

CATEGORY: ROBUST COMPETITION

<i>Original Category Definition used as per Beta Report</i>	<i>Representative Critique from Advisory Panel</i>	<i>Revised Category Definition (as of 2017-04-20)</i>
#1: Diversity exists in the choice of a service provider, including:	-A suggestion was provided to revise this to ensure we keep into account the fact that the registrant should be at the core of the requirement for diversity.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 slop 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
#2: The commercial marketplace is thriving –demonstrated by growth in new gTLDs and 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. As others have noted, 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.
#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. We have actually four type of players in the value chain: registries, the back-end specialists of the management of TLDs at least on its technical side, registrars, and resellers.	#3: The TLD marketplace is open to new providers, including back-end technology service providers, registries, registrars, and resellers.
#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 kept this should be limited to only track changes in perception over time.	-deleted-
#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. We have actually four type of players in the value chain: registries, the back-end specialists of the management of TLDs at least on its technical side, 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 excessively controlled by a small number of providers, including back-end technology service providers, registries, registrars, and resellers.

CATEGORY: MARKETPLACE STABILITY

<i>Original Category Definition used as per Beta Report</i>	<i>Representative Critique from Advisory Panel</i>	<i>Revised Category Definition (as of 2017-04-20)</i>
<p>#1: More gTLD registrars and gTLD registry operators are entering the gTLD marketplace than are leaving.</p>	<p>-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.</p> <p>-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 -Be careful with removing - 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? I agree that this could be more of a 'robust competition'-related metric. With the recent influx of pure drop catch registars, entering and leaving the market is not really a true measurement .</p>	<p>-deleted- Interest in tracking 'supplier consolidation' possibly already covered within Robust Competition Category Definition # 4 - The TLD marketplace as a whole is not excessively controlled by a small number of providers, including back-end technology service providers, registries, registrars, and resellers.</p>
<p>#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).*</p>	<p>- 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 definition '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. 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. - I do like adding some of the compliance metrics to it. Compliance data is also readily available from ICANN. It already collects it so it is an easy win. -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 doesn't 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. -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.</p>	<p>#1: Registries and registrars consistently deliver against their contractual obligations, and do not introduce market instability through their business practices that would result in harm to registrants.</p>

CATEGORY: TRUST

<i>Original Category Definition used as per Beta Report</i>	<i>Representative Critique from Advisory Panel</i>	<i>Revised Category Definition (as of 2017-04-20)</i>
#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. '-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.	
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 registrar 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, use any email address, and use any name server regardless of the written script, length, and newness of the TLD.