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Overview

- APTLD data collection/analysis
- Macro highlights from recent surveys
- Value in numbers – benchmarking
- Moving forward with data
APTLD represents around 47 ccTLDs – mostly based in the Asia Pacific Region.
APTLD Data Collection/Analysis

APTLD represents around 47 ccTLDs – mostly based in the Asia Pacific Region.

APTLD has begun collecting registration count data from 33 of these ccTLDs (70%) as well as data from surveys published to the membership.

What do we do with this data?
- View snapshots of the ccTLD community in our region
- Track growth trends on aggregated and individual level
- Allow members to benchmark their growth achievements against their regional peers, the average as well as other ccTLDs in other regions
APTLD Data Collection/Analysis

Data is fed into a database that helps form historical trend reporting on the status and evolution of APTLD ccTLD members.

The more data, the better the analysis.
APTLD also has begun running more regular surveys with 2 broad streams:

1. Broader data driven surveys (quantitative)
2. Focused topic driven surveys (qualitative)

Surveys should be seen as a mechanism to:

1. Collect/analyse data in the interest of best practices
2. Allow individual members to ask the community on a particular subject matter that interests them
We are the same, but we’re different

**Organisation Types: APTLD members**

- Private company: 41%
- Association: 18%
- Foundation: 18%
- Gov. Dept: 18%
- Regulator: 6%

**Global Comparison**

- APTLD:
  - Regulator: 10%
  - Private company: 16%
  - Association: 18%
  - Academic inst.: 9%
  - Foundation: 16%
  - Government dept.: 10%

- Global ccTLDs:
  - Regulator: 10%
  - Private company: 33%
  - Association: 21%
  - Academic inst.: 0%
  - Foundation: 16%
  - Government dept.: 10%

**41% of APTLD members are private companies**

The rest are split evenly between Associations, Foundations and Government Departments.

This breakdown is similar to the rest of the global ccTLD community.
European ccTLDs (CENTR) have less local presence requirements in general. Note: some European ccTLDs don’t have LP requirements on registrants but do require Admin C to have a local address.
The most common way a ccTLD interacts with government authorities is by way of ‘informal meetings/calls’.

Global survey received around 70 ccTLDs globally.

Other aspects in the survey:
- Formal basis (if any) for carrying out the ccTLD
- Legislation linked to the ccTLD
- If ccTLD explicitly mentioned in any legislation
- Tax liabilities
- Survey ran simultaneously with AFTLD, CENTR and LACTLD

Joint report/results expected ICANN Los Angeles (ccNSO)

Note: This only shows top 3 – see full APTLD report for more detail
Highlights from surveys

DNSSEC Status

57% of ccTLDs in Asia Pacific have implemented DNSSEC with a further 29% planning or considering implementation.

IDN Ratings

IDN update, Registrar Support and user awareness do not score well according to ccTLD operators.
On average, the Registrars used by APTLD members are more likely to be ICANN accredited than those used by European ccTLDs.

Will this fact have an impact on the focus Registrars place on local ccTLD compared to new gTLDs?
Total Registrations is not everything

Registration counts are an important first step in tracking market evolution, however other metrics such as pricing renewal rates and new adds can help build a better picture.
“Strategic Mapping”

CENTR has more recently begun taking a new approach on registrations analyses using new and existing domains to form a scatter plot of TLD positioning. This allows ccTLDs to benchmark the relative positions.

**Maintenance Rate** compares the number of domains registered at the start of a period with the number of those domains still registered at the end of the period.

**Commercial dynamic** is a ratio comparing the number of new domains registered during a certain period with the total number of domains at the start of the same period.
There are 2 broad streams APTLD uses to collect data

**Ongoing data**
- Registration counts (already)
- Wholesale pricing
- DNSSEC and IDN statistics
- Renewal rates, adds/deletes
- Domain usage? (eg. active sites, re-directs etc)
- gTLD market shares

**Focused member initiated surveys**
Examples of focused topics:
- Registrars - Accreditation, authentication, interactions)
- Technical - Registry lock, DNSSEC, Phishing/security, Whois etc)
- Marketing – Campaigns, social media, communications etc
- Legal/Policy – Local presence, domain take-downs, domain release mechanisms, domain auctions etc
- Administrative – billing/invoicing, add grace periods, corporate gov
Why do all this?

• The domain name market is changing. If only looking at the new gTLD program and an increasingly complex internet governance environment there is a lot going on!

• Data knowledge helps better understand a market and be aware and prepared of changing environments
Why do all this?

• The domain name market is changing. If only looking at the new gTLD program and an increasingly complex internet governance environment there is a lot going on!

• Data knowledge helps better understand a market and be aware and prepared of changing environments

Moving forward

• APTLD will continue collecting registration counts & data via surveys

• APTLD has an agreement with other Regional Organisations (AFTLD, CENTR and LACTLD) to share certain aggregated and non-sensitive data. This help us benchmark and collaborate on a global level

• APTLD encourages its members to initiate focused surveys
## APTLD data projects – Recent Survey stats

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey type</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>% of ccTLDs</th>
<th>Data received for</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-Level Survey 2014 (still open)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>.ae, .af, .as, .au, .cc, .cn, .cx, .hk, .id, .jo, .jp, .kr, .lk, .mn, .mo, .mx, .my, .nc, .nf, .nr, .nu, .nz, .om, .pg, .ru, .sa, .sg, .th, .tj, .tw, .vn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Launch and Use of IDNs (2014)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>.au, .cn, .hk, .jp, .kr, .lk, .mo, .my, .nu, .nz, .sa, .sg, .th, .tj, .tw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ccTLDs and National Legislation</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>.as, .au, .hk, .id, .in, .jo, .jp, .kr, .mo, .mw, .my, .nu, .nz, .om, .sb, .sg, .th, .tj, .tw, .vn, .wf</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Under construction:
**International Registrar Benchmarking**
Getting consistent and accurate data is challenging, it requires **trust**, **capacity** and **interest**.

“You will only get out what you put in”

Thanks for your attention