ICANN Transcription
Data & Metrics for Policy Making Working Group
Tuesday 09 June 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 09 June 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-09jun15-en.mp3

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

Attendees:
Sara Bockey - RrSG
Cheryl Langdon-Orr - At–Large
Jonathan Zuck - IPC
Pam Little - RySG
Benjamin Akinmoyeje- NCUC
Graeme Bunton – RrSG
Tony Onorato - Individual
Janvier Ngnoulaye – Afrinic
Mouhamet Diop – RrSG
Nenad Orlic – ISPCP
Marinel Rosca - Individual

Apologies:
Sonigitu Ekpe – NCUC

ICANN staff:
Steve Chan
Berry Cobb
Terri Agnew

Coordinator: The recordings have started you may now proceed.

Terri Agnew: Thank you (Martha). Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. This is the data and metrics for policy making working group call on the 9th of June 2015.

On the call today we have Mouhamet Diop, Benjamin Akinmoyeje, Janvier Ngnoulaye, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Jonathan Zuck, Sara Bockey and Graeme Bunton.

We have apologies from Sonigitu Ekpe. From staff we have Berry Cobb, Steve Chan and myself Terri Agnew. I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and back over to you Jonathan.

And Jonathan this is Terri if you're speaking we're unable to hear you. Steve or Berry are you able to take over until we can get Jonathan's line correct.

Berry Cobb: Yes this is Berry Cobb for the record. Welcome everyone. Yes, Jonathan please call in. So for today's agenda basically what we have is just to review through our work plan real quick and then spend the rest, the remainder of the call reviewing through the first draft of the group's initial report.

I will predominantly be focusing in on Section 5 which discusses the working group deliberations as well as the proposed recommendations that are being put forth at the moment.

So with that in mind I'll go ahead and kick this off. In terms of reviewing the work plan as you see we're meeting today on the 9th and in the next couple of days we'll distribute some materials that will be used in preparation for Buenos Aires.

As mentioned on previous calls we'll put together just a short slide deck for Jonathan to present to the GNSO council to give them an update on the group's status.

Essentially it will be no more than three or four slides discussing where we've come from, where we're at and where we're going. I imagine that there will be a slide that will present very high level aspects of proposed recommendations.

I don't think at this point it will be wise to be to prescriptive with any of the recommendations because predominantly when we do meet on Thursday morning the group will further deliberate Section 5 of the report so that we can...

Jonathan Zuck: Can you hear me now?

Berry Cobb: Yes we can Jonathan.

Jonathan Zuck: Okay I don't know what's going on with this. I say we keep going Berry you're doing fine.

Berry Cobb: So at any rate we'll spend most of our time on the Thursday session to review through the initial report and those recommendations to ready the initial report for public comment sometime hopefully in July.

So outside of that I doubt that there are any other comments in regards to this so we'll go ahead and move on in reviewing the draft initial report. So I did send the initial report out to the group last week.

Again apologies for it being a few days late but we wanted to spend some extra time to ensure that we tried to provide some suggestions to make some of the current draft recommendations that the group had put forward to make them a little bit more tangible and concrete with respect to implementation.

With this particular version staff didn't make any changes to the actual recommendations as they were put forward earlier this year but we did make comments out to the side as a suggestion to make them a bit more specific.

As you may have seen with the report it's pretty much standard fare having the executive summary in the beginning what the objectives of the group are, a brief background as well as just a quick overview on the members of the working group itself.

But the heart of the matter is Section 5 which is the deliberations and recommendations. So for the moment if you need we can send out another version to the list but it might be beneficial to have your own copy up on your own PC.

I'm going to maintain control as we walk through each one of these recommendations. Secondarily and because we can only share one document at a time over in the notes pod on the right hand side of the Adobe Connect room I pasted a link to the GNSO operating procedures that we'll be referencing as potential targets for the proposed recommendations.

Specifically what we tried to highlight is areas of the current procedures where we could possibly make updates or add new content to those procedures that are relative to what this particular group is trying to accomplish.

So moving through Section 5 it's basically broken out by the charter questions that were defined in this group's charter. And we'll just review through each one of these, each of the charter questions very quickly and then more specifically focus on the proposed recommendation.

And then super most specifically is the comments that we suggested out to the side. So charter question A was which comes first, chicken and egg kind of stuff, policy process or definitive data describing the problem.

Along with suggestions as to how data can be gathered when it hasn't been included in the reporting process. So we listed a number of observations that were pulled from either various work products that we created in the past or high level concepts that the group had mentioned before.

We won't go through these in detail but we'll - I do recommend that the group look at these more specifically and offer up either suggested edits and/or additional observations that may also circle back to how the group deliberated on the charter question itself.

So if you'll recall earlier this year when we reconvened I think early February Jonathan had put forward kind of some - I think it was originally for high level recommendations for the group to start to consider.

And then I think shortly thereafter we had added a few others based on some earlier work that focused around the early input process when a working group is seeking additional input for the issues from the respective SO's and AC's and we'll get down to those a little bit later.

But as I mentioned what staff has done for this version here is that the recommendation that was based on earlier materials that were put together we left those intact and as we discussed in our last call that it was necessary for the group to try to convert these recommendations into much more actionable type recommendations that either direct the council to do something or direct staff to do something in relation to the recommendation.

So the first one that the group had put forward is ICANN staff should be directed to perform a quantitative analysis of the issue for every issue report for which such analysis is both possible and appropriate.

You know, having chewed on this for a while, you know, in many ways staff really kind of already does this but typically I think what the issues here is being constrained within a 45 day period to create an issue report.

We touched on this on the last call and what I try to do in the suggested comment over here to the right is to pick up on what we discussed. And this really circles back to when you review the policy process it's basically a seven stage process and the very first step is the issue identification phase which is before staff is directed to create an issue report.

And what was I think very intriguing about the dialogue that we had last week is that often in this issue forming or issue identification stage it is typically or well it practically always is community members within the GNSO or ALAC, other SO's or AC's are allowed to submit issues to the council for their consideration.

But those issues that are submitted are often typically at a higher level and perhaps what this group should consider doing is focusing on how at this early stage we can provide the adequate resources for the community to have access or determine a path for obtaining access to the appropriate data to better scope the issue to better inform the deliberations that the GNSO council before staff is instructed to create an issue report.

So I draw your attention over to the comment that I listed over to the right hand side and in essence it seems like this higher level recommendation could kind of be split into two.

And the thought process here is which is listed about midstream of the comment is its kind of Section number 1. The idea here is to again make this much more specific.

And I think what could potentially be beneficial is if the community itself had access to funds to go seek out specific information to better inform the issue definition of what is actually occurring.

And so the suggestion here is that we migrate half of this higher level recommendation and it will belong to where recommendation three is listed and we'll get to that in a second.

But more specifically what seemed to be appropriate is referring back to Annex 2 of the GNSO operating procedures and draw out on this particular stage of the process, you know, the issue here is that, you know, stakeholder groups and constituencies don't necessarily have the adequate resources to acquire these metrics and what can we do about that.

So what the working group could possibly consider here as a much more targeted recommendation is that the community at GNSO level not necessarily any particular stakeholder group or constituency that we further explore submitting a request every year through the fiscal budgeting cycle there are community inputs into the ICANN budgeting process.

And that a request be made to make specific funds available for such further issue identification. A really large example to this in the past was the Whois studies that were kicked off I believe about four years ago or so.

Granted that was a much larger effort and given the I believe the cost per study was in the nature of $250,000 or so. It was quite a large effort. It took multiple years to accomplish but at least it's kind of a tangible example of what I'm trying to convey here.

And maybe a separate use case and I believe (Graham) subscribe to this as it relates to one of the working group or PDP's that are currently ongoing in the privacy proxy aspects.

At least some community members have said in the past that, you know, was there even adequate beta enough to show that this was a problem in the first place.

And I think if there were in fact funds available for the group that pushed that particular issue forward to provide better visibility into the issue with concrete data that perhaps they could have seen well there, you know, things appear to be working as designed or in fact they're way off target and thus, you know, if way off target the issue is further defined.

It is deliberated at the GNSO council level. Staff kicks off further analysis on the issue that leads to the PDP or conversely more data at this issue identification stage would say well out of the universe of the domain names its resulted that issues with privacy and proxy only result to less than 1/2 of 1% of the issues that we see across the domain universe thus is it really necessary to kick off a PDP at this time.

And I'm not trying to say whether for the purposes of privacy proxy that that's the case or not but just trying to use kind of a tangible example about how a particular group may request access to funds to further scope an issue out.

So that was kind of the first suggestion here and I'm going to stop right there and see if anybody has any questions or comments in relation to this first half of splitting this recommendation one apart. Jonathan please.

Jonathan Zuck: Hey yes, I guess my initial question is what level of overhead would it add to have a community make a budget request? I mean what, how would that affect the timeframe of the workgroup progress?

I mean obviously getting that Whois study was a gargantuan thing so it may not be representative of the effort necessary to get budget for something but I mean what do you think that normal process would look like and could it be

done off cycle or, you know, how would that be place and how would it affect the timeline?

Berry Cobb: Very good question and so I wasn't clear about the request being submitted. This isn't on a per request basis. What is being suggested here is that for future fiscal year budgeting cycles that some small bucket of money be set aside for the community to have access to.

And so the point would be let's just call it $25,000 that, you know, I don't know what the size or anything like that would be but there are funds sitting there for when an issue does present itself that the requestor could say, could go to the GNSO council, well clearly this issue affects, you know, our particular constituency for whatever reason and we would like to have access for approximately $5000 to further explore and find data to discover whether this is really an issue or not.

And so I think to answer your question it wouldn't be on a per issue basis that we would be requesting through the budget process. The specific recommendation here is that a small bucket be set aside to handle multiple requests as they occur throughout the fiscal year.

And it would perhaps probably be an in year one and maybe year two kind of a pilot program to see whether those funds are even used or if they're used how much they're being used and evolve over time.

Jonathan Zuck: How many PDP working groups are typically launched in a year?

Berry Cobb: I don't have that number in front of me but there are as it stands right now current state there are 14 non-PDP's and 3 or 4 PDP's that are active. I think it probably falls around 2 maybe 3 at the most that respond each fiscal year probably closer to 2.

Jonathan Zuck: Yes because five grand doesn't seem like enough but don't know I mean I guess it's really going to depend on the data sources.

Berry Cobb: Correct and every one would be a different animal so to speak. But that's why I think, you know, I mean we wouldn't suggest that this working group specifically submit, you know, a $200,000 per year bucket because I don't think that that would get approved.

Jonathan Zuck: Right.

Berry Cobb: As you know there is a current budget cycle that where the community is engaged and again I'm not very well informed but at a high level some of it is related to travel funding across the SG's and C's and other outreach kinds of events.

You know, there's probably 10 to 20 different budgetary line items that are submitted each fiscal that has collaborated with the finance group of (unintelligible) and some are approved, some aren't approved.

Again I don't know the exact details but, you know, if it's suggested as a pilot program some sort of modest amount, you know, such as $25,000 again I don't know what the appropriate number would be.

But if it were a modest amount then it could probably be approved by the finance group in that entire budgetary process. But again the idea there is let's get the bucket defined first and get it approved and out there then we can start to see how the community wishes to try to use it.

But again I think what's critical here is back at the issue identification stage because what we've focused on up to this point is well staff should be armed to go get that data to further define the issue.

And that's partially true and that's what staff tries to accomplish when putting together and issue report. But, you know, I think at the staff level at least at this stage resources are somewhat limited too.

But at current state the community then doesn't have access to any unless they have private access through their own contacts to obtain that particular data but I'm sure there are certain cases where, you know, where there is no connection possible.

Jonathan Zuck: Right.

Berry Cobb: Any other comments or questions and I guess before I move onto the second one what I should say, so I specifically called out Annex 2 the operating procedures on page 58 and 59 and specifically on requesting an issue report.

So as we mentioned before I think it's further down more specifically on page 58 I'm looking at line item number 2 requesting an issue report. Basically states for those who don't have it in front of you.

As outlined in Annex A of the bylaws a request for an issue report may be initiated upon board council advisory request. Request for the issue of report advisory committee did not requires GNSO council action but are to be reviewed by staff and prepared in accordance with Section 54 below. Pardon me for just a second. What is listed further down in the GNSO operating procedures is a short form for at least stakeholder groups and constituencies to fill out when they're going to request an issue report.

And I believe there is 10 or 12 questions that are listed in there and part of that request could in fact be tied to requesting funds to further define the issue before it actually approaches the GNSO council.

But what I wanted to state here as again as I noted before what we have over here in the comments are just suggestions at this point. As the group agrees

in terms of the next step we can - staff can make modifications to the preliminary recommendations and hold in some of the suggestions here to make them more concrete.

The first step would be writing the actual recommendation language and if specific edits are suggested or suggested changes to the GNSO op procedures that part of that recommendation would be suggested language such as sentence 1 and sentence 2 should be added to Section number 2 on page 58 of the GNSO operating procedures that state X, Y and Z.

And maybe that will make that a little bit more tangible than my chicken scratch over on the right hand side.

Okay with that the second suggestion here in terms of breaking this recommendation one apart into kind of two more tangible ones is to kind of refer back down to charter question 8 which we had this listed down here.

But the idea here was, you know, the recommendation would basically state, staff shall be directed to update the working group guidelines for GNSO council consideration.
The recommendation would be to add a statement which is to be determined and as I mentioned just a second ago the group could offer up suggested language to paragraph 2 of the GNSO operating procedures Annex 1 page 49 paragraph 2.

And so that states - so there is a second paragraph within this section. It's really Section 4.1, session planning for general meeting logistics and requirements.

This is the section of the operating procedures in the early forming stages of the working group but what I'm referring to specifically is the second small paragraph on page 49.

A working group may request additional tools or applications if considered necessary to achieve the objectives set out in the charter. So a possible suggestion could be such additional tools could be, could include access to data and metrics that may be necessary to further define the issue or data and metrics that may further assist the working group to make better informed recommendations.

And refer the reader of these procedures to our data and metrics request template that we've defined here which would be added in a lower section but that there's kind of a reference point that goes to that form.

I think before in our deliberations prior to this we had a form but it didn't really have a home. And what I'm trying to suggest here is that we try to find a home for these deliverables that have been created by the working group.

So that it becomes more or less written in stone and that it's a little bit more procedurally defined in how a working group will go to seek out the data and metrics that they need to be better informed about the policy issues and recommendations that they're suggesting.

And so again this is the way I've got it structured right at the moment with these comments is a little not so tangible for the group to maybe understand but with your permission in the next iteration of this initial report we'll make that much more clear with precise page numbers, maybe some suggested language that the group can digest on so that it makes things a little bit more clear.

And so to conclude out this particular comment essentially referring back to the charter question itself at least from my impression and hopefully the groups I think the deliberations that have occurred have really discussed this.

Especially when you read through the observation which at a high level discuss how we reviewed prior working group aspects et cetera, et cetera.

But I don't necessarily think that there's really any tangible recommendation that's going to be made based off of charter question A.

And so what I'm suggesting is that we perhaps repurpose a few of these observations where there are more concrete recommendations and that the end result here for charter question 1 is that the working group does not offer up any specific recommendations.

And that may change after you see the next version and as we evolve through different versions of this draft. But like I said I'm trying to kind of divide this vaguer recommendation to something more tangible and find better homes for them.

Jonathan please.

Jonathan Zuck: Yes so I mean I think that makes a lot of sense to make this more concrete. I guess the key will be to maintain its readability for when it goes out to the public comment that it doesn't become so procedural that it loses cohesion for somebody reading it for the first time.

So I think that this is a great exercise. It will probably put even more of a burden on the executive summary to have people understand kind of what we were trying to accomplish at the high level and then how we were accomplishing it at the low level.

Berry Cobb: Absolutely and that's where we look forward to more group feedback and input to accomplish that but I think we're at the point where, you know, we do need to ensure that these recommendations are specific so that we can prove they can be, you know, that we can prove that they were implemented at some point in time.

This is before recommendation; this is post recommendation so there is something concrete. Once we have that defined then I think we can go back

and start to adjust it so that it is readable to those that haven't participated in the group.

Okay, no other comments or hands I'm going to move onto the second charter question. This will one will be easy as we discussed in our last call the charter question B is how processes can be continuously improved, simplified and made more consistent wishing to either report a problem or learn about their options when their problems fall outside of ICANN policy.

Per discussions at the last call we decided that this was more or less already been accomplished by ICANN contractual compliance with the migration of their front end.
Therefore the working group doesn't have any (combinations) at this particular time. And seeing no hands or comments so I'll move onto charter question C.

Principles that enhance metrics and data available to better inform the GNSO policy development process. This is kind of a head scratcher when we discuss this during our last call.

There are I wouldn't say opposing views about how these should be handled but more I think what is consistent is we're not really sure exactly how to handle them.

If I recall correctly Jonathan you had mentioned about potentially rewording some of these initial draft principles that we have to make them more descriptive or actionable than necessarily a principle.

And kind of the same dilemma that we faced with recommendation one and where do we find an appropriate home for these so that they can be embedded in a way that does change the culture to become a more data driven policy making aspect here.

So what I've suggested out to the right is first, you know, I think some of these statements that, these draft statements that are made here are really kind of observations that the group has made.

So I don't necessarily want to say that I want to duplicate these word for word to make them as observations that would just go up into the previous section. But the same idea of these has surfaced through the group's deliberation.

The secondary step here I believe is what would be appropriate per Jonathan's suggestion is that we do reword these in a way and try to find a home for them in the GNSO operating procedures.

So kind of looking through the working group guidelines which is essentially Annex 1 of the operating procedures specifically it kind of looked like perhaps Section 4.4 on page 50 might be an appropriate place if the group were to reword them.

Four dot four is titled as briefings and subject matter experts and, you know, I think when we look at this closer we can make a determination do these kind of data and metric principles fit here in Section 4.4 or perhaps maybe a Section 4.5 be created loosely titled access to data and metrics.

And as Jonathan had mentioned that, you know, and I believe staff will definitely need the working groups assistance here to reword these appropriately so that they are more procedures not necessarily principles that can be injected into the operating procedures that make sense and can be actionable by future working groups.

So at a high level that's how we're suggesting to convert this, you know, so the tangible recommendation here would be eventually or I should say there would be a tangible recommendation here we just need to redefine it in a way that, you know, the initial working is staff will be directed to make updates to the working group guidelines.

Update Section 4.4 or create Section 4.5 with the following sets of procedures in reference to using data and metrics within a PDP or working group. Questions or comments?

And I would just add to here, you know, perhaps what can happen here as well if you'll refer to kind of the last sentence of the comment to the right is that perhaps the restructuring of these statements here will also reference the reader to the operating procedures that should you need to request data and metrics that you don't have access to, here's the process which is our decision tree that has been created and we need to find a home for that.

As well as, you know, reference back to the requesting form should the working group need that. Okay seeing no hands and hearing nothing so I'll move on to - before I move onto the next section I just want to point out that you'll notice that for each of these charter question sections for example what you see on the screen 5.3.3.4 is expected to impact to the proposed recommendation as well as the previous section 5.3.3.3 the preliminary level of consensus.

Once we've nailed down what the recommendations are then we'll be able to update the text on the expected impact of that recommendation as well as we can then update if there are any levels of consensus.

It kind of varies at the initial report stage as to whether consensus levels need to be decided at this particular point or not or whether the group is really just seeking feedback before determining consensus.

So the group can make a decision later whether that is appropriate or necessary before we enter into the public comment period but we just left it in here for in terms of kind of utilizing this document as a previous template and we can edit accordingly.

(Tony) I see your hand is raised.

Tony Onorato: Yes hi Berry it's (Tony Aldarado). I'm sorry I'm just a little confused about - and my question is in connection with the preliminary recommendations would it be useful for us to send a proposed revised text to you at this point or is that - or to Jonathan or I'm just trying I guess I got kind of lost in the discussion there how we propose to go about tweaking the language there.

Berry Cobb: Very good question thank you (Tony). What I would suggest is if you have higher level ideas just send them to the list. As I mentioned that I think staff's next step if the working group agrees by the end of this call that we're going - all the comments that are over to the right we're going to inject into the next version of the document to make it much more tangible for the group to understand how we're trying to convert some of these proposed recommendations into actionable ones.

And then once we see that version V.04 then we'll send that out to the list. You'll be able to read it on the airplane ride to Buenos Aires if you're going. If not before the group meets on Thursday in Buenos Aires.

So suggested edits will be welcome all the way up until the meeting in Buenos Aires. The group will deliberate on those further in Buenos Aires. We'll produce a version 0.5 at that time.

And just kind of make it an iterative process until the working group is agreeable upon the various recommendations and content that's loaded into the report.

Tony Onorato: Okay that sounds great thanks I appreciate the clarification.

Berry Cobb: Thank you. Okay so the next Section 5.3.4 actually combines three charter questions together because they really kind of - they're pretty much

consistent with each other or they didn't necessarily warrant dividing them out into individual sections.

But question D is 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, which we more or less have reviewed in some of our review of previous registry and registrar agreement.

Charter question E, mechanisms whereby GNSO working groups can request information both internal and external including GNSO contracted parties which support fact based policy making.

That one at a very high level we have created the - deformed the decision tree and then of course charter question F, mechanisms to ensure appropriate safeguards with regard to the confidentiality of certain types of information which we have discussed in older versions of principles that the group had deliberated on that really have been folded into the decision tree.

Again I'm not going to spend time on the observations here we only have 17 minutes left but we will focus on the preliminary recommendation which again this was reference back, you know, when the group reconvened.

Staff and working groups should be given resources to perform such an analysis including but not limited to streamlined access to compliance data and funding for outside data and third party aggregators.

So if you'll recall from the very first recommendation that we spent some time on I've migrated this down to modify recommendation number three as to what we just discussed which is that a recommendation be put forward to the council that somehow the community can try to request through the community budget process, create a pilot program by which a bucket of funds is available that he community can get access to to better define issues at the

issue identification stage for GNSO council deliberation before an issue report is generated.

And I think some of the other rationale behind this is as everybody knows there are - there's always been a workload issue or workload balance issue within the GNSO and across many of the SO's and AC's.

And the idea here again is if we can be better informed before we even start working groups whether this is really an issue or not perhaps in the future that we prove that this, that some of these issues don't warrant working groups or PDP's.

Maybe we won't have so many thus reducing the workload over time. All right that's kind of the general logic but again as I mentioned earlier what we'll try to do is revamp this recommendation to what we discussed just about 10 minutes ago or so.

Okay, seeing no hands or comments. Next section charter question G and I should because there was three recommend - I'm sorry three charter questions that were listed here I believe there will be reference to some of the deliverables that this working group has used or has developed as well which again it's a decision tree in the request form but I didn't necessarily highlight it here in this comment.

Section 5.3.5 charter question G, a 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.
Again a series of observations here. One of the recommendations as I mentioned earlier was the early working group outreach. And there were essentially two recommendations that were offered up in the earlier stages of this groups deliberations.

Again just like the others is where do we find a home for these and what I discovered in reviewing through the working group guidelines of Annex 1 and 2 of the operating procedures is that I couldn't find anywhere where this was necessarily called out.

In fact the only place that I could find as it pertains to working group outreach; the outreach at the early stage is within the charter that formed the very working group.

And so what might be a good suggestion here is that a new section be defined at the appropriate spot within Annex 1 or Annex 2 of the working groups guidelines where there should be a little subsection that specifically calls out about early working group outreach.

Of the two general recommendations and perhaps these probably need to be worded in a better way that the general sense is that one, you know, we should probably be looking to outreach beyond just SO's and AC's.

That may not be the case in every issue that's being reviewed but where possible, you know, should a survey instrument be created that goes out to the broader community than just the SO's and AC's through the paths of the chairs of those particular organizations or groups.

So that was kind of one of the higher level parts and then secondarily is in the past at least to my knowledge is that the early working group outreach was typically a modified version of the working groups charter questions that was very qualitative seeking qualitative input.

And what we're trying to decide here or what we're trying to enhance here is a more quantitative approach as well. And that that should be used where possible to better supplement that qualitative type data.

So as I mentioned I couldn't really find a place where this would exist in the current working group guidelines. I do want to go take a look back at other charters to see where this is possibly listed and perhaps maybe there's two homes that we can find one for the guidelines as well as the charter.

And Jonathan I believe can you mute your speaker please or your microphone. I think that's you typing perhaps. Thank you sir.

Okay, moving right along we got 11 minutes left. So charter question 8, 5.3.6. Any changes needed to incorporate the processes described above into the ongoing policy development process.

So this, you know, and the original aspect of this this really gets to the heart of the deliverables that the group has created thus far. And I think recommendations 5 and 6 were part of the original four that were submitted by the group.

And when we put this first draft together I think staff added a recommendation 7. So there's a lot going on on this particular section and first and foremost I'll start off with comment number 18.

On our last call we talked about, you know, we talked about how we could update a charter template because the charter template does exist when a new group is formed.

And where we can make a suggested update to that and an update to one of the or the update to charter in of itself which I believe starts to get into some of the comment 20 is that we created a new section that would help guide the drafting team of the charter to instruct the working group to seek out information.

And then secondarily to create a draft in the deliverables section to have a draft template recommendation to ensure that the working group should they

create any consensus policy recommendations that there was an assessment at some future date to understand the implications or impact of the implementation of that policy and whether it meant the intent of that policy or not.

There are other deliverables or work products that we produce such as the issue report from staff and of course as well as the final report from working groups.

But in my time here within the GNSO it's been more or less a practice that one issue report or one final report is really copied from whoever created the last one and modified and adjusted to support the current issue that's being discussed.

And in the interest of openness and transparency that's what we've done with this very document that you see before you now. And even further so I'm practically pulling my hair out because it's so disjointed now in terms of sectioning.
If I want to try to delete a section the numbering at the higher level sections doesn't coincide and while I consider myself a power user of Microsoft Office for the life of me I can't figure out how the numbering of sections and subsections gets fixed in such a document.

So I think one of the working group recommendations here and whether the group chooses to make it a recommendation or not we've met with communications to create issue report and final report templates.

And not only will it improve some of the discomfort that I just mentioned a second ago but it's also going to get a makeover. You'll have noticed that especially in the power point world that ICANN has deployed a new template format that's very bright, colorful, you know, kind of in your face and not so boring aspect.

We want to try to replicate that for these output products that we create in the policy world. Using the same styling and format so at the end result what would be adjusted here is recommendation 5 is staff be directed to create actual templates for issue reports and final reports.

Further within the final report a template recommendation be formed that should the group create any consensus policy recommendations that this review at some point in time in the future be a necessary recommendation that's always submitted.

So that's kind of where we're heading with that. So that really covers comment number 19. Again, you know, make this a formal recommendation. Moving on to comment 20 it is really the recommendation itself.

Staff be directed to do this which is create these particular templates. So we've got the charter, we'll have an issue report and a final report template and then also post to - there's also the mention of the public comment review tool and update links in the working group guidelines.

So why this all of a sudden became a recommendation you can almost argue that it's kind of out of scope for this group although I don't think it's that big of deal.

But what I found in reviewing the working group guidelines on page 50 is products and outputs of working groups. And there's a bulleted section of examples that refer to very old actual outputs that were created by various working groups.

And that's all well and good but they're old and they're not consistent and so I think it would behoove the group to suggest recommending that this section 5.0 products and outputs be reformed so that it points to these templates so that the group is making suggestions on changing anyway.

So, you know, one of them again is the charter itself that we've got a concrete recommendation there. The group can make a concrete recommendation about the final report as it relates to that continuous improvement template recommendation that we're suggesting.

And then by the way since you're at it go ahead and create a template for the initial report as well. So that's the general thought process here.

Secondarily update working group guidelines Annex 1 Section 6.2 of page 53. So also embedded in the guidelines is the working group charter template. I suspect that this template will continue to exist within the guidelines although I do want to have the group or I think the end goal here is that the actual template resides back up into the links that I just mentioned on the previous page of the guidelines where it had the legacy link and either this can be shortened to refer to that particular template.

What the guidelines here are trying to outline is the critical components of a charter that must addressed and completed before a working group gets started to ensure that its scope remains intact and those kinds of things.

But what the group will want to suggest here is the new additions that this group is suggesting or recommending that be updated. So for example that new section about data and metrics as well as the template recommendation for working groups.

So we'll want to embed that new language into these working group guidelines and specifically suggest the appropriate section and then by the way staff go make sure you create the appropriate template and put it in the appropriate place.

So and then lastly I think if those particular changes are made then recommendation 7 would drop. So I believe we're still lined up with three

recommendations through this section but they'll look completely different than what is being listed here thus far.

So I see we're at the top of the hour. That is the review of Section 5. So with the group's permission I would like to make all of these suggested changes. It's probably going to take us into next week before we get to that concrete.

As I mentioned we'll also provide a draft power point that the group intends to use in Buenos Aires. We'll send that out to the list. We don't have any deadlines to submit anything in preparation for the Buenos Aires meeting so we're good to go there.

What I do ask the group is when we do send out the work products as I mentioned in answering (Tony's) question, the next version of the Word document will have track changes enabled.

If you're using Microsoft Word you can edit. If not if you're in PDF only make comments through the PDF and we'll incorporate those into the master Word document and we'll keep this iterative editing process moving forward.

As for the power point like I said it will be very high level but if you do have any suggestions please send any feedback you have to the list and the group will continue to work via the list until we see or hear each other at the Buenos Aires meeting on Thursday.

So with that I'll turn it back over to you Jonathan for any parting comments so that we can close the call.

Jonathan Zuck: Thanks Berry. I think that all sounds good and I really applaud the effort to define these points of integration into existing documents and elsewhere so that people are kind of confronted with these principles on a regular basis.

So I'm excited to have this stuff on the right margin into the document so they can really read it in context and do some editing but I'm looking forward to it I think it's really good work so thank you.

Berry Cobb: All right great and thank you and thank you to the comments in the chart room. So with that I will go ahead and draw the call to close and we'll see you in Buenos Aires or hear you on there hopefully, take care.

Jonathan Zuck: See you there.

Woman 1: Yes see you then bye.

Man 1: Thanks Berry.

Coordinator: Once again the meeting has been adjourned. Thank you very much for joining. Please remember to disconnect all remaining lines and have a wonderful rest of your day.

END