-
Sigma	769 100%	2588 100%	3357 100%	3349 100%	207 100%	460 100%	269 100%	415 100%	419 100%	534 100%	352 100%	401 100%	1341 100%	1539 100%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q765_3. What are your expectations about placing restrictions on purchasing/registering a domain using each of the following gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 92

3. .info

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
STRICT/SOME RESTRICTIONS (NET)	300 39%	1643 63% I	1943 58%	2119 63% ACH	130 63% A	289 63% H	165 61% A	223 54%	232 55% A	327 61% H	209 59% A	251 63% H AGIKBGIKCGIK	907 68%	1029 67% DHJ
Strict purchase restrictions should be required	67 9%	444 17%	511 15%	537 16% AJ	36 17% A	85 18% J	43 16% A	58 14%	60 14% A	57 11%	62 18% A	81 20% DHJ	243 18% AC	256 17% J
Some purchase restrictions should be required	233 30%	1199 46% I	1432 43%	1582 47% ACHL	94 45% A	204 44%	122 45% A	165 40%	172 41% A	270 51% IHL	147 42% A	170 42% AIKBIKCIK	664 50%	773 50% DFHL
No purchase restrictions should be required	469 61% DEGIKM	913 35% M	1382 41% DEM	1230 37% N	71 34%	171 37%	103 38% MMM	192 46% GDFJLN	178 42% EMBEMEM	207 39% N	141 40% MBMM	150 37%	420 31%	510 33%
Not Sure	- -	30 1% D	30 1% D	- -	6 3% FAGKMBGKMGKGM	- -	1 * -	- -	9 2% JAMMCM	- -	2 1% A	- -	12 1% NA	- -
Decline to Answer	-	2 *	2 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 *	-
Sigma	769 100%	2588 100%	3357 100%	3349 100%	207 100%	460 100%	269 100%	415 100%	419 100%	534 100%	352 100%	401 100%	1341 100%	1539 100%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q765_4. What are your expectations about placing restrictions on purchasing/registering a domain using each of the following gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 93

4. .org

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
STRICT/SOME RESTRICTIONS (NET)	446 58%	1733 67% I	2179 65% I	2417 72% ABCHJ	147 71% AIII	339 74% HJ	171 64% I	255 61% I	247 59% I	349 65% I	224 64% I	312 78% KDHJ	944 70% AGIKBGIKCGIK	1162 76% MDHJ
Strict purchase restrictions should be required	186 24% I	620 24% I	806 24% I	925 28% BCJ	59 29% III	149 32% DJ	70 26% III	111 27% J	75 18% I	101 19% I	83 24% I	133 33% KDHJN	333 25% III	431 28% J
Some purchase restrictions should be required	260 34%	1113 43%	1373 41%	1492 45% ACH	88 43% A	190 41% H	101 38% I	144 35% I	172 41% A	248 46% H	141 40% A	179 45% H	611 46% AGBGCG	731 47% DFH
No purchase restrictions should be required	323 42% DEM	826 32% DM	1149 34% DEM	932 28% LN	55 27% I	121 26% I	96 36% EMEMEM	160 39% DFLN	162 39% EMBEMCEM	185 35% DFLN	127 36% LEMEMEM	89 22% I	386 29% N	377 24% I
Not Sure	-	26 1% D	26 1% D	-	5 2% FAGKMBGKMGKGM	-	1 * I	-	10 2% JAGKMBGKMGKGM	-	1 * I	-	9 1% NA	-
Decline to Answer	-	3 * D	3 * I	-	-	-	1 * I	-	-	-	-	-	2 * I	-
Sigma	769 100%	2588 100%	3357 100%	3349 100%	207 100%	460 100%	269 100%	415 100%	419 100%	534 100%	352 100%	401 100%	1341 100%	1539 100%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q765_5. What are your expectations about placing restrictions on purchasing/registering a domain using each of the following gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 94

5. .cn

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	2**	548	550	551	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	548	551
STRICT/SOME RESTRICTIONS (NET)	-	375	375	380	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	375	380
	-	68%	68%	69%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	68% C	69%
Strict purchase restrictions should be required	-	114	114	126	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	114	126
	-	21%	21%	23%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	21%	23%
Some purchase restrictions should be required	-	261	261	254	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	261	254
	-	48%	47%	46%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	48%	46%
No purchase restrictions should be required	2	170	172	171	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	170	171
	100%	31%	31% M	31%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	31%	31%
Not Sure	-	3	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	-
	-	1%	1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%	-
Sigma	2	548	550	551	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	548	551
	100%	100%	100%	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%	100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q765_6. What are your expectations about placing restrictions on purchasing/registering a domain using each of the following gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 95

6. .vn

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	..**	52*	52*	52*	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	52*	52*
STRICT/SOME RESTRICTIONS (NET)	-	35	35	43	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	35	43
	-	67%	67%	83%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	67%	83%
Strict purchase restrictions should be required	-	16	16	19	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	16	19
	-	31%	31%	37%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	31%	37%
Some purchase restrictions should be required	-	19	19	24	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	19	24
	-	37%	37%	46%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	37%	46%
No purchase restrictions should be required	-	17	17	9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	17	9
	-	33%	33%	17%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	33%	17%
Sigma	-	52	52	52	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	52	52
	-	100%	100%	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%	100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q765_7. What are your expectations about placing restrictions on purchasing/registering a domain using each of the following gTLDs?

7. .ph

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	26**	76*	102	101	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	76*	101
STRICT/SOME RESTRICTIONS (NET)	21 81%	63 83%	84 82%	88 87%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	63 83%	88 87%
Strict purchase restrictions should be required	8 31%	26 34%	34 33%	34 34%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	26 34%	34 34%
Some purchase restrictions should be required	13 50%	37 49%	50 49%	54 53%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	37 49%	54 53%
No purchase restrictions should be required	5 19%	13 17%	18 18%	13 13%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	13 17%	13 13%
Sigma	26 100%	76 100%	102 100%	101 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	76 100%	101 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q765_8. What are your expectations about placing restrictions on purchasing/registering a domain using each of the following gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 97

8. .jp

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	..	176	176	176	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	176	176
STRICT/SOME RESTRICTIONS (NET)	-	121 69%	121 69%	122 69%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	121 69%	122 69%
Strict purchase restrictions should be required	-	37 21%	37 21%	29 16%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	37 21%	29 16%
Some purchase restrictions should be required	-	84 48%	84 48%	93 53%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	84 48%	93 53%
No purchase restrictions should be required	-	53 30%	53 30%	54 31%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	53 30%	54 31%
Not Sure	-	2 1%	2 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 1%	-
Sigma	-	176 100%	176 100%	176 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	176 100%	176 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q765_9. What are your expectations about placing restrictions on purchasing/registering a domain using each of the following gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 98

9. .kr

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	32*	69*	101	101	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	69*	101
STRICT/SOME RESTRICTIONS (NET)	14 44%	50 72%	64 63%	67 66% A	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	50 72% AC	67 66%
Strict purchase restrictions should be required	3 9%	11 16%	14 14%	21 21%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	11 16%	21 21%
Some purchase restrictions should be required	11 34%	39 57%	50 50%	46 46%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	39 57% AC	46 46%
No purchase restrictions should be required	18 56% DM	17 25%	35 35% M	34 34%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	17 25%	34 34%
Not Sure	-	2 3%	2 2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 3%	-
Sigma	32 100%	69 100%	101 100%	101 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	69 100%	101 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q765_10. What are your expectations about placing restrictions on purchasing/registering a domain using each of the following gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 99

10. .ru

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	57*	73*	130	128	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	73*	128
STRICT/SOME RESTRICTIONS (NET)	19 33%	30 41%	49 38%	75 59% ABC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	30 41%	75 59% M
Strict purchase restrictions should be required	3 5%	6 8%	9 7%	23 18% AC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6 8%	23 18%
Some purchase restrictions should be required	16 28%	24 33%	40 31%	52 41%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	24 33%	52 41%
No purchase restrictions should be required	38 67% D	43 59% D	81 62% D	53 41%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	43 59% N	53 41%
Sigma	57 100%	73 100%	130 100%	128 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	73 100%	128 100%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q765_11. What are your expectations about placing restrictions on purchasing/registering a domain using each of the following gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 100

11. .in

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	27**	298	325	330	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	298	330
STRICT/SOME RESTRICTIONS (NET)	12 44%	219 73%	231 71%	246 75%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	219 73% C	246 75%
Strict purchase restrictions should be required	4 15%	108 36%	112 34%	106 32%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	108 36% C	106 32%
Some purchase restrictions should be required	8 30%	111 37%	119 37%	140 42%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	111 37%	140 42%
No purchase restrictions should be required	15 56%	76 26%	91 28% M	84 25%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	76 26%	84 25%
Not Sure	-	1 *	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 *	-
Decline to Answer	-	2 1%	2 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 1%	-
Sigma	27 100%	298 100%	325 100%	330 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	298 100%	330 100%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q765_12. What are your expectations about placing restrictions on purchasing/registering a domain using each of the following gTLDs?

12. .id

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	52*	49*	101	100	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	49*	100
STRICT/SOME RESTRICTIONS (NET)	26 50%	25 51%	51 50%	53 53%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	25 51%	53 53%
Strict purchase restrictions should be required	15 29%	10 20%	25 25%	23 23%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10 20%	23 23%
Some purchase restrictions should be required	11 21%	15 31%	26 26%	30 30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15 31%	30 30%
No purchase restrictions should be required	26 50%	24 49%	50 50%	47 47%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	24 49%	47 47%
Sigma	52 100%	49 100%	101 100%	100 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	49 100%	100 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q765_13. What are your expectations about placing restrictions on purchasing/registering a domain using each of the following gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 102

13. .ng

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	17**	190	207	200	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	190	200	..**	..**
STRICT/SOME RESTRICTIONS (NET)	7 41%	124 65%	131 63%	147 74% C	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	124 65% C	147 74%	- -	- -
Strict purchase restrictions should be required	3 18%	47 25%	50 24%	54 27%	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	47 25%	54 27%	- -	- -
Some purchase restrictions should be required	4 24%	77 41%	81 39%	93 47%	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	77 41%	93 47%	- -	- -
No purchase restrictions should be required	10 59%	66 35%	76 37% DK	53 27%	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	66 35%	53 27%	- -	- -
Sigma	17 100%	190 100%	207 100%	200 100%	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	190 100%	200 100%	- -	- -

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q765_14. What are your expectations about placing restrictions on purchasing/registering a domain using each of the following gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 103

14. .za

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	19**	82*	101	101	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	82*	101	..**	..**
STRICT/SOME RESTRICTIONS (NET)	7 37%	43 52%	50 50%	78 77% BC	-	-	-	-	-	-	43 52%	78 77% K	-	-
Strict purchase restrictions should be required	3 16%	16 20%	19 19%	27 27%	-	-	-	-	-	-	16 20%	27 27%	-	-
Some purchase restrictions should be required	4 21%	27 33%	31 31%	51 50% BC	-	-	-	-	-	-	27 33%	51 50% K	-	-
No purchase restrictions should be required	12 63%	39 48% D	51 50% D	23 23%	-	-	-	-	-	-	39 48% L	23 23%	-	-
Sigma	19 100%	82 100%	101 100%	101 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	82 100%	101 100%	-	-

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q765_15. What are your expectations about placing restrictions on purchasing/registering a domain using each of the following gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 104

15. .eg

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	26**	80*	106	100	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	80*	100	..**	..**
STRICT/SOME RESTRICTIONS (NET)	20 77%	55 69%	75 71%	78 78%	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	55 69%	78 78%	- -	- -
Strict purchase restrictions should be required	5 19%	16 20%	21 20%	26 26%	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	16 20%	26 26%	- -	- -
Some purchase restrictions should be required	15 58%	39 49%	54 51%	52 52%	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	39 49%	52 52%	- -	- -
No purchase restrictions should be required	6 23%	24 30%	30 28%	22 22%	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	24 30%	22 22%	- -	- -
Not Sure	- -	1 1%	1 1%	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	1 1%	- -	- -	- -
Sigma	26 100%	80 100%	106 100%	100 100%	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	80 100%	100 100%	- -	- -

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q765_16. What are your expectations about placing restrictions on purchasing/registering a domain using each of the following gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 105

16. .co

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	61*	64*	125	125	..**	..**	64*	125	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**
STRICT/SOME RESTRICTIONS (NET)	24 39%	35 55%	59 47%	74 59% A	- -	- -	35 55%	74 59%	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -
Strict purchase restrictions should be required	6 10%	10 16%	16 13%	14 11%	- -	- -	10 16%	14 11%	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -
Some purchase restrictions should be required	18 30%	25 39%	43 34%	60 48% AC	- -	- -	25 39%	60 48%	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -
No purchase restrictions should be required	37 61% D	29 45%	66 53%	51 41%	- -	- -	29 45%	51 41%	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -
Sigma	61 100%	64 100%	125 100%	125 100%	- -	- -	64 100%	125 100%	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q765_17. What are your expectations about placing restrictions on purchasing/registering a domain using each of the following gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 106

17. .ar

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	32*	68*	100	104	..**	..**	68*	104	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**
STRICT/SOME RESTRICTIONS (NET)	10 31%	29 43%	39 39%	48 46%	- -	- -	29 43%	48 46%	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -
Strict purchase restrictions should be required	2 6%	13 19% D	15 15%	9 9%	- -	- -	13 19% H	9 9%	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -
Some purchase restrictions should be required	8 25%	16 24%	24 24%	39 38% C	- -	- -	16 24%	39 38%	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -
No purchase restrictions should be required	22 69%	39 57%	61 61%	56 54%	- -	- -	39 57%	56 54%	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -
Sigma	32 100%	68 100%	100 100%	104 100%	- -	- -	68 100%	104 100%	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q765_18. What are your expectations about placing restrictions on purchasing/registering a domain using each of the following gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 107

18. .br

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	38*	137	175	186	..**	..**	137	186	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**
STRICT/SOME RESTRICTIONS (NET)	15 39%	73 53%	88 50%	111 60% A	- -	- -	73 53%	111 60%	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -
Strict purchase restrictions should be required	5 13%	20 15%	25 14%	40 22%	- -	- -	20 15%	40 22%	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -
Some purchase restrictions should be required	10 26%	53 39%	63 36%	71 38%	- -	- -	53 39%	71 38%	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -
No purchase restrictions should be required	23 61% D	63 46%	86 49%	75 40%	- -	- -	63 46%	75 40%	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -
Decline to Answer	-	1 1%	1 1%	-	-	-	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sigma	38 100%	137 100%	175 100%	186 100%	-	-	137 100%	186 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q765_19. What are your expectations about placing restrictions on purchasing/registering a domain using each of the following gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 108

19. .it

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	28**	26**	54*	50*	..**	..**	..**	..**	26**	50*	..**	..**	..**	..**
STRICT/SOME RESTRICTIONS (NET)	9 32%	9 35%	18 33%	28 56% C	- -	- -	- -	- -	9 35%	28 56%	- -	- -	- -	- -
Strict purchase restrictions should be required	1 4%	2 8%	3 6%	8 16%	- -	- -	- -	- -	2 8%	8 16%	- -	- -	- -	- -
Some purchase restrictions should be required	8 29%	7 27%	15 28%	20 40%	- -	- -	- -	- -	7 27%	20 40%	- -	- -	- -	- -
No purchase restrictions should be required	19 68%	16 62%	35 65% D	22 44%	- -	- -	- -	- -	16 62%	22 44%	- -	- -	- -	- -
Not Sure	- -	1 4%	1 2%	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	1 4%	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -
Sigma	28 100%	26 100%	54 100%	50 100%	- -	- -	- -	- -	26 100%	50 100%	- -	- -	- -	- -

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q765_20. What are your expectations about placing restrictions on purchasing/registering a domain using each of the following gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 109

20. .tr

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	5**	45*	50*	50*	..**	..**	..**	..**	45*	50*	..**	..**	..**	..**
STRICT/SOME RESTRICTIONS (NET)	3 60%	29 64%	32 64%	32 64%	- -	- -	- -	- -	29 64%	32 64%	- -	- -	- -	- -
Strict purchase restrictions should be required	2 40%	9 20%	11 22%	14 28%	- -	- -	- -	- -	9 20%	14 28%	- -	- -	- -	- -
Some purchase restrictions should be required	1 20%	20 44%	21 42%	18 36%	- -	- -	- -	- -	20 44%	18 36%	- -	- -	- -	- -
No purchase restrictions should be required	2 40%	15 33%	17 34%	18 36%	- -	- -	- -	- -	15 33%	18 36%	- -	- -	- -	- -
Not Sure	- -	1 2%	1 2%	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	1 2%	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -
Sigma	5 100%	45 100%	50 100%	50 100%	- -	- -	- -	- -	45 100%	50 100%	- -	- -	- -	- -

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q765_21. What are your expectations about placing restrictions on purchasing/registering a domain using each of the following gTLDs?

21. .es

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi-straits	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	12**	38*	50*	50*	-**	-**	-**	-**	38*	50*	-**	-**	-**	-**
STRICT/SOME RESTRICTIONS (NET)	6 50%	17 45%	23 46%	27 54%	-	-	-	-	17 45%	27 54%	-	-	-	-
Strict purchase restrictions should be required	1 8%	1 3%	2 4%	4 8%	-	-	-	-	1 3%	4 8%	-	-	-	-
Some purchase restrictions should be required	5 42%	16 42%	21 42%	23 46%	-	-	-	-	16 42%	23 46%	-	-	-	-
No purchase restrictions should be required	6 50%	19 50%	25 50%	23 46%	-	-	-	-	19 50%	23 46%	-	-	-	-
Not Sure	-	1 3%	1 2%	-	-	-	-	-	1 3%	-	-	-	-	-
Decline to Answer	-	1 3%	1 2%	-	-	-	-	-	1 3%	-	-	-	-	-
Sigma	12 100%	38 100%	50 100%	50 100%	-	-	-	-	38 100%	50 100%	-	-	-	-
Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing														

Q765_22. What are your expectations about placing restrictions on purchasing/registering a domain using each of the following gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 111

22. .pl

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	..	53*	53*	53*	..	..	..	..	53*	53*	..	..	..	..
STRICT/SOME RESTRICTIONS (NET)	-	20	20	24	-	-	-	-	20	24	-	-	-	-
	-	38%	38%	45%	-	-	-	-	38%	45%	-	-	-	-
Strict purchase restrictions should be required	-	2	2	7	-	-	-	-	2	7	-	-	-	-
	-	4%	4%	13%	-	-	-	-	4%	13%	-	-	-	-
Some purchase restrictions should be required	-	18	18	17	-	-	-	-	18	17	-	-	-	-
	-	34%	34%	32%	-	-	-	-	34%	32%	-	-	-	-
No purchase restrictions should be required	-	32	32	29	-	-	-	-	32	29	-	-	-	-
	-	60%	60%	55%	-	-	-	-	60%	55%	-	-	-	-
Not Sure	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
	-	2%	2%	-	-	-	-	-	2%	-	-	-	-	-
Sigma	-	53	53	53	-	-	-	-	53	53	-	-	-	-
	-	100%	100%	100%	-	-	-	-	100%	100%	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q765_23. What are your expectations about placing restrictions on purchasing/registering a domain using each of the following gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 112

23. .uk

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	26**	74*	100	100	..**	..**	..**	..**	74*	100	..**	..**	..**	..**
STRICT/SOME RESTRICTIONS (NET)	14 54%	41 55%	55 55%	71 71% BC	-	-	-	-	41 55%	71 71% I	-	-	-	-
Strict purchase restrictions should be required	3 12%	16 22%	19 19%	21 21%	-	-	-	-	16 22%	21 21%	-	-	-	-
Some purchase restrictions should be required	11 42%	25 34%	36 36%	50 50% BC	-	-	-	-	25 34%	50 50% I	-	-	-	-
No purchase restrictions should be required	12 46%	32 43%	44 44% D	29 29%	-	-	-	-	32 43%	29 29%	-	-	-	-
Not Sure	-	1 1%	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-
Sigma	26 100%	74 100%	100 100%	100 100%	-	-	-	-	74 100%	100 100%	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q765_24. What are your expectations about placing restrictions on purchasing/registering a domain using each of the following gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 113

24. .fr

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	26**	75*	101	106	..**	..**	..**	..**	75*	106	..**	..**	..**	..**
STRICT/SOME RESTRICTIONS (NET)	20 77%	33 44%	53 52% I	66 62% B	-	-	-	-	33 44%	66 62% I	-	-	-	-
Strict purchase restrictions should be required	6 23%	9 12%	15 15%	19 18%	-	-	-	-	9 12%	19 18%	-	-	-	-
Some purchase restrictions should be required	14 54%	24 32%	38 38% I	47 44%	-	-	-	-	24 32%	47 44%	-	-	-	-
No purchase restrictions should be required	6 23%	38 51%	44 44%	40 38%	-	-	-	-	38 51% C	40 38%	-	-	-	-
Not Sure	-	4 5% D	4 4% D	-	-	-	-	-	4 5% J	-	-	-	-	-
Sigma	26 100%	75 100%	101 100%	106 100%	-	-	-	-	75 100%	106 100%	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q765_25. What are your expectations about placing restrictions on purchasing/registering a domain using each of the following gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 114

25. .de

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	17**	108	125	125	..**	..**	..**	..**	108	125	..**	..**	..**	..**
STRICT/SOME RESTRICTIONS (NET)	5 29%	57 53%	62 50%	63 50%	- -	- -	- -	- -	57 53%	63 50%	- -	- -	- -	- -
Strict purchase restrictions should be required	- -	18 17%	18 14%	20 16%	- -	- -	- -	- -	18 17%	20 16%	- -	- -	- -	- -
Some purchase restrictions should be required	5 29%	39 36%	44 35%	43 34%	- -	- -	- -	- -	39 36%	43 34%	- -	- -	- -	- -
No purchase restrictions should be required	12 71%	50 46%	62 50%	62 50%	- -	- -	- -	- -	50 46%	62 50%	- -	- -	- -	- -
Not Sure	- -	1 1%	1 1%	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	1 1%	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -
Sigma	17 100%	108 100%	125 100%	125 100%	- -	- -	- -	- -	108 100%	125 100%	- -	- -	- -	- -

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q765_26. What are your expectations about placing restrictions on purchasing/registering a domain using each of the following gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 115

26. .us

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	204	64*	268	255	64*	255	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**
STRICT/SOME RESTRICTIONS (NET)	122 60%	51 80%	173 65%	177 69% A	51 80% AC	177 69%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Strict purchase restrictions should be required	40 20%	20 31%	60 22%	75 29% A	20 31%	75 29%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Some purchase restrictions should be required	82 40%	31 48%	113 42%	102 40%	31 48%	102 40%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
No purchase restrictions should be required	82 40% DE	9 14%	91 34% E	78 31% B	9 14%	78 31% E	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Not Sure	-	4 6% D	4 1%	-	4 6% FAC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sigma	204 100%	64 100%	268 100%	255 100%	64 100%	255 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q765_27. What are your expectations about placing restrictions on purchasing/registering a domain using each of the following gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 116

27. .ca

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	23**	80*	103	105	80*	105	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**
STRICT/SOME RESTRICTIONS (NET)	15 65%	54 68%	69 67%	73 70%	54 68%	73 70%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Strict purchase restrictions should be required	6 26%	15 19%	21 20%	30 29%	15 19%	30 29%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Some purchase restrictions should be required	9 39%	39 49%	48 47%	43 41%	39 49%	43 41%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
No purchase restrictions should be required	8 35%	25 31%	33 32%	32 30%	25 31%	32 30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Not Sure	-	1 1%	1 1%	-	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sigma	23 100%	80 100%	103 100%	105 100%	80 100%	105 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q765_28. What are your expectations about placing restrictions on purchasing/registering a domain using each of the following gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 117

28. .mx

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	39*	63*	102	100	63*	100	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**
STRICT/SOME RESTRICTIONS (NET)	13 33%	29 46%	42 41%	63 63% ABC	29 46%	63 63% E	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Strict purchase restrictions should be required	2 5%	10 16%	12 12%	25 25% AC	10 16%	25 25%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Some purchase restrictions should be required	11 28%	19 30%	30 29%	38 38%	19 30%	38 38%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
No purchase restrictions should be required	26 67% D	33 52%	59 58% D	37 37%	33 52%	37 37%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Not Sure	-	1 2%	1 1%	-	1 2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sigma	39 100%	63 100%	102 100%	100 100%	63 100%	100 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q765_29. What are your expectations about placing restrictions on purchasing/registering a domain using each of the following gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 118

29. .eu

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	..**	..**	..**	484	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	484	..**	..**	..**	..**
STRICT/SOME RESTRICTIONS (NET)	-	-	-	316 65%	-	-	-	-	-	316 65%	-	-	-	-
Strict purchase restrictions should be required	-	-	-	73 15%	-	-	-	-	-	73 15%	-	-	-	-
Some purchase restrictions should be required	-	-	-	243 50%	-	-	-	-	-	243 50%	-	-	-	-
No purchase restrictions should be required	-	-	-	168 35%	-	-	-	-	-	168 35%	-	-	-	-
Sigma	-	-	-	484 100%	-	-	-	-	-	484 100%	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q767. We'd like to ask you another question about restrictions on registration of a gTLD. Do you feel each of the following restrictions should be enforced?

SUMMARY TABLE OF YES

Base: All Qualified Respondents

[illegible]

Q767 1. We'd like to ask you another question about restrictions on registration of a gTLD. Do you feel each of the following restrictions should be enforced?

1. Requirements for validated credentials related to the gTLD (e.g., must be a licensed contractor to register a .builder domain)

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- straunts	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	-.**	-.**	-.**	3349	-.**	460	-.**	415	-.**	534	-.**	401	-.**	1539
Yes	-	-	-	2481 74% FH	-	310 67%	-	276 67%	-	392 73% FH	-	298 74% FH	-	1205 78% DFHJ
No	-	-	-	868 26% N	-	150 33% DJLN	-	139 33% DJLN	-	142 27% N	-	103 26%	-	334 22%
Sigma	-	-	-	3349 100%	-	460 100%	-	415 100%	-	534 100%	-	401 100%	-	1539 100%
Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing														

Q767 2. We'd like to ask you another question about restrictions on registration of a gTLD. Do you feel each of the following restrictions should be enforced?

2. Validation that the person or company registering the site meets intended parameters (e.g., must be involved in the pharmaceutical industry to register a .pharmacy domain)

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	..**	..**	..**	3349	..**	460	..**	415	..**	534	..**	401	..**	1539
Yes	- -	- -	- -	2551 76% N	- -	365 79% N	- -	317 76%	- -	420 79% N	- -	310 77%	- -	1139 74%
No	- -	- -	- -	798 24%	- -	95 21%	- -	98 24%	- -	114 21%	- -	91 23%	- -	400 26% DFJ
Sigma	- -	- -	- -	3349 100%	- -	460 100%	- -	415 100%	- -	534 100%	- -	401 100%	- -	1539 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q767 3. We'd like to ask you another question about restrictions on registration of a gTLD. Do you feel each of the following restrictions should be enforced?

3. Requirements for local presence within a specific city, country, or region for a domain related to that place (e.g., someone registering .ca would have to be located in Canada)

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strafts	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	..	..	..	3349	..	460	..	415	..	534	..	401	..	1539
Yes	-	-	-	2362 71% HJ	-	350 76% DHJL	-	273 66%	-	349 65%	-	281 70%	-	1109 72% HJ
No	-	-	-	987 29% F	-	110 24%	-	142 34% DFN	-	185 35% DFN	-	120 30% F	-	430 28%
Sigma	-	-	-	3349 100%	-	460 100%	-	415 100%	-	534 100%	-	401 100%	-	1539 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q767 4. We'd like to ask you another question about restrictions on registration of a gTLD. Do you feel each of the following restrictions should be enforced?

4. Requirements for use of the name to be consistent with the meaning of the gTLD (e.g., use of a .net name must be for network operations purposes)

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia	
					(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)
Unweighted Base	..**	..**	..**	3349	..**	460	..**	415	..**	534	..**	401	..**	1539	
Yes	- -	- -	- -	2426 72% J	- -	333 72%	- -	305 73%	- -	365 68%	- -	305 76% J	- -	1118 73%	
No	- -	- -	- -	923 28%	- -	127 28%	- -	110 27%	- -	169 32% DL	- -	96 24%	- -	421 27%	
Sigma	- -	- -	- -	3349 100%	- -	460 100%	- -	415 100%	- -	534 100%	- -	401 100%	- -	1539 100%	
Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing															

Base: All Qualified Respondents

Q770. Does having purchase restrictions or requirements on a particular gTLD make it...?

16 Aug 2016
Table 124

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
More trustworthy	428 56% I	1602 62% I	2030 60% I	2308 69% ABCJ	137 66% AIII	320 70% J	189 70% AIIKBIKCIK	324 78% GDFJN	190 45% I	308 58% I	217 62% III	291 73% KJ	869 65% AIBICI	1065 69% MJ
Doesn't make a difference	232 30% DGKM	637 25% DG	869 26% DGM	666 20% H	52 25% GGG	98 21% H	34 13% I	43 10% J	146 35% JEDKMBECNCECKM	148 28% DFHLN	84 24% LGCG	70 17% H	321 24% NGGG	307 20% H
Less trustworthy	34 4% M	133 5% M	167 5% M	154 5% F	7 3% I	10 2% AEMBEMCEM	21 8% I	23 6% F	30 7% AMBMCN	33 6% FL	22 6% N	13 3% I	53 4% I	75 5% F
Not sure	75 10% DEM	215 8% DM	290 9% DM	221 7% I	11 5% I	32 7% I	25 9% I	25 6% JEDKMBECNCECKM	53 13% I	45 8% N	29 8% I	27 7% I	97 7% I	92 6% I
Decline to Answer	-	1 *	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 *	-
Sigma	769 100%	2588 100%	3357 100%	3349 100%	207 100%	460 100%	269 100%	415 100%	419 100%	534 100%	352 100%	401 100%	1341 100%	1539 100%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q780. How do you determine whether a website is legitimate or not?

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
					(A)		(B)		(C)		(D)		(E)	
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
Weighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
APPEARANCE/CONTENT (NET)	347 45% DEGIM	745 29% DM	1092 33% DM	628 19% N	69 33% FMMM	100 22% N	97 36% HMBMM	86 21% N	124 30% JMMM	111 21% N	137 39% LIMBIMCIM	84 21% N	318 24% N	247 16% N
Content/Information on site	210 27% DEIKM	386 15% DM	596 18% DIM	262 8% N	35 17% F	43 9% N	62 23% HIMBIMCIM	41 10% N	51 12% J	36 7% N	63 18% LIMIMIM	37 9% N	175 13% N	105 7% N
Initial appearance/layout/design	61 8% DKM	92 4% DM	153 5% DM	81 2% N	13 6% MBMM	14 3% N	16 6% HMBMM	11 3% N	24 6% MBMM	17 3% N	11 3% N	8 2% N	28 2% N	31 2% N
Look for contact information/Ability to contact site	37 5% DGIM	71 3% IM	108 3% IM	84 3% N	7 3% N	13 3% N	5 2% N	14 3% N	5 1% N	14 3% N	27 8% LEGIMBIMCEGIM	17 4% DN	27 2% N	26 2% N
Correct spelling/grammar	26 3% DGKM	20 1% M	46 1% DM	22 1% N	6 3% FGMBGMGM	3 1% N	-	2 * N	9 2% N	2 * N	4 1% MMM	7 2% DJN	1 * N	8 1% M
Finding something wrong/suspicious/illegal	21 3% D	110 4% DEI	131 4% DI	47 1% N	3 1% N	3 1% N	15 6% HAEIEIEI	6 1% N	9 2% N	6 1% N	29 8% LAIEIMBIMCEIM	3 1% N	54 4% N	29 2% D
Owner/Registered owner of site	20 3% M	33 1% N	53 2% N	76 2% BC	6 3% MBMM	14 3% N	3 1% N	8 2% N	6 1% N	13 2% N	3 1% N	13 3% K	15 1% N	28 2% N
Information/Personal information requested	16 2% DM	29 1% DM	45 1% DM	5 * N	6 3% FMBMM	1 * N	3 1% N	1 * N	6 1% J	1 * N	5 1% L	-	9 1% N	2 * N
Accuracy of information	12 2% IM	14 1% N	26 1% M	27 1% J	2 1% N	4 1% J	4 1% MBMM	7 2% DJ	1 * N	-	3 1% N	3 1% J	4 * N	13 1% J
From the services/What is offered	12 2% M	25 1% M	37 1% M	47 1% N	4 2% MMM	9 2% N	1 * N	4 1% N	5 1% N	5 1% N	9 3% GMGBMCGM	12 3% DHJN	6 * N	17 1% M
Site requesting payments	3 * N	18 1% N	21 1% N	12 * N	1 * N	2 * N	-	-	6 1% JAGGCG	-	2 1% N	2 * N	9 1% N	8 1% N
Look for "About Us" section	2 * N	20 1% M	22 1% M	37 1% ACN	-	6 1% N	-	1 * N	19 5% AEGIMBIMCEGIM	25 5% DFHLN	-	2 * N	1 * N	3 * N
Other appearance/content mentions	20 3% N	47 2% N	67 2% N	64 2% N	4 2% N	12 3% N	3 1% N	14 3% DLN	8 2% N	11 2% N	7 2% N	5 1% N	25 2% N	22 1% N
DOMAIN/NAME/EXTENSION (NET)	158 21% IKM	356 14% M	514 15% M	612 18% BC	34 16% N	76 17% N	51 19% IMBIMIM	109 26% GDFJLN	52 12% N	85 16% N	53 15% N	74 18% N	166 12% N	268 17% M
Domain/Domain name/Name	55 7% EI	149 6% N	204 6% EI	350 10% ABCJ	6 3% N	44 10% E	16 6% N	41 10% N	16 4% N	36 7% I	19 5% N	40 10% K	92 7% EIBEIEI	189 12% MDJ

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q780. How do you determine whether a website is legitimate or not?

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Weighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
If it has "https"/Make sure the "S" is in the "https" link	37 5% DM	89 3% M	126 4% DM	96 3% N	13 6% FMBMM	12 3% N	16 6% MBMM	31 7% DFJLN	17 4% MMM	18 3% N	15 4% MMM	11 3% N	28 2% N	24 2% N
Through URL	20 3% DM	24 1% M	44 1% M	32 1% N	5 2% MBMM	3 1% N	4 1% MMM	11 3% DFN	5 1% N	7 1% N	4 1% N	4 1% N	6 * N	7 * N
By it's extension	19 2% M	46 2% M	65 2% M	120 4% BC	6 3% N	13 3% N	8 3% MMM	26 6% DFLN	10 2% N	23 4% N	6 2% N	12 3% N	16 1% N	46 3% M
SSL/SSL certificate	19 2% DGIM	9 * M	28 1% M	18 1% N	1 * N	5 1% N	1 * N	2 * N	2 * N	3 1% N	3 1% MMM	5 1% N	2 * N	3 * N
Web address (Unspec.)	18 2% D	58 2% D	76 2% D	40 1% N	7 3% F	4 1% N	7 3% N	10 2% DN	6 1% N	6 1% N	8 2% N	4 1% N	30 2% N	16 1% N
Other domain/name/extension mentions	8 1% N	25 1% N	33 1% N	24 1% N	1 * N	1 * N	4 1% N	3 1% N	4 1% N	1 * N	4 1% N	7 2% DFJ	12 1% N	12 1% N
RESEARCH (NET)	147 19% I	551 21% GI	698 21% I	878 26% ABCHJ	37 18% III	125 27% EHJ	44 16% N	74 18% N	49 12% N	87 16% I	81 23% GIGIGI	123 31% KDHJ	340 25% AEGIBEGICEGI	469 30% MDHJ
Researching online/Internet searches	60 8% N	233 9% N	293 9% N	366 11% ABCHJ	17 8% N	73 16% EDHJN	19 7% N	32 8% N	29 7% N	34 6% AGIBGICGI	43 12% AGIBGICGI	73 18% KDHJN	125 9% N	154 10% J
Using specific sites that classify/provide information on sites (i.e., whois.org)	54 7% DEGIM	70 3% I	124 4% EGI	102 3% H	2 1% N	13 3% N	3 1% N	6 1% N	5 1% N	11 2% LEGIBEGIEGI	18 5% N	9 2% N	42 3% III	63 4% DHJ
Sites credibility/Being legitimate/trustworthy	22 3% N	95 4% D	117 3% D	84 3% L	8 4% N	7 2% N	9 3% N	12 3% N	14 3% N	11 2% N	11 3% L	4 1% N	53 4% N	50 3% DL
Check registration/If it's registered	7 1% N	129 5% EGIK	136 4% GI	194 6% ACFHJ	4 2% III	16 3% N	1 * N	15 4% G	1 * N	10 2% I	9 3% AGIGIGI	17 4% J	114 9% AEGIBEGICEGI	136 9% DFHJL
If it's verified/Can be verified	3 * N	45 2% I	48 1% I	103 3% ABCH	3 1% N	9 2% N	9 3% AIBICI	6 1% N	1 * N	15 3% I	8 2% AIII	14 3% N	24 2% AIII	59 4% MDH
Attempt to contact the site/Call/Email/Visit their location	- - N	- - N	- - N	38 1% ABC	- - N	3 1% N	- - N	7 2% G	- - N	6 1% I	- - N	8 2% K	- - N	14 1% M
Other research mentions	15 2% N	44 2% N	59 2% N	57 2% N	5 2% N	9 2% N	4 1% N	3 1% N	3 1% N	7 1% N	5 1% N	7 2% N	27 2% N	31 2% N
SAFETY PROTOCOLS (NET)	143 19% DM	374 14% DM	517 15% DM	404 12% FMBMM	41 20% N	56 12% N	45 17% MMM	94 23% DFJLN	68 16% MMM	66 12% N	78 22% LIMBIMCIN	62 15% DN	142 11% N	126 8% N
INTERNET SAFETY (SUB-NET)	52 7% DM	109 4% M	161 5% M	145 4% N	12 6% N	19 4% N	12 4% N	33 8% DFN	20 5% N	29 5% N	21 6% MMM	20 5% N	44 3% N	44 3% N

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q780. How do you determine whether a website is legitimate or not?

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Weighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
Security certificate	40 5% DKM	57 2% M	97 3% M	81 2% N	5 2% M	10 2% M	9 3% MMM	24 6% DFJLN	15 4% MBMM	13 2% M	9 3% B	10 2% M	19 1% M	24 2% M
Security (Unspec.)	12 2% M	35 1% M	47 1% M	42 1% M	2 1% M	7 2% M	2 1% M	4 1% M	5 1% M	10 2% M	9 3% B	5 1% M	17 1% M	16 1% M
Other internet safety mentions	2 * M	22 1% M	24 1% M	25 1% N	6 3% FAIMBIMCIM	2 * M	2 1% M	5 1% N	- - M	7 1% IN	4 1% III	6 1% N	10 1% M	5 * M
HARDWARE/SOFTWARE (SUB-NET)	42 5% DM	111 4% DM	153 5% DM	93 3% M	14 7% FMMM	14 3% M	9 3% M	18 4% DN	21 5% J	12 2% M	25 7% LGIMBGMCGM	11 3% M	42 3% M	38 2% M
Use of anti-virus software/virus protection	25 3% DM	46 2% M	71 2% M	58 2% M	4 2% M	9 2% M	8 3% MMM	12 3% M	11 3% MMM	9 2% M	8 2% M	7 2% M	15 1% M	21 1% M
Malware/Spyware/Spam software	14 2% DG	38 1% DGM	52 2% DGM	6 * M	6 3% FGMGMGM	1 * M	- - M	2 * M	6 1% JGGG	1 * M	13 4% LGIMBGMCGM	1 * M	13 1% N	1 * M
Use of protection software/filter/program	5 1% M	21 1% M	26 1% M	31 1% M	2 1% M	6 1% M	- - M	4 1% M	4 1% M	3 1% M	3 1% M	3 1% M	12 1% M	15 1% M
Other hardware/software mentions	1 * D	7 * D	8 * D	2 * M	2 1% FIMIMCIM	- - M	1 * M	1 * M	- - M	- - M	2 1% M	- - M	2 * M	1 * M
ALERTS/FLAGS/POP-UPS (SUB-NET)	35 5% DGIM	50 2% DM	85 3% DM	42 1% N	10 5% FIMBIMCIM	6 1% M	5 2% M	12 3% DN	8 2% M	7 1% M	8 2% M	6 1% M	19 1% M	11 1% M
If site has pop-ups/unwanted offers	20 3% DIM	20 1% D	40 1% DM	9 * N	5 2% MBMM	5 1% DJLN	2 1% M	3 1% JN	3 1% M	- - M	3 1% M	- - M	7 1% N	1 * M
Browser flags/Alerts if site is unsafe	11 1% M	21 1% M	32 1% M	27 1% N	4 2% FMMM	1 * M	2 1% M	7 2% DFN	4 1% M	7 1% N	3 1% M	5 1% M	8 1% M	7 * M
Warnings/Warning tabs	4 1% D	5 * M	9 * D	2 * M	1 * M	- - M	- - M	1 * M	- - M	- - M	- - M	1 * M	4 * N	- - M
Other alerts/flags/pop-up mentions	2 * M	6 * M	8 * M	4 * M	- - M	- - M	1 * M	1 * M	2 * M	- - M	2 1% M	- - M	1 * M	3 * M
SITE SECURITY (SUB-NET)	14 2% M	69 3% M	83 2% M	65 2% N	7 3% M	7 2% M	6 2% M	10 2% M	13 3% M	9 2% M	20 6% AGIMBGMCGM	17 4% DFJN	23 2% M	22 1% M
Terms and conditions	4 1% M	26 1% M	30 1% M	40 1% N	2 1% M	4 1% M	2 1% M	7 2% N	8 2% AMMCM	7 1% M	4 1% M	12 3% DFN	10 1% M	10 1% M
Trademarks/Copyright	3 * M	10 * M	13 * M	20 1% M	- - M	3 1% M	1 * M	3 1% M	1 * M	1 * M	4 1% MBMCM	2 * M	4 * M	11 1% M
Other site security mentions	7 1% D	35 1% DM	42 1% DM	5 * M	5 2% FMMM	- - M	3 1% H	- - M	5 1% M	1 * M	13 4% LAGIMBGMCGM	3 1% DN	9 1% N	1 * M

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q780. How do you determine whether a website is legitimate or not?

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Weighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
SYMBOLS/LOGOS (SUB-NET)	13 2%	61 2% M	74 2% M	90 3% N	4 2%	14 3% N	15 6% AEMBCECM	28 7% DFJLN	12 3% MMM	17 3% N	11 3% MMM	13 3% N	19 1%	18 1%
Security logos/symbols (Unspec.)	7 1%	24 1%	31 1%	19 1%	2 1%	3 1%	5 2%	5 1% N	2 *	4 1%	3 1%	2 *	12 1% N	5 *
Padlock symbol	6 1%	31 1% M	37 1% M	48 1% N	1 *	7 2% N	9 3% AEMBCECM	16 4% DFJN	8 2% MMM	9 2% N	7 2% MMM	8 2% N	6 *	8 1%
Other symbols/logos mentions	- -	7 * M	7 * M	24 1% ABCN	1 *	4 1%	2 1% AMMM	7 2% DN	2 *	5 1%	1 *	3 1%	1 *	5 *
PUBLIC AWARENESS/R ECOMMENDATIONS (NET)	75 10%	223 9%	298 9%	286 9% N	24 12%	50 11% JN	19 7%	35 8%	36 9%	39 7%	38 11%	47 12% DJN	106 8%	115 7%
Reviews/Comments/Co mplaints/Compliments	35 5%	139 5% M	174 5%	156 5% AMMCM	17 8%	29 6% JN	11 4%	18 4%	26 6% J	17 3%	26 7% MMM	30 7% DJN	59 4%	62 4%
How well known site is/Reputation	24 3% I	47 2%	71 2% I	75 2% I	3 1%	15 3% N	3 1%	8 2%	3 1%	14 3% I	10 3% III	11 3%	28 2%	27 2%
Through forums/blogs/articles	10 1% D	13 1%	23 1%	17 1%	-	2 *	2 1%	1 *	3 1%	5 1%	1 *	2 *	7 1%	7 *
Family/Friends referral/re commendations	5 1%	23 1%	28 1%	25 1% FAMBMCM	5 2%	-	3 1%	8 2% DFJN	3 1%	2 *	3 1%	4 1% F	9 1%	11 1%
Other public awareness/r ecommandations mentions	5 1%	11 *	16 *	31 1% BC	-	8 2%	1 *	2 *	3 1%	3 1%	-	4 1%	7 1%	14 1%
USAGE (NET)	75 10% IM	190 7% M	265 8% M	258 8% J	19 9%	49 11% DJL	20 7%	29 7%	25 6%	27 5%	42 12% LIMBIMCIM	27 7%	84 6%	126 8% MJ
Prior use/experience with it	24 3% DM	38 1% D	62 2% DM	23 1%	5 2%	4 1%	4 1%	2 *	7 2%	5 1%	6 2%	4 1%	16 1% N	8 1%
By trying it out/visiting it	21 3%	57 2%	78 2%	144 4% ABCH	3 1%	31 7% EDHJL	8 3%	7 2%	5 1%	18 3% I	7 2%	11 3%	34 3%	77 5% MH
Problems with links/broken links	16 2% DM	19 1%	35 1% M	37 1% N	3 1%	8 2% JN	2 1%	15 4% GDJLN	6 1% MMM	2 *	2 1%	4 1%	6 *	8 1%
Through site usage/Activity through users	4 1%	55 2% D	59 2% D	30 1% J	3 1%	3 1%	3 1%	4 1% J	4 1% J	-	23 7% LAEGMBEGIMCEIM	4 1% J	22 2% A	19 1% J
Other usage mentions	12 2% M	26 1% M	38 1% M	28 1%	5 2% MBMM	3 1%	4 1% MMM	4 1%	3 1%	2 *	8 2% MBMCM	4 1%	6 *	15 1%
MISCELLANEOUS (NET)	109 14% DM	280 11% D	389 12% DM	309 9%	24 12%	42 9%	27 10%	30 7%	62 15% MBMCM	67 13% DHLN	36 10%	30 7%	131 10%	140 9%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q780. How do you determine whether a website is legitimate or not?

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
					(E)		(G)		(I)		(K)		(M)	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Weighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
Common sense/Gut feeling	37 5% DGKM	66 3% DG	103 3% DG	53 2% HL	8 4% GGG	14 3% DHLN	1 *	2 *	11 3% GGG	13 2% HL	6 2% L	1 *	40 3% NGGG	23 1% L
Don't/Cannot determine if a website is legitimate	19 2% E	72 3% E	91 3% E	149 4% ABC	1 *	17 4% E	6 2%	13 3%	24 6% AEGMBEGMCEGM	41 8% DFHLN	10 3%	16 4%	31 2%	62 4% M
Through ads/advertisement	15 2% DM	35 1% DM	50 1% DM	23 1% FAIKMBIKMCIKM	9 4%	4 1% J	5 2%	3 1% J	7 2% J	-	4 1%	3 1% J	10 1%	13 1% J
Quality/Reliability of site	12 2% M	20 1% M	32 1% M	46 1% B	2 1%	5 1%	7 3% IKMBIKMCIKM	8 2%	3 1%	6 1%	1 *	5 1%	7 1%	22 1% M
Other mentions	29 4% D	90 3% D	119 4% D	41 1%	4 2%	3 1%	10 4% H	4 1%	18 4% J	9 2%	15 4% L	5 1%	43 3% N	20 1%
EXCLUSIVE (NET)	74 10%	458 18% K	532 16% K	679 20% ABCHL	40 19% AKKK	97 21% L	37 14% KKK	69 17%	99 24% AGKMBGKMCCKM	150 28% DFHLN	30 9%	54 13% K	252 19% AGKGKCGK	309 20% L
Illegible data	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
None	4 1% GK	53 2% GK	57 2% GK	66 2% AH	6 3% AGKGKCGK	6 1%	-	1 *	4 1%	11 2% H	1 *	3 1%	42 3% AGIKBGKICGK	45 3% DHL
Don't know	56 7%	244 9%	300 9%	409 12% ABCN	18 9%	56 12%	27 10%	54 13%	57 14% AKMBKMCCKM	92 17% DFLN	26 7%	41 10%	116 9%	166 11%
Declined to answer	14 2%	161 6% K	175 5% K	204 6% AHL	16 8% AKKK	35 8% HL	10 4% KKK	14 3%	38 9% AGKBGKCGK	47 9% DHL	3 1%	10 2% AGKGKCGK	94 7%	98 6% HL
Sigma	1282 167%	3461 134%	4743 141%	4388 131%	321 155%	641 139%	369 137%	584 141%	563 134%	682 128%	556 158%	554 138%	1652 123%	1927 125%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q785. Have you ever tried to identify who created a particular website?

	2015 Total Registrants				Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia	
					(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539	
Yes	585 76% DEGIKM	1247 48% I	1832 55% DEGIM	1713 51% BJ	96 46%	216 47%	123 46%	206 50% J	167 40%	228 43%	200 57%	225 56% DFJ	661 49% III	838 54% MDFJ	
No	184 24%	1319 51% K	1503 45%	1636 49% ACLN	108 52% AKCK	244 53% LN	145 54% AKCK	209 50% AKMBKMGCKM	242 58% DHLN	306 57% A	151 43%	176 44%	673 50% NAKCK	701 46%	
Not Sure	-	22 1% DM	22 1% D	-	3 1% FA	-	1 *	-	10 2%	-	1 *	-	7 1% NA	-	
Sigma	769 100%	2588 100%	3357 100%	3349 100%	207 100%	460 100%	269 100%	415 100%	419 100%	534 100%	352 100%	401 100%	1341 100%	1539 100%	
Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N Overlap formulae used.															

Q790. What did you use to try and figure this out?

Base: Tried To Identify

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	585	1247	1832	1713	96*	216	123	206	167	228	200	225	661	838
Weighted Base	585	1247	1832	1713	96*	216	123	206	167	228	200	225	661	838
ONLINE ACTIVITY (NET)	466 80% DEGIKM	678 54% M	1144 62% IM	1021 60% BN	53 55%	127 59%	83 67% IMBIMIM	144 70% DFJN	86 51%	131 57%	118 59%	144 64% N	338 51%	475 57% M
SPECIFIC SITE SEARCH (SUB-NET)	349 60% DEGIKM	277 22% M	626 34% DIM	450 26% BN	26 27% MMM	65 30% N	37 30% MBMM	63 31% N	34 20%	68 30% IN	61 31% IMBIMIM	66 29% N	119 18%	188 22% M
Whois search	309 53% DEGIKM	100 8% M	409 22% DEGIKM	149 9% N	13 14% MBMM	51 24% EDHJLN	13 11% MMM	16 8% N	19 11% MMM	25 11% N	28 14% MBMM	22 10% N	27 4%	35 4%
Google	29 5% DM	114 9% M	143 8% M	180 11% ACFN	11 11% AMMM	14 6% AIMBIMCIM	24 20% N	34 17% DFN	10 6%	31 14% IFN	30 15% AIMBIMCIM	39 17% DFN	39 6%	62 7%
Go Daddy	9 2% DM	2 * M	11 1% M	4 * N	- -	1 * N	- -	1 * N	- -	- -	2 1% MBMM	- -	- -	2 * N
DNS records	9 2% DM	2 * M	11 1% DM	1 * N	- -	- -	- -	- -	1 1% MMM	- -	1 1% N	1 * N	- -	- -
Baidu search	- - N	39 3% GIK	39 2% K	63 4% ACFHJL	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	39 6% AEGIKREGIKCEGIK	63 8% DFHJL
Denic	- - N	- - N	- - N	11 1% BCN	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	11 5% IDFHLN	- -	- -	- -	- -
Other specific site search mentions	36 6% GM	36 3% M	72 4% M	72 4% GGG	5 5% N	7 3% N	1 1% N	13 6% G	7 4% N	6 3% N	7 4% N	8 4% N	16 2% N	38 5% M
SOURCE OF SEARCH (SUB-NET)	107 18% DM	172 14% M	279 15% M	232 14% N	14 15% N	38 18% J	21 17% N	31 15% JMMM	29 17% N	24 11% N	34 17% MMM	33 15% N	74 11% N	106 13% N
HTML/Source Code	42 7% DKM	24 2% M	66 4% DKM	41 2% N	7 7% KMBKMKM	10 5% DN	5 4% MMM	7 3% KMBKMKM	9 5% N	7 3% N	2 1% N	5 2% N	1 * N	12 1% M
Domain/IP Address Search	34 6% D	64 5% D	98 5% D	63 4% J	3 3% N	9 4% J	2 2% N	4 2% N	10 6% J	2 1% N	15 8% LGGS	7 3% N	34 5% N	41 5% DJ
Using specific sites that classify/provide information on sites	10 2% N	18 1% N	28 2% N	18 1% N	1 1% N	2 1% N	- - N	1 * N	2 1% N	2 1% N	6 3% N	1 * N	9 1% N	12 1% N
Check website itself	9 2% N	39 3% N	48 3% N	57 3% AN	3 3% N	11 5% N	8 7% AMBMCIM	10 5% N	6 4% N	11 5% N	5 3% N	11 5% N	17 3% N	14 2% N
Social media/blogs	7 1% N	12 1% N	19 1% N	19 1% N	- -	1 * N	4 3% MBMCM	7 3% DFJN	1 1% N	- -	2 1% N	2 1% N	5 1% N	9 1% N

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base

Q790. What did you use to try and figure this out?

Base: Tried To Identify

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o Client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Weighted Base	585	1247	1832	1713	96*	216	123	206	167	228	200	225	661	838
Hosting options	6 1% D	4 *	10 1% D	2 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 1%	1 *	2 *	1 *
Online forums	3 1% D	10 1% D	13 1% D	1 *	1 1%	-	1 1%	1 * DN	3 2% J	-	-	-	5 1% N	-
Other source of search mentions	8 1%	8 1%	16 1%	44 3% BC	1 1%	8 4%	1 1%	2 1%	1 1%	3 1%	2 1%	6 3%	3 *	25 3% M
GENERAL ONLINE ACTIVITY (SUB-NET)	87 15%	282 23%	369 20%	422 25% ACF	20 21%	37 17%	33 27% A	61 30% FJ	32 19%	46 20%	37 19%	62 28% KF	160 24% AC	216 26% F
Internet search/Search engine (Unspec.)	64 11%	230 18%	294 16%	331 19% ACF	15 16%	29 13%	22 18% A	45 22% F	27 16%	34 15%	35 18% A	52 23% FJ	131 20% AC	171 20% F
Email	15 3% DM	20 2% M	35 2% DM	18 1%	4 4% MBMM	4 2% L	8 7% AIKMBIKMCKIM	7 3% DLN	2 1%	2 1%	2 1%	-	4 1%	5 1%
Wikipedia/Web Encyclopedia	2 *	5 *	7 *	21 1% BC	1 1%	2 1%	-	1 *	1 1%	3 1%	1 1%	4 2%	2 *	11 1% M
Online/Internet tools (Unspec.)	2 *	18 1%	20 1%	30 2% A	-	1 *	2 2%	2 1%	-	2 1%	-	3 1% AIBIKCIK	16 2%	22 3% D
Other general online activity mentions	5 1%	11 1%	16 1%	27 2%	-	2 1%	1 1%	6 3%	2 1%	5 2%	-	3 1%	8 1%	11 1%
SITE ATTRIBUTES/TRAD EMARKS (NET)	163 28% M	291 23% M	454 25% M	408 24% N	33 34% GMBGMCGM	66 31% DN	25 20%	48 23% GMBGMCGM	56 34%	59 26% N	69 35% GMBGMCGM	74 33% DHN	108 16%	161 19%
Through the footer/Bottom of page	40 7% DM	44 4% M	84 5% DM	40 2% N	6 6% MMM	8 4% N	5 4%	10 5% DN	7 4% MMM	4 2% MBMCM	15 8% MBMCM	11 5% DN	11 2%	7 1%
Owner of site/Who programmed/developed the website	32 5%	63 5%	95 5%	91 5% AGIMBGMCGIM	12 13% DJN	19 9%	4 3%	13 6%	5 3%	9 4%	14 7%	12 5%	28 4%	38 5%
Check registration/if it's registered/certificate	32 5% DKM	25 2% M	57 3% M	46 3%	4 4% MMM	9 4%	2 2%	4 2%	7 4% MBMM	5 2%	4 2%	10 4%	8 1%	18 2%
Company details/information	23 4%	62 5% M	85 5% M	86 5% N	4 4%	17 8% DN	7 6%	12 6% JAKGMBGIMCIGIM	27 16%	15 7% N	5 3%	16 7% KN	19 3%	26 3%
Site contact information	22 4% M	49 4% M	71 4% M	96 6% BCN	9 9% AIBIMCIM	15 7% N	5 4%	12 6% N	4 2%	26 11% IDHN	20 10% AIBIMCIM	18 8% N	11 2%	25 3%
Credits for the page/website	8 1% DM	4 *	12 1% D	2 *	-	1 * N	-	1 * N	1 1%	-	1 1%	-	2 *	-
Trademarks/Copyright	8 1% M	8 1%	16 1% M	11 1%	1 1%	2 1%	-	1 *	1 1%	1 *	4 2% MBMM	1 *	2 *	6 1%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base

Q790. What did you use to try and figure this out?

Base: Tried To Identify

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Weighted Base	585	1247	1832	1713	96*	216	123	206	167	228	200	225	661	838
Site's legal conditions	7 1% DM	4 *	11 1% M	6 *	-	1 *	-	-	3 2% MBMM	1 *	-	-	1 *	4 *
Website's administrator	4 1%	11 1%	15 1%	18 1% AMBMC	3 3% MCM	2 1%	2 2%	2 1%	1 1%	1 *	1 1%	3 1%	4 1%	10 1%
Privacy information link	3 1% D	-	3 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sites credibility/being legitimate/trustworthy	2 *	28 2%	30 2%	68 4% ABCH	3 3% A	10 5%	2 2%	3 1%	1 1%	4 2%	7 4% AC	10 4%	15 2% A	41 5% MHJ
Age/History of website	-	-	-	5 * C	-	3 1% DN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 *
Security/Security certificate	-	8 1%	8 *	10 1%	-	1 *	1 1% A	2 1%	1 1%	-	2 1% A	1 *	4 1%	6 1%
Other site attributes/trademarks mentions	15 3%	29 2%	44 2% D	24 1%	3 3%	2 1%	4 3% H	-	5 3%	2 1%	4 2%	6 3% H	13 2%	14 2%
OFFLINE ACTIVITY (NET)	8 1%	18 1%	26 1%	17 1%	2 2% F	-	4 3%	6 3% DFJLN	3 2%	1 *	2 1%	1 *	7 1%	9 1%
Telephone	6 1%	10 1%	16 1%	11 1%	-	-	4 3% KMBKMCKM	2 1%	3 2%	1 *	-	-	3 *	8 1%
Other offline activity mentions	2 *	8 1%	10 1%	7 * FAC	2 2%	-	-	4 2% DFJN	-	-	2 1%	1 *	4 1%	2 *
RESEARCH (NET)	6 1%	23 2%	29 2%	29 2%	1 1%	6 3% J	3 2%	3 1%	5 3% J	1 *	4 2%	8 4% DJN	10 2%	11 1%
Research (Unspec.)	3 1%	23 2% D	26 1%	17 1%	1 1%	6 3% DHJN	3 2% HA	-	5 3% JA	1 *	4 2%	4 2%	10 2%	6 1%
Other research mentions	3 1%	-	3 *	12 1% BC	-	-	-	3 1%	-	-	-	4 2% FJ	-	5 1% M
MISCELLANEOUS (NET)	35 6%	185 15% I	220 12% I	288 17% ACF	12 13% A	26 12%	14 11% A	27 13%	10 6%	33 14% I	21 11% A	30 13% AGIKBGKCGIK	128 19% AGIKBGKCGIK	172 21% DFHJL
Various means/ways	5 1%	5 *	10 1%	7 *	-	-	1 1%	1 *	-	1 *	-	-	4 1%	5 1%
Tools/Development tools (Unspec.)	5 1%	6 *	11 1%	10 1%	1 1%	-	-	1 *	-	1 *	1 1%	-	4 1%	8 1%
Reviews/Comments/Co mplaints/Compliments	4 1%	13 1%	17 1%	43 3% ABC	3 3% AMMCM	4 2%	-	8 4% G	1 1%	6 3% AMBMC	5 3%	9 4%	4 1%	16 2% M
Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N Overlap formulae used. * small base														

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base

Q790. What did you use to try and figure this out?

Base: Tried To Identify

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Weighted Base	585	1247	1832	1713	96*	216	123	206	167	228	200	225	661	838
Good/Positive response mentions	3 1%	31 2% K	34 2%	31 2% A	3 3% A	3 1%	2 2%	2 1%	4 2% A	6 3%	1 1%	1 *	21 3% AKKCK	19 2%
Use of software/filter/program	3 1%	20 2%	23 1%	20 1%	1 1%	-	2 2%	-	-	-	2 1%	2 1%	15 2% AIIIC	18 2% DFHJ
Curiosity/I just wanted to know	2 *	8 1%	10 1%	31 2% ABC	1 1%	4 2%	-	-	-	2 1%	-	2 1%	7 1% C	23 3% MDH
Friend/Family Help	1 *	13 1% D	14 1%	7 *	2 2% FA	-	1 1%	2 1%	-	1 *	3 2% A	1 *	7 1%	3 *
Information (Unspec.)	1 *	14 1%	15 1%	61 4% ABC	-	5 2%	1 1%	10 5% G	1 1%	6 3%	2 1%	9 4%	10 2% AC	31 4% M
Records/Record information	-	17 1% D	17 1%	11 1%	1 1% A	-	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	16 2% AIIKBIKCIK	10 1% D
Other	12 2%	61 5%	73 4%	75 4% A	1 1%	11 5%	7 6% A	5 2%	4 2%	9 4%	7 4%	7 3% AEIBEICEI	42 6%	43 5%
EXCLUSIVE (NET)	19 3%	163 13% DGK	182 10% GK	161 9% AHL	16 17% AGKGKCGK	25 12% HL	5 4%	10 5%	28 17% AGKGKCGK	28 12% HL	7 4%	6 3% NAGKBGKCGK	107 16% NAGKBGKCGK	92 11% DHL
Illegible data	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
None	3 1%	43 3% D	46 3%	31 2% A	4 4% A	4 2%	1 1%	-	2 1%	1 *	4 2%	2 1% NAGIBGICGI	32 5%	24 3% DHJ
Don't know	8 1%	25 2%	33 2%	45 3%	2 2%	5 2%	1 1%	6 3% AGKMBGRKCGKM	10 6% L	9 4% L	1 1%	2 1%	11 2%	23 3%
Declined to answer	8 1%	95 8% DGK	103 6% K	85 5% AHL	10 10% AGKGKCGK	16 7% HL	3 2%	4 2% AGKGKCGK	16 10% AGKGKCGK	18 8% DHL	2 1%	2 1% NAGKBGKCGK	64 10% NAGKBGKCGK	45 5% HL
Sigma	864 148%	1483 119%	2347 128%	2159 126%	142 148%	300 139%	150 122%	265 129%	210 126%	275 121%	251 126%	299 133%	730 110%	1020 122%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base

Q830x1. To the best of your knowledge, why have new gTLDs been created?

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
Weighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
CONSUMER DEMAND (NET)	407 53%	1016 39%	1423 42%	1040 31%	90 43%	175 38%	98 36%	128 31%	157 37%	156 29%	168 48%	128 32%	503 38%	453 29%
DEGIM		D	DGIM			DHJN			J		LGIMBGIMCGIM		N	
Availability/Ran out/Shortage of names/domains	207 27%	294 11%	501 15%	256 8%	36 17%	60 13%	14 5%	15 4%	60 14%	50 9%	37 11%	23 6%	147 11%	108 7%
DEGIKM		DG	DGKM		H	GKMBGIMCGIM	DHLN		JGBGG	HL	LGGG		NGGG	H
Provide/Offer new/variety /choices/options	77 10%	194 7%	271 8%	208 6%	14 7%	22 5%	36 13%	42 10%	30 7%	32 6%	36 10%	44 11%	78 6%	68 4%
DM		M	DM		N		EIMBEIMCEIM	DFJN			MBMM	DFJN		
Create new/additional domains/websites	59 8%	210 8%	269 8%	280 8%	17 8%	42 9%	29 11%	34 8%	36 9%	33 6%	43 12%	33 8%	85 6%	138 9%
J		M	M		J		MMM				AMBMM			MJ
To customize/add personality/meet specific needs	59 8%	144 6%	203 6%	155 5%	17 8%	18 4%	9 3%	24 6%	21 5%	16 3%	44 13%	26 6%	53 4%	71 5%
DGM		M	DGM		J	FGMGMGM		J			LAGIMBGIMCGIM		J	
It's needed/Growing demand	55 7%	237 9%	292 9%	254 8%	13 6%	47 10%	21 8%	31 7%	31 7%	42 8%	19 5%	19 5%	153 11%	115 7%
DL		DK	K		L		DL						NAEIKBEIKCEIK	
Other consumer demand mentions	1 *	37 1%	38 1%	14 *	2 1%	3 1%	4 1%	-	2 *	2 *	11 3%	1 *	18 1%	8 1%
HA		D	D				HA				LAIMBIMCIM		NA	
PROVIDE STRUCTURE (NET)	227 30%	372 14%	599 18%	657 20%	48 23%	107 23%	53 20%	106 26%	37 9%	74 14%	49 14%	71 18%	185 14%	299 19%
DGIKM		I	IKM		BJ	IKMBIKMCIKM	DJL	IMBIMIM	DJLN	I	III		III	MJ
To identify/differentiate between businesses/sites	142 18%	191 7%	333 10%	286 9%	26 13%	52 11%	33 12%	56 13%	20 5%	24 4%	25 7%	35 9%	87 6%	119 8%
DEGIKM		I	IM		J	IKMBIKMIKM	DJN	IKMBIKMIKM	DJLN			J		J
To organize/categorize the internet	61 8%	52 2%	113 3%	140 4%	8 4%	24 5%	9 3%	25 6%	3 1%	15 3%	2 1%	4 1%	30 2%	72 5%
DEGIKM		IK	IKM		BL	IKIKIK	L	IKIKIK	JL	I			IKIKIK	ML
Too many/Large volume of sites/domains	21 3%	85 3%	106 3%	151 5%	10 5%	27 6%	7 3%	15 4%	8 2%	23 4%	20 6%	20 5%	40 3%	66 4%
I				ABC	III					I	AIMBIMCIM			
Reduce redundancy/sites with the same name	11 1%	19 1%	30 1%	67 2%	3 1%	12 3%	3 1%	6 1%	2 *	8 1%	1 *	6 1%	10 1%	35 2%
BC														M
To differentiate different locations/countries	-	-	-	33 1%	-	4 1%	-	6 1%	-	3 1%	-	7 2%	-	13 1%
ABC								G				K		M
Other provide structure mentions	1 *	40 2%	41 1%	36 1%	3 1%	4 1%	4 1%	7 2%	5 1%	2 *	3 1%	6 1%	25 2%	17 1%
A				A	A		A	J	A				AC	
IMPROVE BUSINESS (NET)	135 18%	188 7%	323 10%	227 7%	17 8%	32 7%	24 9%	33 8%	32 8%	30 6%	31 9%	44 11%	84 6%	88 6%
DEGIKM		M	DM		N							DFJN		

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q830x1. To the best of your knowledge, why have new gTLDs been created?

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Weighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
Economic interests/Make money/Profits	86 11% DEGIKM	47 2% M	133 4% DGKM	52 2% GKMBGKMGKM	8 4% HL	11 2% HL	3 1% HL	3 1% GKMBGKMGKM	16 4% DHLN	16 3% DHLN	3 1% DHLN	2 * DHLN	17 1% DHLN	20 1% DHLN
To advertise/market/attract new customers	28 4% DIKM	47 2% D	75 2% D	58 2% D	7 3% D	7 2% D	7 3% D	11 3% J	5 1% J	5 1% J	5 1% J	14 3% DHN	23 2% DHN	21 1% DHN
For business purposes (Unspec.)	19 2% D	45 2% D	64 2% D	45 1% D	1 * D	4 1% D	3 1% D	4 1% D	8 2% D	6 1% D	7 2% D	8 2% D	26 2% D	23 1% D
Competition/To compete	1 * D	49 2% M	50 1% D	48 1% AJ	2 1% AJ	6 1% AJ	8 3% AIMMCI	12 3% DHN	4 1% A	2 * LAEMBEIMCEIM	18 5% LAEMBEIMCEIM	9 2% J	17 1% A	19 1% A
Industry demand/New business types/development	- - D	- - D	- - D	30 1% ABCJ	- - D	6 1% J	- - D	2 * D	- - D	1 * D	- - D	11 3% KDHJN	- - D	10 1% M
Other improve business mentions	7 1% D	15 1% D	22 1% D	9 * D	- - D	1 * D	4 1% D	2 * D	3 1% D	1 * D	1 * D	2 * D	7 1% D	3 * D
ACCESSIBILITY (NET)	21 3% D	112 4% I	133 4% I	189 6% ABCJ	7 3% I	22 5% AIMBIMCIM	20 7% AIMBIMCIM	20 5% I	7 2% I	15 3% I	19 5% AIII	35 9% DFHJ	59 4% III	97 6% MJ
Improve search function/Making searching easier	7 1% D	28 1% I	35 1% I	31 1% GGG	3 1% GGG	3 1% GGG	- - D	3 1% GGG	6 1% GGG	3 1% GGG	7 2% GGG	4 1% GGG	12 1% GGG	18 1% GGG
Easy/Easy to use/access the web	5 1% I	51 2% I	56 2% I	104 3% ABCJ	3 1% III	13 3% AEMBEIMCEIM	15 6% AEMBEIMCEIM	14 3% I	- - D	9 2% I	12 3% AEMBEIMCEIM	27 7% KDFHJN	21 2% III	41 3% M
Convenience	2 * I	25 1% I	27 1% I	27 1% I	1 * I	1 * I	2 1% I	- - D	- - D	1 * I	- - D	1 * I	22 2% AIBIKCIK	24 2% DFHJL
Allowing for more flexibility	- - D	- - D	- - D	11 * BC	- - D	4 1% DJ	- - D	- - D	- - D	- - D	- - D	2 * D	- - D	5 * M
Other accessibility mentions	7 1% D	9 * D	16 * D	27 1% B	- - D	2 * D	3 1% KBKK	3 1% D	1 * D	2 * D	- - D	3 1% D	5 * D	17 1% M
IMPROVE EFFICIENCY (NET)	16 2% M	101 4% M	117 3% M	107 3% FAGMBGMCGM	17 8% FAGMBGMCGM	17 4% FAGMBGMCGM	5 2% FAGMBGMCGM	10 2% FAGMBGMCGM	16 4% FAGMBGMCGM	14 3% FAGMBGMCGM	24 7% FAGMBGMCGM	25 6% DHN	39 3% DHN	41 3% DHN
Lack of space/To create more space	16 2% M	48 2% GM	64 2% GM	49 1% N	10 5% AGMBGMCGM	12 3% DN	1 * D	5 1% D	9 2% MMM	10 2% N	19 5% AGMBGMCGM	13 3% DHN	9 1% DHN	9 1% DHN
For use/To use/Usability	- - D	8 * D	8 * D	31 1% ABC	1 * D	3 1% D	- - D	3 1% D	2 * D	2 * D	- - D	5 1% K	5 * D	18 1% M
Other improve efficiency mentions	- - D	46 2% D	46 1% D	28 1% A	7 3% FAC	2 * D	4 1% A	3 1% D	5 1% A	2 * D	5 1% A	2 * D	25 2% NA	14 1% D
INNOVATION/DEVELOPMENT (NET)	13 2% I	137 5% I	150 4% I	208 6% ACFJ	7 3% I	16 3% I	14 5% A	22 5% I	11 3% I	16 3% I	23 7% AIII	34 8% DFJ	82 6% AICI	120 8% DFJ

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q830x1. To the best of your knowledge, why have new gTLDs been created?

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Weighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
Innovation	6 1%	60 2%	66 2%	62 2% AJ	3 1%	4 1%	8 3% A	11 3% FJ	5 1%	4 1%	14 4% AIBICI	10 2% J	30 2% A	33 2% J
Good/Improve quality	3 *	20 1%	23 1%	18 1%	2 1%	1 *	3 1% KKK	3 1%	1 *	4 1%	-	-	14 1%	10 1%
Progress/Improved development/Make it better	3 *	24 1%	27 1%	103 3% ABCFHJ	1 *	7 2%	3 1%	6 1%	4 1%	7 1%	7 2% AMBMC	18 4% FHJ	9 1%	65 4% MDFHJ
Good/Improved technology	1 *	29 1% I	30 1%	27 1% A	1 *	3 1%	-	1 *	1 *	1 *	4 1% A	7 2% DHJ	23 2% AGIBGICGI	15 1%
Other innovation/development mentions	-	8 *	8 *	4 *	-	1 *	-	1 *	-	-	2 1% A	-	6 *	2 *
IMPROVE CREDIBILITY (NET)	3 *	107 4% I	110 3% I	289 9% ABCF	10 5% AIII	22 5%	19 7% AIBIMCIM	50 12% GDFJ	7 2% A	35 7% I	18 5% AICI	37 9% KF	53 4% AIII	145 9% MFJ
Improve security/Make it safer	2 *	66 3% I	68 2%	182 5% ABCF	5 2% A	10 2%	14 5% AIBIMCIM	40 10% GDFJLN	5 1% A	25 5% IF	9 3% A	21 5% F	33 2% A	86 6% MF
Improve reputation/More known	1 *	16 1% D	17 1% D	6 *	2 1% F	-	3 1% HAKKK	-	1 *	1 *	-	4 1% DFHN	10 1% N	1 *
More reliable/trustworthy	-	17 1%	17 1%	33 1% AC	3 1% AIII	4 1%	2 1% A	4 1%	-	2 *	6 2% AIBIMCIM	3 1%	6 *	20 1% M
More legitimate/credible	-	-	-	38 1% ABC	-	4 1%	-	3 1%	-	5 1% I	-	3 1%	-	23 1% M
Other improve credibility mentions	-	13 1%	13 *	43 1% ABC	1 *	4 1%	1 *	5 1%	1 *	3 1%	3 1% A	9 2% J	7 1% A	22 1% M
MISCELLANEOUS (NET)	42 5%	163 6% D	205 6%	171 5% H	12 6%	23 5% H	13 5%	10 2%	20 5%	21 4%	32 9% LAGIBGICGI	20 5%	86 6%	97 6% DHJ
Information/More information	15 2%	44 2%	59 2%	40 1%	5 2%	7 2%	5 2%	4 1%	7 2%	3 1%	9 3%	5 1%	18 1%	21 1%
To be unique/different	7 1%	34 1% D	41 1%	26 1%	4 2%	4 1%	1 *	1 *	4 1%	3 1%	6 2%	3 1%	19 1%	15 1%
Cheaper/More affordable	4 1%	13 1%	17 1%	14 *	-	3 1%	-	1 *	-	4 1%	7 2%	2 *	6 *	4 *
Keep up with the market/trend	3 *	11 *	14 *	17 1%	-	-	1 *	-	1 *	1 *	2 1%	1 *	7 1%	15 1% DFH
Other mentions	13 2%	62 2%	75 2%	77 2% H	3 1%	9 2%	6 2%	4 1%	8 2%	10 2%	8 2%	10 2%	37 3%	44 3% H

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)		2015 South America (w/o client sample)		2015 Europe (w/o client sample)		2015 Africa (w/o client sample)		2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	
					2016 North America	2016 South America	2016 Europe	2016 Africa	2016 Asia					
					(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)
Weighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
EXCLUSIVE (NET)	81 11%	714 28% EK	795 24% K	986 29% ACL	42 20% A	123 27%	61 23% A	112 27%	162 39% AEGMBEGKACEGIM	228 43% DFHLN	67 19% A	88 22% AEKEKCEK	382 28% AEKEKCEK	435 28% L
Illegible data	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
None	5 1%	64 2% DG	69 2% G	58 2% AH	6 3% AGGG	8 2% H	- -	- -	5 1%	12 2% H	4 1%	5 1% H	49 4% NAGIKBGKCGIK	33 2% H
Don't know	58 8%	464 18% E	522 16% E	749 22% ABCN	20 10% E	91 20% E	52 19% AEKE	95 23% AEGMBEGKACEGIM	111 26% DFHLN	167 31% AEKE	57 16% AEKE	77 19% AEKE	224 17% AEKE	319 21% M
Declined to answer	18 2%	186 7% DGK	204 6% GK	179 5% AL	16 8% AGKGKGGK	24 5% L	9 3%	17 4% L	46 11% AGKBGKCGK	49 9% DFHLN	6 2% NAGKGKCGK	6 1% NAGKGKCGK	109 8% NAGKGKCGK	83 5% L
Sigma	1011 131%	3052 118%	4063 121%	4106 123%	264 128%	574 125%	327 122%	522 126%	477 114%	611 114%	462 131%	516 129%	1522 113%	1883 122%
Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N Overlap formulae used.														

Base: All Qualified Respondents

Q800. Which of the following new gTLDs, if any, have you heard of?

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
.guru	265 34% DEGIKM	455 18% DI	720 21% DEIM	511 15% FJ	29 14%	50 11%	50 19% III	71 17% FJ	47 11%	45 8%	77 22% EIBEIEI	84 21% DFJ	252 19% III	261 17% DFJ
.email	258 34% E	1011 39% EK	1269 38% EK	1227 37% F	47 23%	103 22%	127 47% AEIKBEIKCEIK	190 46% DFJLN	149 36% EEE	182 34% F	116 33% EEE	151 38% F	572 43% NAEIKBEIKCEIK	601 39% DFJ
.club	255 33% DEGIKM	606 23% DEIK	861 26% DEIK	676 20% FJL	26 13%	55 12%	62 23% EKEKEK	80 19% FJ	79 19% JEEE	71 13%	51 14%	64 16% EGIKBEGIKCEGIK	388 29% EGIKBEGIKCEGIK	406 26% DFHJL
.photography	218 28% DEGIKM	420 16% K	638 19% DEIK	491 15% FL	24 12%	40 9%	47 17% KKK	82 20% DFJL	56 13%	67 13%	41 12%	45 11% EIKBEIKEIK	252 19% EIKBEIKEIK	257 17% DFJL
.link	176 23% DEI	945 37% EI	1121 33% EI	1118 33% AFJ	48 23%	88 19%	140 52% HAEIKMBEIKCEIK	183 44% DFJLN	109 26%	131 25% F	131 37% AEIEIEI	141 35% FJ	517 39% AEIBEICEI	575 37% DFJ
.realtor	137 18% DGIKM	262 10% DGIK	399 12% DGIK	258 8% HJ	33 16% GIKMBGIKGIK	68 15% DHJLN	17 6% H	11 3%	27 6%	20 4%	20 6%	23 6% H	165 12% NGIKBGIKGIK	136 9% DHJL
.xyz	121 16% EGK	343 13% EGK	464 14% EGK	443 13% FHJ	12 6%	38 8%	21 8%	40 10%	49 12% EEE	47 9%	29 8%	59 15% KFHJ	232 17% EGIKBEGIKCEGIK	259 17% DFHJ
.nyc	61 8% DGIKM	10 * M	71 2% DGIKM	23 1% N	10 5% GIKMBGIKMBGIKM	23 5% DHJLN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
.london	37 5% DEGKM	59 2% DEGKM	96 3% DEGKM	20 1% N	-	-	-	-	59 14% JAEIKMBEGIKCEGIK	20 4% DFHLN	-	-	-	-
.berlin	14 2% DGKM	27 1% M	41 1% KM	32 1% FHLN	-	-	-	-	27 6% AEGIKMBEGIKCEGIK	32 6% DFHLN	-	-	-	-
.ovh	1 * M	8 * M	9 * M	6 * M	-	-	-	-	8 2% AEGIKMBEGIKCEGIK	6 1% DFHLN	-	-	-	-
.wang	1 * DEGIK	123 5% DEGIK	124 4% EGIK	110 3% AFHJL	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	123 9% NAEIKBEGIKCEGIK	110 7% DFHJL
.news	-	-	-	1253 37% ABCFJ	-	113 25% E	-	144 35% GF	-	162 30% IF	-	191 48% KDFHJN	-	643 42% MDFHJ
.site	-	-	-	862 26% ABCFJ	-	76 17% E	-	167 40% GDFJLN	-	114 21% I	-	113 28% KFJ	-	392 25% MF
.toronto	-	-	-	18 1% ABCN	-	18 4% EDHJLN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
.guadalajara	-	-	-	7 * BC	-	7 2% DHJLN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Base: All Qualified Respondents

Q800. Which of the following new gTLDs, if any, have you heard of?

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
.roma	-	-	-	8 BC	-	-	-	-	-	8 1% IDFHLN	-	-	-	-
.istanbul	-	-	-	13 BCN	-	-	-	-	-	13 2% IDFHLN	-	-	-	-
.madrid	-	-	-	5 BC	-	-	-	-	-	5 1% IDFHN	-	-	-	-
.warszawa	-	-	-	9 BCN	-	-	-	-	-	9 2% IDFHLN	-	-	-	-
.paris	-	-	-	28 1% ABCFN	-	-	-	-	-	28 5% IDFHLN	-	-	-	-
Foshan	-	-	-	82 2% ABCFHJL	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	82 5% MDFHJL
.hanoi	-	-	-	9 BC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9 1% MD
.manilla	-	-	-	16 BC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	16 1% MDFHJL
.tokyo	-	-	-	70 2% ABCFHJL	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	70 5% MDFHJL
.seoul	-	-	-	28 1% ABCFJ	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	28 2% MDFHJL
.MOCKBa	-	-	-	18 1% ABC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	18 1% MDFHJL
.delhi	-	-	-	59 2% ABCFHJL	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	59 4% MDFHJL
.jakarta	-	-	-	19 1% ABC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	19 1% MDFHJL
.abuja	-	-	-	17 1% ABCN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	17 4% KDFHJN	-	-
.capetown	-	-	-	20 1% ABCN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	20 5% KDFHJN	-	-
.cairo	-	-	-	26 1% ABCJN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	26 6% KDFHJN	-	-
.bogota	-	-	-	26 1% ABCJN	-	-	-	26 6% GDFJLN	-	-	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Base: All Qualified Respondents

Q800. Which of the following new gTLDs, if any, have you heard of?

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
.cordoba	-	-	-	10	-	-	-	10	-	-	-	-	-	-
				BCN				GDFJLN						
.rio	-	-	-	21	-	-	-	21	-	-	-	-	-	-
				1%				5%						
				ABCN				GDFJLN						
.top	-	-	-	466	-	16	-	44	-	46	-	29	-	331
				14%		3%		11%		9%		7%		22%
				ABCFHJL		E		GF		IF		KF		MDFHJL
.pics	-	-	-	485	-	50	-	49	-	73	-	61	-	252
				14%		11%		12%		14%		15%		16%
				ABCF		E		G		I		K		MDFH
.online	-	-	-	1142	-	86	-	181	-	190	-	165	-	520
				34%		19%		44%		36%		41%		34%
				ABCF		E		GDFJN		IF		KDFN		MF
.space	-	-	-	700	-	68	-	131	-	100	-	82	-	319
				21%		15%		32%		19%		20%		21%
				ABCF		E		GDFJLN		I		KF		MF
.website	-	-	-	886	-	73	-	182	-	129	-	100	-	402
				26%		16%		44%		24%		25%		26%
				ABCF		E		GDFJLN		IF		KF		MF
.xn-ses554g (Chinese for network address)	-	114	114	37	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	114	37
		4%	3%	1%									9%	2%
		DEGIK	DEGIK	AFHJL									NAEGKBEGKCEGK	DFHJL
.xn-55qx5d (Chinese for company)	-	115	115	47	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	115	47
		4%	3%	1%									9%	3%
		DEGIK	DEGIK	AFHJL									NAEGKBEGKCEGK	DFHJL
I am not aware of any of these	305	877	1182	809	101	203	72	83	180	159	150	89	374	275
	40%	34%	35%	24%	49%	44%	27%	20%	43%	30%	43%	22%	28%	18%
	DGM	DGM	DGM	HN	AGMBGMCGM	DHJLN	H	JGMBGMCGM	DHLN	LGMBGMCGM		N	N	
Not Sure	-	13	13	-	-	-	2	-	1	-	-	-	10	-
		1%	1%				1%		*				1%	
		D	D				A						NAC	
TOTAL AWARENESS (NET)	464	1698	2162	2540	106	257	195	332	238	375	202	312	957	1264
	60%	66%	64%	76%	51%	56%	72%	80%	57%	70%	57%	78%	71%	82%
	E	EIK	EIK	ABCFJ		AEIKBEIKCEIK		GDFJ		IF		KFJ	AEIKBEIKCEIK	MDFJL
TOTAL CONSISTENT AWARENESS (NET)	464	1698	2162	2147	106	219	195	292	238	293	202	260	957	1083
	60%	66%	64%	64%	51%	48%	72%	70%	57%	55%	57%	65%	71%	70%
	E	EIK	EIK	FJ		AEIKBEIKCEIK		DFJ		F		KFJ	AEIKBEIKCEIK	DFJL
AWARENESS OF GLOBAL (NET)	449	1650	2099	2487	103	255	195	330	221	356	202	311	929	1235
	58%	64%	63%	74%	50%	55%	72%	80%	53%	67%	57%	78%	69%	80%
	E	EIK	EIK	ABCFJ		AEIKBEIKCEIK		GDFJ		IF		KFJ	AEIKBEIKCEIK	MDFJ
AWARENESS OF GLOBAL CONSISTENT (NET)	449	1650	2099	2107	103	216	195	292	221	275	202	260	929	1064
	58%	64%	63%	63%	50%	47%	72%	70%	53%	51%	57%	65%	69%	69%
	E	EIK	EIK	AFJ		AEIKBEIKCEIK		DFJ				KFJ	AEIKBEIKCEIK	DFJ
AWARENESS OF GEO-SPECIFIC (NET)	107	312	419	677	10	48	-	57	79	115	-	63	223	394
	14%	12%	12%	20%	5%	10%	-	14%	19%	22%	-	16%	17%	26%
	EGK	EGK	EGK	ABCFHL	GKKGK	E		G	AEIKBEIKCEIK	FHL		KF	EGKBEGKCEGK	MDFHL
AWARENESS OF GEO-SPECIFIC CONSISTENT (NET)	107	312	419	216	10	23	-	79	52	223	-	-	223	141
	14%	12%	12%	6%	5%	5%	-	19%	10%	-	-	-	17%	9%
	DEGK	DEGK	DEGK	HL	GKKGK	HL		JAEGKBEGKCEGK	DFHL			NEGKBEGKCEGK		DFHL

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Base: All Qualified Respondents

Q800. Which of the following new gTLDs, if any, have you heard of?

16 Aug 2016
Table 129

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
TOTAL ADDED	-	-	-	2228	-	200	-	308	-	321	-	280	-	1119
AWARENESS (NET)	-	-	-	67% ABCFJ	-	43% E	-	74% GDFJ	-	60% IF	-	70% KFJ	-	73% MDFJ
AWARENESS OF GLOBAL ADDED (NET)	-	-	-	2152 64% ABCFJ	-	198 43% E	-	303 73% GDFJ	-	310 58% IF	-	272 68% KFJ	-	1069 69% MDFJ
AWARENESS OF GEO-SPECIFIC ADDED (NET)	-	-	-	509 15% ABCFJ	-	25 5% E	-	57 14% GF	-	63 12% IF	-	63 16% KF	-	301 20% MDFHJ
Sigma	1849 240%	5388 208%	7237 216%	12111 362%	330 159%	1175 255%	538 200%	1695 408%	791 189%	1657 310%	615 175%	1460 364%	3114 232%	6124 398%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q807. And have you personally registered a domain name using any of these new gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 130

Base: Heard Of New gTLDs

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
					(E)		(G)		(I)		(K)		(M)	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	-**	-**	-**	2540	-**	257	-**	332	-**	375	-**	312	-**	1264
.email	-	-	-	387 15%	-	31 12%	-	62 19% F	-	58 15%	-	41 13%	-	195 15%
.photography	-	-	-	64 3%	-	6 2%	-	6 2%	-	13 3% L	-	3 1%	-	36 3%
.link	-	-	-	154 6% F	-	8 3%	-	25 8% F	-	20 5%	-	19 6%	-	82 6% F
.guru	-	-	-	72 3% H	-	6 2%	-	3 1%	-	9 2%	-	6 2%	-	48 4% DH
.realtor	-	-	-	31 1% H	-	4 2% H	-	-	-	6 2% H	-	1 *	-	20 2% H
.club	-	-	-	98 4% H	-	8 3%	-	5 2%	-	11 3%	-	6 2%	-	68 5% DHL
.xyz	-	-	-	70 3%	-	7 3%	-	9 3%	-	7 2%	-	7 2%	-	40 3%
.top	-	-	-	79 3% H	-	4 2%	-	3 1%	-	6 2%	-	6 2%	-	60 5% DFHJL
.pics	-	-	-	72 3% H	-	5 2%	-	2 1%	-	14 4% H	-	7 2%	-	44 3% H
.online	-	-	-	227 9%	-	16 6%	-	28 8%	-	35 9%	-	27 9%	-	121 10%
.space	-	-	-	97 4%	-	8 3%	-	14 4%	-	18 5% L	-	6 2%	-	51 4%
.website	-	-	-	169 7%	-	13 5%	-	26 8%	-	26 7%	-	19 6%	-	85 7%
.news	-	-	-	157 6% FH	-	6 2%	-	7 2%	-	15 4%	-	14 4%	-	115 9% DFHJL
.site	-	-	-	126 5%	-	7 3%	-	28 8% DFLN	-	18 5%	-	11 4%	-	62 5%
.toronto	-	-	-	1 *	-	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
.guadalajara	-	-	-	1 *	-	DN 1 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Base: Heard Of New gTLDs

Q807. And have you personally registered a domain name using any of these new gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 130

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	..**	..**	..**	2540	..**	257	..**	332	..**	375	..**	312	..**	1264
.roma	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
.istanbul	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	-
.madrid	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
.warszawa	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
.paris	-	-	-	5 *	-	-	-	-	-	5 1% DHLN	-	-	-	-
Foshan	-	-	-	23 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	23 2% DFHJL
.hanoi	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 *
.manilla	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 *
.tokyo	-	-	-	11 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	11 1% D
.seoul	-	-	-	3 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3 *
.MOCKBa	-	-	-	4 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4 *
.delhi	-	-	-	17 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	17 1% DHJL
.jakarta	-	-	-	3 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3 *
.abuja	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 *	-	-
.capetown	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 * DN	-	-
.cairo	-	-	-	8 * N	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8 3% DFHJN	-	-
.bogota	-	-	-	4 *	-	-	-	4 1% DJN	-	-	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Base: Heard Of New gTLDs

Q807. And have you personally registered a domain name using any of these new gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 130

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	..**	..**	..**	2540	..**	257	..**	332	..**	375	..**	312	..**	1264
.cordoba	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	-
.rio	-	-	-	2 *	-	-	-	2 1% DN	-	-	-	-	-	-
.berlin	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	-
.ovh	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	-
.london	-	-	-	2 *	-	-	-	-	-	2 1% DN	-	-	-	-
.nyc	-	-	-	1 *	-	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
.wang	-	-	-	29 1% J	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	29 2% DFHJL
.xn-ses554g (Chinese for network address)	-	-	-	4 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4 *
.xn-55qx5d (Chinese for company)	-	-	-	7 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7 1% D
I have not registered a new gTLD domain	-	-	-	1643 65% N	-	186 72% DN	-	219 66%	-	247 66% N	-	231 74% DHJN	-	760 60%
None of these, but I have registered a different new gTLD	-	-	-	32 1% N	-	10 4% DJLN	-	7 2% N	-	3 1%	-	4 1%	-	8 1%
TOTAL REGISTERED (NET)	-	-	-	897 35% FL	-	71 28%	-	113 34% L	-	128 34% L	-	81 26%	-	504 40% DFJL
REGISTERED GLOBAL (NET)	-	-	-	840 33% FL	-	61 24%	-	104 31% F	-	122 33% FL	-	77 25%	-	476 38% DFHL
REGISTERED GEO-SPECIFIC (NET)	-	-	-	578 23% FL	-	33 13%	-	65 20% F	-	81 22% F	-	54 17%	-	345 27% DFHJL
Sigma	-	-	-	3611 142%	-	328 128%	-	451 136%	-	516 138%	-	418 134%	-	1898 150%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Base: Registered New gTLDs And Registered More Than One

Q809. Of the (...) domains you have registered, how many are of these new gTLDs?

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	-**	-**	-**	693	-**	54*	-**	82*	-**	102	-**	68*	-**	387
1	-	-	-	358 52% H	-	21 39%	-	32 39%	-	47 46%	-	33 49%	-	225 58% DFHJ
2 - 3	-	-	-	238 34%	-	20 37%	-	38 46% DN	-	35 34%	-	22 32%	-	123 32%
4 - 5	-	-	-	39 6% N	-	4 7%	-	7 9%	-	9 9%	-	3 4%	-	16 4%
6 or more	-	-	-	58 8% N	-	9 17% DN	-	5 6%	-	11 11%	-	10 15% N	-	23 6%
MEAN	-	-	-	4.2 N	-	9.5 DJN	-	7.2 N	-	3.2	-	6.8 N	-	2.7
STD. DEV.	-	-	-	17.01	-	29.70	-	34.59	-	5.12	-	20.25	-	7.69
STD. ERR.	-	-	-	0.65	-	4.04	-	3.82	-	0.51	-	2.46	-	0.39
MEDIAN	-	-	-	1	-	2	-	2	-	2	-	2	-	1
Sigma	-	-	-	693 100%	-	54 100%	-	82 100%	-	102 100%	-	68 100%	-	387 100%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Base: Registered New gTLDs

Q812. Would you say that your primary reason for a registering new gTLD was?

16 Aug 2016
Table 132

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	-**	-**	-**	896	-**	71*	-**	113	-**	128	-**	81*	-**	503
To protect my existing domain(s) and ensure no one else got a domain similar to one I already have registered	-	-	-	534 60%	-	38 54%	-	70 62%	-	81 63%	-	46 57%	-	299 59%
Because they will appeal to new Internet users or new types of customers-they will be effective and provide benefits	-	-	-	305 34%	-	24 34%	-	31 27%	-	42 33%	-	24 30%	-	184 37%
Because the name I wanted was not available using one of the older gTLDs	-	-	-	57 6% N	-	9 13% DJN	-	12 11% JN	-	5 4%	-	11 14% DJN	-	20 4%
Sigma	-	-	-	896 100%	-	71 100%	-	113 100%	-	128 100%	-	81 100%	-	503 100%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q813_1. Please indicate how each of the following statements apply to your registration of new gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 133

1. I gave up a legacy gTLD registration when I registered the new gTLD

Base: Registered New gTLDs

	2015 Total Registrants				Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia	
					(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)
Unweighted Base	..	..	..	897	..	71*	..	113	..	128	..	81*	..	504	
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	570	-	46	-	49	-	68	-	47	-	360	
				64% HJ		65% H		43%		53%		58% H		71% DHJL	
Applies to ALL of my new gTLD registrations	-	-	-	166	-	16	-	11	-	20	-	13	-	106	
				19% H		23% H		10%		16%		16%		21% DH	
Applies to SOME of my new gTLD registrations	-	-	-	404	-	30	-	38	-	48	-	34	-	254	
				45% H		42%		34%		38%		42%		50% DHJ	
DOES NOT apply to any of my new gTLD registrations	-	-	-	327	-	25	-	64	-	60	-	34	-	144	
				36% N		35%		57% DFLN		47% DN		42% N		29%	
Sigma	-	-	-	897	-	71	-	113	-	128	-	81	-	504	
				100%		100%		100%		100%		100%		100%	

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q813_2. Please indicate how each of the following statements apply to your registration of new gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 134

2. I kept an existing gTLD registration(s) similar to the new gTLD

Base: Registered New gTLDs

	2015 Total Registrants				Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia	
					(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)
Unweighted Base	-**	-**	-**	897	-**	71*	-**	113	-**	128	-**	81*	-**	504	
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	755 84% L	-	60 85%	-	88 78%	-	108 84% L	-	59 73%	-	440 87% DHL	
Applies to ALL of my new gTLD registrations	-	-	-	271 30%	-	20 28%	-	33 29%	-	30 23%	-	23 28%	-	165 33% J	
Applies to SOME of my new gTLD registrations	-	-	-	484 54%	-	40 56%	-	55 49%	-	78 61% L	-	36 44%	-	275 55%	
DOES NOT apply to any of my new gTLD registrations	-	-	-	142 16% N	-	11 15%	-	25 22% N	-	20 16%	-	22 27% DJN	-	64 13%	
Sigma	-	-	-	897 100%	-	71 100%	-	113 100%	-	128 100%	-	81 100%	-	504 100%	
Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing															

Q813_3. Please indicate how each of the following statements apply to your registration of new gTLDs?
3. This was a completely new registration, no prior domain was registered for this use

16 Aug 2016
Table 135

Base: Registered New gTLDs

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	..**	..**	..**	897	..**	71*	..**	113	..**	128	..**	81*	..**	504
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	733 82%	-	53 75%	-	88 78%	-	108 84%	-	61 75%	-	423 84% D
Applies to ALL of my new gTLD registrations	-	-	-	312 35%	-	27 38%	-	42 37%	-	40 31%	-	28 35%	-	175 35%
Applies to SOME of my new gTLD registrations	-	-	-	421 47%	-	26 37%	-	46 41%	-	68 53% F	-	33 41%	-	248 49% F
DOES NOT apply to any of my new gTLD registrations	-	-	-	164 18% N	-	18 25%	-	25 22%	-	20 16%	-	20 25%	-	81 16%
Sigma	-	-	-	897 100%	-	71 100%	-	113 100%	-	128 100%	-	81 100%	-	504 100%
Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing														

Q827. Have you considered switching from your existing registered domain name to one of the new gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 136

Base: Has Not Registered New gTLDs

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	-**	-**	-**	1643	-**	186	-**	219	-**	247	-**	231	-**	760
YES (NET)	-	-	-	694 42% FJL	-	38 20%	-	104 47% FJL	-	80 32% F	-	59 26%	-	413 54% DFJL
Yes, I considered switching and may do so	-	-	-	415 25% FJL	-	22 12%	-	52 24% FL	-	50 20% F	-	34 15%	-	257 34% DFHJL
Yes, I considered switching but decided not to	-	-	-	279 17% FJL	-	16 9%	-	52 24% DFJL	-	30 12%	-	25 11%	-	156 21% DFJL
No, have not considered	-	-	-	949 58% N	-	148 80% DHJN	-	115 53%	-	167 68% DHN	-	172 74% DHN	-	347 46%
Sigma	-	-	-	1643 100%	-	186 100%	-	219 100%	-	247 100%	-	231 100%	-	760 100%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Base: Has Not Registered New gTLDs And Considered Switching

Q828. Why have you considered switching?

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	-.**	-.**	-.**	694	-.**	38*	-.**	104	-.**	80*	-.**	59*	-.**	413
The new gTLDs will be more effective	-	-	-	267 38%	-	12 32%	-	37 36%	-	35 44%	-	25 42%	-	158 38%
New gTLDs better target specific groups of people/communities	-	-	-	299 43%	-	18 47%	-	38 37%	-	30 38%	-	30 51%	-	183 44%
The new gTLDs are modern	-	-	-	324 47%	-	15 39%	-	52 50%	-	36 45%	-	33 56%	-	188 46%
The new gTLDs allow a greater range of characters/symbols in their names	-	-	-	223 32%	-	11 29%	-	25 24%	-	25 31%	-	18 31%	-	144 35% H
The new gTLDs allow more flexibility to use my language in their names	-	-	-	232 33%	-	9 24%	-	33 32%	-	23 29%	-	16 27%	-	151 37% D
The new gTLDs are a good value/priced well	-	-	-	258 37%	-	13 34%	-	37 36%	-	24 30%	-	18 31%	-	166 40% D
The new gTLDs are better focused on specific topics versus general uses	-	-	-	293 42% L	-	16 42%	-	49 47% L	-	39 49% L	-	16 27%	-	173 42% L
Something else	-	-	-	4 1%	-	2 5% DHN	-	-	-	1 1%	-	-	-	1 *
Sigma	-	-	-	1900 274%	-	96 253%	-	271 261%	-	213 266%	-	156 264%	-	1164 282%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Base: Has Not Registered New gTLDs And Considered Switching But Did Not

Q829. Why did you decide not to switch?

[illegible]

Base: Has Not Registered New gTLDs And Has Not Considered Switching

Q831. Why have you not considered switching?

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	-**	-**	-**	949	-**	148	-**	115	-**	167	-**	172	-**	347
New gTLDs will not be as effective as hoped	-	-	-	86 9% L	-	13 9%	-	6 5%	-	12 7%	-	7 4%	-	48 14% DHJL
New gTLDs are too new and need to be proven	-	-	-	210 22% FH	-	20 14%	-	14 12%	-	35 21%	-	45 26% FH	-	96 28% DFH
Cost to switch to new gTLDs is too high	-	-	-	111 12%	-	17 11%	-	11 10%	-	20 12%	-	18 10%	-	45 13%
We are satisfied with the performance of our domains on existing gTLDs	-	-	-	482 51%	-	84 57% H	-	49 43%	-	88 53%	-	91 53%	-	170 49%
Just not a high enough business priority for us at this time	-	-	-	360 38%	-	49 33%	-	53 46% FJ	-	54 32%	-	61 35%	-	143 41%
Something else	-	-	-	71 7% N	-	23 16% DJLN	-	10 9%	-	11 7%	-	13 8%	-	14 4%
Sigma	-	-	-	1320 139%	-	206 139%	-	143 124%	-	220 132%	-	235 137%	-	516 149%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q820. If you were setting up a new website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following new gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 140

SUMMARY TABLE OF TOP 2 BOX

Base: Has Heard Of New gTLDs (Variable Bases)

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
.email	134 17%	1331 51% EIK	1465 44% EI	842 69% ABCFHJ	69 33% A	55 53% E	139 52% AEIEICEI	112 59% A	153 37% A	113 62% I	163 46% AEIEIEI	106 70% KFH	807 60% AEIGKBEGIKCEGK	456 76% MDFHJ
.photography	150 20%	1098 42% EIK	1248 37% EI	289 59% ABCFH	54 26% A	14 35% E	107 40% AEIEIEI	43 52% G	123 29% A	40 60% IF	126 36% AEIE	22 49% AEIGKBEGIKCEGK	688 51% AEIGKBEGIKCEGK	170 66% MDFHL
.link	119 15%	1267 49% EI	1386 41% EI	686 61% ABCFH	65 31% A	44 50% E	135 50% AEIEICEI	87 48% A	140 33% A	85 65% IFH	167 47% AEIEICEI	92 65% KFH	760 57% AEIKBEIKCEIK	378 66% MDFH
.guru	141 18%	964 37% EGI	1105 33% EI	303 59% ABCFH	43 21% A	19 38% E	84 31% AEIEIEI	32 45% G	93 22% A	24 53% I	120 34% AEIEIEI	43 51% K	624 47% AEIGKBEGIKCEGK	185 71% MDFHJL
.realtor	73 9%	864 33% EIK	937 28% EI	145 56% ABCFH	34 16% A	11 16% E	76 28% AEIEIEI	10 91% A	83 20% A	15 75% AEIE	86 24% AEIE	10 43% AEIGKBEGIKCEGK	585 44% AEIGKBEGIKCEGK	99 73% MDF
.club	163 21%	1097 42% EIK	1260 38% EI	423 63% ABCFH	51 25% A	27 49% E	101 38% AEIEIEI	39 49% A	114 27% A	37 52% I	119 34% AEIEIEI	33 52% K	712 53% AEIGKBEGIKCEGK	287 71% MDFHJL
.xyz	62 8%	867 34% EGIK	929 28% EIK	228 51% ABCL	38 18% A	18 47% E	72 27% AEKEKEK	22 55% G	90 21% A	24 51% I	66 19% A	21 36% K	601 45% AEIGKBEGIKCEGK	143 55% ML
.top	-	-	-	297 64% H	-	38% H	-	19 43% H	-	25 54% H	-	16 55% H	-	231 70% DHJ
.pics	-	-	-	313 65% FL	-	50% FL	-	31 63% FL	-	42 58% FHL	-	32 52% FHL	-	183 73% DFJL
.online	-	-	-	805 70% J	-	57 66% J	-	117 65% J	-	118 62% J	-	111 67% J	-	402 77% DFHJL
.space	-	-	-	417 60% HL	-	33 49% HL	-	60 46% HL	-	65 65% FHL	-	39 48% FHL	-	220 69% DFHL
.website	-	-	-	594 67% H	-	51 70% H	-	110 60% H	-	81 63% H	-	65 65% H	-	287 71% DH
.news	-	-	-	717 57% FL	-	34 30% FL	-	73 51% F	-	88 54% F	-	92 48% F	-	430 67% DFHJL
.site	-	-	-	573 66% L	-	47 62% L	-	102 61% L	-	74 65% L	-	64 57% L	-	286 73% DHL
.toronto	-	-	-	9 50% L	-	9 50% L	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
.guadalajara	-	-	-	3 43% L	-	3 43% L	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q820. If you were setting up a new website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following new gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 140

SUMMARY TABLE OF TOP 2 BOX

Base: Has Heard Of New gTLDs (Variable Bases)

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
.roma	-	-	-	4 50%	-	-	-	-	-	4 50%	-	-	-	-
.istanbul	-	-	-	12 92%	-	-	-	-	-	12 92%	-	-	-	-
.madrid	-	-	-	3 60%	-	-	-	-	-	3 60%	-	-	-	-
.warszawa	-	-	-	3 33%	-	-	-	-	-	3 33%	-	-	-	-
.paris	-	-	-	15 54%	-	-	-	-	-	15 54%	-	-	-	-
Foshan	-	-	-	53 65%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	53 65%
.hanoi	-	-	-	6 67%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6 67%
.manilla	-	-	-	12 75%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	12 75%
.tokyo	-	-	-	31 44%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	31 44%
.seoul	-	-	-	15 54%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15 54%
.MOCKBa	-	-	-	12 67%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	12 67%
.delhi	-	-	-	44 75%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	44 75%
.jakarta	-	-	-	12 63%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	12 63%
.abuja	-	-	-	9 53%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9 53%	-	-
.capetown	-	-	-	10 50%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10 50%	-	-
.cairo	-	-	-	20 77%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	20 77%	-	-
.bogota	-	-	-	13 50%	-	-	-	13 50%	-	-	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q820. If you were setting up a new website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following new gTLDs?
SUMMARY TABLE OF TOP 2 BOX

16 Aug 2016
Table 140

Base: Has Heard Of New gTLDs (Variable Bases)

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
.cordoba	- -	- -	- -	2 20%	- -	- -	- -	2 20%	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -
.rio	- -	- -	- -	9 43%	- -	- -	- -	9 43%	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -
.berlin	3 18%	29 27%	32 26%	8 25%	- -	- -	- -	- -	29 27%	8 25%	- -	- -	- -	- -
.ovh	- -	19 18%	19 15%	3 50%	- -	- -	- -	- -	19 18%	3 50%	- -	- -	- -	- -
.london	8 7%	100 24%	108 20%	3 15%	- -	- -	- -	- -	100 24% AC	3 15%	- -	- -	- -	- -
.nyc	17 8%	11 17%	28 10%	8 35%	11 17% A	8 35%	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -
.wang	- -	313 57%	313 57%	82 75% BC	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	313 57%	82 75% M
.xn-ses554g (Chinese for network address)	1 50%	326 59%	327 59%	30 81% BC	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	326 59%	30 81% M
.xn-55qx5d (Chinese for company)	1 50%	330 60%	331 60%	40 85% BC	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	330 60%	40 85% M
CONSIDERED ALL (NET)	308 40%	1739 67% EI	2047 61% EI	1957 77% ABCFJ	104 50% A	155 60% E	184 68% AEIEICEI	247 74% F	209 50% A	259 69% IF	243 69% AEIEICEI	241 77% KFJ AEGKBEGKCEGR	999 74% AEI	1055 83% MDFHJL
CONSIDERED CONSISTENT (NET)	308 40%	1739 67% EI	2047 61% EI	1537 72% ABCFHJ	104 50% A	116 53% AEIEICEI	184 68% AEIEICEI	193 66% F	209 50% A	183 62% IF	243 69% AEIEICEI	188 72% FJ AEGKBEGKCEGR	999 74% AEI	857 79% MDFHJL
CONSIDERED ADDED (NET)	- -	- -	- -	1646 74% FJ	- -	122 61%	- -	217 70% F	- -	221 69%	- -	199 71% F	- -	887 79% DFHJL
CONSIDERED GLOBAL (NET)	303 39%	1721 66% EI	2024 60% EI	1910 77% ABCFJ	103 50% A	150 59% AEIEICEI	184 68% AEIEICEI	244 74% F	202 48% A	250 70% IF	243 69% AEIEICEI	239 77% KF AEI	989 74% AEI	1027 83% MDFHJL
CONSIDERED GLOBAL CONSISTENT (NET)	303 39%	1721 66% EI	2024 60% EI	1513 72% ABCFHJ	103 50% A	114 53% AEIEICEI	184 68% AEIEICEI	193 66% F	202 48% A	179 65% IF	243 69% AEIEICEI	188 72% F AEI	989 74% AEI	839 79% MDFHJL
CONSIDERED GLOBAL ADDED (NET)	- -	- -	- -	1586 74% FJ	- -	118 60%	- -	213 70% F	- -	212 68% F	- -	190 70% F	- -	853 80% DFHJL
CONSIDERED GEO-SPECIFIC (NET)	29 9%	499 48% EI	528 39% EI	399 59% ABCFHJ	11 17%	20 42% E	- -	24 42%	110 26% A	48 42% I	- -	39 62% FHJ AEI	378 69% AEI	268 68% DFHJ
CONSIDERED GEO-SPECIFIC CONSISTENT (NET)	29 9%	499 48% EI	528 39% EI	131 61% ABCJ	11 17%	8 35%	- -	- -	110 26% A	11 21%	- -	- -	378 69% AEI	112 79% MDJ

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Base: Has Heard Of New gTLDs (Variable Bases)

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q820. If you were setting up a new website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following new gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 141

SUMMARY TABLE OF BOTTOM 2 BOX

Base: Has Heard Of New gTLDs (Variable Bases)

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
					(E)		(G)		(I)		(K)		(M)	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
.email	568 74% DEGIKM	970 37% DM	1538 46% DGM	297 24% N	121 58% FGKMBGKMGKM	35 34% DLN	106 39% MMM	62 33% DLN	206 49% JGKMBGKMGKM	58 32% DLN	146 41% LMMM	33 22% N	391 29% N	109 18% N
.photography	558 73% DEGIKM	1143 44% DM	1701 51% DM	158 32% N	131 63% GKMBGKMGKM	19 48% DN	125 46% MMM	29 35% JGMBGKMGKM	230 55% N	25 37% LMBMM	179 51% N	15 33% N	478 36% N	70 27% N
.link	580 75% DEGIKM	994 38% DM	1574 47% DGKM	338 30% N	115 56% FGKMBGKMGKM	33 38% N	106 39% MMM	68 37% DLN	213 51% JGKMBGKMGKM	39 30% LMMM	145 41% N	37 26% N	415 31% N	161 28% N
.guru	563 73% DGIKM	1262 49% DM	1825 54% DM	156 31% N	141 68% FGKMBGKMGKM	25 50% DN	148 55% MBMM	30 42% DN	256 61% JKMBKMGKM	20 44% DN	179 51% LMMM	28 33% N	538 40% N	53 20% N
.realtor	626 81% DEGIKM	1339 52% DM	1965 59% DM	99 38% N	151 73% GKMBGKMGKM	53 78% DN	154 57% MMM	1 9% MBMCM	264 63% N	5 25% MBMM	209 59% N	13 57% N	561 42% N	27 20% N
.club	544 71% DGIKM	1139 44% DM	1683 50% DM	205 30% N	133 64% FGKMBGKMGKM	18 33% N	133 49% MMM	33 41% DN	239 57% JMBMCM	31 44% DN	180 51% LMBMM	22 34% N	454 34% N	101 25% N
.xyz	640 83% DEGIKM	1336 52% DM	1976 59% DM	171 39% N	145 70% FGKMBGKMGKM	16 42% HMBMM	155 58% N	12 30% MBMM	257 61% N	23 49% LMBMCM	226 64% N	28 47% N	553 41% N	92 36% N
.top	- -	- -	- -	133 29% N	- -	8 50% N	- -	18 41% N	- -	18 39% N	- -	9 31% N	- -	80 24% N
.pics	- -	- -	- -	136 28% N	- -	19 38% N	- -	13 27% N	- -	29 40% DN	- -	22 36% N	- -	53 21% N
.online	- -	- -	- -	253 22% N	- -	20 23% N	- -	46 25% N	- -	63 33% DLN	- -	34 21% N	- -	90 17% N
.space	- -	- -	- -	215 31% N	- -	29 43% DN	- -	48 37% N	- -	31 31% N	- -	25 30% N	- -	82 26% N
.website	- -	- -	- -	216 24% N	- -	14 19% N	- -	51 28% N	- -	41 32% DN	- -	24 24% N	- -	86 21% N
.news	- -	- -	- -	439 35% N	- -	70 62% DHJLN	- -	55 38% N	- -	67 41% N	- -	77 40% N	- -	170 26% N
.site	- -	- -	- -	222 26% N	- -	21 28% N	- -	48 29% N	- -	34 30% N	- -	36 32% N	- -	83 21% N
.toronto	- -	- -	- -	9 50% N	- -	9 50% N	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -
.guadalajara	- -	- -	- -	3 43% N	- -	3 43% N	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q820. If you were setting up a new website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following new gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 141

SUMMARY TABLE OF BOTTOM 2 BOX

Base: Has Heard Of New gTLDs (Variable Bases)

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
.roma	-	-	-	4 50%	-	-	-	-	-	4 50%	-	-	-	-
.istanbul	-	-	-	1 8%	-	-	-	-	-	1 8%	-	-	-	-
.madrid	-	-	-	2 40%	-	-	-	-	-	2 40%	-	-	-	-
.warszawa	-	-	-	6 67%	-	-	-	-	-	6 67%	-	-	-	-
.paris	-	-	-	12 43%	-	-	-	-	-	12 43%	-	-	-	-
Foshan	-	-	-	25 30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	25 30%
.hanoi	-	-	-	3 33%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3 33%
.manilla	-	-	-	4 25%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4 25%
.tokyo	-	-	-	35 50%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	35 50%
.seoul	-	-	-	11 39%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	11 39%
.MOCKBa	-	-	-	6 33%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6 33%
.delhi	-	-	-	13 22%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	13 22%
.jakarta	-	-	-	6 32%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6 32%
.abuja	-	-	-	7 41%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7 41%	-	-
.capetown	-	-	-	8 40%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8 40%	-	-
.cairo	-	-	-	5 19%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5 19%	-	-
.bogota	-	-	-	10 38%	-	-	-	10 38%	-	-	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q820. If you were setting up a new website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following new gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 141

SUMMARY TABLE OF BOTTOM 2 BOX

Base: Has Heard Of New gTLDs (Variable Bases)

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
.cordoba	- -	- -	- -	8 80%	- -	- -	- -	8 80%	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -
.rio	- -	- -	- -	10 48%	- -	- -	- -	10 48%	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -
.berlin	14 82%	67 62%	81 65%	21 66%	- -	- -	- -	- -	67 62%	21 66%	- -	- -	- -	- -
.ovh	17 100%	75 69%	92 74%	3 50%	- -	- -	- -	- -	75 69%	3 50%	- -	- -	- -	- -
.london	97 85%	244 58%	341 64%	14 70%	- -	- -	- -	- -	244 58%	14 70%	- -	- -	- -	- -
.nyc	178 87%	50 78%	228 85%	15 65%	50 78%	15 65%	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -
.wang	1 50%	176 32% D	177 32% D	23 21%	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	176 32% N	23 21%
.xn-ses554g (Chinese for network address)	1 50%	176 32% D	177 32% D	5 14%	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	176 32% N	5 14%
.xn-55qx5d (Chinese for company)	1 50%	168 31% D	169 31% D	7 15%	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	168 31% N	7 15%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q820_1. If you were setting up a new website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following new gTLDs?
1. .email

16 Aug 2016
Table 142

Base: Has Heard Of New gTLDs

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	1227	207	103	269	190	419	182	352	151	1341	601
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	134 17%	1331 51% EIK	1465 44% EI	842 69% ABCFHJ	69 33% A	55 53% E	139 52% AEIEICEI	112 59% A	153 37% A	113 62% I	163 46% AEIEIEI	106 70% KFH	807 60% AEGIBEGICEIK	456 76% MDFHJ
Very likely	41 5%	650 25% EIK	691 21% EI	454 37% ABC	28 14% A	29 28% E	78 29% AEIKEIKCEIK	66 35% A	65 16% A	59 32% I	70 20% A	60 40% K	409 30% AEIKBEIKCEIK	240 40% MDF
Somewhat likely	93 12%	681 26% EI	774 23% EI	388 32% ABCH	41 20% A	26 25% A	61 23% A	46 24% A	88 21% A	54 30% I	93 26% A	46 30% AEGIBEGICEI	398 30% AEGIBEGICEI	216 36% MDFH
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	568 74%	970 37% DM	1538 46% DGM	297 24% N	121 58% FGKMBGKMGKGM	35 34% DLN	106 39% MMM	62 33% DLN	206 49% JGKMBGKMGKGM	58 32% DLN	146 41% LMMM	33 22% N	391 29% N	109 18% N
Somewhat unlikely	93 12%	418 16% DK	511 15% D	147 12% A	36 17% A	13 13% A	46 17% A	27 14% AKKCK	81 19% A	29 16% A	43 12% A	14 9% NA	212 16% NA	64 11% NA
Very unlikely	475 62%	552 21% DM	1027 31% DGM	150 12% N	85 41% FGKMBGKMGKGM	22 21% DN	60 22% MMM	35 18% DN	125 30% JGMBGKMGGM	29 16% N	103 29% LMBMM	19 13% N	179 13% N	45 7% N
Not sure	67 9%	285 11% D	352 10% D	88 7% A	17 8% A	13 13% DN	24 9% A	16 8% JAEGBEGCEG	59 14% A	11 6% A	43 12% A	12 8% A	142 11% N	36 6% A
Decline to Answer	-	2 *	2 *	-	-	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	1 *	-
Sigma	769 100%	2588 100%	3357 100%	1227 100%	207 100%	103 100%	269 100%	190 100%	419 100%	182 100%	352 100%	151 100%	1341 100%	601 100%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q820_2. If you were setting up a new website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following new gTLDs?
2. .photography

16 Aug 2016
Table 143

Base: Has Heard Of New gTLDs

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	491	207	40*	269	82*	419	67*	352	45*	1341	257
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	150 20%	1098 42% EIK	1248 37% EI	289 59% ABCF	54 26% A	14 35%	107 40% AEIEIEI	43 52% G	123 29% A	40 60% IF	126 36% AE	22 49% AEIKBEGIKCEGIK	688 51% MDFHL	170 66%
Very likely	52 7%	417 16% EIK	469 14% E	136 28% ABC	18 9%	8 20% E	38 14% A	25 30% G	46 11% A	19 28% I	42 12% A	14 31% K	273 20% AEIKBEGIKCEGIK	70 27% M
Somewhat likely	98 13%	681 26% EI	779 23% EI	153 31% ABCFHL	36 17%	6 15%	69 26% AEIEIEI	18 22%	77 18% A	21 31% I	84 24% A	8 18% AEIKBEIKCEIK	415 31% MDFHL	100 39%
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	558 73%	1143 44% DM	1701 51% DM	158 32% N	131 63% GKMBGKMGKMG	19 48% DN	125 46% MMM	29 35% JGMBGKMG	230 55% A	25 37% LMBMM	179 51% A	15 33% A	478 36% N	70 27%
Somewhat unlikely	87 11%	522 20% D	609 18% D	80 16% A	41 20% A	5 13%	61 23% AC	12 15%	87 21% A	9 13% A	60 17% A	7 16% A	273 20% AC	47 18%
Very unlikely	471 61%	621 24% DM	1092 33% DGM	78 16% N	90 43% GKMBGKMGKMG	14 35% DN	64 24% MMM	17 21% N	143 34% GMBGKMG	16 24% N	119 34% LGMBGKMG	8 18% A	205 15% N	23 9%
Not sure	61 8%	345 13% D	406 12% D	44 9% N	22 11%	7 18% JN	37 14% A	10 12% J	65 16% JAC	2 3% A	47 13% A	8 18% DJN	174 13% NA	17 7%
Decline to Answer	-	2 *	2 *	-	-	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	1 *	-
Sigma	769 100%	2588 100%	3357 100%	491 100%	207 100%	40 100%	269 100%	82 100%	419 100%	67 100%	352 100%	45 100%	1341 100%	257 100%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base

Q820_3. If you were setting up a new website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following new gTLDs?
3. .link

16 Aug 2016
Table 144

Base: Has Heard Of New gTLDs

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	1118	207	88*	269	183	419	131	352	141	1341	575
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	119 15%	1267 49% EI	1386 41% EI	686 61% ABCFH	65 31% A	44 50% E	135 50% AEIEICEI	87 48% A	140 33% A	85 65% IFH	167 47% AEIEICEI	92 65% KFH	760 57% AEIKBEIKCEIK	378 66% MDFH
Very likely	44 6%	507 20% EI	551 16% EI	297 27% ABC	18 9% ABC	17 19% E	68 25% AEIKBEIKCEIK	44 24% A	51 12% A	33 25% I	61 17% AEIEIEI	38 27% K	309 23% AEIKBEIKCEIK	165 29% M
Somewhat likely	75 10%	760 29% EI	835 25% EI	389 35% ABCH	47 23% A	27 31% A	67 25% A	43 23% A	89 21% A	52 40% IH	106 30% AIICI	54 38% H	451 34% AEGIBEGICEGI	213 37% H
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	580 75% DEGIKM	994 38% DM	1574 47% DGKM	338 30% FGKMBGKMGKMGK	115 56% FGKMBGKMGKMGK	33 38% MMM	106 39% MMM	68 37% DLN	213 51% JGKMBGKMGKMGK	39 30% LMMM	145 41% LMMM	37 26% LMMM	415 31% LMMM	161 28% LMMM
Somewhat unlikely	84 11%	430 17% K	514 15% K	187 17% A	28 14% A	17 19% A	44 16% A	28 15% AKKCK	79 19% AKKCK	22 17% AKKCK	45 13% AKKCK	20 14% AKKCK	234 17% AKKCK	100 17% AKKCK
Very unlikely	496 64% DEGIKM	564 22% DM	1060 32% DGM	151 14% FGKMBGKMGKMGK	87 42% FGKMBGKMGKMGK	16 18% N	62 23% MMM	40 22% DJLN	134 32% JGMBGKMGKMGK	17 13% LMBMM	100 28% LMBMM	17 12% LMBMM	181 13% LMBMM	61 11% LMBMM
Not sure	70 9%	325 13% D	395 12% D	94 8% N	27 13% N	11 13% N	28 10% N	28 15% DJN	65 16% JABC	7 5% JABC	40 11% JABC	12 9% JABC	165 12% NA	36 6% NA
Decline to Answer	-	2 *	2 *	-	-	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	1 *	-
Sigma	769 100%	2588 100%	3357 100%	1118 100%	207 100%	88 100%	269 100%	183 100%	419 100%	131 100%	352 100%	141 100%	1341 100%	575 100%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base

Q820_4. If you were setting up a new website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following new gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 145

4. .guru

Base: Has Heard Of New gTLDs

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	511	207	50*	269	71*	419	45*	352	84*	1341	261
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	141 18%	964 37% EGI	1105 33% EI	303 59% ABCFH	43 21%	19 38% E	84 31% AEIEIEI	32 45% G	93 22%	24 53% I	120 34% AEIEIEI	43 51% K	624 47% AEGKBEGIKCEGIK	185 71% MDFHJL
Very likely	43 6%	371 14% EIK	414 12% E	144 28% ABCH	14 7%	11 22% E	29 11% A	11 15%	43 10% A	10 22% I	37 11% A	24 29% K	248 18% AEGKBEGIKCEGIK	88 34% MDH
Somewhat likely	98 13%	593 23% EI	691 21% EI	159 31% ABCF	29 14%	8 16%	55 20% AIII	21 30%	50 12%	14 31% I	83 24% AEIEIEI	19 23% AEGIBEGICEGI	376 28% AEGIBEGICEGI	97 37% MDFL
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	563 73%	1262 49% DM	1825 54% DM	156 31% FGKMBGKMCCKM	141 68%	25 50% DN	148 55% MBMM	30 42% DN	256 61% JKMBKMCCKM	20 44% DN	179 51% LMMM	28 33% N	538 40% N	53 20%
Somewhat unlikely	89 12%	551 21% DK	640 19% D	74 14%	44 21% A	7 14%	60 22% A	19 27% DJLN	84 20% A	5 11%	59 17% A	9 11% NAKKCK	304 23% N	34 13%
Very unlikely	474 62%	711 27% DM	1185 35% DM	82 16% N	97 47% GKMBGKMCCKM	18 36% DHN	88 33% HMBMM	11 15% N	172 41% GKMBGKMCCKM	15 33% DHN	120 34% LMBMM	19 23% N	234 17% N	19 7%
Not sure	65 8%	360 14% D	425 13%	52 10%	23 11%	6 12%	37 14% A	9 13%	69 16% JAC	1 2%	53 15% A	13 15% J	178 13% NA	23 9%
Decline to Answer	-	2 *	2 *	-	-	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	1 *	-
Sigma	769 100%	2588 100%	3357 100%	511 100%	207 100%	50 100%	269 100%	71 100%	419 100%	45 100%	352 100%	84 100%	1341 100%	261 100%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base

Q820_5. If you were setting up a new website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following new gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 146

5. .realtor

Base: Has Heard Of New gTLDs

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	258	207	68*	269	11**	419	20**	352	23**	1341	136
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	73 9%	864 33% EIK	937 28% EI	145 56% ABCF	34 16% A	11 16%	76 28% AEIEIEI	10 91%	83 20% A	15 75%	86 24% AEIE	10 43% AEGKBEGKCEGK	585 44%	99 73% MDF
Very likely	23 3%	309 12% IK	332 10% IK	58 22% ABCF	18 9% A	5 7%	26 10% AKKK	5 45%	29 7% A	7 35%	19 5% A	3 13% AEGKBEGKCEGK	217 16% MDF	38 28%
Somewhat likely	50 7%	555 21% EI	605 18% EI	87 34% ABCF	16 8%	6 9%	50 19% AEIEIEI	5 45%	54 13% A	8 40%	67 19% AEIEIEI	7 30% AEGKBEGKCEGK	368 27% MDF	61 45%
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	626 81% DEGIKM	1339 52% DM	1965 59% DM	99 38% N	151 73% GKMBEGKCEGK	53 78% DN	154 57% MMM	1 9%	264 63% MBMCM	5 25%	209 59% MBMM	13 57% N	561 42% N	27 20%
Somewhat unlikely	67 9%	573 22% DK	640 19% D	28 11% A	45 22% A	8 12%	62 23% A	-	97 23% AC	2 10%	63 18% A	3 13% NAKKCK	306 23% N	15 11%
Very unlikely	559 73% DEGIKM	766 30% M	1325 39% DM	71 28% N	106 51% GKMBEGKCEGK	45 66% EDN	92 34% MMM	1 9%	167 40% MBMM	3 15%	146 41% MBMM	10 43% N	255 19% N	12 9%
Not sure	70 9%	383 15% D	453 13% D	14 5% A	22 11%	4 6%	39 14% A	-	71 17% AEECE	-	57 16% A	-	194 14% NA	10 7%
Decline to Answer	-	2 *	2 *	-	-	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	1 *	-
Sigma	769 100%	2588 100%	3357 100%	258 100%	207 100%	68 100%	269 100%	11 100%	419 100%	20 100%	352 100%	23 100%	1341 100%	136 100%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/F/H/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/I/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q820_6. If you were setting up a new website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following new gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 147

6. .club

Base: Has Heard Of New gTLDs

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	676	207	55*	269	80*	419	71*	352	64*	1341	406
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	163 21%	1097 42% EIK	1260 38% EI	423 63% ABCFH	51 25%	27 49% E	101 38% AEIEIEI	39 49%	114 27% A	37 52% I	119 34% AEIEIEI	33 52% K	712 53% AEGKBEGIKCEGK	287 71% MDFHJL
Very likely	56 7%	444 17% EIK	500 15% EIK	208 31% ABCH	21 10%	16 29% E	36 13% A	17 21%	49 12% A	22 31% I	36 10% AEIEIEI	13 20% K	302 23% AEGKBEGIKCEGK	140 34% MDHL
Somewhat likely	107 14%	653 25% EI	760 23% EI	215 32% ABCFJ	30 14%	11 20%	65 24% AEIEIEI	22 28%	65 16% AKKK	15 21%	83 24% AEIEIEI	20 31% AEGKBEGIKCEGK	410 31% AEGKBEGIKCEGK	147 36% MDFJ
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	544 71% DGIKM	1139 44% DM	1683 50% DM	205 30% N	133 64% FGMBGKMGK	18 33%	133 49% MMM	33 41% DN	239 57% JMBMCM	31 44% DN	180 51% LMBMM	22 34% DN	454 34% N	101 25% N
Somewhat unlikely	91 12%	494 19% DK	585 17%	102 15%	42 20% A	6 11% AKMBKMKM	65 24%	15 19%	87 21% AKKK	13 18%	50 14%	12 19%	250 19% NA	56 14%
Very unlikely	453 59% DEGIKM	645 25% DM	1098 33% DGM	103 15% N	91 44% FGMBGKMGK	12 22% N	68 25% MMM	18 23% N	152 36% GMBGKMGK	18 25% DN	130 37% LGBGKMGK	10 16% DN	204 15% N	45 11%
Not sure	62 8%	350 14% D	412 12% D	48 7% N	23 11%	10 18% DJN	35 13% A	8 10% N	65 16% JAC	3 4%	53 15% A	9 14% DJN	174 13% NA	18 4%
Decline to Answer	-	2 *	2 *	-	-	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	1 *	-
Sigma	769 100%	2588 100%	3357 100%	676 100%	207 100%	55 100%	269 100%	80 100%	419 100%	71 100%	352 100%	64 100%	1341 100%	406 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base

Q820_7. If you were setting up a new website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following new gTLDs?
7. .xyz

16 Aug 2016
Table 148

Base: Has Heard Of New gTLDs

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	443	207	38*	269	40*	419	47*	352	59*	1341	259
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	62 8%	867 34% EGIK	929 28% EIK	228 51% ABCL	38 18% A	18 47% E	72 27% AEKEKEK	22 55% G	90 21% A	24 51% I	66 19% A	21 36% K	601 45% AEGKBEGKCEGIK	143 55% ML
Very likely	21 3%	338 13% EGK	359 11% EK	96 22% ABCL	8 4% A	10 26% E	24 9% AEKEKEK	7 18% AEKEKEK	44 11% A	11 23% I	19 5% A	7 12% K	243 18% AEGKBEGKCEGIK	61 24% ML
Somewhat likely	41 5%	529 20% EIK	570 17% I	132 30% ABC	30 14% A	8 21% A	48 18% AIII	15 38% G	46 11% A	13 28% I	47 13% A	14 24% K	358 27% AEGKBEGKCEGIK	82 32% ML
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	640 83%	1336 52% DEGIKM	1976 59% DM	171 39% FGIMBGIMCGIM	145 70% A	16 42% A	155 58% HMBMM	12 30% MBMM	257 61% A	23 49% LMBMCM	226 64% A	28 47% K	553 41% AEGKBEGKCEGIK	92 36% ML
Somewhat unlikely	68 9%	560 22% D	628 19% D	80 18% A	40 19% A	4 11% A	62 23% A	6 15% A	87 21% A	10 21% A	78 22% A	11 19% A	293 22% AC	49 19% J
Very unlikely	572 74%	776 30% DEGIKM	1348 40% DM	91 21% N	105 51% FGIMBGIMCGIM	12 32% N	93 35% HMMM	6 15% MBMM	170 41% A	13 28% MBMM	148 42% A	17 29% N	260 19% A	43 17% J
Not sure	67 9%	383 15% D	450 13% D	44 10% J	24 12% A	4 11% J	42 16% A	6 15% J	71 17% JAC	- - AC	60 17% AC	10 17% J	186 14% NA	24 9% J
Decline to Answer	-	2 *	2 *	-	-	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	1 *	-
Sigma	769 100%	2588 100%	3357 100%	443 100%	207 100%	38 100%	269 100%	40 100%	419 100%	47 100%	352 100%	59 100%	1341 100%	259 100%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base

Q820_16. If you were setting up a new website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following new gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 149

16. .top

Base: Has Heard Of New gTLDs

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	-**	-**	-**	466	-**	16**	-**	44*	-**	46*	-**	29**	-**	331
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	297 64% H	-	6 38%	-	19 43%	-	25 54%	-	16 55%	-	231 70% DHJ
Very likely	-	-	-	148 32%	-	4 25%	-	9 20%	-	13 28%	-	5 17%	-	117 35% D
Somewhat likely	-	-	-	149 32%	-	2 13%	-	10 23%	-	12 26%	-	11 38%	-	114 34%
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	133 29% N	-	8 50%	-	18 41% N	-	18 39% N	-	9 31%	-	80 24%
Somewhat unlikely	-	-	-	77 17%	-	5 31%	-	11 25%	-	5 11%	-	5 17%	-	51 15%
Very unlikely	-	-	-	56 12% N	-	3 19%	-	7 16%	-	13 28% DN	-	4 14%	-	29 9%
Not sure	-	-	-	36 8% N	-	2 13%	-	7 16% DN	-	3 7%	-	4 14%	-	20 6%
Sigma	-	-	-	466 100%	-	16 100%	-	44 100%	-	46 100%	-	29 100%	-	331 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q820_17. If you were setting up a new website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following new gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 150

17. .pics

Base: Has Heard Of New gTLDs

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
					(E)		(G)		(I)		(K)		(M)	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	-**	-**	-**	485	-**	50*	-**	49*	-**	73*	-**	61*	-**	252
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	313 65% FL	-	25 50%	-	31 63%	-	42 58%	-	32 52%	-	183 73% DFJL
Very likely	-	-	-	134 28%	-	13 26%	-	11 22%	-	14 19%	-	16 26%	-	80 32% DJ
Somewhat likely	-	-	-	179 37% F	-	12 24%	-	20 41%	-	28 38%	-	16 26%	-	103 41% FL
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	136 28% N	-	19 38% N	-	13 27%	-	29 40% DN	-	22 36% N	-	53 21%
Somewhat unlikely	-	-	-	77 16%	-	10 20%	-	10 20%	-	12 16%	-	11 18%	-	34 13%
Very unlikely	-	-	-	59 12% N	-	9 18% N	-	3 6%	-	17 23% DHN	-	11 18% N	-	19 8%
Not sure	-	-	-	36 7%	-	6 12% J	-	5 10%	-	2 3%	-	7 11% J	-	16 6%
Sigma	-	-	-	485 100%	-	50 100%	-	49 100%	-	73 100%	-	61 100%	-	252 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q820_18. If you were setting up a new website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following new gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 151

18. .online

Base: Has Heard Of New gTLDs

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
					(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	.**	.**	.**	1142	.**	86*	.**	181	.**	190	.**	165	.**	520
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	805 70% J	-	57 66%	-	117 65%	-	118 62%	-	111 67%	-	402 77% DFHJL
Very likely	-	-	-	418 37% J	-	27 31%	-	72 40% J	-	52 27%	-	64 39% J	-	203 39% J
Somewhat likely	-	-	-	387 34% H	-	30 35%	-	45 25%	-	66 35% H	-	47 28%	-	199 38% DHL
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	253 22% N	-	20 23%	-	46 25% N	-	63 33% DLN	-	34 21%	-	90 17%
Somewhat unlikely	-	-	-	138 12%	-	10 12%	-	19 10%	-	33 17% DL	-	15 9%	-	61 12%
Very unlikely	-	-	-	115 10% N	-	10 12% N	-	27 15% DN	-	30 16% DN	-	19 12% N	-	29 6%
Not sure	-	-	-	84 7% N	-	9 10%	-	18 10% N	-	9 5%	-	20 12% DJN	-	28 5%
Sigma	-	-	-	1142 100%	-	86 100%	-	181 100%	-	190 100%	-	165 100%	-	520 100%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q820_19. If you were setting up a new website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following new gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 152

19. .space

Base: Has Heard Of New gTLDs

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
					(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	-**	-**	-**	700	-**	68*	-**	131	-**	100	-**	82*	-**	319
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	417 60% HL	-	33 49%	-	60 46%	-	65 65% FHL	-	39 48%	-	220 69% DFHL
Very likely	-	-	-	190 27% H	-	13 19%	-	26 20%	-	28 28%	-	20 24%	-	103 32% DFH
Somewhat likely	-	-	-	227 32%	-	20 29%	-	34 26%	-	37 37% L	-	19 23%	-	117 37% DHL
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	215 31% N	-	29 43% DN	-	48 37% N	-	31 31%	-	25 30%	-	82 26%
Somewhat unlikely	-	-	-	106 15%	-	16 24% DN	-	22 17%	-	12 12%	-	12 15%	-	44 14%
Very unlikely	-	-	-	109 16% N	-	13 19%	-	26 20% N	-	19 19%	-	13 16%	-	38 12%
Not sure	-	-	-	68 10% JN	-	6 9%	-	23 18% DJN	-	4 4%	-	18 22% DFJN	-	17 5%
Sigma	-	-	-	700 100%	-	68 100%	-	131 100%	-	100 100%	-	82 100%	-	319 100%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q820_20. If you were setting up a new website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following new gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 153

20. .website

Base: Has Heard Of New gTLDs

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
					(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)	
Unweighted Base	..**	..**	..**	886	..**	73*	..**	182	..**	129	..**	100	..**	402
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	594 67% H	-	51 70%	-	110 60%	-	81 63%	-	65 65%	-	287 71% DH
Very likely	-	-	-	318 36%	-	28 38%	-	68 37%	-	42 33%	-	35 35%	-	145 36%
Somewhat likely	-	-	-	276 31% H	-	23 32%	-	42 23%	-	39 30%	-	30 30%	-	142 35% DH
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	216 24%	-	14 19%	-	51 28%	-	41 32% DN	-	24 24%	-	86 21%
Somewhat unlikely	-	-	-	109 12% F	-	3 4%	-	21 12%	-	19 15% F	-	8 8%	-	58 14% F
Very unlikely	-	-	-	107 12% N	-	11 15% N	-	30 16% DN	-	22 17% N	-	16 16% N	-	28 7%
Not sure	-	-	-	76 9%	-	8 11%	-	21 12%	-	7 5%	-	11 11%	-	29 7%
Sigma	-	-	-	886 100%	-	73 100%	-	182 100%	-	129 100%	-	100 100%	-	402 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q820_21. If you were setting up a new website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following new gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 154

21. .news

Base: Has Heard Of New gTLDs

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
					(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)	
Unweighted Base	..	..	..	1253	..	113	..	144	..	162	..	191	..	643
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	717	-	34	-	73	-	88	-	92	-	430
	-	-	-	57% FL	-	30%	-	51% F	-	54% F	-	48% F	-	67% DFHJL
Very likely	-	-	-	346	-	15	-	42	-	36	-	42	-	211
	-	-	-	28% F	-	13%	-	29% F	-	22%	-	22%	-	33% DFJL
Somewhat likely	-	-	-	371	-	19	-	31	-	52	-	50	-	219
	-	-	-	30% FH	-	17%	-	22% F	-	32% FH	-	26%	-	34% DFHL
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	439	-	70	-	55	-	67	-	77	-	170
	-	-	-	35% N	-	62% DHJLN	-	38% N	-	41% N	-	40% N	-	26%
Somewhat unlikely	-	-	-	217	-	21	-	24	-	25	-	39	-	108
	-	-	-	17%	-	19%	-	17%	-	15%	-	20%	-	17%
Very unlikely	-	-	-	222	-	49	-	31	-	42	-	38	-	62
	-	-	-	18% N	-	43% DHJLN	-	22% N	-	26% DN	-	20% N	-	10%
Not sure	-	-	-	97	-	9	-	16	-	7	-	22	-	43
	-	-	-	8%	-	8%	-	11% J	-	4%	-	12% DJN	-	7%
Sigma	-	-	-	1253	-	113	-	144	-	162	-	191	-	643
	-	-	-	100%	-	100%	-	100%	-	100%	-	100%	-	100%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q820_22. If you were setting up a new website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following new gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 155

22. .site

Base: Has Heard Of New gTLDs

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	-**	-**	-**	862	-**	76*	-**	167	-**	114	-**	113	-**	392
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	573 66% L	-	47 62%	-	102 61%	-	74 65%	-	64 57%	-	286 73% DHL
Very likely	-	-	-	280 32%	-	25 33%	-	61 37%	-	36 32%	-	33 29%	-	125 32%
Somewhat likely	-	-	-	293 34% H	-	22 29%	-	41 25%	-	38 33%	-	31 27%	-	161 41% DFHL
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	222 26% N	-	21 28%	-	48 29%	-	34 30%	-	36 32% N	-	83 21%
Somewhat unlikely	-	-	-	128 15%	-	7 9%	-	27 16%	-	15 13%	-	24 21% DF	-	55 14%
Very unlikely	-	-	-	94 11% N	-	14 18% DN	-	21 13% N	-	19 17% DN	-	12 11%	-	28 7%
Not sure	-	-	-	67 8% N	-	8 11%	-	17 10%	-	6 5%	-	13 12% N	-	23 6%
Sigma	-	-	-	862 100%	-	76 100%	-	167 100%	-	114 100%	-	113 100%	-	392 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q820_23. If you were setting up a new website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following new gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 156

23. .toronto

Base: Has Heard Of New gTLDs

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	._**	._**	._**	18**	._**	18**	._**	._**	._**	._**	._**	._**	._**	._**
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	9 50%	-	9 50%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Very likely	-	-	-	3 17%	-	3 17%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Somewhat likely	-	-	-	6 33%	-	6 33%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	9 50%	-	9 50%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Somewhat unlikely	-	-	-	3 17%	-	3 17%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Very unlikely	-	-	-	6 33%	-	6 33%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Not sure	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sigma	-	-	-	18 100%	-	18 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q820_24. If you were setting up a new website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following new gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 157

24. .guadalajara

Base: Has Heard Of New gTLDs

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	..**	..**	..**	7**	..**	7**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	3 43%	-	3 43%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Very likely	-	-	-	3 43%	-	3 43%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Somewhat likely	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	3 43%	-	3 43%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Somewhat unlikely	-	-	-	1 14%	-	1 14%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Very unlikely	-	-	-	2 29%	-	2 29%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Not sure	-	-	-	1 14%	-	1 14%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sigma	-	-	-	7 100%	-	7 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q820_25. If you were setting up a new website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following new gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 158

25. .roma

Base: Has Heard Of New gTLDs

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	._**	._**	._**	8**	._**	._**	._**	._**	._**	8**	._**	._**	._**	._**
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	4 50%	-	-	-	-	-	4 50%	-	-	-	-
Very likely	-	-	-	2 25%	-	-	-	-	-	2 25%	-	-	-	-
Somewhat likely	-	-	-	2 25%	-	-	-	-	-	2 25%	-	-	-	-
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	4 50%	-	-	-	-	-	4 50%	-	-	-	-
Somewhat unlikely	-	-	-	1 13%	-	-	-	-	-	1 13%	-	-	-	-
Very unlikely	-	-	-	3 38%	-	-	-	-	-	3 38%	-	-	-	-
Not sure	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sigma	-	-	-	8 100%	-	-	-	-	-	8 100%	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q820_26. If you were setting up a new website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following new gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 159

26. .istanbul

Base: Has Heard Of New gTLDs

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	._**	._**	._**	13**	._**	._**	._**	._**	._**	13**	._**	._**	._**	._**
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	12 92%	-	-	-	-	-	12 92%	-	-	-	-
Very likely	-	-	-	7 54%	-	-	-	-	-	7 54%	-	-	-	-
Somewhat likely	-	-	-	5 38%	-	-	-	-	-	5 38%	-	-	-	-
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	1 8%	-	-	-	-	-	1 8%	-	-	-	-
Somewhat unlikely	-	-	-	1 8%	-	-	-	-	-	1 8%	-	-	-	-
Very unlikely	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Not sure	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sigma	-	-	-	13 100%	-	-	-	-	-	13 100%	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q820_27. If you were setting up a new website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following new gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 160

27. .madrid

Base: Has Heard Of New gTLDs

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	._**	._**	._**	5**	._**	._**	._**	._**	._**	5**	._**	._**	._**	._**
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	3 60%	-	-	-	-	-	3 60%	-	-	-	-
Very likely	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Somewhat likely	-	-	-	3 60%	-	-	-	-	-	3 60%	-	-	-	-
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	2 40%	-	-	-	-	-	2 40%	-	-	-	-
Somewhat unlikely	-	-	-	1 20%	-	-	-	-	-	1 20%	-	-	-	-
Very unlikely	-	-	-	1 20%	-	-	-	-	-	1 20%	-	-	-	-
Not sure	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sigma	-	-	-	5 100%	-	-	-	-	-	5 100%	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q820_28. If you were setting up a new website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following new gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 161

28. .warszawa

Base: Has Heard Of New gTLDs

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	._**	._**	._**	9**	._**	._**	._**	._**	._**	9**	._**	._**	._**	._**
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	3 33%	-	-	-	-	-	3 33%	-	-	-	-
Very likely	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Somewhat likely	-	-	-	3 33%	-	-	-	-	-	3 33%	-	-	-	-
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	6 67%	-	-	-	-	-	6 67%	-	-	-	-
Somewhat unlikely	-	-	-	3 33%	-	-	-	-	-	3 33%	-	-	-	-
Very unlikely	-	-	-	3 33%	-	-	-	-	-	3 33%	-	-	-	-
Not sure	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sigma	-	-	-	9 100%	-	-	-	-	-	9 100%	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q820_29. If you were setting up a new website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following new gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 162

29. .paris

Base: Has Heard Of New gTLDs

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	._**	._**	._**	28**	._**	._**	._**	._**	._**	28**	._**	._**	._**	._**
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	15 54%	-	-	-	-	-	15 54%	-	-	-	-
Very likely	-	-	-	7 25%	-	-	-	-	-	7 25%	-	-	-	-
Somewhat likely	-	-	-	8 29%	-	-	-	-	-	8 29%	-	-	-	-
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	12 43%	-	-	-	-	-	12 43%	-	-	-	-
Somewhat unlikely	-	-	-	5 18%	-	-	-	-	-	5 18%	-	-	-	-
Very unlikely	-	-	-	7 25%	-	-	-	-	-	7 25%	-	-	-	-
Not sure	-	-	-	1 4%	-	-	-	-	-	1 4%	-	-	-	-
Sigma	-	-	-	28 100%	-	-	-	-	-	28 100%	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q820_30. If you were setting up a new website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following new gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 163

30. Foshan

Base: Has Heard Of New gTLDs

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	._**	._**	._**	82*	._**	._**	._**	._**	._**	._**	._**	._**	._**	82*
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	53 65%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	53 65%
Very likely	-	-	-	32 39%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	32 39%
Somewhat likely	-	-	-	21 26%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	21 26%
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	25 30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	25 30%
Somewhat unlikely	-	-	-	16 20%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	16 20%
Very unlikely	-	-	-	9 11%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9 11%
Not sure	-	-	-	4 5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4 5%
Sigma	-	-	-	82 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	82 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q820_31. If you were setting up a new website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following new gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 164

31. .hanoi

Base: Has Heard Of New gTLDs

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	..	..	..	9**	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	9**
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	6 67%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6 67%
Very likely	-	-	-	2 22%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 22%
Somewhat likely	-	-	-	4 44%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4 44%
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	3 33%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3 33%
Somewhat unlikely	-	-	-	2 22%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 22%
Very unlikely	-	-	-	1 11%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 11%
Not sure	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sigma	-	-	-	9 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q820_32. If you were setting up a new website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following new gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 165

32. .manilla

Base: Has Heard Of New gTLDs

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	._**	._**	._**	16**	._**	._**	._**	._**	._**	._**	._**	._**	._**	16**
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	12 75%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	12 75%
Very likely	-	-	-	6 38%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6 38%
Somewhat likely	-	-	-	6 38%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6 38%
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	4 25%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4 25%
Somewhat unlikely	-	-	-	3 19%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3 19%
Very unlikely	-	-	-	1 6%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 6%
Not sure	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sigma	-	-	-	16 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	16 100%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q820_33. If you were setting up a new website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following new gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 166

33. .tokyo

Base: Has Heard Of New gTLDs

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	._**	._**	._**	70*	._**	._**	._**	._**	._**	._**	._**	._**	._**	70*
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	31 44%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	31 44%
Very likely	-	-	-	9 13%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9 13%
Somewhat likely	-	-	-	22 31%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	22 31%
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	35 50%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	35 50%
Somewhat unlikely	-	-	-	16 23%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	16 23%
Very unlikely	-	-	-	19 27%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	19 27%
Not sure	-	-	-	4 6%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4 6%
Sigma	-	-	-	70 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	70 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q820_34. If you were setting up a new website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following new gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 167

34. .seoul

Base: Has Heard Of New gTLDs

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	._**	._**	._**	28**	._**	._**	._**	._**	._**	._**	._**	._**	._**	28**
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	15 54%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15 54%
Very likely	-	-	-	6 21%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6 21%
Somewhat likely	-	-	-	9 32%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9 32%
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	11 39%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	11 39%
Somewhat unlikely	-	-	-	6 21%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6 21%
Very unlikely	-	-	-	5 18%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5 18%
Not sure	-	-	-	2 7%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 7%
Sigma	-	-	-	28 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	28 100%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q820_35. If you were setting up a new website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following new gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 168

35. .MOCKBa

Base: Has Heard Of New gTLDs

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	..	..	..	18**	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	18**
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	12 67%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	12 67%
Very likely	-	-	-	8 44%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8 44%
Somewhat likely	-	-	-	4 22%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4 22%
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	6 33%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6 33%
Somewhat unlikely	-	-	-	2 11%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 11%
Very unlikely	-	-	-	4 22%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4 22%
Not sure	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sigma	-	-	-	18 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	18 100%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q820_36. If you were setting up a new website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following new gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 169

36. .delhi

Base: Has Heard Of New gTLDs

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	._**	._**	._**	59*	._**	._**	._**	._**	._**	._**	._**	._**	._**	59*
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	44 75%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	44 75%
Very likely	-	-	-	25 42%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	25 42%
Somewhat likely	-	-	-	19 32%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	19 32%
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	13 22%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	13 22%
Somewhat unlikely	-	-	-	5 8%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5 8%
Very unlikely	-	-	-	8 14%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8 14%
Not sure	-	-	-	2 3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 3%
Sigma	-	-	-	59 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	59 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q820_37. If you were setting up a new website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following new gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 170

37. .jakarta

Base: Has Heard Of New gTLDs

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
					(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)	
Unweighted Base	._**	._**	._**	19**	._**	._**	._**	._**	._**	._**	._**	._**	19**	
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	12 63%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	12 63%	
Very likely	-	-	-	6 32%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6 32%	
Somewhat likely	-	-	-	6 32%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6 32%	
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	6 32%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6 32%	
Somewhat unlikely	-	-	-	5 26%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5 26%	
Very unlikely	-	-	-	1 5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 5%	
Not sure	-	-	-	1 5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 5%	
Sigma	-	-	-	19 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	19 100%	

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q820_38. If you were setting up a new website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following new gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 171

38. .abuja

Base: Has Heard Of New gTLDs

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	._**	._**	._**	17**	._**	._**	._**	._**	._**	._**	._**	17**	._**	._**
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	9 53%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9 53%	-	-
Very likely	-	-	-	5 29%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5 29%	-	-
Somewhat likely	-	-	-	4 24%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4 24%	-	-
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	7 41%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7 41%	-	-
Somewhat unlikely	-	-	-	2 12%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 12%	-	-
Very unlikely	-	-	-	5 29%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5 29%	-	-
Not sure	-	-	-	1 6%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 6%	-	-
Sigma	-	-	-	17 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	17 100%	-	-

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q820_39. If you were setting up a new website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following new gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 172

39. .capetown

Base: Has Heard Of New gTLDs

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	._**	._**	._**	20**	._**	._**	._**	._**	._**	._**	._**	20**	._**	._**
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	10 50%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10 50%	-	-
Very likely	-	-	-	4 20%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4 20%	-	-
Somewhat likely	-	-	-	6 30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6 30%	-	-
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	8 40%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8 40%	-	-
Somewhat unlikely	-	-	-	3 15%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3 15%	-	-
Very unlikely	-	-	-	5 25%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5 25%	-	-
Not sure	-	-	-	2 10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 10%	-	-
Sigma	-	-	-	20 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	20 100%	-	-

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q820_40. If you were setting up a new website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following new gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 173

40. .cairo

Base: Has Heard Of New gTLDs

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	..**	..**	..**	26**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	26**	..**	..**
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	20 77%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	20 77%	-	-
Very likely	-	-	-	6 23%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6 23%	-	-
Somewhat likely	-	-	-	14 54%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	14 54%	-	-
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	5 19%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5 19%	-	-
Somewhat unlikely	-	-	-	2 8%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 8%	-	-
Very unlikely	-	-	-	3 12%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3 12%	-	-
Not sure	-	-	-	1 4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 4%	-	-
Sigma	-	-	-	26 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	26 100%	-	-

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q820_41. If you were setting up a new website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following new gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 174

41. .bogota

Base: Has Heard Of New gTLDs

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	._**	._**	._**	26**	._**	._**	._**	26**	._**	._**	._**	._**	._**	._**
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	13 50%	-	-	-	13 50%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Very likely	-	-	-	6 23%	-	-	-	6 23%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Somewhat likely	-	-	-	7 27%	-	-	-	7 27%	-	-	-	-	-	-
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	10 38%	-	-	-	10 38%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Somewhat unlikely	-	-	-	3 12%	-	-	-	3 12%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Very unlikely	-	-	-	7 27%	-	-	-	7 27%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Not sure	-	-	-	3 12%	-	-	-	3 12%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sigma	-	-	-	26 100%	-	-	-	26 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing														

Q820_42. If you were setting up a new website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following new gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 175

42. .cordoba

Base: Has Heard Of New gTLDs

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	..**	..**	..**	10**	..**	..**	..**	10**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	2 20%	-	-	-	2 20%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Very likely	-	-	-	1 10%	-	-	-	1 10%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Somewhat likely	-	-	-	1 10%	-	-	-	1 10%	-	-	-	-	-	-
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	8 80%	-	-	-	8 80%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Somewhat unlikely	-	-	-	1 10%	-	-	-	1 10%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Very unlikely	-	-	-	7 70%	-	-	-	7 70%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Not sure	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sigma	-	-	-	10 100%	-	-	-	10 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q820_43. If you were setting up a new website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following new gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 176

43. .rio

Base: Has Heard Of New gTLDs

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	._**	._**	._**	21**	._**	._**	._**	21**	._**	._**	._**	._**	._**	._**
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	9 43%	-	-	-	9 43%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Very likely	-	-	-	3 14%	-	-	-	3 14%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Somewhat likely	-	-	-	6 29%	-	-	-	6 29%	-	-	-	-	-	-
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	10 48%	-	-	-	10 48%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Somewhat unlikely	-	-	-	7 33%	-	-	-	7 33%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Very unlikely	-	-	-	3 14%	-	-	-	3 14%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Not sure	-	-	-	2 10%	-	-	-	2 10%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sigma	-	-	-	21 100%	-	-	-	21 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q820_8. If you were setting up a new website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following new gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 177

8. .berlin

Base: Has Heard Of New gTLDs

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	17**	108	125	32*	..**	..**	..**	..**	108	32*	..**	..**	..**	..**
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	3 18%	29 27%	32 26%	8 25%	-	-	-	-	29 27%	8 25%	-	-	-	-
Very likely	1 6%	15 14%	16 13%	5 16%	-	-	-	-	15 14%	5 16%	-	-	-	-
Somewhat likely	2 12%	14 13%	16 13%	3 9%	-	-	-	-	14 13%	3 9%	-	-	-	-
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	14 82%	67 62%	81 65%	21 66%	-	-	-	-	67 62%	21 66%	-	-	-	-
Somewhat unlikely	6 35%	20 19%	26 21%	6 19%	-	-	-	-	20 19%	6 19%	-	-	-	-
Very unlikely	8 47%	47 44%	55 44%	15 47%	-	-	-	-	47 44%	15 47%	-	-	-	-
Not sure	-	12 11%	12 10%	3 9%	-	-	-	-	12 11%	3 9%	-	-	-	-
Sigma	17 100%	108 100%	125 100%	32 100%	-	-	-	-	108 100%	32 100%	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% nsk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q820_9. If you were setting up a new website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following new gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 178

9. .ovh

Base: Has Heard Of New gTLDs

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	17**	108	125	6**	._**	._**	._**	._**	108	6**	._**	._**	._**	._**
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	-	19 18%	19 15%	3 50%	-	-	-	-	19 18%	3 50%	-	-	-	-
Very likely	-	11 10%	11 9%	3 50%	-	-	-	-	11 10%	3 50%	-	-	-	-
Somewhat likely	-	8 7%	8 6%	-	-	-	-	-	8 7%	-	-	-	-	-
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	17 100%	75 69%	92 74%	3 50%	-	-	-	-	75 69%	3 50%	-	-	-	-
Somewhat unlikely	3 18%	21 19%	24 19%	1 17%	-	-	-	-	21 19%	1 17%	-	-	-	-
Very unlikely	14 82%	54 50%	68 54%	2 33%	-	-	-	-	54 50%	2 33%	-	-	-	-
Not sure	-	14 13%	14 11%	-	-	-	-	-	14 13%	-	-	-	-	-
Sigma	17 100%	108 100%	125 100%	6 100%	-	-	-	-	108 100%	6 100%	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q820_10. If you were setting up a new website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following new gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 179

10. .london

Base: Has Heard Of New gTLDs

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	114	419	533	20**	..**	..**	..**	..**	419	20**	..**	..**	..**	..**
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	8 7%	100 24%	108 20%	3 15%	-	-	-	-	100 24% AC	3 15%	-	-	-	-
Very likely	1 1%	39 9%	40 8%	1 5%	-	-	-	-	39 9% AC	1 5%	-	-	-	-
Somewhat likely	7 6%	61 15%	68 13%	2 10%	-	-	-	-	61 15% AC	2 10%	-	-	-	-
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	97 85% 	244 58%	341 64%	14 70%	-	-	-	-	244 58%	14 70%	-	-	-	-
Somewhat unlikely	18 16%	90 21%	108 20%	4 20%	-	-	-	-	90 21%	4 20%	-	-	-	-
Very unlikely	79 69%	154 37%	233 44% 	10 50%	-	-	-	-	154 37%	10 50%	-	-	-	-
Not sure	9 8%	74 18%	83 16%	3 15%	-	-	-	-	74 18% AC	3 15%	-	-	-	-
Decline to Answer	-	1 *	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	-	-
Sigma	114 100%	419 100%	533 100%	20 100%	-	-	-	-	419 100%	20 100%	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q820_11. If you were setting up a new website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following new gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 180

11. .nyc

Base: Has Heard Of New gTLDs

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	204	64*	268	23**	64*	23**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	17 8%	11 17%	28 10%	8 35%	11 17% A	8 35%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Very likely	11 5%	8 13%	19 7%	2 9%	8 13%	2 9%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Somewhat likely	6 3%	3 5%	9 3%	6 26%	3 5%	6 26%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	178 87%	50 78%	228 85%	15 65%	50 78%	15 65%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Somewhat unlikely	8 4%	6 9%	14 5%	5 22%	6 9%	5 22%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Very unlikely	170 83% E	44 69%	214 80% E	10 43%	44 69%	10 43%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Not sure	9 4%	3 5%	12 4%	-	3 5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sigma	204 100%	64 100%	268 100%	23 100%	64 100%	23 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q820_12. If you were setting up a new website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following new gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 181

12. .wang

Base: Has Heard Of New gTLDs

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	2**	548	550	110	._**	._**	._**	._**	._**	._**	._**	._**	548	110
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	-	313 57%	313 57%	82 75% BC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	313 57%	82 75% M
Very likely	-	138 25%	138 25%	38 35% BC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	138 25%	38 35% M
Somewhat likely	-	175 32%	175 32%	44 40%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	175 32%	44 40%
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	1 50%	176 32% D	177 32% D	23 21%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	176 32% N	23 21%
Somewhat unlikely	-	111 20%	111 20%	18 16%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	111 20%	18 16%
Very unlikely	1 50%	65 12% D	66 12% D	5 5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	65 12% N	5 5%
Not sure	1 50%	59 11% D	60 11% D	5 5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	59 11% N	5 5%
Sigma	2 100%	548 100%	550 100%	110 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	548 100%	110 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q820_13. If you were setting up a new website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following new gTLDs?
13. .xn-ses554g (Chinese for network address)

16 Aug 2016
Table 182

Base: Has Heard Of New gTLDs

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	2**	548	550	37*	._**	._**	._**	._**	._**	._**	._**	._**	548	37*
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	1 50%	326 59%	327 59%	30 81% BC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	326 59%	30 81% M
Very likely	-	153 28%	153 28%	13 35%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	153 28%	13 35%
Somewhat likely	1 50%	173 32%	174 32%	17 46%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	173 32%	17 46%
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	1 50%	176 32% D	177 32% D	5 14%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	176 32% N	5 14%
Somewhat unlikely	-	112 20%	112 20%	3 8%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	112 20%	3 8%
Very unlikely	1 50%	64 12%	65 12%	2 5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	64 12%	2 5%
Not sure	-	46 8%	46 8%	2 5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	46 8%	2 5%
Sigma	2 100%	548 100%	550 100%	37 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	548 100%	37 100%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% nsk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q820_14. If you were setting up a new website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following new gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 183

14. .xn-55qx5d (Chinese for company)

Base: Has Heard Of New gTLDs

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	2**	548	550	47*	._**	._**	._**	._**	._**	._**	._**	._**	548	47*
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	1 50%	330 60%	331 60%	40 85% BC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	330 60%	40 85% M
Very likely	-	138 25%	138 25%	18 38% C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	138 25%	18 38%
Somewhat likely	1 50%	192 35%	193 35%	22 47%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	192 35%	22 47%
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	1 50%	168 31% D	169 31% D	7 15%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	168 31% N	7 15%
Somewhat unlikely	-	96 18% D	96 17%	3 6%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	96 18% N	3 6%
Very unlikely	1 50%	72 13%	73 13%	4 9%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	72 13%	4 9%
Not sure	-	50 9% D	50 9% D	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	50 9% N	-
Sigma	2 100%	548 100%	550 100%	47 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	548 100%	47 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Base: All Qualified Respondents

Q823. Which of the following would be most important to you in determining which gTLD to register your domain name under?

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
					(E)		(G)		(I)		(K)		(M)	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
Has a well-known extension	396 51% DI	1246 48% DI	1642 49% DI	722 22%	93 45% F	100 22%	144 54% HIII	92 22%	177 42% J	107 20%	194 55% LEIMBEIMCEIM	81 20%	638 48% N	342 22%
Reasonable price	166 22%	804 31% D	970 29% D	774 23% F	68 33% FA	82 18%	76 28% HA	89 21%	155 37% AGKMBGIMCGKM	173 32% DFHLN	103 29% A	93 23%	402 30% NA	337 22%
All of my other preferred gTLDs are unavailable	127 17% DGIKM	202 8% DM	329 10% DM	-	28 14% FGMBGIMGM	-	19 7% H	-	44 11% JMBMM	-	33 9% LMMM	-	78 6% N	-
Has a new extension	16 2%	296 11% DEIK	312 9% DK	227 7% AFJ	13 6% A	17 4%	26 10% AKKK	26 6%	31 7% A	24 4%	15 4% A	20 5% NAEGNBEORCEGK	211 16% N	140 9% DFJL
One that is close to the one I wanted and is available to register	-	-	-	514 15% ABCFL	-	54 12% E	-	82 20% GDFJL	-	73 14% I	-	45 11% K	-	260 17% MDFL
One that seems most relevant to my needs	-	-	-	1094 33% ABCJN	-	204 44% EDHJN	-	123 30% G	-	152 28% I	-	161 40% KDHJN	-	454 29% M
Other	64 8% DEGIKM	22 1% M	86 3% DM	18 1%	3 1% MMM	3 1%	3 1%	3 1%	5 1%	5 1%	6 2% LMMM	1 *	5 *	6 *
Not Sure	-	17 1% D	17 1% D	-	2 1% FA	-	1 *	-	6 1% JABC	-	1 *	-	7 1% NA	-
Decline to Answer	-	1 *	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	1 * C	-	-	-	-	-
Sigma	769 100%	2588 100%	3357 100%	3349 100%	207 100%	460 100%	269 100%	415 100%	419 100%	534 100%	352 100%	401 100%	1341 100%	1539 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q825. Please rate the following gTLDs by how trustworthy you feel they are.

SUMMARY TABLE OF TOP 2 BOX

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
.email	375 49%	1751 68% EI	2126 63% I	2270 68% ACFJ	121 58% A	262 57% AEIEICEI	187 70% AEIEICEI	288 69% F	236 56% A	341 64% IF	232 66% AIII	264 66% F AEIKBEIKCEIK	975 73% F	1115 72% DFJL
.photography	463 60% DI	1516 59% DI	1979 59% DI	1857 55% H	123 59% H	256 56% H	146 54% H	189 46% H	220 53% H	290 54% H	216 61% III	222 55% H	811 60% IBII	900 58% DH
.link	305 40% EI	1617 62% EI	1922 57% I	2024 60% ACFJ	110 53% A	221 48% AEIEICEI	174 65% AEIEICEI	252 61% FJ	220 53% A	275 51% AEIEICEI	227 64% AEIEICEI	239 60% FJ AEIBEICEI	886 66% FJ AEIBEICEI	1037 67% DFHJL
.guru	320 42% I	1261 49% DEI	1581 47% DEI	1433 43% FJ	82 40% FJ	149 32% H	121 45% III	164 40% FJ	138 33% H	178 33% AEIEICEI	173 49% AEIEICEI	179 45% FJ NAEGKBEGICEGK	747 56% FJ	763 50% DFHJ
.realtor	343 45% GI	1215 47% GI	1558 46% GI	1560 47% HJ	109 53% AGIGIGI	276 60% DHJLN	101 38% III	127 31% H	126 30% H	198 37% IH	175 50% GIGIGI	200 50% HJ AGIBGIGI	704 52% HJ AGIBGIGI	759 49% DHJ
.club	384 50% EI	1411 55% EI	1795 53% EI	1752 52% FHJ	93 45% H	207 45% H	139 52% HIII	178 43% H	171 41% H	235 44% H	182 52% III	194 48% H NAEGKBEGICEGK	826 62% H	938 61% DFHJL
.xyz	176 23% DEGIK	1079 42% DEGIK	1255 37% EI	1284 38% AFHJ	64 31% A	119 26% H	93 35% A	121 29% H	127 30% A	168 31% H	118 34% A	143 36% FH NAEGKBEGICEGK	677 50% H	733 48% DFHJL
.top	-	-	-	1578 47% FHJL	-	144 31% H	-	151 36% H	-	221 41% F	-	169 42% F	-	893 58% DFHJL
.pics	-	-	-	1649 49% FHJ	-	205 45% H	-	155 37% H	-	230 43% H	-	207 52% FHJ	-	852 55% DFHJ
.online	-	-	-	2175 65% F	-	221 48% H	-	270 65% F	-	338 63% F	-	283 71% DFJ	-	1063 69% DFJ
.space	-	-	-	1743 52% FJ	-	196 43% H	-	201 48% H	-	255 48% H	-	202 50% F	-	889 58% DFHJL
.website	-	-	-	2059 61% F	-	221 48% H	-	281 68% DFJL	-	323 60% F	-	241 60% F	-	993 65% DF
.news	-	-	-	2403 72% HJ	-	313 68% H	-	269 65% H	-	354 66% H	-	305 76% DFHJ	-	1162 76% DFHJ
.site	-	-	-	1971 59% F	-	218 47% H	-	247 60% F	-	295 55% F	-	238 59% F	-	973 63% DFJ
.toronto	-	-	-	67 64% H	-	67 64% H	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
.guadalajara	-	-	-	45 45% H	-	45 45% H	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q825. Please rate the following gTLDs by how trustworthy you feel they are.

SUMMARY TABLE OF TOP 2 BOX

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
.roma	-	-	-	29 58%	-	-	-	-	-	29 58%	-	-	-	-
.istanbul	-	-	-	38 76%	-	-	-	-	-	38 76%	-	-	-	-
.madrid	-	-	-	33 66%	-	-	-	-	-	33 66%	-	-	-	-
.warszawa	-	-	-	33 62%	-	-	-	-	-	33 62%	-	-	-	-
.paris	-	-	-	54 51%	-	-	-	-	-	54 51%	-	-	-	-
Foshan	-	-	-	351 64%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	351 64%
.hanoi	-	-	-	27 52%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	27 52%
.manilla	-	-	-	57 56%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	57 56%
.tokyo	-	-	-	111 63%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	111 63%
.seoul	-	-	-	63 62%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	63 62%
.MOCKBa	-	-	-	77 60%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	77 60%
.delhi	-	-	-	194 59%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	194 59%
.jakarta	-	-	-	79 79%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	79 79%
.abuja	-	-	-	106 53%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	106 53%	-	-
.capetown	-	-	-	77 76%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	77 76%	-	-
.cairo	-	-	-	61 61%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	61 61%	-	-

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q825. Please rate the following gTLDs by how trustworthy you feel they are.

SUMMARY TABLE OF TOP 2 BOX

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
.bogota	-	-	-	71 57%	-	-	-	71 57%	-	-	-	-	-	-
.cordoba	-	-	-	28 27%	-	-	-	28 27%	-	-	-	-	-	-
.rio	-	-	-	89 48%	-	-	-	89 48%	-	-	-	-	-	-
.berlin	13 76%	70 65%	83 66%	75 60%	-	-	-	-	70 65%	75 60%	-	-	-	-
.ovh	3 18%	29 27%	32 26%	31 25%	-	-	-	-	29 27%	31 25%	-	-	-	-
.london	68 60%	213 51%	281 53%	67 67% BC	-	-	-	-	213 51%	67 67% I	-	-	-	-
.nyc	116 57% D	38 59%	154 57% D	118 46%	38 59%	118 46%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
.wang	1 50%	356 65%	357 65%	333 60%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	356 65%	333 60%
.xn-ses554g (Chinese for network address)	1 50%	378 69% D	379 69% D	295 54%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	378 69% N	295 54%
.xn-55qx5d (Chinese for company)	1 50%	369 67% D	370 67% D	312 57%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	369 67% N	312 57%
TOTAL TRUSTWORTHY (NET)	557 72%	2112 82% I	2669 80% I	3016 90% ABCFJ	162 78%	385 84%	216 80% AIII	375 90% GF	305 73%	466 87% I	292 83% AIII	371 93% KFJ	1137 85% AEIBEICEI	1419 92% MDFJ
TOTAL TRUSTWORTHY CONSISTENT (NET)	557 72%	2112 82% I	2669 80% I	2872 86% ABCFJ	162 78%	370 80%	216 80% AIII	359 87% GF	305 73%	442 83% I	292 83% AIII	347 87% F	1137 85% AEIBEICEI	1354 88% MDFJ
TOTAL TRUSTWORTHY ADDED (NET)	-	-	-	2940 88% ABCFJ	-	365 79% E	-	370 89% GFJ	-	449 84% I	-	363 91% KFJ	-	1393 91% MDFJ
TRUSTWORTHY GLOBAL (NET)	549 71%	2090 81% I	2639 79% I	2993 89% ABCFJ	160 77%	384 83%	216 80% AIII	375 90% GF	293 70%	461 86% I	292 83% AIII	367 92% KFJ	1129 84% AEIBEICEI	1406 91% MDFJ
TRUSTWORTHY GLOBAL CONSISTENT (NET)	549 71%	2090 81% I	2639 79% I	2853 85% ABCFJ	160 77%	366 80%	216 80% AIII	359 87% GFJ	293 70%	429 80% I	292 83% AIII	347 87% FJ	1129 84% AEIBEICEI	1352 88% MDFJ
TRUSTWORTHY GLOBAL ADDED (NET)	-	-	-	2901 87% ABCFJ	-	363 79% E	-	369 89% GFJ	-	445 83% I	-	354 86% KFJ	-	1370 89% MDFJ

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

O825. Please rate the following gTLDs by how trustworthy you feel they are.

SUMMARY TABLE OF TOP 2 BOX

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Reg-istrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
TRUSTWORTHY GEO-SPECIFIC (NET)	186 24% GK	702 27% EGK	888 26% EGK	2042 61% ABCFH	38 19% GKGK GK	230 50% E	-	188 45% G	225 54% AEGBMBGKMGCSGN	334 63% IFH	-	244 61% KFH	439 33% AEGBKBGKCGK	1046 69% MDFHJ
TRUSTWORTHY GEO-SPECIFIC CONSISTENT (NET)	186 24% DGK	702 27% DEGK	888 26% DEGK	663 20% HL	38 18% GKGK GK	118 26% EDHL	-	-	225 54% JAEBMBGKMGCSGN	147 28% DHL	-	-	439 33% NAEBKBGKCGK	398 26% DHL
TRUSTWORTHY GEO-SPECIFIC ADDED (NET)	-	-	-	1690 50% ABCFHJ	-	112 24% E	-	188 45% GFJ	-	187 35% IF	-	244 61% KDFHJ	-	959 62% MDFHJ

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q825. Please rate the following gTLDs by how trustworthy you feel they are.

SUMMARY TABLE OF BOTTOM 2 BOX

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
					(E)		(G)		(I)		(K)		(M)	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)		(F)		(H)		(J)		(L)		(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
.email	394 51% DEGIKM	778 30% M	1172 35% DGM	1079 32% N	78 38% MBMM	198 43% DHJLN	79 29% GKMBGKMGKM	127 31% DN	171 41% MMM	193 36% DN	112 32% MMM	137 34% N	338 25% N	424 28% N
.photography	306 40% DEGIKM	1000 39% M	1306 39% GKM	1492 45% ABCN	71 34% E	204 44% E	119 44% E	226 54% GDFJLN	186 44% E	244 46% GDFJLN	128 36% E	179 45% K	496 37% K	639 42% M
.link	464 60% DEGIKM	910 35% M	1374 41% GKM	1325 40% BN	86 42% MBMM	239 52% EDHLN	92 34% EDHLN	163 39% N	187 45% GKMBGKMGKM	259 49% DHLN	118 34% DHLN	162 40% N	427 32% N	502 33% N
.guru	449 58% KM	1252 48% M	1701 51% M	1916 57% BCN	109 53% MMM	311 68% EDHLN	145 54% MMM	251 60% N	266 63% E	356 67% DHLN	170 48% MMM	222 55% DHLN	562 42% N	776 50% M
.realtor	426 55% EKM	1298 50% EM	1724 51% EM	1789 53% BFN	83 40% E	184 40% E	165 61% E	288 69% GDFJLN	280 67% AEKMBEKMCEKM	336 63% DFLN	168 48% DHLN	201 50% F	602 45% N	790 51% MF
.club	385 50% M	1105 43% M	1490 44% M	1597 48% BCN	100 48% MMM	253 55% DN	127 47% MMM	237 57% GDN	232 55% GKMBGKMGKM	299 56% DN	161 46% MMM	207 52% N	485 36% N	601 39% N
.xyz	593 77% DEGIKM	1437 56% M	2030 60% M	2065 62% BN	130 63% MBMM	341 74% EDLN	173 64% MBMM	294 71% DLN	277 66% MBMCM	366 69% DN	225 64% MBMM	258 64% N	632 47% N	806 52% M
.top	-	-	-	1771 53% N	-	316 69% DJLN	-	264 64% DN	-	313 59% DN	-	232 58% DN	-	646 42% N
.pics	-	-	-	1700 51% N	-	255 55% DLN	-	260 63% DFLN	-	304 57% DLN	-	194 48% DN	-	687 45% N
.online	-	-	-	1174 35% LN	-	239 52% DHJLN	-	145 35% DN	-	196 37% LN	-	118 29% DN	-	476 31% N
.space	-	-	-	1606 48% N	-	264 57% DLN	-	214 52% N	-	279 52% DN	-	199 50% N	-	650 42% N
.website	-	-	-	1290 39% HN	-	239 52% DHJLN	-	134 32% DN	-	211 40% H	-	160 40% H	-	546 35% N
.news	-	-	-	946 28% LN	-	147 32% LN	-	146 35% DLN	-	180 34% DLN	-	96 24% DN	-	377 24% N
.site	-	-	-	1378 41% N	-	242 53% DHJLN	-	168 40% DN	-	239 45% N	-	163 41% DN	-	566 37% N
.toronto	-	-	-	38 36% N	-	38 36% DN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
.guadalajara	-	-	-	55 55% N	-	55 55% DN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q825. Please rate the following gTLDs by how trustworthy you feel they are.

16 Aug 2016
Table 186

SUMMARY TABLE OF BOTTOM 2 BOX

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
.roma	-	-	-	21 42%	-	-	-	-	-	21 42%	-	-	-	-
.istanbul	-	-	-	12 24%	-	-	-	-	-	12 24%	-	-	-	-
.madrid	-	-	-	17 34%	-	-	-	-	-	17 34%	-	-	-	-
.warszawa	-	-	-	20 38%	-	-	-	-	-	20 38%	-	-	-	-
.paris	-	-	-	52 49%	-	-	-	-	-	52 49%	-	-	-	-
Foshan	-	-	-	200 36%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	200 36%
.hanoi	-	-	-	25 48%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	25 48%
.manilla	-	-	-	44 44%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	44 44%
.tokyo	-	-	-	65 37%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	65 37%
.seoul	-	-	-	38 38%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	38 38%
.MOCKBa	-	-	-	51 40%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	51 40%
.delhi	-	-	-	136 41%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	136 41%
.jakarta	-	-	-	21 21%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	21 21%
.abuja	-	-	-	94 47%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	94 47%	-	-
.capetown	-	-	-	24 24%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	24 24%	-	-
.cairo	-	-	-	39 39%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	39 39%	-	-

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q825. Please rate the following gTLDs by how trustworthy you feel they are.

16 Aug 2016
Table 186

SUMMARY TABLE OF BOTTOM 2 BOX

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
.bogota	-	-	-	54 43%	-	-	-	54 43%	-	-	-	-	-	-
.cordoba	-	-	-	76 73%	-	-	-	76 73%	-	-	-	-	-	-
.rio	-	-	-	97 52%	-	-	-	97 52%	-	-	-	-	-	-
.berlin	4 24%	38 35%	42 34%	50 40%	-	-	-	-	38 35%	50 40%	-	-	-	-
.ovh	14 82%	78 72%	92 74%	94 75%	-	-	-	-	78 72%	94 75%	-	-	-	-
.london	46 40%	193 46% D	239 45% D	33 33%	-	-	-	-	193 46% J	33 33%	-	-	-	-
.nyc	88 43%	20 31%	108 40%	137 54% ABC	20 31%	137 54% E	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
.wang	1 50%	182 33%	183 33%	218 40% BC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	182 33%	218 40% M
.xn-ses554g (Chinese for network address)	1 50%	162 30%	163 30%	256 46% BC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	162 30%	256 46% M
.xn-55qx5d (Chinese for company)	1 50%	172 31%	173 31%	239 43% BC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	172 31%	239 43% M

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q825_1. Please rate the following gTLDs by how trustworthy you feel they are.

16 Aug 2016
Table 187

1. .email

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	375 49%	1751 68% EI	2126 63% I	2270 68% ACFJ	121 58% A	262 57% AEIEICEI	187 70% AEIEICEI	288 69% F	236 56% A	341 64% IF	232 66% AIII	264 66% F AEIKBEIKCEIK	975 73% AEIKBEIKCEIK	1115 72% DFJL
Very trustworthy	69 9%	603 23% EIK	672 20% I	727 22% AFJ	32 15% A	69 15% AEIKBEIKCEIK	80 30% AEIKBEIKCEIK	111 27% DFJL	57 14% A	78 15% AIII	67 19% AIII	78 19% J AEIKBEIKCEIK	367 27% AEIKBEIKCEIK	391 25% DFJL
Somewhat trustworthy	306 40%	1148 44%	1454 43%	1543 46% AC	89 43% AC	193 42%	107 40%	177 43%	179 43%	263 49% IFH	165 47% A	186 46% A	608 45% A	724 47%
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	394 51% DEGIKM	778 30% M	1172 35% DGM	1079 32% N	78 38% MBMM	198 43% DHJLN	79 29% DHJLN	127 31% GKMBGKMGCKM	171 41% GKMBGKMGCKM	193 36% DN	112 32% MMM	137 34% N	338 25% N	424 28%
Not very trustworthy	238 31% DGKM	577 22% M	815 24% GM	771 23% N	54 26% N	130 28% DHN	50 19% DHN	88 21% GKMBGKMGCKM	128 31% GKMBGKMGCKM	134 25% N	73 21% N	96 24% N	272 20% N	323 21%
Not at all trustworthy	156 20% DEGIKM	201 8% M	357 11% DM	308 9% N	24 12% MBMM	68 15% DHLN	29 11% MMM	39 9% N	43 10% MBMM	59 11% N	39 11% MBMM	41 10% N	66 5% N	101 7%
Not sure	-	58 2% D	58 2% D	-	8 4% FAGGCG	-	3 1% HA	-	11 3% JA	-	8 2% LA	-	28 2% NA	-
Decline to Answer	-	1 *	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	1 * C	-	-	-	-	-
Sigma	769 100%	2588 100%	3357 100%	3349 100%	207 100%	460 100%	269 100%	415 100%	419 100%	534 100%	352 100%	401 100%	1341 100%	1539 100%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q825_2. Please rate the following gTLDs by how trustworthy you feel they are.

16 Aug 2016
Table 188

2. .photography

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	463 60% DI	1516 59% DI	1979 59% DI	1857 55% H	123 59%	256 56% H	146 54% H	189 46%	220 53%	290 54% H	216 61% III	222 55% H	811 60% IBII	900 58% DH
Very trustworthy	109 14% D	368 14% DI	477 14% DI	379 11% JL	23 11%	46 10%	31 12%	48 12% J	43 10%	38 7%	42 12%	32 8%	229 17% NEGIKBEIKCEGIK	215 14% DFJL
Somewhat trustworthy	354 46%	1148 44%	1502 45%	1478 44% H	100 48%	210 46% H	115 43% H	141 34%	177 42%	252 47% H	174 49% IMBIMIM	190 47% H	582 43% H	685 45% H
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	306 40%	1000 39%	1306 39%	1492 45% ABCN	71 34%	204 44% E	119 44% EKMBEKMEKM	226 54% GDFJLN	186 44% EKMBEKMEKM	244 46%	128 36%	179 45% K	496 37% K	639 42% M
Not very trustworthy	180 23% K	741 29% K	921 27% K	1107 33% ABC	48 23%	146 32% E	78 29% GDFN	159 38% AEKBEKCEK	140 33%	182 34%	84 24%	131 33% K	391 29% AKKK	489 32%
Not at all trustworthy	126 16% DIM	259 10% M	385 11% M	385 11% N	23 11%	58 13% MBMCM	41 15% DJD	67 16% MMM	46 11% MMM	62 12%	44 13% MMM	48 12%	105 8%	150 10%
Not sure	- -	71 3% D	71 2% D	- FAGKMBGIRKMGIRK	13 6%	-	4 1% HA	-	12 3% JA	-	8 2% LA	-	34 3% NA	-
Decline to Answer	- -	1 *	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	1 * C	-	-	-	-	-
Sigma	769 100%	2588 100%	3357 100%	3349 100%	207 100%	460 100%	269 100%	415 100%	419 100%	534 100%	352 100%	401 100%	1341 100%	1539 100%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q825_3. Please rate the following gTLDs by how trustworthy you feel they are.
3. .link

16 Aug 2016
Table 189

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	305 40%	1617 62% EI	1922 57% I	2024 60% ACFJ	110 53% A	221 48% AEIEICEI	174 65% AEIEICEI	252 61% FJ	220 53% A	275 51% AEIEICEI	227 64% AEIEICEI	239 60% FJ AEIBEICEI	886 66% AEIBEICEI	1037 67% DFHJL
Very trustworthy	45 6%	449 17% EI	494 15% I	528 16% AFJ	23 11% A	39 8% AEIEICEI	56 21% AEIEICEI	84 20% DFJL	38 9% A	53 10% A	58 16% AIII	58 14% FJ AEIBEICEI	274 20% AEIBEICEI	294 19% DFJL
Somewhat trustworthy	260 34%	1168 45% EI	1428 43% I	1496 45% AF	87 42% A	182 40% AEIEICEI	118 44% AEIEICEI	168 40% DFJL	182 43% A	222 42% A	169 48% AC	181 45% FJ AEIBEICEI	612 46% AC	743 48% DFHJ
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	464 60% DEGIKM	910 35% M	1374 41% GKM	1325 40% BN	86 42% MBMM	239 52% EDHLN	92 34% N	163 39% GKMBGKMGKM	187 45% DHLN	259 49% DHLN	118 34% N	162 40% N	427 32% N	502 33% N
Not very trustworthy	260 34% DGKM	673 26% K	933 28% GK	927 28% N	60 29% KKK	153 33% DHN	60 22% N	112 27% GKGKGK	124 30% DN	174 33% DN	75 21% N	117 29% KN	354 26% N	371 24% N
Not at all trustworthy	204 27% DEGIKM	237 9% M	441 13% M	398 12% BN	26 13% MMM	86 19% DHLN	32 12% MMM	51 12% N	63 15% MBMM	85 16% DLN	43 12% MBMM	45 11% N	73 5% N	131 9% M
Not sure	- -	60 2% D	60 2% D	- -	11 5% FAGKMBGKMGKM	- -	3 1% HA	- -	11 3% JA	- -	7 2% LA	- -	28 2% NA	- -
Decline to Answer	- -	1 *	1 *	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	1 * C	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -
Sigma	769 100%	2588 100%	3357 100%	3349 100%	207 100%	460 100%	269 100%	415 100%	419 100%	534 100%	352 100%	401 100%	1341 100%	1539 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q825_4. Please rate the following gTLDs by how trustworthy you feel they are.

16 Aug 2016
Table 190

4. .guru

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	320 42% I	1261 49% DEI	1581 47% DEI	1433 43% FJ	82 40% FJ	149 32% FJ	121 45% III	164 40% FJ	138 33% FJ	178 33% AEIEIEI	173 49% AEIEIEI	179 45% FJ	747 56% NAEGKBEGIKCEGK	763 50% DFHJ
Very trustworthy	61 8% DEI	314 12% DEI	375 11% DEI	310 9% FJ	14 7% FJ	31 7% FJ	29 11% J	42 10% J	29 7% J	25 5% J	32 9% J	30 7% J	210 16% NAEGKBEGIKCEGK	182 12% DFJL
Somewhat trustworthy	259 34% I	947 37% DI	1206 36% DI	1123 34% FJ	68 33% FJ	118 26% FJ	92 34% III	122 29% III	109 26% III	153 29% III	141 40% AIII	149 37% FHJ	537 40% AEIBEICEI	581 38% DFHJ
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	449 58% KM	1252 48% M	1701 51% M	1916 57% BCN	109 53% MMM	311 68% EDHLN	145 54% MMM	251 60% N	266 63% EGKMBEGIKCEGKM	356 67% DHLN	170 48% MMM	222 55% DHLN	562 42% MMM	776 50% M
Not very trustworthy	246 32% ABC	866 33% ABC	1112 33% ABC	1251 37% ABC	72 35% ABC	171 37% ABC	87 32% ABC	145 35% AGKMBEGIKCEGKM	169 40% AGKMBEGIKCEGKM	203 38% AGKMBEGIKCEGKM	104 30% AGKMBEGIKCEGKM	146 36% K	434 32% K	586 38% M
Not at all trustworthy	203 26% DEKM	386 15% M	589 18% M	665 20% BCN	37 18% MMM	140 30% EDLN	58 22% MBMM	106 26% DLN	97 23% MBMCM	153 29% DLN	66 19% MBMM	76 19% N	128 10% N	190 12% M
Not sure	- - D	74 3% D	74 2% D	- - FAGKMBEGIKCEGKM	16 8% FAGKMBEGIKCEGKM	- - FAGKMBEGIKCEGKM	3 1% HA	- - JA	14 3% JA	- - JA	9 3% LA	- - LA	32 2% NA	- - NA
Decline to Answer	- -	1 *	1 *	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	1 * C	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -
Sigma	769 100%	2588 100%	3357 100%	3349 100%	207 100%	460 100%	269 100%	415 100%	419 100%	534 100%	352 100%	401 100%	1341 100%	1539 100%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q825_5. Please rate the following gTLDs by how trustworthy you feel they are.

16 Aug 2016
Table 191

5. .realtor

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	343 45% GI	1215 47% GI	1558 46% GI	1560 47% HJ	109 53% AGIGIGI	276 60% DHJLN	101 38% III	127 31% IH	126 30% GIGIGI	198 37% IH	175 50% GIGIGI	200 50% HJ	704 52% AGIBGICGI	759 49% DHJ
Very trustworthy	71 9%	300 12% DIK	371 11% IK	322 10% HJ	19 9% HJ	62 13% DHJL	27 10% DHJL	29 7% IH	30 7% IH	29 5% IH	27 8% IH	35 9% J	197 15% NAEGKBEGIKCEGIK	167 11% DHJ
Somewhat trustworthy	272 35% GI	915 35% GI	1187 35% GI	1238 37% HJ	90 43% AGIBGICGI	214 47% DHJN	74 28% DHJN	98 24% IH	96 23% IH	169 32% IH	148 42% AGIBGICGI	165 41% HJ	507 38% GIBGICGI	592 38% HJ
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	426 55% EKM	1298 50% EM	1724 51% EM	1789 53% BFN	83 40% BFN	184 40% EKM	165 61% GDFJLN	288 69% AEKMBEKCEKM	280 67% AEKMBEKCEKM	336 63% DFLN	168 48% DFLN	201 50% F	602 45% F	780 51% MF
Not very trustworthy	220 29%	895 35% EK	1115 33% ABC	1252 37% ABCF	56 27% ABC	120 26% ABC	89 33% GDFLN	181 44% GDFLN	189 45% AEKMBEKCEKM	219 41% F	102 29% F	145 36% KF	459 34% AEEE	587 38% MF
Not at all trustworthy	206 27% DEKM	403 16% M	609 18% DEM	537 16% N	27 13% N	64 14% EKM	76 28% DFLN	107 26% EMBEMCEM	91 22% DFLN	117 22% DFLN	66 19% MMM	56 14% LA	143 11% LA	193 13% LA
Not sure	-	74 3% D	74 2% D	-	15 7% FAGKMBEGIKCEKM	-	3 1% HA	-	12 3% JA	-	9 3% LA	-	35 3% NA	-
Decline to Answer	-	1 *	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	-	-
Sigma	769 100%	2588 100%	3357 100%	3349 100%	207 100%	460 100%	269 100%	415 100%	419 100%	534 100%	352 100%	401 100%	1341 100%	1539 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/F/H/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/I/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q825_6. Please rate the following gTLDs by how trustworthy you feel they are.

16 Aug 2016
Table 192

6. .club

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	384 50% I	1411 55% EI	1795 53% EI	1752 52% FHJ	93 45%	207 45%	139 52% HIII	178 43%	171 41%	235 44%	182 52% III	194 48%	826 62% AEGKBEGIKCEGK	938 61% DFHJL
Very trustworthy	58 8%	363 14% DIK	421 13% IK	399 12% AJL	21 10%	53 12% JL	30 11%	57 14% JL	31 7%	32 6%	31 9%	26 6%	250 19% NAEGKBEGIKCEGK	231 15% DJL
Somewhat trustworthy	326 42% EI	1048 40% I	1374 41% I	1353 40% FH	72 35%	154 33%	109 41% H	121 29%	140 33%	203 38% H	151 43% III	168 42% FH	576 43% EIBEIEI	707 46% DFHJ
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	385 50% M	1105 43% M	1490 44% M	1597 48% BCN	100 48% MMM	253 55% DN	127 47% MMM	237 57% GDN	232 55% GKMBGKMGCKM	299 56% DN	161 46% MMM	207 52% N	485 36% N	601 39% N
Not very trustworthy	219 28%	812 31% M	1031 31% ABCN	1133 34% ABCN	68 33%	155 34%	83 31%	161 39% GDN	162 39% AGKMBGKMGCKM	207 39% DN	104 30%	149 37% KN	395 29%	461 30%
Not at all trustworthy	166 22% DIKM	293 11% M	459 14% M	464 14% BN	32 15% MMM	98 21% DLN	44 16% MBMM	76 18% DN	70 17% MBMM	92 17% DN	57 16% MBMM	58 14% N	90 7%	140 9% M
Not sure	-	71 3% D	71 2% D	-	14 7%	-	3 1% HA	-	15 4% JAGGCG	-	9 3% LA	-	30 2% NA	-
Decline to Answer	-	1 *	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	1 * C	-	-	-	-	-
Sigma	769 100%	2588 100%	3357 100%	3349 100%	207 100%	460 100%	269 100%	415 100%	419 100%	534 100%	352 100%	401 100%	1341 100%	1539 100%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q825_7. Please rate the following gTLDs by how trustworthy you feel they are.

16 Aug 2016
Table 193

7. .xyz

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	176 23%	1079 42%	1255 37%	1284 38%	64 31%	119 26%	93 35%	121 29%	127 30%	168 31%	118 34%	143 36%	677 50%	733 48%
Very trustworthy	28 4%	263 10%	291 9%	296 9%	11 5%	30 7%	21 8%	30 7%	29 7%	29 5%	14 4%	23 6%	188 14%	184 12%
Somewhat trustworthy	148 19%	816 32%	964 29%	988 30%	53 26%	89 19%	72 27%	91 22%	98 23%	139 26%	104 30%	120 30%	489 36%	549 36%
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	593 77%	1437 56%	2030 60%	2065 62%	130 63%	341 74%	173 64%	294 71%	277 66%	366 69%	225 64%	258 64%	632 47%	806 52%
Not very trustworthy	241 31%	936 36%	1177 35%	1183 35%	75 36%	161 35%	100 37%	166 40%	171 41%	199 37%	129 37%	140 35%	461 34%	517 34%
Not at all trustworthy	352 46%	501 19%	853 25%	882 26%	55 27%	180 39%	73 27%	128 31%	106 25%	167 31%	96 27%	118 29%	171 13%	289 19%
Not sure	-	71 3%	71 2%	-	13 6%	-	3 1%	-	14 3%	-	9 3%	-	32 2%	-
Decline to Answer	-	1 *	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	-	-
Sigma	769 100%	2588 100%	3357 100%	3349 100%	207 100%	460 100%	269 100%	415 100%	419 100%	534 100%	352 100%	401 100%	1341 100%	1539 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/F/H/J/K/M - C/F/H/J/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q825_16. Please rate the following gTLDs by how trustworthy you feel they are.

16 Aug 2016
Table 194

16. .top

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
					(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)	
Unweighted Base	-**	-**	-**	3349	-**	460	-**	415	-**	534	-**	401	-**	1539
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	1578 47% FHJL	-	144 31%	-	151 36%	-	221 41% F	-	169 42% F	-	893 58% DFHJL
Very trustworthy	-	-	-	355 11% FJL	-	29 6%	-	37 9%	-	36 7%	-	28 7%	-	225 15% DFHJL
Somewhat trustworthy	-	-	-	1223 37% FH	-	115 25%	-	114 27%	-	185 35% FH	-	141 35% FH	-	668 43% DFHJL
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	1771 53% N	-	316 69% DJLN	-	264 64% DN	-	313 59% DN	-	232 58% DN	-	646 42% DN
Not very trustworthy	-	-	-	1196 36% N	-	190 41% DN	-	176 42% DN	-	203 38% N	-	151 38% N	-	476 31% N
Not at all trustworthy	-	-	-	575 17% N	-	126 27% DHJLN	-	88 21% DN	-	110 21% DN	-	81 20% N	-	170 11% N
Not sure	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sigma	-	-	-	3349 100%	-	460 100%	-	415 100%	-	534 100%	-	401 100%	-	1539 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q825_17. Please rate the following gTLDs by how trustworthy you feel they are.

16 Aug 2016
Table 195

17. .pics

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	-**	-**	-**	3349	-**	460	-**	415	-**	534	-**	401	-**	1539
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	1649	-	205	-	155	-	230	-	207	-	852
				49% FHJ		45% H		37%		43%		52% FHJ		55% DFHJ
Very trustworthy	-	-	-	333	-	45	-	34	-	28	-	32	-	194
				10% J		10% J		8%		5%		8%		13% DHJL
Somewhat trustworthy	-	-	-	1316	-	160	-	121	-	202	-	175	-	658
				39% FH		35%		29%		38% H		44% FH		43% DFHJ
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	1700	-	255	-	260	-	304	-	194	-	687
				51% N		55% DLN		63% DFLN		57% DLN		48%		45%
Not very trustworthy	-	-	-	1200	-	164	-	170	-	206	-	138	-	522
				36% N		36%		41% DN		39%		34%		34%
Not at all trustworthy	-	-	-	500	-	91	-	90	-	98	-	56	-	165
				15% N		20% DLN		22% DLN		18% DN		14%		11%
Not sure	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sigma	-	-	-	3349	-	460	-	415	-	534	-	401	-	1539
				100%		100%		100%		100%		100%		100%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q825_18. Please rate the following gTLDs by how trustworthy you feel they are.

16 Aug 2016
Table 196

18. .online

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
					(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)	
Unweighted Base	-**	-**	-**	3349	-**	460	-**	415	-**	534	-**	401	-**	1539
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	2175	-	221	-	270	-	338	-	283	-	1063
	-	-	-	65% F	-	48%	-	65% F	-	63% F	-	71% DFJ	-	69% DFJ
Very trustworthy	-	-	-	625	-	52	-	96	-	75	-	88	-	314
	-	-	-	19% FJ	-	11%	-	23% DFJ	-	14%	-	22% FJ	-	20% DFJ
Somewhat trustworthy	-	-	-	1550	-	169	-	174	-	263	-	195	-	749
	-	-	-	46% F	-	37%	-	42% FH	-	49% FH	-	49% F	-	49% DFH
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	1174	-	239	-	145	-	196	-	118	-	476
	-	-	-	35% LN	-	52% DHJLN	-	35% LN	-	37% LN	-	29%	-	31%
Not very trustworthy	-	-	-	832	-	148	-	102	-	140	-	78	-	364
	-	-	-	25% L	-	32% DHJLN	-	25% LN	-	26% L	-	19% LN	-	24%
Not at all trustworthy	-	-	-	342	-	91	-	43	-	56	-	40	-	112
	-	-	-	10% N	-	20% DHJLN	-	10% N	-	10% N	-	10%	-	7%
Not sure	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sigma	-	-	-	3349	-	460	-	415	-	534	-	401	-	1539
	-	-	-	100%	-	100%	-	100%	-	100%	-	100%	-	100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q825_19. Please rate the following gTLDs by how trustworthy you feel they are.

16 Aug 2016
Table 197

19. .space

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	-**	-**	-**	3349	-**	460	-**	415	-**	534	-**	401	-**	1539
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	1743	-	196	-	201	-	255	-	202	-	889
				52% FJ		43%		48%		48%		50% F		58% DFHJL
Very trustworthy	-	-	-	377	-	41	-	61	-	39	-	33	-	203
				11% JL		9%		15% DFJL		7%		8%		13% DFJL
Somewhat trustworthy	-	-	-	1366	-	155	-	140	-	216	-	169	-	686
				41% FH		34%		34%		40% FH		42% FH		45% DFH
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	1606	-	264	-	214	-	279	-	199	-	650
				48% N		57% DLN		52% N		52% DN		50% N		42%
Not very trustworthy	-	-	-	1143	-	170	-	147	-	197	-	141	-	488
				34% N		37% N		35%		37% N		35%		32%
Not at all trustworthy	-	-	-	463	-	94	-	67	-	82	-	58	-	162
				14% N		20% DJLN		16% N		15% N		14% N		11%
Not sure	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
				-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sigma	-	-	-	3349	-	460	-	415	-	534	-	401	-	1539
				100%		100%		100%		100%		100%		100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q825_20. Please rate the following gTLDs by how trustworthy you feel they are.

16 Aug 2016
Table 198

20. .website

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
					(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)	
Unweighted Base	-.**	-.**	-.**	3349	-.**	460	-.**	415	-.**	534	-.**	401	-.**	1539
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	2059 61% F	-	221 48%	-	281 68% DFJL	-	323 60% F	-	241 60% F	-	993 65% DF
Very trustworthy	-	-	-	572 17% FJ	-	54 12%	-	100 24% DFJLN	-	72 13%	-	66 16% F	-	280 18% FJ
Somewhat trustworthy	-	-	-	1487 44% F	-	167 36%	-	181 44% F	-	251 47% F	-	175 44% F	-	713 46% DF
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	1290 39% HN	-	239 52% DHJLN	-	134 32%	-	211 40% H	-	160 40% H	-	546 35%
Not very trustworthy	-	-	-	903 27% H	-	151 33% DHN	-	90 22%	-	145 27%	-	109 27%	-	408 27% H
Not at all trustworthy	-	-	-	387 12% N	-	88 19% DHJLN	-	44 11%	-	66 12% N	-	51 13% N	-	138 9%
Not sure	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sigma	-	-	-	3349 100%	-	460 100%	-	415 100%	-	534 100%	-	401 100%	-	1539 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q825_21. Please rate the following gTLDs by how trustworthy you feel they are.

16 Aug 2016
Table 199

21. .news

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
					(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)	
Unweighted Base	-**	-**	-**	3349	-**	460	-**	415	-**	534	-**	401	-**	1539
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	2403	-	313	-	269	-	354	-	305	-	1162
				72% HJ		68%		65%		66%		76% DFHJ		76% DFHJ
Very trustworthy	-	-	-	753	-	66	-	86	-	87	-	104	-	410
				22% FJ		14%		21% F		16%		26% FJ		27% DFHJ
Somewhat trustworthy	-	-	-	1650	-	247	-	183	-	267	-	201	-	752
				49% H		54% DH		44%		50%		50%		49%
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	946	-	147	-	146	-	180	-	96	-	377
				28% LN		32% LN		35% DLN		34% DLN		24%		24%
Not very trustworthy	-	-	-	696	-	99	-	96	-	134	-	74	-	293
				21% N		22%		23%		25% DLN		18%		19%
Not at all trustworthy	-	-	-	250	-	48	-	50	-	46	-	22	-	84
				7% N		10% DLN		12% DLN		9% N		5%		5%
Not sure	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
				-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sigma	-	-	-	3349	-	460	-	415	-	534	-	401	-	1539
				100%		100%		100%		100%		100%		100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q825_22. Please rate the following gTLDs by how trustworthy you feel they are.
22. .site

16 Aug 2016
Table 200

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	-**	-**	-**	3349	-**	460	-**	415	-**	534	-**	401	-**	1539
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	1971	-	218	-	247	-	295	-	238	-	973
	-	-	-	59% F	-	47%	-	60% F	-	55% F	-	59% F	-	63% DFJ
Very trustworthy	-	-	-	496	-	45	-	78	-	59	-	55	-	259
	-	-	-	15% FJ	-	10%	-	19% DFJ	-	11%	-	14%	-	17% DFJ
Somewhat trustworthy	-	-	-	1475	-	173	-	169	-	236	-	183	-	714
	-	-	-	44% F	-	38%	-	41%	-	44% F	-	46% F	-	46% DFH
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	1378	-	242	-	168	-	239	-	163	-	566
	-	-	-	41% N	-	53% DHJLN	-	40%	-	45% N	-	41%	-	37%
Not very trustworthy	-	-	-	971	-	149	-	119	-	172	-	112	-	419
	-	-	-	29% N	-	32% N	-	29%	-	32% N	-	28%	-	27%
Not at all trustworthy	-	-	-	407	-	93	-	49	-	67	-	51	-	147
	-	-	-	12% N	-	20% DHJLN	-	12%	-	13%	-	13%	-	10%
Not sure	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sigma	-	-	-	3349	-	460	-	415	-	534	-	401	-	1539
	-	-	-	100%	-	100%	-	100%	-	100%	-	100%	-	100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q825_23. Please rate the following gTLDs by how trustworthy you feel they are.

16 Aug 2016
Table 201

23. .toronto

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
					(E)		(G)		(I)		(K)		(M)	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	..**	..**	..**	105	..**	105	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	67 64%	-	67 64%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Very trustworthy	-	-	-	19 18%	-	19 18%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Somewhat trustworthy	-	-	-	48 46%	-	48 46%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	38 36%	-	38 36%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Not very trustworthy	-	-	-	25 24%	-	25 24%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Not at all trustworthy	-	-	-	13 12%	-	13 12%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Not sure	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sigma	-	-	-	105 100%	-	105 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing														

Q825_24. Please rate the following gTLDs by how trustworthy you feel they are.

16 Aug 2016
Table 202

24. .guadalajara

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	..	..	..	100	..	100	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	45 45%	-	45 45%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Very trustworthy	-	-	-	11 11%	-	11 11%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Somewhat trustworthy	-	-	-	34 34%	-	34 34%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	55 55%	-	55 55%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Not very trustworthy	-	-	-	37 37%	-	37 37%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Not at all trustworthy	-	-	-	18 18%	-	18 18%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Not sure	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sigma	-	-	-	100 100%	-	100 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q825_25. Please rate the following gTLDs by how trustworthy you feel they are.

16 Aug 2016
Table 203

25. .roma

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	..**	..**	..**	50*	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	50*	..**	..**	..**	..**
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	29 58%	-	-	-	-	-	29 58%	-	-	-	-
Very trustworthy	-	-	-	2 4%	-	-	-	-	-	2 4%	-	-	-	-
Somewhat trustworthy	-	-	-	27 54%	-	-	-	-	-	27 54%	-	-	-	-
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	21 42%	-	-	-	-	-	21 42%	-	-	-	-
Not very trustworthy	-	-	-	17 34%	-	-	-	-	-	17 34%	-	-	-	-
Not at all trustworthy	-	-	-	4 8%	-	-	-	-	-	4 8%	-	-	-	-
Not sure	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sigma	-	-	-	50 100%	-	-	-	-	-	50 100%	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q825_26. Please rate the following gTLDs by how trustworthy you feel they are.

16 Aug 2016
Table 204

26. .istanbul

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
					(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)	
Unweighted Base	..**	..**	..**	50*	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	50*	..**	..**	..**	..**
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	38 76%	-	-	-	-	-	38 76%	-	-	-	-
Very trustworthy	-	-	-	12 24%	-	-	-	-	-	12 24%	-	-	-	-
Somewhat trustworthy	-	-	-	26 52%	-	-	-	-	-	26 52%	-	-	-	-
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	12 24%	-	-	-	-	-	12 24%	-	-	-	-
Not very trustworthy	-	-	-	9 18%	-	-	-	-	-	9 18%	-	-	-	-
Not at all trustworthy	-	-	-	3 6%	-	-	-	-	-	3 6%	-	-	-	-
Not sure	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sigma	-	-	-	50 100%	-	-	-	-	-	50 100%	-	-	-	-
Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing														

Q825_27. Please rate the following gTLDs by how trustworthy you feel they are.

16 Aug 2016
Table 205

27. .madrid

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	..	..	..	50*	..	..	..	..	..	50*	..	..	..	..
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	33 66%	-	-	-	-	-	33 66%	-	-	-	-
Very trustworthy	-	-	-	7 14%	-	-	-	-	-	7 14%	-	-	-	-
Somewhat trustworthy	-	-	-	26 52%	-	-	-	-	-	26 52%	-	-	-	-
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	17 34%	-	-	-	-	-	17 34%	-	-	-	-
Not very trustworthy	-	-	-	15 30%	-	-	-	-	-	15 30%	-	-	-	-
Not at all trustworthy	-	-	-	2 4%	-	-	-	-	-	2 4%	-	-	-	-
Not sure	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sigma	-	-	-	50 100%	-	-	-	-	-	50 100%	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q825_28. Please rate the following gTLDs by how trustworthy you feel they are.

16 Aug 2016
Table 206

28. .warszawa

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	..**	..**	..**	53*	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	53*	..**	..**	..**	..**
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	33 62%	-	-	-	-	-	33 62%	-	-	-	-
Very trustworthy	-	-	-	3 6%	-	-	-	-	-	3 6%	-	-	-	-
Somewhat trustworthy	-	-	-	30 57%	-	-	-	-	-	30 57%	-	-	-	-
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	20 38%	-	-	-	-	-	20 38%	-	-	-	-
Not very trustworthy	-	-	-	11 21%	-	-	-	-	-	11 21%	-	-	-	-
Not at all trustworthy	-	-	-	9 17%	-	-	-	-	-	9 17%	-	-	-	-
Not sure	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sigma	-	-	-	53 100%	-	-	-	-	-	53 100%	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q825_29. Please rate the following gTLDs by how trustworthy you feel they are.

16 Aug 2016
Table 207

29. .paris

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	..**	..**	..**	106	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	106	..**	..**	..**	..**
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	54 51%	-	-	-	-	-	54 51%	-	-	-	-
Very trustworthy	-	-	-	9 8%	-	-	-	-	-	9 8%	-	-	-	-
Somewhat trustworthy	-	-	-	45 42%	-	-	-	-	-	45 42%	-	-	-	-
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	52 49%	-	-	-	-	-	52 49%	-	-	-	-
Not very trustworthy	-	-	-	37 35%	-	-	-	-	-	37 35%	-	-	-	-
Not at all trustworthy	-	-	-	15 14%	-	-	-	-	-	15 14%	-	-	-	-
Not sure	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sigma	-	-	-	106 100%	-	-	-	-	-	106 100%	-	-	-	-
Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing														

Q825_30. Please rate the following gTLDs by how trustworthy you feel they are.

16 Aug 2016
Table 208

30. Foshan

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	..	..	..	551	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	551
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	351 64%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	351 64%
Very trustworthy	-	-	-	88 16%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	88 16%
Somewhat trustworthy	-	-	-	263 48%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	263 48%
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	200 36%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	200 36%
Not very trustworthy	-	-	-	159 29%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	159 29%
Not at all trustworthy	-	-	-	41 7%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	41 7%
Not sure	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sigma	-	-	-	551 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	551 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q825_31. Please rate the following gTLDs by how trustworthy you feel they are.

16 Aug 2016
Table 209

31. .hanoi

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	..	..	..	52*	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	52*
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	27 52%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	27 52%
Very trustworthy	-	-	-	5 10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5 10%
Somewhat trustworthy	-	-	-	22 42%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	22 42%
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	25 48%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	25 48%
Not very trustworthy	-	-	-	16 31%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	16 31%
Not at all trustworthy	-	-	-	9 17%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9 17%
Not sure	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sigma	-	-	-	52 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	52 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q825_32. Please rate the following gTLDs by how trustworthy you feel they are.

16 Aug 2016
Table 210

32. .manilla

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	..	..	..	101	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	101
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	57 56%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	57 56%
Very trustworthy	-	-	-	8 8%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8 8%
Somewhat trustworthy	-	-	-	49 49%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	49 49%
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	44 44%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	44 44%
Not very trustworthy	-	-	-	34 34%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	34 34%
Not at all trustworthy	-	-	-	10 10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10 10%
Not sure	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sigma	-	-	-	101 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	101 100%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q825_33. Please rate the following gTLDs by how trustworthy you feel they are.

16 Aug 2016
Table 211

33. .tokyo

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	..	..	..	176	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	176
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	111 63%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	111 63%
Very trustworthy	-	-	-	15 9%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15 9%
Somewhat trustworthy	-	-	-	96 55%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	96 55%
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	65 37%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	65 37%
Not very trustworthy	-	-	-	52 30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	52 30%
Not at all trustworthy	-	-	-	13 7%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	13 7%
Not sure	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sigma	-	-	-	176 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	176 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q825_34. Please rate the following gTLDs by how trustworthy you feel they are.

16 Aug 2016
Table 212

34. .seoul

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	..	..	..	101	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	101
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	63 62%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	63 62%
Very trustworthy	-	-	-	17 17%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	17 17%
Somewhat trustworthy	-	-	-	46 46%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	46 46%
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	38 38%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	38 38%
Not very trustworthy	-	-	-	29 29%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	29 29%
Not at all trustworthy	-	-	-	9 9%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9 9%
Not sure	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sigma	-	-	-	101 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	101 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q825_35. Please rate the following gTLDs by how trustworthy you feel they are.

16 Aug 2016
Table 213

35. .MOCKBa

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	..	..	..	128	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	128
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	77 60%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	77 60%
Very trustworthy	-	-	-	21 16%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	21 16%
Somewhat trustworthy	-	-	-	56 44%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	56 44%
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	51 40%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	51 40%
Not very trustworthy	-	-	-	28 22%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	28 22%
Not at all trustworthy	-	-	-	23 18%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	23 18%
Not sure	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sigma	-	-	-	128 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	128 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q825_36. Please rate the following gTLDs by how trustworthy you feel they are.

16 Aug 2016
Table 214

36. .delhi

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	..	..	..	330	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	330
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	194 59%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	194 59%
Very trustworthy	-	-	-	62 19%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	62 19%
Somewhat trustworthy	-	-	-	132 40%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	132 40%
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	136 41%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	136 41%
Not very trustworthy	-	-	-	86 26%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	86 26%
Not at all trustworthy	-	-	-	50 15%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	50 15%
Not sure	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sigma	-	-	-	330 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	330 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q825_37. Please rate the following gTLDs by how trustworthy you feel they are.

16 Aug 2016
Table 215

37. .jakarta

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	..	..	..	100	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	100
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	79 79%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	79 79%
Very trustworthy	-	-	-	20 20%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	20 20%
Somewhat trustworthy	-	-	-	59 59%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	59 59%
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	21 21%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	21 21%
Not very trustworthy	-	-	-	15 15%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15 15%
Not at all trustworthy	-	-	-	6 6%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6 6%
Not sure	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sigma	-	-	-	100 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q825_38. Please rate the following gTLDs by how trustworthy you feel they are.

16 Aug 2016
Table 216

38. .abuja

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	._**	._**	._**	200	._**	._**	._**	._**	._**	._**	._**	200	._**	._**
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	106 53%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	106 53%	-	-
Very trustworthy	-	-	-	17 9%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	17 9%	-	-
Somewhat trustworthy	-	-	-	89 45%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	89 45%	-	-
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	94 47%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	94 47%	-	-
Not very trustworthy	-	-	-	60 30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	60 30%	-	-
Not at all trustworthy	-	-	-	34 17%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	34 17%	-	-
Not sure	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sigma	-	-	-	200 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	200 100%	-	-

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q825_39. Please rate the following gTLDs by how trustworthy you feel they are.

16 Aug 2016
Table 217

39. .capetown

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	..**	..**	..**	101	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	101	..**	..**
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	77 76%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	77 76%	-	-
Very trustworthy	-	-	-	16 16%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	16 16%	-	-
Somewhat trustworthy	-	-	-	61 60%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	61 60%	-	-
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	24 24%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	24 24%	-	-
Not very trustworthy	-	-	-	18 18%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	18 18%	-	-
Not at all trustworthy	-	-	-	6 6%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6 6%	-	-
Not sure	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sigma	-	-	-	101 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	101 100%	-	-

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q825_40. Please rate the following gTLDs by how trustworthy you feel they are.

16 Aug 2016
Table 218

40. .cairo

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	..	..	..	100	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	100	..	..
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	61 61%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	61 61%	-	-
Very trustworthy	-	-	-	10 10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10 10%	-	-
Somewhat trustworthy	-	-	-	51 51%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	51 51%	-	-
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	39 39%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	39 39%	-	-
Not very trustworthy	-	-	-	29 29%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	29 29%	-	-
Not at all trustworthy	-	-	-	10 10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10 10%	-	-
Not sure	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sigma	-	-	-	100 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100 100%	-	-

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q825_41. Please rate the following gTLDs by how trustworthy you feel they are.

16 Aug 2016
Table 219

41. .bogota

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	..	..	..	125	..	..	..	125	..	..	..	..	..	..
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	71 57%	-	-	-	71 57%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Very trustworthy	-	-	-	24 19%	-	-	-	24 19%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Somewhat trustworthy	-	-	-	47 38%	-	-	-	47 38%	-	-	-	-	-	-
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	54 43%	-	-	-	54 43%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Not very trustworthy	-	-	-	37 30%	-	-	-	37 30%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Not at all trustworthy	-	-	-	17 14%	-	-	-	17 14%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Not sure	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sigma	-	-	-	125 100%	-	-	-	125 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q825_42. Please rate the following gTLDs by how trustworthy you feel they are.

16 Aug 2016
Table 220

42. .cordoba

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	..**	..**	..**	104	..**	..**	..**	104	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	- -	- -	- -	28 27%	- -	- -	- -	28 27%	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -
Very trustworthy	- -	- -	- -	7 7%	- -	- -	- -	7 7%	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -
Somewhat trustworthy	- -	- -	- -	21 20%	- -	- -	- -	21 20%	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	- -	- -	- -	76 73%	- -	- -	- -	76 73%	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -
Not very trustworthy	- -	- -	- -	46 44%	- -	- -	- -	46 44%	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -
Not at all trustworthy	- -	- -	- -	30 29%	- -	- -	- -	30 29%	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -
Not sure	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -
Sigma	- -	- -	- -	104 100%	- -	- -	- -	104 100%	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q825_43. Please rate the following gTLDs by how trustworthy you feel they are.

16 Aug 2016
Table 221

43. .rio

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	..	..	..	186	..	..	..	186	..	..	..	..	..	..
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	89 48%	-	-	-	89 48%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Very trustworthy	-	-	-	27 15%	-	-	-	27 15%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Somewhat trustworthy	-	-	-	62 33%	-	-	-	62 33%	-	-	-	-	-	-
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	97 52%	-	-	-	97 52%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Not very trustworthy	-	-	-	61 33%	-	-	-	61 33%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Not at all trustworthy	-	-	-	36 19%	-	-	-	36 19%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Not sure	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sigma	-	-	-	186 100%	-	-	-	186 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q825_8. Please rate the following gTLDs by how trustworthy you feel they are.

16 Aug 2016
Table 222

8. .berlin

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	17**	108	125	125	..**	..**	..**	..**	108	125	..**	..**	..**	..**
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	13 76%	70 65%	83 66%	75 60%	-	-	-	-	70 65%	75 60%	-	-	-	-
Very trustworthy	3 18%	16 15%	19 15%	20 16%	-	-	-	-	16 15%	20 16%	-	-	-	-
Somewhat trustworthy	10 59%	54 50%	64 51%	55 44%	-	-	-	-	54 50%	55 44%	-	-	-	-
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	4 24%	38 35%	42 34%	50 40%	-	-	-	-	38 35%	50 40%	-	-	-	-
Not very trustworthy	2 12%	22 20%	24 19%	36 29%	-	-	-	-	22 20%	36 29%	-	-	-	-
Not at all trustworthy	2 12%	16 15%	18 14%	14 11%	-	-	-	-	16 15%	14 11%	-	-	-	-
Not sure	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sigma	17 100%	108 100%	125 100%	125 100%	-	-	-	-	108 100%	125 100%	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q825_9. Please rate the following gTLDs by how trustworthy you feel they are.

16 Aug 2016
Table 223

9. .ovh

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	17**	108	125	125	..**	..**	..**	..**	108	125	..**	..**	..**	..**
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	3 18%	29 27%	32 26%	31 25%	-	-	-	-	29 27%	31 25%	-	-	-	-
Very trustworthy	1 6%	4 4%	5 4%	5 4%	-	-	-	-	4 4%	5 4%	-	-	-	-
Somewhat trustworthy	2 12%	25 23%	27 22%	26 21%	-	-	-	-	25 23%	26 21%	-	-	-	-
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	14 82%	78 72%	92 74%	94 75%	-	-	-	-	78 72%	94 75%	-	-	-	-
Not very trustworthy	5 29%	46 43%	51 41%	51 41%	-	-	-	-	46 43%	51 41%	-	-	-	-
Not at all trustworthy	9 53%	32 30%	41 33%	43 34%	-	-	-	-	32 30%	43 34%	-	-	-	-
Not sure	-	1 1%	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-
Sigma	17 100%	108 100%	125 100%	125 100%	-	-	-	-	108 100%	125 100%	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q825_10. Please rate the following gTLDs by how trustworthy you feel they are.

16 Aug 2016
Table 224

10. .london

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	114	419	533	100	..**	..**	..**	..**	419	100	..**	..**	..**	..**
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	68 60%	213 51%	281 53%	67 67% BC	-	-	-	-	213 51%	67 67% I	-	-	-	-
Very trustworthy	8 7%	41 10%	49 9%	10 10%	-	-	-	-	41 10%	10 10%	-	-	-	-
Somewhat trustworthy	60 53% I	172 41%	232 44% I	57 57% BC	-	-	-	-	172 41%	57 57% I	-	-	-	-
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	46 40%	193 46% D	239 45% D	33 33%	-	-	-	-	193 46% J	33 33%	-	-	-	-
Not very trustworthy	23 20%	140 33% D	163 31%	21 21%	-	-	-	-	140 33% JAC	21 21%	-	-	-	-
Not at all trustworthy	23 20% I	53 13%	76 14% I	12 12%	-	-	-	-	53 13%	12 12%	-	-	-	-
Not sure	-	12 3%	12 2%	-	-	-	-	-	12 3%	-	-	-	-	-
Decline to Answer	-	1 *	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	-	-
Sigma	114 100%	419 100%	533 100%	100 100%	-	-	-	-	419 100%	100 100%	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q825_11. Please rate the following gTLDs by how trustworthy you feel they are.

16 Aug 2016
Table 225

11. .nyc

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	204	64*	268	255	64*	255	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	116 57% D	38 59%	154 57% D	118 46%	38 59%	118 46%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Very trustworthy	30 15%	11 17%	41 15%	25 10%	11 17%	25 10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Somewhat trustworthy	86 42%	27 42%	113 42%	93 36%	27 42%	93 36%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	88 43%	20 31%	108 40%	137 54% ABC	20 31%	137 54% E	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Not very trustworthy	45 22%	13 20%	58 22%	86 34% ABC	13 20%	86 34% E	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Not at all trustworthy	43 21%	7 11%	50 19%	51 20%	7 11%	51 20%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Not sure	-	6 9% D	6 2% D	-	6 9% FAC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sigma	204 100%	64 100%	268 100%	255 100%	64 100%	255 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q825_12. Please rate the following gTLDs by how trustworthy you feel they are.

16 Aug 2016
Table 226

12. .wang

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	2**	548	550	551	._**	._**	._**	._**	._**	._**	._**	._**	548	551
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	1 50%	356 65%	357 65%	333 60%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	356 65%	333 60%
Very trustworthy	-	101 18%	101 18%	88 16%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	101 18%	88 16%
Somewhat trustworthy	1 50%	255 47%	256 47%	245 44%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	255 47%	245 44%
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	1 50%	182 33%	183 33%	218 40% BC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	182 33%	218 40% M
Not very trustworthy	1 50%	149 27%	150 27%	184 33% BC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	149 27%	184 33% M
Not at all trustworthy	-	33 6%	33 6%	34 6%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	33 6%	34 6%
Not sure	-	10 2% D	10 2% D	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10 2% N	-
Sigma	2 100%	548 100%	550 100%	551 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	548 100%	551 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q825_13. Please rate the following gTLDs by how trustworthy you feel they are.

16 Aug 2016
Table 227

13. .xn-ses554g (Chinese for network address)

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	2**	548	550	551	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	548	551
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	1 50%	378 69% D	379 69% D	295 54%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	378 69% N	295 54%
Very trustworthy	-	122 22% D	122 22% D	67 12%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	122 22% N	67 12%
Somewhat trustworthy	1 50%	256 47%	257 47%	228 41%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	256 47%	228 41%
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	1 50%	162 30%	163 30%	256 46% BC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	162 30%	256 46% M
Not very trustworthy	1 50%	134 24%	135 25%	207 38% BC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	134 24%	207 38% M
Not at all trustworthy	-	28 5%	28 5%	49 9% BC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	28 5%	49 9% M
Not sure	-	8 1% D	8 1% D	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8 1% N	-
Sigma	2 100%	548 100%	550 100%	551 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	548 100%	551 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q825_14. Please rate the following gTLDs by how trustworthy you feel they are.
14. .xn-55qx5d (Chinese for company)

16 Aug 2016
Table 228

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	2**	548	550	551	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	548	551
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	1 50%	369 67% D	370 67% D	312 57%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	369 67% N	312 57%
Very trustworthy	-	127 23% D	127 23% D	59 11%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	127 23% N	59 11%
Somewhat trustworthy	1 50%	242 44%	243 44%	253 46%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	242 44%	253 46%
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	1 50%	172 31%	173 31%	239 43% BC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	172 31%	239 43% M
Not very trustworthy	1 50%	146 27%	147 27%	191 35% BC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	146 27%	191 35% M
Not at all trustworthy	-	26 5%	26 5%	48 9% BC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	26 5%	48 9% M
Not sure	-	7 1% D	7 1% D	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7 1% N	-
Sigma	2 100%	548 100%	550 100%	551 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	548 100%	551 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Base: Registrants

Q848. As a registrant, how would you describe your satisfaction with the new gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 229

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	-**	-**	-**	1706	-**	274	-**	196	-**	287	-**	170	-**	779
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	1057 62% FHJ	-	132 48%	-	105 54%	-	163 57% F	-	103 61% F	-	554 71% DFHJL
Very satisfied	-	-	-	409 24% FJ	-	46 17%	-	55 28% FJ	-	46 16%	-	39 23%	-	223 29% DFJ
Somewhat satisfied	-	-	-	648 38% FH	-	86 31%	-	50 26%	-	117 41% FH	-	64 38% H	-	331 42% DFH
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	301 18%	-	48 18%	-	58 30% DFJLN	-	41 14%	-	25 15%	-	129 17%
Somewhat dissatisfied	-	-	-	207 12%	-	28 10%	-	32 16% J	-	26 9%	-	17 10%	-	104 13%
Very dissatisfied	-	-	-	94 6% N	-	20 7% N	-	26 13% DFJLN	-	15 5%	-	8 5%	-	25 3%
No experience with them	-	-	-	348 20% N	-	94 34% DHLN	-	33 17%	-	83 29% DHN	-	42 25% N	-	96 12%
Sigma	-	-	-	1706 100%	-	274 100%	-	196 100%	-	287 100%	-	170 100%	-	779 100%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q855. How well do each of the following adjectives describe new gTLDs such as .email, .photography and .club?

16 Aug 2016
Table 230

SUMMARY TABLE OF TOP 2 BOX

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
Innovative	387 50%	1807 70% EI	2194 65% E	2386 71% ACF	115 56%	282 61%	183 68% AEEE	301 73% F	256 61% A	368 69% IF	261 74% AEIEICEI	295 74% F	992 74% AEIGBEGICEGI	1140 74% DFJ
Cutting edge	322 42%	1548 60% EG	1870 56% EG	1983 59% ACFHJ	98 47%	224 49%	133 49% A	198 48% AECEGEG	242 58% FH	336 63% FH	207 59% AECEGEG	235 59% FH	868 65% AEIGBEGICEGI	990 64% DFHL
Extreme	178 23%	1277 49% DEI	1455 43% I	1558 47% ACFHJ	78 38% A	156 34%	119 44% HAIII	149 36%	148 35% A	208 39% AEIEICEI	181 51% AEIEICEI	195 49% FHJ	751 56% AEIGBEGICEGI	850 55% DFHJL
Trustworthy	260 34%	1500 58% EI	1760 52% E	2006 60% ACFJ	86 42% A	234 51% E	158 59% AEIEICEI	243 59% F	201 48% A	286 54% AEIEICEI	195 55% AEIEICEI	239 60% F	860 64% AEIKBEIKCEIK	1004 65% DFHJL
Unconventional	402 52%	1449 56% DE	1851 55% F	1786 53% F	101 49%	202 44%	164 61% AEIKBEIKCEIK	247 60% DFN	220 53% F	297 56% F	185 53% F	214 53% F	779 58% NAEIBEICEI	826 54% F
Practical	401 52%	1701 66% EI	2102 63% E	2349 70% ABC	108 52%	312 68% E	174 65% AEEE	299 72% G	246 59% A	360 67% I	236 67% AEIEICEI	278 69% AEIBEICEI	937 70% AEIBEICEI	1100 71% AEIBEICEI
Technical	352 46%	1674 65% EI	2026 60% E	2193 65% ACFJ	105 51%	259 56%	177 66% AEIEICEI	264 64% F	237 57% A	329 62% AEIEICEI	224 64% AEIEICEI	247 62% AEIKBEIKCEIK	931 69% AEIKBEIKCEIK	1094 71% DFHJL
Confusing	247 32%	1106 43% DGK	1353 40% G	1273 38% AHL	86 42% A	175 38% H	91 34%	112 27%	171 41% A	221 41% HL	131 37% HL	129 32% NAGIKBGICGK	627 47% NAGIKBGICGK	636 41% DHL
Overwhelming	177 23%	1203 46% EGI	1380 41% EGI	1500 45% ACFHJ	66 32% A	165 36% H	90 33% A	120 29%	138 33% A	192 36% H	167 47% AEIGBEGICEGI	196 49% FHJ	742 55% AEIGBEGICEGI	827 54% DFHJ
Useful	428 56%	1800 70% EI	2228 66% EI	2393 71% ACJ	123 59%	313 68% E	197 73% AEIEICEI	309 74% FJ	254 61% F	358 67% I	244 69% AEIEICEI	277 69% F	982 73% AEIBEICEI	1136 74% DFJ
For people like me	261 34%	1430 55% EI	1691 50% EI	1934 58% ACFJ	78 38%	197 43%	149 55% AEIEICEI	237 57% F	189 45% A	274 51% F	182 52% AEIEICEI	232 58% FJ	832 62% AEIGBEGICEGI	994 65% DFHJL
Interesting	401 52%	1741 67% EI	2142 64% EI	2306 69% ACFJ	114 55%	272 59% AEIEICEI	193 72% AEIEICEI	297 72% FJ	249 59% A	340 64% AEIEICEI	243 69% AEIEICEI	292 73% FJ	942 70% AEIBEICEI	1105 72% DFJ
Exciting	221 29%	1462 56% EGI	1683 50% EI	1821 54% ACFHJ	72 35%	168 37%	136 51% AEIEICEI	197 47% F	177 42% A	255 48% F	220 63% AEIGBEGICEGI	253 63% DFHJ	857 64% AEIGBEGICEGI	948 62% DFHJ
Helpful	390 51%	1743 67% EI	2133 64% EI	2346 70% ABCFJ	110 53%	284 62% E	179 67% AEIEICEI	285 69% F	239 57% A	348 65% I	240 68% AEIEICEI	284 71% F	975 73% AEIGBEGICEGI	1145 74% DFHJ
Informative	455 59%	1769 68% I	2224 66% I	2425 72% ABCF	131 63%	315 68%	191 71% AIII	308 74%	259 62%	370 69% I	249 71% AIII	300 75% F	939 70% AICI	1132 74% MF

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q855. How well do each of the following adjectives describe new gTLDs such as .email, .photography and .club?
SUMMARY TABLE OF BOTTOM 2 BOX

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
Innovative	382 50% DEGIKM	723 28% M	1105 33% DKM	963 29% N	82 40% GKMBGKMGKM	178 39% DHJLN	82 30% MMM	114 27% KMBKMKM	152 36% N	166 31% N	85 24% N	106 26% N	322 24% N	399 26% N
Cutting edge	447 58% DEGIKM	977 38% M	1424 42% M	1366 41% BN	96 46% MBMM	236 51% DJLN	132 49% IKMBIKMCIKM	217 52% DJLN	167 40% MMM	198 37% N	136 39% N	166 41% N	446 33% N	549 36% N
Extreme	591 77% DEGIKM	1248 48% M	1839 55% KM	1791 53% BN	117 57% KMBKMKM	304 66% EDLN	146 54% MBMM	266 64% GDLN	259 62% KMBKMCKM	326 61% DLN	165 47% N	206 51% N	561 42% N	689 45% N
Trustworthy	509 66% DEGIKM	1022 39% M	1531 46% DGM	1343 40% N	107 52% GKMBGKMGKM	226 49% DHLN	107 40% N	172 41% N	206 49% GMBGGM	248 46% DN	150 43% MMM	162 40% N	452 34% N	535 35% N
Unconventional	367 48% GM	1081 42% M	1448 43% M	1563 47% BCH	95 46% EDHJLN	258 56% N	101 38% N	168 40% N	190 45% GGG	237 44% N	159 45% N	187 47% N	536 40% N	713 46% MH
Practical	368 48% DGIKM	833 32% M	1201 36% DM	1000 30% FKMBKMKM	87 42% N	148 32% N	91 34% N	116 28% JKMBKMKM	165 39% N	174 33% N	110 31% N	123 31% N	380 28% N	439 29% N
Technical	417 54% DEGIKM	856 33% M	1273 38% DGM	1156 35% N	93 45% GKMBGKMGKM	201 44% DHN	87 32% N	151 36% N	170 41% GMBGGM	205 38% DN	121 34% MMM	154 38% N	385 29% N	445 29% N
Confusing	522 68% DEIKM	1423 55% M	1945 58% M	2076 62% BCN	110 53% E	285 62% EIMBEIMCEIM	175 65% GDFJN	303 73% MMM	238 57% N	313 59% MBMM	214 61% KDJN	272 68% N	686 51% N	903 59% M
Overwhelming	592 77% DEGIKM	1326 51% M	1918 57% KM	1849 55% BN	131 63% KMBKMKM	295 64% DLN	176 65% KMBKMCKM	295 71% DFJLN	270 64% KMBKMCKM	342 64% DLN	179 51% MMM	205 51% N	570 43% N	712 46% M
Useful	341 44% DEGIKM	738 29% M	1079 32% DGM	956 29% N	74 36% GMBGGM	147 32% HN	68 25% N	106 26% N	157 37% GKMBGKMGKM	176 33% DHN	102 29% N	124 31% N	337 25% N	403 26% N
For people like me	508 66% DEGIKM	1091 42% M	1599 48% DM	1415 42% N	118 57% GKMBGKMGKM	263 57% DHJLN	116 43% MMM	178 43% N	217 52% GMBGGM	260 49% DLN	164 47% MMM	169 42% N	476 35% N	545 35% N
Interesting	368 48% DEGIKM	788 30% M	1156 34% DGKM	1043 31% N	82 40% GKMBGKMGKM	188 41% DHLN	72 27% N	118 28% GKMBGKMGKM	162 39% DHLN	194 36% N	102 29% N	109 27% N	370 28% N	434 28% N
Exciting	548 71% DEGIKM	1069 41% KM	1617 48% DKM	1528 46% BLN	123 59% GKMBGKMGKM	292 63% DHJLN	128 48% KMBKMKM	218 53% DLN	232 55% GKMBGKMGKM	279 52% DLN	125 36% N	148 37% N	461 34% N	591 38% M
Helpful	379 49% DEGIKM	786 30% M	1165 35% DKM	1003 30% N	86 42% GKMBGKMGKM	176 38% DHLN	85 32% MMM	130 31% N	170 41% GKMBGKMGKM	186 35% DN	105 30% N	117 29% N	340 25% N	394 26% N
Informative	314 41% DEGKM	761 29% M	1075 32% DKM	924 28% N	64 31% N	145 32% DLN	74 28% N	107 26% GKMBGKMGKM	152 36% N	164 31% N	95 27% N	101 25% N	376 28% N	407 26% N

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q855_1. How well do each of the following adjectives describe new gTLDs such as .email, .photography and .club?

16 Aug 2016
Table 232

1. Innovative

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	387 50%	1807 70% EI	2194 65% E	2386 71% ACF	115 56%	282 61%	183 68% AEEEE	301 73% F	256 61% A	368 69% IF AEIEICEI	261 74% AEIEICEI	295 74% F AEGIBEGICEGI	992 74%	1140 74% DFJ
Describes very well	127 17%	631 24% EI	758 23% EI	812 24% AFJ	33 16%	76 17%	68 25% AEIEIEI	111 27% FJ	73 17%	103 19% AEIBEICEI	104 30% AEIBEICEI	109 27% FJ AEIBEICEI	353 26%	413 27% DFJ
Describes somewhat well	260 34%	1176 45%	1436 43%	1574 47% AC	82 40%	206 45%	115 43% A	190 46%	183 44% A	265 50%	157 45% A	186 46% AEBECE	639 48%	727 47%
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	382 50% DEGIKM	723 28% M	1105 33% DKM	963 29% N GKMBSGKMGCKM	82 40%	178 39% DHJLN	82 30% MMM	114 27% KMBKMKM	152 36% N	166 31% N	85 24%	106 26%	322 24%	399 26%
Does not describe very well	175 23% KM	502 19% KM	677 20% KM	690 21% L KMBKMKCKM	54 26% L	110 24% L	57 21%	84 20% KMBKMKCKM	103 25% L	122 23% L	54 15%	67 17%	234 17%	307 20%
Does not describe at all	207 27% DEGIKM	221 9% M	428 13% DKM	273 8% N MBMM	28 14% DHJLN	68 15%	25 9%	30 7% MBMM	49 12% N	44 8%	31 9%	39 10% N	88 7%	92 6%
Decline to Answer	-	3 *	3 *	-	-	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	2 *	-
Not Sure	-	55 2% D	55 2% D	-	10 5% FAGKBSGKMGCKM	-	4 1% HA	-	10 2% JA	-	6 2% LA	-	25 2% NA	-
Sigma	769 100%	2588 100%	3357 100%	3349 100%	207 100%	460 100%	269 100%	415 100%	419 100%	534 100%	352 100%	401 100%	1341 100%	1539 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q855_2. How well do each of the following adjectives describe new gTLDs such as .email, .photography and .club?

16 Aug 2016
Table 233

2. Cutting edge

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	322 42%	1548 60% EG	1870 56% EG	1983 59% ACFH	98 47%	224 49%	133 49% A	198 48% AEEGEGEG	242 58% FH AEEGEGEG	336 63% FH AEEGEGEG	207 59% FH AEEGEGEG	235 59% FH AEEGEGEG	868 65% F AEIBEICEI	990 64% DFHL
Describes very well	100 13%	497 19% E	597 18% E	588 18% AFH	24 12%	59 13%	46 17%	57 14%	71 17%	89 17% AEEEE	68 19% AEEEE	75 19% F AEIBEICEI	288 21% F AEIBEICEI	308 20% DFH
Describes somewhat well	222 29%	1051 41% G	1273 38% G	1395 42% ACFH	74 36%	165 36%	87 32%	141 34% AGGG	171 41% AGGG	247 46% DFH	139 39% A	160 40% AEEGEGEG	580 43% AEEGEGEG	682 44% DFH
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	447 58% DEGIKM	977 38% M	1424 42% M	1366 41% BN	96 46% MBMM	236 51% DJLN	132 49% IKMBIKMCKM	217 52% DJLN	167 40% MMM	198 37% MMM	136 39% MMM	166 41% N	446 33% N	549 36% N
Does not describe very well	180 23%	696 27%	876 26%	978 29% ABCJ	59 29%	153 33% DJ	91 34% AIKMBIKMCKM	139 33% DJ	111 26% DJ	134 25%	88 25%	111 28%	347 26%	441 29%
Does not describe at all	267 35% DEGIKM	281 11% M	548 16% DM	388 12% N	37 18% MBMM	83 18% DJN	41 15% MBMM	78 19% DJN	56 13% MMM	64 12% N	48 14% MMM	55 14% N	99 7% N	108 7% N
Decline to Answer	-	4 *	4 *	-	-	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	3 *	-
Not Sure	-	59 2% D	59 2% D	-	13 6% FAGIKMBIKMCKM	-	4 1% HA	-	9 2% JA	-	9 3% LA	-	24 2% NA	-
Sigma	769 100%	2588 100%	3357 100%	3349 100%	207 100%	460 100%	269 100%	415 100%	419 100%	534 100%	352 100%	401 100%	1341 100%	1539 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q855_3. How well do each of the following adjectives describe new gTLDs such as .email, .photography and .club?

16 Aug 2016
Table 234

3. Extreme

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	178 23%	1277 49% DEI	1455 43% I	1558 47% ACFHJ	78 38% A	156 34%	119 44% HAIII	149 36%	148 35% A	208 39%	181 51% AEIEICEI	195 49% FHJ AEGIBEGICEGI	751 56% DFHJL	850 55%
Describes very well	57 7%	398 15% GI	455 14%	458 14% AJ	26 13% A	50 11%	30 11%	47 11%	45 11%	46 9%	54 15% A	64 16% FJ AEGIBEGICEGI	243 18% DFHJ	251 16%
Describes somewhat well	121 16%	879 34% EI	1000 30% I	1100 33% ACFH	52 25% A	106 23%	89 33% HAIII	102 25%	103 25% A	162 30% IFH AEIEICEI	127 36% AEIEICEI	131 33% FH AEIEICEI	508 38% DFHJL	599 39%
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	591 77%	1248 48% M	1839 55% KM	1791 53% BN KMBKMKM	117 57% EDLN	304 66%	146 54% MBMM	266 64% GDLN KMBKMKM	259 62%	326 61% DLN	165 47%	206 51% N	561 42%	689 45%
Does not describe very well	208 27%	793 31%	1001 30%	1170 35% ABCN	56 27%	169 37% E	86 32%	168 40% GDLN AEMBEMCEM	147 35%	189 35%	106 30%	134 33%	398 30%	510 33% M
Does not describe at all	383 50% DEGIKM	455 18% M	838 25% DKM	621 19% N KMBKMKM	61 29% FACRMBEGKMKM	135 29% DLN	60 22% MBMM	98 24% DLN KMBKMKM	112 27% JA	137 26% DLN	59 17% MMM	72 18% N	163 12%	179 12%
Decline to Answer	-	3 *	3 *	-	-	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	2 *	-
Not Sure	-	60 2% D	60 2% D	-	12 6%	-	4 1% HA	-	11 3% JA	-	6 2% LA	-	27 2% NA	-
Sigma	769 100%	2588 100%	3357 100%	3349 100%	207 100%	460 100%	269 100%	415 100%	419 100%	534 100%	352 100%	401 100%	1341 100%	1539 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/F/H/J/L/N - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q855_4. How well do each of the following adjectives describe new gTLDs such as .email, .photography and .club?

16 Aug 2016
Table 235

4. Trustworthy

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region											
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia		
					(A)		(B)		(C)		(D)		(E)		(F)	(G)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539		
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	260 34%	1500 58% EI	1760 52% E	2006 60% ACFJ	86 42% A	234 51% E	158 59% AEIEICEI	243 59% F	201 48% A	286 54% AEIEIEI	195 55% AEIEIEI	239 60% F AEIKBEIKCEIK	860 64% AEIKBEIKCEIK	1004 65% DFHJL		
Describes very well	75 10%	503 19% DEI	578 17% EI	583 17% AFJ	25 12% AEIEICEI	54 12% AEIEICEI	59 22% AEIEICEI	78 19% FJ	54 13% FJ	61 11% FJ	57 16% A	63 16% AEIKBEIKCEIK	308 23% AEIKBEIKCEIK	327 21% DFJL		
Describes somewhat well	185 24%	997 39% E	1182 35% E	1423 42% ABC	61 29% ABC	180 39% E	99 37% A	165 40% A	147 35% A	225 42% I	138 39% AEIEE	176 44% AEIEICEI	552 41% AEIEICEI	677 44% AEIEE		
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	509 66% DEGIKM	1022 39% M	1531 46% DGM	1343 40% N GKMBSGKMGKM	107 52% N	226 49% DHLN	107 40% DHLN	172 41% N GMBGGMGM	206 49% N GMBGGMGM	248 46% DN	150 43% MMM	162 40% N	452 34% N	535 35% N		
Does not describe very well	235 31% M	699 27% M	934 28% M	982 29% BN	67 32% MMM	144 31% N	68 25% N	131 32% N	128 31% MMM	188 35% DLN	99 28% DLN	115 29% DLN	337 25% DLN	404 26% DLN		
Does not describe at all	274 36% DEGIKM	323 12% DM	597 18% DM	361 11% N	40 19% MBMM	82 18% DHLN	39 14% MMM	41 10% JMBMM	78 19% JMBMM	60 11% JMBMM	51 14% MMM	47 12% N	115 9% N	131 9% N		
Decline to Answer	-	3 D	3 D	-	-	-	-	-	1 A	-	-	-	2 NA	-		
Not Sure	-	63 2% D	63 2% D	-	14 7% FACRMBGKMGKM	-	4 1% HA	-	11 3% JA	-	7 2% LA	-	27 2% NA	-		
Sigma	769 100%	2588 100%	3357 100%	3349 100%	207 100%	460 100%	269 100%	415 100%	419 100%	534 100%	352 100%	401 100%	1341 100%	1539 100%		

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q855_5. How well do each of the following adjectives describe new gTLDs such as .email, .photography and .club?

16 Aug 2016
Table 236

5. Unconventional

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	402 52%	1449 56% DE	1851 55%	1786 53% F	101 49%	202 44%	164 61% AEIKEIKCEIK	247 60% DFN	220 53%	297 56% F	185 53%	214 53% F	779 58% NAEIBEICEI	826 54% F
Describes very well	156 20% DEI	432 17% I	588 18% DI	506 15% F	29 14%	51 11%	54 20% III	92 22% DFJN	53 13%	66 12%	61 17%	76 19% DFJN	235 18% NIII	221 14%
Describes somewhat well	246 32%	1017 39%	1263 38%	1280 38% AF	72 35%	151 33%	110 41% A	155 37%	167 40% A	231 43% DFL	124 35%	138 34%	544 41% AC	605 39% F
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	367 48% GM	1081 42%	1448 43% M	1563 47% BCH	95 46%	258 56% EDHJLN	101 38%	168 40%	190 45% GGG	237 44%	159 45%	187 47%	536 40%	713 46% MH
Does not describe very well	157 20%	704 27%	861 26%	1045 31% ABCH	60 29% A	155 34% HJ	61 23%	99 24%	112 27% A	149 28%	96 27% A	128 32% H	375 28% AC	514 33% MDHJ
Does not describe at all	210 27% DEGIKM	377 15% M	587 17% DM	518 15% N	35 17% MMM	103 22% DHJLN	40 15%	69 17%	78 19% MBMM	88 16% N	63 18% MMM	59 15%	161 12%	199 13%
Decline to Answer	-	4 *	4 *	-	-	-	-	-	2 *	-	-	-	2 *	-
Not Sure	-	54 2% D	54 2% D	-	11 5% FAGIMBGIMCGIM	-	4 1% HA	-	7 2% JA	-	8 2% LA	-	24 2% NA	-
Sigma	769 100%	2588 100%	3357 100%	3349 100%	207 100%	460 100%	269 100%	415 100%	419 100%	534 100%	352 100%	401 100%	1341 100%	1539 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q855_6. How well do each of the following adjectives describe new gTLDs such as .email, .photography and .club?

16 Aug 2016
Table 237

6. Practical

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	401 52%	1701 66% EI	2102 63% E	2349 70% ABC	108 52%	312 68% E	174 65% AEEEE	299 72% G	246 59% A	360 67% I	236 67% AEIEIEI	278 69% AEIEIEI	937 70% AEIEIEI	1100 71%
Describes very well	132 17%	563 22% EI	695 21% I	690 21% AFJ	32 15%	75 16%	64 24% AEIEIEI	93 22% FJ	66 16%	85 16%	91 26% AEIEIEI	95 24% FJ	310 23% AEIEIEI	342 22% DFJ
Describes somewhat well	269 35%	1138 44% E	1407 42%	1659 50% ABC	76 37%	237 52% E	110 41%	206 50% G	180 43% A	275 51% I	145 41% A	183 46% AEIEIEI	627 47% AEIEIEI	758 49%
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	368 48% DGIKM	833 32% M	1201 36% DM	1000 30% FKMBKMKM	87 42%	148 32%	91 34%	116 28% JKMBKMKM	165 39%	174 33%	110 31%	123 31%	380 28%	439 29%
Does not describe very well	166 22%	598 23% M	764 23%	727 22% FAKMBKMKM	63 30%	97 21%	63 23%	90 22%	109 26% MMM	124 23%	79 22%	79 20%	284 21%	337 22%
Does not describe at all	202 26% DEGIKM	235 9% M	437 13% DKM	273 8% N	24 12% MMM	51 11% DHN	28 10%	26 6% KMBKMKM	56 13% N	50 9% N	31 9% DHN	44 11% DHN	96 7%	102 7%
Decline to Answer	-	3 * D	3 *	-	-	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	2 *	-
Not Sure	-	51 2% D	51 2% D	-	12 6% FACRMBKMKM	-	4 1% HA	-	7 2% JA	-	6 2% LA	-	22 2% NA	-
Sigma	769 100%	2588 100%	3357 100%	3349 100%	207 100%	460 100%	269 100%	415 100%	419 100%	534 100%	352 100%	401 100%	1341 100%	1539 100%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q855_7. How well do each of the following adjectives describe new gTLDs such as .email, .photography and .club?

16 Aug 2016
Table 238

7. Technical

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	352 46%	1674 65% EI	2026 60% E	2193 65% ACFJ	105 51%	259 56%	177 66% AEIEIEI	264 64% F	237 57% A	329 62%	224 64% AEIEIEI	247 62% AEIKBEIKCEIK	931 69%	1094 71% DFHJL
Describes very well	114 15%	543 21% EI	657 20% I	650 19% AFJ	31 15%	63 14%	65 24% AEIEICEI	96 23% DFJ	65 16%	85 16%	74 21% AIII	81 20% F AEIBEICEI	308 23%	325 21% DFJ
Describes somewhat well	238 31%	1131 44% E	1369 41%	1543 46% ACHL	74 36%	196 43%	112 42% A	168 40%	172 41% A	244 46%	150 43% A	166 41% AEBECE	623 46%	769 50% DFHL
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	417 54% DEGIKM	856 33% M	1273 38% DGM	1156 35% N GMBGMGM	93 45%	201 44% DHN	87 32%	151 36% N GMBGMGM	170 41% DN	205 38% DN	121 34% MMM	154 38% N	385 29%	445 29%
Does not describe very well	201 26% M	601 23% M	802 24% M	857 26% BN	59 29% MMM	135 29% DN	67 25%	114 27% N	113 27% MBMM	149 28% N	83 24%	112 28% N	279 21%	347 23%
Does not describe at all	216 28% DEGIKM	255 10% M	471 14% DGM	299 9% N GMBGMGM	34 16%	66 14% DHN	20 7%	37 9% GMBGMGM	57 14% N	56 10% N	38 11% N	42 10% N	106 8%	98 6%
Decline to Answer	-	3 *	3 *	-	-	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	2 *	-
Not Sure	-	55 2% D	55 2% D	-	9 4% FAMBMCM	-	5 2% HA	-	11 3% JA	-	7 2% LA	-	23 2% NA	-
Sigma	769 100%	2588 100%	3357 100%	3349 100%	207 100%	460 100%	269 100%	415 100%	419 100%	534 100%	352 100%	401 100%	1341 100%	1539 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q855_8. How well do each of the following adjectives describe new gTLDs such as .email, .photography and .club?

8. Confusing

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	247 32%	1106 43% DGK	1353 40% G	1273 38% AHL	86 42% A	175 38% H	91 34% A	112 27% A	171 41% HL	221 41% HL	131 37% NAGIKBGKCGIK	129 32% NAGIKBGKCGIK	627 47% DHL	636 41% DHL
Describes very well	95 12%	345 13% D	440 13% D	350 10% H	19 9% H	52 11% H	28 10% H	31 7% H	50 12% H	49 9% H	43 12% H	42 10% H	205 15% H	176 11% H
Describes somewhat well	152 20%	761 29% GK	913 27% GK	923 28% AHL	67 32% AGGG	123 27% H	63 23% H	81 20% H	121 29% A	172 32% DHL	88 25% A	87 22% AGKBGKCGK	422 31% DHL	460 30% DHL
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	522 68% DEIKM	1423 55% M	1945 58% M	2076 62% BCN	110 53% BCN	285 62% E	175 65% EIMBEIMCEIM	303 73% GDFJN	238 57% MMM	313 59% MMM	214 61% MBMM	272 68% KDJN	686 51% KDJN	903 59% M
Does not describe very well	199 26%	847 33% ABCJ	1046 31% ABCJ	1220 36% ABCJ	56 27% ABCJ	162 35% E	93 35% A	167 40% J	130 31% J	170 32% J	118 34% A	158 39% J	450 34% AC	563 37% J
Does not describe at all	323 42% DEGIKM	576 22% M	899 27% M	856 26% BN	54 26% MMM	123 27% N	82 30% MBMM	136 33% DJN	108 26% MMM	143 27% N	96 27% MBMM	114 28% N	236 18% N	340 22% M
Decline to Answer	-	6 *	6 *	-	1 *	-	-	-	1 *	-	1 *	-	3 *	-
Not Sure	-	53 2% D	53 2% D	-	10 5% FAGKMBGKMGKDM	-	3 1% HA	-	9 2% JA	-	6 2% LA	-	25 2% NA	-
Sigma	769 100%	2588 100%	3357 100%	3349 100%	207 100%	460 100%	269 100%	415 100%	419 100%	534 100%	352 100%	401 100%	1341 100%	1539 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q855_9. How well do each of the following adjectives describe new gTLDs such as .email, .photography and .club?

9. Overwhelming

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	177 23%	1203 46% EGI	1380 41% EGI	1500 45% ACFHJ	66 32% A	165 36% H	90 33% A	120 29% A	138 33% A	192 36% H AEGIEGICEGI	167 47% AEGIEGICEGI	196 49% FHJ AEGIBEGICEGI	742 55% AEGIBEGICEGI	827 54% DFHJ
Describes very well	69 9%	373 14% EGI	442 13% EI	432 13% AHJ	14 7% A	49 11% A	26 10% A	38 9% A	39 9% A	52 10% AEEEE	48 14% AEEEE	54 13% NAEGIBEGICEGI	246 18% NAEGIBEGICEGI	239 16% DFHJ
Describes somewhat well	108 14%	830 32% EGI	938 28% I	1068 32% ACFHJ	52 25% A	116 25% A	64 24% A	82 20% A	99 24% A	140 26% H AEGIEGICEGI	119 34% AEGIEGICEGI	142 35% FHJ AEGIBEGICEGI	496 37% AEGIBEGICEGI	588 38% DFHJ
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	592 77% DEGIKM	1326 51% M	1918 57% KM	1849 55% BN KMBKMKM	131 63% DLN KMBKMKM	295 64% DLN KMBKMKM	176 65% DFJLN KMBKMKM	295 71% DLN KMBKMKM	270 64% AKKCK	342 64% DLN	179 51% MMM	205 51% N	570 43% N	712 46% M
Does not describe very well	218 28%	815 31%	1033 31%	1136 34% ABC	68 33% N	162 35% DLN	94 35% A	166 40% DLN	147 35% AKKCK	186 35% DLN	99 28% MMM	124 31% N	407 30% N	498 32% M
Does not describe at all	374 49% DEGIKM	511 20% M	885 26% DM	713 21% N KMBKMKM	63 30% DLN KMBKMKM	133 29% DLN KMBKMKM	82 30% HA	129 31% DLN KMBKMKM	123 29% JA	156 29% DLN	80 23% MMM	81 20% N	163 12% N	214 14% M
Decline to Answer	-	4 *	4 *	-	-	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	3 *	-
Not Sure	-	55 2% D	55 2% D	-	10 5% FAGKMBEGKMKDKM	-	3 1% HA	-	10 2% JA	-	6 2% LA	-	26 2% NA	-
Sigma	769 100%	2588 100%	3357 100%	3349 100%	207 100%	460 100%	269 100%	415 100%	419 100%	534 100%	352 100%	401 100%	1341 100%	1539 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q855_10. How well do each of the following adjectives describe new gTLDs such as .email, .photography and .club?

10. Useful

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	428 56%	1800 70% EI	2228 66% EI	2393 71% ACJ	123 59%	313 68% E	197 73% AEIEICEI	309 74% FJ	254 61% I	358 67% I	244 69% AEIEIEI	277 69% AEIBEICEI	982 73% AEIBEICEI	1136 74% DFJ
Describes very well	148 19%	601 23% I	749 22% I	747 22% FJ	40 19%	76 17% AEIMBEIMCEIM	82 30%	106 26% FJ	64 15%	80 15%	92 26% AIII	104 26% FJ	323 24% AIIICI	381 25% DFJ
Describes somewhat well	280 36%	1199 46%	1479 44%	1646 49% ABCL	83 40%	237 52% EL	115 43%	203 49%	190 45% A	278 52% IL	152 43% A	173 43% AEKBEKCEK	659 49% L	755 49% L
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	341 44% DEGIKM	738 29% M	1079 32% DGM	956 29% N	74 36% GMBGMGM	147 32% HN	68 25%	106 26% GKMBGKMGKM	157 37% DHN	176 33% DHN	102 29% MMM	124 31% DHN	337 25% DHN	403 26% DHN
Does not describe very well	160 21%	499 19%	659 20%	726 22% BC	47 23%	97 21%	47 17%	82 20%	95 23% MMM	135 25% DHN	65 18%	94 23%	245 18%	318 21%
Does not describe at all	181 24% DEGIKM	239 9% DM	420 13% DGM	230 7% N	27 13% MMM	50 11% DHN	21 8%	24 6% JGMBGMGM	62 15% JA	41 8% MMM	37 11% LA	30 7% DHN	92 7% DHN	85 6% DHN
Decline to Answer	-	3 * D	3 *	-	-	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	2 *	-
Not Sure	-	47 2% D	47 1% D	-	10 5% FAGRMBGKMGKM	-	4 1% HA	-	7 2% JA	-	6 2% LA	-	20 1% NA	-
Sigma	769 100%	2588 100%	3357 100%	3349 100%	207 100%	460 100%	269 100%	415 100%	419 100%	534 100%	352 100%	401 100%	1341 100%	1539 100%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q855_11. How well do each of the following adjectives describe new gTLDs such as .email, .photography and .club?
11. For people like me

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants			Region											
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia	
					(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539	
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	261 34%	1430 55% EI	1691 50% EI	1934 58% ACFJ	78 38% ACFJ	197 43% ACFJ	149 55% AEIEIEI	237 57% F	189 45% A	274 51% F	182 52% AEIEI	232 58% FJ	832 62% AEIGKBEGKCEGK	994 65% DFHJL	
Describes very well	85 11%	483 19% EI	568 17% EI	566 17% AFJ	19 9% AFJ	43 9% AEIEIEI	57 21% AEIEIEI	85 20% DFJ	52 12% DFJ	68 13% AEIEIEI	69 20% AEIEIEI	82 20% DFJ	286 21% AEIBEICEI	288 19% DFJ	
Describes somewhat well	176 23%	947 37% E	1123 33% E	1368 41% ABCF	59 29% ABCF	154 33% ABCF	92 34% A	152 37% A	137 33% A	206 39% A	113 32% A	150 37% AEIGKBEGKCEGK	546 41% MDFHJL	706 46% MDFHJL	
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	508 66% DEGIKM	1091 42% M	1599 48% DM	1415 42% N	118 57% GKMBGKMGKMGK	263 57% DHJLN	116 43% MMM	178 43% N	217 52% GMBGKMGKMGK	260 49% DLN	164 47% MMM	169 42% N	476 35% AEIGKBEGKCEGK	545 35% MDFHJL	
Does not describe very well	199 26%	715 28% E	914 27% E	934 28% N	69 33% AMMCM	152 33% DHN	72 27% MMM	110 27% N	128 31% MBMM	164 31% DN	95 27% MBMM	111 28% DN	351 26% AEIGKBEGKCEGK	397 26% MDFHJL	
Does not describe at all	309 40% DEGIKM	376 15% M	685 20% DM	481 14% N	49 24% GKMBGKMGKMGK	111 24% DHJLN	44 16% MMM	68 16% N	89 21% MBMM	96 18% DN	69 20% MBMM	58 14% DN	125 9% AEIGKBEGKCEGK	148 10% MDFHJL	
Decline to Answer	-	3 *	3 *	-	-	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	2 *	-	
Not Sure	-	64 2% D	64 2% D	-	11 5% FAGKMBGKMGKMGK	-	4 1% HA	-	12 3% JA	-	6 2% LA	-	31 2% NA	-	
Sigma	769 100%	2588 100%	3357 100%	3349 100%	207 100%	460 100%	269 100%	415 100%	419 100%	534 100%	352 100%	401 100%	1341 100%	1539 100%	

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/F/H/J/L/N - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q855_12. How well do each of the following adjectives describe new gTLDs such as .email, .photography and .club?

12. Interesting

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	401 52%	1741 67% EI	2142 64% EI	2306 69% ACFJ	114 55%	272 59%	193 72% AEIEICEI	297 72% FJ	249 59% A	340 64%	243 69% AEIEICEI	292 73% FJ	942 70% AEIBEICEI	1105 72% DFJ
Describes very well	118 15%	618 24% DEI	736 22% EI	688 21% AFJ	28 14%	62 13%	68 25% AEIEIEI	98 24% FJ	68 16%	77 14%	94 27% AEIEICEI	97 24% FJ	360 27% NAEIBEICEI	354 23% DFJ
Describes somewhat well	283 37%	1123 43%	1406 42%	1618 48% ABC	86 42%	210 46%	125 46% A	199 48%	181 43% A	263 49%	149 42%	195 49%	582 43% A	751 49% M
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	368 48% DEGIKM	788 30% M	1156 34% DGKM	1043 31% N	82 40% GKMBGKMGKM	188 41% DHLN	72 27%	118 28% GKMBGKMGKM	162 39% DHLN	194 36% DHLN	102 29%	109 27%	370 28%	434 28%
Does not describe very well	159 21%	564 22%	723 22%	757 23%	56 27% AKMKMCKM	122 27% DHLN	55 20%	82 20% AKMBKMKM	110 26% DHLN	139 26% DHLN	65 18%	80 20%	278 21%	334 22%
Does not describe at all	209 27% DEGIKM	224 9% M	433 13% DGM	286 9% N	26 13% GMBGMGM	66 14% DHLN	17 6%	36 9% GMBGMGM	52 12% N	55 10% N	37 11% MMM	29 7%	92 7%	100 6%
Decline to Answer	-	3 * D	3 *	-	-	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	2 *	-
Not Sure	-	56 2% D	56 2% D	-	11 5% FAGRMBGKMGKM	-	4 1% HA	-	7 2% JA	-	7 2% LA	-	27 2% NA	-
Sigma	769 100%	2588 100%	3357 100%	3349 100%	207 100%	460 100%	269 100%	415 100%	419 100%	534 100%	352 100%	401 100%	1341 100%	1539 100%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q855_13. How well do each of the following adjectives describe new gTLDs such as .email, .photography and .club?

13. Exciting

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
					(E)		(G)		(I)		(K)		(M)	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	221 29%	1462 56% EGI	1683 50% EI	1821 54% ACFHJ	72 35%	168 37%	136 51% AEIEIEI	197 47% F	177 42% A	255 48% F AEGIBEGICEGI	220 63% A	253 63% DFHJ	857 64% AEGIBEGICEGI	948 62% DFHJ
Describes very well	67 9%	482 19% DEI	549 16% EI	537 16% AFJ	20 10%	41 9%	47 17% AEIEIEI	60 14% F	45 11%	56 10% AEIEIEI	81 23% A	75 19% FJ	289 22% AEIEIEI	305 20% DFHJ
Describes somewhat well	154 20%	980 38% EI	1134 34% E	1284 38% ACFH	52 25%	127 28%	89 33% A	137 33%	132 32% A	199 37% F AEGIEICEI	139 39% A	178 44% DFHJ	568 42% AEGIBEGICEGI	643 42% DFH
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	548 71% DEGIKM	1069 41% KM	1617 48% DKM	1528 46% BLN	123 59% GKMBGKMGCKM	292 63% DHJLN	128 48% KMBKMKM	218 53% DLN	232 55% GKMBGKMGCKM	279 52% DLN	125 36% DLN	148 37% DLN	461 34% AEGIBEGICEGI	591 38% M
Does not describe very well	224 29% KM	711 27% KM	935 28% KM	1036 31% BCLN	71 34% KMBKMKCKM	183 40% DJLN	86 32% KMKMKM	154 37% DLN	147 35% AKMBKMKM	166 31% L	75 21% L	96 24% L	332 25% AEGIBEGICEGI	437 28% M
Does not describe at all	324 42% DEGIKM	358 14% M	682 20% DGKM	492 15% N	52 25% GKMBGKMGCKM	109 24% DHLN	42 16% MMM	64 15% N	85 20% KMBKMKM	113 21% DHLN	50 14% MMM	52 13% DHLN	129 10% AEGIBEGICEGI	154 10% M
Decline to Answer	-	4 *	4 *	-	-	-	-	-	2 *	-	-	-	2 *	-
		D	D						C					
Not Sure	-	53 2% D	53 2% D	-	12 6% FACRMBGKMGCKM	-	5 2% HA	-	8 2% JA	-	7 2% LA	-	21 2% NA	-
Sigma	769 100%	2588 100%	3357 100%	3349 100%	207 100%	460 100%	269 100%	415 100%	419 100%	534 100%	352 100%	401 100%	1341 100%	1539 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q855_14. How well do each of the following adjectives describe new gTLDs such as .email, .photography and .club?

14. Helpful

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2587	3356	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1340	1539
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	390 51%	1743 67% EI	2133 64% EI	2346 70% ABCFJ	110 53%	284 62% E	179 67% AEIEIEI	285 69% F	239 57% A	348 65% I	240 68% AEIEIEI	284 71% F	975 73% AEGIBEGICEGI	1145 74% DFHJ
Describes very well	119 15%	595 23% DEI	714 21% EI	698 21% AFJ	30 14%	67 15%	69 26% AEIEIEI	85 20% FJ	72 17%	77 14%	83 24% AEIEIEI	108 27% DFHJ	341 25% AEIBEICEI	361 23% DFJ
Describes somewhat well	271 35%	1148 44% I	1419 42% I	1648 49% ABCL	80 39%	217 47% E	110 41%	200 48%	167 40%	271 51% IL	157 45% A	176 44% AEIBEICEI	634 47% AEIBEICEI	784 51% L
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	379 49% DEGIKM	786 30% M	1165 35% DKM	1003 30% N	86 42% GKMBGKMGK	176 38% DHLN	85 32% MMM	130 31% N	170 41% GKMBGKMGK	186 35% DN	105 30%	117 29%	340 25%	394 26%
Does not describe very well	178 23% KM	546 21% M	724 22% M	749 22% N	57 28% KMBKMCKM	123 27% DLN	62 23%	97 23% KMBKMCKM	113 27% DLN	139 26% DLN	63 18%	81 20%	251 19%	309 20%
Does not describe at all	201 26% DEGIKM	240 9% DM	441 13% DGM	254 8% N	29 14% MBMM	53 12% DN	23 9%	33 8% JGMBGMMGM	57 14% N	47 9% N	42 12% MMM	36 9% N	89 7%	85 6%
Decline to Answer	-	3 *	3 *	-	-	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	2 *	-
Not Sure	-	55 2% D	55 2% D	-	11 5% FACRMBGKMGK	-	5 2% HA	-	9 2% JA	-	7 2% LA	-	23 2% NA	-
Sigma	769 100%	2587 100%	3356 100%	3349 100%	207 100%	460 100%	269 100%	415 100%	419 100%	534 100%	352 100%	401 100%	1340 100%	1539 100%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q855_15. How well do each of the following adjectives describe new gTLDs such as .email, .photography and .club?

15. Informative

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	455 59%	1769 68% I	2224 66% I	2425 72% ABCF	131 63%	315 68%	191 71% AIII	308 74%	259 62%	370 69% I	249 71% AIII	300 75% F	939 70% AIIIC	1132 74% MF
Describes very well	159 21%	625 24% I	784 23% I	793 24% FJ	39 19%	82 18%	75 28% AEIEIEI	117 28% DFJ	71 17%	85 16%	96 27% AEIEIEI	116 29% DFJ	344 26% AEIEICEI	393 26% DFJ
Describes somewhat well	296 38%	1144 44%	1440 43%	1632 49% ABC	92 44%	233 51%	116 43%	191 46%	188 45% A	285 53% IDHLN	153 43%	184 46%	595 44% A	739 48%
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	314 41% DEGKM	761 29%	1075 32% DKM	924 28%	64 31%	145 32% DLN	74 28%	107 26% GKMBGKMCCKM	152 36%	164 31%	95 27%	101 25%	376 28%	407 26%
Does not describe very well	145 19%	538 21%	683 20%	673 20%	38 18%	95 21%	48 18%	79 19%	99 24%	117 22%	64 18%	71 18%	289 22%	311 20%
Does not describe at all	169 22% DEGIKM	223 9% M	392 12% DM	251 7% N	26 13% MBMM	50 11% DHN	26 10%	28 7% MBMM	53 13% N	47 9% N	31 9%	30 7%	87 6%	96 6%
Decline to Answer	-	3 * D	3 *	-	-	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	2 *	-
Not Sure	-	55 2% D	55 2% D	-	12 6% FACRMBGKMCCKM	-	4 1% HA	-	7 2% JA	-	8 2% LA	-	24 2% NA	-
Sigma	769 100%	2588 100%	3357 100%	3349 100%	207 100%	460 100%	269 100%	415 100%	419 100%	534 100%	352 100%	401 100%	1341 100%	1539 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q890. Which of the following online identities do you have, and which do you use to promote a business or organization,
or to promote a personal activity or interest?
SUMMARY TABLE OF HAVE

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	-**	-**	-**	3349	-**	460	-**	415	-**	534	-**	401	-**	1539
Social media accounts, such as Facebook, QZone, LinkedIn or Twitter	- -	- -	- -	2877 86% FHJ	- -	370 80%	- -	342 82% J	- -	409 77%	- -	375 94% DFHJN	- -	1381 90% DFHJ
Bloggging or publishing account separate from social media account, such as Blogger, Instagram, Pinterest, Tumblr or WordPress	- -	- -	- -	2290 68% FJ	- -	218 47%	- -	290 70% FJ	- -	282 53%	- -	310 77% DFHJ	- -	1190 77% DFHJ
A web page created through a third party service of some form. Examples could be as part of online application like Google Apps, Office 365, review sites like TripAdvisor or Yelp, or online marketing services like HomeAway	- -	- -	- -	2002 60% FJ	- -	175 38%	- -	257 62% FJ	- -	255 48% F	- -	281 70% DFHJ	- -	1034 67% DFHJ
None of the above	- -	- -	- -	399 12% LN	- -	77 17% DLN	- -	67 16% DLN	- -	105 20% DLN	- -	23 6%	- -	127 8%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q890. Which of the following online identities do you have, and which do you use to promote a business or organization, or to promote a personal activity or interest?
SUMMARY TABLE OF PROMOTE BUSINESS

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	..	..	..	3349	..	460	..	415	..	534	..	401	..	1539
Social media accounts, such as Facebook, QZone, LinkedIn or Twitter	-	-	-	1123 34% FJ	-	100 22%	-	155 37% FJ	-	108 20%	-	213 53% DFHJN	-	547 36% DFJ
Blogging or publishing account separate from social media account, such as Blogger, Instagram, Pinterest, Tumblr or WordPress	-	-	-	857 26% FJ	-	65 14%	-	111 27% FJ	-	67 13%	-	136 34% DFHJ	-	478 31% DFJ
A web page created through a third party service of some form. Examples could be as part of online application like Google Apps, Office 365, review sites like TripAdvisor or Yelp, or online marketing services like HomeAway	-	-	-	855 26% FJ	-	60 13%	-	132 32% DFJ	-	85 16%	-	123 31% DFJ	-	455 30% DFJ
None of the above	-	-	-	900 27% HLN	-	166 36% DHLN	-	94 23% L	-	221 41% DHLN	-	42 10%	-	377 24% L

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q890. Which of the following online identities do you have, and which do you use to promote a business or organization,
or to promote a personal activity or interest?
SUMMARY TABLE OF PROMOTE ORGANIZATION

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
					(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	-**	-**	-**	3349	-**	460	-**	415	-**	534	-**	401	-**	1539
Social media accounts, such as Facebook, QZone, LinkedIn or Twitter	- -	- -	- -	722 22% FJ	- -	58 13%	- -	110 27% DFJ	- -	70 13%	- -	105 26% DFJ	- -	379 25% DFJ
Bloggng or publishing account separate from social media account, such as Blogger, Instagram, Pinterest, Tumblr or WordPress	- -	- -	- -	651 19% FJ	- -	39 8%	- -	114 27% DFJL	- -	56 10%	- -	79 20% FJ	- -	363 24% DFJ
A web page created through a third party service of some form. Examples could be as part of online application like Google Apps, Office 365, review sites like TripAdvisor or Yelp, or online marketing services like HomeAway	- -	- -	- -	659 20% FJ	- -	47 10%	- -	100 24% DFJ	- -	61 11%	- -	86 21% FJ	- -	365 24% DFJ
None of the above	- -	- -	- -	1019 30% HLN	- -	203 44% DHLN	- -	104 25% L	- -	239 45% DHLN	- -	47 12%	- -	426 28% L

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q890. Which of the following online identities do you have, and which do you use to promote a business or organization, or to promote a personal activity or interest?
SUMMARY TABLE OF PROMOTE PERSONAL

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	..	..	..	3349	..	460	..	415	..	534	..	401	..	1539
Social media accounts, such as Facebook, OZone, LinkedIn or Twitter	- -	- -	- -	1409 42% FJ	- -	165 36% J	- -	208 50% DFJN	- -	129 24%	- -	231 58% DFHJN	- -	676 44% DFJ
Bloggng or publishing account separate from social media account, such as Blogger, Instagram, Pinterest, Tumblr or WordPress	- -	- -	- -	991 30% FJ	- -	92 20%	- -	153 37% DFJ	- -	84 16%	- -	135 34% FJ	- -	527 34% DFJ
A web page created through a third party service of some form. Examples could be as part of online application like Google Apps, Office 365, review sites like TripAdvisor or Yelp, or online marketing services like HomeAway	- -	- -	- -	616 18% FJ	- -	45 10%	- -	92 22% DFJ	- -	60 11%	- -	85 21% FJ	- -	334 22% DFJ
None of the above	- -	- -	- -	825 25% HLN	- -	164 36% DHLN	- -	79 19% L	- -	217 41% DHLN	- -	38 9%	- -	327 21% L

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q890. Which of the following online identities do you have, and which do you use to promote a business or organization,
or to promote a personal activity or interest?
SUMMARY TABLE OF SOCIAL MEDIA

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
					(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	-**	-**	-**	3349	-**	460	-**	415	-**	534	-**	401	-**	1539
Have	-	-	-	2877 86% FHJ	-	370 80%	-	342 82% J	-	409 77%	-	375 94% DFHJN	-	1381 90% DFHJ
Promote Business	-	-	-	1123 34% FJ	-	100 22%	-	155 37% FJ	-	108 20%	-	213 53% DFHJN	-	547 36% DFJ
Promote Organization	-	-	-	722 22% FJ	-	58 13%	-	110 27% DFJ	-	70 13%	-	105 26% DFJ	-	379 25% DFJ
Promote Personal	-	-	-	1409 42% FJ	-	165 36% J	-	208 50% DFJN	-	129 24%	-	231 58% DFHJN	-	676 44% DFJ

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q890. Which of the following online identities do you have, and which to you use to promote a business or organization,
or to promote a personal activity or interest?
SUMMARY TABLE OF BLOGGING OR PUBLISHING

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	..	..	..	3349	..	460	..	415	..	534	..	401	..	1539
Have	-	-	-	2290	-	218	-	290	-	282	-	310	-	1190
	-	-	-	68% FJ	-	47%	-	70% FJ	-	53%	-	77% DFHJ	-	77% DFHJ
Promote Business	-	-	-	857	-	65	-	111	-	67	-	136	-	478
	-	-	-	26% FJ	-	14%	-	27% FJ	-	13%	-	34% DFHJ	-	31% DFJ
Promote Organization	-	-	-	651	-	39	-	114	-	56	-	79	-	363
	-	-	-	19% FJ	-	8%	-	27% DFJL	-	10%	-	20% FJ	-	24% DFJ
Promote Personal	-	-	-	991	-	92	-	153	-	84	-	135	-	527
	-	-	-	30% FJ	-	20%	-	37% DFJ	-	16%	-	34% FJ	-	34% DFJ

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q890. Which of the following online identities do you have, and which do you use to promote a business or organization,
or to promote a personal activity or interest?
SUMMARY TABLE OF WEB PAGE

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
					(E)		(G)		(I)		(K)		(M)	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	..	..	..	3349	..	460	..	415	..	534	..	401	..	1539
Have	-	-	-	2002	-	175	-	257	-	255	-	281	-	1034
	-	-	-	60% FJ	-	38%	-	62% FJ	-	48% F	-	70% DFHJ	-	67% DFHJ
Promote Business	-	-	-	855	-	60	-	132	-	85	-	123	-	455
	-	-	-	26% FJ	-	13%	-	32% DFJ	-	16%	-	31% DFJ	-	30% DFJ
Promote Organization	-	-	-	659	-	47	-	100	-	61	-	86	-	365
	-	-	-	20% FJ	-	10%	-	24% DFJ	-	11%	-	21% FJ	-	24% DFJ
Promote Personal	-	-	-	616	-	45	-	92	-	60	-	85	-	334
	-	-	-	18% FJ	-	10%	-	22% DFJ	-	11%	-	21% FJ	-	22% DFJ

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Base: Has Alternate Online Identities

Q895. How would you say your use of alternative identities, like social media accounts, blogging or publishing accounts or web pages, has impacted your decision to register a domain name, if at all?

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	-**	-**	-**	2950	-**	383	-**	348	-**	429	-**	378	-**	1412
I have made a decision to not register additional domain names and use these other online identities instead	-	-	-	709 24% L	-	94 25%	-	91 26% L	-	112 26% L	-	74 20%	-	338 24%
I have decided to not renew one or more domain names and use these other identities instead	-	-	-	508 17% FL	-	44 11%	-	52 15%	-	81 19% FL	-	49 13%	-	282 20% DFHL
I am considering letting a domain registration lapse and use these other online identities instead	-	-	-	482 16% L	-	55 14%	-	65 19% L	-	62 14%	-	42 11%	-	258 18% DL
My decision to register domain names is unaffected by my other online identities	-	-	-	1251 42% N	-	190 50% DHJN	-	140 40%	-	174 41%	-	213 56% DHJN	-	534 38%
Sigma	-	-	-	2950 100%	-	383 100%	-	348 100%	-	429 100%	-	378 100%	-	1412 100%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Base: Has Alternate Online Identities

Q896. And, do you expect these online identities to have an impact on domain registrations in the future?

16 Aug 2016
Table 255

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	-**	-**	-**	2950	-**	383	-**	348	-**	429	-**	378	-**	1412
I will be less likely to register a new domain name	-	-	-	903 31% FL	-	97 25%	-	118 34% FL	-	144 34% FL	-	90 24%	-	454 32% FL
I will be less likely to renew domain names I have already registered	-	-	-	690 23% F	-	57 15%	-	77 22% F	-	104 24% F	-	85 22% F	-	367 26% DF
These other identities won't affect my decision to register a domain name-they serve different purposes	-	-	-	1357 46% N	-	229 60% DHJN	-	153 44%	-	181 42%	-	203 54% DHJN	-	591 42%
Sigma	-	-	-	2950 100%	-	383 100%	-	348 100%	-	429 100%	-	378 100%	-	1412 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q897. What value do these alternative online identities provide over registering a domain name?

16 Aug 2016
Table 256

Base: Registration Decision Affected

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	-**	-**	-**	1593	-**	154	-**	195	-**	248	-**	175	-**	821
Lower cost	-	-	-	846 53% J	-	90 58% J	-	102 52% J	-	117 47% J	-	112 64% DHJN	-	425 52% J
EASY (NET)	-	-	-	1276 80% FJ	-	114 74% J	-	164 84% FJ	-	171 69% J	-	152 87% DFJ	-	675 82% DFJ
Easier to set up	-	-	-	749 47% J	-	64 42% J	-	93 48% J	-	84 34% J	-	100 57% DFJ	-	408 50% DJ
Integrate more easily with other tools (e.g., show my Twitter feed)	-	-	-	562 35% J	-	53 34% J	-	91 47% DFJN	-	60 24% J	-	69 39% J	-	289 35% J
Easier to communicate to interested people-they can "follow me" or I can invite my contacts	-	-	-	676 42% J	-	60 39% J	-	102 52% DFJN	-	69 28% J	-	97 55% DFJN	-	348 42% J
Easier to access them on mobile devices (for example, I can use an app)	-	-	-	702 44% J	-	65 42% J	-	91 47% J	-	90 36% J	-	93 53% DFJN	-	363 44% J
No registration process to go through	-	-	-	437 27% L	-	41 27% J	-	56 29% L	-	69 28% L	-	33 19% J	-	238 29% L
They are more credible	-	-	-	539 34% J	-	45 29% J	-	67 34% J	-	75 30% J	-	62 35% J	-	290 35% J
Other	-	-	-	14 1% N	-	9 6% DHJLN	-	-	-	4 2% N	-	-	-	1 *
Sigma	-	-	-	4525 284% J	-	427 277% J	-	602 309% J	-	568 229% J	-	566 323% J	-	2362 288% J

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Base: Registration Decision Not Affected

Q898. What value does a registered domain offer over these alternative identities?

16 Aug 2016
Table 257

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	-**	-**	-**	1357	-**	229	-**	153	-**	181	-**	203	-**	591
More likely to come up in search results	-	-	-	311 23%	-	48 21%	-	37 24%	-	43 24%	-	57 28% N	-	126 21%
The gTLD or domain name communicates the topic better e.g. pet.photography	-	-	-	307 23%	-	50 22%	-	46 30% DJ	-	31 17%	-	44 22%	-	136 23%
It's more legitimate	-	-	-	304 22%	-	47 21%	-	33 22%	-	41 23%	-	38 19%	-	145 25%
It's expected by customers	-	-	-	205 15%	-	30 13%	-	18 12%	-	32 18%	-	22 11%	-	103 17% DL
I have more control over the design	-	-	-	210 15% N	-	46 20% DHN	-	18 12%	-	29 16%	-	39 19% N	-	78 13%
Other	-	-	-	20 1% N	-	8 3% DN	-	1 1%	-	5 3% N	-	3 1%	-	3 1%
Sigma	-	-	-	1357 100%	-	229 100%	-	153 100%	-	181 100%	-	203 100%	-	591 100%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q865. Earlier we asked you about enforcing restrictions on who can register/purchase domains with specific extensions. What level of restrictions would you expect there to be on purchasing the following new gTLDs?

SUMMARY TABLE OF STRICT/SOME RESTRICTIONS

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
.email	377 49%	1697 66% I	2074 62%	2246 67% ACF	127 61% A	285 62%	173 64% A	267 64%	242 58% A	342 64% I	226 64% A	273 68% AEIBEICEI	929 69%	1079 70% DFHJ
.photography	375 49%	1708 66% K	2083 62%	2255 67% AC	139 67% A	321 70%	170 63% A	268 65%	260 62% A	360 67%	207 59% A	264 66% K	932 70% AGIKBGIKCGIK	1042 68%
.link	285 37%	1674 65% EI	1959 58% I	2098 63% ACFJ	110 53% A	253 55%	172 64% AEIEIEI	248 60%	223 53% A	304 57%	215 61% AIII	253 63% F	954 71% NAEGBBGICGIC	1040 68% DFHJ
.guru	295 38%	1649 64% DIK	1944 58%	2033 61% ACF	121 58% A	253 55%	174 65% HAIKICIK	236 57%	239 57% A	313 59%	200 57% A	240 60% NAEIKBEIKCEIK	915 68% DFHJ	991 64%
.realtor	402 52%	1717 66% IK	2119 63%	2308 69% ABCHJ	147 71% AGIKBGICGIC	381 83% EDHJLN	167 62% A	258 62%	248 59% A	338 63%	210 60% A	292 73% KHJN	945 70% AGIKBGICGIC	1039 68% H
.club	366 48%	1716 66% IK	2082 62%	2215 66% ACH	128 62% A	317 69% H	173 64% A	253 61%	248 59% A	342 64%	209 59% A	259 65% NAEGBBGICGIC	958 71% H	1044 68% H
.xyz	236 31%	1574 61% DEIK	1810 54%	1863 56% AF	103 50% A	205 45% HAEIKCEIK	168 62%	225 54% F	221 53% A	296 55% F	178 51% A	210 52% F	904 67% NAEIKBEIKCEIK	927 60% DFHL
.bank	-	-	-	2709 81% N	-	398 87% DHJN	-	327 79%	-	421 79%	-	348 87% DHJN	-	1215 79%
.pharmacy	-	-	-	2602 78% N	-	398 87% DHJN	-	322 78%	-	418 78% N	-	332 83% DN	-	1132 74%
.builder	-	-	-	2402 72% HN	-	368 80% DHJN	-	280 67%	-	377 71%	-	304 76% HN	-	1073 70%
.toronto	-	-	-	82 78%	-	82 78%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
quadalajara	-	-	-	71 71%	-	71 71%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
.roma	-	-	-	33 66%	-	-	-	-	-	33 66%	-	-	-	-
.istanbul	-	-	-	33 66%	-	-	-	-	-	33 66%	-	-	-	-
.madrid	-	-	-	38 76%	-	-	-	-	-	38 76%	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q865. Earlier we asked you about enforcing restrictions on who can register/purchase domains with specific extensions. What level of restrictions would you expect there to be on purchasing the following new gTLDs?

SUMMARY TABLE OF STRICT/SOME RESTRICTIONS

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
.warszawa	-	-	-	35 66%	-	-	-	-	-	35 66%	-	-	-	-
.paris	-	-	-	77 73%	-	-	-	-	-	77 73%	-	-	-	-
Foshan	-	-	-	380 69%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	380 69%
.hanoi	-	-	-	37 71%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	37 71%
.manilla	-	-	-	78 77%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	78 77%
.tokyo	-	-	-	124 70%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	124 70%
.seoul	-	-	-	77 76%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	77 76%
.MOCKBa	-	-	-	89 70%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	89 70%
.delhi	-	-	-	234 71%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	234 71%
.jakarta	-	-	-	72 72%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	72 72%
.abuja	-	-	-	123 62%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	123 62%	-	-
.capetown	-	-	-	76 75%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	76 75%	-	-
.cairo	-	-	-	75 75%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	75 75%	-	-
.bogota	-	-	-	86 69%	-	-	-	86 69%	-	-	-	-	-	-
.cordoba	-	-	-	68 65%	-	-	-	68 65%	-	-	-	-	-	-
.rio	-	-	-	111 60%	-	-	-	111 60%	-	-	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q865. Earlier we asked you about enforcing restrictions on who can register/purchase domains with specific extensions. What level of restrictions would you expect there to be on purchasing the following new gTLDs?

SUMMARY TABLE OF STRICT/SOME RESTRICTIONS

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
.berlin	13 76%	76 70%	89 71%	100 80%	-	-	-	-	76 70%	100 80%	-	-	-	-
.ovh	5 29%	59 55%	64 51%	64 51%	-	-	-	-	59 55%	64 51%	-	-	-	-
.london	68 60%	274 65%	342 64%	78 78% ABC	-	-	-	-	274 65%	78 78% I	-	-	-	-
.nyc	128 63%	51 80%	179 67%	193 76% AC	51 80% AC	193 76%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
.wang	1 50%	357 65%	358 65%	337 61%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	357 65%	337 61%
.xn-ses554g (Chinese for network address)	1 50%	369 67%	370 67%	349 63%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	369 67%	349 63%
.xn-55qx5d (Chinese for company)	1 50%	374 68%	375 68%	352 64%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	374 68%	352 64%
TOTAL RESTRICTIONS (NET)	499 65%	2073 80% GIK	2572 77%	3027 90% ABC	162 78% A	420 91% E	203 75% A	372 90% G	309 74% A	472 88% I	263 75% A	370 92% K AEGKBEGKCEGK	1136 85%	1393 91% M
TOTAL RESTRICTIONS CONSISTENT (NET)	499 65%	2073 80% GIK	2572 77%	2929 87% ABC	162 78% A	414 90% EHJ	203 75% A	351 85% G	309 74% A	454 85% I	263 75% A	361 90% KHJ AEGKBEGKCEGK	1136 85%	1349 88% M
TOTAL RESTRICTIONS ADDED (NET)	-	-	-	2977 89% ABCJ	-	416 90% EJ	-	364 88% G	-	461 86% I	-	366 91% KJ	-	1370 89% M
RESTRICTIONS GLOBAL (NET)	490 64%	2063 80% IK	2553 76%	3014 90% ABC	162 78% A	420 91% E	203 75% A	370 89% G	304 73% A	469 88% I	263 75% A	370 92% KJ AEGKBEGKCEGK	1131 84%	1385 90% M
RESTRICTIONS GLOBAL CONSISTENT (NET)	490 64%	2063 80% IK	2553 76%	2922 87% ABCJ	162 78% A	414 90% EHJ	203 75% A	351 85% G	304 73% A	451 84% I	263 75% A	361 90% KHJ AEGKBEGKCEGK	1131 84%	1345 87% M
RESTRICTIONS GLOBAL ADDED (NET)	-	-	-	2935 88% ABC	-	414 90% E	-	358 86% G	-	459 86% I	-	366 91% KDHJN	-	1338 87% M
RESTRICTIONS GEO-SPECIFIC (NET)	199 26% GK	773 30% GK	972 29% GK	2455 73% ABCHL GKKGK	51 25% EHL	346 75% EHL	-	265 64% G AEGKBEGKCEGK	277 66% IHL	399 75% IHL	-	274 68% K AEGKBEGKCEGK	445 33% MDHL	1171 76% MDHL
RESTRICTIONS GEO-SPECIFIC CONSISTENT (NET)	199 26% GK	773 30% D GK	972 29% D GK	804 24% HL GKKGK	51 25% EDHJLN	193 42% EDHJLN	-	- JAEGBMBEGKCEGK	277 66% DHLN	183 34% DHLN	-	- NAEGKBEGKCEGK	445 33% DHL	428 28% DHL
RESTRICTIONS GEO-SPECIFIC ADDED (NET)	-	-	-	1999 60% ABCFJ	-	153 33% E	-	265 64% GFJ	-	216 40% IF	-	274 68% KDFJ	-	1091 71% MDFHJ

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q865. Earlier we asked you about enforcing restrictions on who can register/purchase domains with specific extensions. What level of restrictions would you expect there to be on purchasing the following new gTLDs?

SUMMARY TABLE OF STRICT/SOME RESTRICTIONS

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q865. Earlier we asked you about enforcing restrictions on who can register/purchase domains with specific extensions. What level of restrictions would you expect there to be on purchasing the following new gTLDs?

SUMMARY TABLE OF STRICT RESTRICTIONS

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
.email	134 17%	566 22% I	700 21% I	748 22% AJ	40 19%	94 20%	59 22%	85 20%	69 16%	97 18%	87 25% AIII	101 25% J	311 23% AII CI	371 24% DJ
.photography	104 14%	516 20% I	620 18%	618 18% A	44 21% A	101 22% DHJN	52 19% A	65 16%	68 16%	88 16%	66 19% A	93 23% DHJN	286 21% NAIICI	271 18%
.link	82 11%	502 19% DI	584 17%	542 16% AFJ	33 16% A	54 12%	55 20% A	69 17% FJ	64 15% A	63 12%	58 16% A	73 18% FJ	292 22% NAIKBIKCIK	283 18% DFJ
.guru	90 12%	497 19% D	587 17%	531 16% A	36 17% A	68 15%	55 20% HA	56 13%	76 18% JA	72 13%	57 16% A	79 20% DHJ	273 20% NAC	256 17%
.realtor	160 21% I	504 19% I	664 20% I	745 22% BCHJN	52 25% IBICI	198 43% EDHJLN	50 19% H	54 13%	66 16%	78 15%	64 18% KDHJN	118 29% III	272 20% III	297 19% HJ
.club	96 12%	491 19% I	587 17%	590 18% AJ	34 16%	75 16%	47 17% A	62 15%	63 15%	73 14%	57 16%	82 20% HJ	290 22% AIKBIKCIK	298 19% DHJ
.xyz	86 11%	472 18% DE	558 17% DE	485 14% AJ	22 11%	76 17% EJ	56 21% HAEEEE	55 13%	68 16% JA	62 12%	53 15%	57 14% NAEKBEKCEK	273 20% J	235 15% J
.bank	-	-	-	1432 43% JN	-	269 58% DHJLN	-	182 44% JN	-	194 36%	-	201 50% DJN	-	586 38%
.pharmacy	-	-	-	1250 37% N	-	261 57% DHJLN	-	157 38% N	-	192 36% N	-	195 49% DHJN	-	445 29%
.builder	-	-	-	732 22% N	-	141 31% DHJN	-	85 20%	-	100 19%	-	109 27% DHJN	-	297 19%
.toronto	-	-	-	30 29%	-	30 29%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
quadalajara	-	-	-	20 20%	-	20 20%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
.roma	-	-	-	7 14%	-	-	-	-	-	7 14%	-	-	-	-
.istanbul	-	-	-	11 22%	-	-	-	-	-	11 22%	-	-	-	-
.madrid	-	-	-	14 28%	-	-	-	-	-	14 28%	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q865. Earlier we asked you about enforcing restrictions on who can register/purchase domains with specific extensions. What level of restrictions would you expect there to be on purchasing the following new gTLDs?

SUMMARY TABLE OF STRICT RESTRICTIONS

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
.warszawa	-	-	-	11 21%	-	-	-	-	-	11 21%	-	-	-	-
.paris	-	-	-	22 21%	-	-	-	-	-	22 21%	-	-	-	-
Foshan	-	-	-	118 21%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	118 21%
.hanoi	-	-	-	13 25%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	13 25%
.manilla	-	-	-	23 23%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	23 23%
.tokyo	-	-	-	34 19%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	34 19%
.seoul	-	-	-	27 27%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	27 27%
.MOCKBa	-	-	-	32 25%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	32 25%
.delhi	-	-	-	79 24%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	79 24%
.jakarta	-	-	-	26 26%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	26 26%
.abuja	-	-	-	43 22%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	43 22%	-	-
.capetown	-	-	-	31 31%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	31 31%	-	-
.cairo	-	-	-	24 24%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	24 24%	-	-
.bogota	-	-	-	26 21%	-	-	-	26 21%	-	-	-	-	-	-
.cordoba	-	-	-	22 21%	-	-	-	22 21%	-	-	-	-	-	-
.rio	-	-	-	35 19%	-	-	-	35 19%	-	-	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q865. Earlier we asked you about enforcing restrictions on who can register/purchase domains with specific extensions. What level of restrictions would you expect there to be on purchasing the following new gTLDs?

SUMMARY TABLE OF STRICT RESTRICTIONS

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
.berlin	4 24%	31 29%	35 28%	32 26%	-	-	-	-	31 29%	32 26%	-	-	-	-
.ovh	-	17 16%	17 14%	15 12%	-	-	-	-	17 16%	15 12%	-	-	-	-
.london	25 22%	85 20%	110 21%	23 23%	-	-	-	-	85 20%	23 23%	-	-	-	-
.nyc	41 20%	21 33%	62 23%	63 25%	21 33% AC	63 25%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
.wang	1 50%	101 18%	102 19%	86 16%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	101 18%	86 16%
.xn-ses554g (Chinese for network address)	1 50%	122 22%	123 22%	103 19%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	122 22%	103 19%
.xn-55qx5d (Chinese for company)	1 50%	121 22%	122 22%	97 18%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	121 22%	97 18%
TOTAL RESTRICTIONS (NET)	240 31%	1091 42% GIK	1331 40%	2114 63% ABCJ	92 44% AGIGIGI	327 71% EDHJN	94 35%	256 62% GJ	149 36%	293 55% I	128 36% KDHJN	276 69% AGIKBGKCGIK	628 47% AGIKBGKCGIK	962 63% MJ
TOTAL RESTRICTIONS CONSISTENT (NET)	240 31%	1091 42% GIK	1331 40%	1644 49% ABCHJ	92 44% AGIGIGI	265 58% EDHJN	94 35%	172 41% GJ	149 36%	212 40% I	128 36% KDHJN	221 55% AGIKBGKCGIK	628 47% AGIKBGKCGIK	774 50% HJ
TOTAL RESTRICTIONS ADDED (NET)	-	-	-	1860 56% ABCJN	-	307 67% EDHJN	-	228 55% GJ	-	251 47% I	-	255 64% KDHJN	-	819 53% MJ
RESTRICTIONS GLOBAL (NET)	227 30%	1038 40% I	1265 38% I	2068 62% ABCJ	89 43% AIII	324 70% EDHJN	94 35%	252 61% GJ	137 33%	290 54% I	128 36% A	274 68% KDHJN	590 44% AGIKBGKCGIK	928 60% MJ
RESTRICTIONS GLOBAL CONSISTENT (NET)	227 30%	1038 40% I	1265 38% I	1596 48% ABCHJ	89 43% AIII	256 56% EDHJN	94 35%	172 41% GJ	137 33%	202 38% I	128 36% A	221 55% KDHJN	590 44% AGIKBGKCGIK	745 48% MHJ
RESTRICTIONS GLOBAL ADDED (NET)	-	-	-	1766 53% ABCJN	-	304 66% EDHJN	-	220 53% GJ	-	243 46% I	-	245 61% KDHJN	-	754 49% M
RESTRICTIONS GEO-SPECIFIC (NET)	67 9% GK	304 12% GK	371 11% GK	873 26% ABCH	21 10% GK	113 25% E	-	83 20% G	94 22% AGIKMBGKCGIK	126 24% I	-	98 24% K	189 14% AGIKBGKCGIK	453 29% MDFHJL
RESTRICTIONS GEO-SPECIFIC CONSISTENT (NET)	67 9% GK	304 12% DGK	371 11% DGK	299 9% HL	21 10% GK	63 14% DHL	-	-	94 22% JAGIKMBGKCGIK	61 11% DHL	-	-	189 14% NAGIKBGKCGIK	175 11% DHL
RESTRICTIONS GEO-SPECIFIC ADDED (NET)	-	-	-	648 19% ABCJN	-	50 11% E	-	83 20% GFJ	-	65 12% I	-	98 24% KDFJ	-	352 23% MDFJ

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q865. Earlier we asked you about enforcing restrictions on who can register/purchase domains with specific extensions. What level of restrictions would you expect there to be on purchasing the following new gTLDs?

SUMMARY TABLE OF STRICT RESTRICTIONS

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- stra-nts	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q865. Earlier we asked you about enforcing restrictions on who can register/purchase domains with specific extensions. What level of restrictions would you expect there to be on purchasing the following new gTLDs?

SUMMARY TABLE OF SOME RESTRICTIONS

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
.email	243 32%	1131 44%	1374 41%	1498 45% AC	87 42% A	191 42%	114 42% A	182 44%	173 41% A	245 46%	139 39% A	172 43% AKBKCK	618 46%	708 46%
.photography	271 35%	1192 46% K	1463 44%	1637 49% ABCL	95 46% A	220 48%	118 44% A	203 49%	192 46% A	272 51% L	141 40%	171 43% AKBKCK	646 48%	771 50% L
.link	203 26%	1172 45% EI	1375 41%	1556 46% AC	77 37% A	199 43%	117 43% A	179 43%	159 38% A	241 45% I	157 45% A	180 45% AEIBEICEI	662 49%	757 49% DFH
.guru	205 27%	1152 45% I	1357 40%	1502 45% ACFL	85 41% A	185 40%	119 44% A	180 43%	163 39% A	241 45%	143 41% A	161 40% AIBKICIK	642 48%	735 48% DFL
.realtor	242 31%	1213 47% K	1455 43%	1563 47% ACF	95 46% A	183 40%	117 43% A	204 49% F	182 43% A	260 49% F	146 41% A	174 43% AGIKBGKCGIK	673 50%	742 48% F
.club	270 35%	1225 47%	1495 45%	1625 49% AC	94 45% A	242 53% L	126 47% A	191 46%	185 44% A	269 50%	152 43% A	177 44% AIBKICIK	668 50%	746 48%
.xyz	150 20%	1102 43% IK	1252 37%	1378 41% ACF	81 39% FA	129 28%	112 42% A	170 41% F	153 37% A	234 44% IF	125 36% A	153 38% FAEIKBEIKCEIK	631 47%	692 45% DFL
.bank	-	-	-	1277 38% F	-	129 28%	-	145 35% F	-	227 43% DFH	-	147 37% F	-	629 41% DFH
.pharmacy	-	-	-	1352 40% FL	-	137 30%	-	165 40% F	-	226 42% FL	-	137 34%	-	687 45% DFL
.builder	-	-	-	1670 50%	-	227 49%	-	195 47%	-	277 52%	-	195 49%	-	776 50%
.toronto	-	-	-	52 50%	-	52 50%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
quadalajara	-	-	-	51 51%	-	51 51%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
.roma	-	-	-	26 52%	-	-	-	-	-	26 52%	-	-	-	-
.istanbul	-	-	-	22 44%	-	-	-	-	-	22 44%	-	-	-	-
.madrid	-	-	-	24 48%	-	-	-	-	-	24 48%	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q865. Earlier we asked you about enforcing restrictions on who can register/purchase domains with specific extensions. What level of restrictions would you expect there to be on purchasing the following new gTLDs?

SUMMARY TABLE OF SOME RESTRICTIONS

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
.warszawa	-	-	-	24 45%	-	-	-	-	-	24 45%	-	-	-	-
.paris	-	-	-	55 52%	-	-	-	-	-	55 52%	-	-	-	-
Foshan	-	-	-	262 48%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	262 48%
.hanoi	-	-	-	24 46%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	24 46%
.manilla	-	-	-	55 54%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	55 54%
.tokyo	-	-	-	90 51%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	90 51%
.seoul	-	-	-	50 50%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	50 50%
.MOCKBa	-	-	-	57 45%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	57 45%
.delhi	-	-	-	155 47%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	155 47%
.jakarta	-	-	-	46 46%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	46 46%
.abuja	-	-	-	80 40%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	80 40%	-	-
.capetown	-	-	-	45 45%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	45 45%	-	-
.cairo	-	-	-	51 51%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	51 51%	-	-
.bogota	-	-	-	60 48%	-	-	-	60 48%	-	-	-	-	-	-
.cordoba	-	-	-	46 44%	-	-	-	46 44%	-	-	-	-	-	-
.rio	-	-	-	76 41%	-	-	-	76 41%	-	-	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q865. Earlier we asked you about enforcing restrictions on who can register/purchase domains with specific extensions. What level of restrictions would you expect there to be on purchasing the following new gTLDs?

SUMMARY TABLE OF SOME RESTRICTIONS

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
.berlin	9 53%	45 42%	54 43%	68 54%	-	-	-	-	45 42%	68 54%	-	-	-	-
.ovh	5 29%	42 39%	47 38%	49 39%	-	-	-	-	42 39%	49 39%	-	-	-	-
.london	43 38%	189 45%	232 44%	55 55% AC	-	-	-	-	189 45%	55 55%	-	-	-	-
.nyc	87 43%	30 47%	117 44%	130 51%	30 47%	130 51%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
.wang	-	256 47%	256 47%	251 46%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	256 47%	251 46%
.xn-ses554g (Chinese for network address)	-	247 45%	247 45%	246 45%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	247 45%	246 45%
.xn-55qx5d (Chinese for company)	-	253 46%	253 46%	255 46%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	253 46%	255 46%
TOTAL RESTRICTIONS (NET)	416 54%	1818 70% GIK	2234 67%	2788 83% ABC	145 70% A	379 82% E	171 64% A	334 80% G	268 64% A	429 80% I	223 63% A	342 85% KJ	1011 75% AGIKBGIKCGIK	1304 85% MDHJ
TOTAL RESTRICTIONS CONSISTENT (NET)	416 54%	1818 70% GIK	2234 67%	2675 80% ABCJ	145 70% A	367 80% E	171 64% A	319 77% G	268 64% A	409 77% I	223 63% A	322 80% K	1011 75% AGIKBGIKCGIK	1258 82% MDHJ
TOTAL RESTRICTIONS ADDED (NET)	-	-	-	2413 72% ABCFJ	-	294 64% E	-	290 70% G	-	359 67% I	-	296 74% KFJ	-	1174 76% MDFHJ
RESTRICTIONS GLOBAL (NET)	407 53%	1804 70% GIK	2211 66%	2760 82% ABCJ	145 70% A	376 82% E	171 64% A	333 80% G	263 63% A	424 79% I	223 63% A	338 84% K	1002 75% AGIKBGIKCGIK	1289 84% MJ
RESTRICTIONS GLOBAL CONSISTENT (NET)	407 53%	1804 70% GIK	2211 66%	2665 80% ABCJ	145 70% A	365 79% E	171 64% A	319 77% G	263 63% A	407 76% I	223 63% A	322 80% K	1002 75% AGIKBGIKCGIK	1252 81% MDHJ
RESTRICTIONS GLOBAL ADDED (NET)	-	-	-	2201 66% ABCF	-	276 60% E	-	260 63% G	-	345 65% I	-	255 64% K	-	1065 69% MDFHL
RESTRICTIONS GEO-SPECIFIC (NET)	133 17% GK	613 24% EGK	746 22% EGK	1768 53% ABCHL GKKGK	30 14% EHL	233 51% G	-	182 44% G	201 48% AEQMBEGKCEGDM	282 53% HL	-	176 44% K	382 28% AEGKBEGKCEGK	895 58% MDFHJL
RESTRICTIONS GEO-SPECIFIC CONSISTENT (NET)	133 17% GK	613 24% DEGK	746 22% DEGK	641 19% HL GKKGK	30 14% EDHL	130 28% G	-	-	201 48% JAEQMBEGKCEGDM	131 25% DHL	-	-	382 28% NAEQMBEGKCEGK	380 25% DHL
RESTRICTIONS GEO-SPECIFIC ADDED (NET)	-	-	-	1351 40% ABCFJ	-	103 22% E	-	182 44% GFJ	-	151 28% IF	-	176 44% KFJ	-	739 48% MDFJ

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q865. Earlier we asked you about enforcing restrictions on who can register/purchase domains with specific extensions. What level of restrictions would you expect there to be on purchasing the following new gTLDs?

SUMMARY TABLE OF SOME RESTRICTIONS

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
					(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q865. Earlier we asked you about enforcing restrictions on who can register/purchase domains with specific extensions. What level of restrictions would you expect there to be on purchasing the following new gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 261

SUMMARY TABLE OF NO RESTRICTIONS

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strahts	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
.email	392 51% DEGIKM	837 32% M	1229 37% DM	1103 33% N	72 35% DN	175 38% DN	94 35% MMM	148 36% N	163 39% MBMM	192 36% N	122 35% MMM	128 32% N	386 29% N	460 30% N
.photography	394 51% DEGIKM	828 32% M	1222 36% DEM	1094 33% N	61 29% DN	139 30% DN	97 36% MMM	147 35% N	146 35% MMM	174 33% EMBEMEM	141 40% EMBEMEM	137 34% N	383 29% N	497 32% M
.link	484 63% DEGIKM	857 33% M	1341 40% DM	1251 37% BN	87 42% MBMM	207 45% DLN	95 35% MMM	167 40% N	179 43% MBMM	230 43% DN	134 38% MBMM	148 37% N	362 27% N	499 32% M
.guru	474 62% DEGIKM	879 34% M	1353 40% GM	1316 39% BN	75 36% EDN	207 45% EDN	93 35% N	179 43% GN	164 39% MBMM	221 41% N	148 42% MBMM	161 40% N	399 30% N	548 36% M
.realtor	367 48% DEGIKM	814 31% EM	1181 35% DEM	1041 31% F	51 25% F	79 17% EMBEMEM	100 37% EMBEMEM	157 38% DFLN	154 37% EMBEMEM	196 37% DFL	138 39% LEMBEMEM	109 27% F	371 28% N	500 32% MFL
.club	403 52% DEGIKM	820 32% M	1223 36% DM	1134 34% MMM	72 35% MMM	143 31% DFN	94 35% MBMM	162 39% N	155 37% MBMM	192 36% MBMM	139 39% MBMM	142 35% N	360 27% N	495 32% M
.xyz	533 69% DEGIKM	951 37% M	1484 44% GM	1486 44% BN	92 44% MBMM	255 55% EDHJLN	99 37% MMM	190 46% GN	181 43% MBMM	238 45% GMBGMGM	170 48% N	191 48% N	409 30% N	612 40% M
.bank	- - -	- - -	- - -	640 19% FL	- - -	62 13% FL	- - -	88 21% FL	- - -	113 21% FL	- - -	53 13% FL	- - -	324 21% DFL
.pharmacy	- - -	- - -	- - -	747 22% FL	- - -	62 13% FL	- - -	93 22% F	- - -	116 22% F	- - -	69 17% F	- - -	407 26% DFJL
.builder	- - -	- - -	- - -	947 28% F	- - -	92 20% F	- - -	135 33% DFL	- - -	157 29% F	- - -	97 24% F	- - -	466 30% DFL
.toronto	- - -	- - -	- - -	23 22% F	- - -	23 22% F	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -
quadalajara	- - -	- - -	- - -	29 29% F	- - -	29 29% F	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -
.roma	- - -	- - -	- - -	17 34% F	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	17 34% F	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -
.istanbul	- - -	- - -	- - -	17 34% F	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	17 34% F	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -
.madrid	- - -	- - -	- - -	12 24% F	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	12 24% F	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q865. Earlier we asked you about enforcing restrictions on who can register/purchase domains with specific extensions. What level of restrictions would you expect there to be on purchasing the following new gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 261

SUMMARY TABLE OF NO RESTRICTIONS

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
.warszawa	-	-	-	18 34%	-	-	-	-	-	18 34%	-	-	-	-
.paris	-	-	-	29 27%	-	-	-	-	-	29 27%	-	-	-	-
Foshan	-	-	-	171 31%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	171 31%
.hanoi	-	-	-	15 29%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15 29%
.manilla	-	-	-	23 23%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	23 23%
.tokyo	-	-	-	52 30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	52 30%
.seoul	-	-	-	24 24%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	24 24%
.MOCKBa	-	-	-	39 30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	39 30%
.delhi	-	-	-	96 29%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	96 29%
.jakarta	-	-	-	28 28%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	28 28%
.abuja	-	-	-	77 39%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	77 39%	-	-
.capetown	-	-	-	25 25%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	25 25%	-	-
.cairo	-	-	-	25 25%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	25 25%	-	-
.bogota	-	-	-	39 31%	-	-	-	39 31%	-	-	-	-	-	-
.cordoba	-	-	-	36 35%	-	-	-	36 35%	-	-	-	-	-	-
.rio	-	-	-	75 40%	-	-	-	75 40%	-	-	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q865. Earlier we asked you about enforcing restrictions on who can register/purchase domains with specific extensions. What level of restrictions would you expect there to be on purchasing the following new gTLDs?

SUMMARY TABLE OF NO RESTRICTIONS

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
.berlin	4 24%	30 28%	34 27%	25 20%	-	-	-	-	30 28%	25 20%	-	-	-	-
.ovh	12 71%	46 43%	58 46%	61 49%	-	-	-	-	46 43%	61 49%	-	-	-	-
.london	46 40% D	132 32%	178 33% D	22 22%	-	-	-	-	132 32%	22 22%	-	-	-	-
.nyc	76 37% DE	7 11%	83 31% E	62 24% B	7 11%	62 24% E	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
.wang	1 50%	182 33%	183 33%	214 39%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	182 33%	214 39%
.xn-ses554g (Chinese for network address)	1 50%	168 31%	169 31%	202 37% BC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	168 31%	202 37% M
.xn-55qx5d (Chinese for company)	1 50%	164 30%	165 30%	199 36% BC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	164 30%	199 36% M
TOTAL RESTRICTIONS (NET)	566 74% DEGIKM	1386 54% M	1952 58% GM	2244 67% BC	121 58%	311 68% E	135 50%	283 68% G	235 56%	352 66% I	208 59% GMBGMGM	270 67% K	687 51%	1028 67% M
TOTAL RESTRICTIONS CONSISTENT (NET)	566 74% DEGIKM	1386 54% M	1952 58% GM	2176 65% BC	121 58%	307 67% E	135 50%	274 66% G	235 56%	344 64% I	208 59% GMBGMGM	263 66%	687 51%	988 64% M
TOTAL RESTRICTIONS ADDED (NET)	-	-	-	1467 44% ABCF	-	125 27% E	-	211 51% GDFJ	-	214 40% IF	-	177 44% KF	-	740 48% MDFJ
RESTRICTIONS GLOBAL (NET)	566 74% DEGIKM	1369 53% M	1935 58% GM	2212 66% BC	121 58% MMM	310 67% E	135 50%	278 67% G	235 56% MMM	348 65% I	208 59% GMBGMGM	270 67% K	670 50%	1006 65% M
RESTRICTIONS GLOBAL CONSISTENT (NET)	566 74% DEGIKM	1369 53% M	1935 58% GM	2152 64% BC	121 58% MMM	307 67% E	135 50%	274 66% G	235 56% MMM	341 64% I	208 59% GMBGMGM	263 66%	670 50%	967 63% M
RESTRICTIONS GLOBAL ADDED (NET)	-	-	-	1227 37% ABCFL	-	109 24% E	-	163 39% GFL	-	201 38% IFL	-	123 31% KF	-	631 41% MDFL
RESTRICTIONS GEO-SPECIFIC (NET)	129 17% EGK	427 16% EGK	556 17% EGK	1174 35% ABCF GKKGK	7 3% E	114 25% E	-	150 36% GF	155 37% F	181 34% F	-	127 32% KF	265 20% EGKBEGKCEGK	602 39% MDFJL
RESTRICTIONS GEO-SPECIFIC CONSISTENT (NET)	129 17% DEGK	427 16% DEGK	556 17% DEGK	452 13% HL GKKGK	7 3% EHL	62 13% EHL	-	-	155 37% JAEGBEGKCEGK	88 16% DHL	-	-	265 20% EGKBEGKCEGK	302 20% DFHL
RESTRICTIONS GEO-SPECIFIC ADDED (NET)	-	-	-	870 26% ABCFL	-	52 11% E	-	150 36% GDFJN	-	93 17% IF	-	127 32% KDFJ	-	448 29% MDFJ

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q865. Earlier we asked you about enforcing restrictions on who can register/purchase domains with specific extensions. What level of restrictions would you expect there to be on purchasing the following new gTLDs?

SUMMARY TABLE OF NO RESTRICTIONS

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
					(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q865_1. Earlier we asked you about enforcing restrictions on who can register/purchase domains with specific extensions. What level of restrictions would you expect there to be on purchasing the following new gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 262

1..email

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
STRICT/SOME RESTRICTIONS (NET)	377 49%	1697 66% I	2074 62%	2246 67% ACF	127 61% A	285 62%	173 64% A	267 64%	242 58% A	342 64% I	226 64% A	273 68% AEIBEICEI	929 69% DFHJ	1079 70%
Strict purchase restrictions should be required	134 17%	566 22% I	700 21% I	748 22% AJ	40 19%	94 20%	59 22%	85 20%	69 16%	97 18%	87 25% AIII	101 25% J	311 23% AIIICI	371 24% DJ
Some purchase restrictions should be required	243 32%	1131 44%	1374 41%	1498 45% AC	87 42% A	191 42%	114 42% A	182 44%	173 41% A	245 46%	139 39% A	172 43% AKBKCK	618 46%	708 46%
No purchase restrictions should be required	392 51% DEGIKM	837 32% M	1229 37% DM	1103 33% N	72 35%	175 38% DN	94 35% MMM	148 36% N	163 39% MBMM	192 36% N	122 35% MMM	128 32%	386 29%	460 30%
Not Sure	-	48 2% D	48 1% D	-	8 4% FAGKMBGKMGKDM	-	2 1% A	-	11 3% JAC	-	4 1% LA	-	23 2% NA	-
Decline to Answer	-	6 * D	6 * D	-	-	-	-	-	3 1% ABC	-	-	-	3 *	-
Sigma	769 100%	2588 100%	3357 100%	3349 100%	207 100%	460 100%	269 100%	415 100%	419 100%	534 100%	352 100%	401 100%	1341 100%	1539 100%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q865 2. Earlier we asked you about enforcing restrictions on who can register/purchase domains with specific extensions. What level of restrictions would you expect there to be on purchasing the following new gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 263

2. .photography

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
STRICT/SOME RESTRICTIONS (NET)	375 49%	1708 66% K	2083 62%	2255 67% AC	139 67% A	321 70%	170 63% A	268 65%	260 62% A	360 67%	207 59% A	264 66% K AGIKBGIKCGIK	932 70%	1042 68%
Strict purchase restrictions should be required	104 14%	516 20% I	620 18%	618 18% A	44 21% A	101 22% DHJN	52 19% A	65 16%	68 16%	88 16%	66 19% A	93 23% DHJN	286 21% NAIICI	271 18%
Some purchase restrictions should be required	271 35%	1192 46% K	1463 44%	1637 49% ABCL	95 46% A	220 48%	118 44% A	203 49%	192 46% A	272 51% L	141 40%	171 43% AKBKCK	646 48%	771 50% L
No purchase restrictions should be required	394 51% DEGIKM	828 32% M	1222 36% DEM	1094 33%	61 29%	139 30%	97 36% MMM	147 35%	146 35% MMM	174 33%	141 40% EMBEMEM	137 34%	383 29%	497 32% M
Not Sure	-	48 2% D	48 1% D	-	7 3% FAGGCG	-	2 1% A	-	11 3% JAC	-	-	-	24 2% NA	-
Decline to Answer	-	4 * D	4 * D	-	-	-	-	-	2 * C	-	-	-	2 * C	-
Sigma	769 100%	2588 100%	3357 100%	3349 100%	207 100%	460 100%	269 100%	415 100%	419 100%	534 100%	352 100%	401 100%	1341 100%	1539 100%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q865_3. Earlier we asked you about enforcing restrictions on who can register/purchase domains with specific extensions. What level of restrictions would you expect there to be on purchasing the following new gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 264

3. .link

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
STRICT/SOME RESTRICTIONS (NET)	285 37%	1674 65% EI	1959 58% I	2098 63% ACFJ	110 53% A	253 55%	172 64% AEIEIEI	248 60%	223 53% A	304 57%	215 61% AIII	253 63% F	954 71% NAEGKBEGIKCEGK	1040 68% DFHJ
Strict purchase restrictions should be required	82 11%	502 19% DI	584 17%	542 16% AFJ	33 16% A	54 12%	55 20% A	69 17% FJ	64 15% A	63 12%	58 16% A	73 18% FJ	292 22% NAIKBIKCIK	283 18% DFJ
Some purchase restrictions should be required	203 26%	1172 45% EI	1375 41%	1556 46% AC	77 37% A	199 43%	117 43% A	179 43%	159 38% A	241 45% I	157 45% A	180 45% AEIBEICEI	662 49% AEIBEICEI	757 49% DFH
No purchase restrictions should be required	484 63% DEGIKM	857 33% M	1341 40% DM	1251 37% BN	87 42% MBMM	207 45% DLN	95 35% MMM	167 40% N	179 43% MBMM	230 43% DN	134 38% MBMM	148 37% A	362 27% NA	499 32% M
Not Sure	-	52 2% D	52 2% D	-	10 5% FAGKMBGKMGKGM	-	2 1% A	-	15 4% JAGKMBGKMGKGM	-	3 1% A	-	22 2% NA	-
Decline to Answer	-	5 * D	5 * D	-	-	-	-	-	2 * A	-	-	-	3 * NA	-
Sigma	769 100%	2588 100%	3357 100%	3349 100%	207 100%	460 100%	269 100%	415 100%	419 100%	534 100%	352 100%	401 100%	1341 100%	1539 100%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q865 4. Earlier we asked you about enforcing restrictions on who can register/purchase domains with specific extensions. What level of restrictions would you expect there to be on purchasing the following new gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 265

4. .guru

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
STRICT/SOME RESTRICTIONS (NET)	295 38%	1649 64% DIK	1944 58%	2033 61% ACF	121 58% A	253 55%	174 65% HAIKIKCIK	236 57%	239 57% A	313 59%	200 57% A	240 60%	915 68% NAEIKBEIKCEIK	991 64% DFHJ
Strict purchase restrictions should be required	90 12%	497 19% D	587 17%	531 16% A	36 17% A	68 15%	55 20% HA	56 13%	76 18% JA	72 13%	57 16% A	79 20% DHJ	273 20% NAC	256 17%
Some purchase restrictions should be required	205 27%	1152 45% I	1357 40%	1502 45% ACFL	85 41% A	185 40%	119 44% A	180 43%	163 39% A	241 45%	143 41% A	161 40% AIKBIKCIK	642 48% A	735 48% DFL
No purchase restrictions should be required	474 62% DEGIKM	879 34% M	1353 40% GM	1316 39% BN	75 36%	207 45% EDN	93 35%	179 43% GN	164 39% MBMM	221 41% N	148 42% MBMM	161 40%	399 30%	548 36% M
Not Sure	-	55 2% D	55 2% D	-	11 5% FAGKMBGKMCQIM	-	2 1% A	-	13 3% JAGGCG	-	4 1% LA	-	25 2% NA	-
Decline to Answer	-	5 * D	5 * D	-	-	-	-	-	3 1% ABC	-	-	-	2 *	-
Sigma	769 100%	2588 100%	3357 100%	3349 100%	207 100%	460 100%	269 100%	415 100%	419 100%	534 100%	352 100%	401 100%	1341 100%	1539 100%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q865 5. Earlier we asked you about enforcing restrictions on who can register/purchase domains with specific extensions. What level of restrictions would you expect there to be on purchasing the following new gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 266

5. .realtor

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
STRICT/SOME RESTRICTIONS (NET)	402 52%	1717 66% IK	2119 63%	2308 69% ABCHJ	147 71% AGIKGKICGK	381 83% EDHJLN	167 62% A	258 62%	248 59% A	338 63%	210 60% A	292 73% KHJN	945 70% AGIKBGKICGK	1039 68% H
Strict purchase restrictions should be required	160 21% I	504 19% I	664 20% I	745 22% BCHJN	52 25% IBICI	198 43% EDHJLN	50 19% H	54 13%	66 16%	78 15%	64 18%	118 29% KDHJN	272 20% III	297 19% HJ
Some purchase restrictions should be required	242 31%	1213 47% K	1455 43%	1563 47% ACF	95 46% A	183 40%	117 43% A	204 49% F	182 43% A	260 49% F	146 41% A	174 43% AGIKBGKICGK	673 50%	742 48% F
No purchase restrictions should be required	367 48% DEGIKM	814 31% EM	1181 35% DEM	1041 31% F	51 25% F	79 17%	100 37% EMBEMEM	157 38% DFLN	154 37% EMBEMEM	196 37% DFL	138 39% LEMBEMEM	109 27% F	371 28%	500 32% MFL
Not Sure	-	53 2% D	53 2% D	-	9 4% FAGKMBGKICGK	-	2 1% A	-	15 4% JAGKMBGKICGK	-	-	-	23 2% NA	-
Decline to Answer	-	4 * D	4 * D	-	-	-	-	-	2 * C	-	-	-	2 * C	-
Sigma	769 100%	2588 100%	3357 100%	3349 100%	207 100%	460 100%	269 100%	415 100%	419 100%	534 100%	352 100%	401 100%	1341 100%	1539 100%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q865 6. Earlier we asked you about enforcing restrictions on who can register/purchase domains with specific extensions. What level of restrictions would you expect there to be on purchasing the following new gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 267

6. .club

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
STRICT/SOME RESTRICTIONS (NET)	366 48%	1716 66% IK	2082 62%	2215 66% ACH	128 62% A	317 69% H	173 64% A	253 61%	248 59% A	342 64%	209 59% A	259 65% NAEGKBEGIKCEGK	958 71%	1044 68% H
Strict purchase restrictions should be required	96 12%	491 19% I	587 17%	590 18% AJ	34 16%	75 16%	47 17% A	62 15%	63 15%	73 14%	57 16%	82 20% HJ AIKBIKCIK	290 22%	298 19% DHJ
Some purchase restrictions should be required	270 35%	1225 47%	1495 45%	1625 49% AC	94 45% A	242 53% L	126 47% A	191 46%	185 44% A	269 50%	152 43% A	177 44% AIKBIKCIK	668 50%	746 48%
No purchase restrictions should be required	403 52% DEGIKM	820 32% M	1223 36% DM	1134 34% MMM	72 35% MMM	143 31%	94 35% DFN MBMM	162 39%	155 37% MBMM	192 36%	139 39% MBMM	142 35%	360 27%	495 32% M
Not Sure	-	48 2% D	48 1% D	-	7 3% FAGGCG	-	2 1% A	-	14 3% JAGKMBGKMGCGKM	-	4 1% LA	-	21 2% NA	-
Decline to Answer	-	4 * D	4 * D	-	-	-	-	-	2 * C	-	-	-	2 * C	-
Sigma	769 100%	2588 100%	3357 100%	3349 100%	207 100%	460 100%	269 100%	415 100%	419 100%	534 100%	352 100%	401 100%	1341 100%	1539 100%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q865 7. Earlier we asked you about enforcing restrictions on who can register/purchase domains with specific extensions. What level of restrictions would you expect there to be on purchasing the following new gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 268

7. .xyz

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
STRICT/SOME RESTRICTIONS (NET)	236 31%	1574 61% DEIK	1810 54%	1863 56% AF	103 50% A	205 45%	168 62% HAEIKEICEIK	225 54% F	221 53% A	296 55% F	178 51% A	210 52% F	904 67% NAEIKBEIKCEIK	927 60% DFHL
Strict purchase restrictions should be required	86 11%	472 18% DE	558 17% DE	485 14% AJ	22 11% AJ	76 17% EJ	56 21% HAEIEE	55 13% JA	68 16% JA	62 12% JA	53 15% JA	57 14% NAEKBCEKCEK	273 20% NAEKBCEKCEK	235 15% J
Some purchase restrictions should be required	150 20%	1102 43% IK	1252 37%	1378 41% ACF	81 39% FA	129 28%	112 42% A	170 41% F	153 37% A	234 44% IF	125 36% A	153 38% F	631 47% AEIKBEIKCEIK	692 45% DFL
No purchase restrictions should be required	533 69% DEGIKM	951 37% M	1484 44% GM	1486 44% BN	92 44% MBMM	255 55% EDHJLN	99 37% MMM	190 46% GN	181 43% MBMM	238 45% GMBGMGM	170 48% GMBGMGM	191 48% N	409 30% N	612 40% M
Not Sure	-	58 2% D	58 2% D	-	12 6% FAGKMBGKMGKGM	-	2 1% A	-	15 4% JAGKMBGKMGKGM	-	4 1% LA	-	25 2% NA	-
Decline to Answer	-	5 * D	5 * D	-	-	-	-	-	2 * D	-	-	-	3 * D	-
Sigma	769 100%	2588 100%	3357 100%	3349 100%	207 100%	460 100%	269 100%	415 100%	419 100%	534 100%	352 100%	401 100%	1341 100%	1539 100%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q865 .44. Earlier we asked you about enforcing restrictions on who can register/purchase domains with specific extensions. What level of restrictions would you expect there to be on purchasing the following new gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 269

.44. .bank

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
					(E)		(G)		(I)		(K)		(M)	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	..	..	..	3349	..	460	..	415	..	534	..	401	..	1539
STRICT/SOME RESTRICTIONS (NET)	-	-	-	2709 81% N	-	398 87% DHJN	-	327 79%	-	421 79%	-	348 87% DHJN	-	1215 79%
Strict purchase restrictions should be required	-	-	-	1432 43% JN	-	269 58% DHJLN	-	182 44% JN	-	194 36%	-	201 50% DJN	-	586 38%
Some purchase restrictions should be required	-	-	-	1277 38% F	-	129 28%	-	145 35% F	-	227 43% DFH	-	147 37% F	-	629 41% DFH
No purchase restrictions should be required	-	-	-	640 19% FL	-	62 13%	-	88 21% FL	-	113 21% FL	-	53 13%	-	324 21% DFL
Sigma	-	-	-	3349 100%	-	460 100%	-	415 100%	-	534 100%	-	401 100%	-	1539 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q865 .45. Earlier we asked you about enforcing restrictions on who can register/purchase domains with specific extensions. What level of restrictions would you expect there to be on purchasing the following new gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 270

45. .pharmacy

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
					(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	-**	-**	-**	3349	-**	460	-**	415	-**	534	-**	401	-**	1539
STRICT/SOME RESTRICTIONS (NET)	-	-	-	2602 78% N	-	398 87% DHJN	-	322 78% N	-	418 78% N	-	332 83% DN	-	1132 74% N
Strict purchase restrictions should be required	-	-	-	1250 37% N	-	261 57% DHJLN	-	157 38% N	-	192 36% N	-	195 49% DHJN	-	445 29% N
Some purchase restrictions should be required	-	-	-	1352 40% FL	-	137 30% F	-	165 40% F	-	226 42% FL	-	137 34% FL	-	687 45% DFL
No purchase restrictions should be required	-	-	-	747 22% FL	-	62 13% F	-	93 22% F	-	116 22% F	-	69 17% F	-	407 26% DFJL
Sigma	-	-	-	3349 100%	-	460 100%	-	415 100%	-	534 100%	-	401 100%	-	1539 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q865 .46. Earlier we asked you about enforcing restrictions on who can register/purchase domains with specific extensions. What level of restrictions would you expect there to be on purchasing the following new gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 271

.46. .builder

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
					(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	-**	-**	-**	3349	-**	460	-**	415	-**	534	-**	401	-**	1539
STRICT/SOME RESTRICTIONS (NET)	-	-	-	2402 72% HN	-	368 80% DHJN	-	280 67%	-	377 71%	-	304 76% HN	-	1073 70%
Strict purchase restrictions should be required	-	-	-	732 22% N	-	141 31% DHJN	-	85 20%	-	100 19%	-	109 27% DHJN	-	297 19%
Some purchase restrictions should be required	-	-	-	1670 50%	-	227 49%	-	195 47%	-	277 52%	-	195 49%	-	776 50%
No purchase restrictions should be required	-	-	-	947 28% F	-	92 20%	-	135 33% DFL	-	157 29% F	-	97 24%	-	466 30% DFL
Sigma	-	-	-	3349 100%	-	460 100%	-	415 100%	-	534 100%	-	401 100%	-	1539 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q865 23. Earlier we asked you about enforcing restrictions on who can register/purchase domains with specific extensions. What level of restrictions would you expect there to be on purchasing the following new gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 272

23. .toronto

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	..**	..**	..**	105	..**	105	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**
STRICT/SOME RESTRICTIONS (NET)	-	-	-	82 78%	-	82 78%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Strict purchase restrictions should be required	-	-	-	30 29%	-	30 29%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Some purchase restrictions should be required	-	-	-	52 50%	-	52 50%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
No purchase restrictions should be required	-	-	-	23 22%	-	23 22%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sigma	-	-	-	105 100%	-	105 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q865_24. Earlier we asked you about enforcing restrictions on who can register/purchase domains with specific extensions. What level of restrictions would you expect there to be on purchasing the following new gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 273

24. quadalajara

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	..	..	..	100	..	100	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
STRICT/SOME RESTRICTIONS (NET)	-	-	-	71 71%	-	71 71%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Strict purchase restrictions should be required	-	-	-	20 20%	-	20 20%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Some purchase restrictions should be required	-	-	-	51 51%	-	51 51%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
No purchase restrictions should be required	-	-	-	29 29%	-	29 29%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sigma	-	-	-	100 100%	-	100 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q865 25. Earlier we asked you about enforcing restrictions on who can register/purchase domains with specific extensions. What level of restrictions would you expect there to be on purchasing the following new gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 274

25. .roma

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	..**	..**	..**	50*	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	50*	..**	..**	..**	..**
STRICT/SOME RESTRICTIONS (NET)	-	-	-	33 66%	-	-	-	-	-	33 66%	-	-	-	-
Strict purchase restrictions should be required	-	-	-	7 14%	-	-	-	-	-	7 14%	-	-	-	-
Some purchase restrictions should be required	-	-	-	26 52%	-	-	-	-	-	26 52%	-	-	-	-
No purchase restrictions should be required	-	-	-	17 34%	-	-	-	-	-	17 34%	-	-	-	-
Sigma	-	-	-	50 100%	-	-	-	-	-	50 100%	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q865_26. Earlier we asked you about enforcing restrictions on who can register/purchase domains with specific extensions. What level of restrictions would you expect there to be on purchasing the following new gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 275

26. .istanbul

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	..**	..**	..**	50*	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	50*	..**	..**	..**	..**
STRICT/SOME RESTRICTIONS (NET)	-	-	-	33 66%	-	-	-	-	-	33 66%	-	-	-	-
Strict purchase restrictions should be required	-	-	-	11 22%	-	-	-	-	-	11 22%	-	-	-	-
Some purchase restrictions should be required	-	-	-	22 44%	-	-	-	-	-	22 44%	-	-	-	-
No purchase restrictions should be required	-	-	-	17 34%	-	-	-	-	-	17 34%	-	-	-	-
Sigma	-	-	-	50 100%	-	-	-	-	-	50 100%	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q865_27. Earlier we asked you about enforcing restrictions on who can register/purchase domains with specific extensions. What level of restrictions would you expect there to be on purchasing the following new gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 276

27. .madrid

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	..**	..**	..**	50*	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	50*	..**	..**	..**	..**
STRICT/SOME RESTRICTIONS (NET)	-	-	-	38 76%	-	-	-	-	-	38 76%	-	-	-	-
Strict purchase restrictions should be required	-	-	-	14 28%	-	-	-	-	-	14 28%	-	-	-	-
Some purchase restrictions should be required	-	-	-	24 48%	-	-	-	-	-	24 48%	-	-	-	-
No purchase restrictions should be required	-	-	-	12 24%	-	-	-	-	-	12 24%	-	-	-	-
Sigma	-	-	-	50 100%	-	-	-	-	-	50 100%	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q865_28. Earlier we asked you about enforcing restrictions on who can register/purchase domains with specific extensions. What level of restrictions would you expect there to be on purchasing the following new gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 277

28. .warszawa

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	..**	..**	..**	53*	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	53*	..**	..**	..**	..**
STRICT/SOME RESTRICTIONS (NET)	-	-	-	35 66%	-	-	-	-	-	35 66%	-	-	-	-
Strict purchase restrictions should be required	-	-	-	11 21%	-	-	-	-	-	11 21%	-	-	-	-
Some purchase restrictions should be required	-	-	-	24 45%	-	-	-	-	-	24 45%	-	-	-	-
No purchase restrictions should be required	-	-	-	18 34%	-	-	-	-	-	18 34%	-	-	-	-
Sigma	-	-	-	53 100%	-	-	-	-	-	53 100%	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q865 29. Earlier we asked you about enforcing restrictions on who can register/purchase domains with specific extensions. What level of restrictions would you expect there to be on purchasing the following new gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 278

29. .paris

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	..	..	..	106	..	..	..	..	..	106	..	..	..	..
STRICT/SOME RESTRICTIONS (NET)	-	-	-	77 73%	-	-	-	-	-	77 73%	-	-	-	-
Strict purchase restrictions should be required	-	-	-	22 21%	-	-	-	-	-	22 21%	-	-	-	-
Some purchase restrictions should be required	-	-	-	55 52%	-	-	-	-	-	55 52%	-	-	-	-
No purchase restrictions should be required	-	-	-	29 27%	-	-	-	-	-	29 27%	-	-	-	-
Sigma	-	-	-	106 100%	-	-	-	-	-	106 100%	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q865 30. Earlier we asked you about enforcing restrictions on who can register/purchase domains with specific extensions. What level of restrictions would you expect there to be on purchasing the following new gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 279

30. Foshan

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	..	..	..	551	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	551
STRICT/SOME RESTRICTIONS (NET)	-	-	-	380 69%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	380 69%
Strict purchase restrictions should be required	-	-	-	118 21%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	118 21%
Some purchase restrictions should be required	-	-	-	262 48%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	262 48%
No purchase restrictions should be required	-	-	-	171 31%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	171 31%
Sigma	-	-	-	551 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	551 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q865 31. Earlier we asked you about enforcing restrictions on who can register/purchase domains with specific extensions. What level of restrictions would you expect there to be on purchasing the following new gTLDs?

31. .hanoi

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	..**	..**	..**	52*	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	52*
STRICT/SOME RESTRICTIONS (NET)	-	-	-	37 71%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	37 71%
Strict purchase restrictions should be required	-	-	-	13 25%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	13 25%
Some purchase restrictions should be required	-	-	-	24 46%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	24 46%
No purchase restrictions should be required	-	-	-	15 29%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15 29%
Sigma	-	-	-	52 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	52 100%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q865 32. Earlier we asked you about enforcing restrictions on who can register/purchase domains with specific extensions. What level of restrictions would you expect there to be on purchasing the following new gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 281

32. .manilla

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	..	..	..	101	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	101
STRICT/SOME RESTRICTIONS (NET)	-	-	-	78 77%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	78 77%
Strict purchase restrictions should be required	-	-	-	23 23%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	23 23%
Some purchase restrictions should be required	-	-	-	55 54%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	55 54%
No purchase restrictions should be required	-	-	-	23 23%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	23 23%
Sigma	-	-	-	101 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	101 100%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q865 33. Earlier we asked you about enforcing restrictions on who can register/purchase domains with specific extensions. What level of restrictions would you expect there to be on purchasing the following new gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 282

33. .tokyo

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	..	..	..	176	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	176
STRICT/SOME RESTRICTIONS (NET)	-	-	-	124 70%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	124 70%
Strict purchase restrictions should be required	-	-	-	34 19%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	34 19%
Some purchase restrictions should be required	-	-	-	90 51%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	90 51%
No purchase restrictions should be required	-	-	-	52 30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	52 30%
Sigma	-	-	-	176 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	176 100%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q865 34. Earlier we asked you about enforcing restrictions on who can register/purchase domains with specific extensions. What level of restrictions would you expect there to be on purchasing the following new gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 283

34. .seoul

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	..**	..**	..**	101	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	101
STRICT/SOME RESTRICTIONS (NET)	-	-	-	77 76%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	77 76%
Strict purchase restrictions should be required	-	-	-	27 27%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	27 27%
Some purchase restrictions should be required	-	-	-	50 50%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	50 50%
No purchase restrictions should be required	-	-	-	24 24%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	24 24%
Sigma	-	-	-	101 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	101 100%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q865 35. Earlier we asked you about enforcing restrictions on who can register/purchase domains with specific extensions. What level of restrictions would you expect there to be on purchasing the following new gTLDs?

35. .MOCKBa

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	-**	-**	-**	128	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	128
STRICT/SOME RESTRICTIONS (NET)	-	-	-	89 70%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	89 70%
Strict purchase restrictions should be required	-	-	-	32 25%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	32 25%
Some purchase restrictions should be required	-	-	-	57 45%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	57 45%
No purchase restrictions should be required	-	-	-	39 30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	39 30%
Sigma	-	-	-	128 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	128 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q865 36. Earlier we asked you about enforcing restrictions on who can register/purchase domains with specific extensions. What level of restrictions would you expect there to be on purchasing the following new gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 285

36. .delhi

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	..**	..**	..**	330	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	330
STRICT/SOME RESTRICTIONS (NET)	-	-	-	234 71%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	234 71%
Strict purchase restrictions should be required	-	-	-	79 24%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	79 24%
Some purchase restrictions should be required	-	-	-	155 47%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	155 47%
No purchase restrictions should be required	-	-	-	96 29%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	96 29%
Sigma	-	-	-	330 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	330 100%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q865 37. Earlier we asked you about enforcing restrictions on who can register/purchase domains with specific extensions. What level of restrictions would you expect there to be on purchasing the following new gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 286

37. .jakarta

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia	
					(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)
Unweighted Base	-**	-**	-**	100	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	100	
STRICT/SOME RESTRICTIONS (NET)	-	-	-	72 72%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	72 72%	
Strict purchase restrictions should be required	-	-	-	26 26%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	26 26%	
Some purchase restrictions should be required	-	-	-	46 46%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	46 46%	
No purchase restrictions should be required	-	-	-	28 28%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	28 28%	
Sigma	-	-	-	100 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100 100%	
Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing															

Q865 38. Earlier we asked you about enforcing restrictions on who can register/purchase domains with specific extensions. What level of restrictions would you expect there to be on purchasing the following new gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 287

38. .abuja

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	..	..	..	200	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	200	..	..
STRICT/SOME RESTRICTIONS (NET)	-	-	-	123 62%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	123 62%	-	-
Strict purchase restrictions should be required	-	-	-	43 22%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	43 22%	-	-
Some purchase restrictions should be required	-	-	-	80 40%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	80 40%	-	-
No purchase restrictions should be required	-	-	-	77 39%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	77 39%	-	-
Sigma	-	-	-	200 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	200 100%	-	-

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q865 39. Earlier we asked you about enforcing restrictions on who can register/purchase domains with specific extensions. What level of restrictions would you expect there to be on purchasing the following new gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 288

39. .capetown

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	..**	..**	..**	101	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	101	..**	..**
STRICT/SOME RESTRICTIONS (NET)	-	-	-	76 75%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	76 75%	-	-
Strict purchase restrictions should be required	-	-	-	31 31%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	31 31%	-	-
Some purchase restrictions should be required	-	-	-	45 45%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	45 45%	-	-
No purchase restrictions should be required	-	-	-	25 25%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	25 25%	-	-
Sigma	-	-	-	101 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	101 100%	-	-

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q865 40. Earlier we asked you about enforcing restrictions on who can register/purchase domains with specific extensions. What level of restrictions would you expect there to be on purchasing the following new gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 289

40. .cairo

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	..**	..**	..**	100	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	100	..**	..**
STRICT/SOME RESTRICTIONS (NET)	-	-	-	75 75%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	75 75%	-	-
Strict purchase restrictions should be required	-	-	-	24 24%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	24 24%	-	-
Some purchase restrictions should be required	-	-	-	51 51%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	51 51%	-	-
No purchase restrictions should be required	-	-	-	25 25%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	25 25%	-	-
Sigma	-	-	-	100 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100 100%	-	-

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q865 41. Earlier we asked you about enforcing restrictions on who can register/purchase domains with specific extensions. What level of restrictions would you expect there to be on purchasing the following new gTLDs?

41. .bogota

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	..	..	..	125	..	..	..	125	..	..	..	..	..	..
STRICT/SOME RESTRICTIONS (NET)	-	-	-	86 69%	-	-	-	86 69%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Strict purchase restrictions should be required	-	-	-	26 21%	-	-	-	26 21%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Some purchase restrictions should be required	-	-	-	60 48%	-	-	-	60 48%	-	-	-	-	-	-
No purchase restrictions should be required	-	-	-	39 31%	-	-	-	39 31%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sigma	-	-	-	125 100%	-	-	-	125 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q865 42. Earlier we asked you about enforcing restrictions on who can register/purchase domains with specific extensions. What level of restrictions would you expect there to be on purchasing the following new gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 291

42. .cordoba

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	..**	..**	..**	104	..**	..**	..**	104	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**
STRICT/SOME RESTRICTIONS (NET)	-	-	-	68 65%	-	-	-	68 65%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Strict purchase restrictions should be required	-	-	-	22 21%	-	-	-	22 21%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Some purchase restrictions should be required	-	-	-	46 44%	-	-	-	46 44%	-	-	-	-	-	-
No purchase restrictions should be required	-	-	-	36 35%	-	-	-	36 35%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sigma	-	-	-	104 100%	-	-	-	104 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q865 43. Earlier we asked you about enforcing restrictions on who can register/purchase domains with specific extensions. What level of restrictions would you expect there to be on purchasing the following new gTLDs?

43. .rio

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	..	..	..	186	..	..	..	186	..	..	..	..	..	..
STRICT/SOME RESTRICTIONS (NET)	-	-	-	111 60%	-	-	-	111 60%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Strict purchase restrictions should be required	-	-	-	35 19%	-	-	-	35 19%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Some purchase restrictions should be required	-	-	-	76 41%	-	-	-	76 41%	-	-	-	-	-	-
No purchase restrictions should be required	-	-	-	75 40%	-	-	-	75 40%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sigma	-	-	-	186 100%	-	-	-	186 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q865_8. Earlier we asked you about enforcing restrictions on who can register/purchase domains with specific extensions. What level of restrictions would you expect there to be on purchasing the following new gTLDs?

8. .berlin

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	17**	108	125	125	-**	-**	-**	-**	108	125	-**	-**	-**	-**
STRICT/SOME RESTRICTIONS (NET)	13 76%	76 70%	89 71%	100 80%	-	-	-	-	76 70%	100 80%	-	-	-	-
Strict purchase restrictions should be required	4 24%	31 29%	35 28%	32 26%	-	-	-	-	31 29%	32 26%	-	-	-	-
Some purchase restrictions should be required	9 53%	45 42%	54 43%	68 54%	-	-	-	-	45 42%	68 54%	-	-	-	-
No purchase restrictions should be required	4 24%	30 28%	34 27%	25 20%	-	-	-	-	30 28%	25 20%	-	-	-	-
Not Sure	- -	1 1%	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-
Decline to Answer	-	1 1%	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-
Sigma	17 100%	108 100%	125 100%	125 100%	-	-	-	-	108 100%	125 100%	-	-	-	-
Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing														

Q865_9. Earlier we asked you about enforcing restrictions on who can register/purchase domains with specific extensions. What level of restrictions would you expect there to be on purchasing the following new gTLDs?

9. .ovh

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Reg-istrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	17**	108	125	125	-**	-**	-**	-**	108	125	-**	-**	-**	-**
STRICT/SOME RESTRICTIONS (NET)	5 29%	59 55%	64 51%	64 51%	-	-	-	-	59 55%	64 51%	-	-	-	-
Strict purchase restrictions should be required	-	17 16%	17 14%	15 12%	-	-	-	-	17 16%	15 12%	-	-	-	-
Some purchase restrictions should be required	5 29%	42 39%	47 38%	49 39%	-	-	-	-	42 39%	49 39%	-	-	-	-
No purchase restrictions should be required	12 71%	46 43%	58 46% 1	61 49%	-	-	-	-	46 43%	61 49%	-	-	-	-
Not Sure	-	2 2%	2 2%	-	-	-	-	-	2 2%	-	-	-	-	-
Decline to Answer	-	1 1%	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-
Sigma	17 100%	108 100%	125 100%	125 100%	-	-	-	-	108 100%	125 100%	-	-	-	-
Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing														

Q865 10. Earlier we asked you about enforcing restrictions on who can register/purchase domains with specific extensions. What level of restrictions would you expect there to be on purchasing the following new gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 295

10. .london

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	114	419	533	100	..**	..**	..**	..**	419	100	..**	..**	..**	..**
STRICT/SOME RESTRICTIONS (NET)	68 60%	274 65%	342 64%	78 78% ABC	-	-	-	-	274 65%	78 78% I	-	-	-	-
Strict purchase restrictions should be required	25 22%	85 20%	110 21%	23 23%	-	-	-	-	85 20%	23 23%	-	-	-	-
Some purchase restrictions should be required	43 38%	189 45%	232 44%	55 55% AC	-	-	-	-	189 45%	55 55%	-	-	-	-
No purchase restrictions should be required	46 40% D	132 32%	178 33% D	22 22%	-	-	-	-	132 32%	22 22%	-	-	-	-
Not Sure	-	11 3%	11 2%	-	-	-	-	-	11 3%	-	-	-	-	-
Decline to Answer	-	2 *	2 *	-	-	-	-	-	2 *	-	-	-	-	-
Sigma	114 100%	419 100%	533 100%	100 100%	-	-	-	-	419 100%	100 100%	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q865 11. Earlier we asked you about enforcing restrictions on who can register/purchase domains with specific extensions. What level of restrictions would you expect there to be on purchasing the following new gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 296

11. .nyc

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strahts	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	204	64*	268	255	64*	255	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**
STRICT/SOME RESTRICTIONS (NET)	128 63%	51 80%	179 67%	193 76% AC	51 80% AC	193 76%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Strict purchase restrictions should be required	41 20%	21 33%	62 23%	63 25%	21 33% AC	63 25%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Some purchase restrictions should be required	87 43%	30 47%	117 44%	130 51%	30 47%	130 51%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
No purchase restrictions should be required	76 37% DE	7 11%	83 31% E	62 24% B	7 11%	62 24% E	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Not Sure	-	6 9% D	6 2% D	-	6 9% FAC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sigma	204 100%	64 100%	268 100%	255 100%	64 100%	255 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q865 12. Earlier we asked you about enforcing restrictions on who can register/purchase domains with specific extensions. What level of restrictions would you expect there to be on purchasing the following new gTLDs?

12. .wang

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi-strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	2**	548	550	551	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	548	551
STRICT/SOME RESTRICTIONS (NET)	1 50%	357 65%	358 65%	337 61%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	357 65%	337 61%
Strict purchase restrictions should be required	1 50%	101 18%	102 19%	86 16%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	101 18%	86 16%
Some purchase restrictions should be required	- -	256 47%	256 47%	251 46%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	256 47%	251 46%
No purchase restrictions should be required	1 50%	182 33%	183 33%	214 39%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	182 33%	214 39%
Not Sure	- D	9 2% D	9 2% D	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9 2% N	-
Sigma	2 100%	548 100%	550 100%	551 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	548 100%	551 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q865 13. Earlier we asked you about enforcing restrictions on who can register/purchase domains with specific extensions. What level of restrictions would you expect there to be on purchasing the following new gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 298

13. .xn-ses554g (Chinese for network address)

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strahts	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	2**	548	550	551	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	548	551
STRICT/SOME RESTRICTIONS (NET)	1 50%	369 67%	370 67%	349 63%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	369 67%	349 63%
Strict purchase restrictions should be required	1 50%	122 22%	123 22%	103 19%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	122 22%	103 19%
Some purchase restrictions should be required	-	247 45%	247 45%	246 45%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	247 45%	246 45%
No purchase restrictions should be required	1 50%	168 31%	169 31%	202 37% BC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	168 31%	202 37% M
Not Sure	-	11 2% D	11 2% D	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	11 2% N	-
Sigma	2 100%	548 100%	550 100%	551 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	548 100%	551 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q865 14. Earlier we asked you about enforcing restrictions on who can register/purchase domains with specific extensions. What level of restrictions would you expect there to be on purchasing the following new gTLDs?

16 Aug 2016
Table 299

14. .xn-55qx5d (Chinese for company)

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	2**	548	550	551	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	548	551
STRICT/SOME RESTRICTIONS (NET)	1 50%	374 68%	375 68%	352 64%	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	374 68%	352 64%
Strict purchase restrictions should be required	1 50%	121 22%	122 22%	97 18%	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	121 22%	97 18%
Some purchase restrictions should be required	- -	253 46%	253 46%	255 46%	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	253 46%	255 46%
No purchase restrictions should be required	1 50%	164 30%	165 30%	199 36% BC	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	164 30%	199 36% M
Not Sure	- -	10 2% D	10 2% D	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	10 2% N	- -
Sigma	2 100%	548 100%	550 100%	551 100%	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	548 100%	551 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q910. How much do you trust that the restrictions on this new registration will actually be enforced?

16 Aug 2016
Table 300

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	-**	-**	-**	3349	-**	460	-**	415	-**	534	-**	401	-**	1539
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	2313 69% FJ	-	232 50%	-	299 72% FJ	-	305 57% F	-	314 78% DFHJ	-	1163 76% DFJ
High level of trust	-	-	-	577 17% FJ	-	47 10%	-	80 19% FJ	-	45 8%	-	81 20% FJ	-	324 21% DFJ
Moderate level of trust	-	-	-	1736 52% F	-	185 40%	-	219 53% F	-	260 49% F	-	233 58% DFJ	-	839 55% DFJ
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	1036 31% LN	-	228 50% DHJLN	-	116 28% L	-	229 43% DHLN	-	87 22% DHLN	-	376 24%
Low level of trust	-	-	-	774 23% LN	-	146 32% DHLN	-	87 21% L	-	184 34% DHLN	-	61 15% DHLN	-	296 19%
Very low level of trust	-	-	-	262 8% N	-	82 18% DHJLN	-	29 7%	-	45 8% N	-	26 6%	-	80 5%
Sigma	-	-	-	3349 100%	-	460 100%	-	415 100%	-	534 100%	-	401 100%	-	1539 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Base: All Qualified Respondents

Q900. How would you describe the processing of registering a domain?

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	646 84% DEGIKM	1386 54% M	2032 61% DGKM	1754 52% HN	129 62% GMBGMGM	314 68% DHJLN	138 51% H	177 43% GMBGMGM	256 61% DHLN	329 62% DHLN	194 55% HN	216 54% HN	669 50% HN	718 47% HN
Very easy	337 44% DEGIKM	436 17% D	773 23% DEIKM	426 13% HN	34 16% DHJLN	96 21% H	54 20% H	30 7% GMBGMGM	71 17% DHLN	75 14% HN	54 15% HN	60 15% HN	223 17% N	165 11% H
Somewhat easy	309 40% GM	950 37% GM	1259 38% GM	1328 40% BN	95 46% GMBGMGM	218 47% DHLN	84 31% GMBGMGM	147 35% GMBGMGM	185 44% DHLN	254 48% GMGMGM	140 40% GMGMGM	156 39% GMGMGM	446 33% GMGMGM	553 36% GMGMGM
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	123 16% EI	1183 46% EI	1306 39% ACFJ	1595 48% ACFJ	77 37% A	146 32% AEIEICEI	130 48% AEIEICEI	238 57% GDFJL	157 37% A	205 38% F	157 45% AIICI	185 46% FJ	662 49% AEIBEICEI	821 53% MDFJL
Somewhat difficult	108 14% EI	1016 39% EI	1124 33% ACFJ	1381 41% ACFJ	58 28% A	127 28% AEIEICEI	104 39% AEIEICEI	194 47% GDFJL	141 34% A	180 34% F	137 39% AEIEICEI	168 42% FJ	576 43% AEIBEICEI	712 46% DFJL
Very difficult	15 2% I	167 6% I	182 5% AF	214 6% AF	19 9% FAIICI	19 4% AIBICI	26 10% AIBICI	44 11% DFJLN	16 4% DFJLN	25 5% DFJLN	20 6% A	17 4% AIICI	86 6% AIICI	109 7% FL
Decline to Answer	-	1 *	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	-	-
Not Sure	-	18 1% D	18 1% D	-	1 *	-	1 *	-	5 1% JA	-	1 *	-	10 1% NA	-
Sigma	769 100%	2588 100%	3357 100%	3349 100%	207 100%	460 100%	269 100%	415 100%	419 100%	534 100%	352 100%	401 100%	1341 100%	1539 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Base: All Qualified Respondents

Q905. What, if anything, would you change about the domain name purchase process?

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
Price	397 52%	1418 55% G	1815 54% G	1825 54% F	116 56% F	206 45%	128 48%	210 51%	215 51%	310 58% IFH AEGIMBEGIMCEGIM	233 66%	261 65% DFHJN	726 54% GGG	838 54% F
Make it easier to register in multiple TLDs	228 30%	890 34% DI	1118 33% DI	1033 31% FJ	65 31% F	89 19%	83 31%	132 32% FJ	110 26%	127 24%	136 39% AGIGICGI	135 34% FJ	496 37% AIBICI	550 36% DFJ
Make it less complicated	168 22%	1244 48% DEGI	1412 42% I	1502 45% ACFHI	84 41% FA	150 33%	108 40% AIII	162 39% FJ	137 33% A	160 30%	179 51% AEGIEGICEGI	196 49% FHJ AEGIBEGICEGI	736 55% DFHJ	834 54% DFHJ
Make it quicker	165 21%	1195 46% EI	1360 41% EI	1470 44% ACFJ	49 24%	110 24%	133 49% AEIEICEI	192 46% FJ	127 30% A	167 31% F	174 49% AEIEICEI	184 46% FJ AEIBEICEI	712 53% DFHJL	817 53% DFHJL
Other	47 6% DEGIKM	19 1%	66 2% DKM	29 1% N KMBKMKM	4 2% DHJLN	18 4%	3 1% KKK	3 1%	4 1%	4 1%	-	1 * N	8 1%	3 *
Nothing	210 27% DEGIKM	189 7% M	399 12% DGKM	258 8% HLN GKMBGKMGKM	27 13% EDHJLN	103 22% MMM	20 7%	22 5% N GKMBGKMGKM	68 16% DHLN	70 13%	18 5%	19 5%	56 4%	44 3%
Not Sure	-	11 * D	11 * D	-	-	-	-	-	2 *	-	-	-	9 1% NAC	-
Decline to Answer	-	1 *	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	1 * C	-	-	-	-	-
Sigma	1215 158%	4967 192%	6182 184%	6117 183%	345 167%	676 147%	475 177%	721 174%	664 158%	838 157%	740 210%	796 199%	2743 205%	3086 201%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q913. How strongly do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the registration process?

16 Aug 2016
Table 303

SUMMARY TABLE OF TOP 2 BOX

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	..	..	..	3349	..	460	..	415	..	534	..	401	..	1539
It was easy to find a domain name and extension that worked for my needs	-	-	-	2002 60% N	-	315 68% DHJLN	-	231 56%	-	319 60%	-	249 62%	-	888 58%
There were plenty of choices between gTLDs that met my needs-for example, .photography and .photo, or .auto and .cars	-	-	-	1684 50% FHJ	-	199 43% J	-	179 43% J	-	188 35%	-	216 54% FHJ	-	902 59% DFHJ
If I had known more about the new gTLDs, choosing a domain to register would have been a lot easier	-	-	-	1837 55% FJ	-	182 40%	-	244 59% FJ	-	221 41%	-	239 60% DFJ	-	951 62% DFJ
I did not feel like I had many alternatives that were available for registration	-	-	-	1331 40%	-	165 36%	-	179 43% FJ	-	193 36%	-	164 41%	-	630 41%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q913. How strongly do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the registration process?

16 Aug 2016
Table 304

SUMMARY TABLE OF BOTTOM 2 BOX

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	..	..	..	3349	..	460	..	415	..	534	..	401	..	1539
It was easy to find a domain name and extension that worked for my needs	-	-	-	631 19% F	-	61 13%	-	107 26% DFJN	-	92 17%	-	89 22% F	-	282 18% F
There were plenty of choices between gTLDs that met my needs-for example, .photography and .photo, or .auto and .cars	-	-	-	638 19% N	-	85 18% N	-	113 27% DFN	-	131 25% DFN	-	86 21% N	-	223 14%
If I had known more about the new gTLDs, choosing a domain to register would have been a lot easier	-	-	-	530 16% N	-	123 27% DHJLN	-	57 14%	-	114 21% DHN	-	71 18% N	-	165 11%
I did not feel like I had many alternatives that were available for registration	-	-	-	875 26% N	-	155 34% DJN	-	127 31% DN	-	139 26%	-	111 28% N	-	343 22%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q913_1. How strongly do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the registration process?

16 Aug 2016
Table 305

1. It was easy to find a domain name and extension that worked for my needs

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
					(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)	
Unweighted Base	-**	-**	-**	3349	-**	460	-**	415	-**	534	-**	401	-**	1539
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	2002 60% N	-	315 68% DHJLN	-	231 56%	-	319 60%	-	249 62%	-	888 58%
Strongly agree	-	-	-	702 21%	-	129 28% DHJLN	-	87 21%	-	97 18%	-	88 22%	-	301 20%
Somewhat agree	-	-	-	1300 39%	-	186 40%	-	144 35%	-	222 42% H	-	161 40%	-	587 38%
Neither agree nor disagree	-	-	-	716 21% L	-	84 18%	-	77 19%	-	123 23% L	-	63 16%	-	369 24% DFHL
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	631 19% F	-	61 13%	-	107 26% DFJN	-	92 17%	-	89 22% F	-	282 18% F
Somewhat disagree	-	-	-	407 12% F	-	39 8%	-	53 13% F	-	65 12%	-	56 14% F	-	194 13% F
Strongly disagree	-	-	-	224 7% N	-	22 5%	-	54 13% DFJLN	-	27 5%	-	33 8% F	-	88 6%
Sigma	-	-	-	3349 100%	-	460 100%	-	415 100%	-	534 100%	-	401 100%	-	1539 100%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q913_2. How strongly do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the registration process?

2. There were plenty of choices between gTLDs that met my needs-for example, .photography and .photo, or .auto and .cars

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	-**	-**	-**	3349	-**	460	-**	415	-**	534	-**	401	-**	1539
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	1684	-	199	-	179	-	188	-	216	-	902
	-	-	-	50% FHJ	-	43% J	-	43% J	-	35% FHJ	-	54% FHJ	-	59% DFHJ
Strongly agree	-	-	-	572	-	59	-	65	-	52	-	83	-	313
	-	-	-	17% FJ	-	13% FJ	-	16% J	-	10% DFJ	-	21% DFJ	-	20% DFHJ
Somewhat agree	-	-	-	1112	-	140	-	114	-	136	-	133	-	589
	-	-	-	33% HJ	-	30% HJ	-	27% HJ	-	25% HJ	-	33% J	-	38% DFHJ
Neither agree nor disagree	-	-	-	1027	-	176	-	123	-	215	-	99	-	414
	-	-	-	31% LN	-	38% DHLN	-	30% DHLN	-	40% DHLN	-	25% DHLN	-	27% DHLN
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	638	-	85	-	113	-	131	-	86	-	223
	-	-	-	19% N	-	18% N	-	27% DFN	-	25% DFN	-	21% N	-	14% N
Somewhat disagree	-	-	-	432	-	59	-	67	-	83	-	60	-	163
	-	-	-	13% N	-	13% N	-	16% DN	-	16% DN	-	15% N	-	11% N
Strongly disagree	-	-	-	206	-	26	-	46	-	48	-	26	-	60
	-	-	-	6% N	-	6% N	-	11% DFLN	-	9% DFN	-	6% N	-	4% N
Sigma	-	-	-	3349	-	460	-	415	-	534	-	401	-	1539
	-	-	-	100%	-	100%	-	100%	-	100%	-	100%	-	100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q913_3. How strongly do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the registration process?
3. If I had known more about the new gTLDs, choosing a domain to register would have been a lot easier

16 Aug 2016
Table 307

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
					(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	-**	-**	-**	3349	-**	460	-**	415	-**	534	-**	401	-**	1539
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	1837	-	182	-	244	-	221	-	239	-	951
	-	-	-	55% FJ	-	40%	-	59% FJ	-	41%	-	60% DFJ	-	62% DFJ
Strongly agree	-	-	-	667	-	64	-	111	-	54	-	102	-	336
	-	-	-	20% FJ	-	14%	-	27% DFJN	-	10%	-	25% DFJ	-	22% DFJ
Somewhat agree	-	-	-	1170	-	118	-	133	-	167	-	137	-	615
	-	-	-	35% F	-	26%	-	32% F	-	31%	-	34% F	-	40% DFHJL
Neither agree nor disagree	-	-	-	982	-	155	-	114	-	199	-	91	-	423
	-	-	-	29% LN	-	34% DHLN	-	27% DHLN	-	37% DHLN	-	23% DHLN	-	27%
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	530	-	123	-	57	-	114	-	71	-	165
	-	-	-	16% N	-	27% DHJLN	-	14% DHJLN	-	21% DHN	-	18% N	-	11%
Somewhat disagree	-	-	-	321	-	70	-	25	-	56	-	52	-	118
	-	-	-	10% HN	-	15% DHJN	-	6% HN	-	10% HN	-	13% DHN	-	8%
Strongly disagree	-	-	-	209	-	53	-	32	-	58	-	19	-	47
	-	-	-	6% N	-	12% DLN	-	8% N	-	11% DLN	-	5% DLN	-	3%
Sigma	-	-	-	3349	-	460	-	415	-	534	-	401	-	1539
	-	-	-	100%	-	100%	-	100%	-	100%	-	100%	-	100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q913_4. How strongly do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the registration process?
4. I did not feel like I had many alternatives that were available for registration

16 Aug 2016
Table 308

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	..	..	..	3349	..	460	..	415	..	534	..	401	..	1539
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	1331	-	165	-	179	-	193	-	164	-	630
	-	-	-	40%	-	36%	-	43% FJ	-	36%	-	41%	-	41%
Strongly agree	-	-	-	359	-	53	-	59	-	33	-	52	-	162
	-	-	-	11% J	-	12% J	-	14% DJN	-	6%	-	13% J	-	11% J
Somewhat agree	-	-	-	972	-	112	-	120	-	160	-	112	-	468
	-	-	-	29% F	-	24%	-	29%	-	30% F	-	28%	-	30% F
Neither agree nor disagree	-	-	-	1143	-	140	-	109	-	202	-	126	-	566
	-	-	-	34% H	-	30%	-	26%	-	38% FHL	-	31%	-	37% DFHL
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	875	-	155	-	127	-	139	-	111	-	343
	-	-	-	26% N	-	34% DJN	-	31% DN	-	26%	-	28% N	-	22%
Somewhat disagree	-	-	-	545	-	88	-	67	-	85	-	62	-	243
	-	-	-	16%	-	19%	-	16%	-	16%	-	15%	-	16%
Strongly disagree	-	-	-	330	-	67	-	60	-	54	-	49	-	100
	-	-	-	10% N	-	15% DJN	-	14% DJN	-	10% N	-	12% N	-	6%
Sigma	-	-	-	3349	-	460	-	415	-	534	-	401	-	1539
	-	-	-	100%	-	100%	-	100%	-	100%	-	100%	-	100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

O915. How much do you trust the domain name industry compared to these other industries?

SUMMARY TABLE OF TOP 2 BOX

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
					(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
Internet service providers/the agency that provides my internet access	227 30%	1269 49% EI	1496 45% EI	1566 47% AFJ	70 34%	150 33%	128 48% AEIEIEI	195 47% FJ	137 33%	189 35%	166 47% AEIEIEI	207 52% DFJ	768 57% NAEIGKBEGCEGK	825 54% DFHJ
Web based marketing companies	253 33%	1030 40% EI	1283 38% EI	1255 37% AFJ	62 30%	141 31% J	101 38% III	148 36% J	119 28%	129 24%	142 40% AEIEIEI	153 38% FJ	606 45% AEGIBEGICEGI	684 44% DFHJL
E-commerce companies	199 26%	1061 41% EI	1260 38% EI	1302 39% AFJ	53 26%	117 25%	112 42% AEIEIEI	166 40% FJ	117 28%	153 29%	149 42% AEIEIEI	169 42% FJ	630 47% AEIBEIEI	697 45% DFJ
Software companies	191 25%	1213 47% EI	1404 42% EI	1510 45% ACFJ	66 32% A	131 28%	126 47% AEIEIEI	208 50% DFJ	132 32% A	166 31%	165 47% AEIEICEI	185 46% FJ	724 54% AEGIBEGICEGK	820 53% DFJL
Computer hardware companies	189 25%	1125 43% EI	1314 39% EI	1487 44% ACFJ	65 31% A	140 30%	114 42% AEIEIEI	205 49% DFJ	121 29%	168 31%	148 42% AEIEIEI	181 45% FJ	677 50% AEGIBEGICEGK	793 52% DFJL

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

SUMMARY TABLE OF BOTTOM 2 BOX

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
Internet service providers/the agency that provides my internet access	157 20% DM	367 14% M	524 16% M	490 15% N	43 21% MBMCM	79 17% N	44 16% MMM	75 18% DN	75 18% MBMM	79 15% N	64 18% MBMM	56 14% N	141 11% N	201 13% M
Web based marketing companies	204 27% DM	553 21% M	757 23% DM	688 21% N	53 26% MMM	100 22% N	62 23% N	106 26% DN	97 23% N	116 22% N	79 22% N	99 25% DN	262 20% N	267 17% N
E-commerce companies	192 25% DM	493 19% M	685 20% DM	599 18% N	49 24% MMM	97 21% N	61 23% MMM	76 18% N	103 25% JMBMCM	103 19% N	71 20% MMM	67 17% N	209 16% N	256 17% N
Software companies	202 26% DGIKM	395 15% M	597 18% DM	489 15% N	55 27% FKMBMBGCMCM	88 19% DHN	43 16% MMM	54 13% N	86 21% MBMM	93 17% DN	56 16% MMM	70 17% N	155 12% N	184 12% N
Computer hardware companies	216 28% DGIKM	469 18% DM	685 20% DM	513 15% N	52 25% MBMM	87 19% DN	51 19% N	64 15% N	88 21% MMM	87 16% N	79 22% MBMM	77 19% DN	199 15% N	198 13% N

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q915_1. How much do you trust the domain name industry compared to these other industries?

1. Internet service providers/the agency that provides my internet access

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	227 30%	1269 49% EI	1496 45% EI	1566 47% AFJ	70 34%	150 33%	128 48% AEIEIEI	195 47% FJ	137 33%	189 35%	166 47% AEIEIEI	207 52% DFJ	768 57% NAEGKBEGKCEGK	825 54% DFHJ
Trust much more	91 12%	497 19% DI	588 18% D	520 16% AFJ	30 14% F	34 7%	49 18% A	69 17% FJ	60 14% J	47 9%	74 21% AIII	85 21% DFJ	284 21% AEIBEICEI	285 19% DFJ
Trust somewhat more	136 18%	772 30% EI	908 27% EI	1046 31% ACFJ	40 19%	116 25%	79 29% AEIEIEI	126 30%	77 18%	142 27% I	92 26% AIII	122 30% AEIGKBEGKCEGK	484 36% AEIGKBEGKCEGK	540 35% DFJ
Trust the same	385 50% DGKM	925 36% M	1310 39% KM	1293 39% BN	90 43% KMBKMKM	231 50% DHLN	95 35%	145 35% GKMBGKMGCKM	198 47% DHLN	266 50% DHLN	120 34%	138 34%	422 31%	513 33%
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	157 20% DM	367 14% M	524 16% M	490 15% N	43 21% MBMCM	79 17% N	44 16% MMM	75 18% DN	75 18% MBMM	79 15%	64 18% MBMM	56 14%	141 11% MBMM	201 13% M
Trust somewhat less	101 13% M	280 11% M	381 11% M	362 11% MBMCM	34 16% MBMCM	56 12%	32 12%	48 12% MBMM	57 14% MBMM	59 11% MBMM	46 13% MBMM	41 10%	111 8%	158 10%
Trust much less	56 7% DIM	87 3% M	143 4% M	128 4% N	9 4% N	23 5% N	12 4% MMM	27 7% DN	18 4% MMM	20 4%	18 5% MMM	15 4%	30 2%	43 3%
Decline to Answer	-	1 *	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	-	-
Not Sure	-	26 1% D	26 1% D	-	4 2% FA	-	2 1% A	-	8 2% JAMMCM	-	2 1% A	-	10 1% NA	-
Sigma	769 100%	2588 100%	3357 100%	3349 100%	207 100%	460 100%	269 100%	415 100%	419 100%	534 100%	352 100%	401 100%	1341 100%	1539 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q915_2. How much do you trust the domain name industry compared to these other industries?

2. Web based marketing companies

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	253 33%	1030 40% EI	1283 38% EI	1255 37% AFJ	62 30%	141 31% J	101 38% III	148 36% J	119 28%	129 24%	142 40% AEIEIEI	153 38% FJ AEGIBEGICEGI	606 45% DFHJL	684 44%
Trust much more	105 14% E	359 14% DEI	464 14% DEI	391 12% FJ	15 7%	37 8%	40 15% EEE	55 13% FJ	44 11% J	33 6%	47 13% EEE	56 14% FJ EIBEICEI	213 16% DFJ	210 14% DFJ
Trust somewhat more	148 19%	671 26% I	819 24% I	864 26% AJ	47 23%	104 23%	61 23%	93 22%	75 18%	96 18%	95 27% AIII	97 24% J AGIBGICGI	393 29% DFHJL	474 31%
Trust the same	312 41% M	975 38% M	1287 38% M	1406 42% BCLN	88 43% MMM	219 48% DHLN	104 39%	161 39% KMBKMCKM	193 46% IDFHLN	289 54%	129 37%	149 37%	461 34%	588 38% M
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	204 27% DM	553 21% M	757 23% DM	688 21% N	53 26% MMM	100 22% N	62 23%	106 26% DN	97 23%	116 22% N	79 22%	99 25% DN	262 20%	267 17%
Trust somewhat less	124 16%	420 16%	544 16%	521 16% N	39 19%	70 15%	46 17%	80 19% DN	71 17%	93 17% N	56 16%	73 18% N	208 16%	205 13%
Trust much less	80 10% DGIKM	133 5% M	213 6% DM	167 5% N	14 7%	30 7% N	16 6%	26 6%	26 6%	23 4%	23 7% MMM	26 6% N	54 4%	62 4%
Decline to Answer	-	1 *	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	1 * C	-	-	-	-	-
Not Sure	-	29 1% D	29 1% D	-	4 2% FA	-	2 1% A	-	9 2% JAMBMC	-	2 1% A	-	12 1% NA	-
Sigma	769 100%	2588 100%	3357 100%	3349 100%	207 100%	460 100%	269 100%	415 100%	419 100%	534 100%	352 100%	401 100%	1341 100%	1539 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q915_3. How much do you trust the domain name industry compared to these other industries?

16 Aug 2016
Table 313

3. E-commerce companies

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	199 26%	1061 41% EI	1260 38% EI	1302 39% AFJ	53 26%	117 25%	112 42% AEIEIEI	166 40% FJ	117 28%	153 29%	149 42% AEIEIEI	169 42% FJ	630 47% AEIBEICEI	697 45% DFJ
Trust much more	76 10%	408 16% DEI	484 14% DE	408 12% FJ	13 6%	32 7%	40 15% AEEEE	57 14% FJ	50 12% JEEEE	34 6%	58 16% AEEEE	56 14% FJ	247 18% NAEIBEICEI	229 15% DFJ
Trust somewhat more	123 16%	653 25% EI	776 23% I	894 27% ACFJ	40 19%	85 18%	72 27% AIII	109 26% F	67 16%	119 22% I	91 26% AIII	113 28% FJ	383 29% AEIBEICEI	468 30% DFJ
Trust the same	378 49% DGKM	1002 39% M	1380 41% GM	1448 43% BN	98 47% GKMBGKMGKM	246 53% DHLN	94 35% GKMBGKMGKM	173 42% GKMBGKMGKM	190 45% IDHLN	278 52% IDHLN	130 37%	165 41%	490 37%	586 38%
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	192 25% DM	493 19% M	685 20% DM	599 18% MMM	49 24% MMM	97 21% N	61 23% MMM	76 18% JMBMCM	103 25% JMBMCM	103 19%	71 20% MMM	67 17%	209 16%	256 17%
Trust somewhat less	125 16% M	382 15% M	507 15% M	463 14% M	35 17%	72 16%	45 17% MMM	60 14% MBMCM	84 20% MBMCM	83 16%	56 16%	48 12%	162 12%	200 13%
Trust much less	67 9% DIKM	111 4% M	178 5% DM	136 4% MMM	14 7% MMM	25 5%	16 6%	16 4%	19 5%	20 4%	15 4%	19 5%	47 4%	56 4%
Decline to Answer	-	2 *	2 *	-	-	-	-	-	2 *	-	-	-	-	-
Not Sure	-	30 1% D	30 1% D	-	7 3% FAGMBGKMGKM	-	2 1% A	-	7 2% JA	-	2 1% A	-	12 1% NA	-
Sigma	769 100%	2588 100%	3357 100%	3349 100%	207 100%	460 100%	269 100%	415 100%	419 100%	534 100%	352 100%	401 100%	1341 100%	1539 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q915_4. How much do you trust the domain name industry compared to these other industries?
4. Software companies

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	191 25%	1213 47% EI	1404 42% EI	1510 45% ACFJ	66 32% A	131 28%	126 47% AEIEIEI	208 50% DFJ	132 32% A	166 31%	165 47% AEIEICEI	185 46% FJ	724 54% AEGKBEGKCEGK	820 53% DFJL
Trust much more	63 8%	433 17% EI	496 15% I	504 15% AFJ	22 11%	35 8%	48 18% AEIEIEI	80 19% DFJ	43 10% J	35 7%	61 17% AEIEIEI	68 17% FJ	259 19% AEIBEICEI	286 19% DFJ
Trust somewhat more	128 17%	780 30% EI	908 27% I	1006 30% ACFJ	44 21%	96 21%	78 29% AIII	128 31% FJ	89 21%	131 25%	104 30% AEIEIEI	117 29% F	465 35% AEIBEICEI	534 35% DFJL
Trust the same	376 49% DEGKM	951 37% M	1327 40% M	1350 40% BN	82 40%	241 52% EDHLN	98 36%	153 37%	193 46% GKMBGKMGCKM	275 51% DHLN	129 37%	146 36%	449 33%	535 35%
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	202 26% DGIKM	395 15% M	597 18% DM	489 15% N	55 27% FGKMBGKMGCKM	88 19% DHN	43 16% MMM	54 13%	86 21% MBMM	93 17% DN	56 16% MMM	70 17% N	155 12% N	184 12%
Trust somewhat less	124 16% DKM	305 12% M	429 13% DM	355 11% N	44 21% FGKMBGKMGCKM	65 14% DHN	32 12%	37 9%	65 16% MBMM	72 13% DHN	38 11%	48 12% N	126 9% N	133 9%
Trust much less	78 10% DEGIKM	90 3% M	168 5% DM	134 4%	11 5% MMM	23 5%	11 4%	17 4%	21 5% MMM	21 4%	18 5% MMM	22 5% N	29 2% N	51 3%
Decline to Answer	-	1 *	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	1 * C	-	-	-	-	-
Not Sure	-	28 1% D	28 1% D	-	4 2% FA	-	2 1% A	-	7 2% JA	-	2 1% A	-	13 1% NA	-
Sigma	769 100%	2588 100%	3357 100%	3349 100%	207 100%	460 100%	269 100%	415 100%	419 100%	534 100%	352 100%	401 100%	1341 100%	1539 100%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q915_5. How much do you trust the domain name industry compared to these other industries?

16 Aug 2016
Table 315

5. Computer hardware companies

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	189 25%	1125 43% EI	1314 39% EI	1487 44% ACFJ	65 31% A	140 30%	114 42% AEIEIEI	205 49% DFJ	121 29%	168 31%	148 42% AEIEIEI	181 45% FJ	677 50% AEGKBEGKCEGK	793 52% DFJL
Trust much more	63 8%	435 17% DI	498 15%	469 14% AFJ	25 12%	41 9%	48 18% AIII	84 20% DFJLN	49 12% A	45 8%	60 17% AIII	56 14% FJ	253 19% NAEIBEICEI	243 16% DFJ
Trust somewhat more	126 16%	690 27% EI	816 24% I	1018 30% ABCFJ	40 19%	99 22%	66 25% AIII	121 29% FJ	72 17%	123 23% I	88 25% AIII	125 31% FJ	424 32% AEGKBEGKCEGK	550 36% MDFHJ
Trust the same	364 47% DGKM	964 37% M	1328 40% M	1349 40% BHLN	86 42% MMM	233 51% EDHLN	102 38% GKMBGKMGCKM	146 35% DHLN	202 48% GKMBGKMGCKM	279 52% DHLN	123 35%	143 36%	451 34%	548 36%
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	216 28% DGIKM	469 18% DM	685 20% DM	513 15% N	52 25% MBMM	87 19% DN	51 19%	64 15%	88 21% MMM	87 16% N	79 22% MBMM	77 19% DN	199 15%	198 13%
Trust somewhat less	120 16% DM	347 13% M	467 14% DM	395 12% N	39 19% MBMCM	62 13%	34 13%	44 11%	61 15%	70 13%	56 16% MMM	61 15% DHN	157 12%	158 10%
Trust much less	96 12% DEGIKM	122 5% DM	218 6% DM	118 4% N	13 6% MMM	25 5% DN	17 6% MMM	20 5% N	27 6% JMMM	17 3%	23 7% MMM	16 4%	42 3%	40 3%
Decline to Answer	-	1 *	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	-	-
Not Sure	-	29 1% D	29 1% D	-	4 2% FA	-	2 1% A	-	7 2% JA	-	2 1% A	-	14 1% NA	-
Sigma	769 100%	2588 100%	3357 100%	3349 100%	207 100%	460 100%	269 100%	415 100%	419 100%	534 100%	352 100%	401 100%	1341 100%	1539 100%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q917. Why do you trust the domain name industry more than these other industries?

Base: Trust Other Industries Much/Somewhat More

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
					(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	-.**	-.**	-.**	2265	-.**	246	-.**	292	-.**	285	-.**	286	-.**	1156
Weighted Base	-.**	-.**	-.**	2265	-.**	246	-.**	292	-.**	285	-.**	286	-.**	1156
CONVENIENCE (NET)	-	-	-	140 6% J	-	13 5% J	-	15 5%	-	6 2%	-	39 14% DFHJN	-	67 6% J
Clear/Easy to understand/differentiate	-	-	-	31 1% J	-	3 1%	-	4 1% J	-	-	-	7 2% J	-	17 1% J
Easy to use/access	-	-	-	52 2%	-	5 2%	-	4 1%	-	4 1%	-	19 7% DFHJN	-	20 2%
Faster/Quicker service	-	-	-	19 1%	-	1 *	-	2 1%	-	-	-	4 1% J	-	12 1%
Harder to obtain/Requires certain criteria	-	-	-	22 1%	-	2 1%	-	4 1%	-	1 *	-	7 2% DJN	-	8 1%
Convenient/More convenience	-	-	-	17 1%	-	-	-	2 1%	-	2 1%	-	1 *	-	12 1%
Other convenience mentions	-	-	-	9 *	-	3 1% D	-	-	-	-	-	1 *	-	5 *
ECONOMY (NET)	-	-	-	46 2%	-	10 4% DJN	-	4 1%	-	3 1%	-	9 3%	-	20 2%
It's paid for/Fee based	-	-	-	5 *	-	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	2 1%	-	2 *
Good/Better price	-	-	-	20 1%	-	7 3% DJN	-	2 1%	-	1 *	-	3 1%	-	7 1%
Other economy mentions	-	-	-	22 1%	-	3 1%	-	2 1%	-	2 1%	-	4 1%	-	11 1%
EXTENSION (NET)	-	-	-	11 *	-	1 *	-	3 1%	-	1 *	-	1 *	-	5 *
.cn	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
.co	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
.com	-	-	-	5 *	-	-	-	2 1%	-	1 *	-	-	-	2 *

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q917. Why do you trust the domain name industry more than these other industries?

Base: Trust Other Industries Much/Somewhat More

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
					(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)	
Weighted Base	-.**	-.**	-.**	2265	-.**	246	-.**	292	-.**	285	-.**	286	-.**	1156
.fr	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
.gov	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
.in	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
.info	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
.net	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 * DN	-	-
.org	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	1 * N	-	-	-	-	-	-
.ru	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Https	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Domain name/extension (Unspec.)	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	1 * N	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other extension mentions	-	-	-	5 *	-	1 *	-	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	3 *
EXTENSION APPEAL (NET)	-	-	-	341 15% H	-	30 12% H	-	20 7%	-	42 15% H	-	38 13% H	-	211 18% DFHL
Accurate	-	-	-	2 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 *
All/Everything	-	-	-	3 *	-	-	-	1 * N	-	1 * N	-	1 * N	-	-
Believable/Confidence/C onvincing	-	-	-	27 1%	-	2 1%	-	4 1%	-	5 2%	-	3 1%	-	13 1%
Better/Best	-	-	-	6 *	-	1 *	-	-	-	1 *	-	1 *	-	3 *
Curiosity/Interesting	-	-	-	4 *	-	1 *	-	-	-	1 *	-	1 *	-	1 *
Depends on language	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q917. Why do you trust the domain name industry more than these other industries?

Base: Trust Other Industries Much/Somewhat More

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
					(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)	
Weighted Base	-.**	-.**	-.**	2265	-.**	246	-.**	292	-.**	285	-.**	286	-.**	1156
Good/Like domain	-	-	-	56 2%	-	9 4%	-	4 1%	-	4 1%	-	3 1%	-	36 3%
Gut feeling/My opinion	-	-	-	63 3% FH	-	2 1%	-	1 *	-	11 4% FH	-	6 2%	-	43 4% DFH
I don't pay attention/Wouldn't notice	-	-	-	3 *	-	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	1 *	-	1 *
It's meaning/Meaningful	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 * DN	-	-
Nothing looks/sounds suspicious	-	-	-	3 *	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	2 *
Ordinary/Traditional/Con ventional	-	-	-	7 *	-	2 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5 *
Professional	-	-	-	75 3% FHL	-	2 1%	-	1 *	-	11 4% FHL	-	3 1%	-	58 5% DFHL
Relevant to topic/Specific to the domain	-	-	-	28 1%	-	5 2%	-	4 1%	-	2 1%	-	5 2%	-	12 1%
Same/Similar to others	-	-	-	3 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 *	-	2 *
Short wording	-	-	-	2 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 *	-	1 *
Wording makes sense	-	-	-	3 *	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	2 *
Other extension appeal mentions	-	-	-	60 3%	-	6 2%	-	4 1%	-	7 2%	-	11 4%	-	32 3%
WEBSITE APPEAL (NET)	-	-	-	4 *	-	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	1 *	-	2 *
Design/Layout/Way it looks	-	-	-	4 *	-	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	1 *	-	2 *
Few/No pop-ups/advertisements	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
INFORMATION (NET)	-	-	-	58 3%	-	3 1%	-	7 2%	-	5 2%	-	12 4% F	-	31 3%
Content/Information provided	-	-	-	45 2%	-	3 1%	-	7 2%	-	3 1%	-	7 2%	-	25 2%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q917. Why do you trust the domain name industry more than these other industries?

Base: Trust Other Industries Much/Somewhat More

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
					(E)		(G)		(I)		(K)		(M)	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Weighted Base	-**	-**	-**	2265	-**	246	-**	292	-**	285	-**	286	-**	1156
Has what I am looking for	-	-	-	12 1%	-	-	-	-	-	2 1%	-	5 2% DFHN	-	5 *
Other information mentions	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 *
REPUTATION (NET)	-	-	-	988 44% JL	-	120 49% JL	-	144 49% DJL	-	105 37%	-	105 37%	-	514 44% JL
Depends on company/website behind the name	-	-	-	14 1%	-	1 *	-	4 1%	-	1 *	-	3 1%	-	5 *
Dependable/Reliable	-	-	-	100 4% N	-	11 4%	-	29 10% DFJLN	-	14 5%	-	9 3%	-	37 3%
Good experience/Never had a problem	-	-	-	80 4% N	-	17 7% DLN	-	15 5% N	-	10 4%	-	9 3%	-	29 3%
Good management/Operation of site	-	-	-	32 1%	-	3 1%	-	2 1%	-	1 *	-	2 1%	-	24 2% DJ
Good company/reputation/track record	-	-	-	52 2%	-	6 2%	-	7 2%	-	3 1%	-	6 2%	-	30 3%
Legitimate/Genuine/Authentic	-	-	-	91 4%	-	8 3%	-	9 3%	-	9 3%	-	14 5%	-	51 4%
Knowledgeable/Area of expertise/It's their business	-	-	-	160 7% N	-	30 12% DLN	-	25 9% N	-	29 10% DN	-	17 6%	-	59 5%
No scams/fraud	-	-	-	41 2% N	-	7 3% N	-	6 2%	-	5 2%	-	10 3% DN	-	13 1%
Tested/Proven/Verified	-	-	-	35 2% F	-	-	-	5 2% F	-	6 2% F	-	3 1%	-	21 2% F
Top level/High ranking	-	-	-	9 *	-	1 *	-	2 1%	-	-	-	-	-	6 1%
Trustworthy	-	-	-	278 12% JL	-	27 11%	-	31 11%	-	18 6%	-	24 8%	-	178 15% DHJL
Well known/Most commonly used	-	-	-	79 3%	-	5 2%	-	7 2%	-	9 3%	-	9 3%	-	49 4%
Established/Been around for long time	-	-	-	33 1%	-	4 2%	-	5 2%	-	3 1%	-	3 1%	-	18 2%
Big/Larger company	-	-	-	12 1%	-	-	-	2 1%	-	-	-	1 *	-	9 1%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q917. Why do you trust the domain name industry more than these other industries?

Base: Trust Other Industries Much/Somewhat More

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
					(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)	
Weighted Base	-**	-**	-**	2265	-**	246	-**	292	-**	285	-**	286	-**	1156
Other reputation mentions	-	-	-	70 3%	-	14 6% DN	-	8 3%	-	7 2%	-	10 3%	-	31 3%
SAFETY/SECURITY (NET)	-	-	-	189 8% N	-	24 10%	-	34 12% DN	-	24 8%	-	34 12% DN	-	73 6%
Check with anti virus software	-	-	-	1 *	-	1 * DN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ensures privacy of personal information	-	-	-	32 1% N	-	8 3% DN	-	5 2%	-	5 2%	-	5 2%	-	9 1%
Not being exposed to virus	-	-	-	4 *	-	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	1 *	-	2 *
Safety/Security/Padlock	-	-	-	148 7% N	-	14 6%	-	30 10% DN	-	18 6%	-	26 9% N	-	60 5%
Other safety/security mentions	-	-	-	11 *	-	1 *	-	-	-	3 1%	-	3 1%	-	4 *
SEARCH (NET)	-	-	-	18 1%	-	1 *	-	2 1%	-	2 1%	-	4 1%	-	9 1%
Search engine/Found through searching	-	-	-	9 *	-	-	-	1 *	-	1 *	-	3 1%	-	4 *
Google search	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Researched it/Check out source first	-	-	-	6 *	-	1 *	-	-	-	1 *	-	1 *	-	3 *
Other search mentions	-	-	-	3 *	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	2 *
USAGE (NET)	-	-	-	192 8%	-	17 7%	-	32 11%	-	20 7%	-	34 12% DJN	-	89 8%
Business/Company use	-	-	-	4 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4 *
Commercial use	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Depends on use (Unspec.)	-	-	-	3 *	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	2 *
Educational use	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q917. Why do you trust the domain name industry more than these other industries?

Base: Trust Other Industries Much/Somewhat More

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Weighted Base	-**	-**	-**	2265	-**	246	-**	292	-**	285	-**	286	-**	1156
Efficient/Work well	-	-	-	25 1% N	-	4 2%	-	3 1%	-	2 1%	-	8 3% DN	-	8 1%
Government use	-	-	-	2 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 *
Helpful/Useful	-	-	-	19 1%	-	2 1%	-	2 1%	-	2 1%	-	1 *	-	12 1%
I would try it	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
More familiar/I use extension	-	-	-	62 3%	-	4 2%	-	12 4%	-	10 4%	-	6 2%	-	30 3%
Necessary/Needed to access internet	-	-	-	23 1%	-	2 1%	-	4 1%	-	1 *	-	6 2%	-	10 1%
Not familiar	-	-	-	3 *	-	-	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	2 *
Non profit use	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Public use	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 *
Used by organizations	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
I have control over domain	-	-	-	9 * N	-	1 *	-	1 *	-	1 *	-	5 2% DN	-	1 *
Other usage mentions	-	-	-	49 2%	-	4 2%	-	9 3%	-	4 1%	-	10 3%	-	22 2%
WEBSITE ORIGIN (NET)	-	-	-	14 1%	-	2 1%	-	1 *	-	2 1%	-	4 1%	-	5 *
Country/State of origin (Unspec.)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Represents my country	-	-	-	3 *	-	-	-	-	-	1 *	-	1 *	-	1 *
Russian origin	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Worldwide/International usage	-	-	-	7 * N	-	2 1% N	-	1 *	-	1 *	-	2 1% N	-	1 *

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q917. Why do you trust the domain name industry more than these other industries?

Base: Trust Other Industries Much/Somewhat More

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
					(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)	
Weighted Base	-.**	-.**	-.**	2265	-.**	246	-.**	292	-.**	285	-.**	286	-.**	1156
Other website origin mentions	-	-	-	5*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	21%	-	3*
WEBSITE (NET)	-	-	-	9*	-	-	-	1*	-	-	-	1*	-	71%
Linked from a trusted site	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Web based use/Used by major websites	-	-	-	9*	-	-	-	1*	-	-	-	1*	-	71%
Other website mentions	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
MISCELLANEOUS (NET)	-	-	-	27612%	-	3012%	-	3612%	-	3011%	-	3613%	-	14412%
Advertised/Promoted	-	-	-	121%	-	31%	-	31%	-	-	-	1*	-	5*
Authorized/Regulated	-	-	-	1145% H	-	177% H	-	72%	-	145%	-	166% H	-	605% H
Good quality	-	-	-	151%	-	21%	-	41%	-	21%	-	21%	-	5*
Good technology/innovation	-	-	-	311%	-	-	-	41%	-	31%	-	41%	-	202% F
Provide good services	-	-	-	402%	-	31%	-	41%	-	21%	-	103% DJ	-	212%
Recommended by others	-	-	-	161%	-	1*	-	52% DJ	-	-	-	1*	-	91%
Good/Better customer service	-	-	-	221%	-	-	-	41%	-	52% F	-	1*	-	121%
Other	-	-	-	362%	-	42%	-	72%	-	52%	-	21%	-	182%
EXCLUSIVE (NET)	-	-	-	31014% L	-	3012%	-	4014% L	-	7526% DFHLN	-	228%	-	14312% L
Illegible data	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
None	-	-	-	924%	-	135% H	-	62%	-	145%	-	72%	-	524%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q917. Why do you trust the domain name industry more than these other industries?

Base: Trust Other Industries Much/Somewhat More

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
					(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)	
Weighted Base	-**	-**	-**	2265	-**	246	-**	292	-**	285	-**	286	-**	1156
Don't know	-	-	-	82 4% N	-	6 2%	-	15 5% N	-	25 9% DFLN	-	6 2%	-	30 3%
Declined to answer	-	-	-	136 6% L	-	11 4%	-	19 7%	-	36 13% DFHLN	-	9 3%	-	61 5%
Sigma	-	-	-	2738 121%	-	300 122%	-	359 123%	-	331 116%	-	360 126%	-	1388 120%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

q919. Why do you trust the domain name industry less than these other industries?

16 Aug 2016
Table 317

Base: Trust Other Industries Much/Somewhat Less

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
					(E)		(G)		(I)		(K)		(M)	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	..	..	..	1242	..	188	..	170	..	192	..	171	..	521
Weighted Base	..	..	..	1242	..	188	..	170	..	192	..	171	..	521
DOMAIN APPEAL (NET)	-	-	-	149 12%	-	16 9%	-	18 11%	-	28 15%	-	16 9%	-	71 14%
Accuracy	-	-	-	2 *	-	-	-	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-	1 *
Just my opinion/Gut instinct	-	-	-	49 4% L	-	3 2%	-	4 2%	-	14 7% DFHL	-	2 1%	-	26 5% FL
Names are not meaningful/relevant	-	-	-	6 *	-	3 2% DN	-	-	-	-	-	2 1%	-	1 *
Not as specific	-	-	-	18 1%	-	1 1%	-	3 2%	-	2 1%	-	4 2%	-	8 2%
Not clear/Hard to understand	-	-	-	26 2%	-	6 3%	-	5 3%	-	1 1%	-	2 1%	-	12 2%
Too new	-	-	-	3 *	-	-	-	-	-	1 1%	-	-	-	2 *
Uncertainty/Hard to judge	-	-	-	12 1%	-	1 1%	-	1 1%	-	2 1%	-	1 1%	-	7 1%
Other domain appeal mentions	-	-	-	37 3%	-	3 2%	-	5 3%	-	8 4%	-	7 4%	-	14 3%
REPUTATION (NET)	-	-	-	540 43% N	-	88 47%	-	76 45%	-	81 42%	-	88 51% DN	-	207 40%
Always trying to up-sell/Pushing products	-	-	-	4 *	-	3 2% DN	-	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Based on size of company	-	-	-	7 1%	-	3 2%	-	-	-	1 1%	-	1 1%	-	2 *
Fraud/Scams	-	-	-	76 6%	-	11 6%	-	10 6%	-	9 5%	-	11 6%	-	35 7%
Greed/Only in it for the money	-	-	-	30 2% N	-	7 4% N	-	3 2%	-	12 6% DHLN	-	3 2%	-	5 1%
Lack of confidence	-	-	-	7 1%	-	-	-	1 1%	-	4 2% DFN	-	1 1%	-	1 *

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

q919. Why do you trust the domain name industry less than these other industries?

16 Aug 2016
Table 317

Base: Trust Other Industries Much/Somewhat Less

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Weighted Base	-**	-**	-**	1242	-**	188	-**	170	-**	192	-**	171	-**	521
Less business oriented/professional	-	-	-	15 1%	-	2 1%	-	2 1%	-	3 2%	-	2 1%	-	6 1%
Less knowledgeable/Lacks expertise	-	-	-	20 2%	-	1 1%	-	4 2%	-	2 1%	-	7 4% DFN	-	6 1%
Less/Not accountable/responsible	-	-	-	9 1%	-	3 2%	-	1 1%	-	-	-	3 2%	-	2 *
Less reliable/dependable	-	-	-	23 2%	-	1 1%	-	3 2%	-	4 2%	-	5 3%	-	10 2%
Less reputable	-	-	-	25 2%	-	5 3%	-	5 3%	-	4 2%	-	1 1%	-	10 2%
Low credibility/Not believable	-	-	-	16 1%	-	-	-	1 1%	-	-	-	7 4% DFHJN	-	8 2%
Markets their customers/Vetting names to other companies	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 1%	-	-
Not developed enough	-	-	-	2 *	-	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 *
Not established/Hasn't been around a long time	-	-	-	15 1%	-	4 2%	-	-	-	3 2%	-	3 2%	-	5 1%
Not legitimate/genuine	-	-	-	62 5%	-	8 4%	-	6 4%	-	9 5%	-	8 5%	-	31 6%
Not sure rules are followed	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	1 1%	-	-	-	-
Not well known/Less popular	-	-	-	27 2%	-	2 1%	-	6 4%	-	2 1%	-	5 3%	-	12 2%
Poor performance/Better performance from others	-	-	-	6 *	-	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-	2 1%	-	3 1%
Poor quality/Sub-standard products	-	-	-	13 1%	-	4 2% J	-	-	-	-	-	1 1%	-	8 2%
Poor customer service/support	-	-	-	22 2%	-	3 2%	-	6 4% JN	-	1 1%	-	6 4% JN	-	6 1%
Previous poor experience	-	-	-	27 2% N	-	7 4% N	-	5 3%	-	8 4% N	-	2 1%	-	5 1%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

q919. Why do you trust the domain name industry less than these other industries?

16 Aug 2016
Table 317

Base: Trust Other Industries Much/Somewhat Less

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
					(E)		(G)		(I)		(K)		(M)	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Weighted Base	-.**	-.**	-.**	1242	-.**	188	-.**	170	-.**	192	-.**	171	-.**	521
Untrustworthy/Less transparent/honest	-	-	-	124 10%	-	24 13%	-	16 9%	-	18 9%	-	17 10%	-	49 9%
Other reputation mentions	-	-	-	80 6% J	-	12 6%	-	13 8% J	-	5 3%	-	23 13% DFJN	-	27 5%
SAFETY/SECURITY (NET)	-	-	-	157 13% N	-	41 22% DJLN	-	25 15%	-	21 11%	-	19 11%	-	51 10%
Not regulated/No back ground checks	-	-	-	61 5% HN	-	30 16% DHJLN	-	2 1%	-	9 5%	-	6 4%	-	14 3%
Poor safety/security	-	-	-	80 6% F	-	5 3%	-	18 11% DF	-	12 6%	-	11 6%	-	34 7% F
Risk of viruses	-	-	-	7 1%	-	-	-	4 2% DFJN	-	-	-	2 1%	-	1 *
Other safety/security mentions	-	-	-	13 1%	-	7 4% DHJLN	-	1 1%	-	1 1%	-	1 1%	-	3 1%
USAGE (NET)	-	-	-	149 12% J	-	34 18% DJN	-	22 13% J	-	11 6%	-	26 15% J	-	56 11% J
Anyone can access/register	-	-	-	25 2%	-	6 3%	-	1 1%	-	4 2%	-	2 1%	-	12 2%
Commercial use	-	-	-	3 *	-	-	-	1 1%	-	1 1%	-	-	-	1 *
Dislike online/web based marketing	-	-	-	30 2% J	-	11 6% DJLN	-	5 3%	-	1 1%	-	3 2%	-	10 2%
Not familiar/Have not used	-	-	-	60 5% JN	-	15 8% DJN	-	13 8% JN	-	4 2%	-	12 7% JN	-	16 3%
Useless/Not helpful	-	-	-	5 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 1%	-	3 1%
Other usage mentions	-	-	-	27 2%	-	2 1%	-	2 1%	-	1 1%	-	7 4% J	-	15 3%
MISCELLANEOUS (NET)	-	-	-	158 13%	-	24 13%	-	24 14%	-	19 10%	-	27 16%	-	64 12%
Cannot physically test product/No physical store	-	-	-	11 1%	-	1 1%	-	5 3% DLN	-	1 1%	-	-	-	4 1%
Cost/Payment issues	-	-	-	27 2%	-	4 2%	-	3 2%	-	4 2%	-	6 4%	-	10 2%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

q919. Why do you trust the domain name industry less than these other industries?

16 Aug 2016
Table 317

Base: Trust Other Industries Much/Somewhat Less

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o Client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
					(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)	
Weighted Base	-**	-**	-**	1242	-**	188	-**	170	-**	192	-**	171	-**	521
Hard to contact a real person/No personal touch	-	-	-	13 1%	-	3 2%	-	1 1%	-	2 1%	-	2 1%	-	5 1%
Less information about domain	-	-	-	27 2%	-	7 4%	-	6 4%	-	1 1%	-	3 2%	-	10 2%
Marketing issues	-	-	-	16 1%	-	-	-	2 1%	-	3 2%	-	4 2%	-	7 1%
Poor advertisements	-	-	-	2 *	-	-	-	1 1%	-	1 1%	-	-	-	-
Too many websites/companies/options	-	-	-	18 1%	-	4 2%	-	2 1%	-	3 2%	-	3 2%	-	6 1%
Other	-	-	-	50 4%	-	5 3%	-	6 4%	-	5 3%	-	10 6%	-	24 5%
EXCLUSIVE (NET)	-	-	-	220 18% L	-	26 14%	-	23 14%	-	44 23% DFHL	-	19 11%	-	108 21% DFHL
Illegible data	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
None	-	-	-	45 4% H	-	7 4% H	-	1 1%	-	3 2%	-	7 4% H	-	27 5% DHJ
Don't know	-	-	-	83 7% F	-	6 3%	-	12 7%	-	23 12% DFLN	-	7 4%	-	35 7%
Declined to answer	-	-	-	92 7% L	-	13 7%	-	10 6%	-	18 9% L	-	5 3%	-	46 9% L
Sigma	-	-	-	1460 118%	-	245 130%	-	198 116%	-	211 110%	-	220 129%	-	586 112%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Base: All Qualified Respondents

Q1000. Which devices do you use to access the Internet?

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
DESKTOP/LAPTOP (NET)	765 99%	2518 97%	3283 98% DE	3241 97%	198 96%	444 97%	264 98%	405 98%	407 97%	522 98%	340 97%	386 96%	1309 98%	1484 96%
Laptop computer	674 88% DEGIKM	2049 79% D	2723 81% DGM	2576 77% H	165 80%	343 75%	205 76%	302 73%	335 80%	414 78%	302 86% GIMBGIMCGIM	345 86% DFHJN	1042 78%	1172 76%
Desktop computer	624 81% DEIKM	1879 73% K	2503 75% DIK	2366 71% JL	143 69%	318 69% L EIKBEIKCEIK	214 80%	313 75% DFJL	291 69%	357 67%	233 66%	248 62% IKBIKIK	998 74%	1130 73% DJL
TABLET/SMARTPHONE (NET)	712 93% DEGIKM	2051 79% M	2763 82% DIM	2661 79% J	161 78%	354 77% J	222 83%	356 86% DFJN	330 79% J	367 69% EIMBEIMEIM	300 85% DFJN	353 88% DFJN	1038 77%	1231 80% J
Smartphone	685 89% DEGIKM	1904 74% DIM	2589 77% DIM	2479 74% FJ	149 72%	318 69% J	201 75%	337 81% GDFJN	300 72% J	333 62% EGIMBEGIMCEGIM	288 82% DFJN	331 83% DFJN	966 72%	1160 75% MFJ
Tablet	550 72% DEGIKM	1257 49% M	1807 54% DM	1649 49%	104 50%	249 54% DHN	132 49%	190 46% MBMM	223 53%	263 49%	177 50%	201 50%	621 46%	746 48%
Other	32 4% DGIKM	16 1% DM	48 1% DM	20 1% N MBMM	4 2% DN	8 2% DN	2 1%	3 1% N	3 1%	5 1% N	2 1%	3 1% N	5 *	1 *
Not Sure	-	2 *	2 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 *	-
Sigma	2565 334%	7107 275%	9672 288%	9090 271%	565 273%	1236 269%	754 280%	1145 276%	1152 275%	1372 257%	1002 285%	1128 281%	3634 271%	4209 273%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Base: All Qualified Respondents

Q1005. What is your experience with URL shorteners?

16 Aug 2016
Table 319

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
USE THEM (NET)	520 68%	1304 50%	1824 54%	1391 42%	102 49%	183 40%	135 50%	183 44%	160 38%	151 28%	222 63%	225 56%	685 51%	649 42%
I use them frequently	173 22%	419 16%	592 18%	424 13%	31 15%	47 10%	46 17%	61 15%	39 9%	38 7%	67 19%	55 14%	236 18%	223 14%
I use them, but not frequently	347 45%	885 34%	1232 37%	967 29%	71 34%	136 30%	89 33%	122 29%	121 29%	113 21%	155 44%	170 42%	449 33%	426 28%
NEVER USES THEM (NET)	249 32%	1270 49%	1519 45%	1958 58%	103 50%	277 60%	133 49%	232 56%	256 61%	383 72%	130 37%	176 44%	648 48%	890 58%
I have heard of them but never used them	142 18%	875 34%	1017 30%	1298 39%	63 30%	145 32%	96 36%	148 36%	165 39%	220 41%	91 26%	131 33%	460 34%	654 42%
I have never heard of them or used them	107 14%	395 15%	502 15%	660 20%	40 19%	132 29%	37 14%	84 20%	91 22%	163 31%	39 11%	45 11%	188 14%	236 15%
Not Sure	-	14 1%	14 *	-	2 1%	-	1 *	-	3 1%	-	-	-	8 1%	-
Sigma	769 100%	2588 100%	3357 100%	3349 100%	207 100%	460 100%	269 100%	415 100%	419 100%	534 100%	352 100%	401 100%	1341 100%	1539 100%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Base: Have Not Used URL Shorteners

Q1010. Why haven't you used URL shorteners?

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2016 Asia			
					2016 North America	2016 South America	2016 Europe	2016 Asia						
					(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)			(F)	(G)	(H)
Unweighted Base	249	1270	1519	1958	103	277	133	232	256	383	130	176	648	890
Never needed to	125 50% D	585 46% D	710 47% D	826 42% L	40 39%	123 44%	66 50%	97 42%	127 50%	165 43%	63 48% L	62 35%	289 45%	379 43%
I have never heard of them	82 33% DM	311 24% M	393 26% DM	423 22% N	40 39%	87 31% DHLN	34 26%	51 22%	67 26%	96 25% N	31 24%	31 18%	139 21%	158 18%
Confused about which website I'm going to	54 22%	307 24% EI	361 24% EI	601 31% ABC FJ	16 16%	64 23%	28 21%	66 28% J	47 18%	82 21%	34 26%	63 36% FJ	182 28% EIBEICEI	326 37% MDFHJ
Don't trust them	31 12%	135 11%	166 11%	253 13% H	11 11%	31 11%	9 7%	19 8%	29 11%	53 14% H	16 12%	24 14%	70 11%	126 14% H
Don't like them	28 11% EK	105 8% EK	133 9% EK	214 11% BCF	3 3%	17 6%	10 8%	29 13% F	22 9% KKK	39 10%	3 2%	16 9% K	67 10% EKBEKEK	113 13% DF
Other	12 5% DIKM	14 1%	26 2% M	29 1% N	3 3% MMM	5 2%	3 2%	4 2%	3 1%	6 2%	1 1%	6 3% DN	4 1%	8 1%
Not Sure	-	6 * D	6 * D	-	2 2% FAIBICI	-	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-	3 * N	-
Sigma	332 133%	1463 115%	1795 118%	2346 120%	115 112%	327 118%	151 114%	266 115%	295 115%	441 115%	148 114%	202 115%	754 116%	1110 125%
Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N Overlap formulae used.														

Base: Have Used URL Shorteners

Q1015. Why do you use URL shorteners?

16 Aug 2016
Table 321

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	520	1304	1824	1391	102	183	135	183	160	151	222	225	685	649
They are convenient	359 69% DG	848 65% G	1207 66% G	891 64% H	66 65% GGG	112 61% H	68 50% GGG	93 51% GGG	108 68% GGG	94 62% H	148 67% GGG	132 59% GGG	458 67% GGG	460 71% DFHJL
They save me time	185 36% DI	759 58% DI	944 52% DI	752 54% AF	52 51% A	84 46% A	77 57% A	95 52% A	81 51% A	88 58% F	130 59% AC	112 50% AC	419 61% AIBICI	373 57% DFL
It's the latest thing	49 9% EGIK	355 27% EGIK	404 22% E	409 29% ACFJ	10 10% ACFJ	21 11% DHJLN	26 19% AEEEE	72 39% GDFJL	31 19% AEEEE	25 17% AEEEE	48 22% AEEEE	55 24% F	240 35% AEGDKBEGKCEGR	236 36% DFJL
Other	117 23% DEGIKM	59 5% M	176 10% DGM	85 6% N	13 13% GMBGMGM	32 17% DHJLN	5 4% AEEEE	9 5% GDFJL	10 6% MMMM	8 5% AEEEE	15 7% MMMM	14 6% AEEEE	16 2% AEEEE	22 3% AEEEE
Not Sure	-	3 *	3 *	-	-	-	-	-	1 1%	-	1 *	-	1 *	-
Decline to Answer	-	1 *	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 *	-
Sigma	710 137%	2025 155%	2735 150%	2137 154%	141 138%	249 136%	176 130%	269 147%	231 144%	215 142%	342 154%	313 139%	1135 166%	1091 168%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Base: All Qualified Respondents

Q1020. What is your experience with QR codes?

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
USE THEM (NET)	519 67%	1396 54%	1915 57%	1838 55%	106 51%	212 46%	124 46%	214 52%	191 46%	249 47%	151 43%	209 52%	824 61%	954 62%
I use them frequently	74 10%	426 16%	500 15%	476 14%	17 8%	32 7%	35 13%	45 11%	37 9%	45 8%	22 6%	20 5%	315 23%	334 22%
I use them, but not frequently	445 58%	970 37%	1415 42%	1362 41%	89 43%	180 39%	89 33%	169 41%	154 37%	204 38%	129 37%	189 47%	509 38%	620 40%
NEVER USES THEM (NET)	250 33%	1181 46%	1431 43%	1511 45%	100 48%	248 54%	144 54%	201 48%	226 54%	285 53%	201 57%	192 48%	510 38%	585 38%
I have heard of them but never used them	195 25%	822 32%	1017 30%	1263 38%	78 38%	218 47%	89 33%	185 45%	170 41%	242 45%	118 34%	166 41%	367 27%	452 29%
I have never heard of them or used them	55 7%	359 14%	414 12%	248 7%	22 11%	30 7%	55 20%	16 4%	56 13%	43 8%	83 24%	26 6%	143 11%	133 9%
Not Sure	-	11 *	11 *	-	1 *	-	1 *	-	2 *	-	-	-	7 1%	-
Sigma	769 100%	2588 100%	3357 100%	3349 100%	207 100%	460 100%	269 100%	415 100%	419 100%	534 100%	352 100%	401 100%	1341 100%	1539 100%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Base: Have Not Used QR Codes

Q1025. Why haven't you used QR codes?

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	250	1181	1431	1511	100	248	144	201	226	285	201	192	510	585
Never needed to	148 59%	658 56%	806 56%	969 64% BCN	51 51%	165 67% EN	78 54%	147 73% GDN	140 62% MBMM	189 66% N	115 57%	133 69% KN	274 54%	335 57%
Don't like them	56 22% DEGIK	145 12% IK	201 14% GIK	231 15% B	12 12%	41 17%	11 8%	22 11%	18 8%	47 16%	14 7%	26 14% K	90 18% GKGBGKCGIK	95 16%
I have never heard of them or seen them	43 17%	279 24% DI	322 23% DI	217 14% FJ	25 25% F	17 7% HAIMIMCIM	42 29%	21 10%	39 17% J	27 9% LAIMBIMCIM	65 32%	23 12%	108 21%	129 22% DFHJL
Don't trust them	17 7%	143 12% K	160 11%	180 12% AFHL	9 9%	20 8%	12 8%	12 6%	28 12% A	44 15% DFHL	15 7%	13 7% AGKBGKCGK	79 15% N	91 16% DFHL
Other	39 16% DGIKM	42 4% M	81 6% M	83 5% BN	10 10% KMBKMKM	35 14% DHJLN	8 6% MMM	11 5%	11 5% MMM	10 4%	6 3%	11 6% N	7 1%	16 3%
Not Sure	-	4 * D	4 * D	-	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3 1%	-
Decline to Answer	-	1 *	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	-	-
Sigma	303 121%	1272 108%	1575 110%	1680 111%	108 108%	278 112%	151 105%	213 106%	237 105%	317 111%	215 107%	206 107%	561 110%	666 114%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Base: Have Used QR Codes

Q1030. Why do you use QR codes?

16 Aug 2016
Table 324

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	519	1396	1915	1838	106	212	124	214	191	249	151	209	824	954
They are convenient	325 63% G	933 67% EGK	1258 66% EGK	1173 64% FHL	58 55%	113 53%	61 49%	97 45% EGEGEG	128 67% FHL	171 69%	88 58%	108 52% AEGKBEGKCEGK	598 73%	684 72% DFHL
They save me time	223 43%	770 55%	993 52%	1028 56% ACFJ	52 49%	103 49%	70 56% A	128 60% FJ	94 49%	123 49%	94 62% LAEIEICEI	107 51%	460 56% AC	567 59% DFJL
It's the latest thing	123 24%	523 37% EI	646 34% EI	662 36% AFJ	25 24%	51 24%	43 35% A	88 41% FJ	50 26%	62 25%	55 36% AEIEIEI	74 35% FJ	350 42% AEIBEICEI	387 41% DFJ
Other	75 14% DGIKM	50 4% M	125 7% DIM	60 3% N	14 13% IKMBIKMCIKM	19 9% DHJN	9 7% MBMM	6 3%	5 3%	10 4% N	5 3%	9 4% N	17 2%	16 2%
Not Sure	-	2 *	2 *	-	-	-	-	-	1 1%	-	-	-	1 *	-
Sigma	746 144%	2278 163%	3024 158%	2923 159%	149 141%	286 135%	183 148%	319 149%	278 146%	366 147%	242 160%	298 143%	1426 173%	1654 173%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Base: All Qualified Respondents

Q1050. What is your preferred way of finding websites now?

16 Aug 2016
Table 325

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
Use a search engine	564 73%	1412 55%	1976 59%	1977 59%	119 57%	311 68%	146 54%	229 55%	259 62%	332 62%	200 57%	270 67%	688 51%	835 54%
Type the domain name directly into my browser and see if it comes up	162 21%	602 23%	764 23%	730 22%	50 24%	96 21%	73 27%	117 28%	92 22%	104 19%	92 26%	85 21%	295 22%	328 21%
Use an app instead of going to websites themselves	27 4%	335 13%	362 11%	279 8%	20 10%	30 7%	29 11%	39 9%	38 9%	45 8%	35 10%	26 6%	213 16%	139 9%
Use a QR code	7 1%	217 8%	224 7%	356 11%	13 6%	20 4%	20 7%	29 7%	30 7%	53 10%	21 6%	20 5%	133 10%	234 15%
Other	9 1%	16 1%	25 1%	7 *	5 2%	3 1%	-	1 *	-	-	4 1%	-	7 1%	3 *
Not Sure	-	6 *	6 *	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	5 *	-
Sigma	769 100%	2588 100%	3357 100%	3349 100%	207 100%	460 100%	269 100%	415 100%	419 100%	534 100%	352 100%	401 100%	1341 100%	1539 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q1036_1. Which of these is the safest, which is the fastest, and which is the easiest way to navigate to a website that may have the information you are looking for?

16 Aug 2016
Table 326

1. Safest

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
Using an app instead of going to the website itself-for example, an app provided by an airline or a bank	35 5%	335 13%	370 11%	647 19% ABC	18 9% A	79 17% E	29 11% A	80 19% G	53 13% A	95 18% I	39 11% A	92 23% KF	196 15% AEBECE	301 20% M
Accessing via a QR code	46 6%	366 14% E	412 12%	489 15% ACFJ	19 9%	36 8%	33 12% A	74 18% DFJ	50 12% A	59 11%	40 11% A	78 19% KDFJ	224 17% AEIKBEIKCEIK	242 16% FJ
Typing the domain name into a browser	431 56% DEGIKM	793 31% DM	1224 36% DM	892 27% FMBMM	83 40% FMBMM	138 30% HMMM	94 35% HMMM	104 25% JMMM	137 33% JMMM	135 25% LIMBIMIM	141 40% LIMBIMIM	113 28% KDFJ	338 25% AEIKBEIKCEIK	402 26% FJ
Finding via an Internet search engine	155 20%	679 26% DI	834 25% D	603 18% ABCL	58 28% FA	83 18% EL	70 26% HA	75 18% L	91 22% AEKEKEK	113 21% DL	97 28% LA	59 15% K	363 27% NAIICI	273 18% L
Accessing via a bookmark	60 8%	278 11% EK	338 10%	431 13% ABCL	13 6%	54 12% EL	33 12% AEKEKEK	56 13% L	43 10% L	75 14% L	26 7%	31 8% AEKBEKCEK	163 12% AEKBEKCEK	215 14% L
Not sure	42 5% K	137 5% KM	179 5% KM	287 9% ABCN	16 8% KMKMKM	70 15% EDHJLN	10 4%	26 6% AGKMBGKMGCKM	45 11% AGKMBGKMGCKM	57 11% HN	9 3%	28 7% K	57 4%	106 7% M
Sigma	769 100%	2588 100%	3357 100%	3349 100%	207 100%	460 100%	269 100%	415 100%	419 100%	534 100%	352 100%	401 100%	1341 100%	1539 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q1036_2. Which of these is the safest, which is the fastest, and which is the easiest way to navigate to a website that may have the information you are looking for?

16 Aug 2016
Table 327

2. Fastest

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
					(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	..	..	..	3349	..	460	..	415	..	534	..	401	..	1539
Using an app instead of going to the website itself-for example, an app provided by an airline or a bank	-	-	-	502 15%	-	62 13%	-	78 19% DFJN	-	75 14%	-	66 16%	-	221 14%
Accessing via a QR code	-	-	-	733 22% FL	-	77 17%	-	91 22% L	-	106 20% L	-	59 15%	-	400 26% DFJL
Typing the domain name into a browser	-	-	-	509 15%	-	70 15%	-	66 16%	-	79 15%	-	72 18%	-	222 14%
Finding via an Internet search engine	-	-	-	672 20% N	-	89 19%	-	84 20%	-	118 22% N	-	101 25% DFN	-	280 18%
Accessing via a bookmark	-	-	-	742 22%	-	115 25% H	-	77 19%	-	115 22%	-	92 23%	-	343 22%
Not sure	-	-	-	191 6% LN	-	47 10% DHLN	-	19 5%	-	41 8% DLN	-	11 3%	-	73 5%
Sigma	-	-	-	3349 100%	-	460 100%	-	415 100%	-	534 100%	-	401 100%	-	1539 100%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q1036_3. Which of these is the safest, which is the fastest, and which is the easiest way to navigate to a website that may have the information you are looking for?

16 Aug 2016
Table 328

3. Easiest

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	..	..	..	3349	..	460	..	415	..	534	..	401	..	1539
Using an app instead of going to the website itself-for example, an app provided by an airline or a bank	-	-	-	481 14%	-	77 17%	-	58 14%	-	72 13%	-	71 18% DN	-	203 13%
Accessing via a QR code	-	-	-	552 16% FH	-	60 13%	-	47 11%	-	74 14%	-	55 14%	-	316 21% DFHJL
Typing the domain name into a browser	-	-	-	508 15% F	-	48 10%	-	82 20% DFN	-	88 16% F	-	64 16% F	-	226 15% F
Finding via an Internet search engine	-	-	-	968 29% N	-	144 31%	-	124 30%	-	164 31%	-	119 30%	-	417 27%
Accessing via a bookmark	-	-	-	670 20%	-	98 21%	-	83 20%	-	95 18%	-	81 20%	-	313 20%
Not sure	-	-	-	170 5% LN	-	33 7% DLN	-	21 5%	-	41 8% DLN	-	11 3%	-	64 4%
Sigma	-	-	-	3349 100%	-	460 100%	-	415 100%	-	534 100%	-	401 100%	-	1539 100%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q1055_1. Which of these are the fastest, easiest and safest way to get to the website you want to buy from?

16 Aug 2016
Table 329

1. Safest

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
					(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	-**	-**	-**	3349	-**	460	-**	415	-**	534	-**	401	-**	1539
Using an app instead of going to a website-for example, an app provided by an airline or a bank	-	-	-	771 23% J	-	94 20% J	-	109 26% FJ	-	80 15%	-	125 31% DFJN	-	363 24% J
Accessing via a QR code	-	-	-	448 13% FJ	-	41 9%	-	61 15% FJ	-	53 10%	-	60 15% FJ	-	233 15% DFJ
Typing the domain name into a browser	-	-	-	864 26%	-	123 27%	-	110 27%	-	164 31% DLN	-	93 23%	-	374 24%
Finding via an Internet search engine	-	-	-	541 16%	-	72 16%	-	65 16%	-	96 18%	-	61 15%	-	247 16%
Accessing via a bookmark	-	-	-	430 13% L	-	59 13%	-	45 11%	-	78 15% L	-	37 9%	-	211 14% L
Not sure	-	-	-	295 9% HLN	-	71 15% DHLN	-	25 6%	-	63 12% DHLN	-	25 6%	-	111 7%
Sigma	-	-	-	3349 100%	-	460 100%	-	415 100%	-	534 100%	-	401 100%	-	1539 100%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q1055_2. Which of these are the fastest, easiest and safest way to get to the website you want to buy from?

16 Aug 2016
Table 330

2. Fastest

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)	
Unweighted Base	-**	-**	-**	3349	-**	460	-**	415	-**	534	-**	401	-**	1539
Using an app instead of going to a website-for example, an app provided by an airline or a bank	-	-	-	555 17% N	-	78 17%	-	75 18%	-	80 15%	-	92 23% DFJN	-	230 15%
Accessing via a QR code	-	-	-	677 20% FHJL	-	62 13%	-	68 16%	-	85 16%	-	58 14%	-	404 26% DFHJL
Typing the domain name into a browser	-	-	-	538 16% N	-	73 16%	-	76 18% N	-	96 18% N	-	77 19% N	-	216 14%
Finding via an Internet search engine	-	-	-	672 20% N	-	92 20%	-	97 23% N	-	113 21%	-	89 22%	-	281 18%
Accessing via a bookmark	-	-	-	718 21%	-	110 24% HL	-	76 18%	-	104 19%	-	71 18%	-	357 23% DHL
Not sure	-	-	-	189 6% LN	-	45 10% DHLN	-	23 6% N	-	56 10% DHLN	-	14 3%	-	51 3%
Sigma	-	-	-	3349 100%	-	460 100%	-	415 100%	-	534 100%	-	401 100%	-	1539 100%
Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing														

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q1055_3. Which of these are the fastest, easiest and safest way to get to the website you want to buy from?

16 Aug 2016
Table 331

3. Easiest

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
					(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)	
Unweighted Base	..	..	..	3349	..	460	..	415	..	534	..	401	..	1539
Using an app instead of going to a website-for example, an app provided by an airline or a bank	-	-	-	533 16%	-	71 15%	-	60 14%	-	74 14%	-	84 21% DFHJN	-	244 16%
Accessing via a QR code	-	-	-	529 16% FHJ	-	52 11%	-	49 12%	-	69 13%	-	60 15%	-	299 19% DFHJL
Typing the domain name into a browser	-	-	-	546 16%	-	73 16%	-	87 21% DJN	-	73 14%	-	76 19% J	-	237 15%
Finding via an Internet search engine	-	-	-	907 27%	-	122 27%	-	112 27%	-	153 29%	-	114 28%	-	406 26%
Accessing via a bookmark	-	-	-	628 19% L	-	95 21% L	-	80 19% L	-	106 20% L	-	55 14%	-	292 19% L
Not sure	-	-	-	206 6% LN	-	47 10% DHLN	-	27 7% LN	-	59 11% DHLN	-	12 3%	-	61 4%
Sigma	-	-	-	3349 100%	-	460 100%	-	415 100%	-	534 100%	-	401 100%	-	1539 100%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q1060_1. Which of these is the safest, which is the easiest, and which is the fastest method to get to the website to access your personal information?

16 Aug 2016
Table 332

1. Safest

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	-**	-**	-**	3349	-**	460	-**	415	-**	534	-**	401	-**	1539
Using an app provided by the website owner-for example, an app provided by an airline or a bank	- -	- -	- -	886 26% JN	- -	130 28% J	- -	144 35% DFJN	- -	98 18%	- -	148 37% DFJN	- -	366 24% J
Accessing via a QR code	- -	- -	- -	442 13% FJ	- -	40 9%	- -	54 13% F	- -	52 10%	- -	53 13% F	- -	243 16% DFJ
Typing the domain name into a browser	- -	- -	- -	770 23%	- -	98 21%	- -	93 22%	- -	148 28% DFLN	- -	82 20%	- -	349 23%
Finding via an Internet search engine	- -	- -	- -	462 14% F	- -	45 10%	- -	47 11%	- -	84 16% F	- -	49 12%	- -	237 15% DFH
Accessing via a bookmark	- -	- -	- -	497 15% L	- -	85 18% DHL	- -	50 12%	- -	81 15%	- -	44 11%	- -	237 15% L
Not sure	- -	- -	- -	292 9% N	- -	62 13% DHLN	- -	27 7%	- -	71 13% DHLN	- -	25 6%	- -	107 7%
Sigma	- -	- -	- -	3349 100%	- -	460 100%	- -	415 100%	- -	534 100%	- -	401 100%	- -	1539 100%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q1060_2. Which of these is the safest, which is the easiest, and which is the fastest method to get to the website to access your personal information?

16 Aug 2016
Table 333

2. Fastest

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
					(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	..**	..**	..**	3349	..**	460	..**	415	..**	534	..**	401	..**	1539
Using an app provided by the website owner-for example, an app provided by an airline or a bank	-	-	-	578 17%	-	84 18%	-	72 17%	-	96 18%	-	81 20% N	-	245 16%
Accessing via a QR code	-	-	-	618 18% FHJL	-	40 9%	-	60 14% F	-	82 15% F	-	59 15% F	-	377 24% DFHJL
Typing the domain name into a browser	-	-	-	572 17% N	-	78 17%	-	89 21% DN	-	89 17%	-	82 20% N	-	234 15%
Finding via an Internet search engine	-	-	-	591 18% N	-	70 15%	-	86 21% FN	-	105 20%	-	82 20% FN	-	248 16%
Accessing via a bookmark	-	-	-	772 23% HJ	-	142 31% DHJLN	-	79 19%	-	105 20%	-	80 20%	-	366 24% H
Not sure	-	-	-	218 7% LN	-	46 10% DLN	-	29 7% N	-	57 11% DLN	-	17 4%	-	69 4%
Sigma	-	-	-	3349 100%	-	460 100%	-	415 100%	-	534 100%	-	401 100%	-	1539 100%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q1060_3. Which of these is the safest, which is the easiest, and which is the fastest method to get to the website to access your personal information?

16 Aug 2016
Table 334

3. Easiest

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
					(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)	
Unweighted Base	-**	-**	-**	3349	-**	460	-**	415	-**	534	-**	401	-**	1539
Using an app provided by the website owner-for example, an app provided by an airline or a bank	-	-	-	587 18%	-	80 17%	-	75 18%	-	78 15%	-	90 22% DJN	-	264 17%
Accessing via a QR code	-	-	-	503 15% FHL	-	50 11%	-	43 10%	-	76 14% L	-	39 10%	-	295 19% DFHJL
Typing the domain name into a browser	-	-	-	561 17%	-	64 14%	-	83 20% F	-	81 15%	-	84 21% DFJN	-	249 16%
Finding via an Internet search engine	-	-	-	767 23% F	-	88 19%	-	95 23%	-	129 24%	-	102 25% F	-	353 23%
Accessing via a bookmark	-	-	-	673 20% L	-	126 27% DHJLN	-	85 20% L	-	101 19%	-	59 15%	-	302 20% L
Not sure	-	-	-	258 8% N	-	52 11% DLN	-	34 8% N	-	69 13% DHLN	-	27 7%	-	76 5%
Sigma	-	-	-	3349 100%	-	460 100%	-	415 100%	-	534 100%	-	401 100%	-	1539 100%
Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing														

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q1100a. How would you describe your familiarity with each of the following abusive internet behaviors?
SUMMARY TABLE OF TOP 2 BOX

16 Aug 2016
Table 335

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	..	..	..	3349	..	460	..	415	..	534	..	401	..	1539
Phishing - The attempt to acquire sensitive information such as usernames, passwords, and credit card details by masquerading as a trustworthy entity in electronic communication.	-	-	-	1561 47% HJ	-	235 51% DHJ	-	143 34%	-	219 41% H	-	216 54% DHJ	-	748 49% DHJ
Spamming - The use of electronic messaging systems to send unsolicited messages.	-	-	-	2066 62% JN	-	316 69% DJN	-	265 64% J	-	286 54%	-	286 71% DHJN	-	913 59% J
Cyber squatting - Registering or using a domain name with bad faith intent to profit from the goodwill of a trademark belonging to someone else.	-	-	-	1087 32% HJ	-	133 29% H	-	90 22%	-	133 25%	-	135 34% HJ	-	596 39% DFHJ
Stolen credentials - When hackers steal personal information stored online such as usernames, passwords, social security numbers, credit cards numbers, etc.	-	-	-	1515 45% J	-	214 47% J	-	171 41%	-	207 39%	-	202 50% DHJ	-	721 47% HJ
Malware - Short for "malicious software", used to disrupt computer operations, gather sensitive information or gain access to private computer systems.	-	-	-	1764 53% J	-	266 58% DJN	-	220 53% J	-	232 43%	-	238 59% DJN	-	808 53% J

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q1100a. How would you describe your familiarity with each of the following abusive internet behaviors?

16 Aug 2016
Table 336

SUMMARY TABLE OF BOTTOM 2 BOX

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	..	..	..	3349	..	460	..	415	..	534	..	401	..	1539
Phishing - The attempt to acquire sensitive information such as usernames, passwords, and credit card details by masquerading as a trustworthy entity in electronic communication.	-	-	-	705 21% FN	-	78 17%	-	150 36% DFJLN	-	129 24% FLN	-	74 18%	-	274 18%
Spamming - The use of electronic messaging systems to send unsolicited messages.	-	-	-	423 13% FL	-	37 8%	-	68 16% DFL	-	87 16% DFL	-	32 8%	-	199 13% FL
Cyber squatting - Registering or using a domain name with bad faith intent to profit from the goodwill of a trademark belonging to someone else.	-	-	-	1194 36% N	-	174 38% N	-	214 52% DFJLN	-	231 43% DLN	-	137 34% N	-	438 28%
Stolen credentials - When hackers steal personal information stored online such as usernames, passwords, social security numbers, credit cards numbers, etc.	-	-	-	641 19% N	-	78 17%	-	104 25% DFLN	-	118 22% FN	-	76 19%	-	265 17%
Malware - Short for "malicious software", used to disrupt computer operations, gather sensitive information or gain access to private computer systems.	-	-	-	545 16% F	-	43 9%	-	79 19% F	-	107 20% DF	-	64 16% F	-	252 16% F

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q1100a_1. How would you describe your familiarity with each of the following abusive internet behaviors?

1. Phishing - The attempt to acquire sensitive information such as usernames, passwords, and credit card details by masquerading as a trustworthy entity in electronic communication.

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
					(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)	
Unweighted Base	-**	-**	-**	3349	-**	460	-**	415	-**	534	-**	401	-**	1539
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	1561	-	235	-	143	-	219	-	216	-	748
	-	-	-	47% HJ	-	51% DHJ	-	34% H	-	41% H	-	54% DHJ	-	49% DHJ
Extremely familiar	-	-	-	577	-	95	-	59	-	85	-	75	-	263
	-	-	-	17% DH	-	21% DH	-	14% H	-	16% H	-	19% DHJ	-	17% DHJ
Very familiar	-	-	-	984	-	140	-	84	-	134	-	141	-	485
	-	-	-	29% HJ	-	30% H	-	20% H	-	25% DHJ	-	35% DHJ	-	32% DHJ
Somewhat familiar	-	-	-	1083	-	147	-	122	-	186	-	111	-	517
	-	-	-	32% L	-	32% L	-	29% L	-	35% L	-	28% L	-	34% L
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	705	-	78	-	150	-	129	-	74	-	274
	-	-	-	21% FN	-	17% FN	-	36% DFJLN	-	24% FLN	-	18% FLN	-	18% FLN
Just know the name	-	-	-	461	-	59	-	89	-	98	-	40	-	175
	-	-	-	14% LN	-	13% LN	-	21% DFLN	-	18% DFLN	-	10% F	-	11% F
Never heard of	-	-	-	244	-	19	-	61	-	31	-	34	-	99
	-	-	-	7% F	-	4% F	-	15% DFJLN	-	6% F	-	8% F	-	6% F
Sigma	-	-	-	3349	-	460	-	415	-	534	-	401	-	1539
	-	-	-	100%	-	100%	-	100%	-	100%	-	100%	-	100%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q1100a_2. How would you describe your familiarity with each of the following abusive internet behaviors?
2. Spamming - The use of electronic messaging systems to send unsolicited messages.

16 Aug 2016
Table 338

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
					(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	-**	-**	-**	3349	-**	460	-**	415	-**	534	-**	401	-**	1539
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	2066	-	316	-	265	-	286	-	286	-	913
	-	-	-	62% JN	-	69% DJN	-	64% J	-	54% J	-	71% DHJN	-	59% J
Extremely familiar	-	-	-	922	-	149	-	122	-	129	-	137	-	385
	-	-	-	28% N	-	32% DJN	-	29% J	-	24% J	-	34% DJN	-	25% J
Very familiar	-	-	-	1144	-	167	-	143	-	157	-	149	-	528
	-	-	-	34% J	-	36% J	-	34% J	-	29% J	-	37% J	-	34% J
Somewhat familiar	-	-	-	860	-	107	-	82	-	161	-	83	-	427
	-	-	-	26% HL	-	23% J	-	20% J	-	30% DFHL	-	21% J	-	28% DHL
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	423	-	37	-	68	-	87	-	32	-	199
	-	-	-	13% FL	-	8% J	-	16% DFL	-	16% DFL	-	8% J	-	13% FL
Just know the name	-	-	-	280	-	28	-	49	-	56	-	22	-	125
	-	-	-	8% L	-	6% J	-	12% DFLN	-	10% FL	-	5% J	-	8% J
Never heard of	-	-	-	143	-	9	-	19	-	31	-	10	-	74
	-	-	-	4% F	-	2% J	-	5% F	-	6% FL	-	2% J	-	5% FL
Sigma	-	-	-	3349	-	460	-	415	-	534	-	401	-	1539
	-	-	-	100%	-	100%	-	100%	-	100%	-	100%	-	100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q1100a_3. How would you describe your familiarity with each of the following abusive internet behaviors?

3. Cyber squatting - Registering or using a domain name with bad faith intent to profit from the goodwill of a trademark belonging to someone else.

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
					(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)	
Unweighted Base	..	..	..	3349	..	460	..	415	..	534	..	401	..	1539
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	1087	-	133	-	90	-	133	-	135	-	596
				32% HJ		29% H		22%		25%		34% HJ		39% DFHJ
Extremely familiar	-	-	-	371	-	42	-	37	-	46	-	49	-	197
				11% J		9%		9%		9%		12%		13% DFHJ
Very familiar	-	-	-	716	-	91	-	53	-	87	-	86	-	399
				21% HJ		20% H		13%		16%		21% HJ		26% DFHJ
Somewhat familiar	-	-	-	1068	-	153	-	111	-	170	-	129	-	505
				32% H		33% H		27%		32%		32%		33% H
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	1194	-	174	-	214	-	231	-	137	-	438
				36% N		38% N		52% DFJLN		43% DLN		34% N		28%
Just know the name	-	-	-	606	-	79	-	90	-	113	-	73	-	251
				18% N		17%		22% DN		21% DN		18%		16%
Never heard of	-	-	-	588	-	95	-	124	-	118	-	64	-	187
				18% N		21% N		30% DFJLN		22% DLN		16% N		12%
Sigma	-	-	-	3349	-	460	-	415	-	534	-	401	-	1539
				100%		100%		100%		100%		100%		100%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q1100a_4. How would you describe your familiarity with each of the following abusive internet behaviors?

4. Stolen credentials - When hackers steal personal information stored online such as usernames, passwords, social security numbers, credit cards numbers, etc.

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	-**	-**	-**	3349	-**	460	-**	415	-**	534	-**	401	-**	1539
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	1515	-	214	-	171	-	207	-	202	-	721
	-	-	-	45% J	-	47% J	-	41% 41%	-	39% 39%	-	50% DHJ	-	47% HJ
Extremely familiar	-	-	-	519	-	87	-	69	-	68	-	60	-	235
	-	-	-	15%	-	19% DJ	-	17% 17%	-	13% 13%	-	15% 15%	-	15% 15%
Very familiar	-	-	-	996	-	127	-	102	-	139	-	142	-	486
	-	-	-	30% HJ	-	28% 28%	-	25% 25%	-	26% 26%	-	35% DFHJ	-	32% DHJ
Somewhat familiar	-	-	-	1193	-	168	-	140	-	209	-	123	-	553
	-	-	-	36% L	-	37% 37%	-	34% 34%	-	39% 39%	-	31% 31%	-	36% L
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	641	-	78	-	104	-	118	-	76	-	265
	-	-	-	19% N	-	17% 17%	-	25% DFLN	-	22% FN	-	19% 19%	-	17% 17%
Just know the name	-	-	-	466	-	64	-	73	-	92	-	46	-	191
	-	-	-	14% N	-	14% 14%	-	18% DLN	-	17% DLN	-	11% 11%	-	12% 12%
Never heard of	-	-	-	175	-	14	-	31	-	26	-	30	-	74
	-	-	-	5% F	-	3% 3%	-	7% DFN	-	5% 5%	-	7% DFN	-	5% 5%
Sigma	-	-	-	3349	-	460	-	415	-	534	-	401	-	1539
	-	-	-	100%	-	100%	-	100%	-	100%	-	100%	-	100%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q1100a_5. How would you describe your familiarity with each of the following abusive internet behaviors?

16 Aug 2016
Table 341

5. Malware - Short for "malicious software", used to disrupt computer operations, gather sensitive information or gain access to private computer systems.

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
					(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)
Unweighted Base	-**	-**	-**	3349	-**	460	-**	415	-**	534	-**	401	-**	1539
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	1764	-	266	-	220	-	232	-	238	-	808
	-	-	-	53% J	-	58% DJN	-	53% J	-	43%	-	59% DJN	-	53% J
Extremely familiar	-	-	-	712	-	120	-	101	-	86	-	87	-	318
	-	-	-	21% J	-	26% DJN	-	24% J	-	16%	-	22% J	-	21% J
Very familiar	-	-	-	1052	-	146	-	119	-	146	-	151	-	490
	-	-	-	31% J	-	32% DJN	-	29% J	-	27%	-	38% DHJN	-	32% J
Somewhat familiar	-	-	-	1040	-	151	-	116	-	195	-	99	-	479
	-	-	-	31% L	-	33% L	-	28% DHLN	-	37% DHLN	-	25% F	-	31% L
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	-	-	-	545	-	43	-	79	-	107	-	64	-	252
	-	-	-	16% F	-	9% F	-	19% F	-	20% DF	-	16% F	-	16% F
Just know the name	-	-	-	370	-	29	-	48	-	74	-	42	-	177
	-	-	-	11% F	-	6% F	-	12% F	-	14% DF	-	10% F	-	12% F
Never heard of	-	-	-	175	-	14	-	31	-	33	-	22	-	75
	-	-	-	5% F	-	3% F	-	7% DFN	-	6% F	-	5% F	-	5% F
Sigma	-	-	-	3349	-	460	-	415	-	534	-	401	-	1539
	-	-	-	100%	-	100%	-	100%	-	100%	-	100%	-	100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q1105. What do you think are the source(s) for each type of abusive Internet behavior?
SUMMARY TABLE OF ORGANIZED GROUPS

Base: Familiar With Abusive Internet Behavior (Variable Bases)

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Phishing	486 68% DGK	1088 62% GK	1574 64% GK	1651 62% HL	107 66% GK GKGKGK	251 66% HL	74 48% GK	144 54% GK BGKCGK	202 70% HL	258 64% HL	126 47% GK	173 53% GK BGKKGK	579 65% GK	825 65% DHL
Spamming	526 72% DGKM	1178 61% GK	1704 64% GK	1809 62% HL	123 68% GK GKGKGK	275 65% HL	98 48% GK	185 53% GK BGKKGK	215 67% HL	290 65% HL	150 50% GK	194 53% GK BGKKGK	592 64% GK	865 65% DHL
Cyber squatting	366 63% DGK	797 64% DGK	1163 64% DGK	1246 58% L	77 67% GK GKGKGK	165 58% HL	51 50% GK	106 53% JAGK BGKCGK	129 71% GK	163 54% HL	110 54% GK	132 50% NGK BGKCGK	430 68% GK	680 62% DHJL
Stolen credentials	474 70% DGK	1121 66% DGK	1595 67% DGK	1659 61% HL	114 72% FGK GKGKGK	240 63% HL	94 58% GK	168 54% JGK BGKKGK	212 71% L	253 61% L	136 52% GK	167 51% GK BGKKGK	565 69% GK	831 65% DHL
Malware	524 72% DGK	1240 68% DGK	1764 69% DGK	1737 62% HL	133 74% FGK BGKKGK	266 64% HL	110 55% GK	176 52% JGK BGKKGK	229 73% GK	268 63% HL	164 60% GK	179 53% NGK BGKKGK	604 70% GK	848 66% DHL

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

SUMMARY TABLE OF INDIVIDUALS

Base: Familiar With Abusive Internet Behavior (Variable Bases)

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
					(E)		(G)		(I)		(K)		(M)	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)		(F)		(H)		(J)		(L)		(N)
Phishing	433 60% D	1085 82% DK	1518 61% DK	1410 53% L	115 71% FAIKBIKCIK	220 58% L	104 68% HIKIKIK	135 51% L	165 57% L	220 54% L	146 55% L	141 43% L	555 63% NKKK	694 55% L
Spamming	432 59% D	1171 61% DK	1603 60% DK	1614 55% L	126 69% AIKBIKCIK	264 62% DJL	130 63% III	199 57% JL	174 54% L	221 49% L	167 55% L	177 48% L	574 62% NIKIKIK	753 56% JL
Cyber squatting	373 64% DK	717 58% DK	1090 60% DK	1131 52% L	79 69% KBKCK	172 60% DHJL	66 64% HKKK	95 47% L	107 59% JKKK	150 50% L	88 43% L	123 47% L	377 59% NKKK	591 54% L
Stolen credentials	411 61% DK	1002 59% DK	1413 59% DK	1460 54% L	111 70% AGHMBIGMOCFMM	236 62% DHJL	94 58% L	167 54% L	176 59% L	226 54% L	138 53% L	145 45% N	483 59% N	686 54% L
Malware	418 57% DK	1036 57% DK	1454 57% DK	1497 53% L	121 68% AGHMBIGMOCFMM	251 60% DJL	111 56% KKK	182 54% L	184 58% KKK	224 52% L	127 46% L	146 43% L	493 57% KKK	694 54% L

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q1105_1. What do you think are the source(s) for each type of abusive Internet behavior?
1. Phishing

Base: Familiar With Abusive Internet Behavior

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	717	1756	2473	2644	163	382	154	265	287	405	267	327	885	1265
ORGANIZED GROUPS (NET)	486 68%	1088 62% GK	1574 64% GK	1651 62% HL	107 66% GK	251 66% HL	74 48%	144 54%	202 70% GK	258 64% HL	126 47%	173 53%	579 65% GK	825 65% DHL
Organized groups from outside my country	441 62%	875 50% DGK	1316 53% DGK	1202 45% HL	92 56% GK	204 53% DHL	53 34%	97 37%	176 61% GK	200 49% HL	105 39%	128 39%	449 51% GK	573 45% HL
Organized groups from within my country	337 47% GK	770 44% GK	1107 45% GK	1190 45% HL	81 50% GK	192 50% DHL	53 34%	100 38%	157 55% GK	186 46% HL	68 25%	99 30%	411 46% GK	613 48% DHL
INDIVIDUALS (NET)	433 60% D	1085 62% DK	1518 61% DK	1410 53% L	115 71% FAIKBIKCIK	220 58% L	104 68% HIKIKIK	135 51%	165 57% GK	220 54% L	146 55% L	141 43%	555 63% NKKK	694 55% L
Individuals from outside my country	378 53% DKM	844 48% DK	1222 49% DKM	1102 42% L	101 62% FAIKMBIKMKCIK	188 49% DHLN	73 47% H	96 36%	147 51% KKK	186 46% HL	112 42% L	99 30%	411 46% N	533 42% L
Individuals from my country	323 45% DK	786 45% DK	1109 45% DK	960 36% L	91 56% FAIKMBIKMKCIK	166 43% DLN	73 47% HKKK	96 36% L	128 45% JKKK	149 37% L	94 35% L	87 27%	400 45% NKKK	462 37% L
Don't know	93 13% M	205 12% M	298 12% M	365 14% BN	15 9% GK	54 14% N	17 11%	41 15% N	38 13% MMM	68 17% N	54 20% AEGIMBEGIMCEGIM	71 22% DFN	81 9% GK	131 10% GK
Not Sure	-	2 *	2 *	-	-	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	1 *	-
Sigma	1572 219%	3482 198%	5054 204%	4819 182%	380 233%	804 210%	269 175%	430 162%	647 225%	789 195%	433 162%	484 148%	1753 198%	2312 183%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q1105_2. What do you think are the source(s) for each type of abusive Internet behavior?
2. Spamming

Base: Familiar With Abusive Internet Behavior

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
					(A)		(B)		(C)		(D)		(E)	
Unweighted Base	733	1931	2664	2926	182	423	205	347	322	447	303	369	919	1340
ORGANIZED GROUPS (NET)	526 72% DGKM	1178 61% GK	1704 64% GK	1809 62% HL	123 68% GK	275 65% HL	98 48% GK	185 53% GK	215 67% GK	290 65% HL	150 50% HL	194 53% GK	592 64% GK	865 65% DHL
Organized groups from outside my country	447 61% DGKM	887 46% GK	1334 50% DGKM	1267 43% H	104 57% GK	213 50% DHLN	69 34% GK	126 36% GK	179 56% GK	206 46% H	117 39% H	152 41% GK	418 45% GK	570 43% H
Organized groups from within my country	412 56% DGKM	902 47% GK	1314 49% DGK	1349 46% HL	104 57% GK	214 51% DHL	75 37% GK	134 39% L	183 57% GK	233 52% DHL	87 29% H	110 30% GK	453 49% GK	658 49% DHL
INDIVIDUALS (NET)	432 59% D	1171 61% DI	1603 60% DI	1614 55% JL	126 69% AI	264 62% DJLN	130 63% III	199 57% JL	174 54% JL	221 49% H	167 55% H	177 48% H	574 62% NI	753 56% JL
Individuals from outside my country	364 50% DGK	890 46% DGK	1254 47% DGK	1211 41% L	103 57% GK	210 50% DHJLN	80 39% GK	140 40% GK	144 45% GK	174 39% H	124 41% H	127 34% NG	439 48% GK	560 42% L
Individuals from my country	369 50% DKM	858 44% DK	1227 46% DKM	1142 39% L	104 57% GK	203 48% DJLN	106 52% HK	149 43% JL	145 45% JL	160 36% GK	110 36% GK	112 30% GK	393 43% K	518 39% L
Don't know	92 13% M	211 11% M	303 11% M	374 13% N	16 9% G	51 12% G	27 13% MMM	49 14% N	50 16% EMB	72 16% DN	47 16% EMB	68 18% DFN	71 8% G	134 10% G
Not Sure	-	3 + D	3	-	-	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	2 *	-
Sigma	1684 230%	3751 194%	5435 204%	5343 183%	431 237%	891 211%	357 174%	598 172%	702 218%	845 189%	485 160%	569 154%	1776 193%	2440 182%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q1105_3. What do you think are the source(s) for each type of abusive Internet behavior?

16 Aug 2016
Table 346

3. Cyber squatting

Base: Familiar With Abusive Internet Behavior

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	581	1239	1820	2155	115	286	103	201	181	303	204	264	636	1101
ORGANIZED GROUPS (NET)	366 63%	797 64%	1163 64%	1246 58%	77 67%	165 58%	51 50%	106 53%	129 71%	163 54%	110 54%	132 50%	430 68%	680 62%
Organized groups from outside my country	DGK 56%	DGK 49%	DGK 51%	L 38%	GKGGK 59%	L 43%	JAGKBGKCGK 38%	JAGKBGKCGK 36%	JAGKBGKCGK 60%	JAGKBGKCGK 38%	JAGKBGKCGK 45%	JAGKBGKCGK 34%	NGKBGKCGK 47%	DHJL 38%
Organized groups from within my country	DGKM 47%	DGK 47%	DGK 47%	HL 41%	GKGGK 52%	HL 44%	HL 35%	HL 33%	HL 59%	HL 39%	HL 30%	HL 30%	HL 50%	DHL 45%
INDIVIDUALS (NET)	373 64%	717 58%	1090 60%	1131 52%	79 69%	172 60%	66 64%	95 47%	107 59%	150 50%	88 43%	123 47%	377 59%	591 54%
Individuals from outside my country	DK 53%	DK 47%	DK 49%	L 40%	KBKCK 60%	DHJL 47%	HKKK 54%	HKKK 34%	JKKK 52%	JKKK 42%	JKKK 33%	JKKK 35%	NKKK 47%	L 39%
Individuals from my country	DGKM 51%	DK 40%	DKM 43%	DKM 34%	FGKMBGKMGK 57%	DHJL 43%	DHJL 35%	DHJL 29%	JKBKK 47%	JKBKK 31%	JKBKK 27%	JKBKK 25%	KKK 39%	HL 36%
Don't know	78 13%	141 11%	219 12%	333 15%	9 8%	49 17%	9 9%	39 19%	26 14%	64 21%	44 22%	50 19%	53 8%	131 12%
Not Sure	-	1 *	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-
Sigma	1281 220%	2400 194%	3681 202%	3639 169%	272 237%	555 194%	176 171%	304 151%	421 233%	518 171%	320 157%	379 144%	1211 190%	1883 171%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q1105_4. What do you think are the source(s) for each type of abusive Internet behavior?

16 Aug 2016
Table 347

4. Stolen credentials

Base: Familiar With Abusive Internet Behavior

	2015 Total Registrants			Region											
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia	
					(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)
Unweighted Base	679	1700	2379	2708	159	382	162	311	298	416	262	325	819	1274	
ORGANIZED GROUPS (NET)	474 70%	1121 66%	1595 67%	1659 61%	114 72%	240 63%	94 58%	168 54%	212 71%	253 61%	136 52%	167 51%	565 69%	831 65%	
Organized groups from outside my country	DGK 63%	DGK 50%	DGK 54%	HL 43%	FGKGGKGGK 62%	HL 52%	JGKBGGKGGK 38%	JGKBGGKGGK 34%	L 60%	DHLN 48%	L 40%	GKKBGGKGGK 35%	GKKBGGKGGK 50%	DHL 42%	
Organized groups from within my country	426 63%	855 50%	1281 54%	1158 43%	99 62%	198 52%	62 38%	106 34%	179 60%	201 48%	104 40%	114 35%	411 50%	539 42%	
INDIVIDUALS (NET)	348 51%	853 50%	1201 50%	1225 45%	93 58%	175 46%	73 45%	130 42%	178 60%	184 44%	86 33%	101 31%	423 52%	635 50%	
Individuals from outside my country	DK 61%	DK 59%	DK 59%	L 54%	FGKBBGGKGGK 70%	L 62%	KKK 58%	L 54%	JGKBGGKGGK 59%	L 54%	L 53%	L 45%	KKK 59%	DHJL 54%	
Individuals from my country	411 61%	1002 59%	1413 59%	1460 54%	111 70%	236 62%	94 58%	167 54%	176 59%	226 54%	138 53%	145 45%	483 59%	686 54%	
Don't know	351 52%	801 47%	1152 48%	1107 41%	97 61%	195 51%	62 38%	110 35%	153 51%	189 45%	96 37%	112 34%	393 48%	501 39%	
Not Sure	DGK 51%	DGK 44%	DGK 46%	HL 38%	FAGKBBGGKGGK 60%	DHLN 47%	DHLN 46%	GKKBGGKGGK 39%	GKKBGGKGGK 50%	DHLN 39%	DHLN 40%	NGKKBGGKGGK 25%	NGKKBGGKGGK 40%	L 37%	
	92 14%	175 10%	267 11%	371 14%	14 9%	52 14%	22 14%	44 14%	37 12%	74 18%	42 16%	68 21%	60 7%	133 10%	
	M	M	M	BCN			MMM		MMM	DN	EMBEMCEM	DFHN		M	
	-	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	
	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	
Sigma	1560 230%	3441 202%	5001 210%	4884 180%	399 251%	801 210%	294 181%	510 164%	698 234%	811 195%	432 165%	477 147%	1618 198%	2285 179%	

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q1105_5. What do you think are the source(s) for each type of abusive Internet behavior?

16 Aug 2016
Table 348

5. Malware

Base: Familiar With Abusive Internet Behavior

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	727	1831	2558	2804	179	417	200	336	315	427	274	337	863	1287
ORGANIZED GROUPS (NET)	524 72% DGK	1240 68% DGK	1764 69% DGK	1737 62% HL	133 74% FGKBGKGGK	266 64% HL	110 55% JGKBGKGGK	176 52% JGKBGKGGK	229 73% HL	268 63% HL	164 60% NGKBGKGGK	179 53% NGKBGKGGK	604 70% DHL	848 66% DHL
Organized groups from outside my country	491 68% DGKM	996 54% DG	1487 58% DGM	1315 47% H	116 65% FGKMBGKMGKM	226 54% DHLN	86 43% JGKM	138 41% JGKM	199 63% JGKM	219 51% DHN	145 53% LGGG	151 45% LGGG	450 52% NGGG	581 45% NGGG
Organized groups from within my country	358 49% DGK	882 48% DGK	1240 48% DGK	1168 42% HL	97 54% FGKGGKGGK	183 44% HL	82 41% HKKK	103 31% JGKM	189 60% JGKM	190 44% HL	69 25% GKBGKCGK	83 25% GKBGKCGK	445 52% DHL	609 47% DHL
INDIVIDUALS (NET)	418 57% DK	1036 57% DK	1454 57% DK	1497 53% L	121 68% AGKMBGKMGKM	251 60% DJLN	111 56% KKK	182 54% L	184 58% KKK	224 52% L	127 46% L	146 43% L	493 57% KKK	694 54% L
Individuals from outside my country	379 52% DGKM	872 48% DK	1251 49% DK	1215 43% L	115 64% FAGKMBGKMGKM	224 54% DHLN	85 43% JGKM	134 40% GKGGKGGK	164 52% L	196 46% L	104 38% L	124 37% L	404 47% NKKK	537 42% NKKK
Individuals from my country	328 45% DK	752 41% DK	1080 42% DK	962 34% L	92 51% FGKMBGKMGKM	173 41% DLN	78 39% KKK	123 37% L	152 48% JGKM	154 36% L	82 30% L	60 18% L	348 40% NKKK	452 35% L
Don't know	97 13% M	229 13% M	326 13% M	399 14% N	16 9% A	58 14% N	36 18% EMBEMCEM	65 19% DFN	43 14% DFN	73 17% N	49 18% EMBEMCEM	73 22% DFN	85 10% DFN	130 10% DFN
Not Sure	- -	4 * D	4 * D	- -	1 % A	- -	- -	- -	1 *	- -	- -	- -	2 *	- -
Sigma	1653 227%	3735 204%	5388 211%	5059 180%	437 244%	864 207%	367 184%	563 168%	748 237%	832 195%	449 164%	491 146%	1734 201%	2309 179%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q1115. How common do you feel each type of abusive Internet behavior is?

16 Aug 2016
Table 349

SUMMARY TABLE OF TOP 2 BOX

Base: Familiar With Abusive Internet Behavior (Variable Bases)

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Phishing	640 89% DM	1521 87%	2161 87% D	2245 85% HJ	149 91%	352 92% DHJLN	130 84% H	197 74%	253 88% J	327 81%	228 85%	284 87% HJ	761 86%	1085 86% HJ
Spamming	701 96% DIM	1781 92% D	2482 93% DM	2647 90% J	174 96%	401 95% DJLN	191 93%	317 91% J	295 92% J	383 86%	282 93%	332 90%	839 91%	1214 91% J
Cyber squatting	437 75%	954 77% I	1391 76% I	1626 75% J	88 77%	215 75% J	80 78%	147 73% J	127 70%	196 65%	160 78%	206 78% J	499 78% III	862 78% DJ
Stolen credentials	552 81%	1402 82% I	1954 82% I	2174 80% HJ	137 86% GIGIGI	335 88% DHJN	125 77%	236 76%	231 78%	307 74%	228 87% AGIBGICGI	269 83% HJ	681 83% III	1027 81% J
Malware	672 92% D	1664 91% D	2336 91% D	2461 88% J	168 94%	383 92% DHJ	181 91%	286 85%	281 89% J	356 83%	254 93% L	296 88%	780 90%	1140 89% J

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q1115. How common do you feel each type of abusive Internet behavior is?

SUMMARY TABLE OF BOTTOM 2 BOX

Base: Familiar With Abusive Internet Behavior (Variable Bases)

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Phishing	54 8%	184 10% E	238 10% E	273 10% AF	7 4%	18 5%	19 12% EEE	50 19% DFJLN	24 8%	47 12% F	30 11% EEE	28 9% F	104 12% AEECE	130 10% F
Spamming	13 2%	102 5% E	115 4%	167 6% ACF	3 2%	8 2%	7 3%	15 4% F	12 4%	32 7% IF	15 5% A	26 7% F	65 7% AEIBEICEI	86 6% F
Cyber squatting	110 19%	225 18%	335 18%	364 17%	15 13%	45 16%	17 17%	38 19%	41 23% EEE	63 21% N	35 17%	42 16%	117 18%	176 16%
Stolen credentials	99 15%	240 14%	339 14%	401 15% F	15 9%	31 8%	29 18% EKEKEK	56 18% F	54 18% EKBKCEK	73 18% F	28 11%	41 13% F	114 14%	200 16% F
Malware	30 4%	104 6% E	134 5%	210 7% ABC	4 2%	22 5%	11 6%	25 7%	22 7% EEE	41 10% F	12 4%	27 8%	55 6% AEEE	95 7%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q1115_1. How common do you feel each type of abusive Internet behavior is?

16 Aug 2016
Table 351

1. Phishing

Base: Familiar With Abusive Internet Behavior

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	717	1756	2473	2644	163	382	154	265	287	405	267	327	885	1265
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	640 89% DM	1521 87% HJ	2161 87% D	2245 85% HJ	149 91% DHJLN	352 92% H	130 84% H	197 74% H	253 88% J	327 81% J	228 85% HJ	284 87% HJ	761 86% HJ	1085 86% HJ
Very common	432 60% DGM	914 52% M	1346 54% DM	1313 50% HN	110 67% GKMBGKMGKMGK	254 66% DHJN	78 51% H	111 42% H	159 55% JMMM	188 46% J	145 54% HJ	195 60% DHJN	422 48% HJ	565 45% HJ
Somewhat common	208 29% E	607 35% E	815 33% E	932 35% AFL	39 24% AFL	98 26% HJ	52 34% HJ	86 32% HJ	94 33% EEE	139 34% FL	83 31% FL	89 27% AEKBEKCEK	339 38% DFHJL	520 41% DFHJL
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	54 8% E	184 10% E	238 10% E	273 10% AF	7 4% AF	18 5% AF	19 12% EEE	50 19% DFJLN	24 8% HJ	47 12% F	30 11% EEE	28 9% F	104 12% AEECE	130 10% F
Not very common	45 6% E	148 8% E	193 8% F	223 8% F	7 4% F	17 4% F	14 9% DFJLN	40 15% DFJLN	19 7% F	35 9% F	23 9% F	22 7% F	85 10% AEECE	109 9% F
Not at all common	9 1% F	36 2% F	45 2% F	50 2% F	- F	1 * F	5 3% EEE	10 4% DFN	5 2% F	12 3% F	7 3% EEE	6 2% F	19 2% F	21 2% F
Don't know	23 3% BC	48 3% BC	71 3% BC	126 5% BC	6 4% A	12 3% A	5 3% A	18 7% FN	10 3% IDFN	31 8% IDFN	9 3% IDFN	15 5% IDFN	18 2% IDFN	50 4% M
Not Sure	- D	3 * D	3 * D	- D	1 1% A	- A	- A	- A	- A	- A	- A	- A	2 * A	- A
Sigma	717 100%	1756 100%	2473 100%	2644 100%	163 100%	382 100%	154 100%	265 100%	287 100%	405 100%	267 100%	327 100%	885 100%	1265 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q1115_2. How common do you feel each type of abusive Internet behavior is?

16 Aug 2016
Table 352

2. Spamming

Base: Familiar With Abusive Internet Behavior

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	733	1931	2664	2926	182	423	205	347	322	447	303	369	919	1340
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	701 96% DIM	1781 92% D	2482 93% DM	2647 90% J	174 96% J	401 95% DJLN	191 93% J	317 91% J	295 92% J	383 86% J	282 93% J	332 90% J	839 91% J	1214 91% J
Very common	647 88% DGIKM	1448 75% DM	2095 79% DM	2064 71% JN	157 86% IMBIMCIM	343 81% DJN	167 81% MBMM	266 77% DJN	241 75% JMMM	286 64% LIMBIMCIM	253 83% J	285 77% DJN	630 69% J	884 66% J
Somewhat common	54 7% EGK	333 17% EGK	387 15% EK	583 20% ABCFHL	17 9% J	58 14% DJN	24 12% A	51 15% AEKEKEK	54 17% FHL	97 22% FHL	29 10% J	47 13% J	209 23% AEIGIBEGICEGK	330 25% DFHL
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	13 2% E	102 5% E	115 4% ACF	167 6% ACF	3 2% J	8 2% J	7 3% J	15 4% F	12 4% J	32 7% IF	15 5% A	26 7% F	65 7% AEIBEICEI	86 6% F
Not very common	10 1% E	82 4% E	92 3% AF	117 4% AF	2 1% J	7 2% J	4 2% J	10 3% J	8 2% J	21 5% F	13 4% A	21 6% F	55 6% AEGIBEGICEGI	58 4% F
Not at all common	3 * F	20 1% F	23 1% ACF	50 2% ACF	1 1% J	1 * J	3 1% J	5 1% J	4 1% J	11 2% F	2 1% J	5 1% J	10 1% J	28 2% F
Don't know	19 3% M	45 2% M	64 2% M	112 4% BCN	4 2% J	14 3% J	7 3% J	15 4% MBMCM	14 4% J	32 7% DFLN	6 2% J	11 3% J	14 2% J	40 3% M
Not Sure	- D	3 * D	3 * J	- J	1 1% A	- J	- J	- J	1 * J	- J	- J	- J	1 * J	- J
Sigma	733 100%	1931 100%	2664 100%	2926 100%	182 100%	423 100%	205 100%	347 100%	322 100%	447 100%	303 100%	369 100%	919 100%	1340 100%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q1115_3. How common do you feel each type of abusive Internet behavior is?

16 Aug 2016
Table 353

3. Cyber squatting

Base: Familiar With Abusive Internet Behavior

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	581	1239	1820	2155	115	286	103	201	181	303	204	264	636	1101
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	437 75%	954 77% I	1391 76% I	1626 75% J	88 77%	215 75% J	80 78%	147 73% J	127 70%	196 65%	160 78%	206 78% J	499 78% III	862 78% DJ
Very common	228 39% D	457 37%	685 38% D	737 34% J	35 30%	110 38% J	45 44% EEE	66 33%	58 32%	88 29%	90 44% EIMBEIMCEIM	117 44% DHJN	229 36%	356 32%
Somewhat common	209 36%	497 40%	706 39%	889 41% AJL	53 46% AKKK	105 37%	35 34%	81 40%	69 38%	108 36%	70 34%	89 34%	270 42% AKKCK	506 46% DFJL
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	110 19%	225 18%	335 18%	364 17%	15 13%	45 16%	17 17%	38 19%	41 23% EEE	63 21% N	35 17%	42 16%	117 18%	176 16%
Not very common	96 17%	199 16%	295 16%	316 15%	12 10%	43 15%	13 13%	30 15%	37 20% EEE	51 17%	30 15%	36 14%	107 17%	156 14%
Not at all common	14 2%	26 2%	40 2%	48 2%	3 3%	2 1%	4 4%	8 4% F	4 2%	12 4% DFN	5 2%	6 2%	10 2%	20 2%
Don't know	34 6% M	58 5% M	92 5% M	165 8% BCN	11 10% MBMCM	26 9% N	6 6%	16 8%	13 7% MMM	44 15% IDFHNLN	9 4%	16 6%	19 3%	63 6% M
Not Sure	-	2 *	2 *	-	1 1% AC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 *	-
Sigma	581 100%	1239 100%	1820 100%	2155 100%	115 100%	286 100%	103 100%	201 100%	181 100%	303 100%	204 100%	264 100%	636 100%	1101 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q1115_4. How common do you feel each type of abusive Internet behavior is?

16 Aug 2016
Table 354

4. Stolen credentials

Base: Familiar With Abusive Internet Behavior

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	679	1700	2379	2708	159	382	162	311	298	416	262	325	819	1274
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	552 81%	1402 82% I	1954 82% I	2174 80% HJ	137 86% GIGIGI	335 88% DHJN	125 77% GIGIGI	236 76% DHJN	231 78% GIGIGI	307 74% AGIBGICGI	228 87% AGIBGICGI	269 83% HJ	681 83% III	1027 81% J
Very common	339 50% DIM	765 45% DIM	1104 46% DIM	1108 41% JN	86 54% IMBIMCIM	186 49% DJN	81 50% IMIMIM	140 45% JN	114 38% JN	143 34% LAIMBIMCIM	154 59% LAIMBIMCIM	163 50% DJN	330 40% DJN	476 37% DJN
Somewhat common	213 31% GK	637 37% GK	850 36% GK	1066 39% ACHL	51 32% ACHL	149 39% H	44 27% H	96 31% AGKGKKGK	117 39% AGKGKKGK	164 39% H	74 28% H	106 33% AEGKBQKCEGK	351 43% AEGKBQKCEGK	551 43% DHL
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	99 15%	240 14%	339 14%	401 15% F	15 9% F	31 8% EKEKEK	29 18% EKEKEK	56 18% F	54 18% EKEKEK	73 18% F	28 11% F	41 13% F	114 14% F	200 16% F
Not very common	91 13% K	206 12% K	297 12% K	342 13% F	13 8% F	29 8% F	21 13% F	44 14% F	48 16% EKEKEK	63 15% F	21 8% F	36 11% F	103 13% KKK	170 13% F
Not at all common	8 1% M	34 2% M	42 2% M	59 2% F	2 1% F	2 1% AMBMCIM	8 5% AMBMCIM	12 4% DF	6 2% DF	10 2% F	7 3% F	5 2% F	11 1% F	30 2% F
Don't know	28 4%	55 3%	83 3%	133 5% BCN	6 4% BCN	16 4% BCN	8 5% BCN	19 6% IDFLN	12 4% IDFLN	36 9% IDFLN	6 2% IDFLN	15 5% IDFLN	23 3% IDFLN	47 4% IDFLN
Not Sure	- -	3 * D	3 * D	- -	1 1% A	- -	- -	- -	1 * D	- -	- -	- -	1 * D	- -
Sigma	679 100%	1700 100%	2379 100%	2708 100%	159 100%	382 100%	162 100%	311 100%	298 100%	416 100%	262 100%	325 100%	819 100%	1274 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q1115_5. How common do you feel each type of abusive Internet behavior is?

16 Aug 2016
Table 355

5. Malware

Base: Familiar With Abusive Internet Behavior

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
					(E)		(G)		(I)		(K)		(M)	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	727	1831	2558	2804	179	417	200	336	315	427	274	337	863	1287
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	672 92% D	1664 91% D	2336 91% D	2461 88% J	168 94%	383 92% DHJ	181 91%	286 85%	281 89% J	356 83%	254 93% L	296 88%	780 90%	1140 89% J
Very common	558 77% DGIM	1179 64% DIM	1737 68% DIM	1623 58% JN	133 74% IMBIMIM	281 67% DJN	139 70% IMIMIM	211 63% JN	184 58% J	217 51% LIMBIMCIM	205 75% L	216 64% DJN	518 60% N	698 54%
Somewhat common	114 16%	485 26% EK	599 23% K	838 30% ABC	35 20%	102 24%	42 21%	75 22%	97 31% AEGKEGCEGK	139 33% FHL	49 18%	80 24%	262 30% AEGKBEGKCEGK	442 34% DFHL
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	30 4%	104 6% E	134 5%	210 7% ABC	4 2%	22 5%	11 6%	25 7%	22 7% EEE	41 10% F	12 4%	27 8%	55 6% AEEE	95 7%
Not very common	23 3%	73 4%	96 4%	152 5% ABC	3 2%	21 5%	6 3%	11 3%	16 5%	29 7% H	8 3%	23 7% KH	40 5%	68 5%
Not at all common	7 1%	31 2%	38 1%	58 2% AF	1 1%	1 *	5 3%	14 4% DFLN	6 2%	12 3% F	4 1%	4 1%	15 2%	27 2% F
Don't know	25 3%	57 3%	82 3%	133 5% BCF	5 3%	12 3%	8 4%	25 7% DFN	11 3%	30 7% IDFN	8 3%	14 4%	25 3%	52 4%
Not Sure	- -	6 * D	6 * D	- -	2 1% FAC	- -	- -	- -	1 * -	- -	- -	- -	3 * N	- -
Sigma	727 100%	1831 100%	2558 100%	2804 100%	179 100%	417 100%	200 100%	336 100%	315 100%	427 100%	274 100%	337 100%	863 100%	1287 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q1120. Have you ever been affected by any of these types of abusive Internet behaviors?
SUMMARY TABLE OF YES

Base: Familiar With Abusive Internet Behavior (Variable Bases)

	2015 Total Registrants				Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia	
					(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)
Phishing	313 44% DIKM	645 37% I	958 39% I	974 37% HJ	58 36% EDHJLN	173 45% HIKBIKIK	71 46% HIKBIKIK	77 29% HIKBIKIK	81 28% HIKBIKIK	128 32% HIKBIKIK	96 36% HIKBIKIK	109 33% HIKBIKIK	339 38% III	487 38% HJ	
Spamming	630 86% DIKM	1456 75% DIKM	2086 78% DIKM	2145 73% N	153 84% IKMBIKMCIKM	339 80% DJLN	168 82% IKMBIKMIKM	298 86% DFJLN	233 72% DFJLN	314 70% DFJLN	223 74% DFJLN	272 74% DFJLN	679 74% N	922 69% N	
Cyber squatting	162 28% DIK	322 26% DI	484 27% DIK	491 23% JL	23 20% III	53 19% HIKBIKIK	32 31% HIKBIKIK	38 19% HIKBIKIK	20 11% I	54 18% I	42 21% III	44 17% NEIKBEIKCEIK	205 32% DFHJL	302 27% DFHJL	
Stolen credentials	160 24% I	402 24% I	562 24% I	616 23% HJ	33 21% HJ	89 23% HJ	43 27% HIII	39 13% HJ	44 15% HJ	61 15% HJ	57 22% III	62 19% H	225 27% IBICI	365 29% DFHJL	
Malware	546 75% DIKM	1168 64% DI	1714 67% DIM	1688 60% J	130 73% IMBIMIM	285 68% DJLN	148 74% IMBIMCIM	228 68% DJLN	172 55% DJLN	214 50% DJLN	182 66% LIII	194 58% J	536 62% III	767 60% J	

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

1. Phishing

Base: Familiar With Abusive Internet Behavior

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
					(E)		(G)		(I)		(K)		(M)	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	717	1756	2473	2644	163	382	154	265	287	405	267	327	885	1265
Yes	313 44% DIKM	645 37% I	958 39% I	974 37% HJ	58 36% EDHJLN	173 45% I	71 46% HIKBIKIK	77 29% I	81 28% I	128 32% I	96 36% I	109 33% I	339 38% III	487 38% HJ
No	337 47%	920 52%	1257 51%	1378 52% AF	89 55% F	169 44%	72 47%	145 55% F	175 61% AGKMBGCMGCM	228 56% F	133 50%	178 54% F	451 51%	658 52% F
Not sure	67 9%	191 11%	258 10%	292 11% N	16 10%	40 10%	11 7%	43 16% GDFN	31 11%	49 12% AGGCG	38 14%	40 12%	95 11%	120 9%
Sigma	717 100%	1756 100%	2473 100%	2644 100%	163 100%	382 100%	154 100%	265 100%	287 100%	405 100%	267 100%	327 100%	885 100%	1265 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

2. Spamming

Base: Familiar With Abusive Internet Behavior

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
					(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)
Unweighted Base	733	1931	2664	2926	182	423	205	347	322	447	303	369	919	1340
Yes	630 86% DIKM	1456 75% DIKM	2086 78% DIKM	2145 73% N	153 84% IKMBIKMICIKM	339 80% DJLN	168 82% IKMBIKMICIKM	298 86% DFJLN	233 72% AEECE	314 70% FH	223 74% A	272 74% FH	679 74% N	922 69% MDFH
No	76 10%	373 19% E	449 17%	613 21% ACFH	22 12% H	66 16% H	32 16% HA	34 10% AEECE	72 22% AEECE	98 22% FH	56 18% A	82 22% FH	191 21% AEECE	333 25% MDFH
Not sure	27 4%	102 5% G	129 5%	168 6% A	7 4%	18 4%	5 2%	15 4%	17 5%	35 8% DFHL	24 8% LAGBGGC	15 4%	49 5%	85 6%
Sigma	733 100%	1931 100%	2664 100%	2926 100%	182 100%	423 100%	205 100%	347 100%	322 100%	447 100%	303 100%	369 100%	919 100%	1340 100%
Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N Overlap formulae used.														

Q1120_3. Have you ever been affected by any of these types of abusive Internet behaviors?
3. Cyber squatting

Base: Familiar With Abusive Internet Behavior

	2015 Total Registrants				Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia	
					(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)
Unweighted Base	581	1239	1820	2155	115	286	103	201	181	303	204	264	636	1101	
Yes	162 28% DIK	322 26% DI	484 27% DIK	491 23% JL	23 20% III	53 19% HIKIKIK	32 31% HIKIKIK	38 19% HIKIKIK	20 11% I	54 18% I	42 21% III	44 17% NEIKBEIKCEIK	205 32% DFHJL	302 27% DFHJL	
No	350 60% M	764 62% M	1114 61% M	1369 64% N	80 70% GMGMGM	187 65% GMGMGM	56 54% GMGMGM	121 60% AGKMBGKACGKM	137 76% AGKMBGKACGKM	207 68% N	133 65% MMM	189 72% DHN	358 56% DHN	665 60% DHN	
Not sure	69 12% N	153 12% N	222 12% N	295 14% N	12 10% N	46 16% N	15 15% N	42 21% DJLN	24 13% DJLN	42 14% DJLN	29 14% DJLN	31 12% DJLN	73 11% DJLN	134 12% DJLN	
Sigma	581 100%	1239 100%	1820 100%	2155 100%	115 100%	286 100%	103 100%	201 100%	181 100%	303 100%	204 100%	264 100%	636 100%	1101 100%	
Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N Overlap formulae used.															

4. Stolen credentials

Base: Familiar With Abusive Internet Behavior

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
					(E)		(G)		(I)		(K)		(M)	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	679	1700	2379	2708	159	382	162	311	298	416	262	325	819	1274
Yes	160 24% I	402 24% I	562 24% I	616 23% HJ	33 21%	89 23% HJ	43 27% HII	39 13%	44 15%	61 15%	57 22% III	62 19% H	225 27% IB/CI	365 29% DFHJL
No	440 65% M	1097 65% M	1537 65% M	1780 66% N	112 70% MMM	264 69% N	100 62%	228 73% GDN	224 75%	301 72% DN	175 67% MMM	236 73% DN	486 59%	751 59%
Not sure	79 12%	201 12%	280 12%	312 12% F	14 9%	29 8%	19 12%	44 14% FL	30 10%	54 13% FL	30 11%	27 8%	108 13%	158 12% FL
Sigma	679 100%	1700 100%	2379 100%	2708 100%	159 100%	382 100%	162 100%	311 100%	298 100%	416 100%	262 100%	325 100%	819 100%	1274 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

5. Malware

Base: Familiar With Abusive Internet Behavior

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
					(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	727	1831	2558	2804	179	417	200	336	315	427	274	337	863	1287
Yes	546 75% DIKM	1168 64% DI	1714 67% DIM	1688 60% J	130 73% IMBIMIM	285 68% DJLN	148 74% IMBIMCMI	228 68% DJLN	172 55% J	214 50% J	182 66% LIII	194 58% J	536 62% III	767 60% J
No	135 19% GK	505 28% GK	640 25% G	886 32% ABCDFH	41 23% N	107 26% J	34 17% J	72 21% J	117 37% J	167 39% DFHLN	60 22% KH	106 31% KH	253 29% AGKGCCKG	434 34% MDFH
Not sure	46 6% E	158 9% E	204 8% J	230 8% N	8 4% J	25 6% J	18 9% J	36 11% FN	26 8% J	46 11% DFN	32 12% AEECE	37 11% FN	74 9% J	86 7% J
Sigma	727 100%	1831 100%	2558 100%	2804 100%	179 100%	417 100%	200 100%	336 100%	315 100%	427 100%	274 100%	337 100%	863 100%	1287 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q1125. How scared are you of each of the following?
SUMMARY TABLE OF TOP 2 BOX

Base: Familiar With Abusive Internet Behavior (Variable Bases)

	2015 Total Registrants				Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia	
					(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)
Phishing	377 53%	1341 76% DEK	1718 69%	1943 73% ACFJ	104 64% A	213 56%	123 80% AEKEKCEK	213 80% DFJ	207 72% A	268 66% F	186 70% A	242 74% FJ	721 81% AEIKBEIKCEIK	1007 80% DFJL	
Spamming	240 33%	1163 60% DEGI	1403 53% E	1624 56% ACFHJL	78 43% A	179 42%	107 52% A	167 48%	174 54% AE	223 50% F	175 58% LAE	185 50% F	629 68% AEIGKBEGIKCEIG	870 65% DFHJL	
Cyber squatting	244 42%	844 68% E	1088 60% E	1423 66% ACF	52 45%	140 49%	78 76% AEIEICEI	157 78% DFJLN	113 62% AE	187 62% F	145 71% AECE	177 67% F	456 72% AEIBEICEI	762 69% DFJ	
Stolen credentials	500 74%	1425 84% I	1925 81%	2224 82% A	125 79%	301 79%	142 88% AEIEICEI	264 85% F	236 79%	334 80%	211 81% A	265 82% NAEIKBEIKCEIK	711 87% A	1060 83% F	
Malware	482 66%	1490 81% DG	1972 77%	2201 78% AF	138 77% A	306 73%	152 76% A	263 78%	246 78% A	327 77%	212 77% A	267 79% NAEIGKBEGIKCEIG	742 86% A	1038 81% DF	

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q1125. How scared are you of each of the following?

16 Aug 2016
Table 363

SUMMARY TABLE OF BOTTOM 2 BOX

Base: Familiar With Abusive Internet Behavior (Variable Bases)

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
					(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)	
Phishing	340 47% DEGIKM	411 23% M	751 30% DGM	701 27% BHN	58 36% GMBGMGM	169 44% DHJLN	31 20% MMM	52 20% DHLN	79 28% GMBGMGM	137 34% GMBGMGM	81 30% N	85 26% N	162 18% N	258 20% N
Spamming	493 67% DEGIKM	763 40% M	1256 47% DM	1302 44% BN	103 57% IKMBIKMCKM	244 58% DHLN	98 48% MBMM	180 52% DN	146 45% MBMM	224 50% DN	128 42% MMM	184 50% KDN	288 31% N	470 35% N
Cyber squatting	337 58% DGIKM	392 32% M	729 40% DGKM	732 34% HN	62 54% GKMBGKMGCKM	146 51% DHJLN	25 24% GMBGMGM	44 22% GMBGMGM	67 37% HN	116 38% HN	59 29% N	87 33% H	179 28% N	339 31% H
Stolen credentials	179 26% DGIKM	271 16% M	450 19% GM	484 18% GMBGMGM	33 21% HN	81 21% HN	20 12% GMBGMGM	47 15% GMBGMGM	60 20% GMBGMGM	82 20% MMM	51 19% MMM	60 18% N	107 13% N	214 17% M
Malware	245 34% DEGIKM	338 18% M	583 23% M	603 22% BN	40 22% MMM	111 27% DN	48 24% MBMM	73 22% GMBGMGM	68 22% MMM	100 23% MMM	62 23% MMM	70 21% N	120 14% N	249 19% M

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q1125_1. How scared are you of each of the following?

1. Phishing

Base: Familiar With Abusive Internet Behavior

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	717	1756	2473	2644	163	382	154	265	287	405	267	327	885	1265
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	377 53%	1341 76% DEK	1718 69%	1943 73% ACFJ	104 64% A	213 56%	123 80% AEKEKCEK	213 80% DFJ	207 72% A	268 66% F	186 70% A	242 74% FJ AEIKBEIKCEIK	721 81%	1007 80% DFJL
Very scared	163 23%	598 34% M	761 31%	931 35% ACFJ	55 34% FA	89 23%	73 47% AEIKMBEIKCEIK	133 50% DFJLN	101 35% A	118 29%	88 33% A	113 35% F	281 32% A	478 38% MDFJ
Somewhat scared	214 30%	743 42% DEGIK	957 39% E	1012 38% AFH	49 30%	124 32%	50 32%	80 30%	106 37% A	150 37%	98 37% A	129 39% H	440 50% NAEIKBEIKCEIK	529 42% DFH
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	340 47% DEGIKM	411 23% M	751 30% DGM	701 27% BHN GMBGMGM	58 36% DHJLN	169 44%	31 20%	52 20%	79 28% MMM	137 34% DHLN GMBGMGM	81 30% N	85 26% N	162 18%	258 20%
Not very scared	198 28% DGIKM	281 16% M	479 19% M	521 20% BHN MBMM	36 22% EDHJLN	123 32%	23 15%	39 15%	51 18% IDHN	101 25% A	48 18%	62 19%	123 14%	196 15%
Not at all scared	142 20% DGIKM	130 7% M	272 11% DGM	180 7% N GMBGMGM	22 13% DHLN	46 12%	8 5%	13 5%	28 10% MMM	36 9% N LGMBGMGM	33 12%	23 7%	39 4%	62 5%
Not Sure	- -	4 * D	4 * D	- -	1 1% A	- -	- -	- -	1 * A	- -	- -	- -	2 * A	- -
Sigma	717 100%	1756 100%	2473 100%	2644 100%	163 100%	382 100%	154 100%	265 100%	287 100%	405 100%	267 100%	327 100%	885 100%	1265 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q1125_2. How scared are you of each of the following?

16 Aug 2016
Table 365

2. Spamming

Base: Familiar With Abusive Internet Behavior

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	733	1931	2664	2926	182	423	205	347	322	447	303	369	919	1340
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	240 33%	1163 60% DEGI	1403 53% E	1624 56% ACFHJL	78 43% A	179 42%	107 52% A	167 48%	174 54% AEEE	223 50% F	175 58% LAEEE	185 50% F	629 68% AEGKBEGKCEGK	870 65% DFHJL
Very scared	86 12%	427 22% E	513 19% E	600 21% AF	25 14%	62 15%	48 23% AEEE	61 18%	60 19% A	79 18% AEIEICEI	80 26% A	86 23% FJ	214 23% AEECE	312 23% DFHJ
Somewhat scared	154 21%	736 38% DEGK	890 33%	1024 35% AFL	53 29% A	117 28%	59 29% A	106 31%	114 35% A	144 32%	95 31% A	99 27% AEGKBEGKCEGK	415 45% A	558 42% DFHJL
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	493 67% DEGIKM	763 40% M	1256 47% DM	1302 44% BN	103 57% IKMBIKMCIKM	244 58% DJLN	98 48% MBMM	180 52% DN	146 45% MBMM	224 50% DN	128 42% MMM	184 50% KDN	288 31% A	470 35% A
Not very scared	237 32% IM	532 28% M	769 29% M	878 30% N	71 39% IKMBIKMCIKM	151 36% DN	62 30%	108 31%	84 26%	153 34% IDN	84 28%	116 31% N	231 25%	350 26%
Not at all scared	256 35% DEGIKM	231 12% M	487 18% DM	424 14% BN	32 18% MBMM	93 22% DJN	36 18% MBMM	72 21% DN	62 19% MBMM	71 16% N	44 15% MMM	68 18% DN	57 6% A	120 9% M
Not Sure	-	5 *	5 *	-	1 1% A	-	-	-	2 1% A	-	-	-	2 *	-
Sigma	733 100%	1931 100%	2664 100%	2926 100%	182 100%	423 100%	205 100%	347 100%	322 100%	447 100%	303 100%	369 100%	919 100%	1340 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q1125_3. How scared are you of each of the following?

16 Aug 2016
Table 366

3. Cyber squatting

Base: Familiar With Abusive Internet Behavior

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	581	1239	1820	2155	115	286	103	201	181	303	204	264	636	1101
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	244 42%	844 68% E	1088 60% E	1423 66% ACF	52 45%	140 49%	78 76% AEIEICEI	157 78% DFJLN	113 62% AEEEE	187 62% F	145 71% AEECE	177 67% F	456 72% F AEIBEICEI	762 69% DFJ
Very scared	93 16%	364 29% E	457 25% E	576 27% AF	22 19%	55 19%	47 46% AEIMBEIMCEIM	79 39% DFJLN	47 26% A	79 26% F	73 36% AEIMBEIMCEIM	78 30% F	175 28% A	285 26% F
Somewhat scared	151 26%	480 39% E	631 35% E	847 39% ACF	30 26%	85 30%	31 30%	78 39% F	66 36% A	108 36% A	72 35% A	99 38% AEGKBEGKCEGK	281 44% AEIGKBEGKCEGK	477 43% DFJ
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	337 58% DGIKM	392 32% M	729 40% DGIKM	732 34% HN	62 54% GKMBGKMGKGM	146 51% DHJLN	25 24%	44 22% GMGMGM	67 37% GMGMGM	116 38% HN	59 29%	87 33% H	179 28% H	339 31% H
Not very scared	181 31% DGIKM	266 21% K	447 25% KM	517 24% H	36 31% GKMBGKMGKGM	82 29% DH	20 19%	32 16% H	38 21% H	82 27% H	33 16% H	60 23% H	139 22% H	261 24% H
Not at all scared	156 27% DGIKM	126 10% M	282 15% DGM	215 10% HN	26 23% GKMBGKMGKGM	64 22% DHJLN	5 5%	12 6% GMBGMGM	29 16% GMGMGM	34 11% HN	26 13% GMGMGM	27 10% H	40 6% H	78 7% H
Not Sure	- -	3 * D	3 *	-	1 1% A	-	-	-	1 1%	-	-	-	1 *	-
Sigma	581 100%	1239 100%	1820 100%	2155 100%	115 100%	286 100%	103 100%	201 100%	181 100%	303 100%	204 100%	264 100%	636 100%	1101 100%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q1125_4. How scared are you of each of the following?

4. Stolen credentials

Base: Familiar With Abusive Internet Behavior

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	679	1700	2379	2708	159	382	162	311	298	416	262	325	819	1274
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	500 74%	1425 84% I	1925 81%	2224 82% A	125 79%	301 79%	142 88% AEIEICEI	264 85% F	236 79%	334 80%	211 81% A	265 82% NAEIKBEIKCEIK	711 87%	1060 83% F
Very scared	292 43%	867 51% D	1159 49%	1282 47% AFJ	82 52%	162 42%	96 59% AIMBIMCIM	188 60% DFJLN	140 47% J	161 39%	147 56% AIMIMCIM	171 53% DFJ	402 49% A	600 47% J
Somewhat scared	208 31%	558 33% K	766 32% K	942 35% AHL	43 27%	139 36% EHL	46 28% K	76 24%	96 32% KKK	173 42% IDHLN	64 24%	94 29% AEGKBEIKCEIK	309 38%	460 36% HL
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	179 26% DGIKM	271 16% M	450 19% GM	484 18% GMGMGM	33 21% HN	81 21% HN	20 12% GMBGMGM	47 15% GMBGMGM	60 20% MMM	82 20% MMM	51 19% MMM	60 18% MMM	107 13% MMM	214 17% M
Not very scared	110 16% GM	188 11% M	298 13% M	367 14% B	23 14% MMM	60 16% MMM	16 10% MMM	35 11% MMM	40 13% MMM	62 15% MMM	33 13% MMM	46 14% MMM	76 9% MMM	164 13% M
Not at all scared	69 10% DGM	83 5% M	152 6% DGM	117 4%	10 6%	21 5%	4 2%	12 4%	20 7% MMM	20 5% GMBGMGM	18 7% GMBGMGM	14 4%	31 4%	50 4%
Not Sure	- -	4 * D	4 * D	-	1 1% A	-	-	-	2 1% AC	-	-	-	1 *	-
Sigma	679 100%	1700 100%	2379 100%	2708 100%	159 100%	382 100%	162 100%	311 100%	298 100%	416 100%	262 100%	325 100%	819 100%	1274 100%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q1125_5. How scared are you of each of the following?

16 Aug 2016
Table 368

5. Malware

Base: Familiar With Abusive Internet Behavior

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	727	1831	2558	2804	179	417	200	336	315	427	274	337	863	1287
TOP 2 BOX (NET)	482 66%	1490 81% DG	1972 77%	2201 78% AF	138 77% A	306 73%	152 76% A	263 78%	246 78% A	327 77%	212 77% A	267 79% NAEGKBEGICGK	742 86% DF	1038 81% DF
Very scared	212 29%	741 40% D	953 37%	1044 37% AFJ	67 37% A	123 29%	78 39% A	120 36%	115 37% A	131 31%	120 44% AC	136 40% FJ	361 42% AC	534 41% DFJ
Somewhat scared	270 37%	749 41% K	1019 40% K	1157 41% AN	71 40%	183 44%	74 37%	143 43%	131 42% KKK	196 46% DN	92 34%	131 39% NAKBKCK	381 44% NAKBKCK	504 39%
BOTTOM 2 BOX (NET)	245 34% DEGIKM	338 18% M	583 23% M	603 22% BN	40 22% MMM	111 27% DN	48 24% MBMM	73 22%	68 22% MMM	100 23%	62 23% MMM	70 21%	120 14%	249 19% M
Not very scared	144 20% DM	235 13% M	379 15% M	452 16% BN	25 14%	83 20% DN	35 18% MBMM	54 16%	49 16% MMM	74 17%	40 15% MMM	54 16%	86 10%	187 15% M
Not at all scared	101 14% DEGIKM	103 6% M	204 8% DM	151 5%	15 8% MMM	28 7%	13 7%	19 6%	19 6%	26 6%	22 8% MMM	16 5%	34 4%	62 5%
Not Sure	- -	3 * D	3 *	- -	1 1% A	- -	- -	- -	1 * -	- -	- -	- -	1 * -	- -
Sigma	727 100%	1831 100%	2558 100%	2804 100%	179 100%	417 100%	200 100%	336 100%	315 100%	427 100%	274 100%	337 100%	863 100%	1287 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q1130. What measures have you taken, if any, to avoid being affected by any of these types of abusive Internet behaviors?

16 Aug 2016
Table 369

SUMMARY TABLE OF PURCHASED

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants			2016 Total Regi- strants	Region									2016 Asia
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources		2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	763	2444	3207	3349	203	460	257	415	391	534	348	401	1245	1539
Phishing	369 48%	1393 57% DEGK	1762 55% G	1771 53% AFH	102 50%	214 47%	126 49%	192 46%	221 57% A	276 52%	178 51%	195 49%	766 62% AEGKBEGKCEGK	894 58% DFHJL
Spamming	345 45%	1362 56% D	1707 53% D	1637 49%	110 54% A	213 46%	136 53% A	190 46%	210 54% JA	248 46%	181 52% A	193 48% NAKBKCK	725 58% NAKBKCK	793 52% DFHJ
Cyber squatting	252 33%	1228 50% DEG	1480 46% E	1487 44% AFJ	78 38%	166 36%	108 42% A	168 40%	180 46% JA	210 39%	166 48% AE	186 46% FJ	696 56% NAEGKBEGKCEGK	757 49% DFHJ
Stolen credentials	388 51%	1417 58% DGK	1805 56% K	1828 55% HJL	109 54%	235 51%	132 51%	199 48%	223 57% A	270 51%	175 50%	198 49%	778 62% AEGKBEGKCEGK	926 60% DFHJL
Malware	521 68%	1687 69% DG	2208 69% DG	2229 67%	149 73% GGG	303 66%	162 63%	260 63%	260 66%	345 65%	245 70%	294 73% DFHJN	871 70% GGG	1027 67%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q1130 1. What measures have you taken, if any, to avoid being affected by any of these types of abusive Internet behaviors?

1. Phishing

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	763	2444	3207	3349	203	460	257	415	391	534	348	401	1245	1539
PURCHASED (NET)	369 48%	1393 57% DEGK	1762 55% G	1771 53% AFH	102 50%	214 47%	126 49%	192 46%	221 57% A	276 52%	178 51%	195 49%	766 62% AEGKBEGKCEGK	894 58% DFHJL
Purchased antivirus software for my computer	338 44%	1132 46% DK	1470 46% DK	1408 42% H	90 44%	191 42% H	109 42% H	144 35% JAGKBGCKGK	199 51% A	226 42% H	141 41%	159 40%	593 48% KKK	688 45% DH
Purchased an identity protection plan	82 11%	423 17% EI	505 16% E	556 17% AFJ	19 9%	47 10%	34 13%	64 15% F	49 13%	70 13%	54 16% AEEE	55 14%	267 21% AEGKBEGKCEGK	320 21% DFHJL
Changed my Internet habits	363 48% DGLM	786 32% DIM	1149 36% DIM	903 27% J FIMBIMIM	83 41%	141 31% J	91 35% IMIMIM	121 29% J	106 27% J	111 21% LIMBIMCIM	149 43% A	125 31% DJ	357 29% A	405 26% J
Stopped making purchases online	25 3%	307 13% DGI	332 10% I	357 11% AFH	18 9%	26 6%	22 9% A	29 7%	28 7% A	52 10% F	37 11% A	42 10% F	202 16% AEGKBEGKCEGK	208 14% DFHJ
Other	95 12% DGIKM	144 6% D	239 7% DGM	192 6% H GMBGMGM	20 10%	35 8% HN	11 4%	15 4%	25 6%	41 8% DHN	20 6%	24 6%	68 5%	77 5%
None	108 14% M	325 13% M	433 14% M	643 19% ABCN	27 13%	111 24% EDLN	46 18% KMBKCMCKM	97 23% DLN	81 21% AEBKMBKCMCKM	124 23% DLN	39 11% A	69 17% K	132 11% A	242 16% M
Not Sure	- -	4 * D	4 * D	- -	2 1% FAMBMCN	- -	- -	- -	2 1% AMMCM	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -
Sigma	1011 133%	3121 128% D	4132 129% D	4059 121% D	259 128% D	551 120% D	313 122% D	470 113% D	490 125% D	624 117% D	440 126% D	474 118% D	1619 130% D	1940 126% D

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q1130_2. What measures have you taken, if any, to avoid being affected by any of these types of abusive Internet behaviors?

16 Aug 2016
Table 371

2. Spamming

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	763	2444	3207	3349	203	460	257	415	391	534	348	401	1245	1539
PURCHASED (NET)	345 45%	1362 56% D	1707 53% D	1637 49%	110 54% A	213 46%	136 53% A	190 46%	210 54% JA	248 46%	181 52% A	193 48% NAKBKCK	725 58%	793 52% DFHJ
Purchased antivirus software for my computer	319 42%	1137 47% D	1456 45% D	1333 40%	99 49%	198 43%	124 48% H	159 38%	190 49% JA	214 40%	150 43%	155 39%	574 46% N	607 39%
Purchased an identity protection plan	64 8%	368 15% EGI	432 13%	472 14% AFJ	19 9%	39 8%	25 10%	48 12%	41 10%	56 10%	49 14% A	57 14% F AEGKBEGKCEGK	234 19%	272 18% DFHJ
Changed my Internet habits	333 44% DEIM	765 31% DIM	1098 34% DIM	928 28% J IMIMIM	72 35% J IMBIMIM	141 31% J	101 39% IMBIMIM	145 35% DJN	103 26%	117 22%	149 43% LIMBIMCIM	121 30% J	340 27%	404 26% J
Stopped making purchases online	20 3%	264 11% EGI	284 9% EG	318 9% AFH	8 4%	26 6%	14 5% A	26 6%	27 7% A	40 7%	31 9% AEEE	28 7% AEGKBEGKCEGK	184 15%	198 13% DFHJL
Other	121 16% DGIKM	196 8% DGM	317 10% DGM	263 8% HN GKMBGKMGKIM	26 13% HN	51 11% DHN	13 5%	18 4%	36 9% DHN	61 11% DHN	26 7% H	32 8% H	95 8%	101 7%
None	126 17% KM	326 13% KM	452 14% KM	658 20% ABCN	30 15%	98 21%	30 12%	85 20% G GKMBGKMGKIM	77 20% DLN	131 25% DLN	36 10%	74 18% K	153 12%	270 18% M
Not Sure	- -	4 * D	4 * D	-	1 *	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	2 *	-
Sigma	983 129%	3060 125%	4043 126%	3972 119%	255 126%	553 120%	307 119%	481 116%	475 121%	619 116%	441 127%	467 116%	1582 127%	1852 120%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q1130_3. What measures have you taken, if any, to avoid being affected by any of these types of abusive Internet behaviors?

16 Aug 2016
Table 372

3. Cyber squatting

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
					(E)		(G)		(I)		(K)		(M)	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	763	2444	3207	3349	203	460	257	415	391	534	348	401	1245	1539
PURCHASED (NET)	252 33%	1228 50% DEG	1480 46% E	1487 44% AFJ	78 38%	166 36%	108 42% A	168 40%	180 46% JA	210 39%	166 48% AEEE	186 46% FJ	696 56% NAEGKBEGICEGK	757 49% DFHJ
Purchased antivirus software for my computer	224 29%	975 40% D	1199 37% D	1128 34% A	70 34%	144 31%	98 38% A	134 32%	158 40% JA	177 33%	129 37% A	143 36%	520 42% NAC	530 34%
Purchased an identity protection plan	65 9%	401 16% EGI	466 15% EGI	543 16% AFHJ	12 6%	42 9%	24 9%	49 12%	42 11%	58 11%	58 17% AEGIEGIEGI	62 15% FJ	265 21% AEGIBEGICEGI	332 22% DFHJL
Changed my Internet habits	214 28% DIM	628 26% DIM	842 26% DIM	723 22% FJ	59 29% FIII	78 17%	81 32% IMBIMCIM	105 25% FJ	82 21%	97 18%	114 33% LIMBIMCIM	100 25% FJ	292 23% FJ	343 22% FJ
Stopped making purchases online	25 3%	274 11% EGI	299 9% EI	329 10% AF	11 5%	24 5%	19 7% A	32 8%	26 7% A	46 9% F	50 14% AEGIBEGICEGI	41 10% F	168 13% AEGIBEGICEGI	186 12% DFHJ
Other	83 11% DGIKM	139 6% D	222 7% D	165 5%	13 6%	21 5%	14 5%	13 3%	19 5%	31 6%	18 5%	15 4%	75 6%	85 6% H
None	307 40% DGIKM	558 23% KM	865 27% KM	1038 31% BCLN	70 34% GKMBGKMCCKM	211 46% EDHJLN	64 25% MMM	133 32% GLN	133 34% GKMBGKMCCKM	197 37% DLN	65 19%	103 26% K	226 18%	394 26% M
Not Sure	- -	9 * D	9 * D	- -	2 1% FA	- -	1 *	- -	2 1% A	- -	1 *	- -	3 *	- -
Sigma	918 120%	2984 122%	3902 122%	3926 117%	237 117%	520 113%	301 117%	466 112%	462 118%	606 113%	435 125%	464 116%	1549 124%	1870 122%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q1130 4. What measures have you taken, if any, to avoid being affected by any of these types of abusive Internet behaviors?

4. Stolen credentials

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
					(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	763	2444	3207	3349	203	460	257	415	391	534	348	401	1245	1539
PURCHASED (NET)	388 51%	1417 58% DGK	1805 56% K	1828 55% HJL	109 54%	235 51%	132 51%	199 48%	223 57% A	270 51%	175 50%	198 49%	778 62% AEGKBGKCEGK	926 60% DFHJL
Purchased antivirus software for my computer	335 44% K	1135 46% DK	1470 46% DK	1377 41% HL	93 46%	191 42% HL	110 43% H	144 35% JAGKBGKCGK	200 51% HL	219 41% HL	130 37%	135 34% AEGKBGKCEGK	602 48% KKCK	688 45% DHL
Purchased an identity protection plan	118 15%	473 19% GI	591 18% I	676 20% AFJ	30 15%	70 15%	38 15%	77 19%	49 13%	75 14%	68 20% III	83 21% FJ	288 23% AEGIBGKCEGI	371 24% DFHJ
Changed my Internet habits	348 46% DGIM	747 31% DM	1095 34% DIM	873 26% N	86 42% FGIMBGMCGM	131 28% N	80 31%	122 29% N	113 29%	131 25%	138 40% LGIMBGMCGM	121 30% DN	330 27%	368 24%
Stopped making purchases online	34 4%	342 14% DI	376 12% I	401 12% AFJ	20 10% A	35 8%	31 12% AIII	39 9%	28 7%	48 9%	51 15% AIII	49 12% F	212 17% AEGIBGKCEGI	230 15% DFHJ
Other	87 11% DEGIKM	141 6% D	228 7% DM	172 5% H	10 5%	24 5% H	11 4%	10 2%	29 7%	39 7% DH	18 5%	18 4%	73 6%	81 5% H
None	124 16% M	334 14% M	458 14% M	623 19% BCN	31 15%	116 25% EDLN	45 18% MMM	87 21% N	72 18% KMBKMCKM	122 23% DLN	45 13%	69 17%	141 11%	229 15% M
Not Sure	- -	5 * D	5 * D	- -	2 1% FAMBMC	- -	- -	- -	1 * -	- -	- -	- -	2 * -	- -
Sigma	1046 137%	3177 130%	4223 132%	4122 123%	272 134%	567 123%	315 123%	479 115%	492 126%	634 119%	450 129%	475 118%	1648 132%	1967 128%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q1130_5. What measures have you taken, if any, to avoid being affected by any of these types of abusive Internet behaviors?

16 Aug 2016
Table 374

5. Malware

Base: All Qualified Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	763	2444	3207	3349	203	460	257	415	391	534	348	401	1245	1539
PURCHASED (NET)	521 68%	1687 69% DG	2208 69% DG	2229 67%	149 73% GGG	303 66%	162 63%	260 63%	260 66%	345 65%	245 70%	294 73% DFHJN	871 70% GGG	1027 67%
Purchased antivirus software for my computer	500 66% DGM	1465 60% M	1965 61% DGM	1931 58% N	146 72% FGIMBGMCGIM	286 62% DHN	141 55%	226 54%	241 62%	301 56%	228 66% GMBGMGM	259 65% DHJN	709 57%	859 56%
Purchased an identity protection plan	76 10%	400 16% EIK	476 15% EI	508 15% AF	12 6%	38 8%	32 12% EEE	51 12% F	45 12% EEE	71 13% F	44 13% EEE	58 14% AEGIKBEGIKCEGK	267 21% DFHJL	290 19%
Changed my Internet habits	313 41% DEGIKM	671 27% DM	984 31% DIM	752 22%	67 33% FMMM	112 24%	85 33% MBMM	113 27% DJN	103 26% J	110 21%	107 31% LMMM	92 23%	309 25% N	325 21%
Stopped making purchases online	23 3%	265 11% EG	288 9% G	314 9% AFHJL	11 5%	27 6%	13 5%	27 7%	32 8% A	32 6%	28 8% A	26 6% AEGIKBEGIKCEGK	181 15% DFHJL	202 13%
Other	81 11% DGIKM	119 5% DKM	200 6% DKM	166 5% ABCL	14 7%	31 7% HLN	10 4%	15 4%	25 6% DHLN	38 7% DHLN	12 3%	14 3%	58 5%	68 4%
None	68 9%	230 9%	298 9%	434 13% ABCL	13 6%	72 16% EL	30 12%	53 13% L	43 11% IDLN	88 16% IDLN	30 9%	28 7%	114 9%	193 13% ML
Not Sure	- -	4 * D	4 * D	- -	1 *	- -	- -	- -	2 1% AC	- -	- -	- -	1 *	- -
Sigma	1061 139%	3154 129%	4215 131%	4105 123%	264 130%	566 123%	311 121%	485 117%	491 126%	640 120%	449 129%	477 119%	1639 132%	1937 126%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Base: All Qualified Respondents

Q775. If you felt a website was being run improperly (for example, appears to be conducting illegal activity, appears to be a fake, etc.), who would you complain to?

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
Contact the website owner/operator	156 20%	1568 61% DEIK	1724 51% DE	985 29% AFJ	85 41% FA	88 19% HAEKEKCEK	162 60% F	116 28% F	226 54% JAE	124 23% JAE	182 52% LAE	120 30% FJ	913 68% NAEGKBEGCEGK	537 35% DFHJ
Local police	-	-	-	951 28% ABCFL	-	101 22% E	-	127 31% GFL	-	176 33% IDFL	-	81 20% K	-	466 30% MDFL
Interpol	-	-	-	360 11% ABCF	-	27 6% E	-	50 12% GF	-	50 9% IF	-	43 11% KF	-	190 12% MDF
ICANN	-	-	-	532 16% ABCHJ	-	75 16% EHJ	-	28 7% G	-	47 9% I	-	60 15% KHJ	-	322 21% MDFHJL
Private security companies	-	-	-	408 12% ABCFJ	-	37 8% E	-	57 14% GFJ	-	41 8% I	-	54 13% KFJ	-	219 14% MDFJ
Consumer protection agency	-	-	-	1145 34% ABCJ	-	147 32% E	-	181 44% GDFJLN	-	151 28% I	-	140 35% KJ	-	526 34% MJ
NATIONAL LAW ENFORCEMENT/FBI (NET)	-	-	-	822 25% ABCF	-	94 20% E	-	101 24% G	-	117 22% I	-	97 24% K	-	413 27% MDFJ
FBI	-	-	-	53 2% ABCHJLN	-	53 12% EDHJLN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
National law enforcement	-	-	-	769 23% ABCF	-	41 9% E	-	101 24% GF	-	117 22% IF	-	97 24% KF	-	413 27% MDFJ
NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY/CIA (NET)	-	-	-	545 16% ABCFJ	-	40 9% E	-	84 20% GDFJ	-	48 9% I	-	95 24% KDFJN	-	278 18% MDFJ
Intelligence agency like the CIA or NSA	-	-	-	16 * BCN	-	16 3% EDHJLN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
A national intelligence agency	-	-	-	529 16% ABCFJ	-	24 5% E	-	84 20% GDFJ	-	48 9% IF	-	95 24% KDFJN	-	278 18% MDFJ
Federal police	-	-	-	511 15% ABCFN	-	41 9% E	-	127 31% GDFJLN	-	111 21% IDFLN	-	58 14% KF	-	174 11% M
Other	283 37% DEGIKM	370 14% DM	653 19% DM	-	52 25% FMBMCM	-	48 18% HMMM	-	77 18% JMBMM	-	75 21% LMBMM	-	118 9% N	-
No one	137 18% DEGIKM	266 10% DIK	403 12% DGIK	-	24 12% FIKIKIK	-	19 7% H	-	29 7% J	-	23 7% L	-	171 13% NGIKBGIKGK	-
Not sure	253 33% DEGIM	469 18% DM	722 22% DM	-	52 25% FMBMM	-	51 19% HMMM	-	102 24% JMBMM	-	99 28% LGMBGCMGCM	-	165 12% N	-

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q775. If you felt a website was being run improperly (for example, appears to be conducting illegal activity, appears to be a fake, etc.), who would you complain to?

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
Decline to Answer	-	2	2	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
					MMCM									
Don't know	-	-	-	744 22%	-	165 36%	-	75 18%	-	115 22%	-	113 28%	-	276 18%
				ABCHN		EDHJLN		G		I		KDHJN		M
Sigma	829 108%	2675 103%	3504 104%	7003 209%	214 103%	815 177%	280 104%	946 228%	435 104%	980 184%	379 108%	861 215%	1367 102%	3401 221%
Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N Overlap formulae used.														

Base: Registered For Business

Q300. Does the company for which you registered domains have multi-national operations?

16 Aug 2016
Table 376

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	-.**	-.**	-.**	1687	-.**	262	-.**	212	-.**	228	-.**	256	-.**	729
Yes	-	-	-	712 42% J	-	104 40% J	-	87 41% J	-	70 31% J	-	126 49% DFJ	-	325 45% J
No	-	-	-	975 58% L	-	158 60% L	-	125 59% L	-	158 69% DFHLN	-	130 51% L	-	404 55% L
Sigma	-	-	-	1687 100%	-	262 100%	-	212 100%	-	228 100%	-	256 100%	-	729 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Base: Registered For Business

Q305. Which of the following sectors does your business fall into?

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	-**	-**	-**	1687	-**	262	-**	212	-**	228	-**	256	-**	729
Agriculture, forestry and fishing	-	-	-	36 2%	-	7 3%	-	4 2%	-	3 1%	-	9 4%	-	13 2%
Mining and quarrying	-	-	-	9 1%	-	-	-	3 1%	-	-	-	3 1%	-	3
Manufacturing	-	-	-	203 12% FJL	-	14 5%	-	17 8%	-	15 7%	-	11 4%	-	146 20% DFHJL
Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply	-	-	-	24 1%	-	1 *	-	1 *	-	5 2%	-	5 2%	-	12 2%
Water supply; sewerage, waste management and remediation activities	-	-	-	5 *	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	2 1%	-	2 *
Construction of buildings	-	-	-	42 2%	-	6 2%	-	2 1%	-	6 3%	-	5 2%	-	23 3%
Civil engineering	-	-	-	22 1%	-	1 *	-	4 2%	-	1 *	-	2 1%	-	14 2%
Specialized construction activities	-	-	-	17 1%	-	4 2% L	-	3 1%	-	3 1%	-	-	-	7 1%
Wholesale and retail trade and repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles	-	-	-	18 1%	-	1 *	-	6 3% DFJ	-	1 *	-	2 1%	-	8 1%
Wholesale trade, except of motor vehicles and motorcycles	-	-	-	29 2%	-	2 1%	-	2 1%	-	4 2%	-	4 2%	-	17 2%
Retail trade, except of motor vehicles and motorcycles	-	-	-	90 5% N	-	26 10% DLN	-	17 8% N	-	12 5%	-	11 4%	-	24 3%
Land transport and transport via pipelines	-	-	-	11 1%	-	1 *	-	4 2% DN	-	2 1%	-	2 1%	-	2 *
Water transport	-	-	-	5 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5 1% D
Air transport	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	-
Warehousing and support activities for transportation	-	-	-	18 1%	-	-	-	-	-	1 *	-	1 *	-	16 2% DFH
Postal and courier activities	-	-	-	5 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5 1% D

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Base: Registered For Business

Q305. Which of the following sectors does your business fall into?

16 Aug 2016
Table 377

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	-.**	-.**	-.**	1687	-.**	262	-.**	212	-.**	228	-.**	256	-.**	729
Accommodations	-	-	-	17 1% N	-	1 *	-	6 3% DFN	-	3 1%	-	4 2%	-	3 *
Food and beverage service activities	-	-	-	47 3% F	-	1 *	-	6 3% F	-	5 2%	-	6 2%	-	29 4% DF
Publishing activities	-	-	-	17 1%	-	2 1%	-	1 *	-	4 2%	-	5 2%	-	5 1%
Motion picture, video and television program production, sound recording and music publishing activities	-	-	-	11 1%	-	3 1%	-	-	-	3 1%	-	2 1%	-	3 *
Programming and broadcasting activities	-	-	-	6 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5 2% DFHJN	-	1 *
Telecommunications	-	-	-	36 2%	-	5 2%	-	9 4% D	-	4 2%	-	4 2%	-	14 2%
Computer programming, consultancy and related activities	-	-	-	98 6% F	-	8 3%	-	10 5%	-	7 3%	-	19 7% FJ	-	54 7% DFJ
Information service activities	-	-	-	74 4% F	-	5 2%	-	6 3%	-	10 4%	-	19 7% DFH	-	34 5% F
Financial service activities, except insurance and pension funding	-	-	-	23 1%	-	4 2%	-	2 1%	-	1 *	-	5 2%	-	11 2%
Insurance, reinsurance and pension funding, except compulsory social security	-	-	-	13 1%	-	2 1%	-	4 2%	-	1 *	-	1 *	-	5 1%
Activities auxiliary to financial service and insurance activities	-	-	-	22 1%	-	1 *	-	2 1%	-	3 1%	-	2 1%	-	14 2%
Real estate activities	-	-	-	40 2%	-	9 3%	-	4 2%	-	5 2%	-	3 1%	-	19 3%
Legal and accounting activities	-	-	-	26 2% N	-	8 3% DJN	-	5 2% N	-	1 *	-	7 3% JN	-	5 1%
Activities of head offices; management consultancy activities	-	-	-	14 1%	-	3 1%	-	-	-	4 2%	-	1 *	-	6 1%
Architectural and engineering activities; technical testing and analysis	-	-	-	18 1%	-	-	-	3 1%	-	3 1%	-	2 1%	-	10 1%
Scientific research and development	-	-	-	22 1%	-	4 2%	-	1 *	-	3 1%	-	2 1%	-	12 2%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Base: Registered For Business

Q305. Which of the following sectors does your business fall into?

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	-.**	-.**	-.**	1687	-.**	262	-.**	212	-.**	228	-.**	256	-.**	729
Advertising and market research	-	-	-	43 3% F	-	2 1%	-	7 3% F	-	3 1%	-	15 6% DFJN	-	16 2%
Other professional, scientific and technical activities	-	-	-	39 2%	-	7 3%	-	7 3%	-	5 2%	-	7 3%	-	13 2%
Veterinary activities	-	-	-	6 *	-	2 1% N	-	2 1% N	-	2 1% N	-	-	-	-
Rental and leasing activities	-	-	-	11 1%	-	3 1%	-	2 1%	-	1 *	-	2 1%	-	3 *
Employment activities	-	-	-	13 1%	-	3 1%	-	-	-	2 1%	-	2 1%	-	6 1%
Travel agency, tour operator, reservation service and related activities	-	-	-	19 1%	-	5 2% J	-	2 1%	-	-	-	2 1%	-	10 1%
Security and investigation activities	-	-	-	6 *	-	2 1%	-	-	-	2 1%	-	-	-	2 *
Services to buildings and landscape activities	-	-	-	6 *	-	1 *	-	1 *	-	1 *	-	1 *	-	2 *
Office administrative, office support and other business support activities	-	-	-	32 2%	-	3 1%	-	2 1%	-	6 3%	-	10 4% DFHN	-	11 2%
Public administration and defense; compulsory social security	-	-	-	6 *	-	-	-	1 *	-	4 2% DFN	-	1 *	-	-
Education	-	-	-	100 6%	-	14 5%	-	12 6%	-	12 5%	-	22 9%	-	40 5%
Human health activities	-	-	-	47 3% N	-	20 8% DHJLN	-	4 2%	-	5 2%	-	7 3%	-	11 2%
Residential care activities	-	-	-	4 *	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	1 *	-	2 *
Social work activities without accommodation	-	-	-	7 *	-	3 1% N	-	1 *	-	2 1%	-	-	-	1 *
Arts, entertainment and recreation	-	-	-	67 4% N	-	24 9% DHLN	-	9 4% N	-	15 7% DN	-	9 4% N	-	10 1%
Other service activities	-	-	-	55 3%	-	8 3%	-	9 4%	-	11 5%	-	5 2%	-	22 3%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Base: Registered For Business

Q305. Which of the following sectors does your business fall into?

16 Aug 2016
Table 377

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	-**	-**	-**	1687	-**	262	-**	212	-**	228	-**	256	-**	729
Activities of households as employers; undifferentiated goods- and services-producing activities of households for own use	-	-	-	7	-	2	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	2
				*		1%				D				*
Activities of extraterritorial organizations and bodies	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
				*										*
Other	-	-	-	199	-	44	-	29	-	43	-	28	-	55
				12%		17%		14%		19%		11%		8%
				N		DN		N		DLN				
Sigma	-	-	-	1687	-	262	-	212	-	228	-	256	-	729
				100%		100%		100%		100%		100%		100%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q318. In what state, province or territory do you currently reside?

Base: Have Region Codes And Region Question To Be Asked

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	398	812	1210	1198	144	360	-**	-**	419	534	-**	-**	249	304
Alabama	2 1%	-	2 *	3 *	-	3 1% DJ	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Alaska	1 *	-	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Arizona	8 2% DIM	2 *	10 1%	7 1%	2 1% IBII	7 2% DJN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Arkansas	-	-	-	1 *	-	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
California	35 9% DEIM	5 1%	40 3% IM	27 2% BJN	5 3% IMBIMIM	27 8% DJN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Colorado	6 2% DI	1 *	7 1%	6 1%	1 1%	6 2% DJN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Connecticut	3 1%	1 *	4 *	6 1%	1 1%	6 2% DJN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Delaware	-	-	-	1 *	-	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
District of Columbia	-	1 *	1 *	-	1 1% C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Florida	12 3% IM	6 1%	18 1% I	22 2% BJN	6 4% IMBIMC	22 6% DJN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Georgia	5 1% I	1 *	6 *	11 1% BJ	1 1%	11 3% DJN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hawaii	1 *	-	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Illinois	8 2% DIM	1 *	9 1%	5 *	1 1%	5 1% DJN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Indiana	2 1%	-	2 *	7 1% B	-	7 2% DJN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Iowa	1 *	-	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kansas	1 *	-	1 *	4 *	-	4 1% DJ	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q318. In what state, province or territory do you currently reside?

16 Aug 2016
Table 378

Base: Have Region Codes And Region Question To Be Asked

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	398	812	1210	1198	144	360	-**	-**	419	534	-**	-**	249	304
Kentucky	4 1% DI	-	4 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Louisiana	1 *	-	1 *	3 *	-	3 1% DJ	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Maine	2 1%	-	2 *	2 *	-	2 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Maryland	5 1% I	3 *	8 1%	6 1% IMBIMCIM	3 2%	6 2% DJN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Massachusetts	2 1%	1 *	3 *	5 *	1 1%	5 1% DJN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Michigan	3 1%	4 *	7 1%	5 *	4 3% IMBIMCIM	5 1% DJN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Minnesota	5 1% I	3 *	8 1%	7 1% IMBIMCIM	3 2%	7 2% DJN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mississippi	2 1% D	-	2 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Missouri	-	-	-	4 * C	-	4 1% DJ	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Montana	2 1% D	-	2 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nebraska	1 *	1 *	2 *	2 *	1 1%	2 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nevada	3 1%	-	3 *	4 *	-	4 1% DJ	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
New Hampshire	-	-	-	2 *	-	2 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
New Jersey	7 2% IM	4 *	11 1%	13 1% J IMBIMCIM	4 3%	13 4% DJN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
New Mexico	1 *	-	1 *	2 *	-	2 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
New York	10 3% IM	6 1%	16 1%	15 1% J IMBIMCIM	6 4%	15 4% DJN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
North Carolina	5 1% I	3 *	8 1%	9 1% J IMBIMCIM	3 2%	9 3% DJN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q318. In what state, province or territory do you currently reside?

Base: Have Region Codes And Region Question To Be Asked

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	398	812	1210	1198	144	360	-**	-**	419	534	-**	-**	249	304
North Dakota	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ohio	7 2% IM	1	8 1%	11 1% BJ	1 1%	11 3% DJN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oklahoma	2 1%	-	2	4	-	4 1% DJ	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oregon	7 2% DIM	1	8 1%	3	1 1%	3 1% DJ	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pennsylvania	3 1%	1	4	11 1% BJ	1 1%	11 3% DJN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Rhode Island	1	-	1	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
South Carolina	3 1%	3	6	2	3 2% IMBIMCIM	2 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
South Dakota	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tennessee	1	1	2	-	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Texas	11 3% IM	7 1%	18 1% I	24 2% BJN	7 5% IMBIMCIM	24 7% DJN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Utah	1	2	3	3	2 1% IBICI	3 1% DJ	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vermont	1	-	1	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Virginia	8 2% DIM	1	9 1%	8 1%	1 1%	8 2% DJN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Washington	8 2% DIM	2	10 1%	3	2 1% IBII	3 1% DJ	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
West Virginia	2 1%	1	3	1	1 1%	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Wisconsin	3 1%	1	4	3	1 1%	3 1% DJ	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Alberta	2 1%	8 1% I	10 1%	15 1% J	8 6% AIMBIMCIM	15 4% DJN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q318. In what state, province or territory do you currently reside?

Base: Have Region Codes And Region Question To Be Asked

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	398	812	1210	1198	144	360	-**	-**	419	534	-**	-**	249	304
British Columbia	2 1%	17 2% IM	19 2% IM	18 2% JN	17 12% FAIMBIMCIM	18 5% DJN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Manitoba	2 1%	2 *	4 *	6 1%	2 1% IBICI	6 2% DJN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
New Brunswick	-	3 *	3 *	4 *	3 2% AIMBIMCIM	4 1% DJ	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Newfoundland	1 *	2 *	3 *	1 *	2 1% IBICI	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Northwest Territories	-	1 *	1 *	1 *	1 1% C	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nova Scotia	1 *	3 *	4 *	2 *	3 2% AIMBIMCIM	2 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nunavut	-	1 *	1 *	-	1 1% C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ontario	13 3% IM	32 4% IM	45 4% IM	40 3% JN	32 22% FAIMBIMCIM	40 11% DJN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Prince Edward Island	-	2 *	2 *	-	2 1% FAIBICI	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Quebec	2 1%	7 1%	9 1%	10 1% J	7 5% AIMBIMCIM	10 3% DJN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Saskatchewan	-	2 *	2 *	6 1%	2 1% AIBICI	6 2% DJN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Yukon Territory	-	-	-	2 *	-	2 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Alsace	-	1 *	1 *	2 *	-	-	-	-	1 *	2 *	-	-	-	-
Aquitaine	1 *	-	1 *	2 *	-	-	-	-	-	2 *	-	-	-	-
Auvergne	2 1% D	1 *	3 *	-	-	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	-	-
Lower Normandy	-	2 *	2 *	3 *	-	-	-	-	2 *	3 1%	-	-	-	-
Burgundy	-	2 *	2 *	4 *	-	-	-	-	2 *	4 1%	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q318. In what state, province or territory do you currently reside?

Base: Have Region Codes And Region Question To Be Asked

	2015 Total Registrants			2016 Total Registrants	Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources		2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	398	812	1210	1198	144	360	-**	-**	419	534	-**	-**	249	304
Brittany	-	6 1%	6 *	5 *	-	-	-	-	6 19% ABC	5 1% D	-	-	-	-
Centre	1 *	6 1%	7 1%	5 *	-	-	-	-	6 19% BC	5 1% D	-	-	-	-
Champagne-Ardenne	-	1 *	1 *	3 *	-	-	-	-	1 *	3 1%	-	-	-	-
Corsica	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	-
Franche-Comte	1 *	-	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Upper Normandy	-	-	-	2 *	-	-	-	-	-	2 *	-	-	-	-
Ile de France (Paris)	13 3% EM	15 2% M	28 2% M	28 2% FN	-	-	-	-	15 4% EMBEMCEM	28 5% DFN	-	-	-	-
Languedoc-Roussillon	1 *	4 *	5 *	4 *	-	-	-	-	4 1%	4 1%	-	-	-	-
Limousin	-	-	-	3 *	-	-	-	-	-	3 1%	-	-	-	-
Lorraine	-	6 1%	6 *	3 *	-	-	-	-	6 19% ABC	3 1%	-	-	-	-
Midi-Pyrenees	1 *	1 *	2 *	4 *	-	-	-	-	1 *	4 1%	-	-	-	-
North Calais	-	5 1%	5 *	7 1%	-	-	-	-	5 19% AC	7 1% DFN	-	-	-	-
Pays de la Loire	-	4 *	4 *	6 1%	-	-	-	-	4 19% C	6 1% DF	-	-	-	-
Picardy	-	1 *	1 *	2 *	-	-	-	-	1 *	2 *	-	-	-	-
Poitou-Charentes	-	2 *	2 *	-	-	-	-	-	2 *	-	-	-	-	-
Provence-Alpes-Cote-D'a zur	2 1%	6 1%	8 1%	13 1% F	-	-	-	-	6 19% BC	13 2% DFN	-	-	-	-
Rhone-Alps	1 *	12 1%	13 1%	9 1%	-	-	-	-	12 3% AEMBEMCEM	9 2% DFN	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q318. In what state, province or territory do you currently reside?

16 Aug 2016
Table 378

Base: Have Region Codes And Region Question To Be Asked

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	398	812	1210	1198	144	360	-**	-**	419	534	-**	-**	249	304
Baden-Wurttemberg	2 1%	15 2% M	17 1%	12 1%	-	-	-	-	15 4%	12 2%	-	-	-	-
Bavaria	3 1%	17 2% M	20 2% M	19 2% FN	-	-	-	-	17 4%	19 4%	-	-	-	-
Berlin	3 1%	7 1%	10 1%	7 1%	-	-	-	-	7 2% MBMCM	7 1% DFN	-	-	-	-
Brandenburg	-	2 *	2 *	1 *	-	-	-	-	2 *	1 *	-	-	-	-
Bremen	-	-	-	2 *	-	-	-	-	-	2 *	-	-	-	-
Hamburg	1 *	4 *	5 *	2 *	-	-	-	-	4 1%	2 *	-	-	-	-
Hesse	1 *	7 1%	8 1%	14 1% F	-	-	-	-	7 2% AMBMC	14 3% DFN	-	-	-	-
Mecklenburg-Western Pomerania	-	4 *	4 *	1 *	-	-	-	-	4 1% C	1 *	-	-	-	-
Lower Saxony	-	11 1%	11 1%	9 1%	-	-	-	-	11 3% AMBMC	9 2% DFN	-	-	-	-
North Rhine-Westphalia	3 1%	26 3% EM	29 2% M	35 3% AFN	-	-	-	-	26 6% AEMBCEM	35 7% DFN	-	-	-	-
Rhineland-Palatinate	1 *	4 *	5 *	4 *	-	-	-	-	4 1%	4 1%	-	-	-	-
Saarland	-	2 *	2 *	1 *	-	-	-	-	2 *	1 *	-	-	-	-
Saxony	1 *	1 *	2 *	7 1%	-	-	-	-	1 *	7 1% DFN	-	-	-	-
Saxony-Anhalt	-	4 *	4 *	4 *	-	-	-	-	4 1% C	4 1%	-	-	-	-
Schleswig-Holstein	-	1 *	1 *	3 *	-	-	-	-	1 *	3 1%	-	-	-	-
Thuringia	1 *	3 *	4 *	4 *	-	-	-	-	3 1%	4 1%	-	-	-	-
Abruzzo	-	1 *	1 *	3 *	-	-	-	-	1 *	3 1%	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q318. In what state, province or territory do you currently reside?

Base: Have Region Codes And Region Question To Be Asked

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	398	812	1210	1198	144	360	-**	-**	419	534	-**	-**	249	304
Basilicata	-	1*	1*	-	-	-	-	-	1*	-	-	-	-	-
Calabria	-	-	-	2*	-	-	-	-	-	2*	-	-	-	-
Campania	1*	7 1%	8 1%	5*	-	-	-	-	7 2% AMBMC	5 1% D	-	-	-	-
Emilia-Romagna	1*	-	1*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Friuli-Venezia Giulia	2 1% D	-	2*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Lazio	2 1%	-	2*	5*	-	-	-	-	-	5 1% ID	-	-	-	-
Liguria	-	-	-	2*	-	-	-	-	-	2*	-	-	-	-
Lombardy	10 3% DIM	3*	13 1%	9 1%	-	-	-	-	3 1%	9 2% DFN	-	-	-	-
Marche	-	1*	1*	-	-	-	-	-	1*	-	-	-	-	-
Molise	-	-	-	1*	-	-	-	-	-	1*	-	-	-	-
Piedmont	4 1% D	5 1%	9 1%	3*	-	-	-	-	5 1%	3 1%	-	-	-	-
Apulia	1*	2*	3*	4*	-	-	-	-	2*	4 1%	-	-	-	-
Sardinia	-	1*	1*	-	-	-	-	-	1*	-	-	-	-	-
Sicily	2 1%	-	2*	5*	-	-	-	-	-	5 1% ID	-	-	-	-
Tuscany	2 1%	3*	5*	3*	-	-	-	-	3 1%	3 1%	-	-	-	-
Umbria	-	-	-	1*	-	-	-	-	-	1*	-	-	-	-
Veneto	2 1%	2*	4*	7 1%	-	-	-	-	2*	7 1% DFN	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q318. In what state, province or territory do you currently reside?

16 Aug 2016
Table 378

Base: Have Region Codes And Region Question To Be Asked

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	398	812	1210	1198	144	360	-**	-**	419	534	-**	-**	249	304
Andalusia	1 *	6 1%	7 1%	11 1%	-	-	-	-	6 1% BC	11 2% DFN	-	-	-	-
Asturias	1 *	- -	1 *	3 *	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	3 1%	-	- -	- -	- -
Balearic Islands	1 *	1 *	2 *	1 *	-	-	-	-	1 *	1 *	-	-	-	-
Canary Islands	- -	3 *	3 *	3 *	-	-	-	-	3 1%	3 1%	-	-	-	-
Cantabria	- -	1 *	1 *	2 *	-	-	-	-	1 *	2 *	-	-	-	-
Castilla-Leon	- -	1 *	1 *	2 *	-	-	-	-	1 *	2 *	-	-	-	-
Castilla-La Mancha	- -	2 *	2 *	3 *	-	-	-	-	2 *	3 1%	-	-	-	-
Catalonia	1 *	7 1%	8 1%	5 *	-	-	-	-	7 2% AMBMCM	5 1% D	-	-	-	-
Extremadura	1 *	2 *	3 *	1 *	- -	- -	- -	- -	2 *	1 *	-	-	-	-
Galicia	- -	1 *	1 *	4 *	-	-	-	-	1 *	4 1%	-	-	-	-
La Rioja	- -	2 *	2 *	1 *	-	-	-	-	2 *	1 *	-	-	-	-
Madrid	5 1%	1 *	6 *	6 1%	-	-	-	-	1 *	6 1% DF	-	-	-	-
Murcia	- -	3 *	3 *	1 *	-	-	-	-	3 1%	1 *	-	-	-	-
Basque Country	- -	2 *	2 *	1 *	-	-	-	-	2 *	1 *	-	-	-	-
Valencia	2 1%	6 1%	8 1%	5 *	-	-	-	-	6 1% BC	5 1% D	-	-	-	-
East of England	3 1%	4 *	7 1%	4 *	-	-	-	-	4 1%	4 1%	-	-	-	-
East Midlands	1 *	3 *	4 *	8 1%	-	-	-	-	3 1%	8 1% DFN	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q318. In what state, province or territory do you currently reside?

Base: Have Region Codes And Region Question To Be Asked

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	398	812	1210	1198	144	360	-**	-**	419	534	-**	-**	249	304
London	5 1%	14 2% M	19 2% M	22 2% FN	-	-	-	-	14 3% AEMBCEM	22 4% DFN	-	-	-	-
North East	1 *	2 *	3 *	1 *	-	-	-	-	2 *	1 *	-	-	-	-
North West	1 *	10 1%	11 1%	12 1%	-	-	-	-	10 2% AMBMC	12 2% DFN	-	-	-	-
Northern Ireland	-	2 *	2 *	2 *	-	-	-	-	2 *	2 *	-	-	-	-
Scotland	2 1%	6 1%	8 1%	8 1%	-	-	-	-	6 1% BC	8 1% DFN	-	-	-	-
South East	8 2% M	14 2% M	22 2% M	16 1% FN	-	-	-	-	14 3% EMBCEM	16 3% DFN	-	-	-	-
South West	1 *	5 1%	6 *	8 1%	-	-	-	-	5 1% C	8 1% DFN	-	-	-	-
Wales	-	4 *	4 *	4 *	-	-	-	-	4 1% C	4 1%	-	-	-	-
West Midlands	3 1%	6 1%	9 1%	10 1%	-	-	-	-	6 1% B	10 2% DFN	-	-	-	-
Yorkshire and the Humber	1 *	4 *	5 *	5 *	-	-	-	-	4 1%	5 1% D	-	-	-	-
Hokkaido	-	7 1%	7 1%	14 1% AFJ	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7 3% AEIBEICEI	14 5% DFJ
Aomori	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 *
Iwate	-	1 *	1 *	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 *	1 *
Miyagi	-	3 *	3 *	4 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3 1% AIBICI	4 1% DFJ
Akita	-	-	-	2 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 1%
Yamagata	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 *
Fukushima	-	4 *	4 *	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4 2% AIBICI	1 *

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q318. In what state, province or territory do you currently reside?

Base: Have Region Codes And Region Question To Be Asked

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	398	812	1210	1198	144	360	-**	-**	419	534	-**	-**	249	304
Tochigi	-	1*	1*	1*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1*	1*
Gunma	-	3*	3*	2*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3 1% AIBICI	2 1%
Ibaraki	-	2*	2*	2*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 1% C	2 1%
Saitama	-	14 2% I	14 1% I	12 1% AJ	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	14 6% AEIBEICEI	12 4% DFJ
Chiba	-	8 1% I	8 1% I	11 1% J	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8 3% AEIBEICEI	11 4% DFJ
Tokyo	-	33 4% EI	33 3% EI	37 3% AFJ	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	33 13% AEIBEICEI	37 12% DFJ
Kanagawa	-	17 2% DI	17 1% I	12 1% AJ	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	17 7% AEIBEICEI	12 4% DFJ
Yamanashi	-	-	-	2*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 1%
Nagano	-	4*	4*	4*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4 2% AIBICI	4 1% DFJ
Niigata	-	3 D	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3 1% AIBICI	-
Toyama	-	-	-	2*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 1%
Ishikawa	-	-	-	1*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1*
Shizuoka	-	2*	2*	5*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 1% C	5 2% DFJ
Gifu	-	2*	2*	2*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 1% C	2 1%
Aichi	-	11 1% I	11 1% I	8 1% I	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	11 4% AEIBEICEI	8 3% DFJ
Mie	-	2*	2*	1*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 1% C	1*
Shiga	-	-	-	1*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1*

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q318. In what state, province or territory do you currently reside?

Base: Have Region Codes And Region Question To Be Asked

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	398	812	1210	1198	144	360	-**	-**	419	534	-**	-**	249	304
Kyoto	-	6 1%	6 *	4 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6 2% AIBICI	4 1% DFJ
Osaka	-	17 2% I	17 1% I	17 1% AFJ	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	17 7% AEIBEICEI	17 6% DFJ
Hyogo	-	10 1% I	10 1%	8 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10 4% AEIBEICEI	8 3% DFJ
Nara	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 *
Tottori	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 *
Shimane	-	1 *	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 *	-
Okayama	-	3 *	3 *	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3 1% AIBICI	1 *
Hiroshima	-	3 *	3 *	4 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3 1% AIBICI	4 1% DFJ
Yamaguchi	-	-	-	2 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 1%
Tokushima	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 *
Kagawa	-	2 *	2 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 1% C	-
Ehime	-	4 *	4 *	2 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4 2% AIBICI	2 1%
Fukuoka	-	6 1%	6 *	4 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6 2% AIBICI	4 1% DFJ
Saga	-	1 *	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 *	-
Nagasaki	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 *
Kumamoto	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 *
Oita	-	2 *	2 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 1% C	-

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q318. In what state, province or territory do you currently reside?

Base: Have Region Codes And Region Question To Be Asked

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	398	812	1210	1198	144	360	-**	-**	419	534	-**	-**	249	304
Miyazaki	-	1	1	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	2
Kagoshima	-	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-
Okinawa	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-
Lower Silesia	-	6	6	4	-	-	-	-	6	4	-	-	-	-
Kuyavia-Pomerania	-	4	4	4	-	-	-	-	4	4	-	-	-	-
Lodz	-	3	3	9	-	-	-	-	3	9	-	-	-	-
Lublin	-	4	4	3	-	-	-	-	4	3	-	-	-	-
Lubusz	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
Lesser Poland	-	6	6	5	-	-	-	-	6	5	-	-	-	-
Masovia	-	8	8	8	-	-	-	-	8	8	-	-	-	-
Subcarpathia	-	3	3	1	-	-	-	-	3	1	-	-	-	-
Pomerania	-	4	4	4	-	-	-	-	4	4	-	-	-	-
Silesia	-	5	5	7	-	-	-	-	5	7	-	-	-	-
Swietokrzyskie (Holy Cross)	-	3	3	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	-
Warmia-Masuria	-	3	3	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	-
Greater Poland	-	3	3	4	-	-	-	-	3	4	-	-	-	-
West Pomerania	-	1	1	3	-	-	-	-	1	3	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q318. In what state, province or territory do you currently reside?

Base: Have Region Codes And Region Question To Be Asked

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	398	812	1210	1198	144	360	-**	-**	419	534	-**	-**	249	304
Altay Republic	1 *	-	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bashkortostan Republic	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 *
Buryatiya Republic	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 *
Kalmykiya Republic	-	1 *	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 *	-
Sakha (Yakutiya) Republic	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 *
Tatarstan Republic	1 *	1 *	2 *	6 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 *	6 2% DFJ
Chechnya Republic	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 *
Chuvashiya Republic	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 *
Krasnodar Kray	1 *	3 D	4 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3 1% IBICI	-
Krasnoyarsk Kray	-	1 *	1 *	2 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 *	2 1%
Primorskiy Kray	1 *	-	1 *	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 *
Stavropol Kray	1 *	-	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Amur Oblast	-	1 *	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 *	-
Astrakhan Oblast	-	1 *	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 *	-
Bryansk Oblast	-	3 *	3 *	2 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3 1% AIBICI	2 1%
Volgograd Oblast	-	-	-	3 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3 1% DJ
Vologda Oblast	-	1 *	1 *	2 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 *	2 1%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q318. In what state, province or territory do you currently reside?

Base: Have Region Codes And Region Question To Be Asked

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	398	812	1210	1198	144	360	-**	-**	419	534	-**	-**	249	304
Voronezh Oblast	-	-	-	2*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 1%
Ivanovo Oblast	1*	1*	2*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1*	-
Irkutsk Oblast	1*	1*	2*	1*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1*	1*
Kaliningrad Oblast	-	1*	1*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1*	-
Kaluga Oblast	-	1*	1*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1*	-
Kemerovo Oblast	1*	-	1*	1*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1*
Kirov Oblast	1*	-	1*	3*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3 1% DJ
Kostroma Oblast	-	-	-	1*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1*
Kurgan Oblast	-	-	-	2*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 1%
Kursk Oblast	-	1*	1*	1*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1*	1*
Leningrad Oblast	2 1%	4*	6*	2*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4 2% IBICI	2 1%
Lipetsk Oblast	-	-	-	1*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1*
Moscow Oblast	6 2% I	11 1% I	17 1% I	12 1% J	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	11 4% AEIBEICEI	12 4% DFJ
Murmansk Oblast	1*	-	1*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nizhny Novgorod Oblast	1*	1*	2*	2*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1*	2 1%
Novgorod Oblast	-	1*	1*	1*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1*	1*
Novosibirsk Oblast	3 1%	2*	5*	2*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 1%	2 1%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q318. In what state, province or territory do you currently reside?

Base: Have Region Codes And Region Question To Be Asked

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
					(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)	
Unweighted Base	398	812	1210	1198	144	360	-**	-**	419	534	-**	-**	249	304
Omsk Oblast	-	2	2	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 1% C	4 1% DFJ
Orenburg Oblast	-	1	1	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	2 1%
Orel Oblast	1	1	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-
Penza Oblast	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Perm Kray	-	1	1	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	4 1% DFJ
Rostov Oblast	1	1	2	6 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	6 2% DFJ
Ryazan Oblast	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Samara Oblast	2 1%	5 1%	7 1%	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5 2% IBICI	4 1% DFJ
Saratov Oblast	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 1%
Sverdlovsk Oblast	3 1%	3	6	6 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3 1% IBI	6 2% DFJ
Smolensk Oblast	2 1%	-	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Tver Oblast	-	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
Tomsk Oblast	1	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Tula Oblast	2 1%	-	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Tyumen Oblast	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3 1% DJ
Chelyabinsk Oblast	1	3	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3 1% IBICI	-
Zabaykalsk (Chita) Kray	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q318. In what state, province or territory do you currently reside?

Base: Have Region Codes And Region Question To Be Asked

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	398	812	1210	1198	144	360	-**	-**	419	534	-**	-**	249	304
Yaroslavl Oblast	-	1*	1*	2*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1*	2 1%
Moscow	14 4% DEI	16 2% I	30 2% I	21 2% FJ	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	16 6% EIBEICEI	21 7% DFJ
Saint Petersburg	5 1% I	2 *	7 1%	14 1% BFJ	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 1%	14 5% MDFJ
Yevrey Jewish Autonomous Oblast	-	-	-	1*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1*
Adana Province	-	-	-	2*	-	-	-	-	-	2*	-	-	-	-
Adiyaman Province	-	-	-	1*	-	-	-	-	-	1*	-	-	-	-
Ankara Province	2 1%	9 1%	11 1%	6 1%	-	-	-	-	9 2% AMBMCM	6 1% DF	-	-	-	-
Antalya Province	-	-	-	3*	-	-	-	-	-	3 1%	-	-	-	-
Aydin Province	-	-	-	1*	-	-	-	-	-	1*	-	-	-	-
Bolu Province	-	1*	1*	-	-	-	-	-	1*	-	-	-	-	-
Bursa Province	-	2*	2*	3*	-	-	-	-	2*	3 1%	-	-	-	-
Canakkale Province	-	1*	1*	-	-	-	-	-	1*	-	-	-	-	-
Denizli Province	-	1*	1*	-	-	-	-	-	1*	-	-	-	-	-
Eskisehir Province	-	-	-	1*	-	-	-	-	-	1*	-	-	-	-
Gaziantep Province	-	-	-	1*	-	-	-	-	-	1*	-	-	-	-
Giresun Province	-	-	-	1*	-	-	-	-	-	1*	-	-	-	-
Isparta Province	-	-	-	1*	-	-	-	-	-	1*	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q318. In what state, province or territory do you currently reside?

16 Aug 2016
Table 378

Base: Have Region Codes And Region Question To Be Asked

	2015 Total Registrants				Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia	
					(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)
Unweighted Base	398	812	1210	1198	144	360	-**	-**	419	534	-**	-**	249	304	
Istanbul Province	1 *	21 3% M	22 2% M	18 2% AFN	-	-	-	-	21 5% AEMBEMCEM	18 3% DFN	-	-	-	-	
Izmir Province	-	6 1%	6 *	8 1%	-	-	-	-	6 1% ABC	8 1% DFN	-	-	-	-	
Kayseri Province	-	1 *	1 *	1 *	-	-	-	-	1 *	1 *	-	-	-	-	
Kocaeli Province	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	-	
Mardin Province	1 *	-	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Mugla Province	1 *	-	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Samsun Province	-	1 *	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	
Sivas Province	-	1 *	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	
Van Province	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	-	
Zonguldak Province	-	1 *	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	
Sirnak Province	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	-	
Other place	15 4% DEIM	-	15 1% DI	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	-	
Sigma	398 100%	812 100%	1210 100%	1198 100%	144 100%	360 100%	-	-	419 100%	534 100%	-	-	249 100%	304 100%	

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q320. U.S. Region-Harris Interactive Definition.

Base: All U.S. Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
					(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)
Unweighted Base	204	64*	268	255	64*	255	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**
East	36 18%	18 28%	54 20%	64 25%	18 28%	64 25%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Midwest	32 16%	11 17%	43 16%	49 19%	11 17%	49 19%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
South	56 27%	22 34%	78 29%	87 34%	22 34%	87 34%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
West	73 36% DE	13 20%	86 32% DE	55 22%	13 20%	55 22%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Unknown	7 3% D	-	7 3% D	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sigma	204 100%	64 100%	268 100%	255 100%	64 100%	255 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q437. What is the highest level of education you have completed or the highest degree you have received?

Base: All U.S. Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	204	64*	268	255	64*	255	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
HIGH SCHOOL OR LESS (NET)	3 1%	3 5%	6 2%	20 8% AC	3 5%	20 8%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Less than high school	2 1%	-	2 1%	1 *	-	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Completed some high school	-	-	-	3 1%	-	3 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Completed high school	1 *	3 5%	4 1%	16 6% AC	3 5% AC	16 6%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
ATTENDED COLLEGE OR COLLEGE DEGREE (NET)	126 62% D	43 67% D	169 63% D	130 51%	43 67% F	130 51%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Some college, but no degree	37 18%	12 19%	49 18%	41 16%	12 19%	41 16%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Associate Degree	15 7%	10 16%	25 9%	22 9%	10 16% A	22 9%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
College (such as B.A., B.S.)	74 36% D	21 33%	95 35% D	67 26%	21 33%	67 26%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
ATTENDED GRADUATE SCHOOL OR GRADUATE DEGREE (NET)	67 33%	17 27%	84 31%	96 38%	17 27%	96 38%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Some graduate school, but no degree	12 6%	4 6%	16 6%	22 9%	4 6%	22 9%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Graduate degree (such as MBA, MS, M.D., Ph.D.)	55 27%	13 20%	68 25%	74 29%	13 20%	74 29%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Job-specific training program(s) after high school	8 4%	1 2%	9 3%	9 4%	1 2%	9 4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sigma	204 100%	64 100%	268 100%	255 100%	64 100%	255 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q437. What is the highest level of education you have completed or the highest degree you have received?

Base: All Non-U.S. Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	151	483	634	637	80*	105	-**	-**	321	431	82*	101	-**	-**
Weighted Base	151	483	634	637	80*	105	-**	-**	321	431	82*	101	-**	-**
Middle School	2 1%	1 *	3 *	4 1%	-	-	-	-	1 *	4 1%	-	-	-	-
HS Diploma	7 5% K	10 2%	17 3%	14 2%	-	-	-	-	10 3% B	14 3% D	-	-	-	-
No formal education	-	1 *	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 1% III	-	-	-
Some high school	-	2 *	2 *	6 1% J	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 2% IBICI	6 6% DFJ	-	-
High school completed	1 1%	14 3% I	15 2% I	24 4% FJ	-	-	-	-	-	-	14 17% AEIBEICEI	24 24% DFJ	-	-
Some University/Technikon college	9 6% DEI	28 6% DEI	37 6% DEI	17 3% J	-	-	-	-	-	-	28 34% LAEIBEICEI	17 17% DFJ	-	-
University/Technikon college completed	6 4% I	33 7% EI	39 6% EI	49 8% FJ	-	-	-	-	-	-	33 40% AEIBEICEI	49 49% DFJ	-	-
Other post-matric qualification	3 2% I	4 1%	7 1%	5 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	4 5% EIBEICEI	5 5% DFJ	-	-
Less Than Secondary School (high school)	1 1%	5 1%	6 1%	2 *	5 6% AIKBIKCIK	2 2% DJ	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Completed some Secondary School (high school)	-	4 1%	4 1%	4 1%	4 5% AIKBIKCIK	4 4% DJL	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Graduated from Secondary School (high school)	2 1% I	11 2% I	13 2% I	6 1% J	11 14% AIKBIKCIK	6 6% DJL	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Trade Certificate or diploma	2 1% I	1 *	3 *	5 1%	1 1% III	5 5% DJL	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Certificate or Diploma from Community College, Institution, CEGEP	1 1%	8 2% I	9 1% I	15 2% J	8 10% AIKBIKCIK	15 14% DJL	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Teaching Certificate from Provincial Department of Education	-	1 *	1 *	2 *	1 1% IICI	2 2% DJ	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Completed some university study, but no degree	2 1% I	13 3% I	15 2% I	18 3% J	13 16% AIKBIKCIK	18 17% DJL	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q437. What is the highest level of education you have completed or the highest degree you have received?

16 Aug 2016
Table 381

Base: All Non-U.S. Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Weighted Base	151	483	634	637	80*	105	-**	-**	321	431	82*	101	-**	-**
University Certificate or Diploma below Bachelor Level	2 1%	12 2%	14 2%	11 2%	12 15% J AIKBIKCIK	11 10% DJL	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bachelor or first professional degree	9 6% IK	17 4%	26 4%	23 4%	17 21% J AIKBIKCIK	23 22% DJL	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Graduate or Professional Degree above Bachelor Level	4 3% I	8 2%	12 2%	19 3%	8 10% J AIKBIKCIK	19 18% DJL	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
CAP / BEP (Vocational training certificate/Technical education certificate)	-	12 2%	12 2%	8 1%	-	-	-	-	12 4% ABC	8 2%	-	-	-	-
High school diploma	2 1%	8 2%	10 2%	15 2%	-	-	-	-	8 2%	15 3% D	-	-	-	-
2-year college degree/Associate's degree	6 4%	14 3%	20 3%	23 4% F	-	-	-	-	14 4% B	23 5% DFL	-	-	-	-
3-year college degree/Bachelor's degree	3 2%	15 3%	18 3%	15 2%	-	-	-	-	15 5% EKBKCEK	15 3% D	-	-	-	-
4-year college degree/Master's degree	4 3%	8 2%	12 2%	12 2%	-	-	-	-	8 2%	12 3% D	-	-	-	-
DESS/DEA /Master (5-year college degree)	5 3%	13 3%	18 3%	19 3%	-	-	-	-	13 4% B	19 4% DFL	-	-	-	-
Doctorate	4 3%	4 1%	8 1%	9 1%	-	-	-	-	4 1%	9 2%	-	-	-	-
Still studying	-	1 *	1 *	1 *	-	-	-	-	1 *	1 *	-	-	-	-
Did not graduate	2 1% I	-	2 *	4 1%	-	-	-	-	-	4 1%	-	-	-	-
Lower Secondary Education (5th - 9 or 10th)	-	3 1%	3 *	1 *	-	-	-	-	3 1%	1 *	-	-	-	-
HS Diploma	1 1%	17 4%	18 3%	13 2%	-	-	-	-	17 5% AEKBEKCEK	13 3% D	-	-	-	-
University Entrance Exam	2 1%	19 4%	21 3%	28 4% FL	-	-	-	-	19 6% AEKBEKCEK	28 6% DFL	-	-	-	-
University of Applied Sciences	6 4%	14 3%	20 3%	14 2%	-	-	-	-	14 4% B	14 3% D	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q437. What is the highest level of education you have completed or the highest degree you have received?

16 Aug 2016
Table 381

Base: All Non-U.S. Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Weighted Base	151	483	634	637	80*	105	-**	-**	321	431	82*	101	-**	-**
Finished University	5 3%	21 4%	26 4%	27 4% FL	-	-	-	-	21 7% EKBEKCEK	27 6% DFL	-	-	-	-
Doctorate	1 1%	1 *	2 *	4 1%	-	-	-	-	1 *	4 1%	-	-	-	-
Completed Apprenticeship	1 1%	26 5% EK	27 4%	21 3%	-	-	-	-	26 8% AEKBEKCEK	21 5% DFL	-	-	-	-
Master Craftsman Diploma	1 1%	3 1%	4 1%	7 1%	-	-	-	-	3 1%	7 2%	-	-	-	-
Other Qualification	-	2 *	2 *	1 *	-	-	-	-	2 1%	1 *	-	-	-	-
Student	-	2 *	2 *	8 1%	-	-	-	-	2 1%	8 2%	-	-	-	-
Some College	4 3% D	5 1%	9 1%	3 *	-	-	-	-	5 2%	3 1%	-	-	-	-
Short Bachelor, 2-3 Year	3 2%	1 *	4 1%	10 2% B	-	-	-	-	1 *	10 2% ID	-	-	-	-
Bachelor, 4-5 Year	7 5% K	6 1%	13 2%	16 3%	-	-	-	-	6 2%	16 4% DF	-	-	-	-
post-bachelor	2 1% D	3 1%	5 1%	1 *	-	-	-	-	3 1%	1 *	-	-	-	-
Doctorate	2 1% DI	-	2 *	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	-
No formal education	1 1%	-	1 *	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	-
Secondary	-	1 *	1 *	3 *	-	-	-	-	1 *	3 1%	-	-	-	-
Baccalaureate	1 1%	14 3%	15 2%	10 2%	-	-	-	-	14 4% ABC	10 2% D	-	-	-	-
Not finalized University studies	1 1%	3 1%	4 1%	4 1%	-	-	-	-	3 1%	4 1%	-	-	-	-
Diploma	-	5 1%	5 1%	11 2%	-	-	-	-	5 2%	11 3% D	-	-	-	-
Degree	5 3%	11 2%	16 3%	15 2%	-	-	-	-	11 3% B	15 3% D	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q437. What is the highest level of education you have completed or the highest degree you have received?

16 Aug 2016
Table 381

Base: All Non-U.S. Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Weighted Base	151	483	634	637	80*	105	-**	-**	321	431	82*	101	-**	-**
Masters/Postgraduate/Doctorate/PHD	5 3% D	4 1%	9 1%	6 1%	-	-	-	-	4 1%	6 1%	-	-	-	-
Still studying	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	-
GCSE/O-Level/CSE	3 2%	10 2%	13 2%	18 3%	-	-	-	-	10 3% B	18 4% DFL	-	-	-	-
Vocational qualifications	-	3 1%	3 *	5 1%	-	-	-	-	3 1%	5 1%	-	-	-	-
A-Level/Scottish Higher or equivalent	5 3%	18 4%	23 4%	21 3%	-	-	-	-	18 6% EKBKCEK	21 5% DFL	-	-	-	-
Bachelor Degree or equivalent	6 4%	26 5% EK	32 5% EK	37 6% FL	-	-	-	-	26 8% EKBKCEK	37 9% DFL	-	-	-	-
Masters/PhD or equivalent	11 7% DEK	12 2%	23 4%	17 3%	-	-	-	-	12 4% B	17 4% DFL	-	-	-	-
No formal qualifications	1 1%	1 *	2 *	2 *	-	-	-	-	1 *	2 *	-	-	-	-
Apprentice/Trainee	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	-
Other	-	4 1% D	4 1% D	-	-	-	-	-	4 1% J	-	-	-	-	-
Sigma	151 100%	483 100%	634 100%	637 100%	80 100%	105 100%	-	-	321 100%	431 100%	82 100%	101 100%	-	-

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q410. Which one of the following best describes your employment status?

Base: 18 Years Old Or Older And (Ask Sequential Employment And Single Employment Item Selected And More Than 1 Valid Code From Q406)

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	743	2512	3255	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1265	1539
Employed full time	344 46%	1570 63%	1914 59%	2070 62%	81 39%	201 44%	127 47%	201 48%	216 52%	295 55%	183 52%	200 50%	963 76%	1173 76%
Employed part time	38 5%	221 9%	259 8%	292 9%	26 13%	46 10%	36 13%	46 11%	47 11%	49 9%	42 12%	49 12%	70 6%	102 7%
Self-employed full time	289 39%	355 14%	644 20%	369 11%	35 17%	41 9%	65 24%	78 19%	55 13%	55 10%	85 24%	87 22%	115 9%	108 7%
Not employed, but looking for work	8 1%	40 2%	48 1%	77 2%	7 3%	15 3%	5 2%	13 3%	18 4%	23 4%	3 1%	3 1%	7 1%	23 1%
Not employed and not looking for work	13 2%	16 1%	29 1%	19 1%	3 1%	4 1%	2 1%	2 *	4 1%	5 1%	-	-	7 1%	8 1%
Retired	24 3%	87 3%	111 3%	151 5%	19 9%	83 18%	9 3%	8 2%	29 7%	37 7%	7 2%	5 1%	23 2%	18 1%
Not employed, unable to work due to a disability or illness	3 *	21 1%	24 1%	23 1%	6 3%	12 3%	1 *	-	10 2%	6 1%	1 *	-	3 *	5 *
Student	18 2%	143 6%	161 5%	144 4%	23 11%	14 3%	19 7%	28 7%	29 7%	28 5%	26 7%	29 7%	46 4%	45 3%
Stay-at-home spouse or partner	6 1%	59 2%	65 2%	77 2%	7 3%	9 2%	5 2%	10 2%	11 3%	21 4%	5 1%	5 1%	31 2%	32 2%
Self-employed part time	-	-	-	127 4%	-	35 8%	-	29 7%	-	15 3%	-	23 6%	-	25 2%
Sigma	743 100%	2512 100%	3255 100%	3349 100%	207 100%	460 100%	269 100%	415 100%	419 100%	534 100%	352 100%	401 100%	1265 100%	1539 100%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q462. Which of the following income categories best describes your total 2015 household income before/after taxes?

Base: Online Survey And Over 18 Years Of Age And Household Income Is To Be Presented And Have Household Income Codes

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	451	1485	1936	1929	207	460	137	186	344	428	-**	-**	797	855
Less than \$15,000	5 1% M	6 *	11 1% M	8 *	6 3% GIMBGMCGIM	8 2% DJN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
\$15,000 to \$24,999	4 1% M	2 *	6 *	23 1% BCJN	2 1% MBMM	23 5% EDHJN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
\$25,000 to \$34,999	11 2% DIM	7 *	18 1% M	23 1% BJN	7 3% GIMBGMCGIM	23 5% DHJN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
\$35,000 to \$49,999	15 3% DGIM	8 1% M	23 1% IM	32 2% BJN	8 4% GIMBGMCGIM	32 7% DHJN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
\$50,000 to \$74,999	30 7% DGIM	15 1% M	45 2% IM	54 3% BHJN	15 7% GIMBGMCGIM	54 12% DHJN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
\$75,000 to \$99,999	26 6% DGIM	10 1% M	36 2% IM	50 3% BHJN	10 5% GIMBGMCGIM	50 11% EDHJN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
\$100,000 to \$124,999	20 4% DGIM	9 1% M	29 1% IM	17 1% N	9 4% GIMBGMCGIM	17 4% DHJN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
\$125,000 to \$149,999	19 4% DEGIM	1 *	20 1% M	11 1% BN	1 *	11 2% DHJN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
\$150,000 to \$199,999	23 5% DEGIM	1 *	24 1% IM	19 1% BJN	1 *	19 4% EDHJN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
\$200,000 to \$249,999	6 1% DIM	-	6 *	3 *	-	3 1% DN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
\$250,000 or more	10 2% DIM	1 *	11 1% M	4 *	1 *	4 1% DN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Less than \$15,000 (in Canadian dollars)	1 *	8 1% M	9 *	6 *	8 4% FAGIMBGMCGIM	6 1% DJN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
\$15,000 to \$24,999 (in Canadian dollars)	-	5 *	5 *	7 *	5 2% AIMBIMCIM	7 2% DJN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
\$25,000 to \$34,999 (in Canadian dollars)	5 1% M	5 *	10 1% M	14 1% N	5 2% IMBIMCIM	14 3% DHJN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
\$35,000 to \$49,999 (in Canadian dollars)	-	9 1% M	9 *	8 *	9 4% FAGIMBGMCGIM	8 2% DJN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
\$50,000 to \$74,999 (in Canadian dollars)	3 1% M	7 *	10 1% M	20 1% JN	7 3% AGIMBGMCGIM	20 4% DHJN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q462. Which of the following income categories best describes your total 2015 household income before/after taxes?

Base: Online Survey And Over 18 Years Of Age And Household Income Is To Be Presented And Have Household Income Codes

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	451	1485	1936	1929	207	460	137	186	344	428	-**	-**	797	855
\$75,000 to \$99,999 (in Canadian dollars)	5 1% M	11 1% M	16 1% M	9 N FAGIMBGIMCGIM	11 5% D	9 2% DJN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
\$100,000 to \$124,999 (in Canadian dollars)	3 1% M	11 1% M	14 1% M	10 1% N FAGIMBGIMCGIM	11 5% D	10 2% DHJN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
\$125,000 to \$149,999 (in Canadian dollars)	1 *	5 *	6 *	7 2% AIMBIMCIM	5 2% D	7 2% DJN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
\$150,000 to \$199,999 (in Canadian dollars)	2 *	6 *	8 *	9 3% N AGIMBGIMCGIM	6 3% D	9 2% DJN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
\$200,000 to \$249,999 (in Canadian dollars)	-	1 *	1 *	4 *	1 C	4 1% DN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
\$250,000 or more (in Canadian dollars)	1 *	1 *	2 *	3 *	1 *	3 1% DN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Less than 10,000 yuan	-	4 *	4 *	8 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4 1% C	8 1% DFJ
10,000 to 19,999 yuan	-	6 *	6 *	6 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6 1% BC	6 1% D
20,000 to 29,999 yuan	-	8 1%	8 *	8 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8 1% ABC	8 1% DFJ
30,000 to 39,999 yuan	-	10 1%	10 1%	9 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10 1% AIBICI	9 1% DFJ
40,000 to 49,999 yuan	-	8 1%	8 *	7 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8 1% ABC	7 1% D
50,000 to 59,999 yuan	-	22 1% DI	22 1% I	13 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	22 3% AEGIBEGICEGI	13 2% DFJ
60,000 to 79,999 yuan	-	36 2% EI	36 2% EI	38 2% AFJ	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	36 5% AEGIBEGICEGI	38 4% DFHJ
80,000 to 99,999 yuan	-	68 5% DEGI	68 4% EGI	48 2% AFHJ	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	68 9% NAEGIBEGICEGI	48 6% DFHJ
100,000 to 124,999 yuan	1 *	133 9% DEGI	134 7% EGI	122 6% AFHJ	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	133 17% AEGIBEGICEGI	122 14% DFHJ
125,000 to 149,999 yuan	-	96 6% EGI	96 5% EGI	117 6% AFHJ	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	96 12% AEGIBEGICEGI	117 14% DFHJ
150,000 or more yuan	1 *	145 10% EGI	146 8% EGI	171 9% AFHJ	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	145 18% AEGIBEGICEGI	171 20% DFHJ

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q462. Which of the following income categories best describes your total 2015 household income before/after taxes?

Base: Online Survey And Over 18 Years Of Age And Household Income Is To Be Presented And Have Household Income Codes

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	451	1485	1936	1929	207	460	137	186	344	428	-**	-**	797	855
Less than 1,000,000 yen	-	5	5	8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5 1% C	8 1% DFJ
1,000,000 to 1,499,999 yen	-	3	3	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	2
1,500,000 to 1,999,999 yen	-	7	7	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7 1% ABC	3
2,000,000 to 2,999,999 yen	-	13	13	14	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	13 2% AIBICI	14 2% DFJ
3,000,000 to 3,999,999 yen	-	19	19	13	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	19 2% AEIBEICEI	13 2% DFJ
4,000,000 to 4,999,999 yen	-	16	16	19	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	16 2% AEIBEICEI	19 2% DFHJ
5,000,000 to 5,999,999 yen	-	27	27	23	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	27 3% AEGIBEGICEI	23 3% DFHJ
6,000,000 to 6,999,999 yen	-	21	21	17	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	21 3% AEIBEICEI	17 2% DFJ
7,000,000 to 7,999,999 yen	-	13	13	17	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	13 2% AIBICI	17 2% DFJ
8,000,000 to 9,999,999 yen	-	24	24	20	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	24 3% AEGIBEGICEI	20 2% DFHJ
10,000,000 or more yen	-	24	24	34	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	24 3% AEGIBEGICEI	34 4% DFHJ
Less than 4,000 real	9 2% EIM	24 2% IM	33 2% IM	35 2% FJN	-	-	24 18% AEIMBEIMCEIM	35 19% DFJN	-	-	-	-	-	-
4,000 to 7,999 real	7 2% IM	17 1% IM	24 1% IM	27 1% FJN	-	-	17 12% AEIMBEIMCEIM	27 15% DFJN	-	-	-	-	-	-
8,000 to 11,999 real	1	4	5	16 1% BCN	-	-	4 3% AEIMBEIMCEIM	16 9% GDFJN	-	-	-	-	-	-
12,000 to 15,999 real	2	8 1% M	10 1% M	4	-	-	8 6% AEIMBEIMCEIM	4 2% DFJN	-	-	-	-	-	-
16,000 to 19,999 real	2	4	6	8	-	-	4 3% AEIMBEIMCEIM	8 4% DFJN	-	-	-	-	-	-
20,000 to 29,999 real	3 1% M	17 1% IM	20 1% M	18 1% FJN	-	-	17 12% AEIMBEIMCEIM	18 10% DFJN	-	-	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q462. Which of the following income categories best describes your total 2015 household income before/after taxes?

Base: Online Survey And Over 18 Years Of Age And Household Income Is To Be Presented And Have Household Income Codes

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
					(E)		(G)		(I)		(K)		(M)	
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	451	1485	1936	1929	207	460	137	186	344	428	-**	-**	797	855
30,000 to 39,999 real	3 1% M	10 1% M	13 1% M	12 1% N	-	-	10 7% AEIMBEIMCEIM	12 6% DFJN	-	-	-	-	-	-
40,000 to 49,999 real	1 *	10 1% M	11 1% M	11 1% N	-	-	10 7% AEIMBEIMCEIM	11 6% DFJN	-	-	-	-	-	-
50,000 to 74,999 real	-	14 1% M	14 1% M	14 1% N	-	-	14 10% AEIMBEIMCEIM	14 8% DFJN	-	-	-	-	-	-
75,000 to 99,999 real	2 *	5 *	7 *	19 1% BCFJN	-	-	5 4% AEIMBEIMCEIM	19 10% GDFJN	-	-	-	-	-	-
100,000 or more real	5 1% M	19 1% IM	24 1% IM	14 1% N	-	-	19 14% AEIMBEIMCEIM	14 8% DFJN	-	-	-	-	-	-
Less than 50,000 Mexican pesos	3 1% M	7 *	10 1% M	6 * AGIMBGIMCGIM	7 3% DJN	6 1% DJN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
50,000 to 74,999 Mexican pesos	4 1% M	4 *	8 *	7 * IMBIMCIM	4 2% DJN	7 2% DJN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
75,000 to 99,999 Mexican pesos	3 1% M	5 *	8 *	6 * IMBIMCIM	5 2% DJN	6 1% DJN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
100,000 to 149,999 Mexican pesos	2 *	7 *	9 *	13 1% N AGIMBGIMCGIM	7 3% DHJN	13 3% DHJN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
150,000 to 199,999 Mexican pesos	1 *	7 *	8 *	11 1% N AGIMBGIMCGIM	7 3% DHJN	11 2% DHJN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
200,000 to 249,999 Mexican pesos	2 *	5 *	7 *	11 1% N AIMBIMCIM	5 2% DHJN	11 2% DHJN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
250,000 to 299,999 Mexican pesos	2 *	5 *	7 *	9 * N AIMBIMCIM	5 2% DJN	9 2% DJN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
300,000 to 399,999 Mexican pesos	3 1% M	3 *	6 *	7 * IMBIMCIM	3 1% DJN	7 2% DJN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
400,000 to 499,999 Mexican pesos	3 1% M	5 *	8 *	8 * IMBIMCIM	5 2% DJN	8 2% DJN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
500,000 to 999,999 Mexican pesos	2 *	6 *	8 *	6 * AGIMBGIMCGIM	6 3% DJN	6 1% DJN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1,000,000 Mexican pesos or more	6 1% DIM	2 *	8 *	4 * MBMM	2 1% DN	4 1% DN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Less than 5.000 Euros	2 *	8 1% M	10 1% M	6 *	-	-	-	-	8 2% AEMBEMCEM	6 1% DFN	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q462. Which of the following income categories best describes your total 2015 household income before/after taxes?

Base: Online Survey And Over 18 Years Of Age And Household Income Is To Be Presented And Have Household Income Codes

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	451	1485	1936	1929	207	460	137	186	344	428	-**	-**	797	855
5.000 Euros - 9.999 Euros	1 *	9 1% M	10 1% M	6 *	-	-	-	-	9 3% AEBMBEBCGM	6 1% DFN	-	-	-	-
10.000 Euros - 19.999 Euros	3 1% M	28 2% EM	31 2% M	34 2% FN	-	-	-	-	28 8% AEBMBEBCGM	34 8% DFHN	-	-	-	-
20.000 Euros - 29.999 Euros	10 2% EM	26 2% M	36 2% EM	40 2% FHN	-	-	-	-	26 8% AEBMBEBCGM	40 9% DFHN	-	-	-	-
30.000 Euros - 39.999 Euros	1 *	28 2% EM	29 1% M	40 2% AFHN	-	-	-	-	28 8% AEBMBEBCGM	40 9% DFHN	-	-	-	-
40.000 Euros - 49.999 Euros	7 2% M	21 1% M	28 1% M	27 1% FN	-	-	-	-	21 6% AEBMBEBCGM	27 6% DFHN	-	-	-	-
50.000 Euros - 74.999 Euros	9 2% EM	20 1% M	29 1% M	29 2% FN	-	-	-	-	20 6% AEBMBEBCGM	29 7% DFHN	-	-	-	-
75.000 Euros - 99.999 Euros	3 1% M	11 1% M	14 1% M	18 1% FN	-	-	-	-	11 3% AEBMBEBCGM	18 4% DFHN	-	-	-	-
100.000 Euros - 149.999 Euros	3 1% M	2 *	5 *	6 *	-	-	-	-	2 1% MBMM	6 1% DFN	-	-	-	-
150.000 Euros - 199.999 Euros	2 *	1 *	3 *	4 *	-	-	-	-	1 *	4 1% DFN	-	-	-	-
200.000 Euros or more	1 * D	-	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Less than 10,000 ZL	-	5 * D	5 *	1 *	-	-	-	-	5 1% AMBMCM	1 *	-	-	-	-
10,000 ZL - 19,999 ZL	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	-
20,000 ZL - 29,999 ZL	-	4 *	4 *	2 *	-	-	-	-	4 1% AMBMCM	2 * DN	-	-	-	-
30,000 ZL - 39,999 ZL	-	4 *	4 *	4 *	-	-	-	-	4 1% AMBMCM	4 1% DFN	-	-	-	-
40,000 ZL - 49,999 ZL	-	5 *	5 *	5 *	-	-	-	-	5 1% AMBMCM	5 1% DFN	-	-	-	-
50,000 ZL - 59,999 ZL	-	4 *	4 *	6 *	-	-	-	-	4 1% AMBMCM	6 1% DFN	-	-	-	-
60,000 ZL - 79,999 ZL	-	11 1% M	11 1% M	9 * N	-	-	-	-	11 3% AEBMBEBCGM	9 2% DFHN	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q462. Which of the following income categories best describes your total 2015 household income before/after taxes?

Base: Online Survey And Over 18 Years Of Age And Household Income Is To Be Presented And Have Household Income Codes

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	451	1485	1936	1929	207	460	137	186	344	428	-**	-**	797	855
80,000 ZL - 99,999 ZL	-	3*	3*	5*	-	-	-	-	3 1%	5 1%	-	-	-	-
									AMBMCM	DFN				
100,000 ZL - 149,999 ZL	-	8 1% M	8*	8*	-	-	-	-	8 2%	8 2%	-	-	-	-
									AEMBCEM	DFN				
150,000 ZL - 199,999 ZL	-	2*	2*	1*	-	-	-	-	2 1%	1*	-	-	-	-
									MBMCM					
200,000 ZL - 249,999 ZL	-	-	-	1*	-	-	-	-	-	1*	-	-	-	-
Less than 5,000 TRY	1*	4*	5*	6*	-	-	-	-	4 1%	6 1%	-	-	-	-
									MBMCM	DFN				
5,000 TRY - 9,999 TRY	2*	4*	6*	4*	-	-	-	-	4 1%	4 1%	-	-	-	-
									MBMCM	DFN				
10,000 TRY - 19,999 TRY	1*	2*	3*	2*	-	-	-	-	2 1%	2*	-	-	-	-
									MBMM	DN				
20,000 TRY - 29,999 TRY	-	7*	7*	6*	-	-	-	-	7 2%	6 1%	-	-	-	-
									AEMBCEM	DFN				
30,000 TRY - 39,999 TRY	-	3*	3*	6*	-	-	-	-	3 1%	6 1%	-	-	-	-
									AMBMCM	DFN				
40,000 TRY - 49,999 TRY	-	7*	7*	3*	-	-	-	-	7 2%	3 1%	-	-	-	-
									AEMBCEM	DN				
50,000 TRY - 74,999 TRY	-	7*	7*	9*	-	-	-	-	7 2%	9 2%	-	-	-	-
				N					AEMBCEM	DFHN				
75,000 TRY - 99,999 TRY	1*	5*	6*	6*	-	-	-	-	5 1%	6 1%	-	-	-	-
									AMBMCM	DFN				
100,000 TRY - 149,999 TRY	-	4*	4*	3*	-	-	-	-	4 1%	3 1%	-	-	-	-
									AMBMCM	DN				
200,000 TRY - 249,999 TRY	-	-	-	1*	-	-	-	-	-	1*	-	-	-	-
250,000 TRY or more	-	2*	2*	2*	-	-	-	-	2 1%	2*	-	-	-	-
									MBMCM	DN				
Less than 2000 RUB	1*	-	1*	1*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1*
2000 RUB - 4000 RUB	1*	-	1*	2*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2*

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q462. Which of the following income categories best describes your total 2015 household income before/after taxes?

Base: Online Survey And Over 18 Years Of Age And Household Income Is To Be Presented And Have Household Income Codes

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	451	1485	1936	1929	207	460	137	186	344	428	-**	-**	797	855
6001 RUB - 8000 RUB	-	-	-	1*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1*
8001 RUB - 10000 RUB	-	1*	1*	3*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1*	3*
10001 RUB - 15000 RUB	3 1%	3*	6*	4*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3*	4*
15001 RUB - 25000 RUB	2*	8 1%	10 1%	6*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8 1%	6 1%
More than 25000 RUB	40 9%	58 4%	98 5%	107 6%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	58 7%	107 13%
Up to 4,499 GBP	DEGI	EGI	EGI	BFHJ C	-	-	-	-	-	4 1%	-	-	EGIBEGICEGI	MDFHJ
4,500 to 6,499 GBP	-	1*	1*	-	-	-	-	-	1*	-	-	-	-	-
6,500 to 7,499 GBP	-	1*	1*	1*	-	-	-	-	1*	1*	-	-	-	-
7,500 to 9,499 GBP	-	4*	4*	-	-	-	-	-	4 1%	-	-	-	-	-
9,500 to 11,499 GBP	-	D	D	-	-	-	-	-	JAMBMCM	-	-	-	-	-
11,500 to 13,499 GBP	-	4*	4*	5*	-	-	-	-	4 1%	5 1%	-	-	-	-
13,500 to 15,499 GBP	-	2*	2*	2*	-	-	-	-	2 1%	2*	-	-	-	-
15,500 to 17,499 GBP	-	3*	3*	4*	-	-	-	-	3 1%	4 1%	-	-	-	-
17,500 to 24,999 GBP	-	4*	5*	4*	-	-	-	-	4 1%	4 1%	-	-	-	-
25,000 to 29,999 GBP	1*	11 1%	13 1%	12 1%	-	-	-	-	11 3%	12 3%	-	-	-	-
30,000 to 39,999 GBP	2*	5*	7*	6*	-	-	-	-	5 1%	6 1%	-	-	-	-
40,000 to 49,999 GBP	2*	7*	8*	14 1%	-	-	-	-	7 2%	14 3%	-	-	-	-
									MBMCM	DFN				

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q462. Which of the following income categories best describes your total 2015 household income before/after taxes?

Base: Online Survey And Over 18 Years Of Age And Household Income Is To Be Presented And Have Household Income Codes

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	451	1485	1936	1929	207	460	137	186	344	428	-**	-**	797	855
50,000 to 74,999 GBP	2 *	11 1% M	13 1% M	18 1% FN	-	-	-	-	11 3% AEGMBEGMCEGM	18 4% DFHN	-	-	-	-
75,000 to 99,999 GBP	2 *	4 *	6 *	9 *	-	-	-	-	4 1% MBMCM	9 2% DFHN	-	-	-	-
100,000 or more GBP	9 2% DEM	3 *	12 1% DM	4 *	-	-	-	-	3 1% MBMM	4 1% DFN	-	-	-	-
Decline to answer	78 17% DEGIM	79 5% M	157 8% DGM	89 5% N	22 11% GMBGMGM	31 7% DN	5 4% N	8 4% GMBGMGM	33 10% DN	36 8% DN	-	-	19 2%	14 2%
Sigma	451 100%	1485 100%	1936 100%	1929 100%	207 100%	460 100%	137 100%	186 100%	344 100%	428 100%	-	-	797 100%	855 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q485. Racial Background.

16 Aug 2016
Table 384

Base: All Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539
White	184 24% DGIKM	106 4% GIKM	290 9% GIKM	289 9% BHJLN	106 51% AGIKMBGKMGKIM	289 63% EDHJLN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hispanic	9 1% DIKM	2 *	11 * M	10 * N	2 1% IMBIMIM	10 2% DHJLN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
BLACK/AFRICAN AMERICAN (NET)	1 *	7 *	8 *	9 * N	7 3% AGIKMBGKMGKIM	9 2% DHJLN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	1 *	7 *	8 *	9 * N	7 3% AGIKMBGKMGKIM	9 2% DHJLN	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Asian or Pacific Islander	3 * DM	2 *	5 * D	- * FIMBIMCIM	2 1% -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Native American or Alaskan Native	3 * M	1 *	4 *	4 * MBMM	1 * DJB	4 1% -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mixed Race	7 1% DM	4 *	11 * DM	3 * GKIMBGKMGKIM	4 2% DN	3 1% -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
First Nation/Native Canadian	-	2 *	2 *	- * FAIMBIMCIM	2 1% -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
South Asian	-	7 * D	7 * D	1 * FAGIKMBGKMGKIM	7 3% -	1 * -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Chinese	1 * D	4 * D	5 * D	- * FAGIKMBGKMGKIM	4 2% -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Korean	-	1 *	1 *	2 * MBMCM	1 * DN	2 * -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Japanese	-	2 *	2 *	1 * AIMBIMCIM	2 1% -	1 * -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other Southeast Asian	-	1 *	1 *	3 * MBMCM	1 * DN	3 1% -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Filipino	-	1 *	1 *	2 * MBMCM	1 * DN	2 * -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Arab/West Asian	1 *	1 *	2 *	1 * MBMCM	1 * -	1 * -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Some other race	2 * D	-	2 *	1 * -	-	1 * -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Q485. Racial Background.

Base: All Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region													
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia				
					(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	769	2588	3357	3349	207	460	269	415	419	534	352	401	1341	1539				
Decline to Answer	16 2%	3 *	19 1%	3 *	3 1%	3 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-				
	DGIKM		DM		GKMBGKMGKM	DN												
Unknown	542 70%	2444 94%	2986 89%	3019 90%	63 30%	130 28%	269 100%	415 100%	419 100%	534 100%	352 100%	401 100%	1341 100%	1539 100%				
	E	DE	E	AF		AEBECE	DF	AEBECE	DF	AEBECE	DF	AEBECE	DF	DF				
Sigma	769 100%	2588 100%	3357 100%	3348 100%	207 100%	459 100%	269 100%	415 100%	419 100%	534 100%	352 100%	401 100%	1341 100%	1539 100%				
Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N Overlap formulae used.																		

Q364. What is your marital status?

Base: Marital Status Is To Be Presented And 18 Or Older

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	752	2398	3150	3149	207	460	269	415	419	534	162	201	1341	1539
Never married	163 22%	716 30% M	879 28%	944 30% AF	60 29% FA	91 20%	87 32% A	155 37% DFJN	136 32% AC	150 28% F	59 36% AMMCM	70 35% F	374 28% A	478 31% F
Married or civil union	435 58% EGIK	1377 57% EGIK	1812 58% EGIK	1812 58% HL	102 49% EHL	283 62% EHL	123 46%	176 42%	203 48%	296 55% IH	80 49%	100 50%	869 65% AEGKBEGKCEGIK	957 62% DHJL
Divorced	56 7% DM	91 4% M	147 5% M	117 4% N	17 8% MBMCM	43 9% DHJN	12 4% MMM	12 3%	27 6% MBMM	24 4% N	8 5% MMM	11 5% N	27 2%	27 2%
Separated	16 2% M	36 2% M	52 2% M	48 2% N	4 2% MMM	8 2% AMBMCN	12 4% AMBMCN	13 3% DN	8 2% MMM	9 2% MBMCM	6 4% MBMCM	5 2% N	6 *	13 1%
Widow/Widower	11 1% M	22 1% M	33 1% M	36 1% N	6 3% MBMCM	13 3% DHN	4 1% MMM	1 *	6 1% MMM	8 1% H	2 1%	3 1%	4 *	11 1%
Living with partner	71 9% DKM	156 7% M	227 7% M	192 6% N	18 9% FMMM	22 5% KMBKMKM	31 12% KMBKMKM	58 14% DFJLN	39 9% KMBKMKM	47 9% DFN	7 4%	12 6%	61 5%	53 3%
Sigma	752 100%	2398 100%	3150 100%	3149 100%	207 100%	460 100%	269 100%	415 100%	419 100%	534 100%	162 100%	201 100%	1341 100%	1539 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used.

Base: All Argentina Respondents

QARREG. In which region do you currently reside?

16 Aug 2016
Table 386

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	32*	68*	100	104	-.**	-.**	68*	104	-.**	-.**	-.**	-.**	-.**	-.**
Buenos Aires	22 69% DG	28 41%	50 50% DG	34 33%	-	-	28 41%	34 33%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Buenos Aires Province (including Gran Buenos Aires)	3 9%	12 18%	15 15%	23 22%	-	-	12 18%	23 22%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Santa Fe	2 6%	4 6%	6 6%	8 8%	-	-	4 6%	8 8%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Cordoba	2 6%	5 7%	7 7%	11 11%	-	-	5 7%	11 11%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Patagonia	1 3%	3 4%	4 4%	8 8%	-	-	3 4%	8 8%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	2 6%	16 24%	18 18%	20 19%	-	-	16 24% AC	20 19%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sigma	32 100%	68 100%	100 100%	104 100%	-	-	68 100%	104 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Base: All South Korea Respondents

QKRINC. Which of the following income categories best describes your total 2015 household income before taxes?

16 Aug 2016
Table 387

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	32*	69*	101	101	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	69*	101
Less than 10,000,000 Won	1 3%	2 3%	3 3%	2 2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 3%	2 2%
10,000,000 to 20,999,999 Won	2 6%	4 6%	6 6%	3 3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4 6%	3 3%
21,000,000 to 29,999,999 Won	4 13%	10 14%	14 14%	11 11%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10 14%	11 11%
30,000,000 to 44,999,999 Won	5 16%	13 19%	18 18%	22 22%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	13 19%	22 22%
45,000,000 to 74,999,999 Won	12 38%	28 41%	40 40%	41 41%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	28 41%	41 41%
75,000,000 or more Won	5 16%	11 16%	16 16%	18 18%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	11 16%	18 18%
Decline to answer	3 9%	1 1%	4 4% M	4 4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 1%	4 4%
Sigma	32 100%	69 100%	101 100%	101 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	69 100%	101 100%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

QKRBUY. In the past 12 months, did you purchase any products or services over the Internet?

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	32*	69*	101	101	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	69*	101
Yes	31 97%	68 99%	99 98%	97 96%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	68 99%	97 96%
No	1 3%	1 1%	2 2%	4 4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 1%	4 4%
Sigma	32 100%	69 100%	101 100%	101 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	69 100%	101 100%
Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing														

Base: All South Korea Respondents

QKRREG1. In which region do you currently reside?

16 Aug 2016
Table 389

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	..	..	..	101	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	101
Seoul	-	-	-	49 49%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	49 49%
Busan	-	-	-	7 7%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7 7%
Gyeonggi-do	-	-	-	17 17%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	17 17%
Ulsan	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Daejeon	-	-	-	3 3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3 3%
Gwangju	-	-	-	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 1%
Incheon	-	-	-	3 3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3 3%
Daegu	-	-	-	6 6%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6 6%
Jeju-do	-	-	-	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 1%
Chungcheongbuk-do	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gangwon-do	-	-	-	4 4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4 4%
Chungcheongnam-do	-	-	-	2 2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 2%
Jeollabuk-do	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Jeollanam-do	-	-	-	3 3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3 3%
Gyeongsangnam-do	-	-	-	2 2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 2%
Gyeongsangbuk-do	-	-	-	3 3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3 3%
Sigma	-	-	-	101 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	101 100%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

QKRREG1. In which region do you currently reside?

[illegible]

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Base: All South Korea Respondents

QKRREG2. REGION CLASSIFICATION

16 Aug 2016
Table 390

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	-.**	-.**	-.**	101	-.**	-.**	-.**	-.**	-.**	-.**	-.**	-.**	-.**	101
Seoul	-	-	-	49 49%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	49 49%
Busan	-	-	-	7 7%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7 7%
Gyeonggi-do	-	-	-	17 17%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	17 17%
All other metropolitan cities	-	-	-	13 13%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	13 13%
All other provinces (do)	-	-	-	15 15%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15 15%
Sigma	-	-	-	101 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	101 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Base: All India Respondents

QINED. What is the highest level of education/literacy you have completed/obtained or the highest degree you have received?

16 Aug 2016
Table 391

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	27**	298	325	330	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	298	330
No education	-	-	-	2 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 1%
Less than primary	-	5 2%	5 2%	5 2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5 2%	5 2%
Primary but less than middle	-	7 2%	7 2%	9 3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7 2%	9 3%
Middle but less than matric	-	6 2%	6 2%	10 3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6 2%	10 3%
Matric but less than graduate	2 7%	24 8%	26 8%	25 8%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	24 8%	25 8%
Graduate or above	25 93%	256 86%	281 86%	279 85%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	256 86%	279 85%
Sigma	27 100%	298 100%	325 100%	330 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	298 100%	330 100%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Base: All India Respondents

QININC2. Which of the following income categories best describes your total 2015 household income before taxes?

16 Aug 2016
Table 392

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	27**	298	325	330	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	298	330
Less than 120,000 rupees	1 4%	38 13%	39 12%	53 16%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	38 13%	53 16%
120,000 rupees or more	13 48%	250 84%	263 81%	257 78%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	250 84% C	257 78%
Decline to answer	13 48%	10 3%	23 7% M	20 6%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10 3%	20 6%
Sigma	27 100%	298 100%	325 100%	330 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	298 100%	330 100%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Base: All India Respondents

QINSUB. Which of the following best describes the area in which you live?

16 Aug 2016
Table 393

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	27**	298	325	330	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	298	330
Metro	17 63%	239 80%	256 79%	281 85% C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	239 80% C	281 85%
Non-metro	10 37%	59 20%	69 21% DM	49 15%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	59 20%	49 15%
Sigma	27 100%	298 100%	325 100%	330 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	298 100%	330 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

QINBUY. In the past month, did you purchase any products or services over the Internet?

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	27**	298	325	330	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	298	330
Yes	25 93%	285 96%	310 95%	311 94%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	285 96%	311 94%
No	2 7%	13 4%	15 5%	19 6%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	13 4%	19 6%
Sigma	27 100%	298 100%	325 100%	330 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	298 100%	330 100%
Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing														

Base: All India Respondents

QINREG1. In which division do you currently reside?

16 Aug 2016
Table 395

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	..**	..**	..**	330	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	330
Uttar Pradesh	-	-	-	10 3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10 3%
Maharashtra	-	-	-	61 18%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	61 18%
Bihar	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 *
West Bengal	-	-	-	29 9%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	29 9%
Andhra Pradesh	-	-	-	34 10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	34 10%
Tamil Nadu	-	-	-	46 14%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	46 14%
Madhya Pradesh	-	-	-	3 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3 1%
Rajasthan	-	-	-	3 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3 1%
Karnataka	-	-	-	29 9%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	29 9%
Gujarat	-	-	-	21 6%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	21 6%
Orissa	-	-	-	4 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4 1%
Kerala	-	-	-	4 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4 1%
Assam	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 *
Punjab	-	-	-	4 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4 1%
Haryana	-	-	-	8 2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8 2%
Jharkhand	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Base: All India Respondents

QINREG1. In which division do you currently reside?

16 Aug 2016
Table 395

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	..	..	..	330	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	330
Chhattisgarh	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Jammu and Kashmir	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 *
Uttaranchal	-	-	-	4 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4 1%
Himachal Pradesh	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tripura	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 *
Manipur	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Meghalaya	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nagaland	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 *
Goa	-	-	-	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 *
Arunachal Pradesh	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mizoram	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sikkim	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Delhi	-	-	-	61 18%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	61 18%
Pondicherry	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Chandigarh	-	-	-	3 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3 1%
Andaman and Nicobar Islands	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Dadra and Nagar Haveli	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Base: All India Respondents

QINREG1. In which division do you currently reside?

16 Aug 2016
Table 395

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	..	..	..	330	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	330
Daman and Diu	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Lakshadweep	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sigma	-	-	-	330 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	330 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

OINREG2. STATE SIZE CLASSIFICATION

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Base: All Indonesia Respondents

Q1500. In which province do you currently reside?

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	52*	49*	101	100	-.**	-.**	-.**	-.**	-.**	-.**	-.**	-.**	49*	100
Irian Jaya Barat	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Papua	1 2%	-	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Banten	2 4%	1 2%	3 3%	9 9%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 2%	9 9%
Jakarta Raya	19 37% D	17 35%	36 36% D	21 21%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	17 35%	21 21%
Jawa Barat	7 13%	5 10%	12 12%	11 11%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5 10%	11 11%
Jawa Tengah	5 10%	5 10%	10 10%	15 15%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5 10%	15 15%
Jawa Timur	4 8%	9 18%	13 13%	16 16%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9 18%	16 16%
Yogyakarta	3 6%	3 6%	6 6%	6 6%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3 6%	6 6%
Kalimantan Barat	1 2%	-	1 1%	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 1%
Kalimantan Selatan	1 2%	-	1 1%	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 1%
Kalimantan Tengah	1 2%	-	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kalimantan Timur	1 2%	-	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Maluku	-	-	-	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 1%
Maluku Utara	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bali	2 4%	-	2 2%	3 3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3 3%
Nusa Tenggara Barat	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Base: All Indonesia Respondents

Q1500. In which province do you currently reside?

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	52*	49*	101	100	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	49*	100
Nusa Tenggara Timur	-	-	-	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 1%
Gorontalo	-	-	-	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 1%
Sulawesi Barat	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sulawesi Selatan	2 4%	-	2 2%	2 2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 2%
Sulawesi Tengah	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sulawesi Tenggara	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sulawesi Utara	-	1 2%	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 2%	-
Aceh	1 2%	-	1 1%	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 1%
Bangka-Belitung	1 2%	-	1 1%	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 1%
Bengkulu	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Jambi	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kepulauan Riau	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Lampung	-	2 4%	2 2%	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 4%	1 1%
Riau	-	1 2%	1 1%	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 2%	1 1%
Sumatera Barat	1 2%	2 4% D	3 3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 4% N	-
Sumatera Selatan	-	-	-	3 3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3 3%
Sumatera Utara	-	3 6%	3 3%	5 5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3 6%	5 5%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q1500. In which province do you currently reside?

[illegible]

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Base: All Indonesia Respondents

Q1502. REGION CLASSIFICATION

16 Aug 2016
Table 398

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	52*	49*	101	100	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	49*	100
Irian Jaya	1 2%	-	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Jawa	40 77%	40 82%	80 79%	78 78%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	40 82%	78 78%
Kalimantan	4 8%	-	4 4%	2 2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 2%
Maluku	-	-	-	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 1%
Nusa Tenggara	2 4%	-	2 2%	4 4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4 4%
Sulawesi	2 4%	1 2%	3 3%	3 3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 2%	3 3%
Sumatera	3 6%	8 16%	11 11%	12 12%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8 16%	12 12%
Sigma	52 100%	49 100%	101 100%	100 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	49 100%	100 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Base: All Nigeria Respondents

Q1580. What is your marital status?

16 Aug 2016
Table 399

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	17**	190	207	200	-.**	-.**	-.**	-.**	-.**	-.**	190	200	-.**	-.**
Single, never married	8 47%	87 46%	95 46%	100 50%	-	-	-	-	-	-	87 46%	100 50%	-	-
Married (monogamous or polygamous)	8 47%	96 51%	104 50%	95 48%	-	-	-	-	-	-	96 51%	95 48%	-	-
Divorced	-	1 1%	1 *	2 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 1%	2 1%	-	-
Separated	1 6%	3 2%	4 2% D	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3 2%	-	-	-
Widowed	-	2 1%	2 1%	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 1%	1 1%	-	-
Loosely coupled	-	1 1%	1 *	2 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 1%	2 1%	-	-
Sigma	17 100%	190 100%	207 100%	200 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	190 100%	200 100%	-	-

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Base: All Nigeria Respondents

Q1503. In which state do you currently reside?

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	17**	190	207	200	-.**	-.**	-.**	-.**	-.**	-.**	190	200	-.**	-.**
Lagos State	7 41%	104 55%	111 54%	112 56%	-	-	-	-	-	-	104 55%	112 56%	-	-
Ogun State	-	9 5%	9 4%	4 2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	9 5%	4 2%	-	-
Oyo State	-	8 4%	8 4%	7 4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	8 4%	7 4%	-	-
Osun State	-	-	-	3 2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3 2%	-	-
Kogi State	-	-	-	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 1%	-	-
Kwara State	1 6%	5 3%	6 3%	3 2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	5 3%	3 2%	-	-
Delta State	-	3 2%	3 1%	2 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	3 2%	2 1%	-	-
Ondo State	-	7 4%	7 3%	2 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	7 4%	2 1%	-	-
Edo State	-	7 4% D	7 3% D	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	7 4% L	1 1%	-	-
Ekiti State	-	-	-	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 1%	-	-
Anambra State	-	1 1%	1 *	2 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 1%	2 1%	-	-
Abia State	1 6%	-	1 *	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 1%	-	-
Enugu State	-	2 1%	2 1%	3 2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 1%	3 2%	-	-
Ebonyi State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Rivers State	2 12%	11 6%	13 6%	13 7%	-	-	-	-	-	-	11 6%	13 7%	-	-
Akwa Ibom State	-	1 1%	1 *	3 2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 1%	3 2%	-	-

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Base: All Nigeria Respondents

Q1503. In which state do you currently reside?

16 Aug 2016
Table 400

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	17**	190	207	200	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	190	200	-**	-**
Imo State	1 6%	2 1%	3 1%	3 2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 1%	3 2%	-	-
Cross River State	-	-	-	5 3% BC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5 3% K	-	-
Bayelsa State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Borno State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Adamawa State	1 6%	-	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Taraba State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Yobe State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kano State	-	-	-	2 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 1%	-	-
Jigawa State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bauchi State	-	1 1%	1 *	2 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 1%	2 1%	-	-
Gombe State	-	1 1%	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 1%	-	-	-
Kaduna State	1 6%	1 1%	2 1% K	2 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 1%	2 1%	-	-
Katsina State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sokoto State	-	1 1%	1 *	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 1%	1 1%	-	-
Kebbi State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Zamfara State	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Benue State	-	-	-	3 2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3 2%	-	-

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Base: All Nigeria Respondents

Q1503. In which state do you currently reside?

16 Aug 2016
Table 400

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	17**	190	207	200	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	190	200	-**	-**
Niger State	-	1 1%	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 1%	-	-	-
Plateau State	-	3 2%	3 1%	4 2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	3 2%	4 2%	-	-
Nassarawa State	-	1 1%	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 1%	-	-	-
Abuja Federal Capital Territory	3 18%	21 11%	24 12%	20 10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	21 11%	20 10%	-	-
Sigma	17 100%	190 100%	207 100%	200 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	190 100%	200 100%	-	-

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Base: All Nigeria Respondents

Q1504. STATE CLASSIFICATION

16 Aug 2016
Table 401

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	17**	190	207	200	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	190	200	-**	-**
Postal Code Region 1	7 41%	113 59%	120 58%	116 58%	-	-	-	-	-	-	113 59%	116 58%	-	-
Postal Code Region 2	1 6%	13 7%	14 7%	14 7%	-	-	-	-	-	-	13 7%	14 7%	-	-
Postal Code Region 3	-	17 9% D	17 8% D	6 3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	17 9% L	6 3%	-	-
Postal Code Region 4	1 6%	3 2%	4 2%	6 3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	3 2%	6 3%	-	-
Postal Code Region 5	3 18%	14 7%	17 8%	24 12%	-	-	-	-	-	-	14 7%	24 12%	-	-
Postal Code Region 6	1 6%	-	1 *	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Postal Code Region 7	-	2 1%	2 1%	4 2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 1%	4 2%	-	-
Postal Code Region 8	1 6%	2 1%	3 1%	3 2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 1%	3 2%	-	-
Postal Code Region 9	3 18%	26 14%	29 14%	27 14%	-	-	-	-	-	-	26 14%	27 14%	-	-
Sigma	17 100%	190 100%	207 100%	200 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	190 100%	200 100%	-	-

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Base: All Nigeria Respondents

Q1585. Do you consider yourself...?

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	17**	190	207	200	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	190	200	-**	-**
Hausa	-	2 1%	2 1%	5 3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 1%	5 3%	-	-
Yoruba	10 59%	100 53%	110 53%	92 46%	-	-	-	-	-	-	100 53%	92 46%	-	-
Igbo/Ibo	4 24%	52 27%	56 27%	50 25%	-	-	-	-	-	-	52 27%	50 25%	-	-
Fulanji	1 6%	1 1%	2 1% K	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 1%	-	-	-
Other	2 12%	32 17%	34 16%	48 24%	-	-	-	-	-	-	32 17%	48 24%	-	-
Decline to answer	-	3 2%	3 1%	5 3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	3 2%	5 3%	-	-
Sigma	17 100%	190 100%	207 100%	200 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	190 100%	200 100%	-	-

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Base: All Egypt Respondents

Q1505. In which governorate do you currently reside?

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	26**	80*	106	100	-.**	-.**	-.**	-.**	-.**	-.**	80*	100	-.**	-.**
Ad Daqahliyah	1 4%	3 4%	4 4%	6 6%	-	-	-	-	-	-	3 4%	6 6%	-	-
Al Buhayrah	-	4 5%	4 4%	2 2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	4 5%	2 2%	-	-
Al Gharbiyah	3 12%	7 9%	10 9%	4 4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	7 9%	4 4%	-	-
Al Isma'iliyah	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kafr ash Shaykh	1 4%	5 6%	6 6%	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	5 6%	1 1%	-	-
Dumyat	-	-	-	4 4% C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4 4%	-	-
Al Qalyubiyah	1 4%	3 4%	4 4%	3 3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	3 4%	3 3%	-	-
Ash Sharqiyah	1 4%	5 6%	6 6%	5 5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	5 6%	5 5%	-	-
Al Minufiyah	-	2 3%	2 2%	4 4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 3%	4 4%	-	-
Al Qahirah	13 50%	21 26%	34 32% K	25 25%	-	-	-	-	-	-	21 26%	25 25%	-	-
Al Iskandariyah	2 8%	14 18%	16 15%	15 15%	-	-	-	-	-	-	14 18%	15 15%	-	-
Bur Sa'id	1 4%	1 1%	2 2%	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 1%	1 1%	-	-
Al Uqsur	-	-	-	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 1%	-	-
As Suways	-	1 1%	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 1%	-	-	-
Aswan	-	-	-	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 1%	-	-
Asyut	-	1 1%	1 1%	5 5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 1%	5 5%	-	-

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Base: All Egypt Respondents

Q1505. In which governorate do you currently reside?

16 Aug 2016
Table 403

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	26**	80*	106	100	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	80*	100	-**	-**
Al Minya	-	3 4%	3 3%	2 2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	3 4%	2 2%	-	-
Suhaj	-	-	-	3 3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3 3%	-	-
Qina	-	-	-	2 2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 2%	-	-
Al Fayyum	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Al Jizah	3 12%	10 13%	13 12%	9 9%	-	-	-	-	-	-	10 13%	9 9%	-	-
Bani Suwayf	-	-	-	3 3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3 3%	-	-
Janub Sina'	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Matruh	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Shamal Sina'	-	-	-	2 2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 2%	-	-
Al Wadi al Jadid	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Al Bahr al Ahmar	-	-	-	2 2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 2%	-	-
Sigma	26 100%	80 100%	106 100%	100 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	80 100%	100 100%	-	-

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Base: All Egypt Respondents

Q1506. REGION CLASSIFICATION

16 Aug 2016
Table 404

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	26**	80*	106	100	-.**	-.**	-.**	-.**	-.**	-.**	80*	100	-.**	-.**
Lower	7 27%	29 36%	36 34%	29 29%	-	-	-	-	-	-	29 36%	29 29%	-	-
City	16 62%	37 46%	53 50%	42 42%	-	-	-	-	-	-	37 46%	42 42%	-	-
Upper	3 12%	14 18%	17 16%	25 25%	-	-	-	-	-	-	14 18%	25 25%	-	-
Desert	-	-	-	4 4% C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4 4%	-	-
Sigma	26 100%	80 100%	106 100%	100 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	80 100%	100 100%	-	-

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Base: All Colombia Respondents

Q4005. Which of the following income categories best describes your total 2015 household income before taxes?

16 Aug 2016
Table 405

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	61*	64*	125	125	-**	-**	64*	125	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**
Menos de \$ 6,000.000 pesos colombianos	11 18%	8 13%	19 15%	14 11%	-	-	8 13%	14 11%	-	-	-	-	-	-
\$ 6,001.000 a \$ 12,000.000 pesos colombianos	3 5%	7 11%	10 8%	16 13%	-	-	7 11%	16 13%	-	-	-	-	-	-
\$ 12,001.000 a \$ 18,000.000 pesos colombianos	4 7%	5 8%	9 7%	10 8%	-	-	5 8%	10 8%	-	-	-	-	-	-
\$ 18,001.000 a \$ 24,000.000 pesos colombianos	2 3%	4 6%	6 5%	8 6%	-	-	4 6%	8 6%	-	-	-	-	-	-
\$ 24,001.000 a \$ 30,000.000 pesos colombianos	2 3%	2 3%	4 3%	14 11% C	-	-	2 3%	14 11%	-	-	-	-	-	-
\$ 30,001.000 a \$ 36,000.000 pesos colombianos	3 5%	3 5%	6 5%	8 6%	-	-	3 5%	8 6%	-	-	-	-	-	-
\$ 36,001.000 a \$ 60,000.000 pesos colombianos	6 10%	11 17%	17 14%	13 10%	-	-	11 17%	13 10%	-	-	-	-	-	-
\$ 60,001.000 a \$ 84,000.000 pesos colombianos	4 7%	4 6%	8 6%	10 8%	-	-	4 6%	10 8%	-	-	-	-	-	-
\$ 84,001.000 o mas pesos colombianos	8 13%	8 13%	16 13%	15 12%	-	-	8 13%	15 12%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Decline to answer	18 30% D	12 19%	30 24% D	17 14%	-	-	12 19%	17 14%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sigma	61 100%	64 100%	125 100%	125 100%	-	-	64 100%	125 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Base: All Colombian Respondents

QCOREG2. In which region do you live?

16 Aug 2016
Table 406

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	-.**	-.**	-.**	125	-.**	-.**	-.**	125	-.**	-.**	-.**	-.**	-.**	-.**
Central	-	-	-	9 7%	-	-	-	9 7%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bogota	-	-	-	54 43%	-	-	-	54 43%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pacifico Norte	-	-	-	1 1%	-	-	-	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Eje Cafetero	-	-	-	12 10%	-	-	-	12 10%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Andina Norte	-	-	-	12 10%	-	-	-	12 10%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Andina Sur	-	-	-	4 3%	-	-	-	4 3%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pacifico Sur	-	-	-	18 14%	-	-	-	18 14%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Caribe	-	-	-	13 10%	-	-	-	13 10%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Orinoquia	-	-	-	2 2%	-	-	-	2 2%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Amazonia	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sigma	-	-	-	125 100%	-	-	-	125 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Base: All Vietnam Respondents

Q4010. What is your current education level?

16 Aug 2016
Table 407

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	-**	52*	52*	52*	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	52*	52*
No schooling	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Some Kindergarten school	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Complete Kindergarten school	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Some Primary school (Grades 1-5)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Complete Primary school (Grades 1-5)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Some Lower Secondary school (Grades 6-9)	-	-	-	1 2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 2%
Complete Lower Secondary school (Grades 6-9)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Some Upper Secondary school (Grades 10-12)	-	2 4%	2 4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 4%	-
Complete Upper Secondary school (Grades 10-12)	-	3 6%	3 6%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3 6%	-
Some Professional Secondary school - Primary level	-	1 2%	1 2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 2%	-
Complete Professional Secondary school - Primary level	-	-	-	1 2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 2%
Some Professional Secondary school - Intermediate level	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Complete Professional Secondary school - Intermediate level	-	1 2%	1 2%	1 2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 2%	1 2%
Some College	-	1 2%	1 2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 2%	-
Complete College	-	5 10%	5 10%	8 15%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5 10%	8 15%
Some University	-	11 21%	11 21%	8 15%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	11 21%	8 15%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Base: All Vietnam Respondents

Q4010. What is your current education level?

16 Aug 2016
Table 407

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	..	52*	52*	52*	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	52*	52*
Complete University	-	25 48%	25 48%	27 52%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	25 48%	27 52%
Some Post graduate degree	-	1 2%	1 2%	1 2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 2%	1 2%
Complete Post graduate degré	-	2 4%	2 4%	5 10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 4%	5 10%
Don't Know/ REFUSED	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sigma	-	52 100%	52 100%	52 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	52 100%	52 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Base: All Vietnam Respondents

Q4015. What is your current occupation?

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	-**	52*	52*	52*	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	52*	52*
GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEE (THE GOVERNMENT'S ORGANIZATIONS OR STATE-OWN COMPANIES)	-	-	-	4 8% BC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4 8% M
Senior government official	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Middle government official	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Low government official	-	1 2%	1 2%	3 6%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 2%	3 6%
Production Worker	-	3 6%	3 6%	1 2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3 6%	1 2%
NON-STATE SECTOR EMPLOYEE	-	2 4%	2 4%	5 10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 4%	5 10%
Top level management	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Middle management	-	8 15%	8 15%	8 15%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8 15%	8 15%
Low manager	-	5 10%	5 10%	2 4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5 10%	2 4%
Executive/Officer	-	1 2%	1 2%	3 6%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 2%	3 6%
EMPLOYER (owners of companies/business establishments having 'employees' on a continuous basis)	-	3 6%	3 6%	1 2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3 6%	1 2%
Owner of a company/agency/farm (10 workers or higher)	-	-	-	1 2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 2%
Owner of a company/agency/farm (1- 9 workers)	-	1 2%	1 2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 2%	-
OWN-ACCOUNT WORKER	-	7 13%	7 13%	5 10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7 13%	5 10%
Investor (real estate, stock,...)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Base: All Vietnam Respondents

Q4015. What is your current occupation?

16 Aug 2016
Table 408

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	-.**	52*	52*	52*	-.**	-.**	-.**	-.**	-.**	-.**	-.**	-.**	52*	52*
Store owner/ individual establishment owner (not having "employees" on a continuous basis)	-	1 2%	1 2%	1 2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 2%	1 2%
Farmer, logger, fisherman (agriculture, forestry and fishing)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other self-employment (professional, freelancer, own-account driver, vendor, hawker,...)	-	1 2%	1 2%	1 2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 2%	1 2%
PART-TIME/UNPAID FAMILY WORKER/ UNEMPLOYED	-	2 4%	2 4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 4%	-
Student/ Apprentice	-	12 23%	12 23%	11 21%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	12 23%	11 21%
Housewife/househusband	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Retired	-	-	-	1 2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 2%
Family workers	-	2 4%	2 4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 4%	-
Unemployed	-	1 2%	1 2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 2%	-
OTHERS (UNCLASIFIABLE BY STATUS)	-	2 4%	2 4%	4 8%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 4%	4 8%
Don't Know/ REFUSED	-	-	-	1 2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 2%
Sigma	-	52 100%	52 100%	52 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	52 100%	52 100%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q4020. What is your approximate net HOUSEHOLD monthly income from all income sources after tax, based on following scale?

16 Aug 2016
Table 409

1. Household Income

Base: All Vietnam Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	..	52*	52*	52*	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	52*	52*
150,000,000 VND or higher	-	5 10%	5 10%	6 12%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5 10%	6 12%
75,000,000- 149,999,999 VND	-	3 6%	3 6%	5 10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3 6%	5 10%
45,000,000- 74,999,999 VND	-	2 4%	2 4%	5 10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 4%	5 10%
30,000,000- 44,999,999 VND	-	4 8%	4 8%	6 12%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4 8%	6 12%
15,000,000- 29,999,999 VND	-	14 27%	14 27%	13 25%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	14 27%	13 25%
7,500,000- 14,999,999 VND	-	18 35%	18 35%	11 21%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	18 35%	11 21%
4,500,000- 7,499,999 VND	-	3 6%	3 6%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3 6%	-
3,000,000- 4,499,999 VND	-	-	-	2 4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 4%
1,500,000- 2,999,999 VND	-	1 2%	1 2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 2%	-
1- 1,499,999 VND	-	-	-	1 2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 2%
No income/ expenditure	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Don't Know/NA	-	2 4%	2 4%	3 6%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 4%	3 6%
Sigma	-	52 100%	52 100%	52 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	52 100%	52 100%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q4020. What is your approximate net HOUSEHOLD monthly income from all income sources after tax, based on following scale?

16 Aug 2016
Table 410

2. Household Expenditure

Base: All Vietnam Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	..	52*	52*	52*	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	52*	52*
150,000,000 VND or higher	-	2 4%	2 4%	1 2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 4%	1 2%
75,000,000- 149,999,999 VND	-	4 8%	4 8%	5 10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4 8%	5 10%
45,000,000- 74,999,999 VND	-	2 4%	2 4%	4 8%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 4%	4 8%
30,000,000- 44,999,999 VND	-	1 2%	1 2%	2 4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 2%	2 4%
15,000,000- 29,999,999 VND	-	5 10%	5 10%	10 19%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5 10%	10 19%
7,500,000- 14,999,999 VND	-	11 21%	11 21%	12 23%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	11 21%	12 23%
4,500,000- 7,499,999 VND	-	14 27%	14 27%	10 19%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	14 27%	10 19%
3,000,000- 4,499,999 VND	-	9 17% D	9 17% D	2 4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9 17% N	2 4%
1,500,000- 2,999,999 VND	-	1 2%	1 2%	3 6%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 2%	3 6%
1- 1,499,999 VND	-	-	-	1 2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 2%
No income/ expenditure	-	1 2%	1 2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 2%	-
Don't Know/NA	-	2 4%	2 4%	2 4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 4%	2 4%
Sigma	-	52 100%	52 100%	52 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	52 100%	52 100%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q4020. What is your approximate net HOUSEHOLD monthly income from all income sources after tax, based on following scale?

16 Aug 2016
Table 411

3. Personal Income

Base: All Vietnam Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	..	52*	52*	52*	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	52*	52*
150,000,000 VND or higher	-	3 6%	3 6%	1 2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3 6%	1 2%
75,000,000- 149,999,999 VND	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
45,000,000- 74,999,999 VND	-	3 6%	3 6%	3 6%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3 6%	3 6%
30,000,000- 44,999,999 VND	-	2 4%	2 4%	1 2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 4%	1 2%
15,000,000- 29,999,999 VND	-	4 8%	4 8%	6 12%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4 8%	6 12%
7,500,000- 14,999,999 VND	-	13 25%	13 25%	11 21%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	13 25%	11 21%
4,500,000- 7,499,999 VND	-	10 19%	10 19%	11 21%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10 19%	11 21%
3,000,000- 4,499,999 VND	-	5 10%	5 10%	8 15%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5 10%	8 15%
1,500,000- 2,999,999 VND	-	5 10%	5 10%	4 8%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5 10%	4 8%
1- 1,499,999 VND	-	3 6%	3 6%	2 4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3 6%	2 4%
No income/ expenditure	-	1 2%	1 2%	2 4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 2%	2 4%
Don't Know/NA	-	3 6%	3 6%	3 6%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3 6%	3 6%
Sigma	-	52 100%	52 100%	52 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	52 100%	52 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q4020. What is your approximate net HOUSEHOLD monthly income from all income sources after tax, based on following scale?

16 Aug 2016
Table 412

4. Personal Expenditure

Base: All Vietnam Respondents

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	..	52*	52*	52*	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	52*	52*
150,000,000 VND or higher	-	3 6%	3 6%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3 6%	-
75,000,000- 149,999,999 VND	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
45,000,000- 74,999,999 VND	-	2 4%	2 4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 4%	-
30,000,000- 44,999,999 VND	-	2 4%	2 4%	2 4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 4%	2 4%
15,000,000- 29,999,999 VND	-	3 6%	3 6%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3 6%	-
7,500,000- 14,999,999 VND	-	2 4%	2 4%	2 4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 4%	2 4%
4,500,000- 7,499,999 VND	-	5 10%	5 10%	6 12%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5 10%	6 12%
3,000,000- 4,499,999 VND	-	10 19%	10 19%	9 17%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10 19%	9 17%
1,500,000- 2,999,999 VND	-	11 21%	11 21%	17 33%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	11 21%	17 33%
1- 1,499,999 VND	-	11 21%	11 21%	12 23%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	11 21%	12 23%
No income/ expenditure	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Don't Know/NA	-	3 6%	3 6%	4 8%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3 6%	4 8%
Sigma	-	52 100%	52 100%	52 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	52 100%	52 100%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Base: All Vietnam Respondents

Q4025. BTS

16 Aug 2016
Table 413

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	-.**	50*	50*	49*	-.**	-.**	-.**	-.**	-.**	-.**	-.**	-.**	50*	49*
Class A5 (150,000,000+)	-	5 10%	5 10%	6 12%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5 10%	6 12%
Class A4 (75,000,000 - 149,999,999)	-	3 6%	3 6%	5 10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3 6%	5 10%
Class A3 (45,000,000 - 74,999,999)	-	2 4%	2 4%	5 10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 4%	5 10%
Class A2 (30,000,000 - 44,999,999)	-	4 8%	4 8%	6 12%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4 8%	6 12%
Class A1 (15,000,000 - 29,999,999)	-	14 28%	14 28%	13 27%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	14 28%	13 27%
Class B (7,500,000 - 14,999,999)	-	18 36%	18 36%	11 22%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	18 36%	11 22%
Class C (4,500,000 - 7,499,999)	-	3 6%	3 6%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3 6%	-
Class D (3,000,000 - 4,499,000)	-	-	-	2 4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 4%
Class E (1,500,000 - 2,999,999)	-	1 2%	1 2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 2%	-
Class F (1 - 1,499,999)	-	-	-	1 2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 2%
Sigma	-	50 100%	50 100%	49 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	50 100%	49 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Base: All Vietnam Respondents

Q4027. In what region do you live?

16 Aug 2016
Table 414

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	-.**	52*	52*	52*	-.**	-.**	-.**	-.**	-.**	-.**	-.**	-.**	52*	52*
North East	-	6 12%	6 12%	10 19%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6 12%	10 19%
Red River Delta	-	15 29%	15 29%	12 23%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15 29%	12 23%
North Central Coast	-	3 6%	3 6%	3 6%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3 6%	3 6%
South Central Coast	-	3 6%	3 6%	3 6%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3 6%	3 6%
Central Highlands	-	2 4%	2 4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 4%	-
South East	-	14 27%	14 27%	15 29%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	14 27%	15 29%
Mekong River Delta	-	8 15%	8 15%	7 13%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8 15%	7 13%
North West	-	1 2%	1 2%	2 4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 2%	2 4%
Sigma	-	52 100%	52 100%	52 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	52 100%	52 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Base: All Philippines Respondents

Q4030. What is your highest educational attainment?

16 Aug 2016
Table 415

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	26**	76*	102	101	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	76*	101
No schooling	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Some elementary	-	-	-	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 1%
Complete elementary	-	-	-	2 2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 2%
Some high school	-	1 1%	1 1%	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 1%	1 1%
Completed high school	-	4 5%	4 4%	2 2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4 5%	2 2%
Some vocational	1 4%	-	1 1%	3 3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3 3%
Completed Vocational	-	4 5%	4 4%	6 6%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4 5%	6 6%
Some college	5 19%	8 11%	13 13%	17 17%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8 11%	17 17%
Completed college/ Has degree	13 50%	46 61%	59 58%	63 62%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	46 61%	63 62%
Some post graduate degree	6 23%	6 8%	12 12% M	5 5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6 8%	5 5%
Completed post graduate degree	1 4%	7 9% D	8 8% D	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7 9% N	1 1%
Not know/Refused	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sigma	26 100%	76 100%	102 100%	101 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	76 100%	101 100%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Base: All Philippines Respondents

Q4035. At the present time, what is your occupation?

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	26**	76*	102	101	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	76*	101
Professional, technical and kindred workers	16 62%	35 46%	51 50%	40 40%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	35 46%	40 40%
Farmers and farm managers	-	-	-	2 2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 2%
Manager, officials and proprietors except farm	2 8%	2 3%	4 4%	3 3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 3%	3 3%
Clerical and kindred workers	2 8%	11 14%	13 13%	12 12%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	11 14%	12 12%
Sales workers	1 4%	2 3%	3 3%	7 7%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 3%	7 7%
Craftsmen, foremen and kindred workers	1 4%	1 1%	2 2%	2 2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 1%	2 2%
Service workers except private household workers	-	1 1%	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 1%	-
Private household workers	-	1 1%	1 1%	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 1%	1 1%
Laborers	-	1 1%	1 1%	2 2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 1%	2 2%
Not gainfully employed	-	1 1%	1 1%	5 5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 1%	5 5%
Housewife	-	6 8%	6 6%	8 8%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6 8%	8 8%
Student	2 8%	2 3%	4 4%	7 7%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 3%	7 7%
Pensioner	-	1 1%	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 1%	-
Others	2 8%	8 11%	10 10%	10 10%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8 11%	10 10%
Refused	-	4 5%	4 4%	2 2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4 5%	2 2%
Sigma	26 100%	76 100%	102 100%	101 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	76 100%	101 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Base: All Philippines Respondents

Q4036. Please select the area in which you live?

16 Aug 2016
Table 417

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	26**	76*	102	101	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	76*	101
National Capital Region	15 58%	19 25%	34 33% M	41 41% B	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	19 25%	41 41% M
Cordillera Administrative Region	-	1 1%	1 1%	7 7% C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 1%	7 7%
Ilocos (Region I)	-	2 3%	2 2%	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 3%	1 1%
Cagayan Valley (Region II)	-	2 3%	2 2%	3 3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 3%	3 3%
Central Luzon (Region III)	1 4%	6 8%	7 7%	7 7%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6 8%	7 7%
Southern Tagalog (Region IV)	3 12%	22 29%	25 25%	17 17%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	22 29%	17 17%
Bicol (Region V)	-	6 8%	6 6%	2 2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6 8%	2 2%
Western Visayas (Region VI)	-	1 1%	1 1%	4 4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 1%	4 4%
Central Visayas (Region VII)	3 12%	10 13%	13 13%	6 6%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10 13%	6 6%
Eastern Visayas (Region VIII)	-	1 1%	1 1%	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 1%	1 1%
Western Mindanao (Region IX)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Northern Mindanao (Region X)	1 4%	4 5%	5 5%	6 6%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4 5%	6 6%
Southern Mindanao (Region XI)	2 8%	2 3%	4 4%	4 4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 3%	4 4%
Central Mindanao (Region XII)	1 4%	-	1 1%	2 2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 2%
Autonomous Region in Muslim Mindanao	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Caraga	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sigma	26 100%	76 100%	102 100%	101 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	76 100%	101 100%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

O4036. Please select the area in which you live?

	2015 Total Registrants				Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- straunts	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia	
					(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)
Unweighted Base	26**	76*	102	101	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	76*	101	
Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing															

Q1507. What is the highest level of education you have completed or the highest degree you have received?

16 Aug 2016
Table 418

Base: All Brazil Respondents And 21+ Years Of Age

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	37*	126	163	168	-**	-**	126	168	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**
Nenhum	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Alfabetizacao	-	-	-	3 2%	-	-	-	3 2%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fundamental incompleto - fundamental I (1a. serie a 4a.)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fundamental incompleto - fundamental II (6a. serie a 8a. serie)	-	2 2%	2 1%	3 2%	-	-	2 2%	3 2%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fundamental completo	-	2 2%	2 1%	5 3%	-	-	2 2%	5 3%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ensino Medio	4 11%	44 35%	48 29%	52 31% A	-	-	44 35% AC	52 31%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Superior	19 51%	61 48%	80 49%	81 48%	-	-	61 48%	81 48%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pos-graduacao (Mestrado, Doutorado ou Pos-doutorado)	14 38% DG	17 13%	31 19% G	24 14%	-	-	17 13%	24 14%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sigma	37 100%	126 100%	163 100%	168 100%	-	-	126 100%	168 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Base: All Brazil Respondents

QBRREG1. In which state do you currently reside?

16 Aug 2016
Table 419

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	-.**	-.**	-.**	186	-.**	-.**	-.**	186	-.**	-.**	-.**	-.**	-.**	-.**
Distrito Federal	-	-	-	3 2%	-	-	-	3 2%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Goiás	-	-	-	2 1%	-	-	-	2 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mato Grosso	-	-	-	3 2%	-	-	-	3 2%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mato Grosso do Sul	-	-	-	2 1%	-	-	-	2 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Acre	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Amapá	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Amazonas	-	-	-	2 1%	-	-	-	2 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Para	-	-	-	3 2%	-	-	-	3 2%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Rondonia	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Roraima	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tocantins	-	-	-	2 1%	-	-	-	2 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Alagoas	-	-	-	4 2%	-	-	-	4 2%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bahia	-	-	-	17 9%	-	-	-	17 9%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ceará	-	-	-	2 1%	-	-	-	2 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Maranhão	-	-	-	2 1%	-	-	-	2 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Paraíba	-	-	-	3 2%	-	-	-	3 2%	-	-	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Base: All Brazil Respondents

QBRREG2. REGION CLASSIFICATION

16 Aug 2016
Table 420

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	-.**	-.**	-.**	186	-.**	-.**	-.**	186	-.**	-.**	-.**	-.**	-.**	-.**
Center-west	-	-	-	10 5%	-	-	-	10 5%	-	-	-	-	-	-
North	-	-	-	7 4%	-	-	-	7 4%	-	-	-	-	-	-
North-east	-	-	-	40 22%	-	-	-	40 22%	-	-	-	-	-	-
South	-	-	-	21 11%	-	-	-	21 11%	-	-	-	-	-	-
South-east	-	-	-	108 58%	-	-	-	108 58%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sigma	-	-	-	186 100%	-	-	-	186 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Q1538. What is the highest level of education you have completed or the highest degree you have received?

16 Aug 2016
Table 421

Base: All Mexican Respondents And 21+ Years Of Age

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	39*	62*	101	95*	62*	95*	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**	..**
No he estudiado	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Primaria incompleta	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Primaria completa	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Secundaria incompleta	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Secundaria completa	-	2 3%	2 2%	1 1%	2 3%	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Carrera comercial	-	-	-	1 1%	-	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Carrera tecnica	-	1 2%	1 1%	3 3%	1 2%	3 3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Preparatoria incompleta	-	1 2%	1 1%	1 1%	1 2%	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Preparatoria completa	-	5 8%	5 5%	3 3%	5 8%	3 3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Licenciatura incompleta	5 13%	10 16%	15 15%	12 13%	10 16%	12 13%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Licenciatura completa	16 41%	37 60%	53 52%	63 66% A	37 60%	63 66%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Diplomado/Maestria	16 41% DE	6 10%	22 22% DE	10 11%	6 10%	10 11%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Doctorado	2 5%	-	2 2%	1 1%	-	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sigma	39 100%	62 100%	101 100%	95 100%	62 100%	95 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Base: All Mexican Respondents

QMXREG. In which state do you currently reside?

16 Aug 2016
Table 422

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	-.**	-.**	-.**	100	-.**	100	-.**	-.**	-.**	-.**	-.**	-.**	-.**	-.**
Aguascalientes	-	-	-	2 2%	-	2 2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Baja California Norte	-	-	-	3 3%	-	3 3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Baja California Sur	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Campeche	-	-	-	1 1%	-	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Chiapas	-	-	-	1 1%	-	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Chihuahua	-	-	-	2 2%	-	2 2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Coahuila	-	-	-	1 1%	-	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Colima	-	-	-	1 1%	-	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Distrito Federal	-	-	-	18 18%	-	18 18%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Durango	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Guanajuato	-	-	-	5 5%	-	5 5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Guerrero	-	-	-	1 1%	-	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hidalgo	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Jalisco	-	-	-	5 5%	-	5 5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mexico	-	-	-	16 16%	-	16 16%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Michoacan	-	-	-	4 4%	-	4 4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Base: All Mexican Respondents

QMXREG. In which state do you currently reside?

16 Aug 2016
Table 422

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	..	..	..	100	..	100	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Morelos	-	-	-	2 2%	-	2 2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nayarit	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nuevo Leon	-	-	-	6 6%	-	6 6%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oaxaca	-	-	-	1 1%	-	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Puebla	-	-	-	5 5%	-	5 5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Queretaro	-	-	-	2 2%	-	2 2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Quintana Roo	-	-	-	2 2%	-	2 2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
San Luis Potosi	-	-	-	5 5%	-	5 5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sinaloa	-	-	-	1 1%	-	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sonora	-	-	-	3 3%	-	3 3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tabasco	-	-	-	1 1%	-	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tamaulipas	-	-	-	4 4%	-	4 4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tlaxcala	-	-	-	1 1%	-	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Veracruz	-	-	-	4 4%	-	4 4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Yucatan	-	-	-	3 3%	-	3 3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Zacatecas	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sigma	-	-	-	100 100%	-	100 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Base: All Chinese Respondents And 21+ Years Of Age

Q1574. What is the highest level of education you have completed or the highest degree you have received?

16 Aug 2016
Table 423

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	2**	540	542	543	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	540	543
High school or less	-	10 2%	10 2%	18 3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10 2%	18 3%
College	2 100%	99 18%	101 19% M	119 22%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	99 18%	119 22%
Bachelor degree	-	379 70%	379 70%	356 66%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	379 70% C	356 66%
Post graduate	-	52 10%	52 10%	50 9%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	52 10%	50 9%
Sigma	2 100%	540 100%	542 100%	543 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	540 100%	543 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

OTRED. What is the highest level of education you have completed or the highest degree you have received?

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	5**	45*	50*	50*	-**	-**	-**	-**	45*	50*	-**	-**	-**	-**
Primary education	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Middle school or junior high school	-	-	-	12%	-	-	-	-	-	12%	-	-	-	-
High school	-	1022%	1020%	1224%	-	-	-	-	1022%	1224%	-	-	-	-
University	480%	2964%	3366%	2958%	-	-	-	-	2964%	2958%	-	-	-	-
Masters degree or doctorate	120%	613%	714%	816%	-	-	-	-	613%	816%	-	-	-	-
No schooling completed	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sigma	5100%	45100%	50100%	50100%	-	-	-	-	45100%	50100%	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Base: All Colombia Respondents

QCOED. What was the last year of schooling that you completed?

16 Aug 2016
Table 425

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	61*	64*	125	125	-**	-**	64*	125	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**
None	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pre-school	1 2%	-	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Primary	-	-	-	1 1%	-	-	-	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Secondary	-	5 8%	5 4%	9 7% A	-	-	5 8% A	9 7%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Technical/Technology	10 16%	22 34%	32 26%	34 27%	-	-	22 34% AC	34 27%	-	-	-	-	-	-
University	25 41%	27 42%	52 42%	63 50%	-	-	27 42%	63 50%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Post Graduate	22 36% DG	10 16%	32 26% DG	17 14%	-	-	10 16%	17 14%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	3 5%	-	3 2%	1 1%	-	-	-	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sigma	61 100%	64 100%	125 100%	125 100%	-	-	64 100%	125 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Base: All Indonesia Respondents

QIDED. What is the highest level of education you have completed or the highest degree you have received?

16 Aug 2016
Table 426

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	52*	49*	101	100	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	49*	100
No schooling	1 2%	-	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Some elementary school	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Elementary school	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Junior high school	-	1 2%	1 1%	2 2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 2%	2 2%
High school or higher	51 98%	48 98%	99 98%	98 98%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	48 98%	98 98%
Sigma	52 100%	49 100%	101 100%	100 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	49 100%	100 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Base: All Japan Respondents

QJPED. What is the highest level of education you have completed or the highest degree you have received?

16 Aug 2016
Table 427

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	-**	176	176	176	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	176	176
Less than high school	-	4 2%	4 2%	3 2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4 2%	3 2%
High school degree	-	47 27%	47 27%	43 24%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	47 27%	43 24%
Junior College degree	-	17 10%	17 10%	16 9%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	17 10%	16 9%
BA or University degree	-	108 61%	108 61%	114 65%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	108 61%	114 65%
Sigma	-	176 100%	176 100%	176 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	176 100%	176 100%

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Base: All Nigeria Respondents

QNGED. What is the highest level of education you have completed or the highest degree you have received?

16 Aug 2016
Table 428

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	-.**	-.**	-.**	200	-.**	-.**	-.**	-.**	-.**	-.**	-.**	200	-.**	-.**
No level completed	-	-	-	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 1%	-	-
Completed FSLC (first school leaving certificate)	-	-	-	3 2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3 2%	-	-
Completed MSLC (middle school leaving certificate)	-	-	-	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 1%	-	-
Vocational/COMM	-	-	-	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 1%	-	-
JSS/O'Level	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Completed O'Level/SSS (senior secondary school)	-	-	-	10 5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10 5%	-	-
Completed A'Level or higher	-	-	-	111 56%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	111 56%	-	-
Other	-	-	-	73 37%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	73 37%	-	-
Sigma	-	-	-	200 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	200 100%	-	-

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Base: All Poland Respondents

QPLED. What is the highest level of education you have completed or the highest degree you have received?

16 Aug 2016
Table 429

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	-.**	53*	53*	53*	-.**	-.**	-.**	-.**	53*	53*	-.**	-.**	-.**	-.**
Incomplete primary or no school education	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Primary	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Basic vocational	-	-	-	1 2%	-	-	-	-	-	1 2%	-	-	-	-
Secondary	-	14 26%	14 26%	16 30%	-	-	-	-	14 26%	16 30%	-	-	-	-
Post-secondary	-	7 13% D	7 13% D	1 2%	-	-	-	-	7 13% J	1 2%	-	-	-	-
Tertiary	-	32 60%	32 60%	35 66%	-	-	-	-	32 60%	35 66%	-	-	-	-
Sigma	-	53 100%	53 100%	53 100%	-	-	-	-	53 100%	53 100%	-	-	-	-

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Base: All Russia Respondents

QRUED. What is the highest level of education you have completed or the highest degree you have received?

16 Aug 2016
Table 430

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	57*	73*	130	128	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	73*	128
Incomplete secondary and lower	2 4% D	-	2 2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Secondary general	1 2%	4 5%	5 4%	7 5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4 5%	7 5%
Secondary special	6 11%	12 16%	18 14%	18 14%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	12 16%	18 14%
Incomplete higher	8 14% M	2 3%	10 8% M	8 6%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 3%	8 6%
Higher (including postgraduate)	40 70%	55 75%	95 73%	95 74%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	55 75%	95 74%
Sigma	57 100%	73 100%	130 100%	128 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	73 100%	128 100%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

Base: All South Korea Respondents

QKRED. What is the highest level of education you have completed or the highest degree you have received?

16 Aug 2016
Table 431

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	32*	69*	101	101	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	69*	101
Less than high school	-	1 1%	1 1%	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 1%	1 1%
High school graduate	6 19%	9 13%	15 15%	18 18%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9 13%	18 18%
College/University graduate	23 72%	53 77%	76 75%	76 75%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	53 77%	76 75%
Post graduate degree	3 9%	6 9%	9 9%	6 6%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6 9%	6 6%
Sigma	32 100%	69 100%	101 100%	101 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	69 100%	101 100%

Proportions/Means: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. * small base; ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

QCININC. Which of the following income categories best describes your total monthly household income before taxes?

	2015 Total Registrants				Region									
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Registrants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
					(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	2**	548	550	551	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	-**	548	551
Less than 1000 RMB	-	-	-	1*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1*
1001-2000 RMB	-	31%	31%	2*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	31%	2*
2001-3000 RMB	-	92%	92%	92%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	92%	92%
3001-4000 RMB	-	143%	143%	92%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	143%	92%
4001-6000 RMB	-	6211% D	6211% D	428%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6211% N	428%
6001-10,000 RMB	150%	18133%	18233%	16330%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	18133%	16330%
Over 10,000 RMB	150%	26548%	26648%	32158% BC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	26548%	32158% M
Decline to answer	-	143% D	143% D	41%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	143% N	41%
Sigma	2100%	548100%	550100%	551100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	548100%	551100%
Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing														

Base: All South Africa Respondents

QZAREG. In which region do you currently reside?

16 Aug 2016
Table 433

	2015 Total Registrants			Region										
	ICANN Sample Only	Nielsen Sample	All Sample Sources	2016 Total Regi- strants	2015 North America (w/o client sample)	2016 North America	2015 South America (w/o client sample)	2016 South America	2015 Europe (w/o client sample)	2016 Europe	2015 Africa (w/o client sample)	2016 Africa	2015 Asia (w/o client sample)	2016 Asia
	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	(H)	(I)	(J)	(K)	(L)	(M)	(N)
Unweighted Base	-.**	-.**	-.**	101	-.**	-.**	-.**	-.**	-.**	-.**	-.**	101	-.**	-.**
Free state	-	-	-	2 2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 2%	-	-
Gauteng	-	-	-	38 38%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	38 38%	-	-
KwaZulu-Natal	-	-	-	19 19%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	19 19%	-	-
Limpopo	-	-	-	3 3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3 3%	-	-
Mpumalanga	-	-	-	4 4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4 4%	-	-
Northern Cape	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Northwest	-	-	-	1 1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 1%	-	-
Western Cape	-	-	-	30 30%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	30 30%	-	-
Eastern Cape	-	-	-	4 4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4 4%	-	-
Sigma	-	-	-	101 100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	101 100%	-	-

Proportions/Mean: Columns Tested (5% risk level) - A/D - B/D - C/D - E/F - G/H - I/J - K/L - M/N - A/E/G/I/K/M - B/E/G/I/K/M - C/E/G/I/K/M - D/F/H/J/L/N
Overlap formulae used. ** very small base (under 30) ineligible for sig testing

T Test Suppressed Because No Base Row

Page Table Title

1	1	Q616. Country
3	2	Q264. In which country or region do you currently reside?
5	3	Q268. I identify my gender as...?
6	4	Q280. Respondent Age.
7	5	Q605. Have you ever registered a domain name?
8	6	Q610. What was your role in the domain registration decision?
9	7	Q615. For what purpose(s) did you register a domain name?
10	8	Q625. For which types of business(es) did you register a domain name?
11	9	Q635. How many total domains have you personally registered, including domains that may no longer be active?
12	10	Q640. Have you ever registered duplicate domain names?
13	11	Q642. Why did you register duplicate domain names?
14	18	Q655. COUNTRY QUOTAS
16	19	Q700. Which of the following domain name extensions, if any, have you heard of?
19	20	Q630. In which of the following TLD(s) have you registered domain names?
22	21	Q795. Of the (...) domains you have registered, how many are in each of the following categories? SUMMARY TABLE OF MEANS (INCLUDING 0)
23	22	Q795. Of the (...) domains you have registered, how many are in each of the following categories? SUMMARY TABLE OF MEANS (EXCLUDING 0)
24	23	Q795 1. Of the (...) domains you have registered, how many are in each of the following categories? 1. Parked-registered and reserved for your use, but not in active service. The site displays a placeholder webpage like "under development" or similar term
25	24	Q795 2. Of the (...) domains you have registered, how many are in each of the following categories? 2. Redirected to an active website-if you enter the URL, it redirects to another URL
26	25	Q795 3. Of the (...) domains you have registered, how many are in each of the following categories? 3. Used for an active website
27	26	Q795 4. Of the (...) domains you have registered, how many are in each of the following categories? 4. Actively used for some purpose other than a website
28	27	Q795 5. Of the (...) domains you have registered, how many are in each of the following categories? 5. Expired-no longer registered in your or your company's name
29	28	Q795 6. Of the (...) domains you have registered, how many are in each of the following categories? 6. Other
30	29	Q720. If you were setting up your own website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following domain name extensions? SUMMARY TABLE OF TOP 2 BOX
33	30	Q720. If you were setting up your own website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following domain name extensions? SUMMARY TABLE OF BOTTOM 2 BOX
36	31	Q720 1. If you were setting up your own website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following domain name extensions? 1. .biz
37	32	Q720 2. If you were setting up your own website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following domain name extensions? 2. .com
38	33	Q720 3. If you were setting up your own website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following domain name extensions? 3. .info
39	34	Q720 4. If you were setting up your own website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following domain name extensions? 4. .mobi
40	35	Q720 5. If you were setting up your own website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following domain name extensions? 5. .net
41	36	Q720 6. If you were setting up your own website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following domain name extensions? 6. .org
42	37	Q720 7. If you were setting up your own website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following domain name extensions? 7. .tel
43	38	Q720 8. If you were setting up your own website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following domain name extensions? 8. .asia
44	39	Q720 9. If you were setting up your own website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following domain name extensions? 9. .pro
45	40	Q720 10. If you were setting up your own website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following domain name extensions? 10. .coop
46	41	Q720 11. If you were setting up your own website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following domain name extensions? 11. .cn
47	42	Q720 12. If you were setting up your own website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following domain name extensions? 12. .vn
48	43	Q720 13. If you were setting up your own website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following domain name extensions? 13. .ph
49	44	Q720 14. If you were setting up your own website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following domain name extensions? 14. .jp

Page Table Title

50	45	Q720_15. If you were setting up your own website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following domain name extensions? 15. .kr
51	46	Q720_16. If you were setting up your own website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following domain name extensions? 16. .ru
52	47	Q720_17. If you were setting up your own website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following domain name extensions? 17. .in
53	48	Q720_18. If you were setting up your own website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following domain name extensions? 18. .id
54	49	Q720_19. If you were setting up your own website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following domain name extensions? 19. .ng
55	50	Q720_20. If you were setting up your own website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following domain name extensions? 20. .za
56	51	Q720_21. If you were setting up your own website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following domain name extensions? 21. .eg
57	52	Q720_22. If you were setting up your own website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following domain name extensions? 22. .co
58	53	Q720_23. If you were setting up your own website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following domain name extensions? 23. .ar
59	54	Q720_24. If you were setting up your own website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following domain name extensions? 24. .br
60	55	Q720_25. If you were setting up your own website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following domain name extensions? 25. .it
61	56	Q720_26. If you were setting up your own website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following domain name extensions? 26. .tr
62	57	Q720_27. If you were setting up your own website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following domain name extensions? 27. .es
63	58	Q720_28. If you were setting up your own website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following domain name extensions? 28. .pl
64	59	Q720_29. If you were setting up your own website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following domain name extensions? 29. .uk
65	60	Q720_30. If you were setting up your own website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following domain name extensions? 30. .fr
66	61	Q720_31. If you were setting up your own website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following domain name extensions? 31. .de
67	62	Q720_32. If you were setting up your own website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following domain name extensions? 32. .us
68	63	Q720_33. If you were setting up your own website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following domain name extensions? 33. .ca
69	64	Q720_34. If you were setting up your own website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following domain name extensions? 34. .mx
70	65	Q720_38. If you were setting up your own website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following domain name extensions? 38. .eu
71	66	q730. To the best of your knowledge, why do websites have different extensions?
76	67	Q748. How would you describe your satisfaction with the types of common domain names we've mentioned so far?
77	68	Q750. If you wanted more information about one of the current domain name extensions, where would you go?
78	69	Q755. How well do each of the following adjectives describe common gTLDs such as .com, .org and .net? SUMMARY TABLE OF TOP 2 BOX
79	70	Q755. How well do each of the following adjectives describe common gTLDs such as .com, .org and .net? SUMMARY TABLE OF BOTTOM 2 BOX
80	71	Q755_1. How well do each of the following adjectives describe common gTLDs such as .com, .org and .net? 1. Innovative
81	72	Q755_2. How well do each of the following adjectives describe common gTLDs such as .com, .org and .net? 2. Cutting edge
82	73	Q755_3. How well do each of the following adjectives describe common gTLDs such as .com, .org and .net? 3. Extreme
83	74	Q755_4. How well do each of the following adjectives describe common gTLDs such as .com, .org and .net? 4. Trustworthy
84	75	Q755_5. How well do each of the following adjectives describe common gTLDs such as .com, .org and .net? 5. Unconventional
85	76	Q755_6. How well do each of the following adjectives describe common gTLDs such as .com, .org and .net? 6. Practical
86	77	Q755_7. How well do each of the following adjectives describe common gTLDs such as .com, .org and .net? 7. Technical
87	78	Q755_8. How well do each of the following adjectives describe common gTLDs such as .com, .org and .net? 8. Confusing

Page	Table	Title
88	79	Q755_9. How well do each of the following adjectives describe common gTLDs such as .com, .org and .net? 9. Overwhelming
89	80	Q755_10. How well do each of the following adjectives describe common gTLDs such as .com, .org and .net? 10. Useful
90	81	Q755_11. How well do each of the following adjectives describe common gTLDs such as .com, .org and .net? 11. For people like me
91	82	Q755_12. How well do each of the following adjectives describe common gTLDs such as .com, .org and .net? 12. Interesting
92	83	Q755_13. How well do each of the following adjectives describe common gTLDs such as .com, .org and .net? 13. Exciting
93	84	Q755_14. How well do each of the following adjectives describe common gTLDs such as .com, .org and .net? 14. Helpful
94	85	Q755_15. How well do each of the following adjectives describe common gTLDs such as .com, .org and .net? 15. Informative
95	86	Q765. What are your expectations about placing restrictions on purchasing/registering a domain using each of the following gTLDs? SUMMARY TABLE OF STRICT/SOME RESTRICTIONS
98	87	Q765. What are your expectations about placing restrictions on purchasing/registering a domain using each of the following gTLDs? SUMMARY TABLE OF STRICT RESTRICTIONS
101	88	Q765. What are your expectations about placing restrictions on purchasing/registering a domain using each of the following gTLDs? SUMMARY TABLE OF SOME RESTRICTIONS
104	89	Q765. What are your expectations about placing restrictions on purchasing/registering a domain using each of the following gTLDs? SUMMARY TABLE OF NO RESTRICTIONS
107	90	Q765_1. What are your expectations about placing restrictions on purchasing/registering a domain using each of the following gTLDs? 1. .com
108	91	Q765_2. What are your expectations about placing restrictions on purchasing/registering a domain using each of the following gTLDs? 2. .net
109	92	Q765_3. What are your expectations about placing restrictions on purchasing/registering a domain using each of the following gTLDs? 3. .info
110	93	Q765_4. What are your expectations about placing restrictions on purchasing/registering a domain using each of the following gTLDs? 4. .org
111	94	Q765_5. What are your expectations about placing restrictions on purchasing/registering a domain using each of the following gTLDs? 5. .cn
112	95	Q765_6. What are your expectations about placing restrictions on purchasing/registering a domain using each of the following gTLDs? 6. .vn
113	96	Q765_7. What are your expectations about placing restrictions on purchasing/registering a domain using each of the following gTLDs? 7. .ph
114	97	Q765_8. What are your expectations about placing restrictions on purchasing/registering a domain using each of the following gTLDs? 8. .jp
115	98	Q765_9. What are your expectations about placing restrictions on purchasing/registering a domain using each of the following gTLDs? 9. .kr
116	99	Q765_10. What are your expectations about placing restrictions on purchasing/registering a domain using each of the following gTLDs? 10. .ru
117	100	Q765_11. What are your expectations about placing restrictions on purchasing/registering a domain using each of the following gTLDs? 11. .in
118	101	Q765_12. What are your expectations about placing restrictions on purchasing/registering a domain using each of the following gTLDs? 12. .id
119	102	Q765_13. What are your expectations about placing restrictions on purchasing/registering a domain using each of the following gTLDs? 13. .ng
120	103	Q765_14. What are your expectations about placing restrictions on purchasing/registering a domain using each of the following gTLDs? 14. .za

Page	Table	Title
121	104	Q765_15. What are your expectations about placing restrictions on purchasing/registering a domain using each of the following gTLDs? 15. .eg
122	105	Q765_16. What are your expectations about placing restrictions on purchasing/registering a domain using each of the following gTLDs? 16. .co
123	106	Q765_17. What are your expectations about placing restrictions on purchasing/registering a domain using each of the following gTLDs? 17. .ar
124	107	Q765_18. What are your expectations about placing restrictions on purchasing/registering a domain using each of the following gTLDs? 18. .br
125	108	Q765_19. What are your expectations about placing restrictions on purchasing/registering a domain using each of the following gTLDs? 19. .it
126	109	Q765_20. What are your expectations about placing restrictions on purchasing/registering a domain using each of the following gTLDs? 20. .fr
127	110	Q765_21. What are your expectations about placing restrictions on purchasing/registering a domain using each of the following gTLDs? 21. .es
128	111	Q765_22. What are your expectations about placing restrictions on purchasing/registering a domain using each of the following gTLDs? 22. .pl
129	112	Q765_23. What are your expectations about placing restrictions on purchasing/registering a domain using each of the following gTLDs? 23. .uk
130	113	Q765_24. What are your expectations about placing restrictions on purchasing/registering a domain using each of the following gTLDs? 24. .fr
131	114	Q765_25. What are your expectations about placing restrictions on purchasing/registering a domain using each of the following gTLDs? 25. .de
132	115	Q765_26. What are your expectations about placing restrictions on purchasing/registering a domain using each of the following gTLDs? 26. .us
133	116	Q765_27. What are your expectations about placing restrictions on purchasing/registering a domain using each of the following gTLDs? 27. .ca
134	117	Q765_28. What are your expectations about placing restrictions on purchasing/registering a domain using each of the following gTLDs? 28. .mx
135	118	Q765_29. What are your expectations about placing restrictions on purchasing/registering a domain using each of the following gTLDs? 29. .eu
136	119	Q767. We'd like to ask you another question about restrictions on registration of a gTLD. Do you feel each of the following restrictions should be enforced? SUMMARY TABLE OF YES
137	120	Q767_1. We'd like to ask you another question about restrictions on registration of a gTLD. Do you feel each of the following restrictions should be enforced? 1. Requirements for validated credentials related to the gTLD (e.g., must be a licensed contractor to register a .builder domain)
138	121	Q767_2. We'd like to ask you another question about restrictions on registration of a gTLD. Do you feel each of the following restrictions should be enforced? 2. Validation that the person or company registering the site meets intended parameters (e.g., must be involved in the pharmaceutical industry to register a .pharmacy domain)
139	122	Q767_3. We'd like to ask you another question about restrictions on registration of a gTLD. Do you feel each of the following restrictions should be enforced? 3. Requirements for local presence within a specific city, country, or region for a domain related to that place (e.g., someone registering .ca would have to be located in Canada)
140	123	Q767_4. We'd like to ask you another question about restrictions on registration of a gTLD. Do you feel each of the following restrictions should be enforced? 4. Requirements for use of the name to be consistent with the meaning of the gTLD (e.g., use of a .net name must be for network operations purposes)
141	124	Q770. Does having purchase restrictions or requirements on a particular gTLD make it...?
142	125	Q780. How do you determine whether a website is legitimate or not?
147	126	Q785. Have you ever tried to identify who created a particular website?
148	127	Q790. What did you use to try and figure this out?
152	128	Q830x1. To the best of your knowledge, why have new gTLDs been created?
156	129	Q800. Which of the following new gTLDs, if any, have you heard of?
160	130	Q807. And have you personally registered a domain name using any of these new gTLDs?

Page Table Title

163	131	Q809. Of the (...) domains you have registered, how many are of these new gTLDs?
164	132	Q812. Would you say that your primary reason for a registering new gTLD was?
165	133	Q813_1. Please indicate how each of the following statements apply to your registration of new gTLDs? 1. I gave up a legacy gTLD registration when I registered the new gTLD
166	134	Q813_2. Please indicate how each of the following statements apply to your registration of new gTLDs? 2. I kept an existing gTLD registration(s) similar to the new gTLD
167	135	Q813_3. Please indicate how each of the following statements apply to your registration of new gTLDs? 3. This was a completely new registration, no prior domain was registered for this use
168	136	Q827. Have you considered switching from your existing registered domain name to one of the new gTLDs?
169	137	Q828. Why have you considered switching?
170	138	Q829. Why did you decide not to switch?
171	139	Q831. Why have you not considered switching?
172	140	Q820. If you were setting up a new website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following new gTLDs? SUMMARY TABLE OF TOP 2 BOX
176	141	Q820. If you were setting up a new website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following new gTLDs? SUMMARY TABLE OF BOTTOM 2 BOX
179	142	Q820_1. If you were setting up a new website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following new gTLDs? 1. .email
180	143	Q820_2. If you were setting up a new website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following new gTLDs? 2. .photography
181	144	Q820_3. If you were setting up a new website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following new gTLDs? 3. .link
182	145	Q820_4. If you were setting up a new website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following new gTLDs? 4. .guru
183	146	Q820_5. If you were setting up a new website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following new gTLDs? 5. .realtor
184	147	Q820_6. If you were setting up a new website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following new gTLDs? 6. .club
185	148	Q820_7. If you were setting up a new website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following new gTLDs? 7. .xyz
186	149	Q820_16. If you were setting up a new website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following new gTLDs? 16. .top
187	150	Q820_17. If you were setting up a new website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following new gTLDs? 17. .pics
188	151	Q820_18. If you were setting up a new website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following new gTLDs? 18. .online
189	152	Q820_19. If you were setting up a new website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following new gTLDs? 19. .space
190	153	Q820_20. If you were setting up a new website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following new gTLDs? 20. .website
191	154	Q820_21. If you were setting up a new website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following new gTLDs? 21. .news
192	155	Q820_22. If you were setting up a new website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following new gTLDs? 22. .site
193	156	Q820_23. If you were setting up a new website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following new gTLDs? 23. .toronto
194	157	Q820_24. If you were setting up a new website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following new gTLDs? 24. .guadalajara
195	158	Q820_25. If you were setting up a new website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following new gTLDs? 25. .roma
196	159	Q820_26. If you were setting up a new website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following new gTLDs? 26. .istanbul
197	160	Q820_27. If you were setting up a new website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following new gTLDs? 27. .madrid
198	161	Q820_28. If you were setting up a new website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following new gTLDs? 28. .warszawa
199	162	Q820_29. If you were setting up a new website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following new gTLDs? 29. .paris
200	163	Q820_30. If you were setting up a new website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following new gTLDs? 30. Foshan
201	164	Q820_31. If you were setting up a new website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following new gTLDs? 31. .hanoi
202	165	Q820_32. If you were setting up a new website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following new gTLDs? 32. .manilla

Page	Table	Title
203	166	Q820_33. If you were setting up a new website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following new gTLDs? 33. .tokyo
204	167	Q820_34. If you were setting up a new website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following new gTLDs? 34. .seoul
205	168	Q820_35. If you were setting up a new website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following new gTLDs? 35. .MOCKBa
206	169	Q820_36. If you were setting up a new website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following new gTLDs? 36. .delhi
207	170	Q820_37. If you were setting up a new website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following new gTLDs? 37. .jakarta
208	171	Q820_38. If you were setting up a new website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following new gTLDs? 38. .abuja
209	172	Q820_39. If you were setting up a new website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following new gTLDs? 39. .capetown
210	173	Q820_40. If you were setting up a new website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following new gTLDs? 40. .cairo
211	174	Q820_41. If you were setting up a new website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following new gTLDs? 41. .bogota
212	175	Q820_42. If you were setting up a new website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following new gTLDs? 42. .cordoba
213	176	Q820_43. If you were setting up a new website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following new gTLDs? 43. .rio
214	177	Q820_8. If you were setting up a new website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following new gTLDs? 8. .berlin
215	178	Q820_9. If you were setting up a new website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following new gTLDs? 9. .ovh
216	179	Q820_10. If you were setting up a new website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following new gTLDs? 10. .london
217	180	Q820_11. If you were setting up a new website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following new gTLDs? 11. .nyc
218	181	Q820_12. If you were setting up a new website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following new gTLDs? 12. .wang
219	182	Q820_13. If you were setting up a new website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following new gTLDs? 13. .xn-ses554g (Chinese for network address)
220	183	Q820_14. If you were setting up a new website in the next 6 months, how likely would you be to consider the following new gTLDs? 14. .xn-55qx5d (Chinese for company)
221	184	Q823. Which of the following would be most important to you in determining which gTLD to register your domain name under?
222	185	Q825. Please rate the following gTLDs by how trustworthy you feel they are. SUMMARY TABLE OF TOP 2 BOX
226	186	Q825. Please rate the following gTLDs by how trustworthy you feel they are. SUMMARY TABLE OF BOTTOM 2 BOX
229	187	Q825_1. Please rate the following gTLDs by how trustworthy you feel they are. 1. .email
230	188	Q825_2. Please rate the following gTLDs by how trustworthy you feel they are. 2. .photography
231	189	Q825_3. Please rate the following gTLDs by how trustworthy you feel they are. 3. .link
232	190	Q825_4. Please rate the following gTLDs by how trustworthy you feel they are. 4. .guru
233	191	Q825_5. Please rate the following gTLDs by how trustworthy you feel they are. 5. .realtor
234	192	Q825_6. Please rate the following gTLDs by how trustworthy you feel they are. 6. .club
235	193	Q825_7. Please rate the following gTLDs by how trustworthy you feel they are. 7. .xyz
236	194	Q825_16. Please rate the following gTLDs by how trustworthy you feel they are. 16. .top
237	195	Q825_17. Please rate the following gTLDs by how trustworthy you feel they are. 17. .pics
238	196	Q825_18. Please rate the following gTLDs by how trustworthy you feel they are. 18. .online
239	197	Q825_19. Please rate the following gTLDs by how trustworthy you feel they are. 19. .space
240	198	Q825_20. Please rate the following gTLDs by how trustworthy you feel they are. 20. .website

Page	Table	Title
241	199	Q825_21. Please rate the following gTLDs by how trustworthy you feel they are. 21. .news
242	200	Q825_22. Please rate the following gTLDs by how trustworthy you feel they are. 22. .site
243	201	Q825_23. Please rate the following gTLDs by how trustworthy you feel they are. 23. .toronto
244	202	Q825_24. Please rate the following gTLDs by how trustworthy you feel they are. 24. .guadalajara
245	203	Q825_25. Please rate the following gTLDs by how trustworthy you feel they are. 25. .roma
246	204	Q825_26. Please rate the following gTLDs by how trustworthy you feel they are. 26. .istanbul
247	205	Q825_27. Please rate the following gTLDs by how trustworthy you feel they are. 27. .madrid
248	206	Q825_28. Please rate the following gTLDs by how trustworthy you feel they are. 28. .warszawa
249	207	Q825_29. Please rate the following gTLDs by how trustworthy you feel they are. 29. .paris
250	208	Q825_30. Please rate the following gTLDs by how trustworthy you feel they are. 30. Foshan
251	209	Q825_31. Please rate the following gTLDs by how trustworthy you feel they are. 31. .hanoi
252	210	Q825_32. Please rate the following gTLDs by how trustworthy you feel they are. 32. .manilla
253	211	Q825_33. Please rate the following gTLDs by how trustworthy you feel they are. 33. .tokyo
254	212	Q825_34. Please rate the following gTLDs by how trustworthy you feel they are. 34. .seoul
255	213	Q825_35. Please rate the following gTLDs by how trustworthy you feel they are. 35. .MOCKBa
256	214	Q825_36. Please rate the following gTLDs by how trustworthy you feel they are. 36. .delhi
257	215	Q825_37. Please rate the following gTLDs by how trustworthy you feel they are. 37. .jakarta
258	216	Q825_38. Please rate the following gTLDs by how trustworthy you feel they are. 38. .abuja
259	217	Q825_39. Please rate the following gTLDs by how trustworthy you feel they are. 39. .capetown
260	218	Q825_40. Please rate the following gTLDs by how trustworthy you feel they are. 40. .cairo
261	219	Q825_41. Please rate the following gTLDs by how trustworthy you feel they are. 41. .bogota
262	220	Q825_42. Please rate the following gTLDs by how trustworthy you feel they are. 42. .cordoba
263	221	Q825_43. Please rate the following gTLDs by how trustworthy you feel they are. 43. .rio
264	222	Q825_8. Please rate the following gTLDs by how trustworthy you feel they are. 8. .berlin
265	223	Q825_9. Please rate the following gTLDs by how trustworthy you feel they are. 9. .ovh
266	224	Q825_10. Please rate the following gTLDs by how trustworthy you feel they are. 10. .london
267	225	Q825_11. Please rate the following gTLDs by how trustworthy you feel they are. 11. .nyc
268	226	Q825_12. Please rate the following gTLDs by how trustworthy you feel they are. 12. .wang
269	227	Q825_13. Please rate the following gTLDs by how trustworthy you feel they are. 13. .xn-ses554g (Chinese for network address)
270	228	Q825_14. Please rate the following gTLDs by how trustworthy you feel they are. 14. .xn-55qx5d (Chinese for company)
271	229	Q848. As a registrant, how would you describe your satisfaction with the new gTLDs?
272	230	Q855. How well do each of the following adjectives describe new gTLDs such as .email, .photography and .club? SUMMARY TABLE OF TOP 2 BOX
273	231	Q855. How well do each of the following adjectives describe new gTLDs such as .email, .photography and .club? SUMMARY TABLE OF BOTTOM 2 BOX

Page	Table	Title
274	232	Q855_1. How well do each of the following adjectives describe new gTLDs such as .email, .photography and .club? 1. Innovative
275	233	Q855_2. How well do each of the following adjectives describe new gTLDs such as .email, .photography and .club? 2. Cutting edge
276	234	Q855_3. How well do each of the following adjectives describe new gTLDs such as .email, .photography and .club? 3. Extreme
277	235	Q855_4. How well do each of the following adjectives describe new gTLDs such as .email, .photography and .club? 4. Trustworthy
278	236	Q855_5. How well do each of the following adjectives describe new gTLDs such as .email, .photography and .club? 5. Unconventional
279	237	Q855_6. How well do each of the following adjectives describe new gTLDs such as .email, .photography and .club? 6. Practical
280	238	Q855_7. How well do each of the following adjectives describe new gTLDs such as .email, .photography and .club? 7. Technical
281	239	Q855_8. How well do each of the following adjectives describe new gTLDs such as .email, .photography and .club? 8. Confusing
282	240	Q855_9. How well do each of the following adjectives describe new gTLDs such as .email, .photography and .club? 9. Overwhelming
283	241	Q855_10. How well do each of the following adjectives describe new gTLDs such as .email, .photography and .club? 10. Useful
284	242	Q855_11. How well do each of the following adjectives describe new gTLDs such as .email, .photography and .club? 11. For people like me
285	243	Q855_12. How well do each of the following adjectives describe new gTLDs such as .email, .photography and .club? 12. Interesting
286	244	Q855_13. How well do each of the following adjectives describe new gTLDs such as .email, .photography and .club? 13. Exciting
287	245	Q855_14. How well do each of the following adjectives describe new gTLDs such as .email, .photography and .club? 14. Helpful
288	246	Q855_15. How well do each of the following adjectives describe new gTLDs such as .email, .photography and .club? 15. Informative
289	247	Q890. Which of the following online identities do you have, and which to you use to promote a business or organization, or to promote a personal activity or interest? SUMMARY TABLE OF HAVE
290	248	Q890. Which of the following online identities do you have, and which to you use to promote a business or organization, or to promote a personal activity or interest? SUMMARY TABLE OF PROMOTE BUSINESS
291	249	Q890. Which of the following online identities do you have, and which to you use to promote a business or organization, or to promote a personal activity or interest? SUMMARY TABLE OF PROMOTE ORGANIZATION
292	250	Q890. Which of the following online identities do you have, and which to you use to promote a business or organization, or to promote a personal activity or interest? SUMMARY TABLE OF PROMOTE PERSONAL
293	251	Q890. Which of the following online identities do you have, and which to you use to promote a business or organization, or to promote a personal activity or interest? SUMMARY TABLE OF SOCIAL MEDIA
294	252	Q890. Which of the following online identities do you have, and which to you use to promote a business or organization, or to promote a personal activity or interest? SUMMARY TABLE OF BLOGGING OR PUBLISHING
295	253	Q890. Which of the following online identities do you have, and which to you use to promote a business or organization, or to promote a personal activity or interest? SUMMARY TABLE OF WEB PAGE
296	254	Q895. How would you say your use of alternative identities, like social media accounts, blogging or publishing accounts or web pages, has impacted your decision to register a domain name, if at all?
297	255	Q896. And, do you expect these online identities to have an impact on domain registrations in the future?
298	256	Q897. What value do these alternative online identities provide over registering a domain name?
299	257	Q898. What value does a registered domain offer over these alternative identities?
300	258	Q865. Earlier we asked you about enforcing restrictions on who can register/purchase domains with specific extensions. What level of restrictions would you expect there to be on purchasing the following new gTLDs? SUMMARY TABLE OF STRICT/SOME RESTRICTIONS
304	259	Q865. Earlier we asked you about enforcing restrictions on who can register/purchase domains with specific extensions. What level of restrictions would you expect there to be on purchasing the following new gTLDs? SUMMARY TABLE OF STRICT RESTRICTIONS
308	260	Q865. Earlier we asked you about enforcing restrictions on who can register/purchase domains with specific extensions. What level of restrictions would you expect there to be on purchasing the following new gTLDs? SUMMARY TABLE OF SOME RESTRICTIONS
312	261	Q865. Earlier we asked you about enforcing restrictions on who can register/purchase domains with specific extensions. What level of restrictions would you expect there to be on purchasing the following new gTLDs? SUMMARY TABLE OF NO RESTRICTIONS

<u>Page</u>	<u>Table</u>	<u>Title</u>
316	262	Q865_1. Earlier we asked you about enforcing restrictions on who can register/purchase domains with specific extensions. What level of restrictions would you expect there to be on purchasing the following new gTLDs? 1. .email
317	263	Q865_2. Earlier we asked you about enforcing restrictions on who can register/purchase domains with specific extensions. What level of restrictions would you expect there to be on purchasing the following new gTLDs? 2. .photography
318	264	Q865_3. Earlier we asked you about enforcing restrictions on who can register/purchase domains with specific extensions. What level of restrictions would you expect there to be on purchasing the following new gTLDs? 3. .link
319	265	Q865_4. Earlier we asked you about enforcing restrictions on who can register/purchase domains with specific extensions. What level of restrictions would you expect there to be on purchasing the following new gTLDs? 4. .guru
320	266	Q865_5. Earlier we asked you about enforcing restrictions on who can register/purchase domains with specific extensions. What level of restrictions would you expect there to be on purchasing the following new gTLDs? 5. .realtor
321	267	Q865_6. Earlier we asked you about enforcing restrictions on who can register/purchase domains with specific extensions. What level of restrictions would you expect there to be on purchasing the following new gTLDs? 6. .club
322	268	Q865_7. Earlier we asked you about enforcing restrictions on who can register/purchase domains with specific extensions. What level of restrictions would you expect there to be on purchasing the following new gTLDs? 7. .xyz
323	269	Q865_44. Earlier we asked you about enforcing restrictions on who can register/purchase domains with specific extensions. What level of restrictions would you expect there to be on purchasing the following new gTLDs? 44. .bank
324	270	Q865_45. Earlier we asked you about enforcing restrictions on who can register/purchase domains with specific extensions. What level of restrictions would you expect there to be on purchasing the following new gTLDs? 45. .pharmacy
325	271	Q865_46. Earlier we asked you about enforcing restrictions on who can register/purchase domains with specific extensions. What level of restrictions would you expect there to be on purchasing the following new gTLDs? 46. .builder
326	272	Q865_23. Earlier we asked you about enforcing restrictions on who can register/purchase domains with specific extensions. What level of restrictions would you expect there to be on purchasing the following new gTLDs? 23. .toronto
327	273	Q865_24. Earlier we asked you about enforcing restrictions on who can register/purchase domains with specific extensions. What level of restrictions would you expect there to be on purchasing the following new gTLDs? 24. .quadalajara
328	274	Q865_25. Earlier we asked you about enforcing restrictions on who can register/purchase domains with specific extensions. What level of restrictions would you expect there to be on purchasing the following new gTLDs? 25. .roma
329	275	Q865_26. Earlier we asked you about enforcing restrictions on who can register/purchase domains with specific extensions. What level of restrictions would you expect there to be on purchasing the following new gTLDs? 26. .istanbul
330	276	Q865_27. Earlier we asked you about enforcing restrictions on who can register/purchase domains with specific extensions. What level of restrictions would you expect there to be on purchasing the following new gTLDs? 27. .madrid
331	277	Q865_28. Earlier we asked you about enforcing restrictions on who can register/purchase domains with specific extensions. What level of restrictions would you expect there to be on purchasing the following new gTLDs? 28. .warszawa
332	278	Q865_29. Earlier we asked you about enforcing restrictions on who can register/purchase domains with specific extensions. What level of restrictions would you expect there to be on purchasing the following new gTLDs? 29. .paris
333	279	Q865_30. Earlier we asked you about enforcing restrictions on who can register/purchase domains with specific extensions. What level of restrictions would you expect there to be on purchasing the following new gTLDs? 30. Foshan
334	280	Q865_31. Earlier we asked you about enforcing restrictions on who can register/purchase domains with specific extensions. What level of restrictions would you expect there to be on purchasing the following new gTLDs? 31. .hanoi
335	281	Q865_32. Earlier we asked you about enforcing restrictions on who can register/purchase domains with specific extensions. What level of restrictions would you expect there to be on purchasing the following new gTLDs? 32. .manilla
336	282	Q865_33. Earlier we asked you about enforcing restrictions on who can register/purchase domains with specific extensions. What level of restrictions would you expect there to be on purchasing the following new gTLDs? 33. .tokyo
337	283	Q865_34. Earlier we asked you about enforcing restrictions on who can register/purchase domains with specific extensions. What level of restrictions would you expect there to be on purchasing the following new gTLDs? 34. .seoul
338	284	Q865_35. Earlier we asked you about enforcing restrictions on who can register/purchase domains with specific extensions. What level of restrictions would you expect there to be on purchasing the following new gTLDs? 35. .MOCKBa
339	285	Q865_36. Earlier we asked you about enforcing restrictions on who can register/purchase domains with specific extensions. What level of restrictions would you expect there to be on purchasing the following new gTLDs? 36. .delhi

Page	Table	Title
340	286	Q865_37. Earlier we asked you about enforcing restrictions on who can register/purchase domains with specific extensions. What level of restrictions would you expect there to be on purchasing the following new gTLDs? 37. .jakarta
341	287	Q865_38. Earlier we asked you about enforcing restrictions on who can register/purchase domains with specific extensions. What level of restrictions would you expect there to be on purchasing the following new gTLDs? 38. .abuja
342	288	Q865_39. Earlier we asked you about enforcing restrictions on who can register/purchase domains with specific extensions. What level of restrictions would you expect there to be on purchasing the following new gTLDs? 39. .capetown
343	289	Q865_40. Earlier we asked you about enforcing restrictions on who can register/purchase domains with specific extensions. What level of restrictions would you expect there to be on purchasing the following new gTLDs? 40. .cairo
344	290	Q865_41. Earlier we asked you about enforcing restrictions on who can register/purchase domains with specific extensions. What level of restrictions would you expect there to be on purchasing the following new gTLDs? 41. .bogota
345	291	Q865_42. Earlier we asked you about enforcing restrictions on who can register/purchase domains with specific extensions. What level of restrictions would you expect there to be on purchasing the following new gTLDs? 42. .cordoba
346	292	Q865_43. Earlier we asked you about enforcing restrictions on who can register/purchase domains with specific extensions. What level of restrictions would you expect there to be on purchasing the following new gTLDs? 43. .rio
347	293	Q865_8. Earlier we asked you about enforcing restrictions on who can register/purchase domains with specific extensions. What level of restrictions would you expect there to be on purchasing the following new gTLDs? 8. .berlin
348	294	Q865_9. Earlier we asked you about enforcing restrictions on who can register/purchase domains with specific extensions. What level of restrictions would you expect there to be on purchasing the following new gTLDs? 9. .ovh
349	295	Q865_10. Earlier we asked you about enforcing restrictions on who can register/purchase domains with specific extensions. What level of restrictions would you expect there to be on purchasing the following new gTLDs? 10. .london
350	296	Q865_11. Earlier we asked you about enforcing restrictions on who can register/purchase domains with specific extensions. What level of restrictions would you expect there to be on purchasing the following new gTLDs? 11. .nyc
351	297	Q865_12. Earlier we asked you about enforcing restrictions on who can register/purchase domains with specific extensions. What level of restrictions would you expect there to be on purchasing the following new gTLDs? 12. .wang
352	298	Q865_13. Earlier we asked you about enforcing restrictions on who can register/purchase domains with specific extensions. What level of restrictions would you expect there to be on purchasing the following new gTLDs? 13. .xn-ses554g (Chinese for network address)
353	299	Q865_14. Earlier we asked you about enforcing restrictions on who can register/purchase domains with specific extensions. What level of restrictions would you expect there to be on purchasing the following new gTLDs? 14. .xn-55qx5d (Chinese for company)
354	300	Q910. How much do you trust that the restrictions on this new registration will actually be enforced?
355	301	Q900. How would you describe the processing of registering a domain?
356	302	Q905. What, if anything, would you change about the domain name purchase process?
357	303	Q913. How strongly do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the registration process? SUMMARY TABLE OF TOP 2 BOX
358	304	Q913. How strongly do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the registration process? SUMMARY TABLE OF BOTTOM 2 BOX
359	305	Q913_1. How strongly do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the registration process? 1. It was easy to find a domain name and extension that worked for my needs
360	306	Q913_2. How strongly do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the registration process? 2. There were plenty of choices between gTLDs that met my needs-for example, .photography and .photo, or .auto and .cars
361	307	Q913_3. How strongly do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the registration process? 3. If I had known more about the new gTLDs, choosing a domain to register would have been a lot easier
362	308	Q913_4. How strongly do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the registration process? 4. I did not feel like I had many alternatives that were available for registration
363	309	Q915. How much do you trust the domain name industry compared to these other industries? SUMMARY TABLE OF TOP 2 BOX
364	310	Q915. How much do you trust the domain name industry compared to these other industries? SUMMARY TABLE OF BOTTOM 2 BOX
365	311	Q915_1. How much do you trust the domain name industry compared to these other industries? 1. Internet service providers/the agency that provides my internet access
366	312	Q915_2. How much do you trust the domain name industry compared to these other industries? 2. Web based marketing companies
367	313	Q915_3. How much do you trust the domain name industry compared to these other industries? 3. E-commerce companies

368	314	Q915 4. How much do you trust the domain name industry compared to these other industries? 4. Software companies
369	315	Q915 5. How much do you trust the domain name industry compared to these other industries? 5. Computer hardware companies
370	316	Q917. Why do you trust the domain name industry more than these other industries?
378	317	q919. Why do you trust the domain name industry less than these other industries?
382	318	Q1000. Which devices do you use to access the Internet?
383	319	Q1005. What is your experience with URL shorteners?
384	320	Q1010. Why haven't you used URL shorteners?
385	321	Q1015. Why do you use URL shorteners?
386	322	Q1020. What is your experience with QR codes?
387	323	Q1025. Why haven't you used QR codes?
388	324	Q1030. Why do you use QR codes?
389	325	Q1050. What is your preferred way of finding websites now?
390	326	Q1036 1. Which of these is the safest, which is the fastest, and which is the easiest way to navigate to a website that may have the information you are looking for? 1. Safest
391	327	Q1036 2. Which of these is the safest, which is the fastest, and which is the easiest way to navigate to a website that may have the information you are looking for? 2. Fastest
392	328	Q1036 3. Which of these is the safest, which is the fastest, and which is the easiest way to navigate to a website that may have the information you are looking for? 3. Easiest
393	329	Q1055 1. Which of these are the fastest, easiest and safest way to get to the website you want to buy from? 1. Safest
394	330	Q1055 2. Which of these are the fastest, easiest and safest way to get to the website you want to buy from? 2. Fastest
395	331	Q1055 3. Which of these are the fastest, easiest and safest way to get to the website you want to buy from? 3. Easiest
396	332	Q1060 1. Which of these is the safest, which is the easiest, and which is the fastest method to get to the website to access your personal information? 1. Safest
397	333	Q1060 2. Which of these is the safest, which is the easiest, and which is the fastest method to get to the website to access your personal information? 2. Fastest
398	334	Q1060 3. Which of these is the safest, which is the easiest, and which is the fastest method to get to the website to access your personal information? 3. Easiest
399	335	Q1100a. How would you describe your familiarity with each of the following abusive internet behaviors? SUMMARY TABLE OF TOP 2 BOX
400	336	Q1100a. How would you describe your familiarity with each of the following abusive internet behaviors? SUMMARY TABLE OF BOTTOM 2 BOX
401	337	Q1100a 1. How would you describe your familiarity with each of the following abusive internet behaviors? 1. Phishing - The attempt to acquire sensitive information such as usernames, passwords, and credit card details by masquerading as a trustworthy entity in electronic communication.
402	338	Q1100a 2. How would you describe your familiarity with each of the following abusive internet behaviors? 2. Spamming - The use of electronic messaging systems to send unsolicited messages.
403	339	Q1100a 3. How would you describe your familiarity with each of the following abusive internet behaviors? 3. Cyber squatting - Registering or using a domain name with bad faith intent to profit from the goodwill of a trademark belonging to someone else.
404	340	Q1100a 4. How would you describe your familiarity with each of the following abusive internet behaviors? 4. Stolen credentials - When hackers steal personal information stored online such as usernames, passwords, social security numbers, credit cards numbers, etc.
405	341	Q1100a 5. How would you describe your familiarity with each of the following abusive internet behaviors? 5. Malware - Short for "malicious software", used to disrupt computer operations, gather sensitive information or gain access to private computer systems.
406	342	Q1105. What do you think are the source(s) for each type of abusive Internet behavior? SUMMARY TABLE OF ORGANIZED GROUPS
407	343	Q1105. What do you think are the source(s) for each type of abusive Internet behavior? SUMMARY TABLE OF INDIVIDUALS
408	344	Q1105 1. What do you think are the source(s) for each type of abusive Internet behavior? 1. Phishing
409	345	Q1105 2. What do you think are the source(s) for each type of abusive Internet behavior? 2. Spamming
410	346	Q1105 3. What do you think are the source(s) for each type of abusive Internet behavior? 3. Cyber squatting
411	347	Q1105 4. What do you think are the source(s) for each type of abusive Internet behavior? 4. Stolen credentials
412	348	Q1105 5. What do you think are the source(s) for each type of abusive Internet behavior? 5. Malware
413	349	Q1115. How common do you feel each type of abusive Internet behavior is? SUMMARY TABLE OF TOP 2 BOX

Page	Table	Title
414	350	Q1115. How common do you feel each type of abusive Internet behavior is? SUMMARY TABLE OF BOTTOM 2 BOX
415	351	Q1115 1. How common do you feel each type of abusive Internet behavior is? 1. Phishing
416	352	Q1115 2. How common do you feel each type of abusive Internet behavior is? 2. Spamming
417	353	Q1115 3. How common do you feel each type of abusive Internet behavior is? 3. Cyber squatting
418	354	Q1115 4. How common do you feel each type of abusive Internet behavior is? 4. Stolen credentials
419	355	Q1115 5. How common do you feel each type of abusive Internet behavior is? 5. Malware
420	356	Q1120. Have you ever been affected by any of these types of abusive Internet behaviors? SUMMARY TABLE OF YES
421	357	Q1120 1. Have you ever been affected by any of these types of abusive Internet behaviors? 1. Phishing
422	358	Q1120 2. Have you ever been affected by any of these types of abusive Internet behaviors? 2. Spamming
423	359	Q1120 3. Have you ever been affected by any of these types of abusive Internet behaviors? 3. Cyber squatting
424	360	Q1120 4. Have you ever been affected by any of these types of abusive Internet behaviors? 4. Stolen credentials
425	361	Q1120 5. Have you ever been affected by any of these types of abusive Internet behaviors? 5. Malware
426	362	Q1125. How scared are you of each of the following? SUMMARY TABLE OF TOP 2 BOX
427	363	Q1125. How scared are you of each of the following? SUMMARY TABLE OF BOTTOM 2 BOX
428	364	Q1125 1. How scared are you of each of the following? 1. Phishing
429	365	Q1125 2. How scared are you of each of the following? 2. Spamming
430	366	Q1125 3. How scared are you of each of the following? 3. Cyber squatting
431	367	Q1125 4. How scared are you of each of the following? 4. Stolen credentials
432	368	Q1125 5. How scared are you of each of the following? 5. Malware
433	369	Q1130. What measures have you taken, if any, to avoid being affected by any of these types of abusive Internet behaviors? SUMMARY TABLE OF PURCHASED
434	370	Q1130 1. What measures have you taken, if any, to avoid being affected by any of these types of abusive Internet behaviors? 1. Phishing
435	371	Q1130 2. What measures have you taken, if any, to avoid being affected by any of these types of abusive Internet behaviors? 2. Spamming
436	372	Q1130 3. What measures have you taken, if any, to avoid being affected by any of these types of abusive Internet behaviors? 3. Cyber squatting
437	373	Q1130 4. What measures have you taken, if any, to avoid being affected by any of these types of abusive Internet behaviors? 4. Stolen credentials
438	374	Q1130 5. What measures have you taken, if any, to avoid being affected by any of these types of abusive Internet behaviors? 5. Malware
439	375	Q775. If you felt a website was being run improperly (for example, appears to be conducting illegal activity, appears to be a fake, etc.), who would you complain to?
441	376	Q300. Does the company for which you registered domains have multi-national operations?
442	377	Q305. Which of the following sectors does your business fall into?
446	378	Q318. In what state, province or territory do you currently reside?
463	379	Q320. U.S. Region-Harris Interactive Definition.
464	380	Q437. What is the highest level of education you have completed or the highest degree you have received?
465	381	Q437. What is the highest level of education you have completed or the highest degree you have received?
469	382	Q410. Which one of the following best describes your employment status?
470	383	Q462. Which of the following income categories best describes your total 2015 household income before/after taxes?
478	384	Q485. Racial Background.
480	385	Q364. What is your marital status?
481	386	QARREG. In which region do you currently reside?

Page Table Title

482	387	QKRINC. Which of the following income categories best describes your total 2015 household income before taxes?
483	388	QKRBUY. In the past 12 months, did you purchase any products or services over the Internet?
484	389	QKRREG1. In which region do you currently reside?
486	390	QKRREG2. REGION CLASSIFICATION
487	391	QINED. What is the highest level of education/literacy you have completed/obtained or the highest degree you have received?
488	392	QININC2. Which of the following income categories best describes your total 2015 household income before taxes?
489	393	QINSUB. Which of the following best describes the area in which you live?
490	394	QINBUY. In the past month, did you purchase any products or services over the Internet?
491	395	QINREG1. In which division do you currently reside?
494	396	QINREG2. STATE SIZE CLASSIFICATION
495	397	Q1500. In which province do you currently reside?
498	398	Q1502. REGION CLASSIFICATION
499	399	Q1580. What is your marital status?
500	400	Q1503. In which state do you currently reside?
503	401	Q1504. STATE CLASSIFICATION
504	402	Q1585. Do you consider yourself...?
505	403	Q1505. In which governorate do you currently reside?
507	404	Q1506. REGION CLASSIFICATION
508	405	Q4005. Which of the following income categories best describes your total 2015 household income before taxes?
509	406	QCOREG2. In which region do you live?
510	407	Q4010. What is your current education level?
512	408	Q4015. What is your current occupation?
514	409	Q4020. What is your approximate net HOUSEHOLD monthly income from all income sources after tax, based on following scale? 1. Household Income
515	410	Q4020. What is your approximate net HOUSEHOLD monthly income from all income sources after tax, based on following scale? 2. Household Expenditure
516	411	Q4020. What is your approximate net HOUSEHOLD monthly income from all income sources after tax, based on following scale? 3. Personal Income
517	412	Q4020. What is your approximate net HOUSEHOLD monthly income from all income sources after tax, based on following scale? 4. Personal Expenditure
518	413	Q4025. BTS
519	414	Q4027. In what region do you live?
520	415	Q4030. What is your highest educational attainment?
521	416	Q4035. At the present time, what is your occupation?
522	417	Q4036. Please select the area in which you live?
524	418	Q1507. What is the highest level of education you have completed or the highest degree you have received?
525	419	QBRREG1. In which state do you currently reside?
527	420	QBRREG2. REGION CLASSIFICATION
528	421	Q1538. What is the highest level of education you have completed or the highest degree you have received?
529	422	QMXREG. In which state do you currently reside?
531	423	Q1574. What is the highest level of education you have completed or the highest degree you have received?
532	424	QTRED. What is the highest level of education you have completed or the highest degree you have received?
533	425	QCOED. What was the last year of schooling that you completed?
534	426	QIDED. What is the highest level of education you have completed or the highest degree you have received?
535	427	QJPED. What is the highest level of education you have completed or the highest degree you have received?
536	428	QNGED. What is the highest level of education you have completed or the highest degree you have received?
537	429	QPLED. What is the highest level of education you have completed or the highest degree you have received?
538	430	QRUED. What is the highest level of education you have completed or the highest degree you have received?
539	431	QKRED. What is the highest level of education you have completed or the highest degree you have received?
540	432	QCNINC. Which of the following income categories best describes your total monthly household income before taxes?
541	433	QZAREG. In which region do you currently reside?
542	434	Banner * Banner