DURBAN – Contractual Compliance Program Update
Wednesday, July 17, 2013 – 09:30 to 11:30
ICANN – Durban, South Africa

MAGUY SERAD:	Good morning, everyone. Thank you for joining us at the Contractual Compliance Update. This is Maguy Serad speaking. So we thank everyone who has joined us also in the Adobe room, especially my team. You guys, I know it's midnight for you or 1:00 a.m., I'm not sure, but we thank you very much for supporting us and being on the call. For the team on the Adobe room, I was just informed that you will not be able to speak directly with us. So please use the Adobe room that's today managed by [Bridgett] to communicate any questions or if you have anything to say to us, but sorry we will not be hearing your voices.
	So in the room with me from the Compliance team I'm very pleased to have, I'll start with, Señor Victor Oppenheimer. And I have Shauna Royston. Shauna is a newcomer to the ICANN meeting and also she has been with us for a few months. Missing in action – will join us shortly – is Stacy Burnette.
	Our objective for this morning's meeting is really, the first part, is to provide you a general update of the activities. Also, we want to do a show-and-tell about how to submit a complaint and share with you once it's submitted what happens, provide you a brief update on some of the policy and contract changes that are happening, and a brief update on Compliance's readiness for a new gTLD. What are the efforts underway? How it's being divided and approached.

Last but not least, share with you metrics. It's one thing to collect, but it's another to share with the community. But also we hope to hear from you any input and feedback about the information you would like to hear and see from us in the future. So the first part of the session is going to be us presenting, and then we will have a Q&A, as the agenda reflects.

So can everyone hear us in the Adobe room fine? Okay. Can you guys hear us in the room? Please, join us. We don't have a large audience today. Join us around the U-table. It's the U-shaped tables. It will be cool to have more people around. I also want to always look around the table when we go to the ICANN meetings. I want to thank a Board member who has been an awesome supporter of Compliance. Let me tell you, she shares her thoughts and gives us guidance, but she's also there with us at every ICANN meeting when we present on Wednesdays, Judith. Judith, thank you very much for always being here with us.

JUDITH DUAVIT VAZQUEZ: Thank you very much. I'm honored to be here, not just as Compliance but really to represent the fair interests of the contracting parties. Thank you.

MAGUY SERAD: Okay. So some of the slides here might be a repetition for two stakeholder groups that we presented at yesterday, but I know some other members have not seen them. So bear with us, guys, when we present those. So the first update is in relation to the Year-1 Audit

Program. ICANN had communicated a few months back that it launched a three-year effort to do an audit of the contracted parties. And the objective of the audit, which was the first time ever we had done an audit of this nature, is we looked at the different provisions in the contract, put a plan together, communicated it, published it, and launched it over a three-year period.

The reason for the three-year period is to allow us to launch it gradually but also because of the volume of effort and resources required if we were to take everything in one year. So Year 1 concluded, and we are very pleased to inform the community that over 99% of all registrars collaborated and immediately remediated their findings.

If you have been keeping up with the Compliance Monthly Update, we publish a monthly update, you would have been hearing throughout the different phases how we're evolving and what's happening. In addition, we published the Year-1 Audit Program on our website. And publishing the stats of the Year-1 Audit also includes a list of which contracted parties were included in Year 1.

Just a brief idea about how Year 1 went. This pie chart is just to provide you an overview – again, the report has a lot more details, and please do refer to the report – just an overview of the percentages of number of deficiencies. We don't call the audit here a pass or fail because it's not about passing or failing. It's looking where are some of the deficiencies, and how can they be addressed. So we issued what we call Deficiencies Reports or No Deficiencies Reports. So this pie chart gives you an idea. When we first launched the audit and received over 20,000 documents over 26 languages that were reviewed and all that, you can

see the percentages of number of deficiencies. Many of these issues, as I stated on the previous slide, were fully remediated. The audit program results – again, published on the website – this slide only wants to share with the community where were some of the areas, these are like the top 10 areas, that had the most deficiencies and you see them. But I want to highlight again, those deficiencies were remediated.

Year-2 Audit is underway. The planning effort will start in a few weeks, and it will follow the same process and scope as Year 1. Again, our objective is over the three-year audit program to be able to do a baseline, to be able to do an apple to apple comparison across all the registrars and registries. So the random sample of the remaining registrars and registries will take place. And if and when we have new gTLD registries with six months of historical information, we will sample those into the pool.

The timeline: mid-August the planning and organization phase, then the pre-audit notification will go out to the members to inform them that they have been sampled to participate. They're the lucky winners to participate in the Year-2 Audit. The process will be consistent. There will be a prevention phase where the Contractual Compliance team will work directly with the contracted parties.

And if I could just share with you, Jacks who managed the program for us, he received over 2,000 e-mails at least – those are the ones at least I was copied on – on the generic Compliance audit e-mail box – and that just one sample of the collaboration and communication. We didn't even count the phone calls and the outreach activities. So this phase of prevention is really important because the objective here is to

collaborate, address any questions, bring any clarity to the topic at hand and help in resolving the deficiencies.

If and when the prevention process does not work, we don't have collaboration or progress, many of you in the room are familiar with the Compliance process. It's three strikes, and then you're out into enforcement. So the prevention process gives an opportunity of three times to collaborate and provide the information. If and when by the third notice it has not happened, we do go into enforcement. And again, in the report, we share with you that some contracted parties were terminated. There was no response, no collaboration, and that puts us in the enforcement phase which is published and is available for everyone to know what's going on and why.

Operational accomplishment: we had been sharing with the community that we've been working towards really a foundational effort for Compliance that was much needed. We had fragmented tools. We had Excel sheets. We had so many different ways to receive complaints. This effort that was communicated about a year ago, we started the consolidation of the different complaint tools we have into one. So we really now have one, we call it, Complaint Management System. This migration completed. We rolled it out in a phased approach. So the consolidation or the migration has completed, and we started to gradually add additional complaint types that were missing. Today the complaint submission is on the ICANN.org. It has more user friendly approach, a lot more information, and Shauna will be doing a show-and-tell on that.

The migration of the complaint type consisted also of bringing together the consistency and the compliance process into full automation. Enforcement was totally manually kept in the past. Now from beginning to end, the lifecycle of a complaint is maintained in one placed, is tracked – history, documentation, everything – in one location. At the end of a complaint when a complaint is closed, a pulse survey is issued because we want to make sure we have a way to receive feedback not only from the reporter or the complaint submitter but also from our contracted parties. And the objective of the pulse survey is to continue with our improvements. There is always room for improvements. We're not stopping.

We added multiple complaint submission. This was requested by the community, and Shauna will demo it. The multiple complaint submission gave the capability to the complainant or the reporter to have their information still kept and just submit more complaints within a complaint type so they don't have to re-enter the information. We also in this trimester – from one ICANN to the next is how we measure our accomplishments – so we had committed that by ICANN 47, we will also launch a pilot bulk complaint submission.

I have more information on that, but let's continue on the activities. Some of the activities that happen behind the scenes, many of the community members hear about it through the Monthly Update or some you don't even hear. So we hope to share with you some things that went on. One of the high-risk areas from a public interest perspective is the data that is kept and stored, referred to as Data Escrow. And in the past, for many reasons we didn't have the resources

and the capacity to really look at it intensely. We would review it based on a reactive request.

I'm very pleased to inform the community that in this past trimester with a collaboration with our vendor Iron Mountain – the scope was only with the Data Escrow with Iron Mountain which is the majority of the contracted parties – and with the collaboration of the registrars, we launched a review of the Data Escrow to ensure that not only it's being loaded properly but it's being loaded according to the specification. So it was conducted, and the results have been worked through. There were opportunities or misinterpretations or misunderstanding. Many, many, many of the registrars are in compliance in that space, and the few areas that we are still following up on require some system changes or remediations that will take time. But everyone that we are working with at this point is collaborating and helping us address this.

Another area that was very important to the community member is the Asia-Pacific region. And the reason it was important because we had heard different concerns, but from a compliance perspective one of the metrics that we look at is the metric of volume of complaints. We wanted to keep it to a very simple measure. We didn't want to put it in relation to this or that. Just very simply, where is the volume of complaints coming from, and what are those complaints about? And we identified these as opportunities to conduct what we call outreach activities.

The outreach activities, as you can see on the slide – I'm not going to read it to you – focused on many different areas. And we have staff within the compliance team if you have been keeping up with our

resource ramp up, on the Compliance team we are 15 fulltime employees. We cover eight languages – and when I say cover eight languages, it's not a language we took in high school or in college. We are from the region, from the culture – from it.

So when we are speaking within this language, we are speaking with the understanding and the nuance of that area. And it makes a world of difference because we can communicate in English all day long; how we hear it and translate it in our head is different sometimes. So these sessions were conducted in the languages needed for the sessions, and collaboration was amazing. Now what's going to be interesting to see is, is the metric going to show more compliance in these areas? We're trying to see if there's any correlation there. But all I can assure the community is that these topics here have been worked on, shared with these registrars, whether at a regional level or one registrar at a time.

So a little bit more information about bulk WHOIS Inaccuracy Complaint. We all know WHOIS inaccuracy is one of the hot topics at ICANN. We've heard of the Expert Working Group and different discussions at different forums. All I can say is that submitting a complaint and ensuring that the WHOIS inaccuracy has been followed up and followed through by the contracted party is really our objective.

So bulk or no bulk, it's about a complaint. Bulk does add a concern because not only to Compliance but also to the contracted party it brings a whole different level of volume. Whereas a submitter in the past would submit one complaint at a time, now we've gone to multiple, now we are piloting what is referred to as bulk. Bulk existed in the past, and was only provided to one individual organization, but it

was not really put properly. It did not have all the production needs. It did not align with the compliance process. It did not have the right validations to follow.

So I don't know if you guys can see this chart. The most important thing I want to highlight is that the users – let me get back to the slide here. So it's a three-month pilot that we started on the 10th of July, and currently we have three users in the pilot – two from the security industry and one from brand protection. I have displayed in parentheses who they are, and this is in parallel if you are submitting a single complaint today you have the option to tell us who you are or remain anonymous. The same thing with bulk. We've asked the same question, and this is the answer we have.

So how does bulk work? Basically, these three reporters or three users are uploading a file through a different login system, and they are only allowed to upload 100 complaints per week. We are really restricting the scope of this to ensure quality, to ensure operational readiness for it, but also to allow us to measure how is this working.

So once a week, if they submit less than 100, it's received; over 100, we only take the first 100. The most important message in this is that it is not a system of its own. These complaints are then merged into the Compliance management system tool. They go through the same validation and checks. If a complaint has been submitted in less the 45 days, it's not submitted back to the registrar. So we look at it from a different perspective. The most important thing is we want to make sure we are forwarding on complaints to the contracted parties that are valid.

At the end of this pilot, we will be assessing what is the next step for bulk based on the feedback not only from the reporters but also from the contracted parties. We're not just going to wait until the end of the third month to do that. We are monitoring this all the time, and on a monthly basis we will be providing updates in our Monthly Update as needed to share with the community. There is one other element here that a reporter to submit a complaint through the bulk will have to agree to terms of use. The terms of use are attached in the Appendix for your reference. I'm not going to put them up here. But we welcome any input and feedback on this from each and every one of you.

This slide here gives you comparison of what was and what is. Again, gradual rollout, we will look and panelize, which will include a suspension or revocation of access. If we are not receiving valid, good complaints, that access to bulk is going to be suspended or taken, and not just access to bulk. We will also stop that reporter from submitting through the single complaint because if there's an issue, it needs to be corrected. With that, I'm going to turn it to Shauna.

SHAUNA ROYSTON: Thank you. Good morning, everyone. I'm here to share with you about the Complaint Management System. We've provided you screenshots from slides 37 to 42. So should you need additional references, please feel free to refer as I'm going along through the presentation. Here is a screenshot of the Complaint Submission landing page. The new Complaint Submission landing page can be found on the ICANN.org website under Resources, Compliance, and then select the Complaint Submission.

MAGUY SERAD: Oh, you know what? I'm sorry.

SHAUNA ROYSTON: That's okay.

MAGUY SERAD: I have to be on the network. What happened here? Sorry about that. Where is my network?

SHAUNA ROYSTON: Can we just go on Firefox? Just open up a new – yeah.

MAGUY SERAD: But I need to be on the network. I got disconnected. Sorry, Shauna.

SHAUNA ROYSTON: That's okay.

MAGUY SERAD: How do you get on the network from here?

SHAUNA ROYSTON: Sorry about that, guys.

MAGUY SERAD: Okay, you know what? Sorry about that.

SHAUNA ROYSTON: That's okay. We can just move if you want.

MAGUY SERAD: Where is the – do we have tech support in the room?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: While you're dealing with the network thing, maybe you could take a few questions on the slides you've presented so far.

MAGUY SERAD: Yeah. While we're waiting on tech support, if you don't mind I would like to continue to the next set of the presentation. Shauna, you can do it towards later. So let me just get back into here, and who's next here? It's Initiatives. All right. Do you want me to drive the slides for you, Stacy?

STACY BURNETTE: Good morning, and welcome to our session on Contractual Compliance. My name is Stacy Burnette. The Contractual Compliance team is responsible for enforcing ICANN policies and ICANN's contracts concerning ICANN accredited registrars and registries. And ICANN has recently adopted the Expired Registration Recovery Policy, the 2013 RAA, and the new gTLD agreement.

                         And so today, I am going to give you a summary of some of the new requirements that registrars will be responsible for complying with concerning the Expired Registration Recovery Policy. In addition, I will give you a summary of the dates that registrars are required to comply

EN

with new provisions contained in the 2013 RAA. And my colleague Victor Oppenheimer will give you a summary of some of the things that we are doing in preparation of enforcing the new gTLD agreement. Next slide, please.

So the Expired Registration Recovery Policy was established to provide some minimum communication requirements that registrars must comply with in terms of informing registrants about the expiration of domain names. It's also intended to align registrant expectations with registrar policies and practices.

Next slide, please. So here we've presented a summary of some of the major changes concerning the Expired Registration Recovery Policy. And so there are some new publication requirements that require registrars to publish their renewal and redemption fees on their websites in their registration agreements by way of a link or the actual terms concerning their renewal fees and redemption fees if that particular registrar does not operate a website. And then these fees also have to be displayed on registrars' resellers' websites.

Another major change concerning this policy requires registrars to give notice concerning expiration dates for domain names, and that was a prior policy under the Expired Domain Deletion Policy. However, there are time periods that are part of the new requirement, meaning one month before expiration registrars must give notice to registrant's that their domain name is about to expire, and then one week before the expiration of the domain name registrars have to give registrants notice of the expiration. And if the domain name is not renewed in five days or the domain name hasn't been deleted by the registrar, then the

registrar must give the registrant notice that the domain name has expired and directions for renewing the domain name.

Also, another new requirement concerns the interruption of the DNS resolution path so that a registrant is aware that something is going wrong with this domain name because their registrar has interrupted the resolution path. And if the registrant for some reason didn't receive the renewal notices or just ignored them, now they know something's wrong with the domain name because it no longer resolves to the place that they requested. And also, there's a required Redemption Grace Period that registries must have, and during that Redemption Grace Period they have to include information in the WHOIS that the domain name is in the Redemption Grace Period. Next slide, please.

Concerning the 2013 RAA, there are certain provisions that become effective either on the date of signing or if there's language in the 2013 RAA that says that the whole agreement becomes effective on a different date from the signing, because it's my understanding that the registrars that recently signed the 2013 RAA although they signed it just a few days ago, the contract states that it becomes effective sometime in August. I think it's August 1st.

But anyway, on the effective date of the contract, registrars become obligated to enter into agreements with all of their resellers. They also have to comply with new WHOIS formatting requirements. They also must publish certain information on their websites and provide certain information to ICANN pursuant to the information specification. And some of the new requirements concerning publication on their websites includes publication of officers' full names, contact information and the

position of officers, as well as the ultimate parent entity of a registrar if that's applicable for that registrar.

Also, another requirement that becomes effective immediately is that registrars have to give ICANN notice in seven days of a bankruptcy, convictions of the registrar or the registrar's officers, and notice of security breaches. The new agreement also includes additional reasons for a suspension and termination. That becomes effective upon the effective date of the agreement. And then a CEO certification, that's a new provision that requires registrars to have an officer, their CEO preferably, certify that the registrar is in compliance with all of the provisions contained in the agreement.

So other provisions of the 2013 RAA become effective in January 2014. And the reason for that is because ICANN and the registrar community acknowledge that certain provisions require some major operational changes for registrars, and so they needed time to prepare for that. So the provisions that become effective in January 2014 include the abuse contact requirements, the description of a customer service handling process that registrars must make available to registrants, that registrars and resellers must provide a link to the registrant benefits and responsibilities document, the requirements of the WHOIS Accuracy Program Specification, the Data Retention Specification, and the Additional Registrar Operation Specification, which concerns compliance with DNSSEC, IDN, and IPv6 requirements, and then the WHOIS Service Level Agreement that registrars have committed to, and then compliance with the privacy and proxy registration program. It's my understanding that program hasn't been completed yet, but upon

completion registrars and their resellers must comply with whatever requirements that go along with that program.

So that's the summary. We have additional slides that explain some of this information in-depth. If you want to get a copy of our entire presentation, it will be available online after this session. And you can always contact the Compliance department if you have questions. And look on our website; we have information about different things all the time, and we have a Monthly Update that we explain things in. So thank you, and I'm going to turn it over to Victor now, or is it Shauna? Victor.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I'm sorry. There are a couple questions here in the chat.

MAGUY SERAD: We leave the questions until the end, please.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Okay.

MAGUY SERAD: It's because we want to make sure that the audience sees everything we're presenting. Not everybody would want to stay for all the questions.

VICTOR OPPENHEIMER: So, Victor Oppenheimer, Compliance Manager. And I'd like to provide you with an overview of efforts made in preparation for the launch of

EN

the new gTLDs. I need the slide, please. Sorry about that. Oh, the first one. The previous one. Yes.

So the takeaway message from the slide is that Compliance's approach has been to design monitoring tools that are proactive, leveraging and in sometimes real-time tools, that would give us real-time data and using ICANN-wide tools in development. And as you can tell from the slide, it also includes as part of the readiness plan enhancing the Complaint Management System, designing the [inaudible] strategy, tracking new gTLD metrics, and planning outreach activities. Next, please.

Some of you might recognize the graphics in the background. It is based on Figure 1.1 of the Application Guidebook. And the message here is that our readiness plan has been aligned with the different phases of the application process. So we had a planning phase, and essentially what we did there, we took the Registry Agreement (RA) and determined what were the registry obligations. Then we evaluated which of those obligations could be the subject of proactive monitoring and which would be more suitable for an audit. That gave us the operational needs and the changes that we needed to make, and that's how we created essentially the readiness plan.

Then in the transition to the delegation phase, Compliance is going to be involved in doing the onboarding process, essentially providing sort of a Compliance 101 outreach to those applicants that had signed the Registry Agreement. And this would be of particular benefit, we think, to those new entities that are not as familiar with Compliance's informal and formal approach.

And then finally, for the delegation phase, I'm showing on this slide the automated processes that would be phased in. And the first two that would come up will be Data Escrow monitoring and Monthly Reports monitoring. But we also will develop reserve names, monitoring of the wildcard redirection prohibition, and the [daily zone] file transfer for [inaudible] purposes as well as the Code of Conduct reports that we should receive every January of each year.

And so what I'd like to talk about on this slide is the different new gTLD complaints that would be rolled out. On the left side are public complaints. In other words, the left side are public complaints; the right side are internal complaints that would be generated based on our monitoring. Talking about the left side, the new gTLD complaints, we would have reserve names, abuse contact data, code of conduct, complaints within the Sunrise period, complaints about dispute resolution processes, and that will be much like the UDRP process that we have right now where we enforced the decision made as applicable, and the code of conduct.

And in terms of an internal complaint, well, you can see there again they go hand-in-hand with the monitoring tools that we're building as we speak. And I should say that's my slide but I just want to reiterate that those complaints will follow our current one-two-three complaints model.

MAGUY SERAD: Thank you, Victor. Before we do the show-and-tell, I wanted to share with you an overview of the Compliance metrics. And we also have provided for your reference later year-to-date metrics in the Appendix.

You hear us talk about the prevention process, one-two-three. That's the only slide you'll see here because enforcement is published; this is not published. What we're sharing with you is important because from the last meeting, from April through June, this is the volume of complaints that were received.

But what I want to share with this audience is how many complaints are being closed before a first notice. Those complaints are closed for many reasons. Some of them get resolved or we address some immediately. Some of them are not valid complaints; we send them back. But the important thing is that there is that filter up front so we are not sending bad reports to the contracted parties. And also the fact that we have upgraded our systems through this new Complaint Management System, there are a lot of FAQs and a lot of things available to the community and reduce some of this, so we're able to refer the complainant to them.

Notice in the first notice, the volume of complaints that were sent to the contracted parties. But the better message in this slide now is look at the collaboration effort. By the time we reach a second notice, and even better a third notice, this shows you the turnaround of tickets between the registrars and the response time. We didn't have the same tools and reporting before because it was all over the map, different systems, but the response time and the collaboration from the contracted parties, it has increased, it's there, it's attentive, I mean, it's present, it's happening. Whereas, when I first came onboard about two years ago, no one took Compliance seriously, only every now and then, and we would end up with thousands of tickets even in third notice. So the story here is good.

The next few slides might be a little bit of an eye chart for the audience in the room because the projection is a little different than what I'm seeing at the screen, but what we wanted to show you here is different Compliance operations score card.

On MyICANN.org, there is a Compliance tab that Fadi announced at the last ICANN meeting. The metrics on that tab are reflect now up-to-date for the past 12 months and reflect what we call general data. That is available to you to look at it and look what type of complaints, the volumes, and all that. Operational Dashboard will not be on MyICANN because that's operational for us to examine how it's going, what's happening in that space. But it also is a reflection of our staff. We look at it by staff, by complaint – dissect it by different things.

What we can share with the audience is also one of the measures we have is turnaround time and staff turnaround time. Why do we measure those? We want to – again, this only reflects June. All the complaint tools now have been migrated as of June. We started a phased approach, but this dashboard is only reflective of June because that's when everybody is on the same system and we could really do this measure. So this gives you an idea how long it takes, and you will relate more to the different phases when Shauna does the presentation.

This shows a bit about the trending, but it also shows by complaint type and it gives you a percentage or of the volume of complaints across the five continents. This here puts it in perspective to new, processed, and closed complaints. It's a lot of operational stats that we look at to help us with resource management, but also eventually as we continue to measure this, help us identify additional opportunities maybe for

automation, for training, whatever might be but again, continuous improvement on this.

The circle here, again, just shows a trend of closure rate before first notice. So I'm going to go back. Shauna, you're going to present while I bring this up.

SHAUNA ROYSTON: Hello, everyone. Let's try this again. This is Shauna Royston for the record. I'm going to do a quick demo. I know many of you have a lot of questions, so I will do my best to go through this very quickly. As I mentioned before, before we can discuss about the operational side of the house, we will start with the reporter side as to filing the complaint. Now that we have migrated all of the FAQs onto one page, I will go ahead and show you first. We go to Resources. Then we go to Compliance. And now we go to the Complaint Submission section.

As you can see, as Maguy said in some previous sessions before, that many of these complaint types now have been translated into all of the six U.N. languages, just to give you a quick preview, as you can see here. So for those that were interested in the WHOIS Inaccuracy, they can learn more in the appropriate language that they're in. So going back.

So now the fun begins. We will go ahead and actually submit a WHOIS Inaccuracy complaint. All right. So as Maguy had mentioned before regarding the multiple submission, I will first have to actually start with the first submission. So I will go ahead and type out here. And as you can see here, there is an option if you choose to elect you can be

anonymous or not by checking the checkbox here. So I can do that. I will go ahead and type in the CAPTCHA and go to the next page.

VICTOR OPPENHEIMER: You're missing the Y.

SHAUNA ROYSTON: Am I missing a letter here? Yes, thank you, Victor. It might help if I can actually read the CAPTCHA. All right. So, okay, I'm going to go ahead and choose just some random specific registrant data. I will go ahead and select "no such person or entity." And for purposes of time, I will go ahead and hit "Submit." So from here, if I do want to submit multiple complaints at this time, I can choose to stop or "click here to submit another." As you can see here, we have basic validation rules set on the particular fields, but as you can see, the contact information remains here for the next submission. I won't go through the process again just due to time.

All right, moving on. So now I will actually go to the operational side of the house, which is our Compliance system for review and process. So now that we've actually submitted the complaint, the ticket will have gone to the complaint system for review and process by staff. Here is an extract of the staff homepage which are able to view tickets by complaint type or by ticket status. Due to confidentiality of staff names and obviously for other reasons, we have shown you here just an example of test data.

Maguy, next slide, please. As we continue for purposes as we showed you earlier with the WHOIS Inaccuracy, we will continue by showing you

on the left-hand side of the navigation bar, this shows an illustration by complaint type with the various queues that the ticket may go through, through the ticket lifecycle. All the queues seen here are consistent across all of the complaint types. So as you can see, we've constantly mentioned about consistency, efficiency of ticket processing. This would go through all of the various different complaint types.

Maguy, next slide, please. So assuming that the ticket has been reviewed and considered valid, we would now illustrate here an example of a first notice to the registrar. It may be a bit hard to see, but we have the domain history, the reporter history, and audit log tabs circled in red. These were some of the points that I wanted to highlight with all of you to share with you that the domain history and reporter tabs contain historical data, but the audit log is probably one of the most important things for us on the operational side because it actually is the key piece for all of the key communications with the recipient. So all of the back and forth that happens once we click, send, or we receive communications either by the reporter or the registrar or registry, all of that is tracked and monitored through the system.

In addition to, that I wouldn't like to highlight but it is in your slides for references later, you will see that the subject line is consistent throughout all complaint types. So as we process these complaints in going through the various notices, the subject line will begin with ICANN, the status of notice, the type of complaint, the registrar name, their IANA ID, and the domain name being reported.

So as we communicate with the registrar or registry at this point, what happens next? I will keep it short, so what I would like to highlight here

is that many of the registrars what we have some difficulty with is that we would hope that we would like to ask for the registrars or the registries to please reply back directly to the ticket. Sometimes the tickets have forwarding messages with correspondence with a registrant. So for expediting and quicker processing, it would be very helpful for us if the registrars or registries could reply directly back to the ticket. Then at that point if the ticket can be closed, it will then be closed and a closure notice e-mail will be sent out both to the reporter and the registrar or registry. If not, it will continue through the ticket process and continue through the enforcement review.

Next slide, please. Last but not least, as I mentioned, Maguy has also discussed about the pulse survey. On the left-hand side, you will see questions that go out to the reporter. On the right-hand side, the questions get sent out to the registrar or registry. These pulse surveys, the numbers are reported to the public but not the content. The feedback that we receive from all of you is for our internal processing use as well as for process improvement for staff as well as internal other processes. The two questions on both the reporter and the registrar/registry, the most critical question we like for all of you to answer is the "Overall, how do you rate the complaint experience?" or "How do you rate the complaint submission experience?" This is a very valuable tool and very helpful for us as we continue to move forward in creating new updates and patches for releases to our complaint system. And that is it.

MAGUY SERAD: Thank you, Shauna. With that, we will start the question and answer phase. So if I may start, [Bridgett] do you have question in the queue? What I'd like to do is alternate one from the queue, one from the audience.

[BRIDGETT BENMOSCHE]:   The first question is from Barbara Knight of VeriSign. On slide seven, you indicated that three registry complaint types have been added. What are they?

VICTOR OPPENHEIMER: The three types are Zone File Access, Reserve Names, and Service Level Agreement.

MAGUY SERAD: Anyone from the room with a question? Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZOOK: Jonathan Zook from the Association for Competitive Technology. I don't know if this is on, but I rarely need a microphone. I might have missed this, but have you thought about creating a kind of a bug that would sit on the website of registry or the registrar that would pre-populate the complaint form with the information about the institution about which the complaint is being filed so that's another pathway. Instead of coming and starting from scratch on a form, is it possible? I mean, it would be pretty easy to do. It would require a lot of people agreeing to let you do it, I guess in a way, but if they had a button on their website

that if you have a complaint it could pre-populate the information and it would ensure more accuracy, etc., in the submission of the complaint.

MAGUY SERAD: Thank you, Jonathan. It's a good feedback. I saw Victor noted, so I don't have an answer for that.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Do you mind if I respond to that as a registrar? Jonathan, I can see a massive problem with that. I understand exactly what you're asking for. I can see ICANN Compliance getting requests for e-mail passwords and logins. You have to realize that you may understand what a domain name is and what a WHOIS complaint is. Think about your mother. She probably doesn't. I mean, we get the most bizarre questions in our support desk, and I really don't think you want to have them going to their support desk.

JONATHAN ZOOK: And I think that's a really valid point, and I don't know the answer to this question. That's why I'm just posing it. But one solution to that might be what screen you place that button on so that if it was something related to a domain transfer, which my mother doesn't do very frequently for example, then having a button there would be more likely a more savvy question that would be recognized that it was a complaint and dealing with a more technical issue than "I've lost my password."

And again, I'm not even asking you to definitively answer the question. We actually submitted as the IPC and the CSG a whole list of possible enhancements to the interface of this, and I don't know what the resolution of that was. I'd be curious what made it in, what didn't, and why, if this was a good idea, bad idea, etc. And as you say, this may be a bad idea, but I'd love to see it investigated further to address the issue of the undereducated complainant, certainly.

But I also wanted to say generally I'm really impressed with the level of categorization and turning this into a database and a real system. I mean, I think the Compliance department really deserves a lot of credit for taking this out of what was really the Dark Ages technologically. I mean, the very first meeting I had with them on this I asked how this information was stored, and it was all just a series of e-mails in Outlook folders. And at the very least, you deserve an incredible amount of credit for taking it out of that world and moving it into this century. And I appreciate that because I think that will make a lot of opportunities for understanding better what those workflows are, how remediation might be improved, etc. So I'm very excited about the progress that has been made here and have high hopes for the future.

MAGUY SERAD: Jonathan, I know you have an amazing voice. I've heard you at music night. If I did have that voice, I would sing to you something now. But to address the point you made earlier – first of all, thank you very much for acknowledging the progress the team has made. It has been a journey. We're not finished.

EN

So if I may address the list that the IPC – and I thank you because you led that effort – when we tapped into the different constituencies or stakeholder teams: What do you expect from Compliance? What would be your needs? We still have the list. The way we prioritized it based on how can we become more transparent first because we really needed to become operational. So by pulling all the tools together under one roof was our priority. Multiple complaints ranked high I remember on your list. And I'm sorry, the list is still available. We're not ignoring it, but the focus, as you heard in the previous update from Stacy, we have policy changes, new gTLD, 2013 RAA. We want to be ready for that. Once we do that, then we'll come back to the list.

[BRIDGETT BENMOSCHE]: The second question from the Adobe room is from Desiree B. of APlus.net. Will there be a development grace period for those registrars who sign the 2013 RAA after 1/1/2014?

STACY BURNETTE: No, unless some other decisions are made, but as far as I know now, if you sign the RAA after January 2014, those provisions are effective immediately. Is there some other information, Mike, that I should know about?

MIKE ZUPKE: So this is Mike Zupke, ICANN Staff. Maguy gave me a look, so I thought I would come up here. But what Stacy said is absolutely correct. The one sort of point that's maybe unanswered is that a question was raised yesterday. I believe one of the registrars asked Cyrus Namazi, is it

possible that date, January 1, might change? And there wasn't a firm answer on that, and that's because I know as we were negotiating the agreement we agreed to that date, and then I think that we got to the Board approval potentially later than we thought. So there is a possibility that the January 1 date could change, but anybody who would sign the agreement after whatever that date is, they would be obligated as soon as they signed the agreement.

MAGUY SERAD: Thank you, Stacy, and thank you, Mike. And guys, what you're seeing here is exactly what we want this forum to be: engaging the different stakeholders, even engaging our cross-functional teams within ICANN. Mike Zupke, as you heard, he has always been in the Registrar Liaison team, but now with the creation of the new division that Fadi announced with Akram and Cyrus they're putting a lot of focus on upfront work and focus on the contracts, contracted parties, and outreach, and all these activities. And we've partnered and we are partnered with them from before but now even stronger to make these efforts. I know we have Chris Chaplow in the room. Did you have a question?

CHRIS CHAPLOW: Yes, thank you. And thank you for demonstrating those new forms, which are obviously a huge improvement on the old Internet form. I've just got a couple of quick questions and comments. Just checking that the Internet form has now been stood down. And seeing all the different sections, I was wondering whether an "Other" section might be a good idea because when you actually come to try and do

something, often you can't find your thing is something different. Does it generate a ticket number, and do you get an autoresponse? And is there any opportunity on the form – or there doesn't seem to be opportunity to add attached documents.

MAGUY SERAD: So, Chris, you asked multiple questions. I'm going to start to address some, and I may need Shauna to help with the rest. So the first question, what ICANN focused for this form, you know, our scope is Contractual Compliance. InterNIC serves a bigger scope than just Compliance. One of the areas InterNIC was used was to submit complaints. So those complaints no longer are on InterNIC. It's ICANN.org. So that's what we call the ICANN-facing complaint management tool. The next question you asked about correspondence and follow up and follow through with the reporter. So I'd like Shauna to address that.

SHAUNA ROYSTON: So I'll start with the first question you had asked regarding the ticket number. Yes, if it is a valid complaint, what generally happens is when the ticket is submitted it will come into the system and generate a ticket number. What then happens is you will receive an autoresponse to actually verify that you are actually reporting the WHOIS Inaccuracy complaint. If it is not responsive within five days, the ticket will auto-close. If not, it will then come back into the system and generate and move through the ticket queue. And then that is where the staff will have to continue to review and process the ticket. So that's how that's

done. And I believe your third question, I'm sorry, if you could repeat that, please.

CHRIS CHAPLOW: One was a suggestion to look into an "Other" section, and the actual question was about how would one attach a document to the complaint, like a Word document or something.

SHAUNA ROYSTON: At this time, we do not. We could definitely note that down as suggestion. Thank you.

[BRIDGETT BENMOSCHE]: We have another question from Desiree B. from APlus.net. What does ICANN see as the benefit to allowing anonymous submissions?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: So a few years back, community members expressed an interest in not informing registrars of their e-mail addresses or who they are because there was some concern by certain reporters that registrars for some reason might not provide information in response to a complaint filed by a particular reporter because that reporter was a frequent reporter. And so there was an interest by community members in remaining anonymous when they submit WHOIS Inaccuracy complaints.

MAGUY SERAD: Judith?

JUDITH DUAVIT VAZQUEZ: When we tabulate the complaints, do we segregate what are the anonymous complaints from the legitimate and named complaints? Because I suggest that we do this.

MAGUY SERAD: Thank you for the question. Let me make sure I understood the question. Anonymous or not, we capture the information. It's what goes out to the registrar that reflects it. The complaint validation, review, and process applies consistent across all. So if it's a bad reporter, anonymous or not, we capture it upfront and we manage it the same way. Did I answer your question?

JUDITH DUAVIT VAZQUEZ: No, it doesn't. When we report the total number of complaints, I think to be fair we should say how many are anonymous and how many are named complaints because an anonymous complaint is like spam for me.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Judith, I think you misunderstood what ICANN means by anonymous. It's anonymous in the sense that the registrar who receives the report does not know who the complainant is, but ICANN has the data.

JUDITH DUAVIT VAZQUEZ: Okay, so ICANN knows who.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes, ICANN knows who it is. Now some of the registrars happen to have concerns around this, and I'm not going to speak to that. But I think it was just you misunderstood what they mean by anonymous. ICANN does know. The registrars have concerns that of you constantly have bad quality complaints coming in from people who want to hide behind this kind of anonymous thing, then that needs to be addressed. In their new system, I think they can. And if they don't, Maguy and her team knows damn well that I will make her life a living hell on behalf of my members.

MAGUY SERAD: One of many people in the community who makes our life hell, but it's a pleasure to have a hell life with you guys because you tell us the facts, we work with you, and we deliver. Don't just complain without facts.

JUDITH DUAVIT VAZQUEZ: Actually, the reason why I bring this up is be even the Board receives anonymous letters. [inaudible] We are opening up to the rest of the world as ICANN, and you'd be surprised that even the Board receives anonymously signed letters. And the question at the highest level is how do we conduct ourselves as listening to the rest of the world, which is only the reason why I brought this up. I'm so glad with the answer. Thank you.

MAGUY SERAD: So we'll take one from the Adobe room. And I know I'm starting to have a queue here.

[BRIDGETT BENMOSCHE]:   There's a follow up question, actually, from Desiree B. The first question, again that Stacy answered, what does ICANN see as the benefit to allowing anonymous submissions? Desiree's follow up question to that is, "But isn't it ICANN's job to ensure all complaints are responded to?"

MAGUY SERAD: So I think, Desiree, if you heard us and heard me clearly, it is anonymous to the registrar. ICANN has the information and validates any and all complaints in the same way. Steve.

STEVE METALITZ: Thank you. Steve Metalitz from the Intellectual Property Constituency. First, I'd just like to agree with what Jonathan said about the remarkable changes that we've seen in the Compliance function. Thank you.

My question has to do with the list of RAA 2013 effective dates. Stacy, you listed that on the privacy and proxy you referenced the provisions in the agreement that say you have to comply with the ICANN program, and the ICANN program is, you know, a work in process. But there is an interim specification on privacy and proxy.

For example, requirement that the proxy services – I'm paraphrasing here – the proxy services associated with the registrar or with the reseller have to publish their policies about revealing and relaying and so forth. When does that come into force, or when are registrars required to comply with that interim specification? Is that January 1, or is that sooner, or do you?

[STACY BURNETTE]:   I don't know off the top of my head, but what I can do is send you an e-mail with that information because I can look it up in five minutes. Maybe I'll find it in two minutes, and we can open it back up and I'll share it.

STEVE METALITZ: That's fine. I just wanted to make sure that was not, I mean…

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [Volker] can probably answer that, Steve.

STEVE METALITZ: Pardon?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [Volker] can probably answer that because he was on the negotiating team.

STEVE METALITZ: Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Regarding the starting date, if I recall correctly that also starts from January 1. But just to correct you on one point, reseller offered services are not encompassed by that clause. It's only those services offered by resellers that are a registrar product. So if the registrar offers it to its resellers, then it's encompassed; if it's a reseller-owned product, then it's not in. I wanted to get to a second point, a question that popped

into my head when the previous one regarding the anonymous complaints was raised. Does ICANN track the quality level differences between anonymous and non-anonymous complaints? i.e., have you seen any differences in the quality of reports between the anonymous reports and the non-anonymous reports?

MAGUY SERAD: We do not track that distinction. We track quality of reports but not if it's anonymous or not because from where we're looking at it, it is a complaint and we have all the data. Is there a need to track that difference?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It just would be interesting in if the anonymous function is abused in any way or what gets people there. It's just something that's interesting to us because we as registrars with an anonymous complaint can no longer track who is the reporter, and therefore we receive more complaints that are anonymous that are BS or more complaints that are good that have the name of the reporter in there. And that having been asked, I'm very happy with the way that Compliance handling of reports, pre-checking of reports has changed. We are seeing a lot less reports for the same names over and over again, and we're seeing a lot less BS complaints.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Just following up on this thing around the anonymous tracking, several of our members have voiced concerns specifically on this topic, so if you were able to provide some metrics at a future date, then it could

actually either kill off the complaints or it could be that you can kind of go, "Well, actually, yes. There's validity in the concern." It might just help both sides here if we knew are the anonymous complaints being abused to hell or are they legitimate.

MAGUY SERAD: Okay. We will take that request. I'm not sure of the difficulty of putting that metric, like I stated earlier, but I'll take it back and Paul Redmond who is the Director for Operations – you know him – he will let me know.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you very much. That will be helpful.

WAYNE DIAMOND: Hi. Wayne Diamond, registrar. Is it not a moot point regarding the anonymous complaints because as a registrar signing the agreement we are obliged to respond to your complaints in a means where you are happy with the responses? So theoretically, anyone who thinks that the registrar is not going to answer their complaint because they are abusing it won't in effect happen because we're obliged to respond to yourselves and not to the actual complainant. Therefore, we should actually be able to receive who the complainant is because we are obliged to respond to you and not to the complainant.

MAGUY SERAD: So, Wayne, thank you for your statement. That's what Stacy answered earlier. It was deployed for I came here, so I don't have the history. But

DURBAN
NO.47 - 14-18 JULY 2013   ICANN

the only statement is what Stacy had shared. Responding to a complaint, you're right. It happens today regardless. That's why I wanted to share with the community the metric that showed the amazing improvement in the response times and the collaboration. So I don't have an answer to the statement, but it's a valid statement. I don't have an answer for it.

[BRIDGETT BENMOSCHE]: We have a question from a [Luc Sufer]. I apologize if I'm mispronouncing the name. Is there an ETA on when only substantiated complaints will be considered as valid? Just asserting one's details are inaccurate should not be considered as a valid complaint. The rules for reporting an inaccuracy and proving the contrary should be the same.

MAGUY SERAD: [Bonjour, Luc. Comment vas tu? Je sais bien ce que tu parlez prendre.] So, [Bridgett] can you repeat it? It was a long question from Luc.

[BRIDGETT BENMOSCHE]: Any ETA on when only substantiated complaints will be considered as valid? Just asserting one's details are inaccurate should not be considered as a valid complaint. The rules for reporting an inaccuracy and proving the contrary should be the same.

MAGUY SERAD: So I'm trying to find the slide here. You are correct, and we are doing that today. The validation at ticket creation is about also additional stuff, not just invalid complaint, but domain status, non-duplicates, valid

gTLDs. So we do have several rules to validate by. Slide 11 once it's published gives a sample of those rules. Questions in the audience? Stacy.

STACY BURNETTE: Hi. I'd like to follow up on Steve Metalitz' question about the implementation of the privacy proxy registration requirements for registrars. And the specification states that until the earlier to occur – which is January 1, 2017 and the date ICANN establishes this privacy proxy accreditation program – registrars are required to comply with the exceptions that you talked about. And that starts beginning January 1, 2014. So that's consistent what was said earlier.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Well, just as a follow up to Luc's question maybe, it would be helpful if we also required the complainant to provide some form of evidence to substantiate this complaint. For example, when he says that he has received a non-delivery failure, he should provide a scan of that or something like that. In those cases, such things as the latest [inaudible] report could have been avoided if all the reporters had been required to provide just that documentation that he now attaches to his report which no one has seen before. I don't know if any of the domain names that he complained about were ours, but seeing such evidence when the complaint is brought would help determine if the complaint was valid or not, and that's just something that might be added to the requirements of bringing of complaint.

STEVE METALITZ: Following up on that, I was actually going to ask a question on that slide. I think it was the bulk submission pilot. And you make a reference to ticket quality, and I wasn't sure what that actually referred to. But I am kind of concerned about all these suggestions that we make it harder for people to file complaints and they have to scan something or if an address is obviously bogus how do they prove that or what is require to make that a valid complaint? I'm concerned about these efforts to restrict this, and if this becomes a review of ticket quality, there's no review of ticket quality now on the left-hand side there, and then it says "outreach to submitters." Could you talk a little bit about what ticket quality is and what you're doing on it?

MAGUY SERAD: So I want to appease your concern. And Compliance is neutral. We're listening to all the feedback. And when we speak of ticket quality, sometimes we receive a complaint about a non-valid gTLD. So in the past before a Compliance review, any and all tickets were just pushed down. So if you look at it from an operational perspective, we're bombarding with non-valuable tickets. We're not doing a quality or a QA check. That's an example. Another example, it could be the domain status, so that determines if there's no need to follow through on it. So this is what's intended by ticket quality. And in addition to that, when we receive complaints sometimes to your point, Steve, some addresses are very obvious – Mickey Mouse House, you know. Actually, I prefer Goofy. But some addresses are not unless you are familiar with the environment.

That's why we have the diverse team. Some of the addresses received from the Asia-Pacific region, some of our staff look at it and they can tell if it's valid or not because they're familiar. I can look at addresses from different regions of the world and can tell. So we look at it. We do that initial scan, and if it's not fact-based, we ask for information. Otherwise, we do depend on the registrar to get it corrected and addressed. So it's not complicating. It's stuff that really needs to be happening in any process or any service you provide, otherwise everybody is going to be looking at non-value out there.

STEVE METALITZ: If I could respond. I totally agree with you. Those are totally legitimate as far as not being an existing TLD. I'm just concerned that it may not be obvious. I mean, the whole idea of this is to submit complaints to the registrar and get a response, so I hope that data quality doesn't become a method of screening that.

The other side of it, of course, is that in terms of a response when invalid WHOIS data is flagged and a complainant says this is invalid and the report comes back, the data has been changed. Well, that to me is not a satisfactory response because we don't know if that data is any more valid than the old data. Now I understand that is going to change under the 2013 RAA, so hopefully that will take care of that. But until that kicks in, I think that remains a problem.

MAGUY SERAD: [Bridgett], any questions from the room? Any questions in the audience? Yes, I'm sorry. I saw you earlier. Yes, sir.

RICH PETERSON: Yes, Rich Peterson from Dyn. I believe I have a question, but I just want to make sure I have my facts correct. There was a slide that demonstrated or broke down the percentage of registrars that receive complaints by region. Can we pull up that slide?

MAGUY SERAD: Let me know when I reach that point.

RICH PETERSON: I think that's it.

MAGUY SERAD: Actually, we have a much better one in the Appendix if you want it by region. We give it by even domain registration and all that. Have you seen this one?

RICH PETERSON: No, I haven't.

MAGUY SERAD: You have not followed us at previous ICANN meetings.

RICH PETERSON: This is only my third meeting.

MAGUY SERAD: Do you want me to go back to the previous one?

RICH PETERSON: No, it's fine. I just noticed that it seems like there is a large disparity in the complaints.

MAGUY SERAD: So if I may explain the slide to you, the legends are down here on the bottom, if I can get – whoops! What happened? Okay. So it's the five ICANN continents. The first, the top part, is the domain volume. The next box is number of complaints for the region, number of registrars in the region, registrars with complaints, and then we do the percentage. What we're seeing if you go back to some of the previous presentations that are currently published, the interesting trend we're seeing is that one region now in the past that used to be the number one from a volume perspective of complaints was Asia-Pacific.

Now we're seeing, again it's per domain registration, this is only a formula where it gets more complicated than some of the other metrics we have. We see that Latin-America is now leading with complaint volume. So we're looking at what shift has happened, which areas, and in the next trimester we'll focus in that area. So do you have a question on specific for the region?

RICH PETERSON: Yes. Well, with the exception of Africa which seems to really be on the ball here, it looks like the non-English regions have a significantly higher level of complaints. And my question to you is, do you believe that's representative that there are language barrier issues or a need for education or outreach to these regions?

MAGUY SERAD: Yes and yes.

RICH PETERSON: Okay.

MAGUY SERAD: So, like I said, we did an outreach – we have been, not just now – in the Asia-Pacific region. Even though it's not a big drop, it's good to see there is a drop. We would be more concerned if there is an increase. We're not able to though put that correlation yet from a metrics perspective because the domain name industry is changing, the audience is changing. We've got users. So we hope that we are on the comment system, which is truly effective. This June when everybody was on, all the complaint types on one system. We're going to start to see how is that trending. What is happening in that space. And we'll bring more data here, and we'll be able to share with you what is it we're discovering. But if you have any other ideas or knowledge, please let us know.

RICH PETERSON: All right. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZOOK: So I don't know if you ever saw the movie "Shawshank Redemption."

MAGUY SERAD: No, I have not.

JONATHAN ZOOK: It's one of my favorite movies. And there's this prisoner, and he wants to establish a library in the prison. And he's having trouble being heard about it, and so he writes a letter every month to the governor about "donate books for a library." And he writes every month, every month, every month, "donate books for a library." And then one day, a bunch of boxes of books arrive, and he has what he wants. So then he starts writing letters every week, right? To really get what he wants, if it makes sense.

And so I just want to contextualize my own aggressive engagement with Compliance in the same way, which is again to say that I'm very excited about how this stuff has been turned into data and that I really want to see the next step which is to define objectives associated with metrics where there might be areas for improvement and then plans for improvement so that the success of those plans – and this is an ICANN-wide problem. And I actually see Compliance, because so much can be reduced to numbers in Compliance, as being the best opportunity to be a showcase for the whole organization of what managing to objectives might look like.

So I would really love to see the next step, which is to say now that we've seen some of the data, where do we look to improve? What are our plans to improve? And then later on, did those plans work and if not, what's the new plan? And to manage to those numbers that way would be very exciting.

MAGUY SERAD: So I'm not familiar with the movie, but I'm familiar with your approach. I have not only received boxes of e-mails and discussions with Jonathan,

for the audience, but no, I do appreciate your comment, Jonathan and you know [inaudible] direction. But what I'd like to ask is if you have specific ideas in mind. You've seen some of the metrics. We would engage with you just to make sure we capture the expectations and the ideas that you're thinking about. Because we can be working on something, and if it's not what you're thinking about, we will have a disconnect always. Maybe after the ICANN meeting, Paul and I can have a conference call with you like we had in the past and just discuss it further.

JONATHAN ZOOK: And I need to go through these in detail to make recommendations, but I don't pretend that I have the answers. It's more of a process that I'm talking about.

MAGUY SERAD: Absolutely.

JONATHAN ZOOK: I trust your analysis of what needs improvement better than mine. It's a question of measuring those improvements, that's all.

MAGUY SERAD: Absolutely. And I think as we stated yesterday in the IPC meeting, this is the beginning. And to your point, what is the goal of capturing this data, and how can it be measured and improved upon with the data? So we want to start capturing it and evolving it, baselining it and see where is

the improvement for the process, operations, and all that – and even number of complaints.

JONATHAN ZOOK: I mean, a perfect example – and this is where my ignorance could be a problem because I don't even know if it's in the remit of the Compliance department – but WHOIS data accuracy is something that comes up a lot. And this data that begins to help to reveal what the baselines are for accuracy, the number of complaints around it, you could set as an objective to cut the number of complaints about WHOIS data accuracy or something, or as a percentage, cut them in half.

But I don't know if it's even in the remit to the Compliance department to decrease the number of complaints. I mean, that may not even be a way that you're allowed to think about the world, right? But that's the kind of thing that I mean is that once you see this data, set an objective to change that information, and that's a very obvious one is to change the number of complaints.

One of the things you've mentioned is putting a new emphasis on prevention and education. I would love to see how you intend to measure the success of those efforts. What metrics do you think you will try to track that might somehow be correlates to those efforts at prevention and what effect they might have had on those numbers so that we know that if education and prevention is, in fact, better than the harsh hammer of enforcement. We would like it to be the answer, right?

I think emotionally it feels better, but do we know if it's more effective or not is only a function of the metrics we track and the changes over time that we track to determine that. So those are some of the kinds of examples that I'm talking about.   And the feedback I also look at from you is which of those things are you allowed to treat that way, and I don't know the answer to that.

MAGUY SERAD: Your closure statement is very valid. The WHOIS Inaccuracy improvement by 50%, I think it was the WHOIS Review Team's recommendation in the report. And when we as staff are asked to respond to the recommendations – and it went in front of the Board also – it is not in the scope of the contract or Contractual Compliance, the WHOIS Inaccuracy. What's in scope is that we enforce what the contract is saying, which says that it's the registrar's responsibility to take reasonable steps to correct, and that's directly with the registrant. And I wish some of our registrars are still in here because they can talk more to it, but I can tell you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

MAGUY SERAD: No, they won't. But I know with the new RAA, there are a lot of different efforts underway. But there are also different discussions about how can that be improved. But it's about also we will continue to fail not only your expectation but the ICANN community's expectation if

they do not frame us in the contract scope. That's what we are. What's in the contract is what we can measure and what we can report on.

JONATHAN ZOOK: And so that may be a question of – and I don't mean to dominate if anybody else wants to talk – but that may be a question of how you phrase the question, right? I mean, if there's a WHOIS accuracy complaint and the complaint is resolved, is the information checked afterward to see if it became accurate, for example? And if that's the case, then you can measure responsiveness to WHOIS Inaccuracy complaints and track the delta of that over time to see if your efforts of enforcement and prevention are improving that.

So again, I look to you for guidance to me about what kinds of areas are within your remit to try and improve. Which of these metrics are things that you think it is your job to improve and which aren't is very useful information that I don't necessarily know, or I might be able to help suss out logically, but then the plan is to try and improve them so that we know if that worked. I guess that's where I'm coming from. Again, it's process not specifics that I specifically want to see this resolved. I would love to see that process.

MAGUY SERAD: Okay, I heard. Thank you very much.

JONATHAN ZOOK: And then I guess my very last question was related to – now maybe I've forgotten it.

MAGUY SERAD: [Bridgett] anyone from the room? Anybody else in the audience? Any more questions? I didn't get a chance to thank the team that left. I didn't want to interrupt everyone, but we really, really want to thank everyone, and I know this is being recorded. What we hoped to accomplish in this forum is bring everybody under one roof because it's not just about Contractual Compliance stuff. It's about the community. It's about the registrars, the registries, registrants, public. And hearing the questions in one area or over the line, and as you noticed earlier we had people responding. It's not only us responding. That's really important because it gives an appreciation to where the source of the question is coming from, but also it gives an appreciation on the receiving end so that we can all understand and balance what we're trying to do as a community.

Last but not least, Mary English from Iron Mountain was not here earlier when I presented data escrow. I want to officially thank you. I thanked the effort and spoke about the effort we launched. I want to thank you for your partnership in making this effort successful with ICANN. Now the last thank you is not only to my staff who's on the line, on the phone, in the room, but to [Bridgett] also for being our Adobe room manager. We appreciate your partnership with us. Okay, guys, let's go have some more fun. Have a great rest of the day.

[END OF AUDIO]