In row 25 of our comment analysis table, there’s this from the USG:

We recommend inclusion of several specific additional measures that will facilitate the evaluation of whether the expansion of gTLDs has improved consumer trust:

| USG comment | WG response |
| --- | --- |
| Relative incidence of complaints received by ICANN involving the new gTLDs, as well as for existing TLDs; | The WG recommended several types of public complaints received by ICANN, with respect to both new and existing gTLDs.  1. Proposed metrics include cybersquatting complaints, whether by UDRP or URS. We also proposed measuring decisions against registrants that arise from UDRP and URS complaints. For these metrics we proposed that new gTLDs should have relative complaint incidence that is lower than for legacy gTLDs during the same year.  2. We proposed an additional metric to assess complaints filed with ICANN by Law Enforcement Agencies and Governments, regarding failure of new gTLD registries to comply with applicable national laws.  3. We proposed a metric for “Quantity and relative incidence of detected phishing sites using new gTLDs” and suggest that this measure be less than for legacy gTLDs.  4. We proposed a metric for “Quantity and relative incidence of complaints regarding inaccurate, invalid, or suspect WHOIS records in new gTLD”, and suggest that this measure be less than for legacy gTLDs.  Given the above metrics, the WG believes we have already addressed this comment. |
| Quantity and relative incidence of mal ware sites in the new gTLDs, as well as for existing TLDs; | The WG recommended metrics for two specific types of malware, and suggested that new gTLDs should have lower relative incidence than legacy gTLDs:  “Quantity and relative incidence of Domain Takedowns”  “Quantity and relative incidence of detected phishing sites using new gTLDs” as reported by Anti-Phishing Working Group.  The WG asks whether there are other instances of malware other than phishing fraud and those that result in takedowns. If so, these could be additional metrics. |
| Quantity and relative incidence of domain names in new gTLDs used in botnets, as well as for existing TLDs; | The WG agrees that a metric should be added for relative incidence of botnets in new and legacy gTLDs.  “Quantity and relative incidence of detected botnet sites using new gTLDs”  Government and law enforcement authorities could be very helpful in providing data on botnet frequency, since there is no obvious source of information on this metric.  We assume that the target for new gTLDs would be lower relative incidence than legacy gTLDs. |
| Quantity and relative incidence of domain names in the new gTLDs associated with identity theft, as well as for existing TLDs; | The WG agrees that a metric should be added for relative incidence of identity theft in new and legacy gTLDs.  “Quantity and relative incidence of sites found to be dealing or distributing identities and account information used in identity fraud.”  Government and law enforcement authorities could be very helpful in providing data on identity fraud, since there is no obvious source of information on this metric.  We assume that the target for new gTLDs would be lower relative incidence than legacy gTLDs. |
| Quantity and relative incidence of domain names in the new gTLDs associated with spam, as well as for existing TLDs; | The WG recommended a metric for spam, and suggested that new gTLDs should have lower relative incidence than legacy gTLDs:  “Quantity of spam received by a "honeypot" email address in each new gTLD”  The WG assumed that this data could be obtained from SpamHaus. Suggestions for other data sources are welcome. |
| Quantity and relative incidence of breach notices, suspensions, and terminations related to legal misconduct of officers of new gTLD registry operators, as well as for existing TLDs; | The WG recommended XX metrics for breach notices  We assume that any “legal misconduct of officers” for a registry would generate a notice for breach of contract. [Check this with ICANN legal] |
| Quantity and relative incidence of security breaches in new gTLDs, as well as for existing TLDs; and | The WG recommendations did not include an explicit metric for data security breaches. However, the WG recommended this metric that would include any data security breach that violates national laws:  “Quantity of Compliance Concerns w/r/t Applicable National Laws”  The WG recommends changing this metric to include security breaches that must be reported to legal authorities, although not all breaches are necessarily “compliance concerns”.  “Quantity of Compliance Concerns w/r/t Applicable National Laws, including reported data security breaches.” |
| Conducting multiple surveys of consumer confusion (rather than conducting a one-time survey as initially proposed | The WG proposed that ICANN conduct this survey of Consumers (defined as actual and potential Internet users and registrants):  “Survey of perceived consumer trust in DNS, relative to experiences before the gTLD expansion. Survey could measure experiences with malware and spam; confusion about new gTLDs”  The WG agrees that this survey should be conducted each year, and not just in the third year when targets were requested by the Board resolution. |