Marketplace Health Index--Comments and Input Tracking Tool		
This tracking tool incorporates comments from the following:		Last Updated: 5 DEC 2017

1. Public Comment Forum: gTLD Marketplace Health Index (Beta): Call for Comments

Open Date:	19-Jul-16	**Close Date:**		9-Sep-16

Name	Submitted by/Affiliation	Initials
Registries Stakeholder Group	Stephane Van Gelder	RySG
Rightside	Statton Hammock	RIGHT
INTA	Lori Schulman	INTA
Donuts Inc.	Mason Cole	DON
Business Constituency	Steve DelBianco	BC
Verisign Inc.	Andy Simpson	VS
Registrar Stakeholder Group	Graeme Bunton	RrSG
At-Large Advisory Committee	Policy Staff	ALAC
Domain Mondo	John Poole	JP
Hosterstats.com	John McCormack	JMcC

2. Messages sent to ICANN staff related to the public comment forum and Oct. 26 Advisory Panel call.
3. 10/26/16 gTLD Marketplace Health Index Advisory Panel Call (where noted as APCall1)
4. ICANN57 Project Overview Session, 7 November (noted as ICANN57_Overview)
5. ICANN57 Advisory Panel working meeting, 8 November (noted as ICANN57_work)
6. 5 December 2016 Advisory Panel Meeting (AP 5 Dec)
7. 21-27 Dec 2016: Emailed feedback on proposed 'Robust Competition' cat def'n (noted as Email dated Dec 2X 2016)
8. 18 January 2017 Advisory Panel Meeting (AP 18 Jan)
9. 19 January 2017: Emailed feedback on 'Robust Competition' category definition (noted as Email dated 19 Jan)
10. 22 February 2017: Advisory Panel Meeting (AP 22 Feb)
11 28 February 2017 Online Survey; n = 15
12 12 March 2017: ICANN 58 Working session (AP 12 Mar)
13 26 April 2017: Advisory Panel meeting (AP 26 Apr)
14 30 May 2017: Advisory Panel meeting (AP 30 May)
15 20 June 2017: Advisory Panel meeting (AP 20 June)
16 26 July 2017: Advisory Panel meeting (AP 26 July)
17 30 Aug 2017: Advisory Panel meeting (AP 30 Aug)
18 28 Oct 2017: ICANN 60 Advisory Panel Working session (AP 28 Oct_ICANN60)

1) Category A: General Feedback

Issue/Suggestion/Recommendation	Status	Staff-Proposed Response/Comments
1.1 "Your gTLD Marketplace Health Index (Beta) is severely flawed and should not be used. You have failed to define the "marketplace" properly[.]" (JP)	Discussed	ICANN has taken note of this input. ICANN has reviewed and reframed the overall scope of this project and specific definitions therein with the Advisory Panel.
1.2 "INTA commends ICANN for its role in collecting and promoting the use of objective metrics to help the community study these issues. INTA fully supports the concept of the Index insofar as it can be used to objectively measure consumer trust in the gTLD marketplace and assist the community in identifying ways to improve that level of trust." (INTA)	Discussed	The coverage of Trust as a category within the indicators effort should support this intent by the INTA.
1.3 "We appreciate ICANN's efforts toward the development of this Beta report, and recognize that the initiative to establish a gTLD Marketplace Health Index advances ICANN's core mission. The BC supports ICANN's priority attention to the implementation of this Index." (BC)	No Action Required	ICANN thanks the Business Constituency for this feedback. This was not included in the Advisory Panel "discussion topics" document because there was no action item or qualifying statement.
1.4 "I think this tool is good. We have been using it on amendments to the Registry Agreement." (Statton Hammock, APCall1 11:15 chat, regarding use of the public comment tracking tool)	Discussed	ICANN appreciates this feedback and will continue to experiment with this tool during this project and discuss its use with the Advisory Panel.
1.5 "Thanks for using the tool it looks like it should help with keeping track of issues." (Andy Simpson, APCall1 11:16 chat, regarding use of the public comment tracking tool)	Discussed	ICANN appreciates this feedback.

1.6 "How and when are new issues going to be added to the list of items being tracked?" (Andy Simpson, APCall1, Chat at 11:17)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback. Using this tool in this context, to track input during both a public comment period and more broadly during this Advisory Panel consultation is a new approach in this project. Keeping this list fully up-to-date with every topic and question raised on each call may be unduly burdensome, but staff plans to try this at the outset and we can revisit this process with the Advisory Panel as the project proceeds.
1.7 "ICANN having a chief scientist or chief statistician is a great idea." (ICANN57_Overview (chat) Robert Guerra/SSAC: (09:35)).	**Discussed**	See discussion topics summary at end of this section.
1.8 "I wish to voice my agreement with Jonathan's and Jay's point that ICANN establish a new department focused on data collection and analysis headed by a competent data scientist. For years, ICANN's decision-making processes have been data starved, mainly due to lack of financial resources. If one thinks of ICANN's core competencies, one should be to be a leader in date access and analysis. With sufficient budget, ICANN can now become an industry leader in this area." (ICANN57_Overview (chat) Kurt Pritz: (09:45)).	**Discussed**	See discussion topics summary at end of this section.
1.9 [Response to question—should ICANN be doing this?] "Sure" (ICANN57_Overview Steve DelBianco, 16:30)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback.

1.10 With regard to priorities, staff and management had the priority of promoting the domain name industry, in particular the gTLD space, but that's not ICANN's job… ICANN's commitments reflect ICANN's fundamental compact with the global internet community. The ultimate interest is in serving that community—registrants. This process is driven by the corporation but that's an advantage—can move faster but doesn't mean we have to. The community wants more data—give them that (ICANN57_Overview Steve DelBianco, 18:00)	**Discussed**	ICANN has taken note of this input. ICANN reviewed and reframed the overall scope of this project and specific definitions therein with the Advisory Panel.
1.11 when ICANN staff and management drive the collection and selection of metrics you have to look at the path that came from, the priorities that ICANN management has and the process that's used… Staff and management had the priority of promoting the gTLD industry but that's not ICANN's job." (ICANN57_Overview, Steve DelBianco, 16:45)	**Discussed**	ICANN has taken note of this input. ICANN has reviewed and reframed the overall scope of this project and specific definitions therein with the Advisory Panel.
1.12 The purpose of this is to verify the influence of ICANN's work and the choices it makes. Should ICANN execute this work? Honestly, I don't think so. ICANN has difficulty leaving its own perspective and taking a more general perspective—I'd recommend leaving this to an expert org. (ICANN57_Overview, 20:30 Roelof Meijer – SIDN)	**Discussed**	ICANN has taken note of this input. ICANN has reviewed and reframed the overall scope of this project and specific definitions therein with the Advisory Panel.
1.13 The process of gathering credible empirical data really needs to be ICANN's role—if not ICANN, who? The key is to find (for stability and trust) datasets that are not only about the health of the industry (not just volume of domains, how long they stay up, and what they are used for) but also need to look at abuse indicators to understand how abuse can impact perceptions of the marketplace and trust in the marketplace (ICANN57_Overview Jeff Bedser, 23:25)	**Discussed**	See discussion topics summary at end of this section.
1.14 Beta says a lot about what we have currently—question about how far we want to go. A lot of data is still missing. Data when it comes to compliance, the relative cases to compliance for example, if we do this and do things really within the remit of ICANN with the contracted parties… (ICANN57_Overview Thomas Keller 24:45)	**Discussed**	ICANN has taken note of this input. ICANN has reviewed and reframed the overall scope of this project and specific definitions therein with the Advisory Panel.
1.15 A lot of this data is available because of the CCT review. Absent theory data is less useful. Raw numbers are less interesting than the concentration numbers. Etc. What does having one additional registry mean? Which TLDs are registrars actually offering? A data dump can be a difficult problem.	**Discussed**	ICANN has taken note of this input. ICANN has reviewed and reframed the overall scope of this project and specific definitions therein with the Advisory Panel.

1.16 This is a simplistic interpretation. ICANN is the organization to do this but I don't think they're ready to do so yet. ICANN needs a mature senior level data science position. This is amateurish. Having the community arguing about how to interpret this could do more harm than good. (ICANN57_Overview, Jonathan Zuck, 26:30)	**Discussed**	See discussion topics summary at end of this section.
1.17 There is a lot of momentum on this—doesn't appear we can stop this train so need to focus on the cars. Compensation is based on plans for this, but don't leave community behind. Give us the other metrics we need. Abuse. Include CCs, etc. (ICANN57_Overview, Steve DelBianco, 31:00)	**Discussed**	ICANN has taken note of this input. ICANN has reviewed and reframed the overall scope of this project and specific definitions therein with the Advisory Panel.
1.18 This isn't an index, it's a dashboard (referring to process for obtaining "percentage complete" number reported in icann.org/progress dashboard) (ICANN57_Overview Steve DelBianco, 35:20)	**Discussed**	ICANN has taken note of this input. ICANN has reviewed and reframed the overall scope of this project and specific definitions therein with the Advisory Panel.
1.19 Re: open data: It is vital to have competing indices about this type of thing. ICANN could have one, DNA could have one, and we can work out which one is best. I really don't think we should be trying to aim for one now—the process of competition will eliminate the bad. (ICANN57_Overview, Jay Daly .nz ~37:00)	**No Action Required**	ICANN appreciates this feedback.
1.20 ICANN needs a chief data officer and start taking data seriously. As of today ICANN has announced open data pilot initiative. No discussion of community engagement but things are clearly starting to work. ICANN's reaction to a chief data office has been (a) horror or (b) we already do data. In order for us to really use this we need the data not just published in a PDF but released in a usable format (ICANN57_Overview, Jay Daly .nz ~37:00)	**Discussed**	See discussion topics summary at end of this section.
1.21 Health Index is important and needs a lot more work. The conclusion I can draw from the draft report is that GDD looked at the data at hand and created a health index based on that rather than the metrics actually needed to provide the community with insight, in particular into stability and trust.(ICANN57_Overview Denise Michel ~40:45)	**No Action Required**	ICANN is using this tracking tool, and also discussed this topic with a BC representative following the first public comment forum on this topic, which closed in January 2016. ICANN provided the BC with a detailed tracker showing exactly how BC comments were incorporated and where they were not at that stage of the project.

1.22 BC provided very detailed comments and specific recommendations. They were largely ignored and certainly weren't responded to in a substantive way. We had a number of suggestions. I would request that GDD staff go back and respond substantively to our specific recommendations and give us more confidence that this index will be created not just to promote domain names but actually to give the community useful meaningful metrics.(ICANN57_Overview Denise Michel ~40:45)	**Discussed**	ICANN is working with the advisory panel to enhance trust and stability metrics in the 1.0 version of this Index.
1.23 At next stage, really try to address trust and stability in a way that is meaningful. (ICANN57_Overview Denise Michel ~40:45)	**Discussed**	ICANN has taken note of this input. ICANN has reviewed and reframed the overall scope of this project and specific definitions therein with the Advisory Panel.
1.24 The timing of asking whether ICANN should be doing this is perplexing, considering the timeline shows we are well into this project. (ICANN57_Overview, Jim Prendergast, 44:45)	**No further action needed**	ICANN notes this feedback.
1.25 If you are tracking health, not enough to know if trend is going up or down—would want to know if the "patient" is healthy or not. If we are just publishing data for others to interpret, this is data, not an index of health. (ICANN57_Overview, 56:30 Roelof Meijer – SIDN)	**Discussed**	See discussion topics summary at end of this section.
1.26 The name is misleading—revisit it (ICANN57_Overview Jeff Bedser, 59:40)	**Discussed**	See discussion topics summary at end of this section.
1.27 I am troubled by this. If you call it a health index, you have to figure out how it impacts the health of the marketplace. I had trouble figuring out how the metrics actually relate to health. You can really game this thing. We have to be very careful how we choose these things.(ICANN57_Overview, Roland LaPlante, Affilias, ~1:00)	**Discussed**	See discussion topics summary at end of this section.
1.28 It's impossible not to draw conclusions from this data—ICANN is going to have to and will have to act in some way. I'm worried about what ICANN will do with the data. If you aren't going to draw conclusions this is a waste of time. (ICANN57_Overview, Roland LaPlante, Affilias, ~1:00)	**Discussed**	See discussion topics summary at end of this section.
1.29 The TLD marketplace is distinct from the entire "domain name marketplace"--the strategic goal refers to the domain name marketplace, not just the TLD marketplace…we need to understand what the goal really is. (ICANN57_Work, Gabe Fried, ~7:50)	**Discussed**	See discussion topics summary at end of this section.
1.30 There seems to be universal agreement that we are not creating an Index here. Is it OK to ignore the word "index"? Can we also ignore the word "health"? (ICANN57_Work, Steve DelBianco ~9:20)	**Discussed**	See discussion topics summary at end of this section.

1.31 Maybe we think of each metric as an index instead of the whole thing as an Index--put these bricks out there that others can use to create their own roll-up metric if they wish to do so. (ICANN57_Work, Gabe Fried ~11:30)	**Discussed**	See discussion topics summary at end of this section.
1.32 Figuring out what we mean by health will help us decide what should be included or not. Let's collect data that's relevant. (ICANN57_work, Jonathan Zuck ~38:00)	**Discussed**	See discussion topics summary at end of this section.
1.33 Change the words "gTLD" and Index in the title--perhaps Marketplace Health Indicators? (AP 5 Dec, Steve DelBianco)	**Discussed**	See discussion topics summary at end of this section.
1.34 This is not an index and it does not measure health (AP 5 Dec John McCormac)	**Discussed**	See discussion topics summary at end of this section.
1.35 "TLD Marketplace Indicators?" (AP 5 Dec, Steve DelBianco; supported by others on the call including John McCormac, Phil Buckingham, Mason Cole)	**Discussed**	See discussion topics summary at end of this section.
1.36 "I am happy with the renaming of the project to "TLD Marketplace Indicators" instead of "gTLD Marketplace Health Index" although the new name is less catchy than the old one." (Olivier MJ Crepin-Leblond, email to mailing list, 12/14/2016)	**Discussed**	See discussion topics summary at end of this section.
1.37 (On the recommendation to rename the project to Domain Name Marketplace Indicators) "Fine by me" (AP 18 Jan, Steve delBianco; supported by others on the call including Katrin Ohlmer, John McCormac, Phil Buckingham, Ivan Rasskazov, Svitlana Tkachenko, Alberto Soto, Andy Simpson) ~7:08	**Discussed**	See discussion topics summary at end of this section.

Relevant Discussion Questions	Decision Points
1. Should ICANN revisit the definition of "marketplace"? Should we change the name of this project? If so, what should it be and why?	1) Members of the Advisory Panel who have commented on this topic appear to agree that the name of this project should be changed. On Group has no objections to the proposed name "Domain Name Marketplace Indicators."
2. Should this project evolve into a data repository initiative and, if so, what does that look like?	2) This will depend on who 'owns' the data used to generate the resulting metrics, and any limitations for publication of any third-party owned data. Project staff facilitators are evaluating the possibility of leveraging any data covered in ICANN's Open Data Initiative.
3. Should ICANN appoint a chief data scientist/statistician beyond current staffing/efforts (including open data initiative)?	3) Bringing on board a full-time data scientist is out of scope for this particular initiative. Nonetheless ICANN will have an independent third-party subject matter expert involved to provide necessary guidance throughout the review process.
4. Does this project reflect ICANN's overall mission in serving registrants? Will this be used to objectively measure trust and assist the community in identifying ways to improve that level of trust? How can we track trust and stability in a meaningful way?	4)Leveraging the input of the advisory panel, ICANN is committed to refining the category definitions and metrics to be selected for future presentation, covering robust competition, stability, and trust. ICANN and the advisory panel are ensuring that registrants will be much better factored into the final schema for Version 1.

2) Category B: Metrics Development Process-Beta		
Issue/Suggestion/Recommendation	Status	Comments/Disposition
2.1 "We note some modest improvements in the index as compared to the prior version in response to community comments, including separating out brand and legacy registrations for relevant indicators, removing the RSEP as an indicator for innovation, including additional registration statistics beyond renewal rates, and using registry/registrar families as the principal unit for some relevant indicators. However, ICANN has still failed to account for a number of key weaknesses raised by the RySG in our prior comments in the modified version, nor responded to why these indicators should remain in the staff summary." (RySG)	Discussed	ICANN thanks the Registry Stakeholder Group for this feedback. Going forward, ICANN commits to increase transparency surrounding the handling of public comments on this project by documenting the response to or action resulting from each public comment, using this tracking form.
2.2 "While we recognize the diversity of comments received makes it difficult to factor in all recommendations, we believe that ICANN staff should be providing more thorough response and analysis, particularly where comments are not incorporated." (RySG)	Discussed	ICANN thanks the Registry Stakeholder Group for this feedback. Going forward, ICANN commits to increase transparency surrounding the handling of public comments on this project by documenting the response to or action resulting from each public comment, using this tracking form (same response as to item 2.1 above).
2.3 "The changes made to the proposed indicators better capture non-technical stability than ICANN's previously proposed metrics, which were primarily technical in nature." (RySG)	No Further Action Needed	ICANN thanks the Registry Stakeholder Group for this feedback.
2.4 "ICANN has decided to move forward with creating the Beta Marketplace Health Index but has not yet created a meaningful dialog that would permit a consensus to be reached among various stakeholders impacted by the index. Thus far, ICANN has requested public comment on their initial gTLD Marketplace Health Index Proposal. Following this initial round of comments, ICANN convened an advisory panel where they presented a revised draft to the panelists who each individually sent additional feedback to ICANN. ICANN did not disclose to the members of the advisory panel how the feedback that panelists provided would be addressed. Instead, ICANN's staff seems to have relied solely on recommendations from its funded research, which was edited and reviewed by ICANN staff alone. The resulting Beta report therefore lacks clarity around goals – as noted in the community feedback -- and continues to arbitrarily define an industry marketplace that does not reflect end users' experience nor the actual marketplace in which TLDs compete." (VS)	Discussed	ICANN thanks Verisign for this feedback. Looking ahead, ICANN commits to documenting its response to or action on each public comment or formal Advisory Panel input received on this project. ICANN will begin this round of Advisory Panel work with a discussion surrounding goals and processes for achieving agreement on refinements to the Index.
2.5 "ICANN has not obtained consensus that this initiative is leading to a meaningful outcome. This is the second comment period on the topic and a volunteer-based advisory panel was also convened. Thus far, ICANN has selectively addressed comments from the first round and not directly responded to comments raised during the advisory panel. The economist that was retained worked exclusively with ICANN staff to develop his paper. In the paper, Professor Bhargava indicated that multiple reviews were conducted with revisions being provided: "After preliminary review and discussions, this draft was revised as well as annotated to provide a more elaborate description and justification of the metrics, including associating each metric to one or more decision elements." The paper was only presented to the advisory panel in final form as a notification that the study had been completed and was going to be published but ICANN did not provide the panel with any opportunity to provide input to the paper. For example, a proper economic evaluation should be open to peer review but we have no indication that this was done with Professor Bhargava's paper. While engaging an economist to support this effort may be beneficial, ICANN should allow a proper economic evaluation to be performed without presumptions at the outset as to what a "healthy" marketplace may be. Similarly, an economic analysis should not be limited to only those metrics which are conveniently available. Such limitations will likely yield an unreliable and potentially misleading Index. The process of developing this initiative thus far has not led to a community consensus and instead appears to present only ICANN staff's perspective on the marketplace." (VS)	Discussed	Looking ahead, ICANN commits to documenting its response to or action on each public comment or formal Advisory Panel input received on this project. ICANN will begin this round of Advisory Panel work with a discussion surrounding goals and processes for achieving agreement on refinements to the Index.
2.6 It might also be useful to point out that metrics were defined based on (not just on the 3 category definitions) - but also with a clear sense that (1) only with respect to data available with ICANN and (2) not to make judgements but to allow diverse stakeholders to evaluate and make their own judgements. (Hemant Bhargava, APCall1, chat at 11:27)	No Further Action Needed	ICANN appreciates Prof. Bhargava reminding the Panel of this point during the call. This was read out loud to the group.

3) Category C: Metrics Development Process-Future		
Issue/Suggestion/Recommendation	**Status**	**Comments/Disposition**
3.1 "I would suggest taking note of all the comments submitted previously and this time, and outsourcing the entire project to CENTR https://www.centr.org/ and/or the Internet Society http://www.internetsociety.org/ or some other entity competent to do the job." (JP)	**Discussed**	ICANN commits to documenting its response to or action on public comments or formal Advisory Panel inputs received on this project. Based on wider input, ICANN will be facilitating the project with the support of the advisory panel and tapping into external independent third-party subject matter experts, as required.
3.2 "We appreciate ICANN's indications that the Index will be an ongoing project and look forward to further discussion on the matter both through RySG participants on the Advisory Committee as well as wider community engagement." (RySG)	**No Action Required**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and looks forward to working with the RySG and the broader community in further developing this project.
3.3 "The BC reiterates its desire that the most appropriate factors be used, despite the fact that they may not be the most easily available, and despite the fact that the data may not currently be collected by ICANN." (BC)	**Discussed**	During discussions with the Advisory Panel to arrive upon V1.0 metrics, ICANN is clear in stating that it is open to evaluating potential external metrics as long as these are relevant, recurring, reliable and rigorous datasets.
3.4 "Use weighting and filtering to prevent large entities from dominating results, to make KPIs more useful by pinpointing potential problem areas." (BC)	**Active**	This suggestion will be noted when considering the design of the Version 1 Indicators

3.5 "Rather than continuing to request comments on specific metrics that have been compiled by staff based upon available data, ICANN should develop a process to lead the community through developing a mutually agreed upon set of goals for a marketplace health index. Once these goals are collectively agreed upon, then data to characterize progress towards those mutually agreed upon goals can be collected. If the advisory panel is going to be the mechanism for establishing these goals, a process for reaching consensus within the panel and eventually the broader community should be clearly outlined." (VS)	**Discussed**	ICANN has taken note of this input. ICANN reviewed and incorporated the essence of the suggestion into the process being followed to arrive upon V1.0 output with the Advisory Panel.
3.6 "Regarding the attached "An Economic Evaluation of gTLD Performance Metrics" report from Dr. Bhargava of UC Davis, we are in agreement with the Caveats and Next Steps named in the report, for points on which ICANN should be mindful, and for recommendations of changes to be made. We especially make note of the statement of caution regarding interpreting results in Section 4 - Summary and General Observations, and the importance of measuring across time, and suggest that these be accounted for in future versions of the report, and communicated to the report's audience." (BC)	**Active**	This suggestion will be noted when considering the design of the Version 1 Indicators

3.7 Is there an appeals process for final disposition? (Ivan Rasskazov, APCall1, 11:17 chat)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this question. As noted during the APCall1, the process for handling disagreement among the Advisory Panel will be discussed. Staff proposes that if a definition, topic, or particular metric(s) are particularly contentious, we should consider seeking broader input on it to ensure a fully-informed decision is reached.
3.8 Consider the fact that ICANN's Open Data initiative pilot might replace this current project as the mechanism that surfaces the metrics selected by the Advisory Panel. The metrics that we idenfity would - via an API - be pulled and presented in real time, in the right form, without any further staff intervention. This would apply to data generated by ICANN, which falls within the Open Data Initiative scope. If, in fact, we select indicators requiring data external to ICANN, we would need to track that quite carefully. (Steve DelBianco, AP 12 Mar)	**Active**	ICANN appreciates this feedback. The Marketplace Indicator project lead commits to keeping on top of the ODI project developments, and will consider opportunities for synergy when charting its short to mid-term plans.
3.9 One of the most important things to garner trust in this Marketplace Indicators effort is for people to be able to reproduce the information by having open access to the underlying data. If we obtain data from a third-party, could we then trust data that cannot be accessed in its raw form? Caution should be applied before buying data. Buying data should be put on as a second tier to-do, i.e. only if there are very clear priorities that cannot be dealt with with internal data because there is potentially an issue with trust which comes through the (lack of) reproduceability (Jay Daley, AP 12 Mar)	**Discussed**	During discussions with the Advisory Panel to arrive upon V1.0 metrics, ICANN is clear in stating that it is open to evaluating potential external metrics as long as these are relevant, recurring, reliable and rigorous datasets.

3.10 When we do identify suitable metrics, we need to concurrently flag if any of the metrics require external data sources because that would lead a need for us to evaluate whetehr the raw data would be republishable, even in anonymized fashion. (Steve DelBianco, AP 12 Mar)	**Discussed**	During discussions with the Advisory Panel to arrive upon V1.0 metrics, ICANN is clear in stating that it is open to evaluating potential external metrics as long as these are relevant, recurring, reliable and rigorous datasets.
3.11 ICANN has massive amounts of raw data that can meet a lot of the requirements of these metrics. It is just that it is not organised or distilled into a usable format. (John McCormac - HosterStats.com, AP 12 Mar)	**No Action Required**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has added it to the list of preliminary discussion topics for the Advisory Panel.
3.12 The point about data from ICANN; If ICANN contracted a third-party to walk through the registrars and the data would reveal the extent to which registrars are offering Arabic script for their terms and payment, then that data would be publishable, its public information. So while it isnt part of contractual compliance, it is data that can be published via ICANN. We shouldn't assume that everything here will be obtained via contractual compliance. It may come from ICANN, but not be part of that. (Steve DelBianco, AP 12 Mar).	**No Action Required**	ICANN appreciates this feedback.
3.13 Given the Open Data Initiative pilot, this deserves further study as a next step. We would request (ICANN Staff facilitator) to devote some time to this so you would be able to advise the Advisory Panel on the types of data that is being planned to be published under the ODI. If there is overlapping parallel data made available that we antiicpate being necessary for our choice of metrics, that would suggest huge efficiencies that can be achieved . (Steve DelBianco, AP 12 Mar).	**Active**	ICANN appreciates this feedback. The Marketplace Indicator project lead commits to keeping on top of the ODI project developments, and will consider opportunities for synergy when charting its short to mid-term plans.
3.14 Your project is about generating KPIs that represent the marketplace. You would do it, even if you have to do it on the back of a napkin. So this project will be running ahead of the ODI initiative. But you should look to merge this project into ODI, at the point that ODI can reproduce the metrics that are relevant to track the marketplace at that time. The KPIs in 2019 may not be the same. Steve DelBianco (AP 28 Oct_ICANN60)	**Active**	ICANN appreciates this feedback. The Marketplace Indicator project lead commits to keeping on top of the ODI project developments, and will consider opportunities for synergy when charting its short to mid-term plans.

3.15: I wanted to put in my vote for folding this into the wider ODI effort. I think that would be useful. We need to avoid silos of conclusionary data that cant be leveraged very easily in the policy development process. Jonathan Zuck (AP 28 Oct_ICANN60)	**Active**	ICANN appreciates this feedback. The Marketplace Indicator project lead commits to keeping on top of the ODI project developments, and will consider opportunities for synergy when charting its short to mid-term plans.
3.16: (On potential mix of 3rd party and internal ICANN data in the report and ODI access) It is what it is. There's going to be a mix of data, different tiers. You should try to negotiate some form of dynamic access to data when you access it. The data is more useful that this biannual report is going to be. So if we start with that premise, it will guide the way we collect, how we choose, where we get, what kind of contracts we negotiate in order to maximize the use of that data. Jonathan Zuck (AP 28 Oct_ICANN60)	**Active**	This suggestion will be noted when considering the design of the Version 1 Indicators
3.17: When ones uses multiple databases, you have to look at the accuracy of each source. Cross-correlating databases usually enhances accuracy because databases agree with each other. Perhaps cross-correlating could be a good first step. Then if the accuracy is increased, you could fold multiple databases together Olivier Crepid Leblond (AP 28 Oct_ICANN60)	**Active**	This suggestion will be noted when considering the design of the Version 1 Indicators

4) Category D: Publication Frequency

Issue/Suggestion/Recommendation	Status	Comments/Disposition
4.1 "INTA would also suggest that the Index be published more frequently than twice per year, given the importance of this information in monitoring marketplace trends and identifying possible areas of concern." (INTA)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback. At this point, we anticipate that the ICANN organization will have the bandwidth to release its report twice a year. However, the Draft V1.0 Schema assessment effort will also identify the extent to which datasets and indicators can be generated more frequently.
4.2 "We note that the intended frequency of publishing is twice each year until v1.0. The BC is interested in knowing the intended frequency ongoing, and again suggests targeting 'quarterly' as the desired frequency of reporting." (BC)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback. At this point, we anticipate that the ICANN organization will have the bandwidth to release its report twice a year. However, the Draft V1.0 Schema assessment effort will also identify the extent to which datasets and indicators can be generated more frequently.
4.3 "Publish reports quarterly. Incorporate period-over-period trend data." (BC)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback. At this point, we anticipate that the ICANN organization will have the bandwidth to release its report twice a year. However, the Draft V1.0 Schema assessment effort will also identify the extent to which datasets and indicators can be generated more frequently.

4.4 "The other quesiton is how frequently will this index/data repository will be updated? That may help decide what is practical to include as well." (ICANN57_work (chat) Ivan Rasskazov: (10:17))	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback. At this point, we anticipate that the ICANN organization will have the bandwidth to release its report twice a year. However, the Draft V1.0 Schema assessment effort will also identify the extent to which datasets and indicators can be generated more frequently.
4.5 So much of this depends on use cases. How do you envision the data being used? A biannual touchbase feels like an underutilization of the effort. I wonder if we broke it down into use cases, we can identify and check later whether a policy or such effectively impacted the direction of the metric value. That suggests a more readily available dataset that could readily leveraged in policy development, than a biannually refreshed PR tool. Jonathan Zuck (AP 28 Oct_ICANN60)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback. At this point, we anticipate that the ICANN organization will have the bandwidth to release its report twice a year. However, the Draft V1.0 Schema assessment effort will also identify the extent to which datasets and indicators can be generated more frequently.

4.6.The BC acknowledge that a publication every six months is a good place to start. And before we move to a quarterly frequency, we have to understand the cost, complexity of some of the sources. For instance, one of the sources is a survey. I don't think we'll ever do quarterly surveys, its too much. Some of them are compilation of data from complaints received. I dont know to what extent Maguy's got departmental-wide data tools that will generate that on a quarterly basis. It could be a constant generation. You can finish one quarter, then have a week to do the regular day job, before getting right back to pulling data. The BC have a lot of data focused people and we dont want to be unrealistic. So once we examine the cost and complexity, it might be that semi-annual is sufficient. (e.g Steve Del Bianco (AP 28 Oct_ICANN60)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback. At this point, we anticipate that the ICANN organization will have the bandwidth to release its report twice a year. However, the Draft V1.0 Schema assessment effort will also identify the extent to which datasets and indicators can be generated more frequently.

5) Category E: Report Design/Features

Issue/Suggestion/Recommendation	Status	Comments/Disposition
5.1 "Introducing a set of defined terms within the Index would also enhance its utility and accessibility for those not closely engaged in the day-to-day work of ICANN." (INTA)	**Discussed**	ICANN thanks INTA for this suggestion. The Index (Beta) contained a limited glossary, but there are many terms used in the index that were not defined in the glossary, but could have been (such as "family" and "distinct"). ICANN will include such a glossary in the updated report featuring Version 1 indicators.
5.2 "We note that the report is a presentation of mainly graphics/charts/figures—and is somewhat light on clarifying statements, explanations, definitions. We look forward to seeing more explanatory text in future versions. Also, figures will benefit from more explanation of inputs, calculations, and results." (BC)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback. The Advisory Panel has provided its advise that ICANN provide further information to clarify, explain, and define the coverage of indicators being presented WITHOUT providing any analytical interpretation.
5.3 "Some calculations in the report are provided with pinpoint precision while others are not. We suggest maintaining consistency across classes of calculations. For example: "These data are presented at a 95 percent confidence interval with an estimated percentage plus or minus approximately two standard errors," is the label for only one of the graphs--Accuracy of WHOIS Records. By contrast, "Second-Level Domain Name Additions in gTLDs: Year-Over_Year Growth Rates (2010-2015)" includes percentages rounded to both a tenth of a percent and a hundredth of a percent, and with no note about deviations or means, or why two different rounding schema are used in a single graph. Consistency where possible will add to the readability of the report and decrease opportunities for confusion." (BC)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and will aim to provide such consistency in the updated report featuring Version 1 indicators.
5.4 "A more diverse color palette for the report's figures will allow distinction of categories and distinction of inputs across figures. For example, in Figures 12 and 13, the color used for new gTLD additions is the same color used in Figure 16 for domain name deletions. Consistency of color schemes across figures can be achieved with a broader color palette and will result in greater readability and comparison of data across figures." (BC)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and will keep this feedback in mind when the time comes to design the next publication of the Index.

5.5 "One test of the gTLD Marketplace Health report should be its utility. Inherent in its utility is that the report's audience understands how to use it, and does not misinterpret that data. To this end, we recommend including solid definitions of terminology. Defining the inputs will be helpful to knowledgeable readers, as well as make the document more understandable those among the audience who are less knowledgeable. It would be useful to have names of Figure(s) in addition to or in lieu of page numbers when referencing content elsewhere in the document." (BC)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and will keep this feedback in mind when the time comes to design the next publication of the Index.
5.6 [*Regarding the gTLD Marketplace Health Index (Beta) glossary*] "Suggest improving the definition of IDN. Current definition does not account for what makes IDNs distinct. • Suggest improving the definition of Geographic gTLD, or provide pointer to inline definition. • Suggest improving the definition of gTLD registrar. (An uneducated reader, the UC Davis author, used the existing definition to confuse "registrar" and "registrant.") • Suggest improving the definition of "registry," to present it as more than a database, as well as to distinguish between registry, registry operator, operator family." (BC)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and will keep this feedback in mind when the time comes to design the next publication of the Index.
5.7 I would like us to revisit our desciption of the effort to 'publish' new versions of the Indicators report. We are not 'publishing', but rather . promising to make updates to a dataset that will be accessible to anyone. Essentially, this is adding another row which is fully visible to anyone. I want to click on something and download it in Excel, something which I can then use on my own. (Steve DelBianco, 26 Jul AP)	**Discussed**	At this junction, the marketplace indicators output will most likely still take the form of a report, at least until the Open Data Initiative allows for a different form of presenting the indicators.
5.8 (To a Q on 'what level of commentary should ICANN provide for these metrics): 'At the very least we have to update rows in an Excel sheet to make it accessible to the greatest number of people. Then if you have some tool that can present the necessary pie charts, bar charts, etc to run against that data - thats what you do now. The next level would be the extent to which you add commentary. That feels like an abstraction right now. A statement like the data shows that trust is improving could be left to the reader. There's no need to lead us by the nose. But there may be commentaries such as data gathering notes which explain anomalies, etc. which you would definitely want to retain. Notes and explanations to understand the way the day that was gathered rather than leading us by the nose to interpret the trend. It would be interesting where you put it. If we have the Excel sheet, you have have a footnote which hyperlinks to those explanations. Steve Delbianco (AP 28 Oct_ICANN60)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback. The Advisory Panel has provided its advise that ICANN provide further information to clarify, explain, and define the coverage of indicators being presented WITHOUT providing any analytical interpretation.
5.9 "A higher publication frequency will capture any volatiliy in the marketplace, while a lower frequency will miss this. Also the use of opinion polls is akin to voodoo, expecially when we have good hard solid data (as an alternative). The problem is that the marketplace is changing so rapidly that these opinion surveys won't really capture what is happening." John McCormack Hosterstats (AP 28 Oct_ICANN60)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback. At this point, we anticipate that the ICANN organization will have the bandwidth to release its report twice a year. However, the Draft V1.0 Schema assessment effort will also identify the extent to which datasets and indicators can be generated more frequently.
5.10 "I assume that commentary would be sourced by the ICANN organization or by the panel? My concern is that you may get some data that you're not equipped to provide commentary on, so you may need the input of those that provide the data or others and that may add extra time to generating the report." Mason Cole (AP 28 Oct_ICANN60)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and will take this into account when generating the report for Version 1.0 indicators. The Advisory Panel has provided its advise that ICANN provide further information to clarify, explain, and define the coverage of indicators being presented WITHOUT providing any analytical interpretation.

5.11 "I'm inclined to agree. Keep the commentary to a minimum and keep the outputs functional." Jonathan Zuck (AP 28 Oct_ICANN60)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback. The Advisory Panel has provided its advise that ICANN provide further information to clarify, explain, and define the coverage of indicators being presented WITHOUT providing any analytical interpretation.

6) Category F: Outside Experts

Issue/Suggestion/Recommendation	Status	Comments/Disposition
6.1 "INTA also welcomes continued exploration and input from academics and others who are able to provide more specific insight from various industry sectors such as information technology and economics that would further enhance the utility of the Index." (INTA)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has included as a consideration for finalization of the Version 1 Metrics. An RFP selection process has been launched with visibility and input from the Advisory Panel
6.2 "We note ICANN's inclusion of an information technology management academic and see the opinions and input as useful, and suggest that the development of this report continue with input from disciplines such as economics and statistics as well, as application of related disciplines to these marketplace metrics will likely improve the baselines and usefulness of this report going forward." (BC)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has included as a consideration for finalization of the Version 1 Metrics. An RFP selection process has been launched with visibility and input from the Advisory Panel
6.3 It might be best to get an independent reviewer who actually knows about the domain business (John McCormac - HosterStats.com: (13:06), AP 26 Apr)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has included as a consideration for finalization of the Version 1 Metrics. An RFP selection process has been launched with visibility and input from the Advisory Panel

7) Category G: General Structure of Metrics Framework

Issue/Suggestion/Recommendation	Status	Comments/Disposition
7.1 "The BC mainly agrees with the factors named for determining health in the areas of competition, stability and trust, with the expectation that ICANN will continually seek to improve measures and calculations and inputs with each publication of the Index." (BC)	Discussed	ICANN appreciates this feedback. The assessment effort of our draft Version 1 indicators will help solidify our direction forward. There is an intention of continuious inprovement of course.
7.2 "As stated in comments by the advisory panel, it is clear that substantial work is necessary to establish and understand the goals of a Marketplace Health Index. Nearly every commenter in the original round of public comments expressed concern around the scope and process of the intended health index. The sheer diversity of the recommended metrics that commenters have suggested indicates at a minimum that the goals of the Index are simply too broad. To make achieving consensus around the Index possible, the scope of what this index intends to cover needs to be defined clearly and the process for reaching consensus must also be described in more detail." (VS)	Discussed	ICANN is very much thankful to the Advisory Panel for its indispensible advise in this regard. Beyond the updates to the category definitions and choice of indicators, the language and tone used to explain the goals and intent of the entire initiative have changed to hopefully be clearer to the community.
7.3 "Other useful items in the UC Davis report which we recommend using are: - Principles for metric design - Suggestion to evaluate if the metrics capture relevant factors - Suggestion to push more sophistication re: measurement, normalization into subsequent phases" (BC)	Active	ICANN appreciates this feedback and will ensure the entity conducting the assessment of the Draft Version 1 Framework have these as reference.
7.4 "It looks like a set of mutually dependent but exclusive parameters (trust/usage/development/stats). A single figure or index might not work well." (ICANN57_Overview (chat) John McCormac - HosterStats: (09:51)).	Discussed	ICANN appreciates this feedback. We have clarified that this is not the intent of the project. Further deliberations with the Advisory Panel have resulted in the decision to rename the project to: Domain Name Marketplace Indicators to ensure that there is no misunderstanding on its intent.

8) Category H: Robust Competition (Scope and Definition)

Issue/Suggestion/Recommendation	Status	Comments/Disposition
8.1 "Donuts has reservations about attempting to assign metrics to such subjective matters, particularly those that involve perceptions instead of quantifiable data or demonstrable fact. Upon what criteria, for example, can a perception of fairness be established? To be sure, ICANN participants, depending on their individual points of view or those of whom they represent, can find nearly any reason to perceive unfair treatment. This is a very slippery path for ICANN to attempt to traverse. Quantifiable measurements—and a rewording of this definition (e.g., "Marketplace competition is independently measured as fair")—are much more preferable." (DON)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.
8.2 "The stated goal in the beta report is to determine if "The commercial marketplace is thriving" and the assumed definition of what this looks like is "growth in new gTLDs and across all gTLDs." This has not been established as an effective measure for measuring the health of the marketplace and is easily influenced by many factors not captured by the index today as noted by Professor Bhargava." (VS)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.
8.3 "Before discussing the metrics, evaluating the definition is important. In the example of robust competition, who is supposed to have diversity of choice to experience competition? Registries, registrars, or end users?" (ICANN57_work (chat) Andy Simpson: (09:59))	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.
8.4 The web dev business has become commoditised. It is often the web developer who registers the domain for the client rather than an individual registrant" (ICANN57_work (chat) John McCormac - HosterStats.com: (10:05))	**No action required**	ICANN appreciates this feedback. No action was required as this did not address an open question
8.5 "ICANN accredited registrars are generally mature market entrants. There are often hundreds or thousands of hosters in a market before this happens." (ICANN57_work (chat) John McCormac - HosterStats.com: (10:15))	**No action required**	ICANN appreciates this feedback. No action was required as this did not address an open question

8.6 " Most hosters outsource their gTLD ops to registrars either in -country or outside of the country" (ICANN57_work (chat) John McCormac - HosterStats.com: (10:16)).	**No action required**	ICANN appreciates this feedback. No action was required as this did not address an open question
8.7"Web development is now commoditised so web developers tend to register doms for their clients." (ICANN57_work (chat) John McCormac - HosterStats.com: (10:17)	**No action required**	ICANN appreciates this feedback. No action was required as this did not address an open question
8.8 I'm assuming that, in the competition definition when it refers to "players" we are talking about multiple parties--registries, registrars, registry/registrar service providers, etc (ICANN57_work, Jonathan Zuck ~101:00)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback. No action was required as this did not address an open question
8.9 Re: service model--I'm not seeing anything about the type of domains that are being offered (ie, premium, $1 a domain, etc--pricing thresholds) and there is a difference between the two. (ICANN57_work, Olivier Crepin-Leblond, ~102:00)	**Discussed**	Input from other members of the Panel indicated that pricing thresholds might be seen as an overreach by ICANN. Several indicated it would be best to hold off from this, particularly as there is no consensus on the type of data that might be used under this category.
8.10 With diversity should also look at services offered in languages and scripts (ie, if a registrant has access to registrar in their language/script but the Rr doesn't offer the service they need (e.g. privacy/proxy) is there really diversity in choice, etc?(ICANN57_work, Steve DelBianco ~1:05)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.
8.11 It would also be interesting to add payment methods to this diversity category. (ICANN57_work, Rubens Kuhl, ~1:11)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.
8.12 Think from the registrant's point of view (regarding these definitions)--availability of language and script is not just about the TLD, but what is on the webpage (not the registry/registrar address, either) (AP 5 December, Steve DelBianco)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.
8.13 If we are measuring perceptions, we should measure changes in perceptions over time (AP 5 Dec, Steve DelBianco)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.
8.14 I am very concerned about using perceptions of fairness--this is too broad and can be defined in many ways (AP 5 Dec Mason Cole)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.
8.15 Web developers tend to register more for their clients than end users. The focus on end users might be a bit of a distraction (AP 5 Dec, John McCormack)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.

8.16 +1 Steve. Geography is not important. Perhaps actual location of the registrant where he/she/it actually operates (for tax purposes). (AP 5 Dec, Phil Buckingham)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.
8.17 The first point is too generic to properly scope it. The choice of a generic "service provider" is so open ended it is impossible to come up with a comprehensive set of metrics to characterize this. Can we be any more specific about the who needs to be able to select a provider to accomplish what to help guide metric selection? Something akin to "Registrants should have a choice for which domains they can purchase and where they can purchase them" would significantly reduce the number of ways to interpret this (AP 5 Dec, Andrew Simpson)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.
8.18 Geography can be difficult to sort out even with all the data. Then there are markets with more than one language and strong overlap between countries. In mature domain markets approximately 80% of the market can be on the top ten hosters in the market (AP 5 Dec John McCormac)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.
8.19 The EU is a single market, so do French registrars form part of the German geography? (AP 5 Dec Michiel Henneke)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.
8.20 Just because it is growing doesn't mean it is thriving (AP 5 Dec, Phil Buckingham)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.
8.21 zone stuffing is a big problem with domain counts (AP 5 Dec John McCormac)	**No action required**	ICANN appreciates this feedback. As it did not specifically address an open question, the input was taken as a point of information.
8.22 In my opinion growth should not be measured by numbers alone, I think diversity in usage is important as well (eg e-commerce website, etc) (AP 5 Dec Sam Frieda)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.
8.23 Similar scoping that narrows the definition to registries/registrars for "the marketplace is open to new players" would be helpful (AP 5 Dec, Andrew Simpson)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.
8.24 @ Andy, that might be related to the number of accredited registrars per gTLD (AP 5 Dec, John McCormac)	**No action required**	This appeared to be a question seeking clarification and required no action from ICANN.
8.25 Considering how the different registries are investing into registrars in regions where there is a lack of awareness for that TLD, also contributing to growth which can be unfairly analyzed between service providers in different regions, which does indirectly affect the growth of a TLD (AP 5 Dec, Sam Frieda)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.
8.26 Can we keep the "insanely optimistic awareness stuff" from the CCT out of this report? It is the awareness thing that is not backed by registration data and trends. We should concentrate on what we can prove with the data, that way we get industry credibility for the report. (AP 5 Dec, John McCormack)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.
8.27 In an open market, some large registries dominate the TLD but the do so by providing their own retail domain registration channel and by providing resellers with a means to register domain names for their clients often with the reseller's branding. Thus while there may only be a small number of active registries in a TLD, there are many resellers. There are two markets. The first is the market for new registry entrants. The second is the market for ICANN accredited registrars and resellers. Distinguishing between the two is important. Perhaps it would be best to express it (category definition #3 and #5) as follows: The gTLD operation marketplace is open to new registries. The gTLD domain name marketplace is open to new registrars and resellers. (John McCormack, Email dated Dec 21 2016)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.

8.28 We have actually four type of players in the Value Chain: - the registries, that is to say, the entities to which the TLDs have been delegated. These might not be specialists of the domain name market, such as big companies which asked for a dot CORP, but they are managing the development and the "global life" of their TLDs. - the back-end registries, which are specialists of the management of TLDs at least on its technical side - the registrars - the resellers The frontiers between some of these categories appear to be moving quite fast, some registries being also back-end for their own TLDs or for third parties, and some of them even controlling their own registrar(s). The registry/registrar model is still dominating, but it is evolving. I would then suggest the following formulation (for #3) The gTLD operation marketplace is open to new registries and back-end registries. The gTLD domain name marketplace is open to new registrars and resellers. We lack data about resellers but John's approach through the hosts may be very interesting to fill the gap. (Loic Damilaville, Email dated Dec 21 2016)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.
8.29 Channels are quite relevant and there is a lack of channels in developing economies. Metrics on this will be very important to promote such growth in those areas and as such improve marketet development for any gTLD. Last survey we did in LAC region broght some metrics but not enough on resellers part. (Vanda Scartezini, Email dated Dec 27 2016)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.
8.30: (Feedback on work-in-progress category definition 1B:'service availability across languages and scripts') Scripts offered might lead to confusion. Perhaps 'languages and language scripts offered ' might be better. (AP 18 Jan, John McCormack)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.
8.31 (Feedback on work-in-progress category definition 1B:'service availability across languages and scripts') There is a nuance here in that this relates to both the domain name availability itself, as well as the availability of language(s)/scripts in the registrar's terms of service pages. So the recommendation would be to rename this to: "Domain names and terms of service available in desired language and scripts" (AP 18 Jan, Steve DelBianco)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated our definition to account for this input.
8.32 (Feedback on work-in-progress category definition 1A: 'Geographical Spread of registrants') - privacy whois would be factored out I presume? (AP 18 Jan, Ivan Rasskazov, concurred to by Steve DelBianco)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback. This will be indeed likely factored out.
8.33 (Feedback on work-in-progress category definition 1A: 'Geographical Spread of registrants') "with a few registrars in a region - can fix prices (higher) - oligopoly market. It is where the registrant is physically based , which registrars they are using / price paid in their region. Very hard to track though . (AP 18 Jan, John McCormack)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.
8.34 (Feedback on work-in-progress category definition 1A: 'Geographical Spread of registrants')all that matters is serving registrants with choices relevant to them. ICANN is not charged with economic development activities, such as planint registrars in every country. An aspiring registrant benefits by having choices AND by having multiple registrars competing to serve them. I just cannot see why it matters WHERE a registrar is located (AP 18 Jan, Steve DelBianco, concurred to by Ivan Rasskazov, Alberto Soto, Jonathan Zuck, John McCormack)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.
8.35: (Feedback on work-in-progress category definition 2: 'Demonstrated by growth in new gTLDs and across all gTLDs')simply measuring Growth doesnt factor in what is happening in secondary markets for resale of domains. Case in point - the NamesCon auction taking place next week. (AP 18 Jan, Jim Prendergast)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.

8.36: (Feedback on work-in-progress category definition 2: 'Demonstrated by growth in new gTLDs and across all gTLDs') Growth does not only relate to pure # of registrations but also to usage (AP 18 Jan, Katrin Ohlmer)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.
8.37: (Feedback on work-in-progress category definition 2: 'Demonstrated by growth in new gTLDs and across all gTLDs') Right, so in terms of strategic definition, I think #2 works. Provided it is supplemented with key data that breaks that growth down. (AP 18 Jan, Ivan Rasskazov)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.
8.38: (Feedback on work-in-progress category definition 2: 'Demonstrated by growth in new gTLDs and across all gTLDs') How about "Demonstrated by growth in new gTLDs RELATIVE to all gTLDs" (AP 18 Jan, Steve DelBianco)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.
8.39: (Feedback on work-in-progress category definition 2: 'Demonstrated by growth in new gTLDs and across all gTLDs'). Disagree with Steve's suggestion above in 8.38. some new gtlds are growing slowly and it would not reflect well or be a good comparison (new tld vs mature tld) (AP 18 Jan, John McCormack, concurred to by Katrin Ohlmer, Phil Buckingham, Ivan Rasskazov (can't really compare a 2y nTLD to one that launched a year ago, may not even be able to compare they cycle to cycle because they could be narrowly targeted to specific market),)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.
8.40: (Feedback on work-in-progress category definition 2: 'Demonstrated by growth in new gTLDs and across all gTLDs') From a definition standpoint, this wording implies that all TLDs have to be growing for their to be robust competition. As others have noted, base sizes fluctuate but that doesn't mean there are fewer TLDs competing for end users. (AP 18 Jan, Andy Simpson)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.
8.41: (Feedback on work-in-progress category definition 2: 'Demonstrated by growth in new gTLDs and across all gTLDs') Secondary Market should count - some of the nTLD registries' model is to build revenue from sale of premium names, not necessarily by new adds…(AP 18 Jan, Sam Frida)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.
8.42: (Feedback on work-in-progress category definition 2: 'Demonstrated by growth in new gTLDs and across all gTLDs') Brand gTLDs are a separate class. Perhaps they should not be grouped with the ordinary open new gTLDs (AP 18 Jan, John McCormack)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.
8.43 (Feedback on work-in-progress category definition 3: The marketplace is open to new back-end technology service providers, registries, registrars, and resellers.') add 'and other players" (secondary market, for example), AP 18 Jan, Svitlana Tkachenko, concurred to by Katrin Ohlmer)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.

8.44 I thought more about the terms we are using, and would propose this text for the concept of languages and scripts: The health of the domain marketplace is measured by the extent to which registrants see domains available in the scripts and languages they seek to use, offered by competing suppliers, and where terms and conditions for domain services are displayed in the scripts and languages they prefer to use. Note that this does not require that suppliers be located in the registrant's own country or region. The internet transcends boundaries quite effectively, as long as it presents choices that are understandable to actual and potential registrants and users. (Steve delBianco, email to mailing list, 1/19/2017)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.
8.45 Though I agree the registrant does not need to be in the same place of suppliers the lack of suppliers presence in developing areas (LAC region for instance) does not allow the market to know different domains even exist. Even with Registrars offering several traditional and new names in those regions, lack of resellers in contact with people where the digital knowledge can be quite superficial, is responsible for the reduced number of domains and even lack of knowledge of the importance of adequate domain for business. I believe this contributes to an unhealthy market (Vanda Scartezini, email to mailing list, 1/19/2017)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.
8.46 When crossing boundaries, payment methods and taxes start becoming less favorable. And if the competition is only among players that all carry a tax burden for a registrant, it doesn't help much. So I suggest something in the line: The health of the domain marketplace is measured by the extent to which registrants see domains available in the scripts and languages they seek to use, offered by competing suppliers, and where terms and conditions for domain services are displayed in the scripts and languages they prefer to use, and where payment options include the ones they prefer to use, with all steps of the process not incurring inconvenient burdens. (Rubens Kuhl, email to mailing list, concurred to by Steve DelBianco via email , 1/19/2017)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.
8.47 RE #1B Perhaps adding the term "character scripts" or "language script/characters" might help remove some of the confusion. A lot of the people reading this report (hosters, web developers etc) may automatically think in terms of computer languages at the mention of the word 'scripts' thus they would think that it refers to PHP, ASP or other scripting language. (John McCormack, email to mailing list, 1/19/2017)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.
8.48 RE#2 Growth of developing markets tends to come from the demand side of the curve, not supply. Essentially, an internet-only product does not require a geographical location of a registrar or registry, but merely that there is enough demand from the local market to warrant the supplier to enter it. Many registrants choose a non-local TLD (.com or .eu) because of either cost, or because they perceive their own endusers are likely to be more accepting of the non-local TLD option. I believe cost is a big part of it because many smaller ccTLDs tend to be very expensive relative to .com in registration fees. The other question is why this growth in demand does not arise and possible solutions. However, as I understand, this may be beyond the scope of what we are trying to answer here. Instead, Steve is suggesting to focus the question around consumer choice and whether it is improving over time. (Ivan Rasskazov, email to mailing list, 1/19/2017)	**Discussed**	Indeed, we have decided to place the registrant at the core of the definition. We also go beyond the more generic 'growth' terminology, given the advise of the wider advisory panel.

8.49 I am not sure about including the part about including payment options and inconvenient burdens. ICANN is not likely to have much input on laws and procedures that national government may impose on payment options or transactions. For example, the Patriot Act in the United States is a widely reaching piece of legislature that carries stringent identification and record requirements. If that prevents parties from using additional payment options, is the U.S. based market less healthy than another country where those limitations do not exist? (Ivan Rasskazov, email to mailing list, 1/19/2017)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.
8.50 ICANN can act based on lack of local registrars in jurisdictions where that makes a difference in registrant's customer journey. Assuming that cross-border works for everyone is unrealistic; on the other hand, assuming that people will only shop local is also not realistic. But payment options and burdens have an effect on that. Just a data point: 64% of Brazilians have a bank account, while only 56% have a card. On a qualitative view, "Boleto", a very popular payment method in Brazil, is not accepted by international domain outlets. Taxes owed by a Brazilian citizen to register a domain in an out of the country domain registrar/reseller amounts to something between 40 and 50%. To asses whether is significant, one needs to weigh in all registrants in all jurisdictions. But if only numbers matter, what happens in India and China will define the experience of everyone in the world... (Rubens Kuhl, email to mailing list, 1/19/2017)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.
8.51 Unless a major payment method like credit cards is missing, I am more likely to be moved by cost and not payment options. As an example, .bo will cost me $204 to register while a .com may cost as little as $2.99. If taxes substantially affect the price differential, I would tend to agree. However, that will require knowledge of how each registry prices its TLDs. If we have that information, I think it would be great to review either way. I just don't think taxes will explain the majority of the $180 difference. Otherwise, I don't believe that the payment options aspect is significant enough. If you have examples, I would greatly appreciate looking them over. I do not mean to add extra work to your points. I just want to make sure that I thoroughly approach the suggested changes. Thank you for the example. I think that in regard to your last point, what happens in a single country can in fact define a global experience. We have seen that in 2016 in terms of domain sales and high levels of registration in many nTLDs by Chinese registrants. However, I realize we are dealing with a broader question. I support collection of the data and then observing what it tells us. I am not against applying a qualitative view. It simply may be very difficult to apply an objective qualitative standard to the entire TLD marketplace given its wide diversity. (Ivan Rasskazov, email to mailing list, 1/19/2017)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.
8.52 The demand side needs to know the existence of the product is being offered - I am not talking about registrars, those can be anywhere - but small resellers are relevant to take the knowledge to small business and even people from less informed regions. Market knowledge is relevant parameter to measure market's health. Just as suggestion, it is interesting to read the study made about LAC Marketplace, published last year shall be in ICANN portal ,as well as similar for Africa's marketplace for a view about less developed markets. (Vanda Scartezini, email to mailing list, 1/19/2017)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates the input provided. Resellers are indeed a valuable part of the ecosystem and are accounted for in the new category definition by name.
8.53 Critique of Definition #5: Perhaps "The gTLD marketplace as a whole is not dependent..." might be better, ok TLD marketplace. (John McCormac - HosterStats.com: (12:10) , AP 22 Feb)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.
8.54 Critique of Definition #1B: yes, it's better (to split into two separate categories). There are mix domains and documents (tem and conditions). (Svitlana Tkachenko, .UA: (12:15), AP 22 Feb)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.

8.54 Critique of Definition #1E on 'Pricing Threshholds' : Pricing thresholds might be a bit sensitive as registries generally set the pricing. It might be seen by overreach by ICANN. Seems a like a bit of a slippery sloap to get ICANN getting into pricing thresholds. Agreed. Best keep a problem metric like this out of the report as it will end up causing more problems than it solves. Strike #1. It is a distraction. Agree with getting rid of it (Jonathan Zuck: (12:21) and John McCormac - HosterStats.com: (12:22), AP 22 Feb)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.
8.55 The question of competition only matters to the registrant. They are the ones making decisions and through which registrars to do it. And if they are able to put up websites in the face of robust competition, well then the end-users those registrants have intended to serve would benefit from the sites that they have put up. (Steve DelBianco, AP 12 Mar).	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.
8.56 (re: Use of term 'Adoption' in Defn 2) The CCT review team just released a pretty robust report. I don't know if they touch on the term 'adoption'; perhaps that can help finetune this definition. (Jim Prendergast, AP 12 Mar)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.
8.57 (re: Use of term 'Adoption' in Defn 2) We learned that its one thing to registrer a domain name in a new TLD, but if that registration isn't live, it would be considered a parked domain. If its redirected, it's a different type of adoption. And if its used as a primary domain of a registrant, thats a higher level of adoption. Whats harder to measure is whether a registrant is actually advertising themselves using that new gTLD domain name, or still via a legacy domain name. Thats harder and will change over time. Adoption has multiple levels of seriousness. There are different levels of adoption and we may want to impart that. I believe the term 'adoption' is OK for now, but we will have to drill down to say what it means. I do hope that adoption will have at least three flavors: acquired not resolved, acquired but redirecting, and acquired and resolving to a unique site. So we can go with 'adoption' for now but understand we may have two or three flavors of that. (Steve DelBianco, AP 12 Mar)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.
8.58 The problem with CCT's definitions and data on Parking is that they are not reliable. It would be risky to use it as any basis for the "adoption" element. It needs more consideration. (John McCormac - HosterStats.com, AP 12 Mar)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.

8.59. (re: Clarification of term 'market players' in Defn 3 and 5) One of the things you did in itemizing the market players, covering registries, back-end technology service providers, registrars and resellers, is that you foreclosed the possibility of something totally new. I would encourage you to just leave an open-ended component in addition to the list (Kristine Dorrain, AP 12 Mar).	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.
8.60. (re: Clarification of term 'market players' in Defn 3 and 5) We can adjust the definition to say "...market providers, **including** back-end technology service providers, registries, registrars and resellers" (Steve Delbianco, AP 12 Mar).	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.
8.61. (re: Reframing Defn 5) Instead of talking about the number of providers, you could talk about the power of providers. Suggestion is to say: the TLD marketplace should not have providers that have excess control of the market. That is the normal way that is defined when you use a market concentration index. You can use various indices, theres about 4 of them. Saying its not dependent on a small number of players is not the right way to put it, its about the impact of having too much control of the market. Thats what you want to measure, its the control that people have of the market." (Jay Daley, AP 12 Mar).	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.
8.62 (re: Reframing Defn 5) I could suggest to rephrase this to the TLD marketplace as a whole is not 'proportionally' dependent on a small number of...(Olivier Crepin LeBlond, AP 12 Mar).	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.
8.63 On Defn#1, the point of IDNs, the marketplace is saying there's no market for this right now. To require providers to offer services the marketplace doesn't want, then to pan them, is not going to help in reinforcing the concept of robust competition. On Defn # 2: on the concept of adoption, this needs a lot more work. If I bought 500K domains for the use of spam, i dont think any of us would think that to be a good idea. But that would be great adoption. On Defn #4: We fail on that one today, 80% of the gTLD business is in one place. In any business, you will see 80% of the business being done by 20% of the providers no matter what is going on, so I dont think the structure is going to help us understand what robust competition is all about. (Roland LaPlante, AP 12 Mar)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.
8.64 If we measure robust competition, there are at least two completely independent perspectives. The first, is that of the registrant w ho does not actually care if every single registrar used the same backend. That is of no consequence whatsoever, as registrants really only want choices among their providers, ideally more than one. The second kind of competition is for those running regstrars and registries, do you have choice for your back-end service providers. It may be that one or few providers is enough and the 80-20 rule is true and applicable for the industry. So we shouldn't tread carelessley into the HHI and other anti-trust measures of competition, but findings here could be interesting for the community to know and debate. (Steve Delbianco, AP 12 Mar).	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.

8.65 (Commenting on #3) There is a problem with the statement "open to registries" because right now it's a closed application process. As long as that stays closed, that is an automatic zero. (Stephanie Duchesneau, AP 12 Mar).	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.
8.66 (Commenting on #2) i think what defines "adoption" is secondary to a bigger conversation yet to be had regarding whether adoption really plays a role when measuring "Robust Competition" (Andy Simpson, AP 12 Mar).	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.
8.67 (Commenting on #2) This is more (about) stability than competition. Measuring #2 is a lot more difficult than it appears. Basically we are using historical frameworks to measure existing usage/adoption (Jim McCormack, AP 26 Apr).	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.
8.68 (Commenting on Reframing #5 to refer to 'excessive control') That was going to be my question -- what does "excessively" mean here? (Mason Cole, AP 26 Apr support for this idea by Sam Frida)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.
8.69 (Commenting on Reframing #5 to refer to 'excessive control') It does get into the mess of having to define significant market power/position. (John McCormack, AP 26 Apr).	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.
8.70 (Commenting on Reframing #5 to refer to 'excessive control') The language 'Excessively controlled' invites someone to say, what did you mean by that? And we will have no ability to respond, it fails the test of a definition that can stand up to scrutiny. I would suggest adjusting the definition to "The TLD Marketplace as a whole is not subject to control over prices or supply ... by a small number of service providers, incl back end, registries, regsitrars, and resellers. If we dont put very specific terms, then using wider 'excessive control' type language will invite questions which we will simply not be able to answer. And "as a whole" is a key phrase. This ensures that we would not be looking at single providers within the market they serve, like Donuts or GoDaddy." (Steve DelBianco, AP 26 Apr).	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.
8.71 (Commenting on Reframing #5 to refer to 'excessive control') There are so many gray areas where Registries have a facade of "not controlling" but there is "control" ...in diff ways...whethere is financial, bandwith, accredited partners etc. (AP 26 Apr, Sam Frida)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.

8.72 (re: Whether Registrant Adoption as per Def # 2 is more related to 'Stability' than Competition) If registrants have a choice, that automatically creates competition. Choice is inherently competition, ,while competiton is not inherently choice. You can have a very unstable market with lots of choice and competition. I dont think we want to confuse stability with competition and choice. Adoption is linked more to choice than stability. It is more related to robust competition. (Steve DelBianco, AP 26 Apr).	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.
8.73 On #2, I just want us to be cautious about our characterisation of what adoption is. The lifecycle called out (i.e. purchase TLD, purchase and use TLD, purchase, use, and brand TLD) is absolutely one of the those that domains follow, but I don't want us to drive our initiative down a path where we predetermine the ideal progression or a specific model of adoption and innovation. (Andy Simpson, AP 26 Apr, support for this idea by John McCormac, Mason Cole).	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.
8.74. On #2, The word adoption implies registration, but says there's more to the domain name, it goes beyond registration to look at use. I find adoption is a generic enough term. We don't have to go and promise to measure all the various stages of adoption, but we want to be able to explain why - if asked - we go beyond just using the term registration and actually refer to adoption instead. (Steve DelBianco, AP 26 Apr, support for this idea by Mason Cole).	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.
8.75 On #5, Does ICANN have the expertise to make the deterination that's embodied in the definition. When it comes to assessing market power or share, there is some speciic expertise called upon. Is that something ICANN has or willing to obtain? (Jim Prendergast, AP 26 Apr).	**Discussed**	ICANN's primary goal will be to collaborate with the Advisory Panel to come up with the entire basket of suiitable metrics. Inevitably a decision will be made on the ability to procure those after an evaluation of the all metrics shortlisted.
8.76 (#5 Question on whether language in the prior definition: "not dependent on" was a better way of addressing the requirement of the category definition, allowing us better flexibility) Perhaps. And you might even say "overly dependent". But someone's still going to ask the question, what do you mean by dependent or overly dependent. Overly dependent and excessively controlled are very similar words. They pretty much mean the same thing. (Steve DelBianco, AP 26 Apr).	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.
8.77 (#5 Question on whether language in the prior definition: "not dependent on" was a better way of addressing the requirement of the category definition, allowing us better flexibility) "dependent" would need to be defined as well. (Andy Simpson, AP 26 Apr).	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.
8.78 (#5 Question on whether language in the prior definition: "not dependent on" was a better way of addressing the requirement of the category definition, allowing us better flexibility) The words excessively controlled lend themselves to metrics later on, versus the word 'dependent'. Its hard for me to think of how you put metrics to the words dependent. (Steve DelBianco, AP 26 Apr).	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.
8.79 (on definition 1B) perhaps, 1b could be "Domain names and hosting services are available ..." (Steve DelBianco, AP 26 Jul).	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback, We are limiting the category definition to the domain name space, in line with Strategic Goal 2.3.

Relevant Discussion Questions	Decision Points	Updated Definition
Critique of Definition #1: Diversity exists in the choice of a service provider, including:	A suggestion was provided to revise this to: Registrants should have a choice for which domains they can purchase and where they can purchase them	#1: Registrants should have a choice for which domains they can purchase and where they can purchase them, as characterized by:
a) –Geography	-Feedback received that geographical spread of the service provider is not truly important. Perhaps actual location of the registrant where he/she/it actually operates (for tax purposes). Geography can be difficult to sort out even with all the data. Then there are markets with more than one language and strong overlap between countries.	a) Geographical spread of registrants
b) –Scripts offered	-Consider combining "language" and "script" as these go hand-in-hand. -There is a nuance here in that this relates to both the domain name availability itself, as well as the availability of language(s)/scripts in the registrar's terms of service pages. The health of the domain marketplace is measured by the extent to which registrants see domains available in the scripts and languages they seek to use, offered by competing suppliers, and where terms and conditions for domain services are displayed in the scripts and languages they prefer to use. 'Scripts offered' might lead to confusion. Perhaps 'languages and character scripts offered ' might be better. -it's better to split these into two separate categories, instead of mixing domains and documents (terms and conditions)	b) Domain names are available across languages and character scripts c) Suppliers' terms & conditions are available across languages and character scripts
c) –Service model*	What does diversity in service model mean? (Note: originally this was meant to cover metrics relating to the wider domain name industry supply-chain, i.e % of domain names acquired via resellers, % of registry operators that also run a registrar, as well as other potential data on service provider service models	-deleted-
d) –Languages offered*	Consider combining "language" and "script"--these go hand-in-hand.	-deleted, combined with (b) and (c) above-
e) Other suggestions	Feedback received that: it would also be interesting to add available payment methods, domain price thresholds, and domain utilization categories (e.g. eCommerce) to this diversity category definition. - Pricing thresholds might be a bit sensitive as registries generally set the pricing. It might be seen by overreach by ICANN. It seems a like a bit of a slippery sloap to get ICANN getting into pricing thresholds. Best keep a problem metric like this out of the report as it will end up causing more problems than it solves.	d) Variety of payment methods

Critique of Definition #2: The commercial marketplace is thriving –demonstrated by growth in new gTLDsand across all gTLDs.	The linkage between the two clauses of this definition falling on either side of the dash has not been established as an effective measure. A suggestion was put forth to strike out "The commercial marketplace is thriving". This wording also implies that all TLDs have to be growing for their to be robust competition. Base sizes fluctuate but that doesn't mean there are fewer TLDs competing for end users. (When thinking of growth, this does not only necessarily relate to pure number of registrations but potentially also to usage.) '-Adoption has multiple levels of seriousness. There are different levels of adoption and we may want to impart that. I believe the term 'adoption' is OK for now, but we will have to drill down to say what it means. I do hope that adoption will have at least three flavors: acquired not resolved, acquired but redirecting, and acquired and resolving to a unique site.	#2: Demonstrated by registrant adoption of new TLDs and across all TLDs.
Critique of Definition #3: The marketplace is open to new players.	Narrowing the definition of 'players' for "the marketplace is open to new players" would be helpful, while also leaving an open-ended component in addition to the list to account for any new innovation.. One suggestion tabled would be to evaluate four players in the Value Chain: registries, back-end technology service providers, registrars and resellers	#3: The TLD marketplace is open to new providers, including back-end technology service providers, registries, registrars, and resellers.
Critique of Definition #4: Marketplace competition is perceived to be fair.	Members of the Advisory Panel present on the 5 December call seemed to support the removal of "perception" (survey-required) metrics from this project. If at all, this should be limitrf to only track changes in perception over time.	-deleted-
Critique of Definition #5: The marketplace is not dependent on one or a small number of players.	Narrowing the definition of 'players' for "the marketplace is open to new players" would be helpful , while also leaving an open-ended component in addition to the list to account for any new innovation.. One suggestion tabled would be to evaluate four players in the Value Chain: registries, back-end technology service providers, registrars and resellers '-Saying the marketplace not dependent on a small number of players is not the right way to put it, its rather about the impact of having too much control of the market. Suggestion is to say: the TLD marketplace should not have providers that have excess control of the market.	#4: The TLD marketplace as a whole is not subject to control by a small number of providers, including back-end technology service providers, registries, registrars, and resellers.

9) Category I: Marketplace Stability (Scope and Definition)		
Issue/Suggestion/Recommendation	Status	Comments/Disposition
9.1 "As to the [draft metric definition "More gTLD registrars and gTLD registry operators are entering the gTLD marketplace than are leaving"], Donuts does not believe this is necessarily an indicative metric. For example, within a six-month period (the frequency proposed for marketplace health updates), it's conceivable that NO provider enters or exits the market, but that gTLD usage still grows steadily. Or that another helpful metric—perhaps penetration in traditionally underserved regions—shows growth. An increase in market participation by providers is a laudable goal, but in isolation, such a metric has the potential to be misleading." (DON)	Discussed	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.
9.2 *(Regarding the definition of "marketplace stability" in the gTLD Marketplace Health Index (Beta))* "The same caveat regarding lack of metrics applies to the starred item in the second bullet here. Donuts again is concerned about the vague nature of this definition; while service providers generally do consistently set and meet expectations for service levels, beyond tools such as service level agreements (which are very specific and technical in nature), it's unclear how (if at all) ICANN could either point to or develop measurements that would be a reliable representation of "stability" in this context." (DON)	Discussed	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.

9.3 "We note that marketplace stability is reported as a measure of the number of gTLD registrars accredited and de-accredited over multiple periods. There is no reporting of marketplace dependencies and vulnerabilities." (BC)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.
9.4 (Feedback on work-in-progress category overall): " There may be attributes of instability that we could look at, maybe a basket of statistics of what non-stable looks like, to look at any evidence of instability. I'm flipping the category definiton 'stability' on its head. From the perspective of registrants and users, we should examine the kinds of evidence which would indicate instability that harms registrars and users, for instance, registrars or registries ceasing operations, failing to perform as promised, and affecting the availability and integrity of the global domain name that I purchased. Market entry/exits should be of no concern for as long as registrants and users enjoy uninterrupted quality of service and continued choices of business terms, proxy services, etc.. If we can't flip this category on its head to measure instability that affects registrants and users, I suggest we delete it" (AP 18 Jan, Steve DelBianco, Concurred to by Jonathan Zuck)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.
9.5: (Feedback on work-in-progress category definition 1: 'More gTLD registrars and gTLD registry operators are entering the gTLD marketplace than are leaving.'). Definately need to revise. Do we need this metric. - could be very misleading" (AP 18 Jan, Phil Buckingham)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.
9.6 (Feedback on work-in-progress category definition 1: 'More gTLD registrars and gTLD registry operators are entering the gTLD marketplace than are leaving.'). Consolidation happens as markets mature. Should this definition be included? Market instability is an element of a healthy market. A stable market is a dead market. " (AP 18 Jan, John McCormac , Concurred to by Jonathan Zuck)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.

9.7 (Feedback on work-in-progress category definition 2: 'Service providers are reliable, setting consistent expectations and meeting levels of service for: gTLD registrants, Internet users and the global community (including gTLD registry operators, gTLD registrars, law enforcement and intellectual property holders).*). "This is getting at the impact on registrants, which is exactly what we want to measure. I agree that it is difficult. But one example would be could we document where registrants through the nature of complaints or ICANN compliance actions - where registrants indicate they are not getting the quality of services, e.g complaints, investigated complaints, complaints that lead to notices, breach warnings from actions impacting QoS to registrants and users, etc." (AP 18 Jan, Steve DelBianco)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.
9.8 (Feedback on work-in-progress category definition 2: 'Service providers are reliable, setting consistent expectations and meeting levels of service for: gTLD registrants, Internet users and the global community (including gTLD registry operators, gTLD registrars, law enforcement and intellectual property holders).*). Def 2 is almost a Trust issue than a Marketplace Stability one. Well it is more in the compliance/IP/breach category than stability. (AP 18 Jan, John McCormac)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.
9.9 (Feedback on work-in-progress category definition 2: 'Service providers are reliable, setting consistent expectations and meeting levels of service for: gTLD registrants, Internet users and the global community (including gTLD registry operators, gTLD registrars, law enforcement and intellectual property holders).*). More compliance data! How many complaints turned to real resolution for example, this could tell us about stability. (AP 18 Jan, Jonathan Zuck)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.
9.10 (Feedback on work-in-progress category definition 1: 'More gTLD registrars and gTLD registry operators are entering the gTLD marketplace than are leaving.') I'd be careful with remoding #1 - how would we determine supplier consolidation if we were to remove this? The new gTLDs introduced a lot of new actors as gTLD operators. What if consolidation happens and these end up purchased by the large registries? Does this not affect market stability? (Olivier MJ Crépin-Leblond: (12:30), AP 22 Feb)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.
9.11 (Feedback on work-in-progress category definition 1: 'More gTLD registrars and gTLD registry operators are entering the gTLD marketplace than are leaving.') I think with the recent influx of pure drop catch reigstars, entering and leaving the market is not really a true measurmeent . I do like adding some of the compliance metrics to it. (Jim Prendergast: (12:31), AP 22 Feb)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.
9.12 (Feedback on work-in-progress category definition 1) In the Netherlands the figure under #1 would not represent the actuel market as we have a number of domainers opening accounts under proxy names (not easily identifiable). (Michiel Henneke: (12:32), AP 22 Feb)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.
9.13 (Feedback on work-in-progress category definition 2) Compliance data is also readily available from ICANN. It already collects it so it is an easy win. (John McCormac - HosterStats.com: (12:36), AP 22 Feb)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.

9.14 Would #2 encompass customer service? I dont think that is something ICANN is invovled with. Compliance is related to contracts and not much else. They way #2 is worded Im afraid it could be construed as including customer service. "Reliable, setting consitsten expectation and meeting levels of service." Levels of service for what? (Jim Prendergast: (12:37), AP 22 Feb)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.
9.15 I don't object to "marketplace." My input just is that let's not confuse operational measurements with external marketplace metrics, whatever those might be. (Mason Cole: (12:41), AP 22 Feb)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.
9.16 Any compliance data would have to be broken down by TLD. (John McCormac - HosterStats.com: (12:47), AP 22 Feb)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.
9.17 There's lots of things that ICANN's compliance team monitors for contractual obligations that have absolutely nothing to do with staying in business (e.g abuse point of contact doesnt determine if the company is profitable and able to stay in business). There are other things besides not meeting your contractual obligations that could cause harm to registrants. For instance a registry going out of business even if they met all their contractual obligations along the way. (Jim Prendergast, AP 12 Mar)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.
9.18 There are three general early warning indicators for a registrar going out of business: failure to pay, failure to cancel people's domain names, and failure to answer support calls or Twitter messages (Jay Daley, AP 12 Mar)	**No further action required**	ICANN notes this feedback.
9.19. (On pricing fluctuation/stability - also covered in the Pricing tab): the issue is that of very large price increases and the impact on registrants who may have built an entire business around the domain only to find the price raised so high it has a material impact whether they choose to pay or choose to move to another domain. This issue appears to straddle both trust and stability. (Jay Daley, Re: [Gtldmarketplace] Work in Progress Category Definitions/ March 13 email)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.
9.20 This points to the need for us to list examples of "instability" to hone our definition (Steve DelBianco, AP 26 Apr, Concurred to by Andy Simpson)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.
9.21 "increased deletions/non renewals would be the best input on that definition (John McCormac - HosterStats.com, AP 26 Apr)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.

9.22 Instability that is harmful to a registrant, that is not exactly breaking a contractual obligation. Let us think of examples: a registry could dramatically increase their prices for domain registration renewal prices. Its hard to imagine that it gets so high that impacts the ability of a registrant to renew. Some astronomical price increase would still be within contractual obligations. I could see that, but its a bit of a stretch. Other way, if I've been running a registry for a reserved group (like a .bank), and if I come across difficult financial circumstances, I decide to open it up to anyone. It could be argued that would be a problem for earlier registrants. Those could be examples. Inevitably, definitions like this live or die on the basis of whether our definitions are plausible. (Steve DelBianco, AP 26 Apr,)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.
9.23 I wonder whether the examples above demonstrate wider marketplace instability or rather an erosion of trust by registrants. Instability relates to change in the overall market, rather than how people perceive it. (Andy Simpson, AP 26 Apr,)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.
9.24 The key here is the 'harm to registrants' section. Instability could be the means by which you harm registrants. Suggest reframing this to: Registries and registrars consistently deliver against their contractual obligations and avoid behaviour that could result in harm to registrants. I dont know why instability becomes our trigger for harm to registrants. Like a brand TLD that revises its defined population, thereby undermining the trust and reliance invested upon it by prior registrants. Pricing policies, registrant restrictions, lets come up with more examples. (Steve DelBianco, AP 26 Apr,)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.
9.25 I think these examples are fine. I wonder if an additional variable is that a Registry may transfer ownership over the Registry to a third party that could affect contractual obligations of the Registry operator (I'm thinking of Donuts' transfer of some of its Registries and the resulting issue whether Donuts' DPML domain name program would continue to apply to the transferred registry (Michael Graham, via email on Wed 5/10/2017' RE: [Gtldmarketplace] Feedback Requested: marketplace stability category definition')	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.
9.26 When I think of market instability, I think of systemic risk which is measured by volatility. Changes in prices, or registrations can both be a measure of volatility. I would consider adding an example for registries that experience a substantial percentage change in their zone file in a given time period. After all, that could plausibly lead to an increase in prices. (Ivan Rasskazov, via email on Wed 5/10/2017 ' RE: [Gtldmarketplace] Feedback Requested: marketplace stability category definition'), concurrence from Michael Graham	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.

9.27 Well, in my opinion both are related to be or not compliant with the original contract with the registrants and not related to make the internet unstable. We need to take care with the wording since translations can make people understand a different meaning for a sentence. I do believe we need to separate concepts in two different sentences to make it more clear when translating. For me : registries and registrars consistently deliver against their contractual obligations, that would result in harm to registrants. Makes clear sense when translated for Spanish or Portuguese for instance. Adding and are not responsible for market instability - may change the intention of first sense, adding the idea that only instability results in harm to registrants. (Vanda Scartezini, via email on Wed 5/11/2017 ' RE: [Gtldmarketplace] Feedback Requested: marketplace stability category definition')	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.

Relevant Discussion Questions	Decision Points	Updated Definition
#1: More gTLD registrars and gTLD registry operators are entering the gTLD marketplace than are leaving.	-The category definition needs to be defined relative to the audience that needs to perceive it to be stable. Evaluating metrics as they relate to stability without a clear audience defined is not possible and will not yield meaningful or reliable data. -An increase in market participation by providers is a laudable goal, but in isolation, such a metric has the potential to be misleading. There is no reporting of marketplace dependencies and vulnerabilities. - Market entry/exits should be of no concern for as long as registrants and users enjoy uninterrupted quality of service and continued choices of business terms,etc. -Consolidation happens as markets mature. Should this definition be included? Strike #1. It is a distraction. Agree with getting rid of it	-deleted- Interest in tracking 'supplier consolidation' already covered within Robust Competition Category Definition # 4
#2: Service providers are reliable, setting consistent expectations and meeting levels of service for: gTLD registrants, Internet users and the global community (including gTLD registry operators, gTLD registrars, law enforcement and intellectual property holders).*	- While service providers generally do consistently set and meet expectations for service levels, beyond tools such as service level agreements (which are very specific and technical in nature), it's unclear how (if at all) ICANN could either point to or develop measurements that would be a reliable representation of "stability" in this context. -This is almost a Trust issue than a Marketplace Stability one. Well it is more in the compliance/IP/breach category than stability. - This is getting at the impact on registrants, which is exactly what we want to measure, although admittedly difficult. Flip the category definiton 'stability' on its head. From the perspective of registrants and users, we should examine the kinds of evidence which would indicate instability that harms registrars and users. -I do like adding some of the compliance metrics to it. Compliance data is also readily available from ICANN.. -There's lots of things that ICANN's compliance team monitors for contractual obligations that have absolutely nothing to do with staying in business. There are other things besides not meeting contractual obligations that could cause harm to registrants. '-The issue is that of very large price increases and the impact on registrants who find the price raised so high it has a material impact whether they choose to pay or choose to move to another domain. Or registry previously targeting a specific audience (such as banks) opening up to all registrants, to the detriment of the original group, Or registry transfer ownership to a third party that could affect contractual obligations of the Registry operator.	#1: Registries and registrars consistently deliver against their contractual obligations and are not responsible for marketplace instability that would result in harm to registrants.

10) Category J: Trust (Scope and Definition)		
Issue/Suggestion/Recommendation	**Status**	**Comments/Disposition**
10.1 (*Regarding the definition of "trust" in the gTLD Marketplace Health Index (Beta))* "Donuts repeats its reservation about perceptions. Donuts agrees that compliance with contractual obligations is a useful and necessary metric (though it's doubtful that this is a metric indicative of trust outside the industry—consumers and end-users generally are not literate with ICANN contractual compliance matters)." (DON)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.
10.2 "The definitions for both trust and stability need to be defined relative to the audience that needs to trust the marketplace and perceive it to be stable. Evaluating metrics as they relate to trust and stability without a clear audience defined is not possible and will not yield meaningful or reliable data. The ambiguity of the current definition allows one to conclude that the metrics are measuring whether ICANN has created a stable set of vendors that it can trust. If the desired goal is to evaluate the perspective of any others in the marketplace, such as domain name users, then the metrics need to be changed to be far more comprehensive." (VS)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.
10.3 "We maintain our previous position that the indicators being considered by ICANN (UDRP/URS decisions and WHOIS Accuracy) are so narrowly targeted that they would be unlikely to have a direct, measurable impact on overall trust in the gTLD marketplace or be perceptible to the average registrant. The measure of syntax accuracy, which suggests that the registrant is still fully contactable, seems particularly misplaced as a measure of overall trust. We advise that ICANN abandon these niche metrics in favor of user impact surveys until a direct linkage between these measures and overall trust can be established." (RySG)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.

10.4 "INTA is pleased to see that "trust" in gTLDs is broadly defined to include not only registry operators, but also registrars, service providers, and registrants, and that the subject involves both compliance with contractual obligations as well as consumer perceptions of trustworthiness." (INTA)	**No Action Required**	ICANN thanks INTA for this feedback. This was not included in the Advisory Panel "discussion topics" document because there was no action item or qualifying statement that would limit its application.
10.5 The whole "Trust" thing is a big problem. Too many possible options and inclusions. And everyone will have a different opinion. (John McCormac - HosterStats.com: (12:48), AP 22 Feb)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.
10.6 While trust as a concept would likely be more of an 'intangible', one could potentially look to put metrics into place to evaluate the extent to which various industry safeguards are functioning effectively, thereby contributing to overall trustworthiness of the marketplace. (Jonathan Zuck (12:49), AP 22 Feb)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.
10.7 Members of the Advisory Panel present on the 5 December call seemed to support the removal of "perception" (survey-required) metrics from this project. If at all kept this should be limited to only track changes in perception over time.	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.
10.8 The term 'safeguards', with the evolution of the compliance department, hiring of a director of consumer safeguards, is a term where we need to tread carefully at the moment, until everything being looked into within ICANN organization is better defined. We can then follow off of that. (Jim Prendergast, AP 12 Mar)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.
10.9 (On a question on whether the draft definition referring to 'domain name industry safeguards' wasn't just a mirror of the draft definition for Stability which aims to look at compliance standards) The way this definition is structured, its broader than just measuring the compliance of a contracted party with its contractual obligations. Its looking broader at the entity called ICANN. When you look at law enforcement or IP, etc. that lodge complaints with ICANN, are those complaints resolved? There was an effort here to put quantitative, operational data in pre-eminence (Steve DelBianco, AP 12 Mar).	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.

10.10 We may need to finetune this definition a little bit because there can be instances where problems are overreported - the system could be misused or abused. Also, the word 'operational' refers to what? A metric of some kind that says X number of content providers or trademarks were violated according to IP Safeguards? I guess I just have a question of what that eventually looks like? The word operational there means were are trying to evaluate the operation of the safeguard itself. Its an open question. (Mason Cole, AP 12 Mar)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.
10.11 The word 'demonstrated' within the draft definition, who has to demonstrate this to whom? If this turns into 25 pages of stuff every quarter that registries and registrars have to put out, that a huge tax of energy for the industry to do this. I would offer 'demonstrated' as one of the words we really need to think about. (Roland LaPlante, Affilias, AP 12 Mar)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.
10.12, Universal acceptance, I can see that having a direct impact on something like user trust, even much more than some of the items related to the contractual stuff which could be obscure to a registrant. UA is very visible and can create bad experiences. It is important to capture, it is a real metric that will have a real impact on registrants and users' trust. (Stephanie Duchesneau, AP 12 Mar).	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.
10.13 Lets consider measuring Universal Acceptance as a way of ascertaining whether registrants and users trust that having obtained a domain name and an email address, that it actually works. It gets to the notion of 'do I trust promise made by the registar and registry when I obtained the domain name', is that actually being delivered. I dont think this fits anywhere else yet in the current definition. (Steve DelBianco, AP 12 Mar).	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.
10.14 Re; Proposed Definition #2 covering Universal Acceptance: it certainly sounds to me like a good definition. Lets go with it. (Steve DelBianco, AP 26 April, concurred to by Mason Cole).	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the category definition considering this input.

Relevant Discussion Questions	Decision Points	Updated Definition
#1: Service providers, gTLD registry operators, gTLD registrars and gTLD registrants are:	The category definition needs to be defined relative to the audience that needs to trust the marketplace. Evaluating metrics as they relate to trust without a clear audience defined is not possible and will not yield meaningful or reliable data.	#1: Demonstrated by operational success of domain name industry safeguards for registrants, Internet users and the global community (including law enforcement and intellectual property holders)
a) Compliant with their contractual obligations	Compliance with contractual obligations is a useful and necessary metric (though it's doubtful that this is a metric indicative of trust outside the industry—consumers and end-users generally are not literate with ICANN contractual compliance matters)." - While trust as a concept would likely be more of an 'intangible', one could potentially look to put metrics into place to evaluate the extent to which various industry safeguards are functioning effectively, thereby contributing to overall trustworthiness of the marketplace.	
b) Perceived to be trustworthy*	Members of the Advisory Panel present on the 5 December call seemed to support the removal of "perception" (survey-required) metrics from this project. If at all kept this should be limited to only track changes in perception over time.	-Deleted
Other suggestions:	Universal Acceptance is very visible and can create bad experiences. It is important to capture, it is a real metric that will have a real impact on registrants and users' trust. Lets consider measuring Universal Acceptance as a way of ascertaining whether registrants and users trust that having obtained a domain name and an email address, that it actually works. It gets to the notion of 'do I trust promise made by the registar and registry when I obtained the domain name', is that actually being delivered.	#2: Users can register and use a domain name in any TLD within widely-distributed web browsers and mobile apps, and when setting up online accounts, can use any email address for service and use any name server regardless of the written script, length, and newness of the TLD.

11) Category K: Relevance of Physical Address to Marketplace Health		
Issue/Suggestion/Recommendation	**Status**	**Comments/Disposition**
11.1 "You are measuring such metrics as "geographic diversity" which may be irrelevant or invalid for reasons I discussed in my earlier comment and which your "expert" Professor Hemant Bhargava also cited. We live in a global economy. GoDaddy and other registrars do business worldwide via the internet. Wake up ICANN, it's the 21st Century! (Get out of your "hub" mentality and into a "global" mentality.)" (JP)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the proposed indicator considering this input.
11.2 "We believe that shortcomings persist in the revised Index's treatment of Geographic Diversity. For instance, the indicators used to measure registry and registrar service offerings remain overly simplistic, simply counting the number of jurisdictions with an ICANN accredited registrar and registrar." (RySG)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the proposed indicator considering this input.
11.3"Similarly, while we believe that geographic distribution of registries and registrars by region is an important metric that should be taken into account, the current presentation overstates its relationship to competition as many registries and registrars compete transnationally." (RySG)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the proposed indicator considering this input.
11.4"INTA supports the envisaged expansion of these metrics to account for additional contracted parties on a country-specific basis. As a result of the new gTLD program, geographic diversity of both registry operators and registrars has increased, as reflected in the Index, which has had an impact on the ability of brand owners to pursue legal action under the Anti-cybersquatting Consumer Protection Act (ACPA) and other U.S. laws designed to remedy direct and vicarious trademark infringement, as well as inducement, within the DNS." (INTA)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the proposed indicator considering this input.

11.5 "Donuts echoes it's May 2016 input: It's a worthy goal to have a geographically meaningful distribution of registry operators, but the absence of operators from a particular region does not necessarily indicate the overall health of the marketplace or of penetration of users in a particular geography. The mailing address of operators in various jurisdictions clearly is not an indicator of usage of those providers' products and services in other jurisdictions." (DON)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the proposed indicator considering this input.
11.6 "The BC recognizes these results as a strong start for this category, agreeing that inputs are currently not reflective of reality within regions, but provide a good beginning view intra-regionally. In addition, it is noted that this measure is for physical presence in a marketplace that is primarily virtual. We look forward to subsequent reporting that strives to account for this factor." (BC)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the proposed indicator considering this input.
11.7 "[W]e find the the indicators for Geographic Diversity to be rudimentary. As acknowledged in the report, many Registrars serve and target markets outside of their own jurisdiction, as well, this measure should take into account the numerous countries served by the re-sellers of wholesale registrars. We would encourage ICANN to dig further into potential measures for diversity." (RrSG)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the proposed indicator considering this input.
11.8 "Both metrics presented for registrars and registries appear to be focussing specifically at the offering (how many suppliers there are), rather than the market take-up. Focussing on the offering does not allow for detection of undue market domination." (ALAC)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the proposed indicator considering this input.
11.9 "While it is probably beyond ICANN's remit to analyse the actual geographic diversity of gTLDs, the concentration on registars per country or ICANN region can be a misleading way of measuring geographic diversity. This is because each country will have a percentage of registrants using the services of registrars in other countries and some registrars are not actually based in the countries that they have listed on their ICANN registry record. " (JMcC)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the proposed indicator considering this input.

11.10 More relevant than location is whether a registrant can find a registrar website in their own language and script (and language and script together, not separately, need both). (ICANN57_work, Steve DelBianco, ~1:03)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the proposed indicator considering this input.
11.11 Where a registry/registrar is physically located (maybe not where it is incorporated) is important because they may tend to do outreach in those areas. (ICANN57_work, Kathy Kleiman ~1:13)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the proposed indicator considering this input.
11.12 I agree, don't stop tracking where they are located, but don't stop there. (ICANN57_work, Steve DelBianco, ~1:14)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the proposed indicator considering this input.
11.13 ICANN regions don't mean anything to those outside ICANN and registries/registrars hence the emphasis on geographical spread by jurisdiction rather than ICANN region. Best keep things simple so that the metrics can be understood by the widest possible audience. Points 1 and 3 (which corresponds to Percentage of Distinct Registrars/Registry Operators by Region) are sufficient to describe geography. The absence of a registry or registrar operation may be a scope of technological (and business) development and outside the scope of this panel. Heading says spread of "registrants" but the questions are about Registrars! We discussed making this more about registrant distribution, not geographic distribution of registrars. String availability should be the key. (Response to Feb 28 online survey, n = 15)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the proposed indicator considering this input.
11.14 With the shift to registrant in our category definitions - thinking of our metric, we only care about 'registrant location', rather than registry/registrar location (ICANN proposal, support for this idea by Steve DelBianco, Mason Cole, Andy Simpson, 26 Apr AP)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the proposed indicator considering this input.

Relevant Discussion Questions	Decision Points
Does the orientation on Registrar and Registry location continue to remain relevant in light of the revised category definition for robust competition?	With the pivot towards registrant within the 'robust competition' category definition, there is widespread agreement among the Advisory Panel that previously published beta indicators related to registry and registrar location no longer remain relevant.

12) Category L: Registrar Locations		
Issue/Suggestion/Recommendation	**Status**	**Comments/Disposition**
12.1 "As captured in our previous comments, a registrar may provide high-quality service and compete effectively across many jurisdictions beyond the one in which it is based provided that language, legal, payment and other issues particular to that jurisdiction are taken into account." (RySG)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the proposed indicator considering this input.
12.2 "The current graphs show a simple metric of geographic diversity of registrars across regions and their development against time. The metric itself shows neither a conclusive growth nor a reduction in offering. It does show an ongoing imbalance worldwide – and this is helpful. However, this metric appears to lack differentiation among the registrars. Indeed, the Generic Top Level Domain offering varies greatly across Registrars. It is a trivial way to compile these statistics by treating a registrar that exists as a service to its own clients of other services in the same manner as a general registrar that derives most of its income from registering domains. See under "Competition" for suggestions on more metrics." (ALAC)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the proposed indicator considering this input.
12.3 The percentage of distinct ICANN-accredited registrars by region makes for a pretty picture but some ICANN registrars may not actually be based in those countries or regions. Some registrars use companies in other countries for tax and administrative purposes. The companies have not physically moved their base of operations. The percentage of distinct ICANN-accredited registry operators in ICANN regions or countries is also affected by this domicile issue. (It may be possible for ICANN to request a periodic report on the number of domains under management grouped by WHOIS record country name from registrars but that may require the cooperation of registrars and a possible amendment to the RAAs. It would provide a more accurate view of the geographical distribution of gTLDs.) (JMcC)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the proposed indicator considering this input.

12.4 ICANN regions don't mean anything to those outside ICANN and registries/registrars hence the emphasis on geographical spread by jurisdiction rather than ICANN region. Best keep things simple so that the metrics can be understood by the widest possible audience. Points 1 and 3 (which corresponds to Percentage of Distinct Registrars/Registry Operators by Region) are sufficient to describe geography. The absence of a registry or registrar operation may be a scope of technological (and business) development and outside the scope of this panel. Heading says spread of "registrants" but the questions are about Registrars! We discussed making this more about registrant distribution, not geographic distribution of registrars. String availability should be the key. (Response to Feb 28 online survey, n = 15)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the proposed indicator considering this input.
12.5 With the shift to registrant in our category definitions - thinking of our metric, we only care about 'registrant location', rather than registry/registrar location (ICANN proposal, support for this idea by Steve DelBianco, Mason Cole, Andy Simpson, 26 Apr AP)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the proposed indicator considering this input.

Relevant Discussion Questions	Decision Points
Does the orientation on Registrar and Registry location continue to remain relevant in light of the revised category definition for robust competition?	With the pivot towards registrant within the 'robust competition' category definition, there is widespread agreement among the Advisory Panel that previously published beta indicators related to registry and registrar location no longer remain relevant.

13) Category M: Registry Operator Locations		
Issue/Suggestion/Recommendation	**Status**	**Comments/Disposition**
13.1 "The jurisdiction is even less relevant when applied to registries, as the registry operator is not generally the primary party engaged in customer support, payments, or other interactions that are highly affected by jurisdiction." (RySG)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the proposed indicator considering this input.
13.2 "The selected method for representing registry geographic diversity is based on the ICANN contact address. The stated goal of selecting this metric is to measure whether "Diversity exists in the choice of a service provider." The context for who's choice should be diverse is not scoped in the goals. Measuring the registry operator's address may be interpreted as a way to indicate where registry operators are able to be successful but it does not effectively measure where registrants and domain users do and do not have choice. One example of this is the new gTLD, .DESI. This is a registry that according to their own goals is a TLD which seeks to be "The worlds first domain that celebrates the global community of 1.7 billion desis." The registry operator, Dot Desi, LLC, is based in Bethesda, Maryland. The registry operator, which is interested in serving desis, has chosen to be based in the United States and according to this metric would count as a United States based registrar. To determine whether or not this is the correct metric, the scope of the goal needs to be more clearly defined." (VS)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the proposed indicator considering this input.
13.3"The same comment can be made for registries. Again all registries are treated in the same way, whether they are catering to a community, a brand, a service, a generic name, a geographic location, etc. There needs to be more detail for this metric to be useful." (ALAC)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the proposed indicator considering this input.

13.4 ICANN regions don't mean anything to those outside ICANN and registries/registrars hence the emphasis on geographical spread by jurisdiction rather than ICANN region. Best keep things simple so that the metrics can be understood by the widest possible audience. Points 1 and 3 (which corresponds to Percentage of Distinct Registrars/Registry Operators by Region) are sufficient to describe geography. The absence of a registry or registrar operation may be a scope of technological (and business) development and outside the scope of this panel. Heading says spread of "registrants" but the questions are about Registrars! We discussed making this more about registrant distribution, not geographic distribution of registrars. String availability should be the key. (Response to Feb 28 online survey, n = 15)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the proposed indicator considering this input.
13.5 With the shift to registrant in our category definitions - thinking of our metric, we only care about 'registrant location', rather than registry/registrar location (ICANN proposal, support for this idea by Steve DelBianco, Mason Cole, Andy Simpson, 26 Apr AP)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the proposed indicator considering this input.

Relevant Discussion Questions	Decision Points
Does the orientation on Registrar and Registry location continue to remain relevant in light of the revised category definition for robust competition?	With the pivot towards registrant within the 'robust competition' category definition, there is widespread agreement among the Advisory Panel that previously published beta indicators related to registry and registrar location no longer remain relevant.

14) Category N: IDNs

Issue/Suggestion/Recommendation	Status	Comments/Disposition
14.1 "We appreciate the steps taken in the current version of the Index to provide a wider range of statistics related to internationalized domain name (IDN) adoption than the previously proposed approach of counting how many registrars offered IDN registrations." (RySG)	**No Action Required**	ICANN thanks the RySG for this feedback. This was not included in the Advisory Panel "discussion topics" document because there was no action item or qualifying statement that would limit its application.
14.3 (Request for input on ICANN proposal to maintain current metric on number of second level registrations in internationalized gTLDs, i.e. IDNs) Agree, it remains relevant. (ICANN proposal, support for this idea by Steve DelBianco, 26 Apr AP)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the proposed indicator considering this input.

15) Category O: Total Second-Level Names in gTLDs

Issue/Suggestion/Recommendation	Status	Comments/Disposition
15.1 "We appreciate the additional metrics proposed to look at overall registration volumes and patterns in new and legacy gTLDs. Some further work may be required to contextualize these variables, particularly in the .brand context where registration volume does not map clearly to demand." (RySG)	Discussed	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the proposed indicator considering this input.
15.2 "[Re: gTLDs – Total] This is a helpful metric." (DON)	No Action Required	ICANN thanks Donuts for this feedback. This was not included in the Advisory Panel "discussion topics" document because there was no action item or qualifying statement that would limit its application.
15.3"ICANN can refine its demonstration of year-over-year growth rates with the addition of the number of new TLDs released in each time period. This would more precisely demonstrate the consistent pattern of strong initial registration growth (due to pent-up demand), followed by a leveling off in rates of growth in subsequent years." (DON)	Discussed	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the proposed indicator considering this input.
15.4"Definitions are here for H1, H2 which are abbreviations used earlier in the report. Suggest defining abbreviations on first reference. Figure 7 - Description is for "total number…in existence," and graphic is for "number of registrations"—174 million. With approximately 326 million current registrations in existence today, this graph shows 174 million registrations after H2 of 2015, with no explanation for the disparity. Also, there appears to be no view in the report of renewals vs. initial registrations, or separation of .com vs other TLDs." (BC)	Discussed	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the proposed indicator considering this input.
15.5 "The economic evaluation that ICANN commissioned identifies market prices, internet users' uptake, gTLD recognition, ICANN policies, time, market demands, application windows and other marketplace factors as factors that may influence the selected metrics. The beta index fails to appropriately acknowledge these limiting factors. The economic evaluation needs to be performed on whether or not "growth in new gTLDs and across all gTLDs" is actually a legitimate way to measure marketplace health. The paper that Professor Bhargava provided ICANN with appears to have taken ICANN's direction for what makes a healthy marketplace and the professor was limited to evaluating whether a provided set of metrics achieved the ICANN-provided definition." (VS)	Discussed	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the proposed indicator considering this input.
15.6 I would strongly recommend adding end-user adoption rates. I'm still confused by the new definition. 'New TLDs' to me means something very specific - TLD launched post 2012. Unclear what the objectives would be for each of these data points to consider them "metrics." More sophisticated "concentration" calculation probably better. The word "adoption" in the definition is too non-specific to say that any metric actually fulfills it. (Response to Feb 28 online survey, n = 15)	Discussed	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the proposed indicator considering this input.

15.7 (Request for input on ICANN proposal to maintain current metric on number of second level gTLD domain name registrations along with added data from ccTLDs) Keep the cctld data separate. ccltds are market specific whereas gtlds are generally not - best to provide both sets rather than a single graph (ICANN proposal, John McCormac, 26 Apr AP)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the proposed indicator considering this input.
15.8 (Request for input on ICANN proposal to maintain current metric on number of second level gTLD domain name registrations along with added data from ccTLDs) Registrations are easy at the zone file level. Is it also sufficiently easy to show registrations that are resolving as ooposed to those that are not. Here you would what to track the percentage of registrations that actually resolve, versus those that are purchased and parked. (ICANN proposal, Steve DelBianco, 26 Apr AP)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the proposed indicator considering this input.
15.9 Dark domains count? A 404 is typically resolving as it has a website. A dark domain has no nameservers and is not in the zone but is regged. (in Response to 15.7 above, John McCormac, 26 Apr AP)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the proposed indicator considering this input.
15.10 Idea: make these bars "stacked bars" where lower stack is legacy gTLDs; upper stack is New gTLDs (2012 vintage). When you have two components of a total, you can show them in a single graph by presenting them as a stacked chart - not side by side. That eliminates to provide them on a side-by-side basis. Steve DelBianco, 30 May AP, Agreement from Michael Graham)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the proposed indicator considering this input.
15.11 Would also be useful to compare Second-Level growth with increase in number of gTLDs available? (Michael Graham 30 May AP)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the proposed indicator considering this input.
15.12 I am not a fan of year-over-year growth rates. When you look at a graph like that, to the casual observer, its not instructive. I don't know what that tells us. If anything you could plot a Compound Annual Growth Rate could be interesting. CAGR could be overlaid as a Line on the stacked bars. Use right-hand axis for percentage scale, Steve DelBianco, 30 May AP and wider agreement from attendees on the call.	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the proposed indicator considering this input.
15.13 YoY growth numbers can be valid and they can be misleading like all other static datapoints. No different from investment industry. So the question Mukesh is then does this statistic help illustrate this purpose or not? (Ivan Rasskazov, 30 May AP)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the proposed indicator considering this input.
15.14 .brands should be a separate category. (John McCormac, 30 May AP)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the proposed indicator considering this input.
15.15 dot brands have very few registrations, so I don't think they matter in these registrationtrend charts (Steve DelBianco, 30 May AP)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the proposed indicator considering this input.
15.16 Include the raw data as well as a possible graph? Even include the raw data as an appendix.(John McCormac, 30 May AP)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the proposed indicator considering this input.

16) Category P: Second-Level Adds/Deletes

Issue/Suggestion/Recommendation	Status	Comments/Disposition
16.1 [Re: gTLDs – Additions and Deletions] This too is a useful set of metrics. However, Donuts again repeats its comment from May 2016: It would be a more meaningful and detailed metric if, along with this data, re-registrations of deleted names also were calculated, as sometimes this is a significant number." (DON)	Discussed	ICANN appreciates this feedback. The suggestion which has reached wider consensus is to provide a 'Net Change' indicator in the report instead, while relegating gross adds & deletions as a further level of detail in the report appendix.
16.2 "Similarly, on page 7 of the presentation, we suggest the addition of text to the "Second-Level Domain Name Additions: IDNs, .brands, Geographic" graphs that would explain these TLDs were launched in late 2014 and early 2015 and thus would have experienced the same phenomenon. These representations otherwise mistakenly project these TLDs as otherwise unhealthy." (DON)	Discussed	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the proposed indicator considering this input.
16.3"It appears that there is a typo in the following sentence, with the second instance of the word "deleted." "Second-level domain name deletions in 2014-2015 are shown (on page 9) as a percentage of total second-level names deleted in each category." Figure 14 - Suggest adding words to the title for agreement with the title of Figure 15 and easier comparison of the two. Figure 17 - Some figures present numbers that are (meant to be) relative to each other. Some are relative to a total number that is not named. (This confusion may be due to a typo in the last paragraph on page 6.) But it requires a closer look to get clarity. Suggest adding text that makes the visuals more reader friendly, as in the explanation for Figure 19, for example. Figure 18 - It appears that some figures are relative to each other, and that some are relative to a total number that appears to not be named. This confusion may be due to a typo in the last paragraph on page 6." (BC)	Discussed	ICANN appreciates this feedback. The suggestion which has reached wider consensus is to provide a 'Net Change' indicator in the report instead, while relegating gross adds & deletions as a further level of detail in the report appendix.
16.4"The graphics showing the second level domain name additions and deletions in gTLDs on pages 6 to 9 are helpful. The ALAC proposes that a single graph should show additions and deletions using the same axis (in other words, merging Figure 11 and Figure 16)." (ALAC)	Discussed	ICANN appreciates this feedback. The suggestion which has reached wider consensus is to provide a 'Net Change' indicator in the report instead, while relegating gross adds & deletions as a further level of detail in the report appendix.
16.5 "Separate .com from other gTLDs in reports of numbers of registrations, deletions." (BC)	Discussed	ICANN appreciates this feedback. The suggestion which has reached wider consensus is to provide a 'Net Change' indicator in the report instead, while relegating gross adds & deletions as a further level of detail in the report appendix. There was wide support in maintaining the current level of information detail, as reflected by results of online survey by Advisory Panel.

16.6 "The new gTLDs are in a very different market phase to these older gTLDs and the promotion of some new gTLDs with heavily discounted or free registrations makes their comparison with legacy gTLDs somewhat problematic in that many newly launched new gTLDs have no historical (veteran registrations that are over one year old) registrations. The rise of deletions and falling renewal rates are products of discounting and increased competition in the marketplace." (JMcC)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this input. There was wide support in maintaining the current level of information detail, as reflected by results of online survey by Advisory Panel.
16.7 I suggest we ONLY report "Net Change" which is additions - deletions, I'm arguing that the only thing that's relevant is the net change. How do the number of registrations grow. All that really matters is the delta from year to year, the net growth. (Steve DelBianco, AP 26 Apr)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback. The suggestion which has reached wider consensus is to provide a 'Net Change' indicator in the report instead, while relegating gross adds & deletions as a further level of detail in the report appendix.
16.8 I would want to show both gross and deletions (Phil Buckingham, AP 26 Apr)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback. The suggestion which has reached wider consensus is to provide a 'Net Change' indicator in the report instead, while relegating gross adds & deletions as a further level of detail in the report appendix.
16.9 The deletions values raises the question of whether the compliance reports is going to work appropriately for this. I think we are seeing a shift in how the complliance data is actually being reported because that's not an actual trend. We need to make sure that the reports and the data we release reflect what we say they reflect. Because I can say authoritatively that this spike in deletions is not real. (Andy SImpson, AP 26 Apr, support for this idea by Phil Buckingham, 26 Apr AP)	**Discussed**	ICANN has explained the spike in deletion values starting 2014 H1 to the Advisory Panel. This is attributable to a change in reporting standards, wherein data on deletions occurring within any of the different "grace periods" that domain names go through in their normal life cycle were previously excluded, and since April 2014 started to be included. ICANN's criteria is to exclude only deletions within "add grace period", while any other deletion should be counted in this total.
16.10 The Gross Adds and Deletions are of secondary importance. You might have them avaialble for reference, but you wouldnt ever lead with that. I think Net Additions (or just TotalDomains Registered) is enough. In fact, we we can't assume there will always be additions. There may be a period where that isn't the case. And they should be stacked to cover Legacy gTLDs and New gTLDs. I could potentially click on the chart to see the underlying adds and deletes. (Steve DelBianco, AP 30 May, support for this idea from Mason Cole, Phil Buckingham, John MacCormack, Michael Graham (M Graham adds: I think we need to somehow coordinate/compare New Registrations/Renewals/Deletions)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback. The suggestion which has reached wider consensus is to provide a 'Net Change' indicator in the report instead, while relegating gross adds & deletions as a further level of detail in the report appendix.
16.11 I don't think that net additions in aggregate are indicative of robust competition. If we use net additions, we probably would have to break it down by types of TLDs. (Ivan Rasskazov, 30 May AP)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback. The suggestion which has reached wider consensus is to provide a 'Net Change' indicator in the report instead, while relegating gross adds & deletions as a further level of detail in the report appendix.

17) Category Q: Registry Operator/Registrar Families

Issue/Suggestion/Recommendation	Status	Comments/Disposition
17.1 "While the Index helpfully provides information regarding the "distinct entities in the gTLD marketplace," it would be helpful to provide more granular detail regarding affiliations between various entities. INTA notes that certain entities have used affiliates to conduct abusive activity in the DNS while preserving the appearance of integrity from other affiliates or parent companies. This kind of activity, and shell games such as these, erodes trust in the gTLD marketplace, and in ICANN's ability to conduct adequate due diligence regarding potential new registry operators and registrars applying to operate new gTLDs or register domain names therein." (INTA)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback. We are using this metric as a Robust Competition related metric. There was wide support in maintaining the current level of information detail by the Advisory Panel.
17.2 "Donuts appreciates ICANN considering its and others' input and consolidating registry and registrar families. We do have a concern here, however: Will ICANN presume that only growth in these numbers will indicate marketplace health? It may be, for example, that the industry enters a period of consolidation, where the absolute number of providers decreases, but products, services and marketplace penetration expand. Alternative points of reference in such instances could be useful, and we encourage the advisory panel to consider their development. Also, we reiterate our input from May, when we stated that "family," in the context of a registry, is not defined—that is, does it include provider-client relationships (whereby a provider manages key registry functions for, say, a variety of single TLD providers)?" (DON)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback. Indeed, the Advisory Panel will be looking at other complementary metrics to accompany these within the v1.0 report, in order to help provide a more nuanced view of the marketplace.
17.3 "In calculating the metrics, each gTLD registrar or gTLD registry operator family is counted once, then added to the number of independent gTLD registrars or gTLD registry operators. It is desired that Competition reveal registrar and registry operators operating independently vs. part of larger families with a corporate parent, the latter of which ICANN's infographics provide." (BC)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback. In fact, the metric on percentage of distinct registrar/registry entities just does reveal the percentage of Registries/Registrars that are operating independently. There was wide support in maintaining the current level of information detail by the Advisory Panel.
17.4 "In the CCTRT, we are discovering we need a little more nuanced analysis to measure thse things such as market concentration instead of just raw numbers of backend providers, for example." (Jonathan Zuck, APCall1, chat at 11:32)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback. Indeed, the Advisory Panel will be looking at other complementary metrics to accompany these within the v1.0 report, in order to help provide a more nuanced view of the marketplace.

18) Category R: ccTLD Data		
Issue/Suggestion/Recommendation	**Status**	**Comments/Disposition**
18.1 "The graphic displaying the growth of the overall domain name market on page 5 is helpful in showing whether the market is healthy, as growth indicates health. It might be interesting to compare this growth with the total growth in registration of second level domain names, including those in Country Code Top Level Domains (ccTLDs). The growth in registrations under ccTLDs should be included on the same graph too." (ALAC)	**Discussed**	See discussion topics summary at end of this section.
18.2 "This was stated during the feedback to the advisory panel but needs to be said again after ICANN has failed to provide a justification for excluding the ccTLD market other than data availability. While it is mutually understood that accurate and consistent data regarding the ccTLD market is not widely available, developing a marketplace health index that fails to measure the entire marketplace is incomplete. gTLDs and ccTLDs coexist in the eyes of end users. When most registrants are evaluating domains to buy, they are often not aware of this distinction that those inside the domain industry use. ccTLDs represent 45% of the overall domain marketplace3 and it is not possible to effectively measure the competitive landscape without considering them. Obviously, gTLDs and ccTLDs compete for the same customers. This is particularly true for Geographic focused gTLDs and the overlapping ccTLDs (.london and .uk, for example). Yet, in the beta report, ICANN presents trends in Geographic focused TLDs but does not include the overlapping ccTLD trends. Indeed, many ccTLDs (.co, .ly, .tv, .io as just a few examples) brand themselves as gTLDs, further necessitating their inclusion in the marketplace analysis." (VS)	**Discussed**	See discussion topics summary at end of this section.

18.3 "The ccTLD data may be an issue as it is not comparing like to like. The ccTLDs have an "adjacent market" effect where not all registrations in the ccTLD are from that ccTLD's country. This can be down to brand protection, speculation and businesses that are geographically close doing business with that country. In addition to the imprecise nature of ICANN registrar by country grouping, it may not provide an accurate view of these markets. Some ccTLD registries may not be willing to provide data in excess of what they publish publically or annually. A ccTLD market is very different from a gTLD market in terms of focus (only the geographical new gTLDs come close to the same kind of market focus) so it would be logical to compare only gTLD registrations associated with that country to a ccTLD." (JMcC)	**Discussed**	See discussion topics summary at end of this section.
18.4 "ccTLD data will be highly market specific (geographical) and might not compare well with global gTLD data." (John McCormac - HosterStats.com: APCall1, chat at 11:42)	**Discussed**	See discussion topics summary at end of this section.
18.5 "I would go against including ccTLD data… Simply because it would require cooperation from ccTLD registries that are depend on their local jurisdictions. No way to standardize as with whois data." (Ivan Rasskazov: APCall1, chat at 11:42)	**Discussed**	See discussion topics summary at end of this section.
18.6 (Additional discussion re: ccTLD data from APCall1, chat transcript times as marked) Andy Simpsonn: (11:43) Can you be more specific about the rationale behind why exclusion is important? Jonathan Zuck: (11:43) and yet ccTLDs are direct competitors to gTLDs John McCormac - HosterStats.com: (11:44) also ccTLD registrars are not necessarily gTLD registrars Katrin Ohlmer | DOTZON: (11:44) ccTLD data would compare well with GeoTLD data Michiel: (11:48) With us only 10% of (.nl) registrars are ICANN accredited John McCormac - HosterStats.com: (11:50) also a lot of ccTLD registrars outsource their gTLD registrations activity to large gTLD registrars.	**Discussed**	See discussion topics summary at end of this section.

18.7 "ccTLD organisations such as CENTR, APTLD, LACTLD and AfTLD. track a subset of the metrics of this index and could contribute to a broader view of the domain industry." (ICANN57_Overview (Chat), Rubens Kuhl: (09:25)	**Discussed**	See discussion topics summary at end of this section.
18.8 "The issue with ccTLDs is that the domain name market at a country level is quite different to that at a registrar or global level. Resellers/hosters play a far more important part in country level markets. Some countries do not even have accredited ICANN registrars but still have vibrant gTLD/ccTLD markets." (ICANN57_Overview (chat) John McCormac - HosterStats: (09:27)).	**Discussed**	See discussion topics summary at end of this section.
18.9 "Google lists the following ccTLDs as operating in a generic non-country-targeted fashion: .ad.as.bz.cc.cd.co.dj.fm.io.la.me.ms.nu.sc.sr.su.tv.tk.ws" (ICANN57_Overview (Chat) Rubens Kuhl: (09:30)).	**Discussed**	See discussion topics summary at end of this section.
18.10 "Most gTLDs are global whereas most ccTLDs are country focused -different markets." (ICANN57_working (chat) John McCormac - HosterStats.com: (09:20).	**Discussed**	See discussion topics summary at end of this section.
18.10 "The best ccTLD for a gTLD:ccTLD comparison is .eu. It is essentially a gTLD in all but name with a set of country level markets and a single "global" market" (ICANN57_working (chat) John McCormac - HosterStats.com: (09:56))	**Discussed**	See discussion topics summary at end of this section.
18.11 [Q-should ccTLDs be included?] "Definitely... (ICANN57_Overview, Steve DelBianco, 16:45), Users make choices and the cc is part of that space (ICANN57_Overview, Steve DelBianco, 22:30)	**Discussed**	See discussion topics summary at end of this section.
18.12 ccs should be included. (ICANN57_Overview, 21:30 Roelof Meijer – SIDN)	**Discussed**	See discussion topics summary at end of this section.
18.13 There are a lot of organizations that already do this with ccTLD data. ICANN could be the entity that pulls all that data together but should do it in a way that includes data already collected by the chartered organizations. (ICANN57_Overview Thomas Keller 25:30)	**Discussed**	See discussion topics summary at end of this section.

18. 14 ccTLDs should absolutely be included. (ICANN57_Overview, Jim Prendergast, 44:45)	**Discussed**	See discussion topics summary at end of this section.
18.15 We definitely need to include ccTLDs, in multiple ways. (a) growing number are marketed like gTLDs (.tv, .co, etc) and (b) to really understand the market we need some regional analysis of ccTLDs that are dominant in their markets (see recent LAC report showing that ccTLDs are very strong in some areas, and other areas where they are not) (ICANN57_Work, Jonathan Zuck ~5:20)	**Discussed**	See discussion topics summary at end of this section.
18.16 It's sort of obvious that we should only include ccTLD data where it is relevant, applicable, and available. ICANN can't compel ccTLD registries to offer any data they don't want to offer. Some business models are different among ccTLDs (direct sale and not, etc). So consider these three words--relevant, applicable and available. We have a lot of ccTLD data from regional orgs (CENTR, AFTLD, LACTLD, etc) only true ccTLDs that are not covered by these orgs are ccTLDs in North America--everything else we can get from the regional orgs. (ICANN57_work, Rubens Kuhl ~7:00)	**Discussed**	See discussion topics summary at end of this section.
18.17 My first instinct re: including ccTLDs is that the markets aren't always the same (but aren't the same for all gTLDs either). The point is that this isn't an exact science. There may be some data that is unavailable for some ccTLDs but if you look at actual magnitude/registrations we can't really treat a ccTLD with 5k regs as the same as 5 million regs, but the data for the 5 million regs is probably more likely to be available. I'm all for including ccTLDs. (ICANN57_work, Olivier Crepin-Leblond ~9:00)	**Discussed**	See discussion topics summary at end of this section.
18.18 Another issue--competition among backend providers for ccTLDs. And backend providers providing services for gTLD registries. (ICANN57_work, Jim Prendergast, ~10:45)	**Discussed**	See discussion topics summary at end of this section.
18.19 I certainly support the inclusion of all TLDs. When one goes and looks at health indices and performance you just need to be aware that some are open to registrations from anyone; others are more restricted. It's important to understand what the registry agreements look like with respect to who can acquire a domain on a particular registry. (ICANN57_Work, Gabe Fried ~12:15)	**Discussed**	See discussion topics summary at end of this section.
18.20 Potential data sources for ccTLD data--CENTR, Verisign, LACTLD report--many listed in slides starting on slide 7. Registries are reporting quite granularly. (ICANN57_work, Andy Simpson, presentation supporting inclusion of ccTLD data in health index. http://schd.ws/hosted_files/icann572016/1e/Marketplace%20ccTLD%20Data.pdf)	**Discussed**	See discussion topics summary at end of this section.

18.21 Not against including ccTLD data, but it is important for the data to be relevant and reliable. ICANN cannot collect ccTLD data as easily as gTLD data. If we make this too complex, if data is too difficult to obtain, we may take away from utility of the Index. Move slower and add over time. (ICANN57_Work, Ivan Rasskazov, presentation (no slides) starts at ~34:00, difficult to hear on recording)	**Discussed**	See discussion topics summary at end of this section.
18.22 Supporting inclusion of ccTLD data despite some differences in restrictions (gTLDs have varied restrictions, too)(ICANN57_work, Rubens Kuhl, ~39:00)	**Discussed**	See discussion topics summary at end of this section.
18.23 Including ccTLD data is obvious--there isn't much of a difference to consumers. Contract differences may make data collection more difficult but that's a separate issue. Doesn't mean we stop trying bc we can't get it perfect. May have to do some sort of cost/benefit analysis to collecting the data but shouldn't exclude ccTLD data at the outset. (ICANN57_work, Jordyn Buchannan, 40:15)	**Discussed**	See discussion topics summary at end of this section.
18.24 Concerns about data availability more important if this is an "Index." if this is a repository (ICANN publishing data without making judgments and letting others do analyisis) it is less important--just a fact that the data is there or it isn't. (ICANN57_work, Jim Prendergast ~44:00)	**Discussed**	See discussion topics summary at end of this section.
18.25 I disagree--I don't think there is a consensus that ccTLDs and gTLDs are the same in the eyes of the consumer. (ICANN57_work, Kathy Kleiman ~45:15)	**Discussed**	See discussion topics summary at end of this section.
18.26 It's pretty clear that the community has told us that this should include ccTLD data (AP 5 Dec, Steve DelBianco)	**Discussed**	See discussion topics summary at end of this section.
18.27 CENTR and APTLD (among others) would be an excellent source of ccTLD-related data. We could pick out one particular market and compare numbers with and without ccTLD data. (AP 5 Dec_Michiel Henneke)	**Discussed**	See discussion topics summary at end of this section.
18.27 Including ccTLD is one thing, knowing how to compare it properly is another thing entirely... Just get periodic ccTLD zone counts/registration base counts and don't try simplistic comparisons. Clustering with geo gTLDs is an easier thing to do than a full spectrum comparison. (AP 5 Dec, John McCormac--hosterstats.com).	**Discussed**	See discussion topics summary at end of this section.
18.28 (in re: Michiel's comment) could do that immediately (like today) for the UK market (AP 5 Dec, John McCormack)	**Discussed**	See discussion topics summary at end of this section.
18.29 (in Re: John McCormack comment above) Or we could cooperate for the Dutch market (AP 5 Dec Michiel Henneke)	**Discussed**	See discussion topics summary at end of this section.
18.30 At dataprovider.com, we have alread indexed TLD data in terms of usage and grouped by ccTLD, gTLD, sTLD, nTLD etc by country as well (AP 5 Dec Samantha Frieda)	**Discussed**	See discussion topics summary at end of this section.

Relevant Discussion Questions	Decision Points
1. Should ccTLD data be included in the Index?	1. It appears that the group has reached agreement that ccTLDs should be incorporated into the Index to the extent the data is available and it is feasible to collect and report it.
2. Where could ICANN obtain ccTLD data for the Index?	It has been suggested that ICANN could work with CENTR, APTLD and others in the private sector to evaluate what data being collected and how/whether this could be included.

19) Category S: Additional Proposed Sstability/Trust Metric—Pricing Fluctuations		
Issue/Suggestion/Recommendation	Status	Comments/Disposition
19.1 "[Y]ou have ignored "pricing" as a key component of determining "Marketplace Health" you should be tracking, and publishing daily, wholesale and retail Pricing[…]" (JP)	Discussed	ICANN appreciates this feedback. There is no consensus on relevance to goals nor a clear approach to data collection that would warrant inclusion of this at present.
19.2 "This list is very thorough and will offer the community much to consider. However, as we did in our previous comment, Donuts urges against use of pricing as a metric in any scenario. ICANN is not a pricing authority and should not report on pricing in any format." (DON)	Discussed	ICANN appreciates this feedback. There is no consensus on relevance to goals nor a clear approach to data collection that would warrant inclusion of this at present.
19.3 "Stats about growth and deletions on pages 6, 7, 8 and 9 have to take into account pricing and market policies. Some registries offer domains for free or a very reduced fee. This significantly affects statistics and should be stated too." (ALAC)	Discussed	ICANN appreciates this feedback. There is no consensus on relevance to goals nor a clear approach to data collection that would warrant inclusion of this at present.
19.4 "ICANN data does provide some of this data (renewal numbers) and it is relatively trivial to generate spreadsheets or webpages from this data. Collecting pricing data from registrars and resellers is a bit more complex." (JMcC)	Discussed	ICANN appreciates this feedback. There is no consensus on relevance to goals nor a clear approach to data collection that would warrant inclusion of this at present.
19.5 On pricing fluctuation/stability: the issue is that of very large price increases and the impact on registrants who may have built an entire business around the domain only to find the price raised so high it has a material impact whether they choose to pay or choose to move to another domain. This issue appears to straddle both trust and stability. (Jay Daley, Re: [Gtldmarketplace] Work in Progress Category Definitions/ March 13 email)	Discussed	ICANN appreciates this feedback. There is no consensus on relevance to goals nor a clear approach to data collection that would warrant inclusion of this at present.

19.6 You are of course referring to the issue of price caps, or the lack of them. For those in the know this is of course to do with Frank Shilling's / Uniregistry's decision last week to raise its Registry prices by 3000% on 16 of their 25 TLDs. Each one has sub 5000 registrations (some less than 1000), so at that price point the individual TLD Registry is not viable. I agree the implication are huge. It can only get worse. I agree this affects trust, stability and competition. It is another metric that needs to be tracked. (Phil Buckingham Re: [Gtldmarketplace] Work in Progress Category Definitions/ March 13 email)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback. There is no consensus on relevance to goals nor a clear approach to data collection that would warrant inclusion of this at present.
19.7 (Metric related to the suggestion on tracking pricing stability/fluctuation as a category definition) One possible way of measuring the effect of a price increase would be a decrease in the number of registrars offering the gTLD. The numbers of domains on various registrars in the affected gTLD should change with smaller count registrars transferring out to other registrars. The source for a kind of consolidated data on this would be the ICANN registry reports. I did a combination spreadsheet of ICANN registrar counts grouped by all/legacy/new gTLDs to see what the registrar breakdowns and approximately 353 had more than 0 new gTLDs according to the ICANN July 2016 data. (John McCormac , Re: [Gtldmarketplace] Work in Progress Category Definitions/ March 13 email), Concurred to by Jay Daley, Re: [Gtldmarketplace] Work in Progress Category Definitions/ March 13 email): "Good idea. That's a good dataset and with wider usage than just price increases."	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback. There is no consensus on relevance to goals nor a clear approach to data collection that would warrant inclusion of this at present.
19.8 (Metric related to the suggestion on tracking pricing stability/fluctuation as a category definition) Currently ICANN has no access to initial gTLD wholesale prices, only to changes made thereafter, and the agreement amendment that is currently being voted by registries will, if approved, remove notification of wholesale pricing changes. Note that retail pricing is usually a good proxy for wholesale pricing. For instance, this registrar pricing table is very close to actual wholesale pricing not taking discounts in consideration: https://www.domaincostclub.com/pricing.dhtml[domaincostclub.com] (Rubens Kuhl , Re: [Gtldmarketplace] Work in Progress Category Definitions/ March 13 email),	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback. There is no consensus on relevance to goals nor a clear approach to data collection that would warrant inclusion of this at present.
19.8 I believe that this metric (despite possible objection by registries that may benefit from opacity) would be useful and insightful. It would also comport with the need for increased transparency in the DNS and domain name registration system and process. It would not be overreaching insofar as it would not be an attempt to set any financial limitations or rules -- but should be approached from a purely informational point of view. Although possible fall-back position would be to allow registries to opt out, to do so would be tacit approval of opacity -- which I believe would not be healthy. It seems to me that a marketplace that operates in a blackbox pricewise is not a healthy or trustworthy marketplace. Imagine if car dealers operated like this? And yet I'm sure they have the same type of sensitivities that registries do. Furthermore, as I pointed out before, sharing prices does not trigger any antitrust/unfair competition concerns unless it is part of a price-fixing plan or conspiracy between producers. (Shortcomings of measuring this metric are) understood. However, I still think we can make the "ask". We can then note the response rate and, if limited, provide the figures we have with the caveat of that limitation. We may still be able to base a report on what we receive – it would not be inaccurate data, just incomplete – but note any shortcomings.(Michael R. Graham [Gtldmarketplace] Work in Progress Category Definitions/ April 12 / 13 / 14 email),	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback. There is no consensus on relevance to goals nor a clear approach to data collection that would warrant inclusion of this at present.

19.9 I would advocate to not reopen a discussion on pricing. Contrary though to any belief that a registry benefits from opacity, I'll give some perspective about why it's important not to: This is a highly competitive industry. For that reason, you're going to have a difficult time getting competitors to discuss or disclose pricing strategies in any forum. It's just too sensitive. Further, many a lawyer has carefully warned competitors to not discuss pricing among themselves, for very good and well-established legal reasons. So we generally stay away from that information. Finally, and importantly, ICANN not a pricing authority or regulator (with one exception that has stood for some time). ICANN's mandate is to coordinate the technical functions of the domain name system and ensure security and stability. I understand how one could advance the argument that changes in price impact trust, but I don't find that there's an encroachment into ICANN's mandate. Even with promises within this panel that price data would be informational only, there are plenty of others interested in that data for lots of other reasons. (Mason Cole, [Gtldmarketplace] Work in Progress Category Definitions/ April 12 email),	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback. There is no consensus on relevance to goals nor a clear approach to data collection that would warrant inclusion of this at present.
19.10 I do agree that pricing is not as transparent as we may think it is and as such would agree that including it would create sensitivities that would not benefit our overall mission here. I agree - its not healthy. I am in full support of healthy and trustworthy. However, some of the Registries are not as open about pricing as it based on Registrar tier and even then its based at times on "potential" - how do you manage that? Marketing campaigns mapped out a year ahead by a registry for a registrar impacts pricing too for a period of time. I agree it should be open and healthy - so, if we decide to go down that route, then we should just be aware of many "closed door deals" that may exist between Registry and Registrar. Its a tough one to address in my opinion and we all have our own respective experiences and knowledge from the industry that we bring to the table here so I am stating this respectfully, to all opinions that have been shared in regards to this topic. We need one clear path to address price as an index, taking into account the challenges - thats all. I don't have a solution as well as I am concerned with the challenges and us all being aware of it, to begin with. My major concern is the lack of transparency to Registry pricing and the challenges thereof as a an index. (Samantha Frida, [Gtldmarketplace] Work in Progress Category Definitions/ April 13/14 email)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback. There is no consensus on relevance to goals nor a clear approach to data collection that would warrant inclusion of this at present.
19.11 I haven't yet heard anyone disagree with the view that a significant pricing change by a registry (let's say just to illustrate this, a minimum of 50% or $50, whichever is the *higher*, not something small) is an issue for stability and trust. If we can get agreement on that, then let's at least note that and separate out the next steps of a) fully defining it; b) measuring it. It would be a mistake to remove it from the list just because we don't currently have a good/agreed way to measure it. When it comes to measuring it, I understand that this is not simple for a whole host of commercial reasons. Rather than us advise on mechanisms perhaps a wider consultation of registries needs to take place, to state the problem as we agree it and ask them how to measure it. (Jay Daley, [Gtldmarketplace] Work in Progress Category Definitions/ April 13 email)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback. There is no consensus on relevance to goals nor a clear approach to data collection that would warrant inclusion of this at present.
19.12 I think we all recognise that it will be very difficult to get healthy and trustworthy data regarding Registrar pricing. Registry and Registrar simply won't supply (and there is no obligation to ICANN , right) and provide their mark ups/ promotional discounts from the Registry wholesale price. It will very difficult to track going forward. We can't put out reports that have inaccurate pricing data. . (Phil Buckingham, [Gtldmarketplace] Work in Progress Category Definitions/ April 14 email)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback. There is no consensus on relevance to goals nor a clear approach to data collection that would warrant inclusion of this at present.

19.13 By publishing the "standard" trade pricing for a registration, the report could end up upsetting the registries, the registrars and the resellers. It would not be unthinkable for a large registrar to be able to demand a discount for carrying a gTLD whereas a small registrar with a handful of registrations may not have the same market position to justify the same discount. As Uniregistry is the first operator to make such a significant change, would it be possible to ask if they would agree to the impact of the price changes being used as a case study? The price changes have been publicised and the effects should be seen in the registry reports. Since the data is effectively open source, it may not be necessary to involve other registry operators yet though a wider consultation would be useful though given the competitiveness of the market, it may be hard to get any widespread agreement on the publication of pricing data. (John McCormack, [Gtldmarketplace] Work in Progress Category Definitions/ April 14 email)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback. There is no consensus on relevance to goals nor a clear approach to data collection that would warrant inclusion of this at present.
19.14 Just to be clear, it's not pricing we're after, it's pricing changes. It might be possible to have a requirement to notify on any price change over a certain threshold. As I noted previously, collecting pricing information would be significant over-collection when all we actually want is pricing changes over a threshold. I don't agree with the need for us to have the data initially to set the index as suggested by Gabe and Samantha because all that does is push us back to the same problem of getting prices. (Jay Daley, [Gtldmarketplace] Work in Progress Category Definitions/ April 14 email)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback. There is no consensus on relevance to goals nor a clear approach to data collection that would warrant inclusion of this at present.
19.15 I don't have an answer to this, but I think the meaningful information is related to registry changes in pricing over time. Therefore I would suggest an index pegged to a moment in time (first survey) with the goal of showing volatility and trend over time. Just something to think about. (Gabe Fried, [Gtldmarketplace] Work in Progress Category Definitions/ April 14 email)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback. There is no consensus on relevance to goals nor a clear approach to data collection that would warrant inclusion of this at present.
19.16 Agreed but it has to start from a base and that is where the challenge is. (Samantha Frida, [Gtldmarketplace] Work in Progress Category Definitions/ April 14 email)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback. There is no consensus on relevance to goals nor a clear approach to data collection that would warrant inclusion of this at present.
19.17 In case it is helpful, a few thoughts: - I have tracked retail pricing each quarter for over a year now and for the most part, the price changes are small and within a limited range. Sometimes there is a promotional period where for example, the registration price is half of standard price which has an increased dollar value due to the higher regular price. There are exceptions but off the top of my head, I would estimate this to be less than five percent. You might receive increased registry engagement, if a 'check the box' option was provided i.e. 'price increase of 5% or a minimum of $x' with several different options with a request on the effective date/month. I think the dollar value threshold would be really helpful and provide a much needed measuring stick beyond a percentage. - it would be very difficult to create meaningful output with all of the relevant details if exact pricing is requested - the footnotes would be lengthy. - perhaps trying to capture unique promotions would be helpful in evaluating 'stability' and 'trust' for instance, where registrants were provided with a free name with or without their permission. - this may just be a blip, but one thing I have seen lately is that some TLDs are no longer being offered at a registrar. I'm not sure what happens with the registrant goes to renew a name but thought I'd mention it helps in furthering the discussion. (Christa Taylor, [Gtldmarketplace] Work in Progress Category Definitions/ April 14 email)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback. There is no consensus on relevance to goals nor a clear approach to data collection that would warrant inclusion of this at present.

19.18 I know the CCTRT looked into pricing in their report and ran into issues gathering wholesale data. Retail is easier to get. But that doesn't give you a definitive view on Pricing so I'm now sure how accurate a measurement you would get. (Jim Prendergast, [Gtldmarketplace] Work in Progress Category Definitions/ April 14 email)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback. There is no consensus on relevance to goals nor a clear approach to data collection that would warrant inclusion of this at present.
19.19 Leaving registry and registrar operators plenty of discretionary room is advisable at this stage. Yes, no question transparency is good. However, it is the market demand that must push it forward. We cannot compare established industries like auto-sales to domains at this point. If we do, let's compare them at their relative market development about 60-70 years ago. Otherwise, it is not a fair comparison.

Additionally, I am trying to understand the end goal which seems to be changing continuously. If we show certain metrics and they look undesirable, or unsatisfactory, who is to take corrective steps in regard to those metrics? Transparency measurement only works if it can be enforced. My understanding, however, is that ICANN did not want to be a CTFC type of regulator. Please let me know if I was wrong in that regard. (Ivan Rasskazov, [Gtldmarketplace] Work in Progress Category Definitions/ April 14 email) | **Discussed** | ICANN appreciates this feedback. There is no consensus on relevance to goals nor a clear approach to data collection that would warrant inclusion of this at present. |
| 19.20 I think we are trying do Richter-scale assessments without precise and ubiquitous seismographs. Pricing is perceived by an end-user depending on which name he or she is considering registering, so understanding it would require an incredible amount of information that is currently either not being stored, or is covered by privacy, or by trade secrets. Think "Big Data", but squared. What we could have would be a Mercalli-scale record of pricing events. For instance, a IV "Light" event could be "significant price increase in more than 3 TLDs", while a XII "Extreme" event could be "All TLDs at least doubled their registration price". For more details on describing earthquakes with Mercalli scale, see https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mercalli_intensity_scale[en.wikipedia.org] (Rubens Kuhl, [Gtldmarketplace] Work in Progress Category Definitions/ April 15 email) | **Discussed** | ICANN appreciates this feedback. There is no consensus on relevance to goals nor a clear approach to data collection that would warrant inclusion of this at present. |
| 19.21 Having been part of the original GNSO CTCCC, the topic of pricing is one that we've had much time to discuss. I completely understand that for commercial reasons some registries might not be ready to disclose wholesale pricing. This is common with other Channels (for example the CISCO Channel Partner Program of hardware resales prevents you from disclosing any information about CISCO's own prices to you) and I can therefore understand Registry & Registrar unease for these numbers to be released. But aren't we looking at the effect on end users? In which case, why do we need wholesale prices? I thought Retail was what you average end user was going to pay, and this is what we would need to collect, in which case, I'd think it's probably pretty easy for a surveying firm to study pricing from Registrar Web sites? There might even already be an organisation tracking this? At that point, one can build an average pricing index which takes into account the volume of sales of a TLD, its average cost & variance, at 3 month increments. (or even 6 months, if we want, or in the long term, yearly) (Olivier Crepin Leblond, [Gtldmarketplace] Work in Progress Category Definitions/ April 15 email) | **Discussed** | ICANN appreciates this feedback. There is no consensus on relevance to goals nor a clear approach to data collection that would warrant inclusion of this at present. |

19.22 Given the quality of some of the ICANN contracted "surveys" that I've seen in other areas, it may not be a good thing to specially contract a firm for this data. All they would do is get an intern to scrape the price pages from registrars and put the data in a spreadsheet and these registration fees would have to be correlated with that registrar's registration volume. (It is actually relatively simple work in a database, (a few tables and some SQL queries once the data has been extracted, transformed and loaded), but resellers complicate it.) It does seem to be moving far beyond the remit of the Marketplace Indicators report. And the other aspect is that some new gTLDs have very low numbers of new registrations each month whereas others have large spikes in registrations due to heavy discounting and promotion. The massive amount of discounting in some gTLDs has damaged the reliability of using domain name counts as a primary metric in determining the popularity of a new gTLD. How does one evaluate "free"? (John McCormack, [Gtldmarketplace] Work in Progress Category Definitions/ April 16 email)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback. There is no consensus on relevance to goals nor a clear approach to data collection that would warrant inclusion of this at present.
19.23 Additionally in some countries monopoly is controlled so, from Registry side they may be controlled related to prices by their own government. Case of Verisign as we all know. Competition on price is what is about under registry agreement with ICANN. Registries are obliged to sell their strings to any Registrar demanding such opportunity. What is, nowadays, more complex is the possibility of all registrar to refuse to sell specific name. With new gTLDs this is happen in many places. I have already suggested some time ago to allow new registries without any channel to sell their strings to be allowed to sell directly to resellers to keep alive the main issue relevant for end users: – competition. (Vanda Scartezini, [Gtldmarketplace] Work in Progress Category Definitions/ April 16 email)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback. There is no consensus on relevance to goals nor a clear approach to data collection that would warrant inclusion of this at present.
19.24 But I think that our error is to think this is exact science. Like any market assessment, it is not. You're right: it is impossible to get every pricing for every TLD from every Registrar & Reseller. So how about taking a representative sample? At the end of the day, if the sample remains the same, does this not then provide trends on a sample of Registrars/Resellers, for a sample of TLDs? Taking a sample is nothing new. It's done in political polls and is done in market analysis. With the Registrar market being dominate by a handful of players, I wouldn't even search further than starting with a sample and taking it from there. My understanding is that the Indicators report will show trends. I really hope that we won't be looking at every fringe TLD. I mean, what is the impact of a TLD with 100 registrations in the wider scheme of things? (Olivier Crepin Leblond, [Gtldmarketplace] Work in Progress Category Definitions/ April 17 email) / Concurred to by Michael Graham, Alberto Soto, Gtldmarketplace] Work in Progress Category Definitions/ April 17 email).	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback. There is no consensus on relevance to goals nor a clear approach to data collection that would warrant inclusion of this at present.

19.25 What worries me is the idea that we could end up with the kind of stuff that CCT got with the "awareness" surveys. The reality of registration volumes and development stats are quite different to those surveys. The reality is that with the new gTLDs, it is the equivalent of trying to poll for individual local level politican's support at national (or international) levels. While the Mathematics of sampling are sound and well established, the registrars are rarely well distributed and some countries have no ICANN accredited registrars. (This is going to be a big problem with the .AFRICA gTLD based on the geographical spread of ICANN accredited registrars.) In mature TLD markets, the top ten hosters or registrars generally dominate a market. There is a good probability that most of these registrars will be retail focused. What makes the new gTLDs somewhat different is that they don't have the same registrar volume (numbers of registrars with registrations in the gTLD) as mature gTLDs. Again this gets back to the idea of using open source data such as the ICANN registry reports. The new gTLDs are at varying phases in their development. Grouping them as a single set gives the kind of impression that may make for pretty graphs but it won't actually provide a reasonable overview of what is happening in these gTLDs. (John McCormack, [Gtldmarketplace] Work in Progress Category Definitions/ April 19 email) / Concurred to by Kathrin Ohlmer/Phil Buckingham Gtldmarketplace] Work in Progress Category Definitions/ April 19 email).	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback. There is no consensus on relevance to goals nor a clear approach to data collection that would warrant inclusion of this at present.
19.26 The idea of an exceptional price change impact survey as proposed earlier is the best one. This is where we can see the effect of a major price increase in a gTLD and measure it easily. We've got the test case with Uniregistry's application of price increases across a number of its gTLDs and we have the published price increases, the dates on which the price changes happen and will have the ICANN registry reports subsequent to these increases. Rather than contracting some firm with a rather nebulous set of expectations and getting something like a CCT "awareness" thing which just perpetuates a lack of precision, we can use hard data to establish the impact of a major price change. To people who study registration volumes and patterns, there are trends. Some of them are due to marketing promotions such as discounting. Others are due to seasonal trends where there's an uptick in registrations coming up to the Christmas period. Taken in isolation, the idea of tracking trends is a good one. However, the questions remain what trends and why? (John McCormack, [Gtldmarketplace] Work in Progress Category Definitions/ April 19 email) Concurred to by Kathrin Ohlmer/Phil Buckingham Gtldmarketplace] Work in Progress Category Definitions/ April 19 email).	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback. There is no consensus on relevance to goals nor a clear approach to data collection that would warrant inclusion of this at present.
19.27 Totally in agreement. Statistical trends (within sub markets) is very important. I suggest these are broken down by "categories" - . brand . generic . geos .IDNs . community . niche .com .legacy. CCTLDs - but we need a defined base/ benchmark so we are comparing apples with apples within clearly defined samples. I agree the CCT "awareness" surveys for the CCT review , done by an contracted outsider, were a waste of money and certainly didn't reflect the market reality. There is sufficient , reliable new gTLD / legacy data ALREADY held within / by ICANN - but somebody just needs to put it in the right format to make it meaningful and understandable. Phil Buckingham Gtldmarketplace] Work in Progress Category Definitions/ April 19 email). ⬜	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback. There is no consensus on relevance to goals nor a clear approach to data collection that would warrant inclusion of this at present.
19.28 Pricing is overreaching due to the need for registrars/registries to promote their gTLDs. Higher prices create initial instability in a gTLD but actually can stabilise it and increase quality. The real danger is that heavy discounting effectively junks a gTLD and kills development. (John McCormack, AP 26 Apr).	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback. There is no consensus on relevance to goals nor a clear approach to data collection that would warrant inclusion of this at present.

Relevant Discussion Questions	Decision Points	Carry-over topics to discuss in later stages
Should pricing fluctuation be specifically covered in the category definition, as a way of looking ahead to capture such a metric? Feedback has been received that pricing fluctuation is important in that very large price increases impact registrants' perception of stability and trust.	The interest in pricing fluctuation, and the need for transparency in this area is noted among panel members. As a counter to this is the point that it will be unrealisitic to expect competitors to discuss or disclose pricing strategies in any forum - at least at wholesale levels. Registry and Registrar simply won't supply and provide their mark ups from the Registry wholesale price so it will very difficult to obtain track reliably going forward.While retail-level prices are more widely available, there was not the same level of interest in presenting this. Input is also provided that this could be an overreach of ICANN's mandate. Given all this feedback, There is no consensus on relevance, nor a clear approach to data collection that would warrant inclusion of this at present.	One possible way of measuring the effect of a price increase would be a decrease in the number of registrars offering the gTLD. The numbers of domains on various registrars in the affected gTLD should change with smaller count registrars transferring out to other registrars. The source for a kind of consolidated data on this would be the ICANN registry reports.

20) Category T: UDRP/URS Decision Metrics

Issue/Suggestion/Recommendation	Status	Comments/Disposition
20.1 "In addition, INTA agrees that the number of UDRP and URS complaints decided against second-level gTLD registrants (annual total plus percentage of cases filed) is also a helpful metric for evaluating trust.14 It would be more helpful to separate out UDRP versus URS cases in the reported data, given the different burden of proof standards required under each procedure (namely, preponderance of the evidence versus clear and convincing evidence, respectively), and the impact that difference may have had on the percentage of decisions decided against registrants (including potentially its relationship to the drop in the complainant success rate as of 2014)." (INTA)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and will consider providing the detail requested in the v1.0 report.
20.2 *[Re: the Number of UDRP/URS Decisions against gTLD Registrants metric]* "It is important to understand and document the fact that URS does not (yet) apply to disputes in the .COM and .NET gTLDs, where the majority of infringement occurs. Accordingly, stakeholders could improperly perceive that disputes are disproportionately occurring in new gTLDs, an unfair perception and contrary to ICANN's ongoing duty to maintain a level playing field. Accordingly, it would be useful if ICANN were to account for this discrepancy without conflating the two and reporting UDRP and URS statistics in absolute numbers for each." (DON)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and will consider providing the detail requested in the v1.0 report.
20.3"For the sake of clarity, consider including an introduction explaining what the figures in this section of the report are intended to communicate. The "Number of UDRP and URS Decisions Against gTLD Registrants" figure and the introduction are descriptive and useful. Suggest keeping this figure as-is." (BC)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and will consider providing the detail requested in the v1.0 report.
20.4"A line/bar graph, rather than a pie chart, would be more helpful for the percentage of UDRP and URS Decisions against gTLD Registrants." (ALAC)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has made a note of it to consider when this report is updated.
20.5 Regarding separating out the data for UDRP and URS cases: Agree -- separate those 2 data points (Steve DelBianco, 20 June AP)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has made a note of it to consider when this report is updated.

21) Category U: WHOIS ARS Metrics

Issue/Suggestion/Recommendation	Status	Comments/Disposition
21.1 "INTA appreciates the data provided regarding WHOIS accuracy, although additional detail regarding the number of WHOIS accuracy complaints would be helpful to contextualize the data presented. Regardless, INTA is concerned that over a third of WHOIS data is both syntactically and operationally inaccurate. INTA understands that the community is engaged in policy development to overhaul the current WHOIS system, including means of improving data accuracy, and will continue to participate in that work to try to develop solutions for improving registration data accuracy. In the meantime, INTA would encourage ICANN and the community to try to develop and enforce interim solutions for improving the syntactic and operational accuracy of data in the WHOIS system, including mandatory field input requirements for registration data (i.e., all email addresses should have an @ symbol in them), incentives for registrants to provide accurate data (i.e., tying rebate programs to accurate registration data) and for registrars to verify such data, and penalties for failures to provide or verify accurate data." (INTA)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has included portions relevant to this specific project in discussion topics for the Advisory Panel. There was wide support in maintaining the current level of information detail by the Advisory Panel.
21.2 *[Re: the WHOIS ARS metric]* "Donuts remains concerned that this statistic is not reliable. The Whois ARS is a new technology still being developed and refined—just recently, an error with the ZIP code accuracy process was discovered. The resulting changes yielded significantly different numbers. While we appreciate taking our previous comment into account (that if the Whois ARS data is to be used, the +/- standard deviation and error rate of measurements reported must also be published), we continue to believe the accuracy of the reporting system is insufficient for use in the index at present." (DON)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback. There was wide support in maintaining the current level of information detail by the Advisory Panel. Accordingly, we are using this metric as a Trust related metric. That being said, we are continuing to work with the Advisory Panel to evaluate other metrics that can also be used alongside this.
21.3 "Figures 22 and 23 are presented with inclusion of standard deviations. The additional specificity may detract rather than add to the message provided by the graphs." (BC)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback. There was wide support in maintaining the current metric by the Advisory Panel. We feel that the deviation notation is helpful to those savvy enough to understand its value. In version 1 of the report, we may consider presenting this as a footnote text, rather than embedded in the chart itself.
21.4 "Otherwise, this section of the document is a model for other sections—it is highly informative, providing explanations for the graphs in language that is easy to understand. Exceptions are the inclusion of standard deviations - unsure if anyone intends to scrutinize this closely on the Beta - matches in color scheme but is otherwise unlike the other graphs w/presence of standard deviation measures - use of SME statistical terms accompanying superfluous information is inconsistent and a distraction." (BC)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback. There was wide support in maintaining the current metric by the Advisory Panel. We feel that the deviation notation is helpful to those savvy enough to understand its value. In version 1 of the report, we may consider presenting this as a footnote text, rather than embedded in the chart itself.
21.5 "Rather than as a pie chart, a line/bar graphic showing the ongoing accuracy on a quarter by quarter basis would be more helpful. Furthermore, it would be interesting to see WHOIS accuracy trends on a per top level domain basis." (ALAC)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback. There was wide support in maintaining the current metric by the Advisory Panel. We will consider alternative chart presentations of this metric in v1.0 of the report, like the one suggested.

22) Category V: Compliance Termination-Related Metrics

Issue/Suggestion/Recommendation	Status	Comments/Disposition
22.1 "As noted above, INTA would appreciate additional detail regarding registrar de-accreditation, including primarily the reason(s) for either voluntary or involuntary de-accreditation. As the Index suggests, this is a matter of consumer trust as well as a matter of marketplace stability and competition." (INTA)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback. The current process for voluntary terminations do not mandate that registrars/registries provide reasons for their voluntary de-accreditation request. As such this additional detail would not be available. All involuntary terminations reported are derived from ICANN's issued notice of breach, which is available: https://www.icann.org/compliance/notices.
22.2 "Furthermore, it would be interesting to note why registrars are, voluntarily or involuntarily, deaccredited. Was that due to high ICANN fees, noncompliance/legal issues, technical incompetence, lack of interest, etc?" (ALAC)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback. The current process for voluntary terminations do not mandate that registrars/registries provide reasons for their voluntary de-accreditation request. As such this additional detail would not be available. All involuntary terminations reported are derived from ICANN's issued notice of breach, which is available: https://www.icann.org/compliance/notices.

23) Category W: Accreditations/Deaccreditations		
Issue/Suggestion/Recommendation	**Status**	**Comments/Disposition**
23.1 [Re: gTLD Registrars – Newly Accredited] "This is an interesting statistic, but is not an indicator of "marketplace security." (DON)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback. The metric is categorized under 'Trust' to provide an indication of the success of industry safeguards.
23.2 [Re: gTLD Registrars – Involuntary Terminations]* "Donuts is pleased to see ICANN staff give credence to input that requested de-accreditations be broken out and documented as due to non-compliance. However, it also would be helpful, and more informative, to denote other reasons for de-accreditation that are not due to inappropriate reasons (for example: acquisition and consolidation)." (DON)	**No Action Required**	ICANN appreciates this feedback. However the current process for voluntary terminations do not mandate that registrars/registries provide reasons for their voluntary de-accreditation request. As such this additional detail would not be available.
23.3 "It seems that voluntary vs. involuntary de-accreditations will be difficult to separate, as abandonment and failure to pay fees can constitute an intentional opt-out." (BC)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback. All involuntary terminations reported are derived from ICANN's issued notice of breach, which is available: https://www.icann.org/compliance/notices. We would expect that 'abandonment and intentional failure to pay fees' would represent an edge case, and so does not need to colour the overall rationale for the inclusion of this metric, i.e. operational success of domain name industry safeguards.
23.4 "Figure 20 - The accompanying note states that a figure with measures for gTLD registry operator terminations is not included because the number is zero. As this Beta is as much about format as results, suggest making a place in the report for it anyway, so that when numbers are greater than one, the community knows that this will be reported. Also, the note states both that this "would normally be reported," and also that ICANN will "consider publishing" the registry metric if numbers are greater than zero. A firm commitment to publish these numbers is suggested. Note that, in the case of registrars, ICANN terminates accreditation agreements and in the case of registries, the registry operator terminates the agreement with ICANN. Both appear under the heading entitled "Involuntary Terminations." Suggest defining de-accreditation vs. termination. Suggest defining the term "registry operators," as some readers may confuse the term with backend registry operators." (BC)	**Discussed**	ICANN has indicated that the V1.0 report would indeed incorporate the datapoint with equal prominence should the metric be deemed salient by the Advisory Panel.
23.5 "Secondly, as also pointed out by the Registries, the number of de-accredited Registrars tells us almost nothing without some sense of scale of the registrars involved. Again we would encourage ICANN to find more robust metrics for this area." (RrSG)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback. Indeed, the Advisory Panel will be looking at other complementary metrics to accompany these within the v1.0 report, in order to help provide a more nuanced view of the marketplace.

24) Category X: Additional Proposed Competition Metric—Registration Numbers

Issue/Suggestion/Recommendation	Status	Comments/Disposition
24.1 "[You should be publishing] corresponding registration numbers, for each and every TLD in the global DNS if you are indeed interested in "Marketplace Health")." (JP)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback. The Advisory Panel has indeed suggested to include a metric for the Total number of second-level domain names registered in Legacy gTLDs, New gTLDs, ccTLDs, .brands, geographic gTLDs, along with the net change for those, and the compound annual growth rate for those registrations.

25) Category Y: Trust: Look Beyond ICANN Compliance		
Issue/Suggestion/Recommendation	**Status**	**Comments/Disposition**
25.1 "Take into account all of the related actions that do not involve ICANN compliance." (BC)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback. The category definition for Trust has been reviewed and adjusted to now evaluate the "Demonstrated by operational success of domain name industry safeguards for registrants, Internet users and the global community (including law enforcement and intellectual property holders)".

26) Category Z: Additional Proposed Competition Metric—Market Share		
Issue/Suggestion/Recommendation	**Status**	**Comments/Disposition**
26.1 "While the trends in registry and registrar market concentration are interesting to follow, we believe that the metrics being used are of limited value as they do not account for overall market share across registry and registrar families. We believe that a closer look at the share of registrations across the major registry and registrar families is necessary to get a sense of the concentration of the market." (RySG)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback. Registrar and Registry market share has been shortlisted by the Advisory Panel as a suitable 'robust competition' metric for the version 1 output.
26.2 "True competition in a market is not solely a measure of the market offering but it also revolves around the share of market from the leading competitors. An example of such statistic, solely for new gTLDs is shown on https://ntldstats.com/registrar." (ALAC)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback. Registrar and Registry market share has been shortlisted by the Advisory Panel as a suitable 'robust competition' metric for the version 1 output.
26.3"Looking at the overall domain name market, a metric tracking share of market, such as the one shown on http://www.domainstate.com/registrar-stats.html is much more suitable to show whether competition among registrars is being stimulated. It appears that so far the vast majority of the market is dominated by one major player. When it comes to the domain registrations on a per country basis, the statistic shown on http://www.domainstate.com/top-country-registrars.html speaks for itself." (ALAC)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback. Registrar and Registry market share has been shortlisted by the Advisory Panel as a suitable 'robust competition' metric for the version 1 output.
26.4"When it comes to metrics about registries, whilst there is some worth in compiling the metrics presented, a better metric would be to track the market share of gTLDs, as on http://www.domainstate.com/registrar-tldbreakup.html." (ALAC)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback. Registrar and Registry market share has been shortlisted by the Advisory Panel as a suitable 'robust competition' metric for the version 1 output.
26.5"The metric presented are very useful. However, as seen in the "Competition" section, it is not just how many new players do we have (registries and registrars) but the market share of each one, for different TLDs or families of TLDs. And symmetrically, the count of the number of TLDs should include their market share too. In addition, statistics per country/region would be welcome in Figure 19." (ALAC)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback. Registrar and Registry market share has been shortlisted by the Advisory Panel as a suitable 'robust competition' metric for the version 1 output.

27) Category AA: Additional Proposed Competition Metric—gTLD Usage

Issue/Suggestion/Recommendation	Status	Comments/Disposition
27.1 "Rightside believes that usage of a TLD is an important data point to monitor and study and this key element does not seem to be included currently as part of the MHI. We believe that domain name usage is a better indicator of long-term viability of a TLD than renewal rates. Rightside defines "usage" as any domain name registered in a TLD, excluding domains that do not resolve or are "parked" for monetization of traffic using advertising." (RIGHT)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the proposed indicators under 'Demonstrated by registrant adoption of new TLDs and across all TLDs' considering this input.
27.2 Chat recommendations re gTLD usage data from Oct. 26 AP call, chat transcript times as marked Michiel: (11:43) I would advocate including usage percentage in the market shares. This can be done by means of a crawler. John McCormac - HosterStats.com: (11:44) web usage measurement is a bit more complex than using a simple crawler Michiel: (11:44) E.g. in The Netherlands: .com has 2 million domain names, but only 50% is used (website), .amsterdam 25.000, but 90% is used (website) Katrin Ohlmer | DOTZON: (11:44) +1 Michiel Jonathan Zuck: (11:45) agree John McCormac - HosterStats.com: (11:45) No. The web usage in .amsterdam is nowhere near 90% Ivan Rasskazov: (11:45) .Amsterdam is closer to 13% usage once you factor out dynamic parking pages Michiel: (11:45) but is usage a relevant criterium? John McCormac - HosterStats.com: (11:46) usage can be used to predict renewal rates Ivan Rasskazov: (11:47) It is also consumer adoption which is likely to predict long term success of the TLD.	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the proposed indicators under 'Demonstrated by registrant adoption of new TLDs and across all TLDs' considering this input.
27.3 Another factor that would really show health is the relationship between registrations or the inventory of domain names and WHOIS requests. That would be of interest. (ICANN57_Overview Thomas Keller, ~1:04)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the proposed indicators under 'Demonstrated by registrant adoption of new TLDs and across all TLDs' considering this input.

27.4 (Request for input on ICANN proposal to maintain current metric on number of second level gTLD domain name registrations along with added data from ccTLDs) Registrations are easy at the zone file level. Is it also sufficiently easy to show registrations that are resolving as ooposed to those that are not. Here you would what to track the percentage of registrations that actually resolve, versus those that are purchased and parked. (ICANN proposal, Steve DelBianco, 26 Apr AP)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the proposed indicators under 'Demonstrated by registrant adoption of new TLDs and across all TLDs' considering this input.
27.5 Another possible metric may be the churn and burn rate for the gTLDs. This is the number of domains that have been registered in a TLD from start of tracking, the number of currently active domains and the number of deleted domains over the same period. (John MacCormack, via email Mon 5/29/2017/ [Gtldmarketplace] Churn and burn rates in gTLDs)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the proposed indicators under 'Demonstrated by registrant adoption of new TLDs and across all TLDs' considering this input.
27.6 Including "Parking" data may not be a good thing. With registration stats supplied from ICANN and the ccTLD registries, we can be confident that the data is generally reliable. This report, if it is to gain the trust of the wider domain name industry, has to be reliable and use reliable data sources and statistics. This report should certainly should not include the CCT's figures on "Parking" because as a definition it has more holes than a chunk of Swiss Cheese. They are so poorly framed and implemented that they miss very important trends in gTLDs and the fact that some of these gTLDs are targeted at different markets. Different markets also have different characteristics. (John MacCormack, via email Tue 5/30/2017 / [Gtldmarketplace] Parking Stuff in the Report	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the proposed indicators under 'Demonstrated by registrant adoption of new TLDs and across all TLDs' considering this input.

28) Category AB: Additional Proposed Competition Metric—Registrant Information

Issue/Suggestion/Recommendation	Status	Comments/Disposition
28.1 "Rightside also believes other metrics have bearing on marketplace health and should be included in any TLD study including: Concentration of registrants per TLD (i.e. how many domains per registrant are registered in the TLD, or registry level); and Average number of years of registration length per TLD." (RIGHT)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the proposed indicators under Robust Competition Category Definitions 1 and 2 considering this input.
28.2 "We urge a more that looks at the dispersion of registrations (by registrar and registry) within particular jurisdictions around the world, to see whether these providers are competing effectively and registrants are being offered widespread choice in registry and registrar regardless of where they reside." (RySG)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the proposed indicators under Robust Competition Category Definitions 1 and 2 considering this input.
28.3 "A more meaningful approach would be to measure domain registration volumes across different countries and then to cross-segment this data by registrar and by registry and study the distribution. This would better capture overall global market penetration, whether providers were competing effectively in these marketplaces, and whether registrants were offered widespread choice in service provider, regardless of where they reside." (DON)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the proposed indicators under Robust Competition Category Definitions 1 and 2 considering this input.
28.4 "All in all, consumers (registrants) are the factors that move the market – the ones who pay – so we should find ways to get more insight on their needs and behaviours. This should be taken into account for future developments." (ALAC)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the proposed indicators under Robust Competition Category Definitions 1 and 2 considering this input.
28.5 Another way to look into competiton within the various regions would be to take registrants who use particular scripts and then look at spreads within that pool. (Stephanie Duchesneau, AP 12 Mar)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the proposed indicators under Robust Competition Category Definitions 1 and 2 considering this input.
28.6 The registries and registrars are the best sources for data on registrant spread by region. The RAA may be an issue and some registrars /registries may not want to provide data. What it will show is that there is a geography to the gTLDs. The other option is to use the registrar density from ICANN reg reports to build a kind of geography for each gTLD based on country of registrar. Again the problem is that the distribution of registrars is not uniform. A purely content based approach will miss all the PPCed/holding pages sites. (John McCormack, 20 June AP)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the proposed indicators under Robust Competition Category Definitions 1 and 2 considering this input.

28.7 Whois info input by Registrants - for geo location v. Content of website which displays an indicatio of location. (whois v. content). Whois accuracy should be taken into account as well - how to verify and determine locaytion of registrant. If there is a proxy - but content indicates location, then shouldnt the content prevail? Why shouldnt a website content prevail to indicate location since oys public data and not needed Registry or Registrar to provide the info? Just asking out aloud. I think its imporrant to not just focus on source of location - be able to gather diff sources and decide how we want to define and categorize the info. (Samantha Frida, 20 June AP)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the proposed indicators under Robust Competition Category Definitions 1 and 2 considering this input.
28.8 Private registrations is an obvious limitation as well. Addition of "proxy" is a relevant one as well. Sam's point is valid that registrant location and intended audience may not always be aligned. It may be relevant but the current definition is explicit with regards to the registrant(Andy Simpson, 20 June AP)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the proposed indicators under Robust Competition Category Definitions 1 and 2 considering this input.
28.9 The reason we pivoted to registrant distribution from registrar distribution is to answer the question 'have we have created gTLDs that are available to registrants around the world, particularly in underserved areas'. Initially, ICANN GDD was looking to show the distribution of the business entities, as in registrars and registries, in these economies. We pushed back on that to say that all that really matters is whether registrants can get access to the registrations in the languages and scripts they want, in the terms of services and payment that is affordable and useable. And that is why we looked at this, over time you can see the GDD program has resulted in a growth in the number of registrants in underserved areas. Thats why its important. I have no personal objection to also including registrars or resellers, but it doesnt answer the same question. (Steve DelBianco, 20 June AP)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the proposed indicators under Robust Competition Category Definitions 1 and 2 considering this input.
28.10 We would have to count the Privacy and Proxy-protected registrants or we would be getting a completely inaccurate picture of where the registrants are coming from. We cant just ignore where those registrations are coming from. Currently I'm told that roughly a third of registrations in the gTLD space are protected by privacy/proxy and that could increase dramatically if registrars have to comply with the European GDPR. We should have within our scope privacy and proxy protected registrations included as well. (Steve DelBianco, 20 June AP, concurrence from Jim Prendergast)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has re-evaluated the proposed indicators under Robust Competition Category Definitions 1 and 2 considering this input.

29) Category AC: Additional Proposed Competition Metric—IDN Registrations/Dispersion

Issue/Suggestion/Recommendation	Discussed	Comments/Disposition
29.1 "[W]e continue to believe that if ICANN wishes to link overall IDN adoption statistics to competition, it should look at marketplace dispersion specifically in the sale of IDNs and whether this evolves as overall demand for IDNs grows or shrinks." (RySG)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback. ICANN appreciates this feedback. The Advisory Panel has indeed suggested to include a metric for the Total number of IDN registrations, along with the net change for those, and the compound annual growth rate for those registrations have been shortlisted as suitable 'robust competition' metrics for version 1 of the marketplace indicators report.
29.2 Total number of registrations is an insufficient measure. Especially if the category is dominated by a few registrants. (Response to Feb 28 online survey, n = 15)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback. ICANN appreciates this feedback. The Advisory Panel has indeed suggested to include a metric for the Total number of IDN registrations, along with the net change for those, and the compound annual growth rate for those registrations have been shortlisted as suitable 'robust competition' metrics for version 1 of the marketplace indicators report.

30) Category AD: Additional Proposed Competition Metric—Types of Registries

Issue/Suggestion/Recommendation	Status	Comments/Disposition
30.1 "For registries, it is worth noting that like-for-like gTLDs tend to compete against each other. For example, brand gTLDs do not broaden competition. A health related gTLD does not compete with a gambling related gTLD. So the true extent of competition is really amongst the more generic gTLDs, plus those that compete on a like-forlike basis in a specific trade." (ALAC)	Discussed	ICANN appreciates this feedback. Given the input of the Advisory Panel, the category definition for Robust Competition has been reframed around the registrant and whether these stakeholders are able to benefit from a robustly competitive marketplace. This pivot away from service provider and towards the recepient of the service will have hopefully addressed this concern.

31) Category AE: Additional Proposed Robust Competition Metrics

Issue/Suggestion/Recommendation	Status	Comments/Disposition
31.1 "First, it would be helpful to capture additional metrics for measuring gTLD competition and the robustness of the gTLD marketplace, such as domain name renewal rates, new registration velocity, average registration and renewal prices at retail, and the number of accredited registrars per gTLD. It would also be helpful to distinguish between renewals and new registrations; to the extent this distinction is not already captured in the Index." (INTA)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has included this in the considerations for the draft V 1.0 metrics
31.2 "Second, in addition to the foregoing, it would be useful to measure how often non-renewed domain names are purchased by new buyers, and whether these result in trademark disputes." (INTA)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has included this in the considerations for the draft V 1.0 metrics
31.3"Fourth, it would be helpful to present distinct data regarding domain name resellers versus registrars to provide a clearer picture of overall marketplace activity." (INTA)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has included this in the considerations for the draft V 1.0 metrics
31.4"Capture direct competitiveness, robustness, other metrics in addition to renewal rate---new registration velocity, average pricing, ratio of registrar agreements per gTLD." (BC)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has included this in the considerations for the draft V 1.0 metrics
31.5"Review market share broken out across families" (BC)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has included this in the considerations for the draft V 1.0 metrics
31.6"Distinguish between renewals and new registrations" (BC)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has included this in the considerations for the draft V 1.0 metrics
31.7"Measure average pricing, pricing spread of actual sales transactions; average or relative number of sales per price point, as little price diversity can indicate a lack of competition" (BC)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has included this in the considerations for the draft V 1.0 metrics
31.8"But just counting the number of registrations in gTLDs is not enough. For instance, other metrics like "Information Density of a TLD" or "Domains with DNS" may offer a more complete view. One really needs to dig a level deeper that tracks the actual use of a TLD. How do registrants use the domains? Are they in parking, for sale, without DNS? Are they used by individuals, associations, companies, or government agencies?" (ALAC)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has included this in the considerations for the draft V 1.0 metrics

31.9"We welcome consideration of the following topics that were raised by the BC in January 2016: Concentration index for gTLD registry operators and gTLD registrars (assuming that this denotes concentration around particular geographies, as opposed to some other type of concentration--like age or pricing schema) Additionally, the BC suggests that counts from registrar resellers are distinguished from counts from ICANN-accredited registrars themselves. Geographic distribution of gTLD registrants Original BC suggestion: Measure volume of new registrations across a country, then cross-segment by registry/registrar country to determine level of competition/choice. [*metrics proposed in the trust category summarized in "Trust" section, below…*] Capture net effect of resellers in the marketplace Note that this is listed in the report as two separate additional topics for community discussion, namely, "Percentage of second-level domain name registrations in gTLDs completed by resellers," and "Number/percentage of resellers broken down by ICANN region and/or legal jurisdiction." (BC)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has included this in the considerations for the draft V 1.0 metrics
31.10"Despite not commenting earlier about the topics below, we note their inclusion in the Beta report and support the development of metrics for these items as helpful additions to the Index: • Survey data on perceived marketplace fairness • Percentage of gTLD registrars offering registrations in IDN gTLDs [*metrics in other categories reported in trust and stability sections below*] Average number of gTLD registrars offering a gTLD (average across gTLDs and broken down by category)" (BC)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has included this in the considerations for the draft V 1.0 metrics
31.11 ""Percentage of second-level domain name registrations in gTLDs completed by resellers. This is likely to be a problem as most registrars would not wish to give up such market-sensitive data. Even at a web hosting level, some of the larger operators prefer to include their reseller hosters with their overall market shares and totals. It is possible to build an approximate registrar share using other methods." **(JMcC)**	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has included this in the considerations for the draft V 1.0 metrics
31.12 "Some of the geographical new gTLDs are not competing with other gTLDs or .COM but rather directly with the local ccTLD. As a metric, it does sound like a kind of Social Science number that would be nice to include in press releases." **(JMcC)**	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has included this in the considerations for the draft V 1.0 metrics
31.13 It would be helpful to break down into different categories of registries (maybe 5? Open? Closed? Restricted? Etc? And then which TLDs fall into which bucket, and then how to we measure health by the agreement type. (ICANN57_Work, Gabe Fried ~47:00)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has included this in the considerations for the draft V 1.0 metrics

31.14 As a TLD matures, domain name registrations generally concentrate on the top registrars in the TLD but the number of accredited registrars should increase. The increase or decrease of the number of accredited registrars in a gTLD could be a simple metric as a table for the report. Some of this is covered at a cumulative level in the Marketplace Stability section. The number of accredited registrars in a TLD and the registar with the highest number of registrations and the average number of registrations per registrar might be good metrics to track. (JMcC, via email on Dec 21, 2016)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has included this in the considerations for the draft V 1.0 metrics
31.15 An intuitive measure of the dynamics of a TLD - wether it is global or focused - would be the number of active registrars (registrars doing at least X creates per month) and the percentage of new creates in the portfolio of the TLD and of each registrar at a given date and for a given period. (Loic Damilaville, via email on Dec 21, 2016)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has included this in the considerations for the draft V 1.0 metrics
31.16 (Rationale for meteric on Terms and Conditions Languages and Scripts) In order to serve potential registrants where they don't use English language or Latin scripts, these are the next billion. They would want to understand what they are signing up for when they read the T&C's of a registrar/reseller and the gTLD they are looking to select.The only way we can look the rest of the workd in the eye and say we are serving a global public interest is that some of our contract partners have chosen to provide those T&C in other languages. Its not mandatory. But it would be good to know which markets we serve in terms of languages. This is no attempt to say that businesses arent doing what businesses do. This is just a way to understand what demand is being served and what isnt being served. (Steve DelBianco, 20 June AP)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has included this in the considerations for the draft V 1.0 metrics
31.17 (Suggestion for metric on Renewal Rates of Second Level Domain Names) would therefore include a Metric that measures the number of Registered and Renewed domain names that direct to a unique website vs. those that either (a) direct to an existing .com or other Legacy registry site, or (b) are parked and direct either to a parking site or nowhere. This is intended to measure the number of renewed domains that are registered purely defensively, and therefore do not indicate a thriving marketplace, but a trapped set of registrants. (Online Survey feedback, covered in 20 June AP meeting)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has included this in the considerations for the draft V 1.0 metrics
31.18 (Suggestion for metric on Renewal Rates of Second Level Domain Names) I guess I don't see the need to disinguish between auto-renwal and manual renewal. We can just count total Renewals, I think. I would definitely like to see data on redirects and parked domains ! (Steve DelBianco, 20 June AP)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has included this in the considerations for the draft V 1.0 metrics
31.19 (Suggestion for metric on Renewal Rates of Second Level Domain Names) The gtlds have their own characteristics so we will end up with a field for each gtld. (John McCormack, 20 June AP)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has included this in the considerations for the draft V 1.0 metrics

31.20 (suggestion on #/% of resellers by ICANN region) Some ICANN registrars are resellers of TLD's - I think it would be interesting to explore resellers beyond the confined defintions we know it as within the industry - eg. CMS providers, for example - looking at the overall intent of this effort.	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has included this in the considerations for the draft V 1.0 metrics
31.21 (Suggestion on metric covering % of gTLD Registries afiliated with Registrars) We need this , but need to break down further re Spec 13 / Spec 9 for .brands (Phil Buckingham, 20 June AP)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has included this in the considerations for the draft V 1.0 metrics
31.22(On Definition 1D) payment methods might be described as creditcard/debitcard, wire transfer, bank transfer, or paypal or similar. (John McCormac - HosterStats.com, 26 JUL AP)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has updated the metric for category 1D based on the discussions held with the Advisory Panel.
31.23 (On Definition 1D) How about "Acceptance of different payment methods" (Katrin Ohlmer | DOTZON, 26 JULY AP)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has updated the metric for category 1D based on the discussions held with the Advisory Panel.
31.24 (On Definition 1D): Acceptance of multiple payment methods by registrars, resellers, and hosting services providers in developing economies (Steve DelBianco, 26 JULY AP)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has updated the metric for category 1D based on the discussions held with the Advisory Panel.
31.25 Yes good idea to track back end providers . This needs to be tracked against the EBERO stats / SLAs. (Phil Buckingham, 26 JULY AP)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has updated the metric for category 1D based on the discussions held with the Advisory Panel.
31.26: on proposed metric "Registered and Renewed sites that direct to a unique New gTLD site, serve as redirects to existing Legacy gTLD site, go to a parked page, or go nowhere": Phil Buckingham: (12:37) Usage as distinct from parked Andy Simpson: (12:37) I still don't really agree that parking means a domain is not in use John McCormac - HosterStats.com: (12:38) The parking thing is a rubbish numerology metric from CCT Mason Cole: (12:38) I would tend to agree with Andy on usage. Katrin Ohlmer | DOTZON: (12:38) Use can be redirecting, setting up a new site or other. Michael R Graham: (12:42) Most redirects, however, are due to the establishment of a POS and use of the domain to prevent third parties from using it or becuase the domain provides increased traffic for any reason. John McCormac - HosterStats.com: (12:43) Many redirects are actually internal. Michael R Graham: (12:46) As I understand -- we should seek separate figures for parked domains, non-resolving domains, and unique pages. (26 JULY AP)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback. Due to the lack of agreement on a singular definition for parking, we have decided to exclude this from Version 1.0. This topic can be reopened again for Version 2.0 should there be a means of calculation that satisfies the requirements stated by members.

31.27: on "Registered and Renewed sites that direct to a unique New gTLD site, serve as redirects to existing Legacy gTLD site, go to a parked page, or go nowhere": Jonathan Zuck:Is "resolving" to a known parking server still part of what were after? John McCormac -HosterStats.com:the danger with "known parking servers" is that it may be a load balancer for shared hosting.Jonathan Zuck:oh I'm well aware of the difficulting in defining parking! Andy Simpson:Without an agreed upon definition of adoption it is really still difficult to determine whether the proposed metric really helps to measure it. Michael Graham:Going back to 1, although most domains do resolve to an IP address, this number does not reveal any characteristics because there is a huge difference between domain names that resolve to an operating website, those that resolve to a generic ad page, those that resolve to a primary site with another domain, and those that do not resollve.measuring based solely on resolution would create a false metric. (30 August AP)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback. Due to the lack of agreement on a singular definition for parking, we have decided to exclude this from Version 1.0. This topic can be reopened again for Version 2.0 should there be a means of calculation that satisfies the requirements stated by members.
31.28: on CHURN/BURN Metric: John McCormac HosterStats.com: Zonefiles will show the core of domains that keep getting registered/renewed.Mason Cole:How often would the measurement be taken?Andy Simpson:would it make sense to normalize the startingpoint across the various TLDs rather than "start of tracking" which will create an asymmetric metric depending on how long a TLD has been operating. My thought is that you analyze X # of months churn/burn as long as the TLD has been in GA for X+Y months (30 August AP)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has updated the metric for category 2.5 based on the discussions held with the Advisory Panel.
31.29: on CHURN/BURN Metric: Mason Cole: Depending on when the TLD was delegated and what is going on within the string, you need to normalize across strings somehow in order to avoid getting skewed data. You also need to take into account marketplace behaviour that may skew the data, like significant price drops in TLDs gave rise to a large number of registrations that came in from China last year and is now being flushed through the system. Whether that is indicative of the marketplace competition, is up for debate. But I'm more concerned that you have a sufficient base that you dont capture and depict a one-off skew. (30 August AP)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has updated the metric for category 2.5 based on the discussions held with the Advisory Panel.
31.30: on Concentration of Registrants (ie domains per registrant) and Years Held per Registrant: Andy Simpson:how does #3 measure adoption?Jim Prendergast:how do you handle privacy proxy ? Mason Cole: A domain can be registered by one registrant for 1 x 10 year increments, or 10 x 1 year increments, or moved around across 10 registrants over 10 years - what do each of those behaviours say about the marketplace? What is the indicator supposed to reveal? (30 August AP)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback. Due to the input received, we have decided to exclude this proposed metric from Version 1.0.
31.31: on Avg # of Reg's per Registrar and Number of Reg's by largest registrar, Number of Registrars doing X Creates each period: John McCormac -HosterStats.com:1. Big registrars will tend to dominate the market. This isn't really control. (30 August AP)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback. Due to the input received, we have decided to exclude this proposed metric from Version 1.0. We have already shortlisted more appropriate metrics such as market share and HHI.

32) Category AF: Additional Proposed Marketplace Stability Metrics

Issue/Suggestion/Recommendation	Status	Comments/Disposition
32.1 "The stability measures that look at deaccreditation would be more meaningful if they additionally looked at the number of domains under management by registrars that were deaccredited voluntarily or involuntarily to help scale the impact on the marketplace and on registrants. It goes without saying that deaccreditation of a registrar with thousands, or millions, of domains under management has a much more destabilizing effect than one with no (or few) domains under management." (RySG)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has included this in the considerations for the draft V 1.0 metrics
32.2 Relatd to the Expansion of "Deaccredited" Metrics : "It may be helpful to separate out legacy gTLDs, including .com, .net, and .org, from new gTLDs in the data as well as brand gTLDs from new gTLDs with respect to the above trust-related metrics, among other data where it might be helpful to compare legacy versus new gTLDs trends and brands vs. other new gTLD trends." (INTA)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has included this in the considerations for the draft V 1.0 metrics
32.3 (Some relevant metrics could include:) breach notices against registrars and registries; complaints by registrants; etc. (Steve DelBianco, 20 June AP)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has included this in the considerations for the draft V 1.0 metrics
32.4 Suggested revision to previously proposed metric: Survey data (from gTLD registrants, Intellectual Property holders, law enforcement and others) indicating improvement in levels of service provided by registry operators, regsistrars, and resellers (Steve DelBianco, 26 July AP, Concurrence from Olivier MJ Crépin-Leblond)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has updated the metric for category based on the discussions held with the Advisory Panel.
32.5 On Percentage breakdown of TLD by domain age & Registrars and Registries are not responsible for market instability: Mike Graham 2:First metric --Not sure how this would provide useful data.Second metric --This would be very useful, but how would we obtain "reasons" --survey I suppose? (30 AUG AP)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback. Due to the input received, we have decided to exclude this proposed metric from Version 1.0.

33) Category AG: Additional Proposed Marketplace Trust Metrics		
Issue/Suggestion/Recommendation	**Status**	**Comments/Disposition**
33.1 "Accuracy of WHOIS records is reported, broken-out by Syntax Accuracy and Operational Accuracy. There is no reporting on WHOIS complaints or WHOIS reputation and/or trust." (BC)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback. The metrics covering WHOIS Syntax Accuracy and Operational Accuracy are derived from the WHOIS ARS Project. This is denoted in the report with a link to further details available at: https://whois.icann.org/en/whoisars. ICANN has requested input from the Advisory Panel for various other complementary metrics that can be used alongside these.
33.2 "RE: trust in the marketplace, separate .com from other gTLDs." (BC)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback. Where relevant, our reporting will provide a lens across Legacy gTLDs, New gTLDs, ccTLDs, .brands, geographic gTLDs
33.3 RE: Perception of Risk: "While these metrics may sound somewhat nebulous, they can easily be measured as part of a well designed web usage survey. The problem is that some poorly designed surveys will categorise a site selling counterfeit goods as an e-commerce site so each site will need to be evaluated in its proper context. The measurement of the rate of abandonment also needs historical data. Web usage and development in a TLD is a form of trust in the TLD. The web usage in the new gTLDs is still at an early stage. (JMcC)	**Discussed**	This category definition has since been deleted based on the advise of the Advisory Panel.
33.4 RE: Number of reported cases of phishing/spam: "Spam is also an issue that affects the perception of risk. The problem with a spam metric is that it can be quite an emotive subject for those affected and the registries. A more diplomatic way of predicting this problem might be for the registries to give a percentage of discounted registrations in the gTLD but this might be commercially sensitive information. Discounting promotions do appear as a derivative pattern in registration trends. (The rate of change of the rate of change on a registrar or hoster.)"(JMcC)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback. Based on the input of the Advisory Panel, number of cases of phishing has been shortlisted as a potential marketplace stability metric.
33.5 "INTA also encourages ICANN to consider including in the Index a number of the additional trust-related metrics set out for community discussion, including in particular: (i) The geographic diversity of gTLD domain name registrants (identifying and segregating proxy registration (ii) The incidence of reported phishing, cybercrime, and malicious activity; and (iii) The incidence of abuse, including but not limited to: • The number of abuse complaints against gTLD registrars involving malicious or abusive registrations. • The number of unique second-level domain names in gTLDs that had abuse complaints filed against them. • The number of second-level domain names in gTLDs suspended for abuse." (INTA)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback. All the metrics suggested have been presented to the Advisory Panel and are to be shortlisted as potential metrics for inclusion in the version 1 report.

33.6 RE: UA, On the universal acceptance, could ICANN look at common e-mail parsing libraries for websites to see if the new gTLDs are included in these classes/modules (John McCormac - HosterStats.com:, 26 July AP)	**Discussed**	Input for the UASG: When we looked into the source code we expected common approaches and common code. What we found when we delved deeper into the code, this was not the case at all1. Very few called server side libraries for validation. Most used a Regular Expression (RegEx) to provide first line validation. But we did not find a consistent RegEx deployed. Instead, it appears as if developers would fetch a RegEx from GitHub or StackOverflow or some other source code repositoriy and then spind their own version.
33.7 Re Universal Acceptance as a Trust metric: John McCormac -HosterStats.com:It seems more like market acceptance than a trust metric.Mason Cole:I agree with John --more a measurement of utility vs. trust.John McCormac -HosterStats.com:It is still useful as it provides an insight into how acceptance is progressing.Mason Cole:If the reports can be sharpened a bit, it's something that would be informative, but I don't think itshould be a trust metric.John McCormac -HosterStats.com:include the payments and IDN scripts as a separate section as they are all acceptance indicators.Phil Buckingham:yes we need more feedback . In b) 54% seems very lowJohn McCormac -HosterStats.com:Possibly a separate section on market acceptance.Michael R Graham 2:Agree withMason, John, Phil (30 AUG AP)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback. Due to the input received, we have decided to exclude this proposed metric from Version 1.0.
33.8 re: Reasons for Registry and Registrar Terminations: Jim Prendergast:failure to pay fees is typically one of the reasonsJohn McCormac -HosterStats.com:2 seems like an easy metric for ICANN to generate with existing data.Michael R Graham 2:@Mukesh --Thanks, explanation good.Are explanations standardized?Michael Graham:Second metric --Yes.Mason Cole:I'm not sure it applies to LEAs and IP specifically, but it's a useful metric. (30 AUG AP)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback and has updated the metric for category based on the discussions held with the Advisory Panel.

34) Category AH: Support for Metrics Proposed in gTLD Marketplace Health Index (Beta)

Issue/Suggestion/Recommendation	Status	Comments/Disposition
34.1 "We welcome consideration of the following topics that were raised by the BC in January 2016: [*metrics suggested in other categories are reported elsewhere in this document*] Number of reported cases of phishing Incidence of cybercrime Incidence of abuse: – Number of abuse complaints against gTLD registrars involving malicious or abusive registrations – Number of unique second-level domain names in gTLDs that had abuse complaints filed against them – Number of times a response was made to a report of abuse." (BC)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback. After discussions with the Advisory Panel, additional metrics have been recommended for inclusion into the Draft version 1 schema, including some of those cited here. The consultant assessing this draft Version 1.0 schema will also have the opportunity to indicate whether any other metrics may have been missed.
34.2 "Despite not commenting earlier about the topics below, we note their inclusion in the Beta report and support the development of metrics for these items as helpful additions to the Index: [*metrics supported in other categories are summarized under those category headings*] Number of gTLD registrar security breaches reported to ICANN • Number of complaints reported to ICANN regarding misleading information from gTLD registrars and resellers • Number of compliance issues with gTLD registry services detected by ICANN SLA monitoring system" (BC)	**Discussed**	ICANN appreciates this feedback. After discussions with the Advisory Panel, additional metrics have been recommended for inclusion into the Draft version 1 schema, including some of those cited here. The consultant assessing this draft Version 1.0 schema will also have the opportunity to indicate whether any other metrics may have been missed.