ICANN Trust Study

Respondents and Methodology
ICANN conducted an anonymous trust study of contracted parties to assess the level of trust and satisfaction contracted parties have with ICANN. The study included an online survey and 12 interviews of contracted parties. The survey had a strong response with 196 parties responding of which 53% were registrars, 46% were registries and 1% were back-end registries. The gross response rate was 12.7% and net response rate (unique parties) was 11.2%, both of which are solid response rates for this type of survey. The respondents broke into three job functions – business (57%), legal/policy (26%) and technical (17%). The survey scored questions on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 = strongly agree and 5 = strongly disagree. The scores for the individual questions are then weighted based on the number of respondents and responses to create a weighted average score for the question.

Findings
Overall the study indicates that the contracted parties strongly believe that ICANN is adequately performing its mission and that:

✓ It’s valuable to engage with ICANN,
✓ ICANN is responsive and can accomplish its objectives, but
✓ ICANN tends to be insular in its approach to policies.

The average score (figure 1) across all questions of 2.58 with a standard deviation of 0.28 on a scale of 1 (strongly agree) to 5 (strongly disagree) indicates that the parties moderately endorse ICANN’s performance and that they are satisfied with ICANN’s performance and its participation in the community. This average score results from the belief that ICANN has a hard job, that the organization has delivered valuable policies and programs and that it is valuable to participate in the ICANN process. However, holding the score down is the widely held belief that ICANN doesn’t consistently apply its decision-making process to individual parties and their unique issues. This belief is commonly observed in organizations such as ICANN since the mission of governance organizations is to meet the needs of the entire community not just individual parties.

Balancing this belief though is the strong agreement that ICANN when compared with other Internet governance organizations is doing a better job supporting the community and listening to the concerns of contracted parties.
To fully capture the results a trust score was created. The trust score is a composite of the key characteristics of trust - Satisfaction, Commitment, Dependability, Integrity and Competence. The composite is created by grouping the questions and findings into groupings that map to each characteristic and then weighting the scores based on their impact on trust. The overall trust score of 2.58 (figure 2) is very similar to the average for the question score which indicates the uniformity across the board that in all areas ICANN is perceived to be adequately performing its mission, generally fair to the parties and often delivers on its commitments. Basically, the contracted parties expressed strong agreement that they want to participation in the ICANN process and that while ICANN has a hard job, ICANN does a good job of delivering its mission.

As illustrated in table 1 each of the characteristics scores between 2.46 and 2.72 which indicates the strength of the belief by contracting parties that ICANN is doing a good job and often is trusted to deliver on its commitments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Overview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>Moderately Agree 2.58</td>
<td>Contracted parties tend to believe ICANN is doing an adequate job fulfilling its mission, generally treats the parties fairly and often delivers on its commitments. However, contracted parties often believe ICANN tends to unevenly bordering on unfairly handle their unique concerns and issues. In addition, they believe ICANN can often be painful to deal with and doesn’t understand the market.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>Moderately Agree 2.49</td>
<td>Contracted parties tend to agree that they benefit from a relationship with ICANN and that in general ICANN’s policies are useful to the contracted parties. However, they only slightly agree they enjoy dealing with ICANN.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependability</td>
<td>Moderately Agree 2.46</td>
<td>Contracted parties strongly believe they need to observe ICANNs work due to their limited trust in the ICANN policy process consistently resulting in the appropriate outcomes. Parties also tend to believe ICANN takes in to account community input when making policies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Integrity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slightly Agree 2.72</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Contracted parties slightly agree that ICANN takes into account their concerns when making a decision, but moderately agree ICANN treats the parties fairly and encourages them to participate, yet strongly agree ICANN pushes its own agenda.

### Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moderately Agree 2.50</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

While contracted parties slightly agree that ICANN understands the domain name marketplace, they strongly believe that compared to other organizations ICANN plays a valuable role.

### Competence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slightly Agree 2.61</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Contracted parties tend to agree ICANN has the competency to achieve its mission, but only slightly believe ICANN is innovative, easy to communicate with, positively address a party’s concern and understands how registrants use domains.

---

**Summary of key questions**

- **2.02**: It is important to observe ICANN’s work closely to ensure the my investment is worthwhile.
- **2.24**: ICANN supports a culture in which parties are able to participate.
- **2.54**: ICANN tends to push its own agenda.
- **2.21**: ICANN acknowledges when they have made an error as it relates to contracted parties.
- **2.55**: ICANN listens to the concerns of the contracted parties.
- **2.26**: Compared with other Internet Governance organizations, I value my relationship with ICANN.
- **2.59**: ICANN is responsive and can accomplish its objectives.
- **2.60**: When ICANN says “no” to a party, the reasoning and thought processes applied are sound and justified.
- **2.56**: ICANN’s staff is responsive to the contracted parties and industry needs.
- **2.69**: I am confident about ICANN’s skills and ability to accomplish its objectives.

Scale: 1 = Strong Agreement, 2 = Agreement, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Disagree, 5 = Strongly Disagree