ICANN Transcription

Data & Metrics for Policy Making Working Group Tuesday 19 May 2015 at 20:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of Data & Metrics for Policy Making Working Group call on the Tuesday 19 May 2015 at 20:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at: http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-dmpm-19may15-en.mp3

On page: http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar#may

Attendees:
Sara Bockey - RrSG
Cheryl Langdon-Orr - At–Large
Nenad Orlic - ISPCP
Marinel Rosca - Individual
Jonathan Zuck - IPC
Tony Onorato - Individual
Pam Little - RySG
Benjamin Okinmoyeje
Janvier Ngnoulaye - Individual
Olevie Kouami - NPOC

Apologies:
Graeme Bunton - RrSG

ICANN staff:
Steve Chan
Berry Cobb
Nathalie Peregrine
Ozan Sahin

Coordinator: Speakers, you may begin.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much, (Blake). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everybody. And welcome to the DMPM working group call on the 19th of May 2015.

On the call today we have Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Nenad Orlic, Olevie Kouami, (Sever Baucket), Tony Onarato, Marinel Rosca, and Jonathan Zuck. We received an apology from Graeme Bunton. And from staff we have Barry Cobb, Steve Sheng, (unintelligible) and myself, Nathalie Peregrine. I'd like you to remind you all to please state your names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you every so much. And over to you, Jonathan.

Jonathan Zuck: Thank you. Is there anyone that's on the phone that isn't online that needs to speak up?

Berry Cobb: We've got Tony.

Jonathan Zuck: Okay.

Berry Cobb: He's the only one.

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Zuck: ...reconnect as our roll call.

Tony Onarato: It's (unintelligible) on the phone, but I'm not online.

Jonathan Zuck: Who is it?

Tony Onarato: It's Tony Onarato, Jonathan.

Jonathan Zuck: Okay, Tony, great.

Tony Onarato: (Unintelligible) I'm on the phone...

Jonathan Zuck: So please...

Tony Onarato: ...I'm on the phone.

Jonathan Zuck: Please add Tony Onarato to the roll call.

Tony Onarato: I'm not online.

Jonathan Zuck: Thank you. Okay. So are there any updates? Does anyone have any updates or statements of interest? Anyone with a new job in the time that - since our last meeting? Or a new client?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: If only.

Jonathan Zuck: Don't ever change, Cheryl. Okay. So then the next thing -- I guess -- is the Kavi pilot discussion. So I'm going to go ahead and hand that back over to Berry and (Steve) to lead that conversation.

Berry Cobb: All right. Thank you, Jonathan. Berry Cobb for the record. We'll just spend a couple of minutes on the Kavi discussion. Tony, unfortunately, since you're not in the AC room you're not going to see much of what's going on in the call today. But afterwards we'll have links to the documents and those kinds of things.

Just real quick, the Kavi pilot for the DMPM Group is still ongoing. I think first and foremost there's - there seems to be an issue with some of the mail routing.

And I think by the members that have joined the working group here at least - at the very least getting the calendar invites - otherwise you probably wouldn't be on the call.

But how we had set - or rearranged some of the mail routing and (term)...

Jonathan Zuck: I just saw (unintelligible). Is it - everybody else still...

Berry Cobb: I can't hear you, Jonathan.

Woman: Hold on. He did sound like he dropped halfway through a word.

Berry Cobb: So anyway, while - at any rate we are having a few issues with some of the mail routing. The intent was that we would utilize the Kavi platform to take over for the primary mail discussions on the list and have those populated onto the actual mailman archive list that we have originally started out with.

For some reason that functionality isn't working as designed, so we're still trying to figure out what some of the mail routing issues. In the meantime, what I'm going to suggest is that we use both addresses.

When I did send the agenda out last Friday I used both addresses. And I could tell that it at least populated onto the archive list -- which is our production list that we need to maintain in terms of openness and transparency.

So we'll send an email to this note - or to this tune of asking anybody that does wish to communicate via the mail list to use both addresses. Unfortunately, that may cause some duplication.

But at the very least we know in the interim that messages are being posted to the archive and on top of that are being received by the members of the working group.

With that in mind - so that's one element that we're working through. The second element is the posting of documents into the working draft section of the Kavi workspace.

From my own personal perspective I do like some of the features that allow to maintain revision control and also the ability to view the quantity of downloads on those particular documents.

And so some of the latest ones that we posted for - that was posted on May 5th, we can see pretty minimal activity members accessing these documents. Granted, they haven't changed a whole lot since we reviewed them back in April.

But this for, you know, for the purposes of this pilot this is kind of the authoritative source where these documents will reside.

Working with (Steve) we'll make sure that these get loaded onto the Wiki space as well -- which I think we've kind of neglected up to this point. But we'll make sure that we get these documents posted in the right place as well.

The last point that I'll touch on real quick is the calendaring and scheduling/attendance. I think for the most part this is working okay. It's not perfect.

And to set up the pilot we've had to create a few work-arounds for maintaining how this gets communicated out to the working groups and how it appears on our calendars.

But from another selfish perspective, one of the features to this is logging the attendance as it relates to each particular meeting. And I'll just show you real briefly.

But if you can view in the AC room you'll see that we've got over on the first-hand side a list of the members of the working group that have participated up to this point.

And then there is additional columns as you move to the right where we're taking the attendance back from - starting from the April 14th to the April 28th.

There are some other features of rolled up reporting that do show promising signs. And the idea is that if this was to ever move to production to be able to roll this up in a much greater view.

So those are kind of the three aspects that I wanted to touch on. As I mentioned we still have a few hook-ups - or hiccups or kinks to work out as we continue through this pilot.

We will continue the pilot at least up and to or through the Buenos Aires meeting. And so with that, I'll just open it up to the group.

If you have any comments or issues that you may have seen on your end in terms of receiving either the calendar entries for the meetings or if there was any issue you saw with me sending out the agenda or thirdly, in terms of the documents being posted into Kavi.

And I see that Jonathan is having some audio issues. So he'll be back on shortly. Okay.

So the last thing that I'll just mention about the Kavi pilot is -- like I said -- we going to continue this up and through the Buenos Aires meeting.

I believe probably around June 9th or so -- the week before people travel to the Buenos Aires meeting we will bring back (Steve Allison) -- that's the ICANN product league for this pilot -- as well as at least one of the Kavi representatives.

And we'll probably spend a little bit more time trying to gain some additional feedback from the members of the group.

So with that, if there are no questions or comments I'm going to go ahead and move on to the real reason why we're here and the real work that this group needs to accomplish.

Before we get into the nitty gritty of what it is that we need to accomplish, we thought it'd be a good time to share what the work plan would be between now and approximately September.

So today is the 19th of May in terms of what we'll be reviewing. Today is just another quick look at the charter questions that are organizing our work here as well as review the small changes that we made to the charter template, the metrics request template. And we'll also briefly review through a decision tree as well as a couple other aspects.

Because we missed last week's meeting we will have a meeting next week on the 26th of May. And we'll continue our discussions around what metrics that we need to - what perspectives we need to look at at the issue-report stage.

And that should help kind of complete our overview of the policy process. And we'll also take another look at the draft recommendations that we have to date.

All of this work is in - with the intent that on the 28th of May we'll send around a first draft of the initial report. We have a skeleton version - or created now that we're filling in some of the blanks with some of the deliverables.

So when you see this first draft -- as we mentioned -- it's going to be a slimmed-down version of a typical initial report. But it will contain all the

deliverables to date, the recommendations that - or the draft recommendations that are on the table at this point.

And then from there that'll pretty much drive our work all the way through to the Buenos Aires meeting. So as I mentioned, on the 28th of May we'll send around the first draft.

This will allow us one good meeting on the 9th of June where we can start to review the contents of that initial report and then understand or have any other discussions on any of the other outstanding charter questions that we may have.

On that time or around that time we'll be preparing materials in preparation for the Buenos Aires meeting. On Saturday in the afternoon Jonathan will be providing an update to the GNSO council about our efforts to date and then as well as we have a face-to-face meeting scheduled for the 25th of June at 07:00 hours where we'll predominantly continue a discussion on the draft report that we have at that point -- which essentially does take care of our Number 7 charter question.

So again, 07:00 am start on Thursday the 25th. After Buenos Aires, essentially July and August are preparing the initial report to post for public comment. You'll notice I don't have specific dates listed here yet.

But we will want to shoot for a 40-day public comment period as well as the close of that comment period we'll want to review the comments and then make any adjustments in terms of completing our final report.

And what we're targeting here is the 13th of September to have this final report complete so that we can meet the GNSO council's deadline by the 14th of September to have them consider the findings from the report.

So that's kind of a high level perspective of our milestones just to show that we're keeping ourselves honest. We have a more blown-out project plan that we maintain internally -- which essentially tracks all of our meetings, our aspects of drafting our initial report moving into the final report, and then delivery to the GNSO council with percent completions.

So any questions or comments about the proposed work plan up to this point? Do members believe that this is doable or that that's a good goal for us to shoot our target for September to deliver a final report?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl. We're used to working on unreasonable timelines, Berry. We're probably hoping it's a good goal.

Berry Cobb: Absolutely. Well in typical fashion, if we don't make it we extend it out. But in general I think this has drug on long enough. It's time to try to put this one to rest and...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Berry Cobb: ...move on to better days. All right. This didn't get sent out to the list. But we'll also make sure to email this out for those that couldn't attend the call today so they have an idea of the timeline ahead of us as well.

All right. Now we're going to move into the details of our work. And (Steve) and I in terms of - in some of our dialogue that we had we thought it would be a good idea - or really not so much the dialogue but in terms of preparing the initial report one feature that is prevalent across every report is essentially how the charter questions were deliberated and in that deliberations what were the findings? And then what were the ultimate recommendations?

So the typical structure is, you know, here is DMPM's first charter question. Here's how the working group deliberated on the issues for that charter

question, and then typically what a recommendation would be to address that.

So we thought it would be good to walk through each of these. And I'll make sure to give you control. This particular document that you see in the Adobe Connect Room is not new.

The first page is a new addition of just me cutting and pasting the charter questions into this document. But the remainder of the document the group has seen before -- which contains on Page 2 what our draft recommendations are.

We essentially have five that we're working with as well as a draft list of some of the deliverables that we've been working on. And there are a few comments out to the right that are pointing to what we've accomplished this far -- such as making an update to the charter template, referring to the deliverable date of request metrics template.

We also have the decision tree that could be useful in terms of that request gets used, as well as - and then, you know, there's essentially kind of some blanks here in case we come up with any additional recommendations or deliverables.

So with that respect, what I was planning to do is just walk thru each of these charter questions. I've taken a few notes myself of how the group has discussed these.

And I'll open up the floor for each one if there's additional activity that we need to document and/or any other thoughts about how that particular charter question is being reviewed by the working group.

So the first charter question which comes first, the 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.

So you'll remember that when we first kicked off this exercise we spent several months reviewing previous working group efforts. They're basically determined what worked and what didn't or establish some sort of baseline as to where metrics were used and where they weren't and how they helped with the policy process.

I think in those discussions there were components of where, you know, without a doubt the metrics did help. I should say metrics and/or survey instruments are a more quantitative approach to some of the analysis did help form some of the recommendations in the working group.

And then clearly there were other instances where data wasn't used and perhaps could have assisted in that policy process. But the simple takeaway is that in issues that are being reviewed the absence of baseline data to better define the issue it's really a problem in of itself.

And I think we've mentioned on the call several times about trying to change the culture within the policy process, to use data is to help inform the policy decision-making process.

And a secondary kind of principle is that for working groups - is that the data should be collected where possible at each stage of the policy process meaning that, you know, an early stage of defining the initial report -- which we'll talk about in our next call - how can metrics better inform the issue definition stage.

We have had discussions about what that meant at the chartering exercise phase of the process as well as how the eventual working group can use or

create that data - or I shouldn't say "create," but seek the data to help inform their further issue definition.

But most importantly is once recommendations have been formed to more or less take a template approach of once those consensus policy recommendations have been implemented and once they have been implemented for x time period that there's some kind of continuous improvement - or at least going back and asking the questions of how did this policy change and what are - did this change actually effect the right course of action as it pertains to the intent of the policy that was being implemented there?

So with that, does anybody have any - anything to add to how the group has responded to this first charter question? Or should - is there anything that we missed in terms of what I just mentioned?

Man: All good.

Berry Cobb: All right. Hearing and seeing none, I'll move on to the second, "How processes can be continuously improved, simplified, and made more consistent for people wishing to either report a problem or learn about their options when the problem falls outside of ICANN policy."

This particular charter question you -- for lack of a better word -- you could almost say it is a legacy charter question from the original - as far back as when this was hatched back in the -- oh my goodness, I can't even remember the group name -- the RAP, the Registration Abuse Policy.

At the time that this was an issue the front end system for engaging with contractual compliance was less than optimal. Between then and now there has been a considerable amount of improvements and enhancements made to the front end complaint intake system for ICANN's contractual compliance.

It had then migrated away from - I can't even remember the old website. But it now has its own dedicated page under ICANN contractual compliance by the types of categories of problems or complaints -- it is much more robust -- as well as with good descriptions of what each of those issues and categories has tried to accomplish -- as well as the complaint intake system itself in terms of filling out and identifying who you are. what your issues is, being able to categorize that, and then sending it through to contractual compliance.

And most importantly is on the backend side or what the output of that process is. ICANN contractual compliance has a dedicated reports page that talks about the number of complaints that were received, how and when they were resolved and those kinds of components.

So I think in general for this particular charter question, this particular group hasn't really discussed this yet. And it's up to the group to decide whether we want to spend additional time on this.

But I think for the most part with the enhancements that contractual compliance has made that this pretty much kind of knolls itself out for any further attention by this particular group.

Anybody have any comments or suggestions in regards to this? I see in the chat that there's agreement that it's been rendered moot and a distraction for what we're trying to accomplish here -- probably more on the policy side than the compliance side.

Okay. Hearing and seeing no other hands, I'll move on to the third. The third is "Principles that enhance metrics and data available to better inform the GNSO policy development process."

As I just briefly mentioned a minute ago, again our, you know, our unofficial task here is (unintelligible) about enhancing the culture, the policy development process, and the use of data and metrics.

We have - and I only just thought of this today. I had a mind lapse a while back.

But before we got to the point of where we created our decision tree matrix and before we created the metrics request template there was a document that we did start a draft on that had some higher level principles about what some of these, you know, some of the use of data and metrics should be.

Some of it was more - (attained) to, you know, the acquisition of specific data -- mostly by contracted parties. But I think that it can be repurposed for this particular group to float some of these higher-level principles up.

And so I'm going to take the action to fish that principles document out and try to bring it more up-to date with what we've accomplished to date, send that around, and look for some additional feedback.

I think it would be a good aspect of the document that if we can - for those that are involved in the CWG and CCWG groups there are basically some high-level principles that created - that govern how their work is supposed to be accomplished -- and more importantly what their end proposal is supposed to be shaped around.

And I think that will help benefit and perhaps be some good talking points when we - when the group goes to socialize the working group's findings with the counsel and the great community -- especially during public comment.

Jonathan Zuck: Berry?

Berry Cobb: Yes, please, Jonathan.

Jonathan Zuck   Yes. As you look I think there's a couple of different versions of that document because I know that when the document first appeared we did everything we could to take some of the principals and incorporate them into the flow diagrams and in some, you know, the process analysis that we were doing for requesting data.

It was a very - at the outset a very specific and a little bit defensive. And so I think there's been some versions since. And we want to make sure that we're working with the latest versions and reincorporating probably some of the defining principles from the charter into that document if we do a principles-based document.

Berry Cobb: Agreed. And yes, I'll definitely make sure I find the latest one. And again, I think it's really just going to be - our actions should be that this is a starter draft and let's try to have a good discussion about what these real principles should be.

Again, I kind of return back to the, you know, the aspect of changing the culture and being - in fact, I just remembered this. When (Steve) created the executive summary for the use case that we were going to send out for IRTP D I believe some of the content that he wrote in that executive summary can be repurposed out to find some of the principles...

Jonathan Zuck: Agreed.

Berry Cobb: ...because it really got to the heart of matter what we were trying to accomplish and why this is a good thing for the GNSO and the policy development process. Okay.

I'll move on to the fourth one, "Improved understanding of the limits of ICANN policies regarding data measurement and tracking and other options to pursue if an issue is not covered by policies that gather data."

You will remember that we did have some extensive discussions about how a working group would request data - not only from ICANN contractual compliance but as well as contracted parties and some of the investigation.

The current contracts really - there isn't much to work on in terms of getting, you know, particular sets of registration data out there. There wasn't enough to make additional requests that would provide access for working groups to get those certain types of data that weren't already somehow addressed in the current agreement.

So, you know, the working group did spend a considerable amount of time discussing that -- especially through one or two ICANN meetings. That has evolved into what we have as our deliverables now in terms of again, the decision tree and what happens when certain data is requested that is not a contractual obligation.

The requesting of that through contracted parties or third parties - because there could be financial implications. And this in turn I think will kind of go back to some of the principles if, you know, if a request is made to contract the parties or third parties that is of a sensitive nature, what are some of the actions that should be taken in that particular case?

So in terms of, you know, that's kind of a high level of the deliberations. But what we really I think accomplished is that - or that we understood that there's a lack of a formal process by which groups can submit these data requests.

And as such, we've made the decision tree and the request form itself as well as I think one of the draft recommendations is ensuring that resources are made available to the GNSO -- either from a staff perspective or an external request perspective -- to get access to this data should there be any financial aspects to that request.

Any comments or suggestions of anything that may relate to this fourth charter question? Hearing and seeing none, so I'll move on to number five, which is "Mechanisms whereby the - where GNSO working groups can request information -- both internal to ICANN or external -- including GNSO contracted parties which support backspaced policy making."

I think that's really a tie back to number four. I won't rehash what I just mentioned other than to say that as part of our deliverables as referenced back to the decision tree to request data as well as a request form that would be taken and worked through the GNSO council and staff should it - a working group get to that point.

Any suggestions or comments for charter Question 5? Okay. I'll move on to Number 6, "Mechanisms to ensure appropriate safeguards with regard to the confidentiality of certain types of information."

Again, this is accounted for in the decision tree. I think that it's also listed in the request template draft that we have at this point.

And this also goes to the - or in a more detailed perspective when you look at that decision tree is if, you know, again there is this issue - this aspect of sensitive data where that data should be aggregated or anonymized to avoid the sensitive nature of that data.

And I think then we've also mentioned about how there should be a commitment by ICANN that should include any financial considerations. So essentially 4, 5, and 6 are really kind of all meshed together in terms of how the group has deliberated as well as the draft recommendations up to this point.

Any questions or comments with respect to Number 6? Hearing and seeing none I'll move on to 7. "Framework for distributing information to the GNSO

policy making community with the intent of both informing those groups and providing the ongoing basis for identifying and correcting problem reporting and data collection problems."

I think this is one that the group hasn't really discussed yet. And the only thing that could come to (Steve) and I's mind about in terms of providing information on an ongoing basis.

There's really two aspects. The first again references back to the reporting pages supplied by ICANN's contractual compliance team. And then the secondary aspect, which is a draft recommendation at this point is that should there be - should a working group create any consensus policy recommendations that there is this effort post-implementation to review the intent of - or to review the success or failure of that policy implementation and course correct as appropriate.

Or, put a little bit simpler, is kind of the continuous improvement aspect of delivering that. But again, I think for the most part I don't recall us having any specific discussions.

And if the group feels that we need to spend a little bit more time talking about this, then perhaps, you know, we can do that at the next call.

Jonathan Zuck: Berry?

Berry Cobb: Please, Jonathan.

Jonathan Zuck: I know in a couple of face-to-face meetings, you know, we - our discussions spilled a little bit into what might be called "open data" type discussions. And I know over on the CCT implementation team there was a real desire to have raw data distributed or owned et cetera so that it could be evaluated by others.

And so that's certainly -- I think -- an open issue inside of ICANN. I just think it's a kind of a can of worms to go down that path and that we're better off with a very targeted set of recommendations.

And I think the point you were raised about the continuous improvement issue and the checking to see whether or not the recommendations we made are having the effect that we intended is probably the best most straightforward answer to this particular charter question because that outcome isn't even really, you know, addressed elsewhere explicitly except maybe in the next question a little bit as well.

But I mean I think that's a powerful part about what we're trying to recommend here. And it's also - it might in some ways be one of the most significant changes - cultural changes that we're recommending, which is to revisit, you know, work at a prescribed period of time to see whether or not the recommendations produce the intended results.

So I think we're wise to go down that path as the answer to the next two questions probably.

Berry Cobb: Great. Thank you, Jonathan. And I see that there's agreement by Cheryl there as well. So I guess in terms of actions our, you know, we'll document that, basically this little - these few statements within the initial report basically referencing back to some of the draft recommendations that we have on the table now.

And we'll more or less call this addressed -- at least from a chartering question perspective. And I would have to agree about keeping the scope very targeted. Otherwise it may linger on unaddressed for quite a while.

Lastly, Number 8, "Any changes needed to incorporate the process described above." Essentially I think that that pretty much encompasses just about everything that we have discussed at this point.

I will draw your attention to the last page that you see in Adobe Connect Room. This is still in draft form. So it was just quickly done. But the intent of this graphic is to highlight the policy development process at a high level and highlighting what changes that the group is suggesting.

So the issue of scoping phase, the output or deliverable for that is the issue report. The group hasn't really discussed that a whole lot yet. And that is on the agenda for next week's meeting.

At the initiation phase or - basically the council has approved that a working group should be formed. The group has made suggestions of some small edits or updates to the charter template that will attempt to guide the charter drafting team to request certain metrics that should either be collected then, there or now -- or more importantly at the working group stage.

At the working group phase or the - kind of the aqua circle there is really a couple of recommendations that we've made here. First is in respect to the early outreach -- which is typically to SOs and ACs the two recommendations there.

The first is that perhaps the outreach should go well beyond just SOs and ACs -- at least where necessary or where possible but necessary.

And then the secondary -- as we just discussed -- kind of the policy change assessment recommendation that will guide staff and eventually back to the counsel a review of the implementation of a consensus policy and did it meet its intent as it was created in the policy process.

And that's directly tied to the last part of this overall process is the implementation phase of actually conducting that assessment itself. The working group stage is just to make it a habit that working groups will include that as a recommendation.

The implementation of that recommendation of course is all the way over to the right of getting into this continuous improvement.

Tony Onarato: Berry...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Tony Onarato: ...can I ask you a question?

Berry Cobb: Yes, please, Tony. Go ahead.

Tony Onarato: Hi. This is Tony Onarato for the record. I apologize. I don't have the documents in front of me. I'm driving.

                  But I wanted to ask a question whether we had in our principles document what we had as far as principles relating to fact-based - in Number 5 of our charter questions you reference -- I think it's probably the only place you reference it in there -- but what did we have as far as principles that define and speak to the -- from a principle's perspective -- the benefit (unintelligible) policy and decision making?

Berry Cobb: Thank you, Tony. Yes. I don't think that we necessarily - and the original principles document that I was referring to was pre-decision tree. And it was really more targeted on the types of request that would go to certain stakeholders -- whether it be internal to ICANN, external to third party or to contracted parties.

                  I think there's a few items in there that can be repurposed. More importantly -- as I mentioned when we were reviewing Number 5 and the executive summary that (Steve) had put together for an exercise that we never finished -- I think those could - some of those statements in there could be floated into higher level principles.

So staff will take the action of combining that into - we'll also provide the links to the original documents. But we'll float that up into a higher level principles document and send that out to the teams.

And I think it would benefit everybody if we can either edit some of the principles that we've identified thus far or certainly add to that list as part of our initial report.

Tony Onarato: Okay. As a follow up - this is Tony again. Because I'm just trying to think ahead to what is going to be a potential lightening rod in our report for - either for GNSO or for during the comment period.

And I think we just need to be really solid on what it is we view as kind of the definition of fact-based and why what it is we're doing is going to really undergird undertaking a fact-based approach because I just see that as a potential place in which we might get questions - potentially difficult questions because it implies, you know, again a change in culture and, you know, it's potentially sort of a loaded term.

So I just wanted to flag that for the group that I think we want to be solid on that in our principles in order to give an understanding of what it is we believe that means and why that will - why that's a benefit in and of itself and how that will be augmented by the data that we're talking about holding it to the process.

Jonathan Zuck: Tony, it's Jonathan. I agree completely. I think we'll want to fuss with that principles document quite a bit because it would be the primary elevator pitch of our work. So I think that's...

Tony Onarato: Got it.

Jonathan Zuck: I think that's exactly right.

Berry Cobb: Excellent. Thank you, Jonathan.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I just realized Tony wouldn't be able to see my agreement. But, Tony, Cheryl here.

Jonathan Zuck: Plus one.

Berry Cobb: In fact I don't think there would be anybody on this call that would have disagreed with that but thank you very much. Okay so that draws to the close the review of the charter questions. I think we can go ahead and we've only got about 14 minutes left, which we should be able to run through this rather quickly.

The next item on the agenda was just to review through the draft template of the charter. As I've mentioned, this hasn't changed much since I sent it around three, four weeks ago. I'll just draw the group's attention to two areas that have changed. The first is a dedicated section in the charter that asks the charter drafting team to start to seek out certain types of goals and what types of metrics that could helpfully - potentially help answer the goals that are trying to be accomplished.

I do think we probably need to flush out some of the text that we have in here to make a little bit more user-friendly. There is one action to maybe to try to provide an example of what one of these might look like or an hypothetical situation to provide some guidance.

What I will suggest is, as I mentioned in the draft initial report that we're going to send out on the 28th, this draft template will be included in that report because it is one of our recommendations. And what I'll recommend to the group is to hold off on any editing or please do brainstorm some ideas when you review this but we'll hold off any edits at this point to these particular documents until we get them into the overall initial report.

And then that will it'll allow us to track changes appropriately from this point forward. So at any point this - there's a new dedicated section for key metric considerations. And it does ask the drafting team to determine what goals that they want to try to accomplish based on those issues and what metrics, again, would maybe provide insight or to achieve that particular goal.

And then secondarily, in the deliverables and timeframes section of the draft charter is pretty much been template-based except for really complex issues that have been addressed in the past but typically the same language is more or less listed in here which refers to the working group that they should follow working group guidelines and create recommendations per ICANN bylaws and PDP manual and that it be submitted to the GNSO Council.

The section that we added specifically targets the working group - the drafting team should help target to the working group about creating this continuous improvement component with any consensus policy recommendations that they plan to offer up or suggest to the GNSO Council.

And so probably some of the wording in here will probably need to be cleaned up as well but I just wanted to draw your attention to this because primarily this is what we're about to fold into the draft initial report. Any questions or comments as it relates to this draft charter template?

Jonathan Zuck: Berry, it's Jonathan.

Berry Cobb: Please.

Jonathan Zuck: Yeah, so I think it's looking good. I think one of the things we may want to clear up from a vocabulary standpoint is the distinction between data and metrics. I think we kind of use them interchangeably and they're not the same thing. And that might help with some of the readability of some of these things.

And I guess my other question is is there another document - is the charter document template enough or does there need to be a work group report template update that kind of shows what it would look like to define a database goal, define a timeframe for achieving that goal and measuring the success of the recommendations of achieving it? Do we need to - do we need to template that out too as to what that might actually look like?

Berry Cobb: Thank you, Jonathan. This is Berry. Certainly the group is welcome to make that recommendation. I think it's really kind of a loose discussion of implementation. The initial reports and subsequently the final report there is kind of a standard template that's used by staff but it's a lot more loosely defined than what we're getting here with this charter document.

Where we were headed with this for right now is that, you know, this is a definitive recommendation that we're making to the GNSO Council. I believe staff, you know, as Marika and her team will ensure that this particular type of recommendation does get folded in to future final reports or initial reports and then final reports.

But I'm not so sure that if it's not of clean - of an implementation exercise for staff to load these - this particular kind of standard recommendation into a template it's - there isn't an authoritative template per se at this point in time such as there is with the charter. But if you prefer I think what maybe the working group may want to consider is something to the tune that the working group recommends that staff create a formal final report template that includes this particular recommendation. I don't think we'll be at a stage to try to fold that into our particular report that we have here. Is that satisfactory?

Jonathan Zuck: Yeah, maybe. I guess it'll all come down to the words we use and things like that. So, I mean, and I - and I don't even know if there's a set of words that we could put together that would really represent a template. But I think we just want to - and a lot of it's handled in the charter, right, so as people go

back to their - the charter that gets created with our charter questions it'll force them to take some action anyway, right, and so, I mean, it may not be necessary.

It's just the question of being as explicit as possible as you can with what is currently a hypothetical scenario. Let's go down the path of just recommending staff come up with a standard way of representing if there was a data component to the working group recommendations, you know, what metrics were established by the work group and what objectives were set and then what timeframe so that at that timeframe or there was - or halfway to it if it's a long one they would look at the data again to see if it was trending the right way.

Berry Cobb: Correct. And, you know, I think to just clarify when we're looking at this charter template this is specifically why I loaded in the deliverables and timeframes part in the language that's in here. So maybe the action on us is to make this more clear but what this should do by having this language here is to trigger staff to ensure that it does wind up in the final report.

Whereas the dedicated section up above on part of 1 and mostly on Page 2 is more about forcing the drafting team building the charter to put together a set of questions, goals and potential metrics that the group can use to be more focused on the issue whereas in the deliverables and timeframes section is more focused on staff ensuring that this type of recommendation mechanism or this continuous improvement aspect is added during the working group deliberations and their final report.

Jonathan Zuck: Okay.

Berry Cobb: Okay we've only got five minutes left. I just want to share with you it's really more a memory recollection exercise. The next - the next - wrong one. I'm not used to having so many documents to share with this group at the same time. Here we go.

All right so this shouldn't be anything new to the group either. Essentially this is the decision tree or work flow process that I think we had reviewed I want to say it was in London during our face to face. This really hasn't been updated much. This will be an appendix because it is part of our recommendations in the initial report.

Pardon me. This is something that will be added to the initial report so I do ask working group members to kind of run through the logic of what we have here and see if there's any additional changes that we should be making to this work flow diagram.

In essence it's almost kind of stating the obvious but it's never been formally documented before so I think that's really kind of the output behind this recommendation. But in essence, either staff or the working group recognizes that they need data and/or metrics to help define the issue. You make a determination as, you know, is the data publicly available or is there access to it.

If not what does that particular tree branch look like? And if it is then, you know, determining whether there is costs associated with it, the aspect of working through the GNSO Council and working with staff should there be any budget implications down to the aspect of, you know, is there sensitive data that is a part of this to the actual activity of collecting and compiling the data and constructing the metrics for use by the working group for their deliberations.

So I really don't have any much more to say here other than when we do get this loaded into the initial report to review through this process or this decision tree with a - in fine detail and see if any of the logic doesn't make sense or we need to add additional decisions and/or actions that would occur during this process.

And with that I'll move finally into the last document to share which is - if I can find it - is just the metrics request template itself. And so this is just the template version, again, just as a reminder we created this particular template to review through the IRTP Part D exercise. That since has been boiled back down to just the template itself with instructions and/or data format of a template such as the date, month and year and those kinds of aspects.

This will also be loaded into our initial report. I think that it does go hand in hand with our decision tree. And we'll want to look at this with a little bit more scrutiny to make sure that it doesn't cause confusion or maybe perhaps add additional instructions or descriptions to make it more obvious as to what is being requested and when.

The one thing that I - when I was thinking out loud earlier with my - the topic around the principles perhaps the principle might be a good fit to fit onto this template once we do have those defined because they do go hand in hand with the request that's being made to help drive that issue resolution to potential recommendations should the groups come up with any of these.

So I'll stop that there. If there are no comments or suggestions about this, again, by the 28th expect the first draft of the document that'll have everything that we just reviewed through here today. And then I definitely look forward to the group's input for changes, adds or deletes that we need to be making.

We're at the top of the hour. We've really already discussed Buenos Aires meeting which again is 7:00 am Thursday. Mark your calendars now. And then lastly, we are meeting again next Tuesday the 26th at 20 UTC. So expect to see some calendar invites here shortly.

Again, if you do have any communication over the mail list to please use both the first is the - look at it - is the GNSO-cmpm@icann.org as well as the (bmpm@cibby.com) mailing list just so that we can ensure that the group is -

BMPM@icann@(cobby).com just to make sure that the groups are getting both of the messages. And we'll send out any changes that may occur from - once we hopefully get some of the mail routing issues figured out.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks, Berry. Berry, Cheryl here. Just on that I only got the one from the (cobby) when I went back to check what I'd got for the prep for this agenda so that was interesting. I didn't get the ordinary one, just the one from (cobby) so.

Berry Cobb: Yeah, and thanks, Cheryl. That's what's kind of the head scratcher about this is that different people are getting different experiences and so I'm not sure why I'm the one that's getting it all.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh there's the contribution from my experience. I'll keep you posted.

Berry Cobb: Great, thank you. Jonathan, any parting comments before we close the call?

Jonathan Zuck: Nope, I think I'm good. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks, everyone.

Berry Cobb: Thank you, everyone, for your attendance. And, operator, you can stop the recording. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Bye.

Tony Onarato: Thanks, everyone. Take care.

Jonathan Zuck: Thank you.

((Crosstalk))

END