AT-LARGE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
ALAC Statement on the At-Large New gTLD Metrics Task Force Report

Introduction
By the Staff of ICANN

An initial draft of this Statement was composed by Evan Leibovitch, ALAC Executive Committee (ExCom) Vice-Chair and ALAC member from the North American Regional At-Large Organization (NARALO) and ALAC Liaison to the GNSO, after discussion of the topic in a single purpose ad-hoc working group created as a follow-up to the ALAC Correspondence on the Report of the GNSO WG on Consumer Trust, Consumer Choice and Competition (Reference AL/ALAC/CO/0213/1). This follow-up is a Statement to the Board.

On 17 March 2013, this Statement was posted on the At-Large New gTLD Metrics Task Force Report Workspace.

On 11 April 2013, this Statement was discussed in the ALAC & Regional Leadership Wrap-up Meeting.

During that meeting, the draft Statement was discussed by all present At-Large members, as well as those participating via Remote Participation.

The Chair of the ALAC then requested that a ratification vote be held on the Statement.

Staff then confirmed that the vote resulted in the ALAC endorsing the Statement with 14 votes in favor, 0 votes against, and 0 abstentions.

You may review the result independently under: https://community.icann.org/x/GQV-Ag.

The Chair then requested that the Statement be transmitted to the Public Comment process, copying the ICANN Staff member responsible for this Public Comment topic.

[End of Introduction]

ALAC Statement on the At-Large
New gTLD Metrics Task Force Report

Background

On February 28 2013, the [At-Large Advisory Committee approved a correspondence](#) in response to the GNSO report on metrics designed to evaluate the performance of ICANN's gTLD expansion program. The statement, which was sent as correspondence by ALAC Chair Olivier Crepin-Leblond to the Chair of the ICANN Board and the Chair of the Board gTLD Working Group, indicated that the GNSO report did not adequately address metrics that would accurately measure end-user benefits and trust resulting from the expansion. In the statement, the ALAC committed to produce recommendations for additional metrics which it believes are required to supplement the GNSO recommendations. The ALAC created a Task Force to create the new metrics, which are listed below.

Scope

The ALAC found the scope of metrics used by the GNSO to be too limiting to be effective in measuring end-user benefit and confidence. To be effective, the metrics must evaluate the gTLD program not only between the different registries, but between the use of domain names and alternate methods to access Internet information. We are concerned about the effect of the expansion program not only on the new gTLDs, but on public confidence in the whole domain name system. It is possible that a reduction in confidence in new gTLDs could spill over to legacy registries which we believe metrics need to track.

The metrics proposed are intended to measure the gTLD expansion program from the point of view of Internet end-users, the ALAC's community as defined in ICANN bylaws. We assume that the needs of domain buyers and sellers are sufficiently addressed by the GNSO in its metrics. The metrics below supplement, not replace, the GNSO recommendations.

Format

In the interest of minimizing complexity and simplifying use, we will maintain the structure used by the GNSO metrics report. The section numbering starts at 4 to avoid confusion with the GNSO metrics.

#	Measure related to End-User Trust	Source	Anticipated Difficulties in Obtaining and/or Reporting	3-year target
End-User Confusion				
4.1	Frequency of success in reaching the intended information supplier through direct entry of domain names	Survey of end-users; SEO research	Note 1	Neutral or increase
4.2	Frequency of landing at unintended destinations	Survey of end users, SEO analytics	Note 1 Selective sampling of analytics may help determine the success of typo-squatting or other unintended destinations	Neutral or decrease
4.3	Frequency of redundant or defensive domains (ie,	Survey of registrants	Note 2	Neutral or decrease

	multiple domains pointing to the same destination)			
4.4	Frequency of dead-end domains (registered but do not resolve)	Registry data + automated sampling	Note 3	Proportion relative to total domains should decrease
4.5	Numbers of complaints received by ICANN regarding improper use of domains	ICANN	Supplements GNSO metric 1.9 by assessing volume of end-user complaints (which may not come from name owners or result in URS/UDRP action)	
Growth in use of both domain-based and non-domain-based alternatives for Internet resource access				
5.1	Relative preference of explicit use of domain names versus search engines for end-user general Internet use	Survey of end users; SEO analytics	Note 1	Note 4
5.2	Growth in use of hosted pages for organizations (such as Facebook or Google+)	Market research	Ie, ComScore	Note 4
5.3	Growth in use of QR codes	Market research	ie, ScanLife	Note 4
5.4	Growth in use of URL shortening services	Market research		Note 4
5.5	Growth in registrations in ccTLDs relative to gTLDs	Registry data	Note 3	A significant increase in the use of ccTLDs could mean reduced trust in generic TLDs.
5.6	Growth of Software Defined Networking (SDN) as alternative to the DNS	Market research		Note 4
Complaints to, and action taken by, police, regulatory agencies and advocacy groups				
6.1	Number of consumer complaints to government agencies related to confusing or misleading domain names	Government regulatory agencies	Establishing relationships with consumer protection and regulatory agencies may be difficult to initiate; however ICANN is expected to have such relationships in place anyway, either directly or through GAC representatives	Proportion relative to total domains should decrease
6.2	Number of complaints to police agencies alleging fraud or misrepresentation based on – or traced to – domain names	Law enforcement agencies	ICANN already has existing communications with LEA groups. Supplements GNSO	

			metrics 1.15 and 1.16 by adding complaints as well as remedial action	
6.3	Number of fraud investigations where WHOIS information positively assisted investigation and identification of offending parties	Law enforcement agencies		

Transparency of contact information and domain-allocation policies for all gTLDs

7.1	How many gTLD registries have privacy policies which are clearly and easily accessible by end users	Registry websites	Manual auditing	As many as possible
7.2	How many gTLD registries have allocation policies which are clearly and easily accessible by end users, even if those policies simply restrict or prohibit public availability	Registry websites	Manual auditing	As many as possible
7.3	How many registries disclose end-user information regarding their codes of conduct for sub-domain owner/operators	Registry websites	Manual auditing	As many as possible

Accuracy of new gTLD promotion to end users

8.1	How many complaints are received by ICANN related to confusion or misunderstanding of TLD functions	ICANN		
8.2	How many registries are subject to Compliance activity based on reported breaches of RAA	ICANN		
8.3	How many registries have been the subject of complaints related to their Public Interest Commitments (PICs)	ICANN		
8.4	How many registries have lost a dispute resolution process related to their PICs	ICANN		

Technical issues encountered (including application support)

9.1	Are end-user software applications capable of implementing all of the new	Audit		All major browsers and operating systems should have versions capable of

	gTLDs; Can browsers and DNS clients in end-user systems resolve all new gTLDs			resolving all new gTLDs, including IDNs
9.2	Which browsers or other end-user applications require plugins or user-installed enhancements in order to use new gTLDs	Audit		Support should preferably be native rather than as an add-in

Notes

1. As the scope of ALAC and ICANN itself is global, we anticipate and expect that any metrics to be measured by survey (both the ALAC and GNSO metrics) would need to be globally distributed and multi-lingual

2. External sources (such as business intelligence publications) can supplement (and reduce the cost of) customized surveys.

3. An automated system could sample random second-level domains to perform tests based on lists of domain names supplied by registries. The witholding of source data for metrics by contracted parties, in order to prevent collection of metrics which may be perceived to reflect upon them negatively, could impact the metrics and prevent ICANN from accurately measuring end-user trust

4. Significant growth in alternative methods of accessing Internet services may indicate a corresponding reduction in the relative trust of domain names to perform the same function. When possible, statistics should provide comparison with similar statistics for legacy TLDs.