1. **Meta-issue : Uniformity of Reporting**

This working group has identified the need for more uniformity in the mechanisms to initiate, track, and analyze policy-violation reports. The IRTP Working Group identified a similar need during its review of compliance reports in that arena. This issue is much broader than registration abuse, is being discussed by a number of working and advisory groups simultaneously, and will require more than simple uniformity of contracts to address.

1. **The Problem**

The processes by which a person experiencing a problem learns about their options to resolve that problem, or learns which remedies are covered by ICANN policy and which are not, is sometimes difficult. As a result:

* End-users and registrants find it confusing and difficult to identify the most appropriate problem-reporting venue or action to take when they experience problems.
* Registrars and registries are frustrated if their customers file complaints in error, in the wrong place, or without first seeking help from the most relevant provider.
* Working and advisory groups find their work hampered by the lack of reliable (rather than anecdotal) data upon which to base policy decisions.

In addition, the process of reporting a perceived policy violation could be used to educate people on the limits of ICANN policies and available options if their issue is not covered by policy.

The RAPWG suggests, as a starting point for discussion, that every abuse policy should have:

* **Reporting**: a mechanism whereby violations of the policy can be reported by those who are impacted
* **Notification:** standards as to how contracted parties make visible:
	+ where to report policy violations,
	+ “plain language” definitions of what constitutes a “reportable” problem,
	+ “just in time education” describing reporting or action options that are available when the person’s problem falls outside ICANN policy.
* **Tracking**: transparent processes to collect, analyze, and publish summaries of valid policy-violation reports, the root-causes of the problems and their final disposition
* **Compliance:** processes to provide due process, and sanctions that will be applied, in the case of policy violations.

If the GNSO creates a subsequent effort to address this issue, it might consider the following tentative list of goals:

* Providing “just in time” education and knowledge to people wanting to report problems
* Making it easier to submit a valid complaint
* Reduce the number of erroneous complaints
* Improving understanding of the limits of ICANN policies and other options to pursue if the issue is not covered by policy
* Improving the effectiveness of policy-compliance activities
* Improving the data available for GNSO (working-group) and ICANN (advisory-group) policy-making
* Improving the data available for compliance activities
* Answering the question “which comes first, policy-process or definitive data describing the problem?” along with suggestions as to how data can be gathered when it hasn’t yet been included in the reporting process.
1. **Recommendation**

***The RAPWG recommends that the GNSO, and the larger ICANN community in general, create and support uniform reporting processes.***

 ***The WG achieved unanimous consensus on the above recommendation.*** *In favour (13): Aaron (RySG), Amadoz (RySG), Bladel (RrSG), Cobb (CBUC), Felman (MarkMonitor), Neuman (RySG), O’Connor (CBUC), Queern (CBUC), Rasmussen (Internet Identity), Rodenbaugh (CBUC), Shah (MarkMonitor), Sutton (CBUC), Young (RySG). Against, or alternate views: none.*