

Notes from Metrics presentation to GNSO Council, 23-Jun-2012

Key Issues slide:

40+ Metrics for Consumer Trust, Consumer Choice, & Competition

combination of surveys and stats

some attempt to measure costs;

not all have targets

None are intended to steer indiv Ry operators or drive policy development

User and registrant Surveys for Consumer Trust & Consumer Choice

Combined annual surveys of users and registrants

Assess awareness of new gTLDs in general; and of specific-purpose gTLDs

perceptions about trust,

experience in finding desired content;

experience with phishing & malware;

registrant experience pursuing cybersquatting

Consumer Trust - Relative Incidence of UDRP, URS, & Litigation

UDRP+URS complaints and decisions against registrants “relative” to legacy gTLDs.
E.g. 1000 UDRP+URS decisions against registrants in 1 million registrations give a relative rate of 0.1 percent or 1 per 1000

Ry Contract breach notices: [significantly] lower than in legacy gTLDs. $1/20 = 5\%$ of registries. 5% of new Registries could be as high as 100 breach notices!

Consumer Choice - Defensive & Duplicate Registrations, Redirects

3 potential indicators of registrations done for “defensive” purposes:

sunrise registrations or blocks using TM clearinghouse

redirects (automated

self-reported duplicate registrations

Collect data from IP organizations on quantities and costs of def registrations and of pursuing cybersquatting.

Competition - Wholesale and Retail pricing of Domain Registrations

Our proposed Competition metrics include comparing wholesale and retail prices in new gTLDs open to public vs legacy gTLDs open to general public. No target, just comparison.

USG is keenly interested in weekly data on revenue and registration volume, both legacy and new gTLDs.

Appendix B: ICANN legal advised us they are concerned about collecting, comparing, and sharing non-public price data. Also concerned about potential that price focus could lead to price recommendations.

To address this: WG could recommend that a third party could collect and analyze the data, sharing only aggregates and stats.

gTLD expansion program Costs and Benefits

USG comments: “benefits of new gTLDs must outweigh costs to consumers and other market participants”

WG asked the USG reps to reconcile that with what’s in the Affirmation.

WG won’t attempt to measure all benefits and costs. Some significant costs are evaluated, though.

Q&A/Discussion on Council:

Jeff Neuman: troubled by timing of 3-yr targets; some targets are unreasonable too.

Ching Chiao: will these metrics drive registry contract requirements? (No)

Wendy Seltzer: flag concerns with framing of Consumer Trust; looking backwards at past abuses; need to see unexpected benefits of new innovation

Mary Wong: recommended the WG add advice to modify the metrics as new benefits (and new abuses) become evident. (good idea)

Alan Greenberg: concern with Redirect metric. Some redirects are beneficial and not defensive

Zahid Jamil: compliments on progress; ICANN has an obligation here; likes Flexibility (Mary’s idea); how do registrants know which national laws apply to them and to the Registrar and Registry they’re considering? (described our choice metric on visibility and clarity)

Jonathan Robinson: Helpful and interesting perspective on new gTLD program. Troubled with 3-year target, given ramp-up time and gradual delegations

Michael Graham (IPC): Q18 proposed mission and purpose could support consumer trust

NPOC Chair: gave anecdote of World Bank project to define 160 metrics for poverty reduction projects. When the WB asked citizens in developing nations they got 500 metrics for poverty. Are we asking regular consumers about our metrics? (contrasted WB process with ICANN’s pub comment process)

Jeff Neuman: Closed (single registrant) TLDs may not fit with open gTLDs when doing many metrics. (cited the Competition measures where we excluded closed TLDs; said that trust and choice for internet users would apply to closed TLDs)

James Bladel: redirects: should get baseline data from legacy gTLDs today (good idea)

Jeremy Beal: interesting to look at “potential” consumers. (cited choice metrics on IDNs, languages, geographic diversity)

Olivier CLB (ALAC): metrics should be seen as trends too. Look at progress over time.

Chuck Gomes: this is a good example of M-S model working well. Compliments.

Jeff Neuman: excellent work.