LOS ANGELES – Contractual Compliance Program Updates and Q&A Session
Wednesday, October 15, 2014 – 08:30 to 09:45
ICANN – Los Angeles, USA

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:	It is October 25, Westwood room, 8:30 start for the Contractual Compliance Program updates meeting.
MAGGIE ZURRET:	Good morning everyone. It's 8:30. Thank you for joining us for an 8:30 dialog with us. I just realized we probably should have ordered coffee for this room, but I have my coffee at 5:30 and by now it's lunch time. I apologize. I'll make sure that the team reminds me to make sure there's coffee here next time.
	Thank you for joining the Contractual Compliance Session. This session is being recorded so that we can share the transcript online and upload the presentations. The intention is to have a dialogue with you, provide you an update on a lot of the activities we have, but the first activity I want to share with you, compliance does know how to have fun.
	We stopped by music night last night to upload the Tuesday meetings and this is some of the team members. I think that's quite a good-looking bunch here. All right. Here we go, Jennifer.
	So before we start, what I'd like to do is first recognize my new boss. I have Allen Grogan to my left here. Many of you know him, but we also know him and have worked with Allen for about a year and a half now so we're very happy he's not taking on a new team. We're taking on a new leader on our team so we appreciate having him as our leader now.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

But also in the audience with me, I have the LA-based Compliance Team. If you just raise your hand, I'm not going to embarrass you first thing this morning or stand up, whatever you'd prefer, but we have the LA-based team joining us. We also have, I'm sure, the Istanbul is joining us through Adobe. I know the team. And Singapore, it's a maybe because it's really late still.

So this is our Wednesday outreach session that we host for everybody. It's an open session where we bring everyone within the ICANN community to get to know compliance, we provide a general update on our activities, but mostly it's to create a dialogue between not just compliance and ICANN stakeholders but between compliance, contracted parties, IPC, ALAC, whoever's present in the audience so we can have an appreciation for the different roles and responsibilities and help address some of the questions.

So with that, I'm just going to turn to Allen. Allen, do you want to say anything this morning?

ALLEN GROGAN: So, a lot of familiar faces here. I think I've talked to a lot of you over the last few days. We're going to try to do some deeper analytics and strategic thinking about interpretation of the agreements in terms of compliance, and if any of you think there are ambiguities or differences of opinion about interpretation, I'm happy to discuss those. I'm not sure we'll always see eye to eye, but I'm happy to discuss them and see if we can reach some resolution.

I also want to think about ways that we can address some issues that may not strictly be contract breach issues, but that relate to best practices in the industry, so you'll be hearing some things from us in the coming weeks about ways we might address that.

MAGGIE ZURRET: I just noticed that Fadi's also in the room. So, guys, many of you are asking me so many questions about my new role. Some people thought it was a demotion, some people thought I'm in for a different role. The best thing is I'm doing my global leader rotation role. So I have Fadi here in the room that also joined us. Fadi do you want to…?

FADI CHEHADÉ: Good morning. Good morning to all of you. It's good to be here. I'm just a listener here more than anything. But just to echo what Maggie said, I think we have arrived at a point where the whole area of compliance and safeguards is going to take a central role in where we go forward. It is also a reaffirmation of our commitment to the global interest and to serving the public.

Having said that, we need to grow to the next stage together. Maggie is not only part of that; she is a central part of that in every way she has been. There is no change in Maggie's role. Maggie will continue to play exactly the same role with the same leadership, with the same fervor that all of you know about and commitment to what she does. Allen will simply bring an additional dimension to this discussion, which I think Maggie and I and Allen and the whole community from what we are

hearing is welcoming. That it's a good new dimension that adds to what we do already in this department.

So I urge all of you to continue discussing things with Maggie and now with Allen to understand how we shape this area together. ICANN is not a regulatory body. I said that in the opening. We are not replacing any law enforcement agencies or consumer protection agencies. This is not our job.

But it's a body that is working for you to make sure this industry continues to grow and thrive as it should. And that's our commitment. So, please consider these folks as people who represent the public interest, represent the need to have a solid industry. I spoke to leaders in our DNS industry and they're, frankly, confirming that from their perspective a solid respected global industry is better for all of us.

You saw the compliance audit results. Very impressive. And I featured them and highlighted them in my opening speech. You have me as your best advocate running around the world, telling the world we have a superb industry of committed people working hard to make sure we serve the public well and I believe that. I believe that.

I believe there are, like in any sector, some bad actors. And, fine. We will make sure we find them and we deal with them, but we have largely, by and large, we have a superb group of people. That is our starting point. That's how we think about it.

Maggie, thank you also for your continued commitment to what we're doing. It is very important and I'm counting on it. All of us are counting on it. Allen is counting on it.

When I approached Allen about helping you with this, he says, "Without Maggie and her commitment, I won't take the role." He's right next to you. He told me, "We have to be aligned. We have to be working together."

So, I look at both of you and I think we should all feel fortunate to have both of you at the helm, so good luck.

ALLEN GROGAN: I also just want to say something about Maggie's team. She's built a great team now spread around the world. They do a great job. I know a lot of you have interacted with them and just wanted to give a shout out to them, too.

MAGGIE ZURRET: Thank you very much for the shout outs. What a great way to start a day. Don't you agree guys? I feel more energetic. So you're stuck with us still. We look forward to continue to work with all of you. I really mean it and I have had a lot of hallway conversations with many people. I know it's tough. I know we challenge each other and if we do not challenge each other that means we've reached a point where we're not making improvements. So thank you in advance for your continued support everyone around this table, and not even with us in this room.

With this, the way we're going to conduct the session, we received a lot of information. People asking – they want to learn more about the compliance metrics. So what I've asked is what we call our metrics king, Paul, to show and tell his pride and joy. This is a project that Paul

launched when he joined my team and has been bringing us all in a focused way. I drive Paul crazy. His office is right next to mine. It's like, "Paul, I want to see this metric. Paul, I want to see this."

So in addition to your feedback, we've built this tool. Let us know if there's something else we're not being transparent on and we'll be more than happy to share with you.

Another feedback received – many of you wanted to learn more about the audit program, so I've got Yan Agranonik who is the manager for risk and audit for compliance who's going to be presenting that.

Then, for everyone around this table, the two subjects that are near and dear to our heart is enforcing the contractual obligations for registrars and registries. This is an opportunity to dialog. Oh man, I don't like cameras.

Q&A is open throughout the session, but I would ask for the courtesy of allowing us to cover one topic at a time and then we will discuss it more.

Before I proceed, I want to also acknowledge the KPMG team who is sitting here under Matt's leadership. The KPMG team has been our partner in delivering the audit services over the last two years, now on our third year, very good quality, they deliver on time and with quality. So I really – it's not a marketing – and everybody knows me I don't give feedback and praises unless it's earned. So I thank you in front of this whole audience for an amazing job and continued partnership.

With that, I'm going to turn it over to Paul to start the learn more about compliance metrics.

PAUL REDMOND: Thank you, Maggie. Let's try the technology and go live to ICANN.org and here we go.

This is the new revised compliance performance report landing page. We've added a monthly dashboard. This information we've been using internally for about a year and a half now, so now we've decided to post this. It's a monthly update. Scroll down just a little bit and you'll see that this is in addition to other global reports we've been producing for about a year and a half now.

So, let's go take a look at the learn more. We even included definitions of what these new metrics are. So, if you have a question, you can go back later, you can try to see what we're talking about with these metrics. All right. Let's go back.

So let's go click on September. Let's see how we did. Any guesses? What's turnaround time? How many complaints?

Here we go. Here's the registrars. So we take all of the complaints we get for the month of September, and lo and behold, WHOIS is still the number one complaint type that we get.

So, we have a pie chart that shows the different types of complaint types we have. To the left is the complaint counts so you actually have the raw numbers. So we compare the current month plus last month. Let's stop there for a minute.

Then to the right, we have the process volume and turnaround time. So the idea is how many notices did we send – and you're familiar with our one, two, three process. Well, we've added also the formal notices, the suspension terminations. So, you can see how many of those that we have sent each month.

Now, my eye focuses to termination. You'll see that there's no terminations that were sent in the month of September, but I have turnaround time. Well, compliance is an ongoing process. We have complaints from the prior month. We always get complaints. We get complaints every day of the week.

So here, we're showing that we did finish a complaint in September that started in August or an earlier time. It's hard to come up with some mechanism to do a snapshot in time of this evolving rollercoaster we're always on. But this is our attempt to try to show that.

Okay, let's scroll down a little bit more and here's the registries. So you can see the break out of that and again, same format.

Scroll down just a little. We have the complaint types to the left and the number of notices and the turnaround time. Now this is from the registrars back to ICANN and the registries back to ICANN. That's there turnaround time.

Scroll down a little bit more and here's the rollercoaster we've been on with complaint volume. So it's sloping up and to the right – used to be a good thing if you're making money.

Scroll down a little bit more and here we have the total volume and also closure rates. So what we're trying to show here is the total number of registrar and registry complaints –and again, we're showing you prior month, too. And then we have the closure rates. So we have a complaint. How long does it take us to close it and at what stage?

So the current month in September, we closed 67% of what we got in September. Now, remember, we can't close all of the complaints we get every month. If they come in on the 30th of the day I can't close that ticket that day.

That's the next one – received all. So here, this shows the closure rate was 75%. So of all of the complaints that we were processing, we closed 75% of that month.

Now we have staff turnaround time. So, this is how we're doing from open to notice, open to first notice, the different queues. So this is our turnaround queues. We send it out, here's our time to process it back. And then we also have receive to close, the whole average. This case 9.6.

So this information will now be updated monthly. You can go back up and – don't do it – but click on previous months and that's where you'll see prior months' data. Okay.

Now, let me take you now to one of the global reports, domain count and trending. So of the complaint information I get, we also need domain numbers. So here, we have a breakdown by TLD of the domain counts by region.

So let's zip down all the way through there so you can see we have them all. Keep on going. I don't think you went past it yet. The next blue bar. Yes, there we go.   There you go.

This is the domain count by time. So here, we have all the TLDs and you can start looking and seeing what the domain count is. So if you scroll down, let's go find .com. So .com has been pretty steady, solid numbers every month. Now, you can start looking at some of the new TLDs and start seeing the evolution of the number of domains that are being by TLD. Okay, so that information is there also.

Okay. So, demo worked. Let's go to the PowerPoint.

So how do I do this? Well, we have a simple process. We go find all of the data from our source systems. A majority of that is the complaint ticketing system. We take that and we build it in to a data warehouse. That information is then put in to – think of a Rubik's Cube. We can take that information, slice it, dice it, twist it around to look at it different ways and ultimately, get it to a presentation mode.

We started the project about 2.5 years ago with six metrics. We now have almost 600 metrics. If somebody had said you would have this many metrics for compliance I would have thought, "What are you talking about?" But we have.

Let me focus on one particular piece that's interesting: dimensions. If I said, 2014, what would you think of? How many participants are at this meeting? Well, how about a year? You have to assign that information to something that makes it relevant so that you can understand what it is. The key to this is finding those relevant tags, and now you can twist it

and connect those tags that says, "Oh, how many complaints per registrars for 2014? How many complaints per registries 2014?"

So this pivot capability – and we have 38 of these different ways – this allows us to twist the data and build that Rubik's Cube.

The net effect, we can now look at information about complaint volume, pre and post 2013 RAA, pre and post gTLDs. How many hits on the webpage, by what category, complaint closure reasons. This is something new that we've added to the complaint tracking system in about the last nine months. So now when we close a ticket, we can start recording why are we closing that ticket. Terrific feedback for policy. That type of information about what are we doing.

This is a running 13-month history, the global complaint trend. So you can see that North America's still going up, Europe is flattening out a bit, Australia's flattening, and Latin America's on a rollercoaster ride.

But you can see that the global complaint trend started off 1.5 thousand complaints in September, now we're at 3.7. So from 1,000 complaints, almost 4,000 complaints. So that to me is a pretty good growth trend for the complaints.

This slide we've been using for almost two years now. There's one change this time around. We introduced this at the regional registry outreach sessions. We've added the registry counts to this.

So look at the legend on the bottom. So we've got three rows: the domain count, registrars, and registries. So what we do is we take the total number of domains, then we have the number of complaints for

those domains, and now we come up with a percentage of complaints per domain. This is what I was trying to strive for. What's the percentage?

So everybody thinks that North America has 104 million domains, they've got more complaints than anybody. Well, look at it. They're .007%. Whereas, Asia Pacific is .14%. So domain count doesn't necessarily drive complaint count.

Well, we also have the breakdown by registrars and registries. So if you look at North America 46% of the registrars, we have a complaint against. 66.9% of registries, we have a complaint against. So we do this breakdown across all of the ICANN regions.

Now what do we do with these besides report these, track these? We actually use some of this to govern ourselves. So this is where I'm calling our governance metrics.

So we have the customer survey, we have the registrar and registry audits that Yan will talk about. Those are yearly, so that's a hard one to measure for frequency. Do you see what's going on?

Let's focus on the registrar and registry complaint compliance. So the target was 95%. You can see the trend line for both. So, 96 and 99%. So what we're doing there is we're taking the total number of complaints that are in that third notice and beyond, meaning third notice and formal notices, and counting those against the base. So that way you can sort of see how we're doing.

And then the key measure that I use is the compliance closure rate. This is a simple one. It just says how many complaints did we close? But there's so many different factors that come involved with this, this to me is a good KPI (key performance measure) that says how well we're treading water with all of this.

So, look at the [red .53]. We had a system issue. The system wasn't automatically closing tickets like it should be. We had to do that manually. When we did that manually, it took longer for us to do that. That's why the number dropped.

Now look what happened in September, 75%. Not only did we have almost 1,000 more complaints that month, we also surpassed our target. We hit 75% closure rate and that's pretty good considering the complaint volume and how thorough we go through all of these complaints to process.

So yes, we use the metrics internally, we use them for ourselves to guide us, we use the metrics to show how the contracted parties are performing, and we're also reporting how well we do. So this is just a summary. You'll see other slides in the different presentations following [some] of the metrics unique for the registrars or registries.

Okay. So, Yan.

YAN AGRANONIK: Good morning. Yan Agranonik, Audit Manager. A few slides on – first of all, new registry agreement audit update. As you know or you may not know, we currently are in the middle of a new registry audit. We have

selected back in May 14 new gTLDs as a representative sample of what over the population that existed at that point. As of today, we are in a process of wrapping up the remediation phase. Next slide please.

This basically, the previous slide just show you some stats on how many documents were received and what did we do with them and how we reviewed them.

This slide shows you the preliminary initial deficiencies noted. Again, the key word here is initial. The percentage of TLDs that we appear to be initially deficient seems to be high because even when we have not received the document itself, we recorded it as a deficiency. So it not necessarily means that the problem existed. It means that the registry at that point either did not provide the document or we didn't understand what we're asking for, but through the communication we were able to resolve it. Next slide please.

So this slide shows you as of October 2nd our status. As of today, I can tell you that the numbers are considerably lower. At this point out of 14 new gLTDs or registry operators five already received the clean reports and tomorrow we plan to send another five clean reports. The other four still have to do something to resolve the deficiencies noted.

I just want to really briefly mention what are the main two I guess deficiencies that we discovered and I think that really has a value not just for ICANN, but as well as for the registries as well. So one deficiency would be the number of domains reported on the monthly reporting was incorrect. Sometimes it was over-reported, sometimes under-

reported. By now we know the reasons and the back end providers are working on resolving this issue.

The second issue was the quality of a data escrow file itself, meaning we know it is that some of the fields in the data escrow file were mismatched. Again, the backend providers are working on that to resolve. They haven't resolved it yet. So that's why we're not issuing clean reports as of today.

Any of you have any questions on the new gTLD audit I can answer?

MAGGIE ZURRET: If you guys wouldn't mind, hold the questions till the end because I have a lot of audience members who are just are interested in the presentation and need to leave. We promise you about ten more minutes and then we will open it up and it will be your session for dialoguing.

OWEN SMIGELSKI: Morning everyone. Owen Smigelski, Director of Contractual Compliance. I oversee the registrar side of the complaint processing so I'll do a brief update on things that have happened since ICANN 50.

So one initiative that compliance piloted and then put into production was a WHOIS in accuracy quality review – or QR as we call it. And that's going back and looking at domains that were suspended during a WHOIS in accuracy complaint processing. Those complaints are considered resolved if a domain is suspended and compliance went

back to look to see if – to ensure that the registrars were still in compliance with their contractual obligations.

And so this is the data of all domains that were suspended for WHOIS inaccuracy complaints from January through June 2014. About 90% of them were either suspended or deleted, and of the remaining ones, either transfer or otherwise, the registrars were able to demonstrate compliance with their contractual obligations.

Another thing that we launched was a remediation quality review (or QR). Certain complaints, such as for a WHOIS inaccuracy complaint, it's very easy for a registrar to resolve generally updated information or verified correct, but there aren't generally issues a systemic issue that needs to be modified. That does happen sometimes with certain complaints.

A registrar may need to modify some systems, and so what they do is they put remediation in to place. This can be for a formal or informal compliance matter and now compliance will go back and check later to ensure that whatever remediation happened is still in place and that the registrar is in compliance.

Failure to be able to demonstrate that may result in an escalated notice, which has a much shorter time line for a resolution.

Some other areas that continue to be pretty busy are the abuse complaints under the 2013 RAA in order of volume are ones about online pharmaceuticals, malware, viruses and spam. Some complaints are rejected because they're on the 2009 RAA registrar or the reporter did not actually reach out to the registrar first. We want to ensure that

that process is being followed and ICANN shouldn't be the ones processing the complaints first.

Compliance has also done some outreach with registrars in the community to do some level setting and expectations and to ensure that these are being handled in an efficient manner.

Something else that compliance did was taking a look at some of the domain registration scams. These are generally e-mail solicitations quite often targeting trademark holders. However, they do go to general populations as well.

They can also be very customized and generally have a claim to charge high premium costs and it's not readily apparent who the reseller is, so ICANN is either following up with the registrar or the reseller and taking action to ensure that there is either compliance or that that site, if it's not authorized, is dealt with properly. There's also an ICANN blog about this.

As Paul indicated along with the metrics, one of the things we do now is we have a large number of closure codes so that we can track why complaints are being closed. We're seeing here our top five closure reasons for our two biggest buckets of complaints, WHOIS inaccuracy and transfer. Some of the closure codes such as WHOIS inaccuracy about a duplicate complaint or if it's a complainants own domain name those are actually closed before first notice so they're not actually sent to the registrar.

Going down here are some other large volume complaints – domain renewal, WHOIS format, and you can see the different reasons that we

have and we do track and report on that and do some training analysis as well.

So with that, I will pass it off to Victor.

VICTOR OPPENHEIMER: Thank you, Owen. Victor Oppenheimer, Senior Manager ICANN Compliance. I'd like to provide a brief update since ICANN 50 and those are the topics that I'll be presenting. Before I do, clearly the public interest commitments has been the proactive monitoring of the public interest commitments it's one of the highlights since ICANN 50. I'd like to briefly restate some of what compliance stated yesterday at the meeting yesterday with the Registry Stakeholder Group because it's important to understand why ICANN is doing, performing these proactive monitoring.

In the opening ceremony, Fadi stated that ICANN is anchored on the public interest and that the public interest is at the core of ICANN's mission. He also stated that the DNS industry is a good industry, but sometimes a few contracted parties that are in noncompliance are the ones that make the headlines and make the rest of the contracted parties that are complying look bad.

And so, what ICANN is doing with this proactive monitoring is raising the level of the PIC discussion and anchoring it on numbers and facts rather than assumptions and perceptions, and so this is why we are asking for the contracted parties' collaboration and we have gotten in general by and large collaboration from the registries.

EN

So if you're a TLD, you know what are the mandatory provisions. For those of you that are not, those are listed on the slide so you would see what are the mandatory provisions and the voluntary provisions that are the subject of the proactive monitoring.

Since ICANN 50, ICANN, our compliance has been very busy verifying compliance with the required abuse contact data in TLD's website. You can see there some of the stats on our progress on that. I want to make sure that the takeaway for both monitoring the PIC and the abuse contact data monitoring is that the target was 100% of all TLDs in general availability by 1 October 2014.

So we've made great progress. We still have data to review, but again, the collaboration has been, in general, outstanding.

Also, since ICANN 50, we are continuing with the monitoring of rights protection mechanisms and things like timely delivering of their delivery of the LORDN files, which of course are needed for trademark holders to receive their notifications of registrations in case of potential infringements. We're also making sure that the TLDs are publishing the general registration policies on their websites and verifying that [inaudible] compliance with the improper allocation of names before some [inaudible] registrations.

And finally, as you all know, since August 2014, ICANN has been implementing the name collision occurrence assessment and Compliance has been partnering with other ICANN departments to make sure that the [inaudible] is being complied with.

I'm not going to go over. I'd like to allow time for questions, but like Owen was stating, you have the information on the top five reasons or closure codes for the various complaints and you can check that out at your leisure later.   Next, please.

Again, we have zone file data access and a few of the other complaints.

And so with that, thank you for…

MAGGIE ZURRET: So before we open the floor for what we call the collaboration session, I would like to say please keep in mind for the audience – I know we've already done a roadshow yesterday – when we're faced with new contracts and new players it is a challenge for everyone –community, contracted parties, ICANN compliance –because we're introducing new things in to the environment, new players.

So in advance, I want to inform everybody that a lot of the complaints you heard us talk about are not just complaints that are coming from the outside through the monitoring. Whether it's proactive monitoring or exception reports we receive internally through the other system monitorings, we at ICAN also generate complaints.

So when we speak of volume – because one of the questions like, the community's going to think that there are 50% of PIC DRPs already filed. No. They were not. There was some, but there was not really PIC DRP scope, but most of those are through the proactive effort, because we don't want to wait to find out something is broken.

Compliance has been in the past in a more reactive approach taking complaint at a time and making it happen. We're taking compliance to the next level through what we call proactive collaborative approach with the contracted party.

So those efforts are driven by what we call hot topics and hot concerns not just by the GAC and the Board, but by all the different stakeholders and constituencies at ICANN.

Abuse, for example, has been very hot and heavy and abuse is misunderstood by some community members, which is causing a lot of volume on all the registrars, so we've heard that as a big concern.

But I would like to share with you – before the ICANN meeting, I, personally, witnessed an e-mail that went to a registrar and the registrar is in our presence. It went at the half hour. Within one minute, the registrar acknowledged that e-mail and took care of it. Within less than five minutes, the appropriate action was taken so I gave that registrar a high five. It's the person sitting on the right of this table. That's all I'm going to give you.

And again, it's not that I'm marketing the registrar. I's basically I'm letting you know that we all care, like the blog said. People use to say – somebody this morning also told me, "We can't be upset at you guys or mad at you, Maggie, because you're so nice." It's like, it doesn't mean that if we are not doing right job or a good job, please let us know.

Being mad and being upset doesn't help. Believe me, I heard an earful from the Registry Stakeholder Group yesterday. I know we're causing you a lot of work. It's causing us a lot of work.

But it's like building a house. It doesn't happen overnight. If we don't establish a strong foundation and address the issues up front with the facts, the perceptions going to always be compliance is not doing their job, the contracted parties are bad players.

So I want to vocally, and in presence of many stakeholders here, thank the many registrars and registries for their collaboration. They do care, guys. They drive us more nuts than you guys.

Every day we're talking to registrars and registries. What are you doing? What is this for? We collaborate, we work, and man, we come to a conclusion and we address the issues.

Even registrars on the 2009 RAA are coming forward and addressing areas that are not within their scope because they want to work.

Now, we still have some challenges and opportunities. We're not done – not just as a compliance team, but also as a contracted parties. So your feedback and input is greatly appreciated.

So with that, I think Allen wants to say one more thing and I'll start taking the questions.

ALLEN GROGAN: Sure. I just wanted to say a few words about my new role and what that means to you and what kind of dialogue we might engage in.

There are a lot of dramatic changes under way in the industry right now. We're seeing on the horizon the end of U.S. oversight of IANA. We've seen internationalization of the gTLDs. We're seeing an expansion from

27 generic top-level domains a year ago to 500 or so today and soon to be over 1,000. And all of that presents challenges for compliance.

Maggie and her team have done a great job of automating and operationalizing the compliance functions, so I think we're well-equipped to deal with the expansion that is coming at us now.

One of ICANN's core values is to be accountable to the internet community and compliance is one of the principle mechanisms through which we try to maintain that accountability.

As we look to monitoring and managing 1,000-plus new gTLDs with public interest commitments and safeguards, there are going to be challenges that we're going to face on interpretation of those, on how to enforce those, and I want to reach out to you and start a dialogue so that we can think intelligently about what's important to enforce and how properly to interpret those things.

We've always recognized that a lot of the safeguards in our existing agreements, and particularly in the new gTLD agreements, are directed towards protection of consumers. Not just registrants and registries and registrars, but protection of the general consumer industry out there in the Internet community. That's the reason there are provisions dealing with malware and viruses and copyright infringement and unlawful activity.

We're also creating a new position which will be a Director of Consumer Safeguards, and that person will be dedicated to implementing safeguards that are specifically directed towards protection of consumers. I see that as being contractual safeguards the ones that are

there and the ones that are in the public interest commitments, and also potentially safeguards that we might implement through other mechanisms like promotion of best practices to try to keep this industry the way that all of you want it to be, which is a safe and secure environment for consumers and to try to marginalize the few bad actors out there that are engaged in bad activities.

So I look forward to working with you, I hope we can talk to each other in the coming weeks, and I'll turn it over to Maggie.

MAGGIE ZURRET: All right, guys. Like our leader at ICANN kicks off our sessions with calm, confidence, and optimist attitude let's start the dialogue, if you would raise your hand. Okay. I'm going to start with James, please.

[JAMES]:   Thanks Maggie. Thanks to everybody for your presentation. I thought it was very well done and well informed and I think it's the exact antidote for an ICANN meeting that kicked off with the statement that registrars need to be hauled off to a jail, so thank you for that.

I had a whole list of questions, but we're running out of time so in the interest, I'll just ask you two quick ones.

MAGGIE ZURRET: We have 45 minutes.

[JAMES]:   I don't. I'm sorry. Maybe I can just beg the indulgence of the rest of the crowd. Just a couple of quick…

MICHELE NEYLON: [inaudible] or I'll take over.

[JAMES]:   Yes, or I'll fire them over to Michele and he'll run with them. But I noted that WHOIS, at some point since the last update, WHOIS inaccuracy has overtaken transfer as the number one issue that's driving complaints. That's news to me. I mean, I've been operating under transfers being that problem.

I wonder if you have any normalized data that indicates that this is a direct consequence of reactivating the bulk WHOIS submission tool and is it just one or two or three individuals or organizations that are driving the majority of those invalid WHOIS as part of a campaign to or crusade to suss out WHOIS problems? I wonder if you can discern that from your numbers.

I like the quality review program. Owen, just a word of advice. When you're going to kick something like that off, please give us a heads up.

When those started dropping onto our laps, we had a lot of people coming to me like, "What is this? What do I do with this? I don't have a procedure for this."

I know that you guys are fairly collaborative. Please don't just spring those on us. It's a good idea and I think it's working, but just with the

volumes we're talking about, a little bit of foreknowledge would be great.

And then finally, I really wanted to hear a little bit more about what you're doing to push back on what I consider to be misunderstandings or misconceptions about what the abuse obligations are under the 2013 RAA. There seems to be this expectation set that "if I follow this recipe XYZ a registrar has to take down a website or else I can turn them in to compliance." That's not correct.

Registrars and registries and other service providers have discretion, have jurisdictional concerns, local law and their own procedures so can you maybe help me understand what sort of campaign you have underway or planned to push back on that and maybe help reset that expectation? Thanks.

MAGGIE ZURRET: So, I would like Owen to address the WHOIS volume. We heard from the registrars and registries when compliance takes on a new mission of monitoring and reviews in qualities to inform you. We will do that, and I personally apologize for not doing that in advance.

We get so in to, "Whoa, we've got to get moving." We're in a Ferrari guys. A long time ago, we were on a bicycle.

So, I commit to communicating to that more so let's start with addressing the WHOIS and a lot of those things and then move back in to the abuse, and then I would like to open it to the community also. Then, I know Allen has a comment.

OWEN SMIGELSKI: So James, regarding the WHOIS, maybe that is just what happened with going to your registrar. Consistently WHOIS has been the biggest bucket anywhere from 60 to 80% depending upon the month. Since I've joined ICANN and as far as I know going back historically, it's always been the biggest section.

Transferred is the second biggest; domain renewal, third. That's been pretty consistent for some time now.

Regarding the number of complaints [inaudible], that is something that's actually tracked. That's in the metrics. The WHOIS data should show what is the total complaint volume, and then additionally, in a different color you'll see – I think that should be at the end of the slides – the total volume. There's an appendix.

But it will show which ones are designated as bulk, and if my recollection is there's not really that much activity right now. Most of the complaint volume and WHOIS inaccuracy is from single-submission complaints.

Regarding the abuse, we have been doing for some time, as we mentioned, outreach. That's been with registrars but also with individual reporters as well as organizations representing that, and part of what we've also done here at ICANN 51 is gone and talked with some of these groups as well including the submitters of the reports to let them know what the expectations are from compliance and understand that the registrars aren't under that obligation to shut something down just because there is a complaint about that.

ALLEN GROGAN: Yes. Just in the last 48 hours in talking to various constituencies and people in the hallway, it's clear there is a wide divergence of opinion about what some of these safeguards mean and how they should be interpreted.

I think it's kind of like a Rorschach test. People tend to read into it what they want to see there, whether that's actually what the agreement says or not. And I do think we need to be clearer in the messaging on that, so that's one of the things I will work on is trying to be more clear to the community about what the safeguards in these agreements actually mean and how they'll actually be enforced.

MAGGIE ZURRET: So before I take the next question, is there any comment from the people in the room about the two, three questions or topics we've talked about? Michele?

MICHELE NEYLON: Thanks, Maggie. Now just keep following on from what Allen was just saying, you need to be very, very careful about the messaging that you have set around these things.

While you may want to move forward with some of these initiatives with the best intentions in the world, if you don't set that expectation correctly, you're going to cause issues for yourselves and you're going to cause issues for us.

So for example, the fact that the department name now includes references to safeguards and you've used the consumer word, which is a C word, which has all sorts of interesting under tones, you'd be very, very careful about what you're doing because otherwise, you're going to see more and more of this "if ICANN has to fix the Internet" type thing and we as the contracted parties as an extension of that.

Now, I'm sure James and others around the room are more than happy to give you copious quantities of examples of the kind of irrelevant and spurious complaints that we all get. But for example, being asked to take down a website because it's got a blink tag is obviously not a consumer protection issue. Thanks.

ALLEN GROGAN: Yes. So just to be clear, whatever we do in this regard has to be consistent with the very limited remit that we have.

We're not a law enforcement agency, we are not a consumer protection agency, we are not a regulatory body. Whatever we're going to do needs to be perfectly consistent with the limited purpose and the limited mission that ICANN has and we'll need to work with the community to try to get consensus on what we can and can't do.

MAGGIE ZURRET: So I have Maximus and Allen and two people in the chat room, so Maximus.

MAXIMUS: The question is about statistics – first question, short. It would be nice if you split self-generated I'd say notices and complaints from those we generated from outside, because either way – for example, something glitched in your system as we saw and we all have a notification, and it proves statistics in terms of numbers but it doesn't reflect the reality.

And also, the second thing is please start gathering statistics on those who sends complaints, because some companies they have engines we generate complaints on full order and send it to you, and actually top complainants might be abusing your procedures.

So, I agree that it makes numbers bigger and greater but it doesn't reflect the reality of violation of contract or breaking the consumer trust. So please, stop doing it because as I understand now your system doesn't distinguish between the self-generated messages and those which come from outside.

The second short thing is the response time. For example, as a registry we have cases where we have to send a response in seven days, and on average we have the replies in four weeks. It beats not even I'd say, because as a normal flow of business we do something, we expect at least the same time scale. That's it. Thanks.

MAGGIE ZURRET: Thank you, Maximo. I think the most important note here is two things. On the self-generating, it's not like there's a system that's crunching those self-generation. We do have a QA that looks through it, but it doesn't mean that some bad reports come through. So please

communicate to us and we'll make sure we can keep an eye, and if possible, automate.

On the response time, let us know. This is why when we send something – a notice or an inquiry – and a registrar or registry communicates back to ICANN "I need more than five days because of X we extend and we will collaborate. We understand that the model is not the same. Everybody operates a business model that's different and we respect that. But at the same time, if we are not informed we move on to the next phase.

MAXIMUS: One small [notice]. As a registrar we have [inaudible] control few of them. Every time we ask for extension, we say, "No, no, no." It's formal thing. So you do it on the date we ask you for. So we were promised to have informal way of things twice, but unfortunately, we don't see it now. Maybe it will be in the future.

MAGGIE ZURRET: Thank you for your feedback. If you don't mind, Maximus, please let me know the scenarios. We have an amazing team, but we always, including myself, have opportunities for continuous improvement. Any more comments on Maximo's [inaudible]?

JIM PRENDERGAST: Hi. Jim Prendergast with the Galway Strategy Group. I think maybe I heard your question slightly different, the first part of it. And that was if you could identify complaints that are coming from outside into ICANN

versus ICANN compliance generated actions. Is that what you…? Yes. So I think that would be helpful to some people to see what's the reactive compliance efforts from complaints from the outside versus the internal proactive efforts of ICANN.

MAGGIE ZURRET: Alan is next, and then I have to take two people from the chat room before we go back to the room please.

ALAN GREENBERG: Uncharacteristically, I have largely a compliment. For those who know me. And also uncharacteristically, it's very much in line with the previous comment.

I'm delighted to hear the word proactive being used regularly. That's new and if it's not new in what you're doing it's certainly new in what you're talking about. And in particular, on the PIC we – and when I say we I'm talking about the At-Large Advisory Committee – was told at very senior levels of this organization that under no conditions would ICANN do any proactive work on PICs. It would be purely complaint driven. So I'm delighted to hear that that's not the case.

We're clearly in the very early days of PIC and PIC enforcement and PIC infractions or whatever. So as we ramp up, it'll be interesting to see how you are able to do that, and I too would like to be able to carefully understand the difference between the internally-generated ones and the ones that are purely complaint-driven. Thank you.

MAGGIE ZURRET: Thank you for the feedback.

JENNIFER SCOTT: Hi. This is Jennifer Scott, Manager Contractual Compliance. I'm also acting as the remote participation manager today. We now have three questions in the queue and apologies if I pronounce anyone's name incorrectly.

The first is from Elaine Pruis from Donuts and the question is, "PIC DRP complaint numbers seem very high? Please provide some insight. Where are the complaints coming from? What are they about?

VICTOR OPPENHEIMER: Thank you for the question, Elaine, and as discussed to date, all of those complaints were self-generated by ICANN as part of the proactive monitoring.

JENNIFER SCOTT: The second question comes from Volker Greimann – sorry if I'm mispronouncing that. It's a comment. It says, "I do not see unwarranted complaint as a closure reason. Yet we see a lot of those and they get closed by ICANN."

OWEN SMIGELSKI: Volker, there is an invalid complaint closure code that we have for actually all the complaint types. We also do break that down in to some categories that's a broad one, such as if somebody's complaining about

ICANN
LOS ANGELES

a customer issue, we do include that as a closure code. That's an invalid complaint but we kind of find a reason in there. If you see there a complainants own domain name, that would be an invalid complaint that we wouldn't forward to the registrar or as well as duplicate complaint. Those are ones that were closed before a first notice was sent, generally.

If you do have some concerns about if you think it's an invalid complaint, when you receive a notice from ICANN, please let us know the reasons why and if it's not being addressed, please follow up with me on that if it's a registrar issue.

JENNIFER SCOTT: And the next question comes from Michael Fleming. "How often is the domain count per TLD page updated? It does not seem to be updated monthly."

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: The information for that, we get monthly. But we're restricted by providing the last three months so it has to be three months old basically. That's the quick answer.

MAGGIE ZURRET: I see Jordyn. You have a question?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Jordyn Buchanan with Google. I like in the registrar data that you have here, we get a sense of what happened or the impact of the complaint and the resolution. I feel like as I've looked at the registry data, we have less of a sense of whether the action that you guys have undertaken was resulted in a meaningful outcome for in terms of the benefit.

So for example, thinking about data escrow notices or something like that, it would be interesting to see once that that compliance effort had been undertaken, did the data escrow complete? Was there any data in the file that needed to be data escrowed?

So I feel like often there's a lot of energy being spent in areas where the benefit to consumer protection as you guys talk about being the end goal of this is very low in that we're spending a lot of energy talking about very small escrow files or zone data when there's not much data.

I think similarly, the result of the automation, which is great, but often the automations a little bit ahead of even where ICANNs internal systems are and so often a lot of that back and forth ends up being like, "Oh, ICANN system was down for a little while and therefore, we're talking to you about why you're BRDA deposit wasn't made," or something like that and it was really because ICANN couldn't pick it up.

And, all of that just doesn't seem that useful. And so to have those complaints next to the complaints where we actually see results in terms of useful data being put in to the system, it would be helpful to get some sense of what the consumer benefit of some of these activities are.

Because I do think that there's places where you guys are spending time that's really useful and I think there's other places where you're spending time where it's probably frustrating for you and for us because we're spending a lot of time talking about relatively unimportant things in terms of consumer protection. So, just in terms of guiding your own time allocation, it would be helpful to get a better understanding of the impact of some of the follow-up actions.

MAGGIE ZURRET: Thank you for your question. If I may address it in two ways.

Of course like many of the contracted parties, there are growing pains even within ICANN. So, for those system issues you've mentioned, we're trying to – I think most of them have been addressed and we continue to work and proactively address them.

However, regarding the benefits, Jordyn, you would be amazed how many people tell us we're spending our time wrongly in so many different areas. We listen to all of you.

But I would like to make one statement. It's like anything in life, it may seem useless now. It's a foundation. We all know the value of data escrow. Thank you for mentioning that.

If it is not established correctly from the beginning – when I came on board, gosh, it seems like many years ago, it's only 3.5 years ago – garbage in, garbage out. We all know that concept. So we had to launch a full data escrow audit because we learned that the data is either not formatted properly, not populated right, whatever it is.

All I'm saying is sometimes what seems to be useless at the beginning is a foundational proactive effort to make sure it's set up correctly. And once it gets on that routine, then it becomes more of what we call an audit aspect to it.

So thank you for your feedback. We'll take some of it we can address differently, but again, part of making sure we are ready is some of this aspect you mentioned.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yes, and just to be clear, I'm just trying to look for more information along these lines because to understand we sent out N compliance requests related to data escrow, of those they were resolved, but the files in 98% of the cases were only three lines long or something like that. That's a very different statement.

I agree. We just saw the results of an audit and I think the first pass of that there was some growing pains there, too. We went back and forth to figure out which of the audit procedures were correct and which weren't. But that was really useful to say does the data actually escrowed match the data that people have put in to the system?

That [inaudible] strikes me as a really useful exercise whereas, doing a lot of discussion about whether there is an escrow file during a period of time in which no registrations are being taken seems a lot less useful.

So I'm just trying to get to how do we quantify or present data on where you're spending time and what the impact is between those sorts of activities?

ALLEN GROGAN:

Yes. To some extent, it sounds like what you're talking about is the difference between purely quantitative measures and some kind of introduction of qualitative analysis on top of that, too, and I think that that's something we can think about. It's not easy to do.

DAVID PAYNE:

I'm David Payne with Afilias and I wanted to make two general comments. One's about incentives and the other is about this issue of being proactive.

But first, I definitely want to say that I really appreciate the data that you have provided and especially a consistent approach to compliance notices, etc. The consistency and the quantity of data that you've given us is very helpful.

So Afilias is in a unique perspective. We have a unique perspective on compliance because we're both registry operator and we provide the same registry system that we use for our TLDs for many, many back-end clients. And so, a compliance notice that we receive are usually multiplied. They're magnified because we're going to see the notices for our own as well as all of those for all of our clients being sent to us when they have a technical nature.

The reason I bring up incentives is because we know what the consequence is if we are not in compliance. We'll receive a ton of notices. And then there's a lot of scrambling to hit these deadlines. But what's the reward for being in compliance?

The answer is nothing. And so when I'm trying to motivate – so think about this. When I'm trying to motivate an entire team of developers to work over time over the weekend, what are we shooting for?

Let's go for zero. It's a really hard goal from a psychological perspective. I'd encourage you to think about balancing the incentives within the program.

The other issue that's been brought up is being proactive. I think there are a lot of different things that we could say about that. But the one insight that I wanted to add is if you're going to be proactive on compliance issues, how can we also be proactive?

Because if there's going to be an issue, I'd rather not wait until I get a notice and have to follow the one, two, three process to deal with, especially when it comes to technical issues.

The registry system is very complex. Changes to it require an extensive amount of code and testing and a lot of different teams are involved in that. We've dealt with an issue that was – it really came down to a different interpretation of the rights protection mechanism. This is one that I'm sure that you guys are addressing on your end because like I said, when we get this notice we're going to get 10, 20 of them, 30 of them.

It was actually an issue that we had discussed extensively internally about how to implement that particular rights protection mechanism and it had technical consequences. Basically, there was a fork in the road. We looked to the registry agreement and the supplementary

ICANN
LOS ANGELES

documents, and through discussions we arrived at what we thought was a very reasonable conclusion and one that I still agree with.

And yet, when it came time to do from your end the testing on that, you obviously had a different interpretation of how that rights protection mechanism should be implemented. And now we have a lot of fear of how do we change a system that we have invested this much in to over this period of time?

I would have appreciated the opportunity looking back what can I learn from this is to be able to approach someone and have this discussion when we're at the fork in the road, not when we're six months down the road and discover that you see it differently.

MAGGIE ZURRET: David, thank you for your comments. If I may address the latter one because the first one I'll address it, too.

So, I think you stated it so well about the proactive approach. It's the unknown. The complexity is one element of it and also the depth and the implication as it spreads across different areas and that's one of the reasons why compliance took on the effort of proactive approach is to find out now not later, and then the impact later will have much bigger consequences on all of us. So I understand.

I appreciate the comment you made about the consistency in the approach, but what we've learned through the proactive approach is it's allowed us to and it's allowed you – I'm talking to the contracted parties – we have had a lot of contracted parties come back and say, "This is

the issue. It's going to take us three months to get to the point to be really in compliance. Here's our plan how we're going to get there."

And what compliance does is we put that issue on hold and an issue that relates to it for that TLD or for that registrar on hold and we inform the team, and what means is that based on the remediation plan that the contracted party shared with compliance, they report to us on the progress, because it doesn't need to be a push. You've committed to a plan to become compliant by – it's that informal approach, proactive approach, preventive approach. There's so many words can be used in it.

But the best part of it is we have seen success stories come out of it. Because during that one, two, three process, it has allowed it to become compliant without impacting the ICANN community or the public or the registrant. But it's allowed you also to proactively address it, so when there is another matter of that same issue, it's already done.

On the incentive, my best answer to that is the same incentive the compliance team has – it's our passion. We love what we do. We take it seriously. If a person is asking for incentives, you have to start from within.

I'm sorry I don't have a better answer than that. We all took a commitment part of this ecosystem, part of this obligations, part of this role we have to fulfil here.

I tell the same to my team. There is no Monday, Sunday, Saturday, 2:00 AM or 3:00 PM. We do it because we believe in it and we're committed to the role we have in this ICANN.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: On the topic of proactivity, I think I heard a slightly different question of what you're answering. Maybe I think it's not purely a question for compliance – and Allen's probably got a great perspective here – is like where there's issues of contractual interpretation, how do we get in to those issues before it becomes a compliance matter?

When we're making implementation decisions, it's often the case that there are various ways to view the language in a contract and it would be useful if there is some way to engage with ICANN. And I don't think it is necessarily compliance, but some way to engage with ICANN to get some advice or some standard that then compliance is later going to implement before registries or registrars spend a lot of time developing systems that then later on you're going to come along and say, "Oh, it's not in compliance."

It's great that you guys are flexible once we get to that point but it would be better not to have written the code in the first place that you guys don't like and how do we engage in order to avoid that?

ALLEN GROGAN: I'll let Maggie comment on this too, but I think that's a good comment. I do think we need to address it and I think you're right. I'm not sure that that's – I don't know if that's compliance or registry services or registrar

MAGGIE ZURRET: And to add to what Allen said, bring those to our attention. We will take ownership in bringing the right sources together, resources to talk about them.

If it's registry services, we know we have Francisco and Christa we can partner with up front. So you are, that's right.

I see some hands. Bill?

BILL SMITH: Sure. Bill Smith. I'm a recovering member of the WHOIS review team. I continue to recover.

A couple of things. One, I noted that in that June to September time period on WHOIS complaints, 100% of them were resolved. Is that, in fact, the case? Because that's not my recollection in the past. If so, congratulations – 100% is fabulous.

The second thing is on the incentives. This is something we talked about in the review team. We concluded our work some two years ago and I haven't been around here over a year and so I will just say, for me personally – my corporate hat is clearly not on – it's frustrating to come back after over a year and comments that were made over two years ago to hear the same thing. What do we have for incentives?

And there's nothing there and I don't know whether it's name and shame, name and praise. We discussed many things in the review team about ways that this community could encourage people to do better at compliance.I think most of the players want to comply.

They want to do well. As was said from Afilias, getting [inaudible] letters is not a necessarily great way to encourage people to do better. They're just going to do the bare minimum to stop the letters probably.

So I'd encourage the community to find a way to create some incentives that are meaningful for the people who have to comply; and if that means changing contracts, change contracts.

OWEN SMIGELSKI: I just want to differentiate. The slide that we showed earlier was the WHOIS inaccuracy QR and that was going back – and yes, those were all resolved complaints and they were previously closed between January and June of 2014.

You mentioned you were on the WHOIS Review Team from several years ago. I know there was different systems and things in process.

Every WHOIS inaccuracy complaint that is received by ICANN is addressed and resolved and closed per process. Generally, they have longer timelines because the contract gives 15 business days as a first notice. The other ones are five business days for the first notice. But yes, all of those complaints are now being processed and closed appropriately.

BEN TOWN: Hi. My name is Ben Town and I'd like to go back to that issue of incentives. I hear where these points of view are coming from and it sounds to me like you currently have a couple of different levels. You're either terminated or you're getting letters or you're in compliance.

I think that it would be possible to add a few levels to really recognize excellence where that is present and whether that's the name and praise or putting people on a list or giving people something that they can advertise on for the factors that are under their control, and then if he can say, "Everybody who's using my technical back end has this mark of excellence for all the technical factors," then that's something that would probably be meaningful.

These are some incentives that don't necessarily cost anything. It might be worth considering.

MAGGIE ZURRET: Thank you everyone, started with Dave and Bill and then Ben. We hear you.

I think what we'll need to do is take that to a larger discussion. Definition of incentives, alignment on the criteria. I'll work with Allen to see who needs to be in those discussions and dialogues. Let's table that and see what can be done. Like Bill said, it was mentioned but apparently the community did not act on it, so we'll see where to find a home for it.

But in the meantime, being in compliance, the percent of audits and compliance, that's the story. I wish I had gold stars.

But again, you put a gold star, somebody's going to say why it's gold, not bronze, not yellow, not red, why it's a happy face not a happy face with sunglasses?

We are such a global organization. Everyone looks at the star differently. So unless this community defines what does it mean and what it is, we're always going to fail somehow even with an incentive.

You guys think about it, bring it to the right forum to define it. My favorite is the happy faces with the sunglasses, so if I can put my vote – yes.

LIBBY BANEY: Hi. Libby Baney, Forward Strategies. I really like Ben's idea and I like yours of happy faces with sunglasses so I'll support that in whatever form it requires.

I also wanted to build on something that Jordyn and you brought up about having some ability to engage on implementation of rights protection mechanisms or whatever the case may be in advance. I use an analogy from the federal election commission as an example where they have an advisory opinions process where you can say, "I'm going to do a lobbying event." I'm from Washington. So "I'm going to do a lobbying event and I want to know is this going to comply with ethics rules?"

And, you can ask in advance and say this is my program and plan, get some council on that, and the other thing I like about that process is it's also event transparent.

So I'm looking at the FEC Commissions website right now and so the community then could say, "Hey. This question was already asked by Jordyn or Michele." So, I don't need to bother you but I can also seek guidance and that's helpful for the folks that are trying to implement that as well as those from the community and the business community and others that are saying, "What is actually going on and what is the dialogue between compliance and the contracted parties?"

That would give us I think a lot of clarity and transparency to the broader issues.

Desiree Boxberger: Desiree Boxberger with Dot Latin LLC, the .UNO registry. I'd like to mimic what Libby just said. I, too, managed [a pack] in my former career and I think that would be a good process because just going through the first round of audits, I don't know what other registries and those interpretation issues and contract are facing

There's no transparency to me as another registry operator. So I think there would be real value added to have an opinion page or something when there are contract interpretation issues to come out so that it's shared with the registry community so we can act proactively.

I think that's very important to work proactively as much as we can, and so seeing those other opinions out there where other registries may have faced an issue that you don't know about yet on your system, it allows us – the other registries – to go back and check their systems and make sure that they're also continue to be in compliance.

Because ICANN compliance can't catch everything in an audit across all registries and all registrars. So I think that would be very helpful and I think that was a wonderful suggestion is to have a place maybe on the compliance page where you can render an opinion based on a contractual interpretation. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thanks, Maggie. This is actually semi-related to this entire thing around implementation and everything else.

As things stand at present, there is no one place that a registrar or registry can go to to get a comprehensive easy-to-digest list of things that they're meant to do. There's no checklist. The updates, changes, and everything else are buried in slide decks that were presented at meetings two, three, four years ago or newsletters that were sent nine months ago.

Now, while the registry operators may not, but not necessarily may have more legal resources on their teams, I can assure you for a lot of the registrars we definitely don't.

And the idea that you use the audit which in many respects is like a great big stick as being an opportunity to "remedy" this isn't exactly ideal. The thing that would be more helpful would be to actually have these things documented more clearly that when a policy or a whatever is updated or changed that it isn't a question of having to go off and find something in a slide deck from a presentation in a meeting that somebody may or may not have been present for because that's not particularly helpful.

To give you an example, when we were going live with our own accreditation, our team had read various documents and there was a transfer policy and you might just have an FOA. They put everything live before they realized that the FOA had to be worded in a particular fashion, because you just don't have that information readily available.

If this [goes] back to the information management and everything else that several of us have raised with ICANN since we got here Thursday, so we're not asking you for anything special. Just document the stuff in a fashion that doesn't require somebody to have a degree in information management in order to find the damn information to begin with. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll second that and third it and fourth it.

MICHELE NEYLON: For the record, Alan agreed with me.

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh, no, Michele, I agree with you a lot of the time – just not all the time.

Seriously though, there's been a lot of discussion in various forms at this meeting about the inability of finding things on the ICANN website, even if you know it's there and you think you know where it is.

Registrars and registries, given that they're proliferating now, are in a similar position in that where do you go to find out what they're

supposed to do. And it's not only registrars who want it. As someone who cares about users, before I go off charging and make a complaint, I'd like to understand what the real responsibilities are. And getting those together in one place [is] really nice.

JIM PRENDERGAST: Just to fourth, fifth, and sixth it, but put a different point on it. Varying registry back end service providers provide varying levels of support on the compliance function and when you have 600-plus brands coming in to the ICANN world, who Michele forgets more in a day than they know, I think that's a culture – the check lists and stuff like that I think that's the audience you've got to think about when you're trying to design some of this stuff.

CRYSTAL ONDO: Crystal Ondo from Donuts. I just want to say while I agree with everyone that we should have information readily available on the website, I'd like you to think very carefully before you issue opinions or dictates on contractual interpretation before asking the contracted parties. Because as we started the meeting saying everyone has varying degrees of interpretation of the language in the RAAs or in the [RIAAs] so I think that is something that the community should work on together and not something that should just come top-down from ICANN.

MAGGIE ZURRET: Thank you.

ALLEN GROGAN: Point well taken.

MAGGIE ZURRET: Has this session been helpful? Head shake. Head shake. This way means yes.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Ask for a bigger room now.

MAGGIE ZURRET: You know, we did.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: We really need to. This is the third time you've had a compliance update where it's been literally standing room only. I remember in Toronto, people were practically sitting on top of each other.

MAGGIE ZURRET: Yes. But we've also had big rooms and they were not utilized so the meeting team is struggling with allocation. But thank you for your feedback on the room. But most importantly, thank you for coming out this morning to join us after music night. I don't know if many of you went.

I want to thank the remote participants including my team from Istanbul and Singapore and the team locally here. I want to thank everybody at

the ICANN, stakeholders, community members for your continued feedback.

Like I said, we don't take just complaints. We want your feedback. Don't just criticize. Tell us what is it we're not doing and what is it you're expecting. Don't just say, "You don't do a good job." At what, and how, and why is it perceived it's not, so we can work with you to address it.

So thank you again. Have a great rest of the week and for the contracted parties, we'll see you tomorrow at our session. Come ready with your sleeves rolled up so we can work and address any questions you have. Have a great day everyone.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Are you bringing us coffee tomorrow, Maggie?

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]