

# At-Large Related-Issue Compliance Submission Process Workspace

Comment Close Date	Statement Name	Status	Assignee (s) and RALO(s)	Call for Comments	Call for Comments Close	Vote Announcement	Vote Open	Vote Reminder	Vote Close	Date of Submission	Staff Contact and Email	Statement Number
n/a	<a href="#">Related-Issue Compliance Submission Process</a>	Adopted 13Y, 0N, 0A	<a href="#">Alan Greenberg</a> (NARALO)	21.02.2014	24.02.2014	n/a	<a href="#">ALAC Monthly Teleconference 25.02.2014</a>	n/a	<a href="#">ALAC Monthly Teleconference 25.02.2014</a>	25.02.2014	ICANN Compliance <a href="mailto:compliance@icann.org">compliance@icann.org</a>	AL-ALAC-ST-0214-03-00-EN

Should the ALAC begin to send a copy of the Related-Issue Compliance Submission Process to the necessary parties?

- Motion: Alan Greenberg
- Second: Eduardo Diaz, Evan Leibovitch, Jean-Jacques Subrenat
- 14Y: Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Maureen Hilyard, Alan Greenberg, Dev Anand Teelucksingh, Eduardo Diaz, Evan Leibovitch, Fatima Cambroner, Hadja Ouattara Sanon, Jean-Jacques Subrenat, Leon Sanchez, Rafid Fatani, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Sandra Hoferichter, Holly Raiche
- 0N: n/a
- 0A: n/a

## FINAL VERSION TO BE SUBMITTED IF RATIFIED

[Please click here to download a copy of the PDF below.](#)

**FINAL DRAFT VERSION TO BE VOTED UPON BY THE ALAC**

ICANN Contractual Compliance (CC) accepts complaints either on a one-by-one basis using web-based submission tools, or for selected partners, using a bulk-submission process. The ALAC understanding is that regardless of the submission vehicle, each complaint is reviewed on its merits and processed individually. Such a methodology is warranted to address the wide range of complaints that might be received by CC, coupled with the need to ensure that all of the specifics of a complaint are understood and well-founded before any action with a registrar is initiated.

However, this methodology is not suitable when the subject of a complaint is not an individual occurrence, but a more wide-spread problem that affects multiple gTLD registrations. In such case, the individual handling of related situations causes much repetitive work and moreover, does not allow CC to avail itself of the underlying patterns and related issues discovered by the complaint originator.

Just as the UDRP allows multiple related disputes to be filed in the same single complaints, CC should allow multiple, related issues to be raised in a single complaint. Just as a UDRP panel has the opportunity to consider the complete set of related complaints at the same time, CC should give itself the same benefit.

If such a process were created, the workload of CC could be better controlled, and substantive issues could be resolved quicker and earlier than by using today's methodology alone. Moreover, as ICANN develops its internal technology to review Whois accuracy, the discovery of such related problems are likely to be made in-house, and it is inevitable that CC must gear up for these cases.

It is reasonable that, at least at the start, the use of such a "related complaint" submission process be used only by those with whom ICANN can develop a good working relationship, and possibly accreditation for the existing bulk-submission tool could be used to determine who could use the new process.

This recommendation is being submitted to CC on behalf of the At-Large Advisory Committee, and the ALAC believes that it is to all parties' mutual advantage that we have the opportunity to further investigate such a process with Contractual Compliance.

## **FIRST DRAFT SUBMITTED**

ICANN Contractual Compliance (CC) accepts complaints either on a one-by-one basis using web-based submission tools, or for selected partners, using a bulk-submission process. The ALAC understanding is that regardless of the submission vehicle, each complaint is reviewed on its merits and processed individually. Such a methodology is warranted to address the wide range of complaints that might be received by CC, coupled with the need to ensure that all of the specifics of a complaint are understood and well-founded before any action with a registrar is initiated.

However, this methodology is not suitable when the subject of a complaint is not an individual occurrence, but a more wide-spread problem that affects multiple gTLD registrations. In such a case, the individually handling of related situations causes much repetitive work and moreover, does not allow CC to avail itself of the underlying patterns and related issues discovered by the complaint originator.

Just as the UDRP allows multiple related disputes to be filed in the same single complaints, CC should allow multiple, related issues to be raised in a single complaint. Just as a UDRP panel has the opportunity to consider the complete set of related complaints at the same time, CC should give itself the same benefit.

If such a process were created, the workload of CC could be better controlled, and substantive issues could be resolved quicker and earlier than by using today's methodology alone. Moreover, as ICANN develops its internal technology to review Whois accuracy, the discovery of such related problems are likely to be made in-house, and it is inevitable that CC must gear up for these cases.

It is reasonable that, at least at the start, the use of such a "related complaint" submission process be used only by those with whom ICANN can develop a good working relationship, and possibly accreditation for the existing bulk-submission tool could be used to determine who could use the new process.

This recommendation is being submitted to CC on behalf of the At-Large Advisory Committee, and the ALAC believes that it is to all party's mutual advantage that we have the opportunity to further investigate such a process with Contractual Compliance.