
ICANN69 | Prep Week – Contractual Compliance Update
Wednesday, October 07, 2020 – 18:30 to 19:30 CEST

JAMIE HEDLUND: Thank you, JD, and thank you all for joining the ICANN69 Pre-Meeting Webinar presented by ICANN Contractual Compliance. I'm Jamie Hedlund and I'm proud to lead the Compliance team. Today we're going to give an update to our last webinar which was given before ICANN67. We have a good deal to report and hope you will ask questions after we go through the slides.

Here, quickly is an overview of our agenda. As JD just mentioned, Leticia, a Director for Contractual Compliance will give a brief summary of our role within ICANN. She's then going to describe one of the most significant operational developments in Compliance, our recent migration to a new Salesforce-based ticketing platform, which we hope will bring tangible benefits and complaint handling efficiency and capturing more granular data.

Amanda Rose, Compliance Lead on Registration Data Accuracy, Temporary Specification Obligations, and Domain Name Renewal and Redemption Issues, will then discuss recent enforcement of the Interim Registration Data Policy and the Temporary Specification.

Joseph Restuccia, Senior Specialist for Risk and Audit, will then preview the upcoming audit of registrar compliance with obligations related to DNS security threats.

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.

Then finally, Leticia will go back and give a comprehensive overview of our enforcement activities since ICANN67.

As JD just mentioned, we will post the slides to both the Prep Week page as well as the Compliance Outreach page. JD gave instructions and we put them in the chat on asking questions. We are going to do everything we can to answer the questions during the session, but if there are questions that we can't answer, we will provide answers and post those following the ICANN69 meeting. Without further ado, I now turn it over to Leticia. Thank you.

LETICIA CASTILLO:

Thanks, Jamie. Hi, everyone. My name is Leticia Castillo. I'm a Director for the Contractual Compliance function. And today I'm providing an overview of Compliance developments and enforcement activities since ICANN67 in March. Like with prior program updates, I will start by briefly explaining what the Compliance function does and how, for those of you who may not be as familiar with us. So with that, let's start.

The ICANN community develops policies to preserve and enhance the security, stability and resiliency of the Domain Name System. These policies are incorporated into ICANN agreements. We, Contractual Compliance, make sure that the obligations in those agreements are met by the contracted parties mainly by processing cases related to instances of non-compliance that we are made aware of through complaints that we receive via our web forms or through our own monitoring and audit activities. But we also use the expertise gained

through completing thousands of these investigations to participate along with other teams within the org in training and outreach sessions, to explain and discuss contractual requirements, and to take input from the community.

During this past month, as you can imagine, some of these activities have been impacted by the inability to attend in-person gatherings due to the pandemic. However, we have continued processing complaints and gathering expertise and data that can be useful for this and other activities. To that extent, in August, the ICANN organization launched its Compliance solution within the Naming Services portal. Next slide, please. Thank you.

On the 29th of August 2020, we launched NSp Compliance. NSp stands for the Naming Services portal and it's a platform, like Jamie mentioned, that is intended to eventually provide a single interface for communications between ICANN and contracted parties. It has a secure and scalable architecture that will enable ongoing improvements to better serve the community.

So what does this mean for Compliance? It means that we have migrated the processing of the complaints received from one ticketing system to a new and improved one. It means that contracted parties can now monitor and respond to their Compliance cases that were created after the 29th of August within the platform itself. But it also means that we have updated the page through which the public can report Compliance issues to us to first make it easier to find the right form that addresses a particular issue.

Throughout the years, the Compliance team has observed how we are receiving a large number of misfiled complaints that, for example, involved a domain renewal issue but were filed through the form related to abuse reports. Misfile complaints often means delays in our process and ultimately in the resolution of the matter because we have to reach out to the complainant again to request additional information needed to address the complaint that was not requested through the form they used, for example.

Also with the new forms, these are intended to gather all the information and evidence needed to address a complaint from the beginning with the initial submission. So they are more defined questions. In some instances, there are more questions than in the retired form, not because we want the complainants to spend more time completing a submission but because we want to avoid, as much as possible, having to go back to the complainant for more information, for more evidence once the complaint is submitted. This aims to reduce processing time and allow for faster resolution of the cases.

NSp Compliance is also intended to, like Jamie was mentioning before, allow us to gather more granular data concerning the complaints that we receive, to enhance our metrics and reporting to the community. And finally, with NSp Compliance, we released specific forms for complaints related to the Temporary Specification such as request for access to non-public gTLD Registration Data. I will be giving some specific examples of the all of these improvements with the next slides. Next slide, please. Thank you.

This is a screenshot of a portion of the new complaint submission form. The retired intro page included three columns in several links related to different aspects of contracted parties' obligations. The new webpage, as you can see, comprises two columns with a simple description of what the issue refers to, and right next to it, the corresponding form.

One example, with the old form, to get to the abuse dedicated one, you had to click on a link to a page with information dedicated to several areas of registrar compliance and not only to abuse, and it was not always easy to find. The new forms addressing obligations related to abuse for registrars and registries—as you can see on your screen—are easily identifiable.

We have been using this is updated page for a little over a month now. And although it is still early to be 100% certain, it is accurate to say that we have already seen a decrease in misfiled complaints. Next slide. Thanks.

So once you get to the right form, you are presented with some useful information concerning the contractual requirements that are relevant to the specific complaint type. So for example, here you're seeing the text that precedes the abuse form. And this is also meant to help with the submission because a large number of complaints that we received in the Abuse group indicated that some complainants misunderstood ICANN's role and authority. They were, for example, reporting the allegedly abuse domain to us directly instead of to the registrar.

So as you can see here, the new form explains that abuse reports must be filed with the registrar first and also gives instructions on how to identify the registrar and how to find its abuse contact details. So our goal is not only to get within scope complaints that are as complete as possible from the beginning so we can start process, but also to provide useful information as soon as possible for those that come to us for help, including with that information is how to find the right entity to report an issue and getting addressed. Next slide, please. Thank you.

So we're talking about complete submissions. The new forms provide us with the possibility of collecting all the information and evidence from the get-go, as I was mentioning before. For example, the complainant can attach a list of domain names. If the complaint refers to several domains, the old form just allows one domain per submission, and then we have to follow-up for the rest. It also includes more defined questions comprising the different situations that may appear within a complaint and that we have observed throughout these years.

And finally, it also requests to attach all applicable evidence with the submission. Here I'm saying "possibility" because it has to be effectively taken by the complainant. We're still seeing some submissions that, for example, do not include the evidence. So we still need to go back to the complainant and ask for it, like with the old system when this happens. I would like to point out here that it may look like we are asking for more, but in many instances, it's just that we are asking for it sooner so the process is more efficient for

everyone involved. Like I was saying before, we wanted to avoid, as much as possible, having to go back and get more information later on during the process or even before be able to start the investigation that may result in the contracted party being breached and potentially losing its accreditation with ICANN. So this is why it's important that we review all the information and all the evidence available to assess compliance. Next slide please. Thanks.

NSp is also intended to allow us to gather more granular data concerning the complaints. For example, we're now asking the complainant to please select the capacity in which he or she is submitting the complaint. This can be the registrant, this can be the contracted party, UDRP provider, law enforcement agency, etc. These are all options in a drop down list. And this information is needed to address complaints. For example, if someone is requesting the Auth-Info Code that can only be used to identify a registrant, but it also can help us get some useful information to, for example, determine potential areas of outreach. We could, for example, determine most individuals who submitted, who identify themselves as the registrant that submitted renewal complaints during this time period more than any other complaint. And most of them selected North America as their region. By the way, this is just an example. I'm not saying this is the case. I just wanted to illustrate what I meant.

Another example through the forms and other functionalities in NSp, we're capturing more granular data concerning the complaint itself. So if in the future there is a working group reviewing [renewal] obligations, for example, and the working group wanted to determine

whether there's data suggesting that registrants are still having issues with even knowing that a domain name is expiring, we could check for number of complaints received, not only within the domain renewal complaint type, but where the registrant selected the option indicating that they did not receive renewal notifications. So NSp has been designed to capture this kind of information as it is entered by the complainant with a submission. Next slide, please.

Last but not least, with NSp Compliance, we have introduced complaint forms that are dedicated to Temporary Specification matters such access to non-public Registration Data or the display of data where the registrant has requested and consented to such display.

Now speaking of the Temporary Specification, I am going to pass it over to Amanda, who is going to give us some updates on the subject. Amanda?

AMANDA ROSE:

Thank you, Leticia. As Leticia was presenting, we do have—can we have the next slide? I'm sorry. Thanks.

This just briefly introduces some of the changes that Contractual Compliance has undertaken since the Temporary Specification came into effect back in May of 2019. A year after that Temporary Specification was implemented, the Interim Registration Data Policy became effective in May of 2019, but that essentially just requires the contracted parties to continue to

implement measures consistent with the Temporary Specification. So that's currently the contractual requirements that we're living under and enforcing through Compliance.

So we briefly summarized some of the changes that Compliance has made on our end in our processing of complaints received. Firstly, we do have to go back—I know Leticia laid out a lot of the information we can get at the outset from reporters, but we still have to sometimes go back and request additional evidence necessary to validate complaints that we might have otherwise seen in the public WHOIS data or Registration Data Directory.

Then secondly, we will, through our inquiries and notices to contracted parties, have to sometimes go back and request the Registration Data directly from the contracted parties that again is otherwise not publicly available in the RDDs.

Finally, a large part of what we do is to educate reporters on some of the changes that have come into effect since May of 2018. A lot of that is because the Registration Data is no longer visible so there's a lot of misunderstanding of what is compliant and what is not compliant with respect to how Registration Data has to be displayed and its impact on registrants and end-users. So we can go to the next slide.

This is a summary of some of the metrics that we have or documented. We began specific to Temporary Specification obligations, gathering the metrics beginning in February 1, 2020 through August 2020 so far. We will have updated metrics as the monthly dashboards are published. However, through that time period, we have received 25

complaints with evidence of alleged violations of the Temporary Specification obligations. That includes any type of obligation under there, so we broke that down. 12 specifically related to request for access to non-public Registration Data in the RDDS, whereas the other 13 related to how registrars are displaying Registration Data in the public RDDS. Now, just to clarify, those are actual complaints that we have evidence of the violation or are able to verify it by observing what's in the public RDDS. So not necessarily every complaint we've received where we might not get a response are necessary to proceed forward.

The next bullet is the five inquiries that we have sent in this time period related to request for access to non-public Registration Data. The contracted parties' explanation on processes regarding their actions taken with respect to these types of requests or actions that will be taken are currently under review with respect to these five inquiries. We also sent 25 new inquiries during this time period concerning display of Registration Data, how it is displayed.

Some examples of that would be either under redacting data where it appears that they might be displaying Registration Data that would be subject to processing under GDPR, which may need to be redacted pursuant to the Temporary Specification. Others would be where they're over redacting, for example, not providing a web form or an e-mail or anonymized e-mail to access the registrant in the RDDS, which is required.

19 RDDS inquiries were closed. This was after registrars have fixed issues or fixed areas of non-compliance or demonstrated compliance. There are others that are still in process that are continuing their remediation efforts currently.

And then lastly, in this timeframe, we sent one new inquiry concerning consent to display Registration Data that's still in process, and that is where the registrant request to actually have data that's currently redacted displayed, which is also required.

I have just a note down here just explaining that these figures above don't capture everything. There are many complaints that were received prior to February 2020 that are included or may have been involved in some of the inquiries sent. Some of the inquiries may also be based on information that Compliance saw through their own monitoring, such as the RDDS concerns of under redacting, for example. Then in addition, there are inquiries not reflected here that are still in process from prior months. We can go ahead and continue to the next slide.

So, just a recap on some of the Compliance efforts related to Temporary Specification since ICANN67. As Leticia explained, we have launched the new complaint forms specific to Temporary Specification obligations. These will continue to be adjusted as we continue forward but also relate to some of the new EPDP recommendations that will come down the line, but currently relate to specific Temporary Specification obligations. But again, the slide that Leticia had presented does also include third party requests that may

involve a denial of or a failure to respond to a request for access for non-public Registration Data, which was one of the subjects of the ICANN66 GAC communiqué.

As we noted on the prior slide, we began publishing metrics on the monthly dashboard. This was started in May but reflects the data from February through the current month that's concerning Compliance issues related to the Temporary Specification, including specifically the third party access requests and breaking those down by complaint type there so you can see how many we actually received that or validated by Compliance meaning, again, we had evidence supporting that the request went through, that it was either not responded to pursuant to the complaint alleged or that we can actually verify that there is some concerns in the RDDS, for example.

We also continued addressing previously submitted cases currently under remediation and there may be some that are pending for the response and collaboration with the contracted parties.

And then finally, we continue educating complainants on changes, which I discussed earlier, but there is still some misunderstanding in the community where complainants believe that Registration Data is missing, where it's all redacted or not all redacted but certain portions are redacted as permitted under the Temporary Specification, whereas it is compliant, for example, with the Temporary Specification but there's misunderstanding as to what can and cannot be displayed. Also a lot of community members believe that privacy/proxy data is redactions and that is handled differently

pursuant to the privacy/proxy obligations in the RAA versus the [redactions] pursuant to the Temporary Specification.

And then finally, noted here are that the belief that non-European data should be displayed, which there are some areas of the Temporary Specification which allows flexibility in permitting either geographical differentiation in the RDDS or redactions beyond the EEA pursuant to their business.

So with that, I will go ahead and pass it over to Joe, who's going to present Audit Program Update. Thank you.

JOSEPH RESTUCCIA:

Thanks, Amanda. Hey, everyone. My name is Joe Restuccia and I'm an Audit Senior Specialist. I have the privilege of providing you all with the audit updates since ICANN67.

Currently we are in the process of preparing to launch the next audit, which will be a registrar audit. And similar to the most recent registry audit, which was focused on registry handling of DNS security threats, this audit will focus on registrars' abuse report handling obligations as highlighted in Section 3.18 of the 2013 RAA.

As part of the audit and to help us understand registrars' process and procedures regarding DNS security threats, additional information from both the reputation block lists, as well as registry operators' security threat reports will be used. And for those of you who are unfamiliar with our audit process, here we have provided a brief overview of the process for the upcoming audit.

Some of you may notice that this process is the same process that was used during the most recent registry audit, and basically at a high level, auditees will receive a request for information which we commonly refer to as the RFI and it will contain the list of audit questions. After auditees submit their responses to ICANN, we will review them. After the review, ICANN then will issue an initial audit report to each auditee that will contain both findings and or observations. Auditees then will work with ICANN to address those findings and observations. After addressing the findings and observations, ICANN will then issue an individual final audit report to each auditee. And lastly, a consolidated audit report which will summarize the entire audit round will be shared and published. With regards to the timing of the next audit, we are still in the process of determining the exact date for launching it.

That's it for the audit update. So I will hand things back over to Leticia to provide an update on the enforcement activities.

LETICIA CASTILLO:

Thanks, Joe. Next slide please. Thanks. So now, like with prior webinars, I'm going to provide you with some metrics concerning the cases we have processed since ICANN67. And I believe this may also answer some of the questions that I have been seeing in the chat.

This slide shows the number of new complaints received from February to August. The number is 10,791, and whether they were related to registrar obligations like transfer or renewal of domain name or registry obligations like zone file access or reserved names. In

this case, it was 9,451 for registrar, 1,340 for registry operators. It also shows that we closed 9,220 complaints without being able to contact the registrar or the registry operator.

As with prior updates, we can share that the largest number of closures across the most complaint types during this time period continues to occur because the complainants do not respond to our request for evidence supporting the complaint and/or misunderstood ICANN's role. Examples are cases where complainants ask us to update the Registration Data or to remove content from a website or to delete a domain name that is allegedly abusive. We have also observed cases where the issue has already been addressed at the time the complaint is reviewed. For example, the request for zone file access has already been approved or the transfer has been completed or the domain name has already been renewed.

For these complaints, we provide any relevant clarification or information that is needed to the complainant and we ask the complainant to reply back to us if help is still needed. Where the complainant does not reply back, either because the information provided is sufficient or the issue has been resolved or didn't want to pursue it for whatever reason, the case is closed and the complainant is explained why. We send a note with the information regarding why we're closing the complaint. At the bottom of this slide, like JD said is going to be shared, you have a link to go to our metrics and see more details about these complaints and others. This is for the complaints that are never sent to the contracted party. Now for the rest, scroll up to the next slide, please. Thank you.

At the bottom of this slide, there's a link to a detailed explanation of the process that Compliance follows when forwarding complaints to registrars and registry operators. I am also going to give a brief explanation of this process before I get into the numbers so the numbers make more sense.

Once a complaint is confirmed to be within our scope and we have everything that we need from the complainant and we have all the information and all the evidence, we start what we call the informal resolution process by forwarding a first Compliance notification, giving a notice or an inquiry to the registrar or registry operator with the complaint and explanation of the contractual obligations involved, what is needed from the contracted party to demonstrate compliance and by when. If this is not provided then the matter is escalated to a second and eventually to a third Compliance notification. In certain cases where they are critical, where registrants are at immediate risk, for example, we may skip the first, second, and/or third and go straight to an escalated notice that may result in a formal breach if it's not timely addressed. Now, with that explanation in mind, let's talk about the numbers.

From February to August, we sent 1,985 notifications within the informal resolution stage. By the way, I want to clarify the number of complaints received during this time period does not necessarily equal number of close before contacting the contracted party, plus the number of first notification sent. And this is because these reflect activity per month. So a complaint can be received in January 2020 and closed in February 2020, so it will not be reflected as complaint

received here but it will be reflected as complaint closed. I hope it makes sense.

Another clarification that I wanted to make is that these numbers do not include follow-up communications in between notifications. This means that, for example, if a registrar timely replies to a notice and there's a need for additional clarification or evidence following that response, we will send a follow-up to the first notice as opposed to escalating to second notice. And those communications will not be reflected in this chart either. This is just to say that the amount of communications that are completed to get to a resolution is larger than those on the screen.

This slide also includes a breakdown of the top three complaint types in volume, meaning the types within the registrar space and within the registry space for which we have sent the largest amount of Compliance notifications during this time period. The largest number of notification sent to registrars addressed obligations related to the accuracy of the Registration Data associated with domains, obligations under the transfer policy that comprises inter-registrar and inter-registrant changes in abuse report handling. With regard to registrar obligations, the large number of notifications refer to zone file access request, to provide an access to thin data to ICANN and monthly reports to ICANN as well.

So you can see here how the number decreases from first to second to third, and this is because once the contracted party provides us with everything that is required during this stage, the case is closed. And

both parties, the complainant and the registrar or registry, receive a closure note with the reasons for the closure. And the number of closures is on the slide as well, for those that were sent to the contracted party.

Every closure also includes a satisfaction survey link, and we do review each result and comments on a monthly basis. And if a result of these comments we need to send additional clarification to the complainant or reopen a case, all that is done to ensure that all cases are properly and fully addressed. And this has not changed with the transition to NSp, our closure notes we continue to include a link to the survey.

So, if no evidence of Compliance is provided during this informal resolution process, the matter is escalated to what we call the formal resolution or enforcement process where a formal notice is issued to the contracted party. This notice is public and it states the specific areas of non-compliance, what's needed from the contracted party [to cure] and by when. And failure to fully provide this information and fully address the notice results into a suspension or termination of the accreditation for registrars and termination for registries. All formal notices are published on our website. The link is also at the bottom of this slide.

With this, this concludes the summary of the activities conducted to ensure compliance and the ways in which we continue to seek improvement doing so. Now we are happy to start answering questions, JD.

JONATHAN DENISON: Okay. So we did get a number of questions in here. I think we might have answered some of them, but we'll just kind of go through them just to make sure. The first one comes from Mr. Maxim. I think it's regarding NSp Compliance: "Do all complainants have to log into the platform?"

LETICIA CASTILLO: Yeah, I can take that one. Thanks, Maxim. The answer is no. The complainant don't have to log into the platform. The communications that we send out to complainants and responses that we get are through e-mail.

JONATHAN DENISON: All right. From Fabricio, the question is, "Can NSp be purposed to also handle inbound requests for disclosure of WHOIS data?"

JAMIE HEDLUND: I can take a stab. Thanks, Fabricio for the question. It sounds like you're trying to turn NSp Compliance into the SSAD, but maybe I misunderstood. NSp is for handling complaints. It's not for forwarding inquiries. As Leticia described earlier, one of the benefits of the new platform is that it does everything it can to encourage complainants to provide evidence that their attempt to resolve their issue, whatever it is, with the contracted party was somehow unsatisfactory. So that's supportive of a complaint. We are not repurposing it. We are not using it to handle inquiries. Rather, we make sure that any complaints are preceded by either declined inquiry or an inquiry handled

inappropriately in the view of the complainant. I think it's a great topic for you to raise within the EPDP unless I've totally misunderstood it. Thanks.

JONATHAN DENISON:

Okay. Next question here is regarding abuse. This comes from [inaudible]. basically asking if Compliance can provide a plain language summary of the types of abuse complaints that are currently in scope for Compliance efforts. Basically, what are we assessing Compliance against when working with contracted parties? I think Leticia may be able to handle this one.

LETICIA CASTILLO:

Thanks, JD. Thanks for the questions. When it comes to the complaints that we receive from complainants regarding abuse report handling, we assess those against Section 3.18 of the RAA that is comprised by three subsections. The first one talks about the registrar must take reasonable and prompts steps to investigate and respond appropriately to abuse report. The second one talks about those reports that are actually submitted by certain authorities like law enforcement and having contact details for those and review within a certain period of time. And the third one talks about having the procedures that the registrar follows to address these abuse reports in public on their website and also to retain records regarding the received and response to those abuse reports for a certain period of time.

So what we do is when we receive a complaint, the questions we're going to ask from the contracted party, the evidence is going to depend on the complaint itself. For example, we get a complaint saying, "I submitted an abuse report to this registrar and I don't believe it was investigated and responded appropriately." So once we get all the information from the reporter, including copies of those reports that were submitted to the registrar and responses from the registrar, we initiate the contact with the registrar. We're going to ask them to explain how the abuse report was investigated and responded to, the steps that were taken to do so. We're going to ask them, where applicable, to explain how the steps are consistent with the registrar's on abuse policies, and we will ask for copies of the records regarding that investigation and response.

And I was saying that depends on the content that complaint because we may have a complaint that is received that what they're saying is that the registrar is not publishing an abuse contact on their website. That's also part of the obligation on the 3.18.1. So if that is the case, we will not ask for everything else that I just listed but just for the registrar to address that part. So that is for the operational part where we get the abuse complaint. The audit part, I don't know if Joe or Jamie wants to add more to that. Was that just related to RAA, the question, JD?

JONATHAN DENISON: I think it was—sorry, Jamie, was that you?

JAMIE HEDLUND: No, go ahead. Go ahead, JD.

JONATHAN DENISON: I think it was a kind of a broader question regarding registrars and registry requirements, and basically kind of like going through the respective requirements regarding how to handle abuse.

LETICIA CASTILLO: Okay. Also there's an obligation for the registry to include in the Registry/Registrar Agreement that they have with the registrars a provision prohibiting certain activities like phishing, copyright infringement, etc., and including the consequences for such activities. And so when we receive a complaint or part of our review, we will make sure that the content is in there. That's also related to abuse obligations and there's also an obligation for the registry to conduct a technical analysis to assess whether domain names in the TLD are being used to perpetrate security threats, and maintain statistical reports and provide it to ICANN upon request. That's also an obligation that we assess compliance with. There was an audit last year and I don't know, Jamie, if you wanted to talk a little bit about the audit here or add something.

JAMIE HEDLUND: Sure. I guess I'd back up a little bit. I couldn't tell from your question whether it was just about abuse or whether you were asking about what is Compliance role generally or what obligations do we enforce. Okay, good. You're only interested in abuse. Terrific.

Last year we did an audit of the registry operators and we took a different tack rather than auditing a subset of the registries against all or most of the obligations in the Registry Agreement. Given a high interest in DNS abuse and DNS security threats, we pursued a sort of a risk-based audit approach in which we narrowly targeted the obligations that we audit against, which were on DNS security threats and it was primarily Specification 11.3(b) from the Registry Agreement.

We published a general report with aggregated data from that audit and it's on our webpage. We intended to have follow-up shortly thereafter with an audit of the registrars and their obligations to enforce against DNS security threats, and that has been postponed due to the pandemic. We do plan to launch it, though. We hope to launch it before the end of the year. The questions we asked, the approach that we take will all be published. So audits are another way of tracking and assessing compliance with abuse and DNS security threat obligations. I hope that's helpful.

JONATHAN DENISON:

All right. Next we'll get to Susan Payne's questions that came a couple of minutes apart but they seem kind of related, relevant to the interim policy. So I think, Amanda, you'll be answering these. But basically, the questions are, "Can you please explain the difference between complaints and inquiries? Are these inquiries issued as a result of the complaints received or are they separate actions?" And then the other question is, "How many of the complaints led to inquiries? How many

did not result in follow-up with a contracted party, etc.? Do you publish that info?” I think Leticia kind of got to that in the in the overall sense of complaints versus inquiries, but since these came up during the Temp Spec section, maybe you can address those relevant specifically to those policies. Thanks, Amanda.

AMANDA ROSE:

Sure. Thank you, Susan, for the questions. Leticia may have covered this, but basically, when we receive a complaint, it can come from a number of different sources but this is usually an outside party as it relates to the Temporary Specification anyway. We’ll receive it, it’ll possibly allege a violation of the Temporary Specification. That would be different than an inquiry or a notice that is sent to the contracted party.

In slide #12, the figures that we have there, the 25 complaints that we received represent, again, validated complaints. So, these are complaints where we actually do have enough information to proceed to an inquiry or a notice with the contracted party. If we get a complaint that lacks that sufficient information, it will not result in a notice. So, hopefully that that clarifies the difference there.

As far as separate actions, it’s all part of the same usually complaint, but with respect to Temporary Specification obligations, we might receive multiple complaints that have the same issue alleged that may results in one inquiry, for example. Especially in the RDDS display obligations, we might have anywhere from one to five or more complaints about a missing web form or e-mail, inability to contact

the registrant because that information is not available but it's only concerning one issue with respect to Temporary Specification obligation so it would only result in one inquiry. So we may have a discrepancy between the number of complaints versus the number of inquiries as far as complaints that are validated.

Now, the next question, how many complaints received led to inquiries? With the reporting that we were able to do within our old system and reflected in slide 12, we did not have that specific information published and we didn't have quite as much capability to track the metrics on those issues. Moving forward with NSp, we're going to be publishing increased metrics and reporting specific to Temporary Specification and we are working on that currently, so we'll have that rolling out shortly.

As far as how many did not result in follow-ups with the contracted party, again, you'll be able to then see exactly how many complaints received with respect to each type of queue and how many inquiries or notices went to the contracted parties, which is not available currently in the May through August dashboard. So hopefully those cover the questions. I will pass it over to whoever's next.

JONATHAN DENISON:

Great. Thanks, Amanda. Susan, I think your third question regarding the audit process was answered by Yan in the chat. But just feel free to jump into the chat and let us know if you still require—okay, cool. Good. Okay. All right. Then we'll go to another NSp question for Leticia. It also comes from Maxim: "Will a contracted party receive an

e-mail to Compliance/Legal contacts after something has opened or changed in the cases?”

LETICIA CASTILLO:

Thanks, Maxim. The answer is yes. So when a case is created for a contracted party in the portal, there is an initial e-mail notification that is sent out to the Compliance contact. That is in NSp for the contracted party that informs there’s a new case that has been opened and includes a summary of the case, what type of complaint it is and the details of the complaint itself. And that is followed right after with the actual Compliance notice or inquiry with that list of what is needed from the contracted party to address that. So yeah, the answer is yes. And where there’s a post on the portal for the contracted party related to the case, there’s also a notification sent out.

Now, for the Legal contact, our process has not changed with NSp Compliance, so when a case reaches the third notice or inquiry or we escalate it, in addition to the Compliance contact, yes, the Legal contact will be added and informed as well.

JONATHAN DENISON:

All right. Thanks, Leticia. Actually, we’re going to keep it with you. I think next question here from Eng. Moamin Hamad is, “How is NSp designed for inbound handling and its importance for content?”

LETICIA CASTILLO:

Thanks for the question. I am not 100% certain that I am understanding that. I'm going to attempt to answer it but feel free to let us know in the chat if that was not the actual question or if it's something else that needs to be elaborated.

NSp Compliance is designed to address all types of complaints that we're getting. Where the complaint is within our scope, it will be forwarded to the contracted party per the process I was explaining before. We also have a team of people that are trained in different areas across all the agreements and they are dedicated to different complaint types so everything is covered. So we have the system, we have the people. I'm not sure if I answered your question, please let us know.

JONATHAN DENISON:

All right. In the meantime, I think, Jennifer, Jamie addressed your comment there regarding providing links. I appreciate the feedback for sure.

And then actually the last question is from Jeff Neuman regarding NSp. "I think you stated that there is no historical data in the NSp with respect to complaints prior to the launch of the NSp for complaints. Where can that data be accessed, if not through the portal?" It sounds like the question is about the open Compliance issues that were existing prior to NSp.

LETICIA CASTILLO:

Thanks, Jeff. Yes, correct. The cases that were open prior to the migration have not been migrated to the new portal. So we are operating with two systems for a short period of time. So those cases will continue to operate like we have until August 29. The contracted parties still receive an e-mail with the notice attaching the complaint, what's needed, and can reply like that. There's also, for example, for registrars, into our portal, they have an informative tab with a list of the IDs of tickets that they have in the prior system.

So to answer your question, those that have not been migrated that are still open can be addressed through e-mail like it has been done before this, before NSp Compliance.

JONATHAN DENISON:

All right. I think that was the last question we received. I note, it is now two minutes until the end of the meeting so it seems like good timing here. Again, we can always send any further questions to compliance@icann.org if anything comes up. I think what I'll do now is send it over to Jamie in case he wants to take us out here.

JAMIE HEDLUND:

Sure. Thank you, JD. Thank you, Leticia. Thank you, Joe. Thank you, Amanda. And thank you all, most importantly, for joining the webinar. As JD said, if you have any further questions at any time, please send them our way. We're happy to answer them and we are grateful, as always, for your feedback and participation. Thank you. With that, we give you one minute back. Take care, all.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]