Los Angeles Headquarters



\$ 12025 Waterfront Drive, Suite 300 Los Angeles, CA 90094-2536 USA

+1 310 301 5800

+1 310 823 8649

30 April 2018

RE: Response to Complaint Regarding Edited Remote Participation Comment

Jamie Baxter Dotgay LLC Via electronic mail

Dear Jamie Baxter,

Thank you for your submission. In your complaint (see:

https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/complaint-c-2018-00013-redacted-23mar18-en.pdf) you explain that during ICANN's Public Forum #2 in San Juan, Puerto Rico, you submitted a remote participation comment of which only a portion of it was read into the transcript. I appreciate you bringing this to the attention of the ICANN org (all subsequent uses of "ICANN" refer to the ICANN organization). I've researched this issue with various departments inside ICANN and worked with the Communications team, who is responsible for managing the session, to provide you with this response.

Following my research and internal discussions, I found that a mistake was made by the ICANN org when it read the comment you submitted remotely during Public Forum #2. ICANN follows a consistent process for receiving, handling, and reading questions and comments that are submitted remotely during ICANN meeting Public Forums. The process for handling remote submissions involves providing the submitted text to the Public Forum manager so they may share it with the facilitator for reading. However, in this case an error was made when copying and pasting your submission for the facilitator to read aloud. A portion of your text was inadvertently not copied onto the screen from which the facilitator reads the submission. This is why your comment was not read in full.

Although your comment was not read in full during Public Forum #2 in San Juan, Puerto Rico, it has been published in its entirety on ICANN's website. As you may recall, you submitted questions during Public Forum #1 and the Q&A Session with the ICANN org Executive team that were related to the comment you submitted during Public Forum #2. The ICANN Board committed to providing you with a response regarding your issue and ultimately published the full text of your questions from Public Forum #1, the Q&A Session with the ICANN org Executive team, your comment from Public Forum #2, and the Board's response. You can view this publication at: https://static.ptbl.co/static/attachments/170763/1522155265.pdf?1522155265, or if you go to the Public Forum #1 meeting page (https://static.ptbl.co/static/attachments/170763/1522155265.pdf?1522155265, or if you go to the Public Forum #1 meeting page (https://static.ptbl.co/static/attachments/170763/1522155265.pdf?1522155265, or if you go to the Public Forum #1 meeting page (https://static.ptbl.co/static/attachments/170763/1522155265.pdf?1522155265, or if you go to the Public Forum #1 meeting page (https://e1.schedule.icann.org/meetings/647618), it is linked on the right had side of the page entitled "Response to Baxter Question during PF1". Additionally, since it is unknown whether the full ICANN Board has seen the referenced publication, I have recommended, and the persons within the ICANN org that are responsible for managing the Public Forum have committed, to share your full Public Forum #2 comment with the full Board.

My research indicates this mistake was caused by human error and I was not able to identify other instances of it happening under the current process, which has been in use for several years. Because this appears to be a one-off error, no process improvements are currently being recommended or undertaken. However, as noted above, the ICANN org did publish your



comment in full, is providing it to the full Board, and the team will continue to evaluate the effectiveness of its processes. I've asked the team to let me know if other issues arise, so I can keep an eye on this and determine if it requires additional involvement of the Complaints Office.

In addition to the above, the session producers have offered to meet, either in-person at an ICANN meeting or remotely, if you'd like to get a better understanding of how the Public Forums are run and discuss your thoughts on how the process can be improved. ICANN's Public Forums have evolved with each iteration, and the community's feedback is important to ensuring every stakeholder is being offered an opportunity to participate.

ICANN appreciates you taking the time to bring this information to our attention and takes responsibility for its mistake of not reading the entirety of the comment you submitted during Public Forum #2. We are committed to always working to increase the effectiveness and to provide additional transparency and accountability, all in service of ICANN's mission. Your willingness to submit this information helps us to achieve these commitments.

I appreciate your continued participation in ICANN, your contributions to helping us work towards being our very best, and the opportunity to provide you with this information.

Kind regards,

Krista Papac Complaints Officer ICANN