TORONTO – Contractual Compliance – Performance Measurement and Application Update
Wednesday, October 17, 2012 – 14:00 to 15:15
ICANN - Toronto, Canada

MALE: This is Wednesday, October 17th, 2:00 PM local time in Toronto and this is a meeting of the Contractual Compliance Working Group.

MAGUY SERAD: So while we're waiting, I would like to make some introductions in the room here. First of all, I've got an amazing staff team joining us. Again I apologize for the delay in starting, we always start on time, and just technical setup was not completed. So with me from the Contractual Compliance Team I have Pam Little, if you would raise your hand so we know who you are please. I have Paul Redmond, I have Jacks Khawaja, Atif Beg, Victor Oppenheimer, Sumi Lee, and Leticia Castillo.

Several of the team members are new to ICANN, therefore they still have the green tag and this is their first meeting. Then before continuing, I'd also like to recognize one of our board members who has been an amazing supporter and follower of Contractual Compliance, Judith Vazquez. I would like to also introduce the VP of IT, Ed Beck. I keep reminding Ed we're his only and favorite customers but of course I'm competing for his services like everybody is at ICANN.

With Ed, who always saves our lives is David Closson with us in the back, thank you David. We're ready. Alright. For the audience on Adobe and on the Bridge, we apologize again for the delay. Some of the technical set up was not completed. Thanks for joining us this afternoon. We are presenting two sessions and since joining ICANN we started this in the car, we tried to have different compliance sessions on Wednesday afternoon and a lot of the people now are accustomed to that.

We hope to bring to the ICANN communities specific and more focuses updates to some of the topics and the activities in compliance. This afternoon the first topic will be the performance measurement and deporting update and a live demo of one of the business intelligence tools that is still in prototype and evaluation but we wanted to show you where we are and what we're working towards. Next slide please.

If you've heard me and followed us in the different stakeholder meetings, this should look familiar to everyone. Our three year plan. The second part, the 2012 plan, we've committed that we'd be working towards system enhancements that align with the process and building global metrics. That's what the session this afternoon is about. Next slide.

This process approach and the general approach for our compliance activities is the common language now for all of us in the ICANN community when it comes to contractual compliance activities. We aligned all complaint types, processing, in this process regardless of registry or registrar. When we go through what we call the 1-2-3 Process, I would like to remind everyone in the audience that when we are in the informal resolution it's always between us and the contracted party.

It's that professional courtesy we have with the contracted party to work through and come to a resolution or clarification of whatever complaint we are dealing with. If that's not obtained, then we will breach. A breach notice is the first time the community is made aware of an issue with a specific contracted party. A breach notice is published and it's updated based on the status of the breach.

What we hope to accomplish through this process which we did alignment of all the complaint type processing and now merging into the next level of our activities.

With that, I'd like to turn it over to Paul to take you through an update on our tools and I know it's probably a lot of details. I would like to propose that we hold the questions until the end; we will allocate time for questions and we will stay a little extra to accommodate the lost time we had earlier. Paul?

PAUL REDMOND: My name is Paul Redmond, let me just get to it. We've been after four areas to work on. The first one will be real quick. We've stood up a document repository so this is for internal use to keep track of our documents, templates, processes, and etc. The whole team is engaged in this one. This also has some future for perhaps archive of some of the documents.

Let me go into what we've done with the system side. The column on the left, the bridge gap solution, that's exactly what we've done basically over the summer. We've taken the old existing systems and we've updated them to meet the business requirements of this 1-2-3 notification process. Some of them were simple and some of them were a little more complicated. It took us longer than we hoped but the idea is that now we've set the stage, we've aligned for the most part the who-is ticket, the transfer, the major complaint type activity into the 1-2-3 process. That will make the migration to the next phase of this much more simpler which is the one compliance tool.

That effort has already started; we are trying to do several things with this, first and foremost, to improve the user experience. Hold that thought, I've got a slide that will show you what we have up our sleeve. I'll talk about a little bit more about of follow through and follow up, our abilities to track the tickets much more systematically, in the past it was basically we got a ticket and it was logged into the ticketing system; most of the effort from that point was done in Excel and email.

Now we're trying to bring it into the ticketing systems and now we want to consolidate and put it all into one so it's all under one process mechanism and we can go after it a little more holistically. That allows us the scalability to one, get ready for the gTLD effort but also it will be a little more proactive working through this and handling additional enhancements that we have planned.

This is a picture of what the current environment is and where we're going to the future. Again, I've got different input mechanisms that we've received the complaints from the community, which goes into different tracking systems that we then process separately with a heavy sprinkle of email and Excel files. What we're trying to get to is that box on the right, that future, which is all in one complaint tracking mechanism.

We base it a little bit more on accepting processes; throw in a lot more automation along the way to make it easier for us to process the volume of activity. If you look at the circle on the bottom, the two yellow boxes, the web input and the email. We still recognize that that is our inputs into this but we definitely want to make some improvements to that. Email I don't think, email will be there, but what can we do on that website to make it a little bit easier.

Then actually we have some other ideas I want to solicit your ideas on. This sort of paints the picture of where we are trying to get to. How do we do that? Again, improve the user experience, multiple complaints, we want to add that to the list, registry, new gTLD capabilities, and the long term vision of this especially if you've heard what Fadia has talked about with my ICANN, this is some ideas that we were tossing around, through my ICANN portal, perhaps, if we can get the security setup, that this is something you can go in and look at your own tickets. That's not here, that's the long term vision of where we want to go but we have to get these first phases working first and then that's something we can look forward to stretching.

This is, remember, to improve the interface, I'm quite sure this is good old internet, you've seen this. It's very easy to find what the issue is and information about it. We want to try and change this. We want to bring this into, I'll call it the ICANN Model, this is sort of a concept, and not a picture of anything but this is what we're talking about changing it to. Bring it under the ICANN.org or something, and then we have more of a matrix, a table view. This is a way to organize the topics that we can help you with.

Then there's the column of "Learn More" because a lot of the stuff is educational, it's FAQ type answers, and then there's the "Take Action" column. For the power users that want to go straight to the point where they know exactly what they want to do and submit a complaint, here's where you go. If you don't, if you're the general public and you want to know more information about this, here's a way you can look at the category, you can drill down, go to the next page, if you look at what I have for domain name to the right it's says the main name with the arrow, that will take you to another page with a list of things about domain names.

You can go through and choose; hopefully one of those is what you're looking for. So [there will be] sort of some type of hierarchy mechanism; two or three levels deep just to make it a little bit simpler than what this page looks like.

With this, one of the things that we'd like to do, we process about 500 tickets a month that we respond basically with an FAQ response. If we can take those complaints out, put them up front, and prove the FAQs, make it easier for the general public to submit, or before they submit questions to find the information they're looking for, we can try to reduce some of the tickets coming through. This is again, the concept we're trying to go through, we've got meetings in a week to start figuring out how we want to play this into the systems.

Let me make one comment here on this. I'd love to hear feedback. If you can send me feedback by next Friday, we've got an email at the end of the section you can send that to. Send me your thoughts; I'd love to hear what you've got because I'm trying to make the internet page much easier to understand. That's the goal. Let me go into the metrics. What we're trying to do is, we have a whole bunch of data about all of these complain types, what can we do to mine that, turn it into some nuggets of information that we can then improve performance and improve contractual compliance performance.

One page here talks a little about how we put it together and then we'll get into the demo. We can have multiple input sources, in my case; I have a lot of different ticketing systems. We take that data and summarize it into what we call a data mart. It's a small database. We're not keeping operational data. This is what the ticketing system is for, the complaint systems are for. So we're summarizing it at the right level here. That allows us to build what we call the cube. Think of it as a Rubik's Cube. You put the data in there and you can turn it around, look at it, spin it, and you can have your ah-ha moment by looking at that type of data. From that, we present. We have it on the PCs for staff to look at, we can cut and paste.

Some of you may have seen the metrics that we presented before at the global meetings. When I first came on board it took me a few weeks to go and put in all of that data manually, try to build it in Excel and then put it together. We've now started collecting the data; it's in the tool and in four hours I've built all the decks. It's just going through, finding the metrics, cutting and pasting, and putting it in PowerPoint. So from a couple of weeks or longer to a couple of hours, that's a nice productivity improvement, plus I'm sure more consistent on how I'm calculating the data.

Speaking of data, we have a few metrics. We started in May and with about three metrics, and we're almost up to 50 metrics. Let me talk about this column on the right called "Dimensions". The metric is a number; it's a value. Today's the 17th but until you put information around that number 17, it makes no sense. It could be a date; it could be the number of registrars, the number of complaints, or whatever.

The ideas of these dimensions explain and make reference to that value. It makes sense. Today's the 17th; there are 17 people in the meeting, whatever. What we've done by combining this dimensional data with it, registrars, TLDs, dates, complaint types, with this volume we can now start building this Rubik's Cube of data. Now once we understand those connection points, what's common, we can start pivoting each other's piece of information and that's how we can build this multi-dimensional data base.

As we go through the data, just a couple of things to look for. What we've built is a homepage which is public data. It's a lot of information and again, this is compliance focus. We also have two dashboards behind this that is for ICANN internal use. That will have individual registrar information about that. We're not going to show that; not here.

I've got a mock up that I'll show to illustrate what we have here. While you're looking at the demo, look how we can slice and dice this information. I've got charts, I've got tables, I've got text, I've got different pieces of information that we can display along the way. One of the things that we use in the terminology here is the ability to drill down. I can start at the high level and I go down a level and I keep drilling down until I get to my ah-ha moment.

So I've now figured out what I want to go and look at. Now what we're trying to do is make that an actionable metric. Now I've got five of these. I know it's five, now what do I do with it. This last bullet, we've made it where it's actionable, we will link back to those five tickets, those five complaints that generated that and we can now then go and research those tickets, do the root cause, understand with its trend, what's going on and what caused that.

So that gives us that ability to take it to a very high level, slice and dice, get down to that piece of information we're looking for and then go reference back to the details if we need it to understand the root cause of this. That to me is the closed loop cycle of what we've put together here that enables us to take all of this high level data and go back down to the details to figure out what to do with it. With that let me switch over to the demo.

This is the homepage for the Contractual dashboard so you can see we've got a map, we've got some buttons here to push. I have simple things; what's a list of the registrars, what's a list of the registries. I have global domain count. I have global domain count by TLD. Anybody interested? What's the breakdown, the ICANN regions of the world; Europe, North America, etc.; TLD by total, by grand total. So very quickly we can start looking at that.

Here's a geographical map representation so let me pick on Europe here. This is a percentage of registrars with complaints. You take the public address of the registrar with all the complaints and let's do a simple calculation of how many complaints we're getting from that area. In this case, in Europe it's 52%. If I click on that, here are the countries, the number of registrars in that country, the number of complaints, number of percent of registrars with complaints, because not everybody has a complaint filed against them. We also have the domain count size so we can try and get those ratios of going, if you have a lot of domains but you have very few complaints, is that the right ratio? If you have a lot of complaints but your domain count is high, well then maybe that's a good indicator that you've just had a lot of volume and it's an appropriate percentage of what you have.

Let me scroll down, I'm sorry about the awkwardness of this. It really does look nice on the laptop. We talked about the notification cycles. We did not get the WHOIS tickets loaded in time. I just got that update an hour ago so it's not on the laptop. This is only what we call the c-ticket, or the consumer, the transfer; those types of complaints. This gives you some idea of the number of tickets that we've processed versus received because remember we had tickets, complaints from last month that we're s till processing as we go through the cycle. But in this case, in September, we had 1266 new tickets.

We can try to see how many red tickets, here the red, we closed 788 tickets before we sent it out. We looked at it, we did our thing with it, and we analyzed it and said it's closed. It could be as simple as the FAQs or it could be something that's not a good complaint, we're going to basically close it and that's it. Then you can see the volume that we're sending through the first, second, and third motives and the volumes closed. If I go click on this I can drill down a little bit more and again, here's that geography spin on it; the amount of the complaints that we processed by region, how many we received and it goes through all of those notice cues all over again.

[background conversation]

PAUL REDMOND: Yes. There wasn't a good way to describe that but that's what it is. It's because we're actually processing it. If you think about it, if the time is short enough, you can hit a ticket in the first and the second notice cue in one month cycle or if it's split; you get the ticket on the 25th and you don't hit it until the next phase until the 5th of the next month. We'll have a lot of tickets that will span so it's hard to get a, you can't add up this and go, "Ah-ha you have this many tickets."

It's a rolling cycle every day. This give you that comparison, this is what I'm trying to show you here, between July, August, and September, how many complaints we processed through all of this. I just can't get that to scroll nicely, there we go. You can get some idea of the volume of complaints that we were processing excluding WHOIS tickets.

Let's go over here and take a look at "Enforcement". Remember this is our global page, it's public information, enforcement activity is public. From here, I can take a look and show you. This is the number of breaches or suspensions that we sent out. If I scroll down here, and we get it just right with this chart that's a little bit, I don't think I can make it smaller on here, or any bigger on here. Sorry, but what we have here on the left and I know you can't read it, but these are all of the breach notices and then up here on the columns are the registrars.

The color coding is green; the breach has been cured, red has been terminated, and this one different tan color is an activity right now. This is current as of last Friday. So, this is a nice graphic representation if we can make it bigger it would look better in the presentation, I'm sorry, but it's a nice way for us to show and this is the activity for these last four months.

Let's look at complaints by TLD. Here, when IANA issues the TLDs they issue them in rounds, or that's what I was told by that team. We've grouped it based on what they've given me. With the pre-ICANN 2000 and 2004 round. Now, you're going to see "unknown" here for both the TLD and the region. I have complaint tickets that are consumer based, they're not specific to a registrar, and they literally are unknown. That's a valid item here. It's the level of ticket; it did not get that far to be specified to a specific registrar or region.

Here you can look at see what the volume is by TLD round, when they were issued, how many complaints we have, and you can also look at it a little bit lower here by the TLD type. You can see how we're doing by the actual TLD itself by region. I think this sets the stage as we add new TLDs. I have another column so now I can start cross-referencing the complaints to the different TLD rounds. This gives us the ability to I think grow with the new gTLD as they start bringing in the complaints.

Let me show you the registrar and registry. Now this is the stuff I can't show you, real data, but I do have a mock up so I'm going to show you that so you can get an idea of what we have behind it. This is a dummy demo registrar. I clicked on this and I'm running a PDF. Again, I ran a PDF from my intelligence tool, which is sort of nice, I can combine things; I can run Excel if I wanted to. From the registrar dashboard, same idea, I got a geographical map when I'm trying to understand those percentages across the globe, tasks that I want to look up, complaints by TLD, trending, turnaround time, remember that first bottom page, the notifications, I can look at it here. I repeat the list of registrars because I don't want to go back to the homepage to find a registrar name.

We also have the registrar's score card. I can build this report card for an individual registrar. This is demo name A, so here I've got how is the business response time doing, I've got an overall count on how many complaints, the trend of that, the percentage and type of complaints, and you'll see who is leading the pack. I can list the number of complaints by TLD, along with the domain size. I got that ratio again down here at the bottom of the number of complaints, the domain size, so we can have that ratio for comparison. We can generate this based on an individual registrar. I also have a spot for enforcement so if you had a breach notice it would show up here, but we have no data for this one.

If we go back up here, Maggie likes top 25, so we build a button bar just for that. What's in the top 25? We have the top 25 complaints, the top 25 registrars by TLD, top 25 registrars who-is, top 25 registrar transfer complaints, UDRP complaints. We can track and give you; we have a list of who has the most activity going on with these areas.

[background conversation]

PAUL REDMOND: No.

MALE: Hello, all participants, when you please ask a question can you please state your name and the question for record on microphone so that people on the audio can hear you? Thank you.

PAUL REDMOND: So that's for the registrar and now for the registry, again we have that same map idea. We have a similar score card that we can build for the registry and we have certain items that are, you have a SLA component of that one, so let me pick on who-is availability and with that, you can see, I don't know if you can see where the mouse is on the far left, this name that I'm circling, that's just registry but in the real world it will list the registry names and you can see how they did for this one particular SLA.

If you notice what I have highlighted as the misc. vessel, you'll see a little red box around this one, so this one item for who-is availability for that month was a miss. Very quickly you can see the power of the tool where once we give certain threshold values, if it's go below that, we can flag it so it's more visible to go look at and then we can pass it on to the team for analysis. I think that's all I have for the registry.

That was a whirlwind tour through our compliance tool of what we're trying to put together from the metrics piece.

MAGUY SERAD: This is Maguy Serad for the record. As we are closing for the presentation and we're going to open up for Q and A, what I would like to say is all of this material will be uploaded to the compliance website under “Outreach”. We’ve been keeping track of all that, I don’t know if you guys have visited our website and we will put a link to the presentation to give you material to go back and look at because the tool is not open for everybody. We did PDF slides of the tool that you saw here today. With that, I’m going to start facilitating the questions if you’d like. Like Jack said, state your name and your question and we’ll take it.

JOE WALDRON: Joe Waldron from VeriSign. Just a point I think is when you’re getting some of this data I think it would be helpful if you had it documented either in the tool where that was readily available, I’m interested to know where you’re getting the domain name counts and how you’re doing the geographic break down of those. I’m assuming you’re getting that from the registry reports, and it’s important to note that the data is going to be three months delayed.

PAUL REDMOND: Yes, we made sure of that one, this is what’s public. I wasn’t about to confuse that and have an accident. This is public data.

MAGUY SERAD: It’s a good comment, I’ve captured it. That data source so when this information is available, when we start producing and putting updates more in our newsletter, I will add some of those. Good idea.

PAUL REDMOND: Let me make one comment. As you start looking into some of this, the count of registrars, if I register (inaudible), we had one that was terminated, I still have complaint tickets. I still have to remember he was there a year ago or whenever that incident was. You just can't look at that and go, "Ugh, this is the number today." You have to go back in time, remember, I still have complaints that were outstanding from him that we went through the cycles, we actually followed up and terminated him, but I still have him listed in the system as a registrar somewhere. Next.

JONATHAN ZUCK: This is Jonathan Zuck from the Association for Competitive Technology. Thanks a lot for the demo, appreciate it. I just have some curiosity questions I guess which is, is this off the shelf or largely off the shelf solution for compliance management or are you guys building this from the ground up? Is it an incremental change from the system you had in place before, what's the underlying technology?

PAUL REDMOND: This is an off the shelf product. It's a business intelligence reporting tool that we've had prior experience with so we've used that. The purpose of this prototype was for us to get our hands, not necessarily on the tool, but the information we're trying to put together for the business to use. Now then, Ed is here, VP of IT, he's going to help us take this to the next level. This is still a prototype, I have a lot of data in it but with Ed's help, we're going to take it to a more permanent platform rather than on our PC's that we're crunching this. It is a standard off the shelf project.

JONATHAN ZUCK: And the more permanent platform will be that same off the shelf product, you made a decision to use that?

PAUL REDMOND: No.

JONATHAN ZUCK: You just used an off the shelf for the prototype?

PAUL REDMOND: We built it for the prototype, yes. Ed's coming to provide some consulting with us on what direction to go.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Ok, I just had an understanding from you earlier that at this point you would have done an evaluation of tools that you thought you would use going forward.

MAGUY SERAD: Right, you're right, you understood correctly. That was in the absence of the VP of IT. Since his arrival about a month ago there are a lot of efforts underway to put through an enterprise solution strategy because this tool is really needed across the entire ICANN community, not just staff. Ed's been tasked to look at that, so we've held back on going to production, you're right Jonathon. He's got good memory. Did that answer your question on that?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes.

MAGUY SERAD: Bret?

BRET FAUSETT: Bret from Internet Pro. I had two questions. On the slide that was caption proposed complaining, you had six model complaints that people could put in. I wondered whether that was, that's the one, is that a set of examples or is that a complete list?

PAUL REDMOND: This was just a mock up, just an example. We tried to build it based on the existing help page of ICANN.org because if you look at that they've tried to condense that first list. This was our attempt at that first list of what should be the more popular complaints or a more generic compliant. Behind this would be a cascade of more details.

BRET FAUSETT: Is this the kind of thing you'd be interested in hearing feedback from?

PAUL REDMOND: Absolutely.

BRET FAUSETT: Okay, I'll send you an email.

PAUL REDMOND: I'll also admit that I used my reporting tool to figure out the top ones.

MAGUY SERAD: If I may add to the statement for the audience, we started this dialog from day one when I got here; I've heard a lot of complaints from many stakeholder group team members. It's like Alan Greenberg from ALAC, he used to say, "This is my pet peeve, it's not user friendly, I get to the IP and the constituency, we don't like this, it's not user friendly, there's not enough types, it's not allowing us to enter multiple—"

So we listen to all of that and again, in the scheme of prioritization and as we amped up our resources and brought additional subject matter experts on board, we engage with those specific stakeholder groups. Jonathon, on behalf of the IPC was awesome to bring us the input for the whole constituency and kind of bring it into a consolidated format, prioritize so that we were able to work with something. It's hard to please every individual around the table.

We want to put the solution that's going to serve the bigger picture, the entire ICANN community. As Paul said, please send your feedback to him, it's not too late and as you saw from our plan, there's no way it's all going to be stood up by day one. We are going to migrate current to future centralized, add some validation, some automation, and there's always going to be a continuous cycle for improvement and additions.

If it doesn't happen today, we will make sure to let you know when that's happening and if not, why that's not happening. Your input, and provide Paul some input, don't send the Wall Street Journal please, or a full analysis. Bullet formats work fine. "I'm a user from this environment, my business needs are the following, and no I'd like to see this." What is the business need to you? How is this going to help you do your job better and be able to collaborate with the rest of us better? Step out of just your little silo or big silo and think, "What is the business value of this request?" This is how we're going to prioritize that request.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Hi I'm Rod Rasmussen with Internet Identity. I noted that you're planning on providing a mechanism for multiple complaint submissions, I just want to understand how that's going to affect metrics going forward, which if you have one complaint that has several complaints in it, how are you going to be treating that in the statistics because I can see people trying to gain the system based one way or the other on how you're actually going to track that kind of stuff.

PAUL REDMOND: The simple answer is we'll split it and it becomes a unique complaint.

MAGUY SERAD: In addition to that, you saw on the dashboard, we want to have that Rubik's Cube look. At the same time, we also want to become more efficient and effective. If you noted on the process map, the general approach, in the past we were doing a single ticket at a time. Our staff now is takes a complaint received or if we're having a breach or something, we identify other concerns and hit it immediately. You can't afford every time to go back to step one otherwise you're going to be circling. We will have that Rubik's Cube look by complaint or by registrar; our objective is to bring that efficiency and effectiveness to the contracted party while they're processing complaints but to the ICANN community, to the level of details needed.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Jonathon Zuck again from ACT. I don't want to derail your purpose for this meeting so tell me if this question is out of scope. You have some months of data now that you've been collecting it at a more rigorous way. I don't know if it's six months' worth of data or something like that that you're presumably using for some of these demos. I guess I feel a certain urgency in parallel to develop what seems to be a very nice system, I'm excited about the system but part of the reason it would have been great if it had existed five years ago is that we would have five years of data on which to base decisions now about where the weakness in the system lie and what needs to happen going forward in the New gTLD Program, etc.

So I guess I'm just going to ask the question whether or not the six months' worth of data, I know you don't feel comfortable about the accuracy and want to share it, but is there enough there that you've been able to form some conclusions about where the weaknesses in the compliance system lie, what needs to be fixed, where the deficiencies are in the registry and registrar agreements, have you been able to gain business intelligence that's been collected from the data that's been collected up to date and come up with a plan of action?

I've seen your plan add more staff but I haven't seen it mapped to the data that might reveal where the deficiencies are and setting some targets for what those metrics, we see a list metrics but what are reasonable expectations or aspirational goals for what those numbers will read a year into the New gTLD Program, for example?

MAGUY SERAD: So for the time being, you're right. Those metrics are very operational. We don't have the history to do deficiencies at a high level as contract related deficiencies. What we're targeting is the operational and where are the weak points and opportunities for us to work with a contracted party to improve. We've leveraged this data for the past six months and we have done several outreaches with a contracted party and with even different communities. For example, we all saw the high level of inter registrar transfer tickets. It continues to be high and thanks to this data and availability of it, without spending days of trying to get it together, we were able to sort it by region and the registrar community and Pam Little was able to hold what we call an Outreach Webinar in the month of September and it was focused on Asia-Pacific. The webinar was held in Chinese. Out of the 33 registrars in the region, we had 27 represented, 40 total. That's one. Another outreach we did prior to that one was with Who-Is, we're doing it for the education and formally getting us to address that. We're not able to tie if there's deficiency in the contract yet.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Have you been able to determine if there are deficiencies in the compliance function of ICANN? Are there things that need fixing? I don't mean to sound mean but is the data revealing, is the problem just not enough people because I know one of the things you're doing is adding people, does the data reveal that if we had more people would the numbers be better? That's what I'm sort of getting at, did you learn anything about yourselves as a result of the data and is your plan designed specifically to address that?

MAGUY SERAD: We are learning. Like I said, in 2011 when we assessed the current state, I didn't have that data. I didn't need that data to tell me what was missing. We needed to align the processes, we need to do this. We're trying to measure internally to your point, the volume of tickets. But you don't want to just add resources based on the volume of tickets. We're trying to address the issues that are causing this volume and to your point, we are learning from that and trying to do that proactive work.

The other thing we're learning is internally, where are, you know we're a data consistent process and I'm first, to be very transcendent as you know me to be, do we all follow that process consistently to that (inaudible) hour? We're still learning. There's a learning curve to get there, the tools are still fragmented.

So the short answer, yes we are learning internally but before we add resources, by 2013, we hope to stabilize all of this to truly measure the level of complaints, level of education versus resources or training. All of that is going to come together, absolutely. We will in 2013 look at the process from beginning to end. What is my turn around time from beginning to end? Where are the deficiencies in the process, or in the tools or in the resources? That's ultimately our goal Jonathon.

[ASHISH LOTRIPHOLIOUS]: I missed the first ten minutes so ignore my question if you already answered. I believe on the registrar registry section you mentioned it's only available to ICANN and the rest of it is public. Will the registries get any access to view their own TLDs as part of this dashboard? One of the slides you had was complaints by TLD by region but I didn't see on those any specifics. I've been managing abused departments at Afilias, I would like to know to see where I can improve from an audit compliance prospective as well.

MAGUY SERAD: So the short answer, it's Ashish right? The short answer is yes but we cannot open it yet, we don't have the infrastructure or security behind it. We're leveraging this internally to know how we collaborate with each contracted party as needed and are able to generate this data on a specific contracted party at a time. At the same time we are now able to generate these at a higher level so that we can provide more regular updates to the community on the different activities. Our objective is to get there. Yes. I know we're five years behind. Everybody reminds me of that every time. Any more questions?

MARK MORROW: Mark Morrow, I'm with the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. You'd mentioned you added a category of "other" in the different categories. There seems to be a lot, like 6,000 if I'm not mistaken, what do those look like? How does somebody make a complaint and not specifically address to a registrar? That seems like a high amount, does it not?

PAUL REDMOND: Yeah when we first looked it at we thought, “Oh, we missed something.” We’ve gone back and it’s because of the, we get a lot of complaints that we consider the consumer type where it’s so nebulous it’s not associated to a specific domain or a specific registrar so that account is for most of those. We actually had one error fixed. That was one where I knew the process was working because we had one registrar that wound up in that unknown, and we’re like, “Wait a minute, this should work.” We had to update his geographic location to the map and yeah.

MAGUY SERAD: Thanks for the question Mark. One of the outreaches we did, I don’t want the audience to think we’re only focusing on registrars or the contracted party, one of the things we learned from our data is based on the other and even some other valid complaint types. The complaint itself may not be correct, what we call, I don’t want to say bad reporter, but we follow the same process. Not all complaints are valid complaints but yet we do have that volume. Another activity led by Pam’s team was to identify who are these people and get back to them. All that is manual, you still need people to do that, to take a look at these things. I don’t care how much you computerize, you still need that. What we’re trying to identify is criteria is to make it computerized with a human milestone to stop and check on it to make sure the audience knows it’s not just contracted party, we’re serving the whole audience.

DESIREE BOXBERGER: Desiree Boxberger, Aplus.net. My question is for Maguy Serad. On your metrics that you're capturing, are you capturing metrics on rejected complaints by registrar or are those simply thrown out of the system and not captured?

MAGUY SERAD: Can you define rejected?

DESIREE BOXBERGER: Incomplete complaints, sent back to the complainant, I think in one of the slides the metrics addressed rejected complaints, like repeat offenders, you know that are abusing the system, that type of thing. Can you speak to what your collections on those metrics are?

MAGUY SERAD: Pam? Do you mind providing an update on the activity your team led for the bad reporter?

PAM LITTLE: We have a set of criteria we use to determine whether a ticket or complaint is valid. For example, it the context of WDPRS which is the tool for reporting inaccuracy, if there's already a complaint about the same domain and that's in process that we will void that complaint out, we will reject it and the reporter will be informed about the reason why it was rejected.

DESIREE BOXBERGER: My question is those metrics being captured? Say you have an incomplete against my registrar that's maybe rejected because it's a duplicate or incomplete, is that still counted in the metrics is what I'm asking.

PAM LITTLE: That won't be counted as a take away process, for example that will become a statistic for how many tickets we rejected, for example.

DESIREE BOXBERGER: Okay, thank you and thank you for your work on the WDPRS system. I've noticed a dramatic decrease and I would like to thank you.

PAM LITTLE: Thank you for that feedback.

BRET FAUSETT: Bret Fausett again. I had a question about the volume being closed before first notice and I assume that some complaints come into ICANN come through the compliance portal but are not appropriate for being addressed in compliance but maybe appropriate for being addressed in other parts of ICANN and that you're pushing them into a different place. I wondered if you're distinguishing between volume closed by you and maybe volume transferred to another part of ICANN.

PAUL REDMOND: What we've seen here is that those tickets are transferred to the other department and I don't believe I'm counting them in this particular count here. We don't close that ticket; we transfer it out.

MALE: You've captured any of those boxes?

PAUL REDMOND: Yeah, this read one, this 788, the volume closed before first notice. I don't have a mechanism in the existing tickets for closure code; it doesn't exist. Rather than put the effort in to trying to fix the old one, we're going to put that into the new one; the one we're working on now. I just don't even have a place to record that.

MALE: I just want to say I really appreciate this. It's well done. It's important to me that we be measured relative to each other so I appreciate that your metrics capture that, so thank you.

MAGUY SERAD: The thanks goes to Paul Redmond for his leadership. We all supported him, one hand alone cannot clap, we have an amazing team that's been supporting, but it's Paul's leadership and the support from metrics and performance measurement.

PAUL REDMOND: I take it there are no more questions then. I actually brought us eight minutes early.

MAGUY SERAD: The next session will be on audit and we're scheduled to start, let me pull up my calendar. 3:30 PM. You brought us more; we're scheduled until 3:15 PM I think. We're going to be around and take a little break if you guys have specific questions. Same room. Yes, you kidding? I'm not leaving.

[End of Transcript]