ICANN Transcription
Data & Metrics for Policy Making Working Group
Tuesday 09 September 2014 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 September 2014 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-20140909-en.mp3

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

Attendees:
Cheryl Langdon-Orr – ALAC
Olivier Kouami – NPOC
Jonathan Zuck – IPC
Graeme Bunton – RrSG
Marinel Rosca – Individual
Pam Little – RySG
Jeremy Beale- Independent
Gabriel Vergara-NCUC

Apologies:
none

ICANN staff:
Amy Bivins
Berry Cobb
Steve Chan
Brenda Brewer
Terri Agnew

Coordinator: The conference is now being recorded.

Terri Agnew: Thank you (Nakia). Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. This is the data and metrics for policy making working group call on the 9th of September, 2014.

On the call today we have Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Olevie Kouami, Marinel Rosca, Pam Little, Jonathan Zuck, Graeme Bunton and Jeremy Beale. We have no apologies.

From staff we have Berry Cobb, Steve Chan, Amy Bivins, Brenda Brewer 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 please begin.

(Jonathan): Thanks a lot everyone, this is the group that doesn't believe in apologies that's why we don't have any apologies we're an unapologetic group and I think that's important to put out there.

But so there's a - we did the roll call are there any updates to statements of interest that anyone wants to bring up, anything we should know about? All right so I think we're going to look at the report, issue report guide draft.

And then I and then hopefully we're going to begin to discuss, you know, the beginnings of a framework for requesting data from contracted parties and hopefully with good input from Graeme and Pam and to - so that maybe we can try to organize something face-to-face in Los Angeles so that's the other big agenda item.

Does anybody else have any questions about the agenda before we dive in? Okay so Steve go ahead I presume you're leading us through this document?

Steve Chan: Yes that - sorry this is Steve thanks (Jonathan). I just wanted to say a couple quick words to that. Berry's probably going to be taking a little bit more of a

back seat role on this group he's stretched thin and so I'll be taking the lead for this group just to relieve a bit of the burden on him.

Rest assured he'll still be available and participating so we will not lose his wisdom, experience and overall contributions. And so yes you might have seen me on the calls lurking at the bottom of the list since it's always in alphabetic order.

And I sent a couple things around but just to give you a little bit of background about who I am. I joined ICANN in 2008 and I've been here about 5-1/2 years.

Most of those years with the new gTLD ops team and I moved over to the policy team to support the GNSO policy group about 4-1/2 months ago so that's all thanks.

(Jonathan): Thanks Steve, yes I noticed that Berry had changed his designation from host to participant but I think we're all in this together so there's not much of a hierarchy for what we're trying to do.

Woman: I would hope not.

(Jonathan): What?

Woman: I said I would hope not a hierarchy in this type of discussion isn't going to be very productive at all.

(Jonathan): Exactly. So Steve do you want to begin the conversation of this report...

Steve Chan: Sure.

(Jonathan): ...of this draft?

Steve Chan: Sure thing, so Steve so this is the first and kind of informal look at - so we want to look at the PDP process overall and see where it can be augmented to take data into consideration to achieve better outcomes.

This is just it's really a central part of the charter and this working group overall. So this document itself is looking at one of the first steps in that PDP process it's the issue report.

And so like I said this is an informal starting point and it's listing out a number of questions that we would expect would be useful for any working group to start looking at, actually I guess it's not a working group yet.

But the staff, the issue requestor and potentially even the GNSO council to take a look at and to think about as they are thinking of requesting an issue report and drafting an issue report.

So what this is intended to do is to look at the issue to think about the scope of the issue, think about who it affects, the likelihood of it affecting those parties or unintended parties, the severity.

So this document was circulated last week I'm not sure if you guys had a chance to take a look at it I hope you did. So I'm not sure what the group wants to do if we want to look at these individually or if we have overall thoughts that working group members had that they wanted to bring up.

So I turn it over to the group to give me guidance on how you want to proceed on this.

(Jonathan): Sure so this is (Jonathan) again for the transcript and we did get a chance to look at this and I think in large measure this captures the conversation we had on this topic.

I'm not sure that we reached a definitive conclusion about what we thought the boundaries of the issue report were versus the responsibility of the chartering team versus the responsibility of the workgroup when it came to the analysis of the data.

But certainly I think that the - there seems to be some consensus on the call that it would be valuable for the issue report to begin to compile data and make available objective statistics about ways that the problem might be measured and what some of those measures might be.

So that they could be used by the chartering team for scoping purposes, you know, if a workgroup was going to be formed and what the scope of that endeavor was.

Do other people have other things they wanted to raise from that conversation that appear to be reflected inaccurately in this document or do you feel like that it was relatively captured the conversations we were having because I know that those lines between the three, if you will the three groups that would convene around a particular issue are a little bit hazy.

And it might be outside our remit to make them less so but there did seem to be some good consensus that we'd want the data collection and analysis to begin at the issue report level. Does anybody want to get in the queue to talk about that today?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: This is Cheryl, (Jonathan) I didn't put my hand up sorry. I just want to suggest that I'm actually in agreement with what you are saying but we didn't have a complete group when we had that conversation.

And we haven't got a complete group now and we probably need to take it that concept to the complete group. I believe we will get consensus but we haven't tested that as yet.

(Jonathan): No and I think that's right and I - I mean so I think it's more like if you have any recollection of something that was said that we failed to capture because I think in large measure we're going to table this particular document to focus on preparation for LA.

But if anybody spots anything here that seems like a misrepresentation of something they said or heard said this would be a good time to bring it up. I think that's why it's on the agenda today not to come up with any definitive conclusions about it.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And Cheryl, the (unintelligible) I think.

(Jonathan): I'm sorry Graeme that we used the expression backwards but what I mean is we are going to set it down on the table and pick up something new and I appreciate you speaking up because it means you're volunteering to speak up on the next issue that we're discussing.

So if no one has anything further about this in the near term as a kind of a quick bulleted summary of the conversations we've had thus far then I think we'll set it aside for the time being and then circle back to it after LA.

Is everybody okay with that approach? Okay excellent thank you Steve for sharing it and bringing it up and we'll revisit it. My initial impression that it captures pretty well the conversations that we had and there will be some refinements later on but that we really want to focus on preparing for LA to the extent that we can.

So Graeme do you want to take a minute to explain the appropriate use to - of the expression to table something?

Graeme Bunton: It's the document you're putting on the table that you're all discussing. You're sitting around the table and that's what you're looking at. So and I think...

(Jonathan):   I see.

Graeme Bunton: ...Australian, English, Canadian when you table a motion or bring it forward to do something with it it's not what...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Absolutely.

(Jonathan):   Yes well that's interesting.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl here, that is it you - to table is to do that you table reports, you table discussions you table things and then you deal with them.

(Jonathan):   Interesting.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: You Americans have your own little quirky ways.

(Jonathan):   We do, we do so in our case so we pick things up off the table to deal with them and so we put them back down on the table to not deal with them I guess that's the way of that.

Then when you say that something's off the table it usually means that you're never going to deal with it. So in that light what we want to do is I would like to table the discussion in the Australian sense of how we might begin to think about a framework or a set of considerations or scenarios for requesting data from contracted parties.

With an (ICORD) getting a broader participation of those contracted parties in LA in a face-to-face meeting so that's another big part of our conversation today is how to actually bring that about and what's the best formula for success in what will be everyone's very busy week to have that face-to-face meeting.

So two parts one is to begin to noodle the content for that to have a basis of discussion in LA and the other is to noodle how do we get butts in the seats for that conversation.

So we started to have a little bit of a conversation about this on the previous call in terms of questions that may come up and we talked a little bit about data that, you know, that I presented a sort of crass distinction between data that the contracted parties would be happy to share and data they would be unhappy to share and some of the reasons they might be unhappy to share it.

And some of which were cost labor associated with getting the data prepared, synching it with data of their counterparts of the competitive nature of the data.

And so what I'd love to do is just start a brainstorming in this meeting and I'm hoping that maybe Graeme and Pam can kind of lead that brainstorming session as to what do you think that the elements are that we need to capture.

And, you know, what are the important components in the types of data that we might be requesting and the best way to request it in a way that that request will be well received. So can I get Graeme or Pam to speak up, Graeme go ahead.

Graeme Bunton: Sure, hi this is Graeme Bunton for the transcript. So that is a sort of long and tricky question. I've got a few bits and pieces that I'll preface that with, you know, I floated this out to the registrar stakeholder group but there hasn't quite been a (unintelligible) yes I think for that whole discussion to take place.

Although there's a little bit of feedback coming in so hopefully in the future I'll have a little bit more meat to put on these bones. But sort of another category moving into it there is a new category that came out that I thought was pretty interesting raised by one of my registrar colleagues and that was in the

context of ICANN requesting something like data from our customer support systems to identify if there's a particular issue.

And how that should probably be fully excluded from any sort of policy development process mostly because that speaks to how we necessarily implemented something and not necessarily if there is an issue that is worthy of those for the policy development process.

So that doesn't I think quite fit into the categories of sort of exclusionary stuff that we've talked about before but that was an interesting, you know, category that I thought was worth some discussion.

Most of the response I was getting from registrars of over my - was the sort of over my dead body type, you know, information that shouldn't or wouldn't be shared and I guess we're thinking about it a bit.

Let me see if I can find some of that discussion here to refer back to it. Things like financial information we've discussed that I think previously how much people are charging for things and making of stuff is probably (unintelligible) as well as end user registrant information like how registrar customers actually are.

I thought maybe an interesting way to get at some of this might be to think about a possible future working group and one I sort of had in my head is we're wrapping up IRTPD at the moment the delight that's its been.

And one of the issues coming out of that and that we're sort of expressively acknowledging is that there needs to be a sort of overarching look at how transfers work similar to I guess how sort of who has been looked at.

And as a part of that, you know, there is going to need to be data collected from contracted parties around how transfers work. And I certainly think

that's, you know, possible we can do that and there would be a willingness amongst registrars to do so, you know, and provide that.

You know, it's going to be how many transfer requests happen, how many fail and in what states do they fail. And so I was sort of pitching that as a scenario to the registrars and it, you know, concerns their amount of time it takes to collect that data and people were probably saying a minimum of four weeks.

What else was going on in there, let me see if I can find it in my notes. Yes they need to make sure to be anonymization of that data so that individual registrants are exposed but it may also make sense to an anonymize things in a way that they're still linkable so that if, you know, there could be a lot of transfers but not from a, you know, but from very few actual individual registrants.

Things like that in that context need to be thought about. So I'm a bit brain dumping now as I go through my emails. Maybe I'll let those things out and see if there's any questions I see Cheryl's got her hand up.

(Jonathan):   Yes Cheryl, I have a question as well but Cheryl go ahead.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks (Jonathan) and Graeme I put my hand up when you were talking about the (unintelligible) corps hands information. And you were talking specifically about the identifiable - not that I wanted to use the anonymize word because I know that we would be dealing in anonymized fashions if this was an issue anyway.

But I wondered how far that identifiable concern went with your particular stakeholder group. Let me see if I can make myself clearer. For example the actual registrant that's kind of a no brainer but what if the data was to be socioeconomic, industry sectored, business type blah, blah, blah.

So you were suddenly getting information about the nature of the businesses that are or individuals who are the registrants. So you could then profile for the micro, medium size, large enterprises, various industry sectors perhaps even turnover of the client should those questions be asked.

How nervous would your stakeholder group be about giving that type of profile away, thanks?

Graeme Bunton: Thanks Cheryl this is Graeme for the transcript. I'll just respond to that. Two things came to mind, one is that anonymization is probably also going to happen at the registrar level.

So however data is collected you're not going to be able to tell and you shouldn't be able to tell, which registrar it came from. So a number of registrars may submit data, you know, end user registrant.

And then once all that registrar data is collected and anonymized from its source that becomes less dangerous because...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Right.

Graeme Bunton: ...it would be difficult at that point. The other thing that...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That makes a big different yes, sorry it's just that I just thought there might be a concern about profiling particular market sector interests and if it's anonymized at that double wire then that's not going to be an issue thanks.

Graeme Bunton: It shouldn't be I mean it depends on how many, you know, registrars end up contributing data, you know, if you find it's only us and GoDaddy and we're wholesale and they're all retail you might be able to begin segmenting some of that.

The other thing is that that kind of presumes that some of us have that data already and I suspect out of the very largest registrars outside of that and

even including some of the largest registrars may have not idea especially in a wholesale scenario where we don't have that end user relationship with those, with the registrant.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Graeme Bunton: Yes, you know, those aren't the people we sell to. We sell to the hosting companies right. So, you know, that sort of segment information is not particularly useful for a company like (Tukes) and...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Understood yes.

Graeme Bunton: ...we just don't have it. (Jonathan) you had a question I also see Pam's got her hand up. Sorry now I'm pretending I'm in the middle of privacy and proxy.

(Jonathan):   My question actually had to do with the issue you said was raised by one of your counterparts about the type of data. And I just didn't understand what you were saying so but pardon me if I have missed the point.

But it sounded like that the data that had to do with the implementation of policy wouldn't have to do with the formation of policy and I'm not sure I understood what you meant by that because if we're in the process of trying to scope a problem, which is that the average time of, you know, some kind of corrective measure is three days and we want to set an objective that that corrective measure only takes one day to complete instead then at some level execution of existing policy could very well inform policy development.

So I - your conclusion I didn't agree with but I may have missed why you said it.

Graeme Bunton: Yes I don't think I disagree with that I think the distinction is that they want to make sure that and we would too is that our own support information is excluded. So that you could see from, you know, sort of open SRS

transactional system how long a transfer takes to complete and we might want to look at improving the speed of transfers.

(Jonathan): Right.

Graeme Bunton: But none of that information is going to come from our - so that's all going to come from sort of the raw transactional stuff and none of that's coming out of our support ticket system where we, you know, getting people complaining about, you know, a slow transfer or who knows what.

And so the support stuff is going to be more informed by, you know, a registrar's particular implementation.

(Jonathan): Sure and I the problem is this is very hypothetical but I mean isn't there still an incidence in which we might want to know the - something about the percentage of complaints of a certain type or something like that and to gain an understanding of what end user perception is surrounding a particular policy implementation?

Graeme Bunton: I can imagine scenarios in where that is useful but I suspect that's data you will have an extremely difficult time getting. It also requires...

(Jonathan): Even in an anonymized world where we don't know what registrar we're talking about or what registry we're talking about?

Graeme Bunton: ...that also makes it extremely difficult to anonymize that data because most of that is going to be free form text, you know, captured in sort of tickets.

(Jonathan): Sure, yes I guess I don't know enough about your system I know compliance is finally doing more categorized capturing of complaints that make this kind of analysis easier and I don't know if you guys are there but.

Graeme Bunton: So that's sort of analysis where you're looking at, you know, sort of broad overviews of support tickets is a lot of free form text it requires a lot of really crazy sort of analysis sort of just going through it and reading them all.

It can be arduous to extract and to collect and would also contain all sorts of, you know, personal tidbits about, you know, registrants, resellers and information that I think people including us would want to sort of exclude from most of this process.

(Jonathan):   Sure and I don't want to put you...

((Crosstalk))

(Jonathan):   ...sorry I don't want to put you to much on the spot either because we are just brainstorming but just trying to hash this out to its conclusion right like it's to treat this as a guinea pig conversation.

Graeme Bunton: So...

(Jonathan):   Is it possible that that would be an environment in which a third-party could be contracted to have a bunch of little elves go through and read the free form text with a set of pre-defined categories and all they're doing is checking boxes and essentially generating data based on that information and it's just that generated data we would have access to.

Graeme Bunton: ...yes so I don't want to say, you know, no forever and, you know, slam the steel doors closed or something but it would just be - that was a scenario that was brought forward and I agreed that it was problematic...

(Jonathan):   Sure.

Graeme Bunton: ...and we would have to think pretty long and hard about how that would be implemented and done and is certainly worth discussing maybe some more

probably in LA face-to-face and we can get some of the registrars out and see what they think.

There is another thought I was having in there about that but that's now lost. If it comes back to me I'll bring it up.

(Jonathan):   All right thanks Graeme don't - I don't mean to turn on the heat or anything like that I'm just trying to figure out how we...

Graeme Bunton: No that's okay.

(Jonathan):   ...because that might be kind of a scenario that we try to walk all the way through to get to how the useful could be extracted from the private if that makes sense in such a way that it's both useful and still private.

And so I mean that might want to be part of a framework and part of a pathway to what might be costly I mean but maybe worth it given the stakes of the particular issue involved of involving an independent third-party whose job is, you know, to extract the useful data out of the private data in a trusted way or something like that but that's all that came to mind just now.

Pam go ahead you've had your hand up for a bit.

Pam Little: Thank you, hey (Jonathan) I started - (Andrew) and I started to circulate the question of what the initial framework for requesting data from contact parties might look like to the registry stakeholder group.

We haven't had any feedback yet to be honest so I suspect, you know, registries are really busy, new ones are busying launching the new gTLDs and the existing ones probably also busy with other tracks of ICANN work, you know, there's so much going on at the moment.

So we'll bring back feedback as we go along with are deliberations. I just want to sort of start off by making a distinction about data from the registry perspective.

From our perspective there is also some data that is required to - of registry to provide to ICANN on a regular basis to ICANN under the contract we have with ICANN.

So I presume we are talking about in here we are talking about data that is not included in those mandatory obligations is that correct?

(Jonathan):   I think that's a very good question and I think on the whole that it would probably be true. The one I guess caveat I would make to that is much of the data that you share under contract with ICANN has very specific prescriptions as to how that data can be used by ICANN.

So I don't - so it's probably not safe for us to assume that just because there's data you share with ICANN that it would immediately be sharable in a useful way with the workgroup.

It might require a separate request that you can get at data you already share if that makes sense.

Pam Little: Okay it does but what we're thinking is or (Andrew) and I were discussing about this is if the data is already made available to ICANN under contract and or supplied to ICANN under contract we the (unintelligible) working group can get that data from ICANN rather than from registry this goes to cost and time and resource obviously right.

We - if you already got that data...

(Jonathan):   Of course.

Pam Little: ...with ICANN why would you bother to go to the contract party right?

(Jonathan): No I think that's exactly the case if provided there wasn't anything in the contract that would require your prior approval to ICANN, the people at ICANN who receive that data sharing it with whatever workgroup wanted to make use of the data that's all.

Pam Little: Agree, agree and the...

((Crosstalk))

(Jonathan): So it may be a question of getting permission from the people that have already shared data to use the data in the context of the workgroup and that still would be a request that would go out to the contracted parties potentially.

Pam Little: So if the contract doesn't allow a specific purpose that data will be used then yes you probably need to seek additional contact from the contracted party to use that data that's granted.

(Jonathan): That's right.

Pam Little: And even the registry agreement with the new gTLD it actually contemplated registry providing data for some economic study in the future. You were in that group, you know, the consumer trust, the consumer choice.

(Jonathan): That's right.

Pam Little: So that is actually contemplated in the agreement and registry would need to provide data or, you know, that we request reasonable obviously. So I just want...

((Crosstalk))

(Jonathan):   That (unintelligible) just went out on the eighth by the way so you'll probably be receiving requests.

Pam Little: ...exactly.

(Jonathan):   Before to long I think mid-November I think is when that economic study will be awarded.

Pam Little: Okay great so I think we are trying to sort of draw a line there just for - to make it easier for registry stakeholder group members to think about this issue.

                If they get an ad hoc request from a PDP working group how should the framework look like. So that's really also to make things a bit easier otherwise our relationship with ICANN is under contract and the contract deals with the data we need to provide and how ICANN can use that data.

                And then so we don't want to deal with that area for now that's the way we are thinking. Does that make sense?

(Jonathan):   I think that's fair I think all things being equal if ICANN already has the data we would just try to use the data without placing any additional burden on the contracted parties.

                So this is - these scenarios are really for situations in which the workgroup does not have access to data that contracted parties have.

Pam Little: Okay so just based on that premise I think we have a few or (Andrew) and I sort of come up with some very high level principle built those you actually alluded to in your email.
                So and we - but they just are outsourced it's not the groups kind of registry stakeholder as a group the principle would consent to that type of thing. So do you want me to just very quickly run through those?

(Jonathan):   Sure I mean and if you have something that's written in any kind of bullet form we can probably get it emailed to...

Pam Little: Yes.

(Jonathan):   ...staff and they can put it up on the screen.

Pam Little: Listen, so very quickly I think I agree with Graeme from a registry perspective the data should be anonymized and aggregated to the extent possible and still usable to the working group.

(Jonathan):   Sure.

Pam Little: And we also think the data should - that the request for data from registry should be based on the non-discriminatory principle to the extent possible again.

                   You know, maybe you need to go to a specific registry but if possible it should be requested from all registries.

(Jonathan):   Right.

Pam Little: Okay and the other one is about the optional - because we just make the distinction whether data is actually mandatory under the contract or this is just ad hoc optional.

                   So we think then if it's ad hoc then the request, the data request must make it very clear to contracted parties that providing this data is optional. So that might be a big controversy.

(Jonathan):   Well yes I mean that's a - I mean that's going to be a sticky question obviously.

Pam Little: Agree, agree.

(Jonathan):   So I mean we'll probably have to deal with the fact that there's only certain data that's required by the contract and that the rest is optional but the contracted parties are still part of a community to build a better TLD system.

And so I guess what we're trying to do is define a framework in which the resistance to sharing data is minimized because the concerns that's been addressed.

But yes probably at some very fundamental level from a legal perspective it will have to be considered optional.

Pam Little: Okay and also the purpose for the data will have to be very clearly stated. What's the purpose of collecting this data from contracted parties and then the data can only be used for that purpose.

In other words for a very limited purpose and clearly understood by the contracted parties. And the other one is...

(Jonathan):   And that's...

Pam Little: ...sorry.
(Jonathan):   ...go ahead that makes sense.

Pam Little: Okay the other one is about cost. I think we were thinking about how to overcome the unwillingness or reluctance to provide data. It's about cost, you know, everything has a cost associated with it.

So registry has to kind of prepare the data, provide the data and I think most people agree if this is optional or ad hoc requests the cost of providing such data should not be borne by the contracted parties.

(Jonathan): Now somebody has got to mute their phone, thank you.

Pam Little: Okay so...

(Jonathan): Yes those are reasonable please do circulate those bullet points to the list.

Pam Little: ...okay I will do that, I will do that so we've got about seven or eight bullet points basically just to sort of - also safeguards about, you know, unauthorized access or user, these are just common sense right.

(Jonathan): Sure.

Pam Little: So to build that trust so the contracted party will feel comfortable to providers that are ready to provide a framework and incentive they feel is safe to give that to either third-party or ICANN.

(Jonathan): Right okay I think that's right I mean it probably shouldn't be a profit generating endeavor to share data but certainly if there's costs associated with the anonymization or the collection or the cleaning of data or something like that those should probably be borne by ICANN's through similar approved budget for the workgroup. Graeme go ahead.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks this is Graeme for the transcript again. I just wanted to agree with much of what Pam was saying in there especially around and you sort of addressed it subsequently but compulsion in that there's a strong resistance from registrars to be against mandatory sharing of data.

Many of them are small and don't have the resources of, you know, big registrars to spend time and energy to, you know, go find, you know, the relevant data formatted appropriately and send it out.

And, you know, running the business intelligence team at two counts I can tell you that these sort of requests take considerable amount of time and effort and you have to be careful that it's right and get a couple sets of eyes on it.

And so you just probably can't compel all reseller or registrars to participate it would be impossible for lots of smaller people. And then yes cost is a not necessarily performing that sort of search and, you know, contributing data but making sure it's processed and anonymized we might have to think about how that cost is taken care of, that's all.

(Jonathan): Agreed, Steve Chan.

Steve Chan: Steve, yes thanks. Yes I just had a couple points and so just agreeing with Graeme's point about the contract parties not wanting to and presumably not being or cannot be compelled to share data.

I think it's - there's probably compelling reasons that they may want to because it does inform the policy development process, which ultimately affects these same contracted parties.

So I think at some point we may want to highlight the benefits to them and really highlight to them what benefit it serves to them to actually share this data.

The second point I want to make...

(Jonathan): Yes that's definitely a fair point.

Steve Chan: ...the second point I wanted to make was that you were mentioning data from ICANN. I think it was envisioned that we would want to develop a similar framework for internal data requests from the registry department, the registrar department and compliance. So that's all thanks.

(Jonathan): That makes sense and yes obviously a request for I mean most of these things are not done behind closed doors people are clearly aware of issues that are being discussed by workgroups and things like that.

And why these are being discussed I think there probably are going to be instances in which the potential policy recommendations of the working group are adverse at least to the short-term economic interest of a contracted party with a particular product or something like that.

So I mean I - we're probably not going to always find complete kumbaya style agreement on every request for data in the policy development process. But to the extent possible I think we always want to showcase what the net benefit of having good policy would be and why that data would be helpful. Other things that this inspires from other folks, (Gabrielle) go ahead, (Gabrielle) am I mis-pronouncing your name (Regara) do you have your hand up?

(Gabriel): Yes do you hear me?

(Jonathan): I do now yes.

(Gabriel): Okay sorry, yes I was wondering a little bit about the anonymizing the data and when you are talking about or asking the right questions to mine the correct data to the policy making it's really important to try to be sure when we ask to the registrars the data, that the data provides all the information that we need.

And it in the first stage when you are mining data probably you can't anonymize data you have to go and pick it all the data and try to figure out, which are the best bits to make policies.

And in my case I was explaining it for instance how you are going to track sites that are - or registrars that are having most (unintelligible) or most malicious software providers and so on.

So that you can make the right policies to correct those problems or how you solve the situation where a register is in trouble with a lot of malicious customers.

And that in fact makes a bad reputation for the registrar itself so you can help also with the right questions with the right data to provide tools to the registrars to protect themselves also against those things because for instance here in the European Union well for in Finland one of the things that I've noticed that while people is well behaved somehow and when something is not going right then they go to the parliaments and then where in Finland they put regulations to the providers of anything to try to fix the issues.

And one of the routes that they use or the tools that they use is asking the right questions. And it's really effective when you are, you know, a small community like Finland (unintelligible) so you can make policies for everyone and it's for everyone.

But in the Internet world it's really difficult to make policies so we have to be careful how we can mind the right data. Data mining is real extensive, it's really a resource (e-team) so how much people are we going to have behind or are we only counting with the people that is working in the - on the registrar side for adding data to us.

It's also something that we have to...

((Crosstalk))

(Jonathan): No not at all and as per Berry's comment down in the chat this is only one aspect of data collection. The other aspect is outside sources, internal ICANN data, compliance data.

There are a lot of different potential sources for data only one of which is contracted parties. But, you know, if it's spam house is the source of data for example then the only conversation we really need to have is if we can have the money to go get the data, right.

And so because that data is already for sale and then, you know, with the compliance office it will be a question again whether or not the collection of that data is in any way in conflict with the contracts that govern the relationship between ICANN and contracted parties.

So I mean this is literally just one slice of data collection that might take place.

(Gabriel): Yes.

(Jonathan): And that's data from contracted parties but those are folks that have a special set of concerns that we may need to come up with a framework to address that's all. Does that make sense?

(Gabriel): So yes that makes sense. So one other question about this is are we going to have different teams for each type of data like Pam was saying in the first for instance the business and the type of (capitalizations) that you have and then you are going to have another team collecting data for problems related to registers and so on in providing - how are you going to make a (unintelligible) for that data? How many teams will be behind?

(Jonathan): Well I don't - (Gabriel) I don't think that it's a question of teams, we're the team and there's just one team. What I...

(Gabriel):   Yes I know.

(Jonathan):   ...what I had done was ask Graeme and Pam and (Andrew) to begin to brainstorm on issues that might come up...

(Gabriel):   Right.

(Jonathan):   ...from contacted parties as we deal with that particular slice of data. It's not like they're in charge of the framework but that's still going to be all of us figuring out what the framework is that the work product of this workgroup right.

So I mean this isn't - they aren't the team they were just individuals that had some special insights to help get the creative juices flowing on a framework that we would all agree to as a group.

So I don't know yet whether or not this is...

(Gabriel):   Yes I know.

(Jonathan):   ...going to be extensive enough that we should have separate teams or not they just seemed to be good folks to get things started in the conversation that's all.

(Gabriel):   Yes, yes my point was that I started to go over many things where to - not to much people hear.

(Jonathan):   No that's right so I mean I think this is something that's going to get quickly less complex than it seems right now as we really start to delve into it and try to build this framework.

I mean one of the things we're trying to do and I guess I'd like to get to this conversation sooner rather than later is in dealing with this particular slice of

data, which is contracted parties I feel like there's a real opportunity if we do some kind of a broader, a median, which is broader participation for contracted parties in Los Angeles.

And I'd be really interested in ideas about how to bring that about but Graeme go ahead you have a comment on something.

Graeme Bunton: Thank you there's a couple things in there that I wanted to address so I might be backing up a little bit. We talked briefly and I think I've mentioned this before about encouraging registrar contracted party participation.

I think there's lots of good examples where us sharing data ahead of time would have reduced considerable amounts of pain for us, in the future registrant verification being a big one.

There are plenty of and these typically come from now I'm throwing people under the bus but, you know, law enforcement and IP protection about how things are huge problem and there's actually considerable data that there is not.

And so...

(Jonathan): Right.

Graeme Bunton: ...the registrar's engagement process sharing data can be extremely good for us and for the community as a whole so. There is certainly the opportunity to pitch these things to registrars on other contracted parties in a way that would be positive.

I wanted to go back to a bit of what (Gabriel) was saying though and I think it also relates to what Pam was saying about how we need to ensure that our questions are to contracted parties are extremely focused and narrow.

What (Gabriel) was talking about there and that's something that will never fly with contracted parties is just a data dump so that they can go mining for the bits that they want.

And, you know, we're never going to share with you data so you can go and find a couple bad actors in it. That's just not how this sort of process would work.

We want to make sure we've got a well defined question around a larger policy issue within the ICANN community and then we can look at that addressing but there's no here's all our domains go find some bad guys.

(Jonathan):   Of course.

Graeme Bunton: So you would find quick resistance to that sort of thing.

(Jonathan):   Yes I'm confident of that.

(Gabriel):   My point was for instance it was just an example if you want to make a policy of how to tackle down problems with bad behavior or something like that and you want to make policies you have to ask the right questions.

(Unintelligible) my thing the bad guys it will be a little bit difficult to find them, that was my point. It's just a board example but yes just asking the right questions is the secret.

(Jonathan):   That's right and so what I mean again this is - can be difficult at the hypothetical level but I mean it could be that the profile of a bad actor, hypothetical actor could be developed together with compliance and that can be used for asking the right questions of the data but then it's anonymized before it's used.

So I think there's some ways around that but obviously would love more open data and that conversation came up in one of our meetings not in London but the meeting before in Singapore, you know, let's try to make everything open.

And I recognized that that's not going to happen in the context of the contracted parties or certainly not in its entirety. But the - I think that the - I think we will need to work to figure out how to ask the right questions on a case-by-case basis.

And that should be part of the framework just to be narrow in our request for data for sure.

Graeme Bunton: Yes to jump in again sorry very briefly.

(Jonathan): Yes go ahead.

Graeme Bunton: When people start talking about bad actors a lot of that is very quickly outside of the domain name space and becomes content and other activity related and it's just although making sure that we remain focused on data that's relevant to ICANN and focus those questions in ways that we can develop good policy.

(Jonathan): Agreed. So if folks don't mind I'd like to switch the conversation over to Los Angeles and again maybe put the onus back on Pam and Graeme to figure out if its feasible to have a larger brainstorming discussion in LA and how we might bring that about or when it might best happen et cetera. Pam go ahead.

Pam Little: Hey (Jonathan), I understand there is a joint registry, registrar session planned for the LA meeting. I need to find out exactly what time it is and whether there will be a, you know, if we can squeeze in say 10, 15 minutes for that topic even because usually it's very tight.

I thought that might be a good opportunity where both contracted parties are in the room rather than holding separate sessions. I presume some of the concerns registrars have might be also what registry might have so they would have common consent or common issues although their data might be very different.

(Jonathan):   I think that's probably right. I don't know that that's what we're after I think having three people each or something from registries and registrars in an hour long meeting is more what I was hoping for.

Pam Little: Okay.

(Jonathan):   As opposed to have a huge, having ten minutes in your huge meeting, which will be enough to tell people what we're up to but not really enough to brainstorm on or to look at a straw man or something like that.

I think it's my objective to try and have some kind of a straw man set of principles and some kind of a flow chart to put in front of contracted parties in time for LA.

And if - so just having kind of a little bit of representative group to get a real discussion going is kind of what I was hoping for. Graeme go ahead and then as Cheryl said both would be great obviously it would be great to get to ten minutes I won't turn that down I didn't mean to imply that.

Pam Little: That's okay.

(Jonathan):   I also want - it would also be great to just get a little bit broader participation for contracted parties for just that one face-to-face meeting where we talk about something that's very specific to them, all right Graeme go ahead.

Graeme Bunton: Yes a ten minute slot in constituency day would be good to let people know and then also assuming DMPMs got a time slot after constituency day you

can use that slot to invite, you know, registrars and registries to join us in our meeting I guess because it's going to be rather than try and spin up another session we'll probably just have to use that main one to get as much discussion from whoever we can in there.

(Jonathan):   Right and that's what I mean I do mean our meeting I don't mean having two meetings with this group but getting more of them to our meeting and kind of helping them to know that it's really, you know, a surge, you know, as it's been put in some instances of participation around this particular topic.

Now that would suggest that we should try to have it later though Berry, Berry is suggesting in the comment period a slot on Monday but I guess the question is whether or not we should try to have it after constituency day so that we can use a small time slot on constituency day as a sales pitch.

Berry do you want to speak or are you just going to write? Thursday am you mean that breakfast meeting that we had before? So let me ask this question to again to Graeme and Pam then.

I remember Graeme how you felt about the last Thursday am meeting if that was the only option do you think you could be successful in getting a - some participation even though it might be that the morning after the gala again?

Graeme Bunton: Morning after gala's are exquisitely difficult.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: The gala is Monday again.

(Jonathan):   It's going to be Monday okay.

Graeme Bunton: Weird, that make sit a little more likely.

(Jonathan):   Pam go ahead.

Pam Little: Yes I'm not so confident about that slot I just feel it's to late in the ICANN meeting week and people have so much on and it's 8 o'clock it's really a not very positive slot in my view. I'm not hopeful that we would get a lot of people attending that.

(Jonathan):   Well if we take the Monday slot can you guys do the sales work or can I be invited onto a call with each of your constituencies for two minutes prior to LA to help with that pitch?

                Is there a way to do the invite some other time than the constituent day so we're not having to tail wag the dog as they way?

Pam Little: We're happy to do that.

Graeme Bunton: This is Graeme I mean we can if we - yes if it's Monday we can certainly wrap a rouse on our email list ahead of time to see if we can get any traction. I wouldn't be holding my breath for huge participation in any way anyway.

(Jonathan):   No that's right just I mean just getting a little, this just has a direct effect on that - on those constituencies that's all and so if we could just even have a little burst of participation on that day I think it would be helpful.

                Especially from other people like you Graeme that deal with data inside your organizations. You haven't started a trade association yet of data intelligence, registrar data intelligence officers or anything?

Graeme Bunton: No, no I think I'm pretty unique right now or I have started that agency and it's just me.

(Jonathan):   So is it your sense I'm sort of putting this into your feet and I apologize for that. Do you feel like with your recruiting and my help if I'm able to help we have a better change of getting more turn out on Monday afternoon than we

do Thursday morning? Which do you think is better, which is the lesser of two evils?

Graeme Bunton: Monday afternoon probably.

(Jonathan):   Okay, Pam.

Pam Little: Yes I tend to agree because morning 8 o'clock it seemed to be early for some people. They either have breakfast business meeting or, you know, something else I don't think it's a very good timing. But we can try...

(Jonathan):   Okay.

Pam Little: ...my experience with registry stakeholder group is this, it's not PDP probably not priority work among all other things. So they might react better if we put something to them rather than asking them to come and brainstorm and come up with the framework. That's my personal feeling.

(Jonathan):   And it's my hope to do both so we'll try to put something to them as well.

Pam Little: Okay.

(Jonathan):   I just I feel like there's a real value to do a face-to-face meeting to the extent to which we can do it. So I'm going to say then unless there's contradiction that we go ahead and grab the 1300 to 1430 timeframe on Monday and that you guys will try to give a heads up and do some wrap rousing on your constituent calls.

                      And I will also do a pitch on the weekend GNSO sessions as Berry suggested. Okay?

Pam Little: Sounds good.

(Jonathan):   Excellent.

Man: Okay.

(Jonathan):   So I mean we're at the end of our time. I think what I'm going to do is take the - if Pam if you would send me the document you posted into chat well send it out to the entire list.

Pam Little: Okay.

(Jonathan):   And then and Graeme if you have any additions or subtractions from that document I'm going to take that together perhaps with Steve and others who are interested and try to figure out what a straw man document might look like that could then be put in front of contracted parties as a framework and circulate that to the list.

                And that if the list feels like it's a good straw man then we will try to get that out to contracted parties in advance. And we'll discuss it on the 23d...

Pam Little: Yes sounds good.

(Jonathan):   ...and we'll discuss it on the 23d of September. Does that sound good to everyone?

Woman: Yep.

Woman: Yes.

(Jonathan):   All right everyone thank you so much and so Pam I'll look for your document and Graeme your comments on the document and Steve and I will pow wow before the 23d to have a good discussion piece on the 23d.

Pam Little: Okay great thanks.

(Jonathan):   All right thanks everyone.

Woman: Bye all, thanks bye.

Man: Bye.

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

Man: Thank you.

Woman: Bye Olevie

Olevie Kouami: Bye-bye.

                    END