## Data & Metrics for Policy Making Working Group
## Tuesday 22 July 2014 at 20:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Data & Metrics for Policy Making Working Group meeting on Tuesday 22 July 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-20140722-en.mp3

On page:http://gnso.icann.org/calendar#jul
(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Attendees:
Cheryl Langdon-Orr – ALAC
Pam Little – RySG
Tony Onorato – Individual
Olivier Kouami – NPOC
Rising John Osazuwa – At Large
Kayode Yussuf – IPC
Nenad Orlic – ISPCP
Jonathan Zuck – IPC
Graeme Bunton – RrSG
Sonigitu Ekpe - NCUC

Apologies:
Marinel Rosca - Individual

ICANN staff:
Berry Cobb
Lars Hoffmann
Steve Chan
Nathalie Peregrine

Nathalie Peregrine:     Jonathan, this is Nathalie. The recordings have been started. Would you
like me to do a roll call for you?

Jonathan Zuck:     Yeah, that would be great, thank you. Let me just ask if...

((Crosstalk))

Nathalie Peregrine: Perfect. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everybody and welcome to the Non PDP Data and Metrics for Policy Making Working Group call on the 22nd of July, 2014.

On the call today we have (unintelligible), (Nanad Ulrich), Olevie Kouami, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Jonathan Zuck, Pam Little, (unintelligible). We have received no apology for today's call.

From staff we have Berry Cobb, Steve Chan and Lars Hoffman, Terri Agnew and myself, Nathalie Peregrine.

I'd like to remind you all to please state your names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and over to you, Jonathan.

Jonathan Zuck: On mute. Thanks, everyone, for joining the Data and Metrics call. It was good seeing some of you in London. And I think we're sort of rounding the corner here in terms of looking at the past and beginning to look at the future and trying to figure out what the framework might look like and what kind of toolkit we might be able to build for policy working groups in the future to take data into consideration.

We - Berry, are you interested in doing a recap from what was discussed in London?

Berry Cobb: Yeah sure. All right thank you, Jonathan. So this is Berry Cobb for the transcript. So just to basically highlight some of the things that occurred in London first and foremost our session was on Thursday morning at 8:00 am. We did have a few participants attend that had also traveled to London. And I think we only had one person on remote so our participant - participation was a little light but that didn't stop us from still having a good meaningful discussion.

Predominantly our agenda was focused around the continuation of reviewing our use cases. And in particular we reviewed through IRTP Part A and went through that.

In a very, very short recap essentially there were no consensus policy recommendations as a result of that particular group and any outstanding issues were converted over into Part B or C or D of the IRTP which was originally broken up into five groups.

Because there had been some other preliminary data gathering exercises leading up to the launch of those PDPs there really wasn't much of a data and metrics component to the analysis and in the final report.

But so very similar to the others we just reviewed through our new template that - I shouldn't say "new" anymore but our revised template of our use case analysis form and just touched on the highlights of the work products as a result such as the issue report, the charter and the final report.

Secondarily we just briefly touched on the fact of one of the use cases that we reviewed which was PDNR which was Post Expiration Domain Name Recovery that is now a consensus policy called the ERRP which is the - I don't know why I can't ever remember the name but consensus policy that was adopted by the GNSO Council and approved by the Board and later implemented by staff. The policy went into effect the 31st of August of last year.

The reason why I brought it up I did have a conversation with the former chair of that working group, Alan Greenberg, and he accepted the offer to review through our use case of that PDNR working group. I have sent him our revised version of our use case analysis form that I send out on the email list today.

And so hopefully in the near future we'll get some direct input from him as to, you know, his perception of how that working group proceeded especially as it relates to capturing data and metrics for the recommendations that were made.

If you recall through our previous review of that bill a couple of surveys that were completed that did provide insight into the recommendations that were formed at the same time there was issues in terms of gaining access to other data as it related to the expiration of domain names and partly one of the reasons why, as Jonathan mentioned about rounding the corners and moving into the future for defining a framework to assist policy development exercises.

Also towards the end of the call I had briefly mentioned that there was an action item several calls ago that was assigned to Tony Onorato in relation to what we've uncovered in terms of the review of these previous efforts.

And just as a quick highlight I did send this out to the list just a little bit ago. But to put this into context per the PDP guidelines it's a requirement that each policy development group reach out to the SOs and the ACs and in relation to the GNSO that includes the stakeholder groups and constituencies for early input into the policy process.

And typically there is a template that is used for that outreach that basically highlights the working group's charter and the charter questions that they're addressing in respect to the issue that's being deliberated on at that particular time.

Most of that input has been very qualitative in nature. And I don't want to spend a whole lot of time on it because, you know, I haven't really given the working group a chance to digest what I sent out in the email.

But essentially, you know, two main issues with that particular aspect of the policy process were identified, one being that the scope of the audience in that outreach exercise was only limited to SOs and ACs. And there were various reasons for that such as that the topic of interest or the issue was not of interest to the relative group that was sought after for providing input.

And secondarily that some groups may not have had an expertise to provide input into that. And thirdly that there were potentially competing resources for what a particular group considered more important issue for them to deliberate on or provide input on. And so those are kind of some of the highlights about the first issue.

Secondarily, as I briefly touched on, all the input that has been utilized or asked for in the past was strictly a qualitative component so essentially they would take a series of these charter questions, define a questionnaire of sorts and send it out for the request for input and basically, in that response, the answers would - that had been deliberated on by that particular group would be of qualitative nature responding to a particular issue question and either providing additional information about the issue or in some cases would also include that particular group's position.

But ultimately what this led to is - in this qualitative component there was no way to provide a quantitative aspect that was structured in a way that can help the working groups prioritize or find common denominators of issues across the groups.

So ultimately what we put together are basically two recommendations which are listed in the middle of the AC room. And the first one is essentially to - that working groups consider expanding the scope of the audience beyond SOs and ACs where additional expertise could provide value and the capture of information to better inform the issues being discussed.

And then secondarily that there should be a component to that outreach exercise noting that the qualitative responses were still valuable and the information that was collected from the various groups but to also include a complementary component that would provide a quantitative element to the input being received such as a survey or other kinds of instruments that would help quantify the issue.

So I just wanted to briefly give the working group a heads up on that. We will circle back around with these preliminary recommendations as we go to review through the other work products that working groups generate throughout the policy process.

But it was an action that was assigned to Tony and I just wanted to make sure that that was brought to everybody's attention and that we can close that particular one out.

Lastly, there were a couple other actions that occurred over the first weekend...

Jonathan Zuck:    Berry, can I ask you a question about the preceding?

Berry Cobb:    Yes.

Jonathan Zuck:    It's Jonathan. I wonder if it's - is it possible to incorporate that survey or quantitative analysis into the chartering group and not just the working group?

Berry Cobb:    That is absolutely correct and that's what I'm hopeful that this working group will do. The early outreach to the SOs ACs are the request for input as it's formally titled as one of the first steps a working group typically takes.

When you had assigned the action item you had asked Tony to specifically target him on this request for input and that's how these two particular recommendations were formed. But most certainly, and we'll talk a little bit

about this towards the end of the call, the other work products that working group is either governed by or produces are on the table for us to explore to include, you know, these frameworks for how metrics should be garnered.

But I think it would benefit us to make a specific recommendation about this particular instrument so that that - because it's pretty much a template as well that is used from staff to kick things off.

Jonathan Zuck:    Right.

Berry Cobb:    If there were a section that had that quantitative component built into it.

Jonathan Zuck:    Yeah, no, I mean, I guess my question - and maybe you're saying this already and I'm just missing it and if so I apologize, is it possible to send this questionnaire out from the charter group rather than the work group?

Berry Cobb:    I would have to add...

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Zuck:    ...the issue is in the - part of the role I believe of the chartering group is to define the scope of the problem, right? Define the scope of the work of the working group and - I mean, this will be part of our discussion about our overall recommendations I suppose.

But if some of this quantitative analysis in terms of the definition of the scope of the problem is going to get pushed to the chartering group out of the working group then that would suggest that any quantitative input might want to happen at the time that the charter group is working, you know, doing that scoping. Does that make sense?

Berry Cobb:    Yes. The only aspect is in terms of the formal process the drafting team that builds the charter and the chartering questions that are contained within need

to be approved by the GNSO Council first before that particular step of when the working group is formed and they do that initial outreach.

And to answer your question more specifically, could that task be moved to that charter drafting team? I need to ask Marika and others if that's possible because that's likely a departure from our standard process now. So I don't have an answer for that.

Jonathan Zuck: I mean, I guess a lot of this is a departure from our standard process. But, so, I mean, is that a takeaway or can one of them speak up - is anybody on the call that - are you going to just take that away as a question to ask Marika?

Berry Cobb: Yes. Yes.

Jonathan Zuck: Okay thanks, Berry. I won't take up any more time.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah, Jonathan. Cheryl here.

Jonathan Zuck: Yeah.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah. Just on that - Cheryl for the record, I hear what you're saying and I see the advantage of where you're heading on that, Jonathan. But I wouldn't want to make it exclusively the role of the chartering team. I think it may be appropriate for outlining and proposing of some key questions and surveying to be done.

It might be appropriate in that chartering space. It might be appropriate for it to be very clearly seen as, you know, a first starting point for the work group. But I think we could get really murky if the chartering space and the ability of the workgroup to act as independently as they can while still pursuing it's a specific questions and charter.

I sort of think that's separation of church and state is still kind of important to have even if the answer back from Marika and staff is a way that this can actually be technically done. But I don't think there's any reason why we can't propose that even if technically there is an issue of putting carts before horses that a chartering group should take a focus and look at first step metrics and survey materials.

I also wouldn't want to see it limited to only assaying in that very early stage because quite often and particularly on some of the longer PDP processes it's during the process that important survey work may come to light and may need to be done. Just my two cents worth.

Jonathan Zuck:    Sure, and I guess I didn't come to the question with an answer. It wasn't one of those cross examination questions where you know the answer before you ask it. I wonder if the chartering process, because part of the process of chartering now is to define the scope - the scope of the activity of the working group is the degree to which the scope of the problem should be part of the charter too. And the answer may be "no" but that was really the question I was asking.

Berry, go ahead.

Berry Cobb:    And just to piggyback on that, you know, there's nothing that says or prevents the charter drafting team From outlining the parameters of what should be requested for input by the SOs and ACs...

Jonathan Zuck:    Right.

Berry Cobb:    And the other drawback that I would think about trying to migrate this task into that charter drafting team is if that were to influence the charter in any way that would really draw out the drafting team component exercise and that's really why there has been this...

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Zuck: ...but in a potentially valuable way. I mean, if it's just time then it's a question of where it gets spent. I'm not sure that I find that compelling, right, it's time that's going to need to be spent having the chartering processed take longer so the worker process take shorter isn't necessarily a bad thing in and of itself I guess I'm saying.

Berry Cobb: This is Berry. Very true but that's also not to exclude us. You know, I think part of the recommendations that this working group will take a strong look at is that the issue report stage and seeking particular data and metrics that better describe the issue being discussed as well as the comment period that is conducted on the initial issue report at that stage as well.

So the charter drafting team is probably the secondary component and the more that we can enhance the issue report side of elements and acquire the proper data and metrics to support the issue thus bridging that gap.

Jonathan Zuck: Sure. Okay, yeah, you need to take up more time with it now but I just wanted to noodle that a little bit more that's all.

Berry Cobb: Absolutely and like I mentioned, this - we'll definitely circle back to these. I know that this very first draft of the recommendations themselves can use work and we'll look at it in the broader context of all of those work products.

The only other two - I think they were basically kind of action items that came out in relation to our effort here with that DMPM, during the Saturday and Sunday sessions with the GNSO it was mentioned I think by the chair, Jonathan Robinson of the GNSO Council, that it might be a good idea that we try to coordinate our efforts with the activities of the GNSO review team which is just basically now getting launched.

So I still have that action on my plate too for at the very least to ensure that, you know, we have a communication line between what their activities are and what our activities are and see how we can complement that exercise.

And then secondarily I think it was between the GNSO and the Board meeting on the weekend there was also some comments made by one of the Board members in terms of some of the improvements. And I think that it also related somewhat to the GNSO review but I need to go fish out the particular comment because I can't remember the exact Board member.

But it had a direct connection with what we were trying to accomplish here so I still have that on my action item list. And I'll fish that out and make sure I send it to the list so that we keep it on our radar.

So outside of that that's pretty much all I had in regards to recap from London. Jonathan or anyone do you want to add anything there?

Jonathan Zuck: No that sounds right. I mean, the only thing that came up was in the presentation to the GNSO Council about getting a copy to the folks that were on the working group, getting a copy of our analysis. And I guess you've done that for one person and I guess the question is just whether or not there's anybody else that we ought to gain input from that isn't directly in our group.

You've got input from Alan, right?

Berry Cobb: Verbally there at the meeting. And I basically asked if you would kindly try to put it in words which I sent him a revised version and hopefully we'll get some feedback from him in the near future.

Jonathan Zuck: So I guess the question is whether or not there is anyone else like him that would provide any additional color on any of the other analyses or do you feel like you've had enough conversations with the people that were involved?

Berry Cobb:    To be honest Alan is the only one that I've reached out to that was at least a chair - a former one of these - a former chair of one of these working groups. I'll be happy to do so if the group thinks that that is going to be a value.

I think a few of the former chairs are not necessarily in the same kind of roles as they were when they chaired those particular groups but that shouldn't prevent them from providing their own input.

And I think the other aspect of it is, you know, based on the analysis we've done so far, you know, I feel like we had a pretty good idea of, you know, some working groups did function well in terms of using data and metrics and creating their recommendation; some didn't and others tried but met resistance.

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Zuck:    And I guess the only reason I bring it up is not to create more work for you, Berry, and I apologize that I may be doing that. It was the nature of Alan's comments in the hallway about what took place that was kind of political the best way I can describe it in terms of the kind of resistance or pushback that they received.

And I know that Cheryl has mentioned on previous calls that not all of the gossip, if you will, makes it into these reports. And if we are particularly trying to look at how to sidestep that in the future that input might be useful, if there's some color or commentary or political perspectives that aren't to be found in the text as we found them. So that's where I was coming from. I welcome other people in the group to speak up on this to see if that's a worthwhile exercise.

Berry Cobb:    Okay and this is Berry. I can, you know, as you and probably not see in the AC room as I have the spreadsheet that has all of the previous use cases that we've analyzed. And at the top I've tried to identify who the chair was for

those particular efforts so I can try to make individual contact to see if they're interested in providing any of that input.

Jonathan Zuck: I mean, maybe it's worth an email just to see if - because it might just be a few lines here and there. The real problem that, you know, the Registries pad with this particular request was XYZ or something like that. It may end up being very little work for them to provide some fairly valuable input.

Berry Cobb: Will do.

Jonathan Zuck: Thank you.

((Crosstalk))

Olevie Kouami: Olevie.

Jonathan Zuck: Olevie, go ahead.

Olevie Kouami: I would like to ask for the (unintelligible) from London. Can we have (unintelligible)?

Jonathan Zuck: Can you have the - you're asking for the transcript from London?

Olevie Kouami: The transcript from London, yes.

Jonathan Zuck: I think that's published. Right, Berry?

Berry Cobb: Yes, I'm attaching the link right now.

Jonathan Zuck: Thank you. Then the only other thing I recall from London as well in the GNSO meeting was a recommendation by Jonathan - and maybe you already said this - about trying to find some way to coordinate our efforts with

the efforts that are going on in the policy versus implementation working group, so maybe that's just a question of when to coordinate with them.

Olevie Kouami:     Thank you (unintelligible).

Jonathan Zuck:     Did you already mentioned that in your summary, Berry?

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:   Cheryl here, Jonathan.

Jonathan Zuck:     Okay, yeah, go ahead. I didn't see your hand.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:   I didn't put up. My fault entirely. When you mentioned coordinating with the policy and implementation working group my immediate question serving on that group is to what end and for what purpose? Because I'm on that group and I'm not sure I see it.

Jonathan Zuck:     Okay well, I mean, and that could be very good feedback. That was a recommendation by Jonathan Robinson at the GNSO meeting when we made our statement.

And I think his logic was that part of what we'll be recommending out of this group are some things to do to check back on the success of the implementation, right, to do some measuring a year out or something like that or to see whether or not the actions that were recommended and consequently taken by the Board or and implemented by the staff, etcetera, had the desired outcome when you revisit your metrics and say that complaints go down and did whatever happened that we had chosen to measure as part of this problem.

And so then the question becomes does that become - just keeping track of those metrics and revisiting them long after the work group has disbanded,

does that become part of implementation? I think that was probably Jonathan logic...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:   Okay, Cheryl here. I can follow that rationale. I can see therefore where the outcomes of our work may have influence on the other work group's endgame. But, yeah, probably a - yeah, worthwhile a chat but I wouldn't want to - I think we should be really specific when we approach the workgroup why we are approaching that were group because the knee-jerk reaction might be exactly the same as mine was. Well, fine but why?

But if it's a matter of that workgroup having the advantage of knowing as we go through our work where our deliberations may be heading and the that may assist in allowing a clear set of nexus or interchange point that make sense as they develop their work then sure.

Jonathan Zuck:    Well so, Cheryl, I appreciate you volunteering to be the liaison...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:   That'll teach me to shut up, won't it? Okay.

Jonathan Zuck:    ...between this working group and that one, so you're a really generous and giving person.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:   Okay.

Jonathan Zuck:    And so I guess all I'll ask given that Jonathan is the one who brought it up, Jonathan Robinson brought it up, if you could keep an eye out for things that we might want to shuttle over to them, drafts, etcetera, that might affect the contemplations they're doing about implementation then speak up.

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Zuck:     That might be enough of a handling of this.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:  Okay I'll take that mantle on.

Jonathan Zuck:     All right thank you. Berry, go ahead.

Berry Cobb:        Yeah, I put this in the chat, I think Jonathan was referring to the GNSO review, not the policy and implementation working group. And that was the context that he was making. But to sprinkle a little bit with what Cheryl had mentioned, I think very soon that working group will - as per one of their charter questions - be reviewing the implementation review teams and taking a look at previous...

((Crosstalk))

Berry Cobb:        ...IRTP efforts and whether - how successful or not successful they were and especially looking at the distinction or the line between when something is being implemented and it raises policy questions how would the IRT reengaged the GNSO Council in those instances.

                   But a subcomponent that we'll also be taking a look at staff's implementation of policy as to which there is a framework that is just about - that's developed. And I know that one component of that after the policy has been implemented is it does zero in on that continuous improvement cycle and measuring the effectiveness of that policy and those kind of components.

                   I don't think it's been shared with Cheryl's working group yet but I know that that's...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:  No.

Berry Cobb:      ...on the runway.

Jonathan Zuck:    So I guess this is just a question of planting the seed in your head and Cheryl's to make sure that we are not stepping on anybody's toes unnecessarily.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:   We can work....

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Zuck:    If it's necessarily then we'll do it but let's not do it unnecessarily. All right, Berry, do you want to go ahead and get into your spreadsheet? I know I derailed is a little bit here.

Berry Cobb:      No worries. Good conversation. So the next part of our agenda is basically the spreadsheet that you can't read in the AC room but I did send it to you in the list though it'll probably be better to follow along with your own version.

The goal here is to compile all of our use cases into one instrument by which they can be compared side-by-side, although again in many ways this is a qualitative exercise what you see before you right now, given that, you know, each working group was addressing a completely different issue that is distinctive from any of the others in the past.

However, we did try to categorize it in a way at least across the three primary work product in that policy process, you know, analyzing what the final issue report contained from data and metrics, what was included in the charter and what was included in the final report.

So two dates we've gone through fast flux, PDNR, which is now ERRP, the add grace period limits policy. We reviewed IRTP-A in London. And I started on IRTP-B and C which I did not get finished prior to this call but I'll make sure to complete this week.

But both of these are actually still being implemented by staff so they won't be - they won't be as complete as some of the previous ones that have been closed out and implemented fully.

So in terms of this part of the call today, really I didn't have one ready for us to review in detail and I'm not so much sure that it's necessary to do that from this point forward unless the working group chooses to.

But what I was hoping that we could have a discussion on this call today, as I mentioned, a lot of what we have contained in the spreadsheet is qualitative extractions of what occurred in these previous efforts. And what I'm hoping to receive is some input from the working group members as to how we can try to quantify some of this.

And most specifically, Jonathan, I sent you an email on this but you may not have seen it yet, but just prior to our session starting in London I talked about this exercise and I had briefly mentioned that I was going to be looking for a way to try to classify the components of our analysis into something that can be rolled up and categorized in that kind of more quantitative summary table.

And you had mentioned three or four attributes that were I think very good in accomplishing that. But unfortunately the recording hadn't started so it's not on the transcript and I didn't have a pen ready to write it down so I'm hoping that you can access your memory files and try to remember what you said because I think there were four categories that you had mentioned that would classify this output that I thought would really be beneficial for us to do.

Jonathan Zuck: All right well why don't we schedule a call and work - to work my memory because right now I'm not - I'm not calling it up instantly but I can probably get back there. But rather than going through these recall exercises on this call let's you and I just - connect and we'll jog it - we'll jog it free.

Berry Cobb:      Sounds good to me. And of course, I mean, I'm opening this up to the working group as well so I'm looking for input and suggestions on as we review fast flux, for example, and the idea would be somewhere at the bottom of the spreadsheet we'll have 3 to 6 categories.

I'm not really sure what they should be but some way that we can rate the use of data and metrics in this exercise that's something that's meaningful, short, sweet and to the point that we can do an even - that's quantitative comparative analysis from one group to another as to what worked, what didn't and what should have been done perhaps so that we can quantify this and make it a little bit more digestible when we do import this into the final report or I should say the initial report.

Jonathan Zuck:   That sounds good. So people probably haven't had a chance to absorb this, but does everybody kind of get the effort? Do you have questions for Berry before you take this away as a homework assignment?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:   Yeah, Cheryl here. I think I've got questions for Berry. I always get a little nervous when we're taking lumps of qualitative data and try and make some sort of quantitative thing because as you know you can make arbitrary labels to then form pie charts and statistics just for the sake of doing it rather than giving you anything more valuable then you can take out of the qualitative information.

Are you looking at a sort of some percentages, some go, no gos? I guess not being privy to the conversation that happened before the recording started in London might just putting me behind the eight ball here. Maybe if I had an idea of what these categories may have been and therefore how those values would be interpreted? Please explain I think is what I'm saying.

Berry Cobb:      Thank you Cheryl. This is Berry. I would love to. And all I can say is that what Jonathan had said was really good. And I just for the life of me - I've been racking my brain for the last 24 hours to try to remember it and I couldn't.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:   Okay. I'm going to put a pin in it then. I think we need to come back to this.

Jonathan Zuck:   All right, yeah, sorry. I will - I'll get it back. We'll figure it out. Berry and I will figure it out.

Berry Cobb:   But I think in general you're right, it wasn't necessarily to produce a pie chart or anything but, you know, kind of a pseudo-executive summary that distills a lot of this down into something that's a lot more digestible by our future readers than the initial report.

And I don't think any of the categories in Column 1, for example, would have percentages per se as a result of our analysis but maybe more definitions behind it, something similar to didn't use quantitative analysis; qualitative analysis was only used across our three work products.

So more like a summary table just to try to get a quicker take away of which ones seem to be effective and which ones didn't. And unfortunately I think I was so blindsided by trying to remember what Jonathan had mentioned that I couldn't even come up with my own. So I agree, we can table this. I did want to just mention it. And certainly if anybody in the working group has other ideas we can try to distill that's on the list and as Jonathan said, we can try to do our memory recall exercise offline.

So with that are there anybody - or any other questions about what we have constructed thus far? Do we believe that this is going to be useful? Hopefully you'll say yes somewhat. At least it's in one document. And certainly each of the individual use cases will all be posted on the wiki and, you know, our report will have links back to those for more in-depth analysis should our readers choose to go there.

Jonathan Zuck:   I certainly think it'll be useful.

Berry Cobb:       Okay great. So I guess that pretty much takes care of Agenda Item 3. Shall I move on to the next one?

Jonathan Zuck:    Yeah, please.

Berry Cobb:       All right, so having put all of these together and one of the other things that we kind of discussed as next steps in London was the, as Jonathan mentioned, but the future looks like as opposed to looking in the past.

And it occurred to me last night that given our charter and one of, you know, I think one of the things that we hope to accomplish is - I think Jonathan had mentioned this in words is that, you know, all of what we're looking at right now can benefit with quantitative components and analysis especially expressed through these work products that the policy process creates or that governs a particular working group. And it's essentially about changing the culture.

So we spent a lot of time now reviewing these past efforts and specifically reading through the issue report, the charter and the final report. I'm wondering if our possible next steps may be to actually start to take a look at those three work products and what sections of that report may look like and start a draft exercise of, you know, what questions need to be asked in a issue report? What types of data are, you know, what types of data may be useful in helping to identify the issue?

Four questions should be asked in the charter that will force this change in culture for when the working group and is formed to go and seek out data in a more quantitative way as well as still promoting the qualitative components.

And then more so within the final report what kinds of questions and content should be contained in these work products that may help. And it just seemed like a - it seemed like a more natural order of flow that while we have some of

these in our shorter term memory to start to take a look at that before we engage in the next part of our exercise which is getting into the defining of the framework on how we may start to engage in data collection exercises with contracted parties and our third party providers.

Cheryl, I see your hand is raised.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:   Thanks, guys. Cheryl again for the record. I think that's an excellent plan, Berry. I also think that it's important that we look at the weightings that we give the provision of metrics and measures at the different stages. So for example out of today's conversation one of my a-ha moments was - I do actually have them even at this hour of the morning - was how important it is to focus at that issues report stage.

And so we can - I'm kind of almost seeing a - at some part of our reporting a bit of a decision tree or flowchart thing that sort of says here in this, you know, puce colored bands, which happens to be issue report, it is vital that the following things you pay attention to. And then, you know, goes through with other sort of sets of recommendations.

And then picking up at sort of the and even post-implementation you've got this requirement to have a baseline measurement taken pre-policy development and implementation or at least early in policy development and well in advance of implementation of such policies.

And then you have your ability to have a comparative checkpoint against that baseline when you're looking at implementation and the various points in time post implementation.

And that I think is going to have to go in two ways; I think it should be - we obviously don't have to have text and checklists but I think we probably need

to try and build a visual. And I don't know whether my method is going to be useful or flowcharting is going to be useful or, you know, just colored bands on the spreadsheet is going to be useful.

But I think we need to try and make it for both sides of the brain so people can understand it in sort of a visual way as well as a sort of a A, B, C and D stuff.

Berry Cobb:     That makes sense.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:  Oh, I can't put my hand down. Oh yes I can put my hand down. Sorry, must have been my Internet decided to go slow for a moment. I was trying to put my hand down, I've meant to do so now. Not volunteering to do the flowchart before you ask me, Jonathan.

Jonathan Zuck:  Berry, go ahead.

Berry Cobb:     Yeah, this is Berry. Well definitely Cheryl, your recommendation about the visual was definitely much more up my lane so I'll be happy to take, you know, our existing policy process documentation and create a layer on top of that that highlights these critical points where we're looking to - where we think those data and metrics components should be engaged at the various stages of the process and then of course, you know, maybe start to create a complementary chart of those three major work products.

Because, you know, I think where I'm struggling at is trying to just do it on - think about it on my own well, what exactly are the right questions that we should be asking at the issue report stage? For more importantly the charter creation stage that, you know, will force that future working group will take a much stronger and deeper look at that data.

So I agree. And as you mentioned that we may not necessarily need to have all the texts and checklists established at that point to dovetail off of that, I

suspect that when we do get to this stage where we talk about the framework for how - where the boundaries for how we will engage data collection from contracted parties or third-party providers that still may influence those components there. So I think it's almost like a parallel process as we continue to move forward.

Jonathan Zuck: That makes sense. Any other questions?

Berry Cobb: Okay. So...

((Crosstalk))

Berry Cobb: ...I think in terms of our next meeting I think we are still meeting on a every other week term so we would be targeting the 5th of August for our next session. Got several actions to take away out of this call that's most importantly my first step will be to complete out the matrix and the IRTP-B and C and get that out to the list.

We'll engage with Jonathan to come up with a draft categorizing or summary of sorts to distill down our analysis. I will keep - I have the other action item, as I mentioned, about finding the Board member comment that seems to have a direct connection with our efforts here.

Hopefully we will hear back from Alan and his input as it relates to be PDNR exercise as well as communicate to the other chairs of those working groups to see if they have interest in providing input, color commentary to their experience.

And then lastly start prepping for our next exercise which is to begin to build the visual/early draft checklist of what components may fit into the policy process work product.

Jonathan Zuck: That makes sense. I'm happy to work with you on that too, Berry.

Berry Cobb:        Great. Thank you. So I think for this - I guess the last question I'll ask him at least for those members, we haven't done a Doodle poll in a while, is the 20 UTC timeframe still appropriate or should we try continuing I think our alternating pattern where the previous one was somewhere around 13 UTC. I'm open...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:   Blah.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:   Blah, blah, blah. That's Cheryl making blah noises. If you're going to alternate I don't have a problem actually with alternating but if you're going to alternate and you alternate off this cycle for example, at 1300 UTC in the night I'm just finishing, because at the moment it's coming up to my 7 am, you would be, I think, third ICANN clashing call running at the same time and the fourth actual conference call competing.

So just watch other commitments that are on the ICANN calendar, not so much for the time but for the day within a month. I couldn't go to the NCSG conference call last night because it happens to clash with the ALAC monthly call and these clashes are happening far too frequently. So, you know, a shared calendar is a good idea but staff actually have to look at.

Berry Cobb:        Right, very good. Well, I think in the interest of blahs, I am maintained that 20 UTC for now until I hear other concerns at least for our next call and we can move from there.

Jonathan Zuck:     Yeah, I see a quick note from (Nanad Ulrich) in the comment section. Is that about trying to get more done in between meetings? Okay so, I mean, there are some things that are going on so my guess is that a lot of folks are getting back to Berry directly with their updates rather than having an open conversation in the interim.

But we'll be circulating some stuff in the near term here on the list so keep an eye open for it/

Berry Cobb: Indeed. Okay well this is Berry. This is all I have for this time. Jonathan, I guess back to you to any last parting comments or close the meeting I guess.

Jonathan Zuck: Good. Okay well thanks everyone. And we'll take (Nanad)'s comment to heart and make sure that we try to keep the conversation active in between meetings. I'm also willing to bump it up to weekly so we should discuss that too if we want to try to hit this a little harder if there's some interest in that so maybe we can ask that on the list as well.

But otherwise, thanks everyone for participating and we'll see you on the next call. Thanks a lot.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks, all. Bye.

Jonathan Zuck: Thanks, Berry.

END