ICANN Transcription
Data & Metrics for Policy Making Working Group
Tuesday 22 September 2015 at 21:00 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 22 September 2015 at 21:00 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-22sep15-en.mp3

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

Attendees:
Cheryl Langdon-Orr - At–Large
Jonathan Zuck - IPC
Pam Little - RySG
Tony Onorato - Individual
Sara Bockey - RrSG
Graeme Bunton – RrSG
Marinel Rosca – Individual

Apologies:
none

ICANN staff:
Berry Cobb
Steve Chan
Nathalie Peregrine
Terri Agnew

Terri Agnew: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. This is the

                 Data and Metrics for Policy Making Working Group call on the 22nd of

                 September, 2015.

On the call today we have Sara Bockey, Pam Little, Jonathan Zuck, Tony Onorato, Marinel Rosca, Cheryl Langdon-Orr and Graeme Bunton. I show no apologies listed for today's conference.

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

And, Jonathan, this is Terri, if you are speaking I believe you are muted and we're unable to hear you.

Berry Cobb: All right, this is Berry Cobb for the record. Looks like Jonathan's audio is - or his mic is on the fritz so we'll go ahead and kick things off...

Jonathan Zuck: I can hear you now.

Berry Cobb: Oh. Yes we can hear you now, Jonathan.

Jonathan Zuck: All right, good. I couldn't hear you for a while. I don't know what happened, it just sort of cut out. So, I mean, I guess I'll just ask if there's anybody - any other statements of interest that anyone has to make an update on for the record. And then otherwise I'll pass it back to you, Berry, to get us picked up from where we left off last call.

Berry Cobb: All right, thank you, Jonathan. So welcome everyone. From the previous call we made it through the first 14 comments of the public comment review tool. For those that have had a chance to look through it we put together first draft responses from the working group for each one of the individual comments.

And based on the group's deliberations there was any possible actions - pending actions to be taken in terms of updating the report or revising the recommendations have been highlighted with a call out comment over to the

side mostly meant just as a flag for once we complete the review of the comments and then we return our attention back to the final report. We'll have those easily highlighted so that we can all take a look at them and complete the work for its eventual submission to the GNSO Council.

On the last call we stopped a Comment Number 14, which was a comment from the Registrars. I think in general we had an overall action item for Graeme from the Registrars to just take a look at Section 5 that focused on the principles.

We haven't seen anything on the list. I suspect that he's still working on that. But I wasn't really going to spend time going back through any of the draft responses. And I'll just ask members of the group to take a look through those and if you think that staff has mischaracterized any of the summary responses or actions please respond back to the list.

If we're lucky we should be able to get through the remaining comments today. And just like last week we'll send out an updated version that the group can edit and then hopefully by the next call we'll go back to the final report.

Any questions or comments before I move on to Number 15? Hearing and seeing none, thank you, Graeme, still - his action is still on the list which again is more in the report itself, not so much this particular document in the AC room. And everybody does have scroll control as I'll be reading off on the actual word document version.

So we'll move on to Comment 15, which is from Amr. He's part of the NCSG and just as a reminder, the NCSG did submit - it was kind of a late comment although there wasn't substance other than to say that they supported what Amr had submitted to this group through the public comment forum and so I'll just start off with that.

Basically he thanks the members of the working group and staff supporting that have done to meet the requirements set forth in the charter as well as the opportunity to have the comments submitted and considered prior to publication for the final report.

In principle he fully supports the notion of the GNSO improving PDPs by using empirical data while considering the intentions and implications of policies being developed. Furthermore and has the working group has noted, metrics and quantitative analysis of data can be very useful in helping to determine the extent to which a previously-developed policy is meeting its desired goal or not.

Having said that, he has the following comments that get a little bit more in detail. And for the group, just like I have with other comments, we tried to separate these out in rows based on the type of topic or issue that they were specifically drawing attention to.

So for Number 15 I think in general this would just be tagged as agreement. The response will be, thank you for this particular comment and there would be no action taken in regards to this particular Number 15.

So with that I'll go ahead and move on to 16 which is also by Amr. I believe this was the last comment of what he had submitted. And then the other two or three comments that he submitted were more specific to the topic, which we'll get to in the subsequent tables below.

Just basically mentions that finally at no point in the DMPM Working Group's initial report or even in the metrics request decision tree is a critical appraisal of the collected data mentioned.

Any quantitative analysis of data should be subject to transparent methods of assessment prior to putting it to use for the purpose of evidenced-based policy development. This could be done during the public comment period for

a preliminary issue report or perhaps during the PDP working group deliberations.

An example where this may be constructive is determining the appropriateness of method - of methods used for data collection; was the data collected using an established reliable system? Are the data element samples geographically temporarily representative of the study (unintelligible), which may be impacted by a policy being developed? Or was the selection of study subjects or controls, if applicable, biased resulting in an inability to generalize the results?

These are simple example questions that need to be answered before determining the extent to which data and metrics are useable in PDP working groups.

So with that I'll open it up for comments or any feedback based on this.

Jonathan Zuck: Berry? Jonathan.

Berry Cobb: Yeah, please.

Jonathan Zuck: I guess my initial reaction to this is that these are questions that are more often applied to studies that are commissioned, you know, the Whois data accuracy study or the - or the recent survey efforts that was launched by the CCT information - implementation advisory group and less about just getting access to raw data that, I mean, we might be able to come up with a list of some subset of these questions but mostly it's things about bias and things like that I think are more often about, you know, if we were going to go out and conduct some kind of a survey more so I think than the types of data that we're talking - envisioning using in our recommendations.

Berry Cobb: Thank you, Jonathan. And, you know, and I - this is Berry - I would add to that that, you know, I think some of the questions that are being answered

here, and perhaps it's just implied by our work and not necessarily spelled out in the deliverables that the group has created. But I guess I'm hopeful and maybe we do need to document it some way that some of these questions would be considered regardless of the data exercise.

So I guess as an example if there was a request to - I'm going to go back to my (unintelligible) transfer data, let's just assume that there was a request to acquire transfer data of some sort certainly we would want to avoid the biases where possible. As Graeme had mentioned, you know, we would want to take into account different business models that may or may not apply to the data being requested and components like that.

Jonathan Zuck: Right. So, I mean, I guess we could update the recommendations to - as part of the data request thing to look at the type of data - to ask some questions about the type of data we're trying to request. I don't think in each case we're going to commission some kind of a study of the data after the fact but maybe as part of the request process we make some assessments about what would constitute appropriate data in the metrics request decision tree that's mentioned in the comments.

Berry Cobb: Thank you, Jonathan. And I guess, you know, something that I think I'm keying on here is, you know, it was something about - I'm sorry, I'm just reading through it again. But basically it almost kind of seems like Amr's comment is after the fact that data has been collected, you know, to ensure that before it is used in any critical decision point along the policy process whether it be at the Council or the working group level that, you know, some of these aspects are taken into consideration.

But I do agree that perhaps we could strengthen, you know, one or two of the recommendations or at least the - either the decision tree or the request form that has some of the requirements to kind of preload some of these questions to be considered by the requestor at that point in time. And, Tony, I see your hand is raised.

Tony Onorato: Yeah, Berry, thanks. Tony for the record. I agree with that. I mean, my sense here would be to put something in the decision tree to say a (unintelligible) point for the working group to ask itself whether the data that has been collected in the particular circumstance that they're addressing whether there's any reason for it to be diminished in its value or if there's any aspect of the data that is troubling for the working group.

I mean, these - I appreciate everything that's being asked here but this is sort of an ideal that, you know, I don't think that there's any solution to it. There's never going to be a solution to it in the sense that data is collected and there has to be some ability to allow the expertise and clear thinking of the working group to assess whether or not the data it has received is actually going to be particularly relevant or persuasive given the question they're trying to answer.

I mean there's a human element to what I guess is what I'm trying to say, which I think is best served by maybe just putting something in the decision tree to ask the working group to basically note in its record whether or not there are already questions about the data that have been raised that caused it to be either more or less valuable for some purposes.

But I think we party built that in is sort of what I'm saying. There's not always going to be a need for geographically or temporally representative data. There isn't always going to be that sort of need. And if it comes back that it's biased by virtue of the fact that only data from one provider or one particular segment of a provider community was received then that should be noted.

And down the line if questions are raised about a decision that's made based on that data the working group can acknowledge that, that it made disclosure that looked at the data and treated it with appropriate weight in that sense. So anyway.

Berry Cobb: Thank you Tony. And I guess to the extreme is should that data be viewed by the group or if there was a lack of consensus about the quality of the data it could practically be tossed out and either go back to the drawing board to find different data or, you know, basically there is an endpoint or a disposal mechanism as to whether it's used appropriately for working group deliberations or it didn't meet certain criteria or standards and was discarded and not really considered.

Tony Onorato: Agreed. Again this is Tony. I would put perhaps one -- put a certain element into the decision tree for the working group's assessment of the data and into the working group report, essentially a bullet on for any considerations about the data raised that needed to be addressed by the working group. And I think that that's my sense on the appropriate way to handle it.

Berry Cobb: Right, thank you. And so I think I have enough of the dialogue to at least formulate the first response and action taken. I'll kind of keep it in a general just to take this as a concept as we review the next version of the final report. Any other comments about Number 16?

                Okay moving along to 17, this is from the ALAC. They appreciate the need for solutions that will improve the way in which consensus policies are developed especially in relation to critical registrant, registry, registrar issues. It's desirable that these issues are addressed within an open and transparent working culture as well as an environment where data is collected in a confidential and anonymous manner.

                Subsequently this will encourage better informed fact-based policy development and decision-making. It's important that all parties involved in GNSO decision-making recognize the benefits and value of relevant baseline data and metrics to the policy development process especially at the initial stages of scoping understanding and describing a problem or issue.

In order to ensure engagement of all parties in the new process ALAC supports the possible need to employ an independent third-party in order to address any concerns relating to the collection, anonymization or aggregation of data.

Fact-based deliberations and decision making will enable the appropriate prioritization and critical issues based on tangible evidence rather than gut feeling or anecdotal examples.

And I'll open this up. For the most part I think this is really much in agreement statement. And I'm not recognizing any specific action as it relates to our report other than to just note that much of what was talked about seem to focus around our first recommendation which is the pilot effort. Any comments?

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...statement. It's Cheryl here. It is an agreement statement indeed.

Berry Cobb: Thank you Cheryl. Any other comments or suggestions? Hearing and seeing none I'll move on to Number 18 which is from the NCSG. So I lied to the group, I thought we are ready went through this one but we didn't yet. And the reason why I thought for it is because I took the liberty of classifying it as agreement and general and referring anybody that reads this report to refer back to Amr's comment. So if there's no concern with this one we can go ahead and move on to Number 19.

There isn't a Number 19 so we're moving into more of our detailed - for those that are following in Adobe Connect room you should be on Page 15. It's the second table labeled as Charter and Final Report Templates. And I believe we have four or five of these. Now, six total.

The first one is from Google. This is the clearly defined objectives at the start of the PDP process by stating deficiencies or desired improvements in the chartering stage. Google strongly supports the recommendation to include key metric considerations at the chartering stage of the PDP.

Because the PDP may have multiple interrelated objectives and phases we recommend that the template provided in Annex A to be augmented to clearly and specifically define the issue or prospective improvement associated with the metrics.

By way of example, for the reasons inter registrar policy - IRTP Part C recommendation a reduction of the number of emergency reversals could have been used as a key metric tied to the goal of reverse domain name hijacking. Tying prospective improvements to tangible metrics will improve the definition of the PDP objective and associated success indicators and better target PDP related work.

In addition to including critical -- sorry -- including criteria that define the success of the policy effort the working group may wish to consider updating the template in Annex A to distinguish between key metrics that relate to measuring the effect of the policy and data elements that the working group itself may find useful during the policy development process.

And I'll open the floor for comments.

Jonathan Zuck: This is Jonathan. I think again this is largely an agreement statement. And I'm not sure that these might be somewhat - I don't know what the distinction looks like that they're mentioning at the end, you know, that we might just find useful versus data we might use to measure the effect of policy.

Because I think how we're defining the problem is through a - is through a certain set of data and then the metrics are what we're coming up with as what we'd like that - that same data to look like in the future.

So, I mean, that's the - those are the key metrics is changes we'd like to see to the data that was used to define the problem. And I guess we could write that down but, I mean, I think that's really the distinction is I doubt very much there's going to be data that we get just to inform the group and that isn't used as part of the metrics.

Berry Cobb: Thank you, Jonathan.

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Zuck: ...point of clarity.

Berry Cobb: Yeah, this is Berry. I mean, I guess in some respect at least, you know, in terms of how the charter is structured or our draft suggestions, you know, it is kind of divided about the - the section of the key metric considerations, and again perhaps maybe we need to make this more clear, what is really centered around what metrics data that a group could use for its deliberations and then of course then we have it separated out further that should the group come up with any recommendations and should they be adopted by the Council and eventually implemented, what are some of those metrics that will gauge success.

And that's kind of the takeaway that I kind of got form the comment, that there needed to be this kind of distinction between the two. But perhaps we need to make that just a little bit more clear.

Jonathan Zuck: Okay, maybe we can take a look at how to make that clear. I guess I feel like this is what we were attempting to do. I mean, you know, the measures - the cross tabulations associated with the data in the research phase of this define the number of, for example, once we decide that the number of emergency transfers is a measure - a way to measure, you know, the - this is a way to

measure domain name hijackings then that number is identified as being a bad number now that could be a better number in the future.

But I guess in theory the problem could be defined by one metric in the - we could be coming up with some indirect way of solving the problem. But again, I think that we're going to do our very best to define the metrics around the same metrics that were used - to define the metrics of success around the same metrics that were used to define the problem in the first place.

Berry Cobb: Thank you, Jonathan. Agreed. Yeah, I would, you know, it's the raw data of current state that is rolled up into some sort of report that describes what, you know, that better describes the issue that is being experienced today and to provide a picture of some sort behind that. Then some sort of recommendation is provided that will change it.

And I guess the, you know, the one use case that we reviewed very early on was domain tasting. And, you know, that was a significant move of the needle. And that group did in fact have data up front that shows that there was a high degree of that activity in the early stages.

They made a policy change and then it was measured after the fact that dramatically - like I don't remember the exact number but it was extremely significant change of activity afterwards.

I suspect that the only thing that probably wasn't applied in that old use case, and maybe is something that we could add as a suggestion or a hints and tips is to try to set some sort of benchmark.

So, for example, as it relates to the comment here with Google that if it was reverse domain name hijacking and the group proposed some sort of policy change that they would expect to see an 80% difference from current state to future state. So perhaps we could try to provide some language in the report in that regard.

But at the same time I think that's kind of a little risky because it's pretty hard to predict a target such as that in the abstract until you actually see it in practice.

All right, any other comments in regards to Number 1?

Jonathan Zuck: Well let's try some language like that, Berry, I think that's good. I'm not afraid of us trying to predict an outcome, that was the entire CCT exercise, right, that...

Berry Cobb: Correct.

Jonathan Zuck: ...these are the kinds of numbers delta that we're looking for so, I mean, I think that's reasonable to expect of a working group.

Berry Cobb: All right. Hearing and seeing nothing else, moving on to Number 2 also by Google. Is provide expanded recommendations for the use of data following the conclusion of a PDP. They strongly support Recommendation 4 which proposes to include an additional recommendation that measures whether the policy change produced the intended effect.

However, while guidelines on how data and metrics will be requested during the early phases of the PDP are captured and relative detail within the initial report and supported by available documentation little information is provided about the process for using data and metrics to support policymaking following the conclusion of a PDP.

They recommend that minimum studies be performed for the indicator set forth in the charter's key metric consideration to allow assessments of whether policy process achieved its intended aims and where deficiencies exist attempt to isolate the gaps or flaws in the PDP process that produced them.

Data garnered from such studies could be used to improve future PDP work both substantively and identifying issues requiring future work and procedurally by forcing a critical look at elements of the PDP that may have produced undesirable, inadequate or unintended outcomes.

So before I open up the floor, you know, my take away from this comment is very similar to the previous one that perhaps we weren't being clear enough in making a distinction within the charter template that the, you know, most of the key metric considerations were more focused around the group's deliberations and not necessarily associated with trying to measure the success of implementation afterwards.

And I think if we maybe kind of refer back to the action of the previous one of taking a look at that or trying to clarify the distinction between the two that that might be satisfactory in terms of responding to this comment. So I'll open up the floor.

Jonathan Zuck: Berry, this is Jonathan. I think that makes sense. I mean it's probably worth noting that if there costs associated with getting the data or identifying the problem there will be similar costs associated with getting updated data downstream.

And so that same process of going in and making a request will probably have to be part of the recommendation that a working group makes for the continuous improvement.

Berry Cobb: Great. Yes understood. Thank you. All right seeing no hands, hearing the voices so we'll move on to Number 3 which is from the Business Constituency. They support the recommendation to include key metric considerations at the chartering stage of the PDP as a PDP may have numerous objectives and phases.

I really won't read the rest of this because it's basically a cut and paste from the prior comment. If anyone disagrees with my assessment please speak up. I think this is what we ran into last week as well.

So I'll move on to Comment Number 4. The ISPCP supports the creation of the working group product templates including updates to the GNSO's Operating Procedures and Working Group Guidelines as well as an update to the charter template to assist trafficking teams in determining key metrics to be used to meet the goals of the resolving issues.

From my perspective that sounds like agreement and no required action. Hearing and seeing none, Tony did type in the chat agreement it is.

Moving onto Comment Number 5, Section 5.3.5.1 third bullet observed that for instance the charter template could require that working groups identifying a set of baseline data that should be captured to allow for the community to determine if a set of recommendations was effective or not. It's important to note here that collection of data and analyzing it quantitatively cannot be the sole determinant of whether or not a set of policy recommendations is effective.

Qualitative research methods play an important role in informing a discussion during policy development and may very well also play a role in measuring its success post-implementation. Although addressing the means by which qualitative research methods may be useful to the GNSO and policy development it is not strictly within the scope of this working group citing the advantage of using quantitative analysis should not be expressed as an absolute detriment of a success or failure of a policy recommendation.

Qualitative methods of research often uncover compelling considerations to be taken account of that may not hold any statistical significance in quantitative analysis. The redline text of Section 9 of the PDP manual suggested by the DMPM take this into account nicely. This should also be

reflected in relevant parts of the working group final report and recommendations.

So I will open up for comments. I think for the most part this is -- it is an agreement especially calling out bad notion of the PDP manual. I can just make a highlight that we review that language in there and perhaps some of that can be added into parts of Section 5 as it relates to the observation of the working group.

But it is certainly something that we've discussed. And I believe Google had also touched on this (unintelligible) of qualitative analysis or the use of qualitative data and its analysis.

And if I recall correctly the group mostly concluded that there is already a fair amount of that today. It may not necessarily be documented anywhere. But when you do review the beginning and end of the policy development process there are many components through that process that touch upon the qualitative component.

And Jonathan responding in the chat that we'd included language about this and it's not like we're recommending doing away with subjective measurements. Or maybe not so much subjective but at least qualitative.

All right moving onto Number 6 which is from the ALAC. Supports the revision of the templates for the issue report, charter and final report to update Working Group Guidelines and also the development of the decision tree. The changes will help determine the best avenue to request additional data and metrics. Development of the PDP manual which will include the metrics request tree and form will ensure consistency of both process and practice.

So I do believe that this one is in agreement as well. No direct action taken. But I have -- I did want to bring up to something real quick in this note. And I don't think we necessarily need adjusting in the final report or anything. I am

kind of curious how after the pilot effort that these instruments get used such as the request form and the decision tree and how they may be updated. Certainly there is a formal process by which the Working Group Guidelines and the like are updated.

You know, once this is implemented this group will more or less be sunset or close down and should we midstride during the pilot effort realized that something needs to be included or something needs to be updated I don't know that we necessarily touched on that in detail.

I think in general since the guidelines will be updated once we completed the completion of the template we could probably pass it to the SCI to try to fast-track the update of course which would have to go through a public comment period.

So I guess the point I'm trying to make here is that any updates that we react to based on our experiences in the pilot effort may be a little slower than we might anticipate should we encounter something like that.

And icy agreement from Jonathan in the chat. So thank you. Let's move on, we were on to the next table which is the pilot effort itself. And we have three comments.

The first comment is from Google. Rescope the proposed pilot study to ensure that it advances real community objectives while minimizing associated costs. While we support the general concept of a pilot study to observe the application of data to ongoing policy processes further scoping work is required to ensure the effort expended advances real GNSO community objectives as well as to minimize cost.

To these ends we propose to specific modifications to the proposed pilot effort. First, to the extent possible pilot studies should focus on ongoing efforts that can be supported by data that is publicly available or that is

readily accessible at low cost. This change to the pilot study would minimize cost and delays associated with appointing a third-party provider and recurring data while still providing a sound early assessment of how data could be used to support policymaking.

And then secondarily they recommend the pilot study focused on efforts that are occurring at the GNSO level as opposed to requests that come from a particular SO or AC to ensure that additional resources leveraged in data collection and analysis are supporting projects and initiatives for which there is general support within the GNSO.

Before I open up the floor I think if it wasn't Google it was somebody else that basically had touched upon their first recommendation. I believe we have an action from prior comments to kind of create a hints and tips section of the request form or the charter, I can't remember which one.

But it was basically listing out what current publicly available free sources for groups to consider. And we might also highlight what some paid sources might be. But at least it is a direction or kind of an initial shopping cart of which to choose from.

And most certainly I believe or I feel confident within the process that we've mapped out that any request that submitted from a working group or from a stakeholder group or constituency would be scrutinized to some degree either by the Council and/or by staff before we just, you know, before the checkbook is opened up to willy-nilly pay for something.

So I feel confident that in terms of trying to be cost conscious about these types of requests it is inherent in what we've developed here. And then secondarily I think we've also mentioned that perhaps we need to review the report. But the scope of the pilot effort is only really SGs and Cs within the GNSO and most certainly within issues that are relevant to the GNSO and the gTLDs environment in general.

And in the chat I see from Jonathan or well Graeme has to drop. Thank you, Graeme for joining. Jonathan mentioned we don't have a way to do that but then follows up that yes about reducing costs etcetera but scoping is so hard for us to do generically.

Jonathan Zuck: I can speak too. I was just trying to get down thoughts while you were - in response to what you were saying. I mean, I guess my point is I agree with you completely that the process by which the funds would be authorized will act as a kind of safeguard against this. But I think the comment presupposes that a particular workgroup interested in data on something wouldn't still be useful because it's often going to, I mean, a particular like AC or SO wouldn't be useful.

But, I mean, I think what we envisioned for this pilot effort was that a group was -- an advocate of getting a policy development process started on something and the use of data would help to bolster or mitigate their claim.

And so, I mean, I almost have the opposite feeling of this comment which is that if, I mean, I'm the IPC and I believe that, you know, there's an issue to be, you know, to be discovered out of compliance or something like that and I've got just a hunch about it instead of going and making my case based on a hunch I make use of this pilot project and actually come with numbers or let those numbers reveal to me that the scope of the problem isn't what I thought it was.

Berry Cobb: Thank you, Jonathan.

Jonathan Zuck: Does that make sense or am I...

Berry Cobb: Oh, it makes sense to me. And there's agreement by Tony as well. And I suspect if Cheryl was in the AC room she would apply a green checky-mark.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Indeed, you are channeling me perfectly. Well done.

Berry Cobb: All right. Thank you, Cheryl.

Jonathan Zuck: So that may be an instance in which we give a response that isn't -- it's a little bit more a disagreement with their comments as opposed to just explanatory I guess, I don't know. So maybe it's just explanation that the whole idea would be to prevent going down a path for which there wasn't a significant need in that need to be revealed by data or lack of need to be revealed by data.

Berry Cobb: Correct. Thank you, Jonathan. I'll be sure to capture that in the draft response and probably kind of cover both sides of that coin. All right moving onto the next one which is from the ISPCP. They believe in particular issue is vitally important to the future of ICANN to determine accountability and to encourage responsible decision-making.

They support a process to better inform fact-based policy development decision-making through the sharing of metrics and data. The ISPCP is enthusiastic - enthusiastically supports the initiation of a pilot effort whereby the GNSO community at the early stages of policy development process can submit tactical size requests for data and metrics to assist in validation of issues or to better inform policy deliberation.

They would see value in the pilot and be happy to engage in it and provide actionable feedback to it. So in short that seems like agreement and no action against the current draft of the report.

Last comment for this section is from the ALAC which supports the introduction of a pilot where working groups would be able to submit proposals or ideas whereby the collection and assessment of fact-based data and metrics can become the basis for the initial identification and analysis of issues and/or problems.

They also support the view that any funding required to implement the pilot should be considered an investment and the improvement of the policy process rather than just a cost against budget.

((Crosstalk))

Berry Cobb: I'm sorry, Jonathan?

Jonathan Zuck: I just said yay ALAC.

Berry Cobb: Oh. So I'm taking that as agreement as well from the ALAC. All rights so we will move on to the metrics request form. There is only one comment here and this is from Amr. The suggested language of Section 4.5 of the GNSO Operating Procedures detailing working groups metrics request form only indicates the procedures for requesting data and metrics.

There is no indication in the proposed changes to the operating procedure or the metrics request tree that prior to aggregation of data there is any requirement for the chartering organization or the GNSO Council to be specific to approve the request.

Considering the potential cost to both time and funds at the issue scoping phase or during the PDP working group phase it may be worthwhile to consider whether or not the chartering organization should play a role in determining the extent to which the issue be solved and the working group metrics request form warrants such delays, costs.

Clarification on a process to approve a submitted working group metrics request form should be ideally included in the final report. I'm starting to slow down on my own within the report. And I thought that we had -- the way I see it from the request form that we do have two decisions acting as a gating factor really from both sides.

The first and maybe it's not so clear who is doing the deciding and perhaps maybe I don't know that it would warrant to put this into a decision or into a swim lane version of the process diagram or the decision tree that there is a decision about whether the budget is approved on a particular request.

I think perhaps we in the group had implied that that would be, you know, the GNSO Council and/or staff. So perhaps they call out on that particular decision box would be helpful. Without a doubt I see that every one of these requests will be going to the GNSO Council.

I don't think -- I don't first see a formal resolution on any of these being necessary other than to keep the Council informed of the request as they work with it with staff.

Back to the comments from Amr and in general then there's kind of a secondary decision based on the parties that might be on the requesting end of the request which is and kind of a case of if they contracted party and/or third party provider can't provide the data or is unable to provide the data that there is that option out. And perhaps that probably needs to be highlighted as well.

So I think in general in closing that we could probably highlight the decision tree a little bit better and maybe perhaps add something to the metrics request form that will basically state that this needs to go through the GNSO Council once it's submitted. And I'll open up the floor.

Jonathan Zuck: It's Jonathan. I think that make sense. I mean obviously the danger here is that we end up with a subjective refusal to collect data to objectively identify whether there is a problem. But, you know, in a real-life situation it could be that the requester, you know, makes a hypothetical that we think the data will show X and then if it does the GNSO Council could maybe decide whether or not that that outcome was worth the cost or something like that. It showed that problem is that problem impactful enough?

But, obviously you don't want a situation where, you know, people are saying I don't think that the problem, you know, as a response to whether or not they collect data about it.

Berry Cobb: Agreed. Thank you. And again, you know, at least at this stage while there is, you know, much more anticipation that this become a cultural change certainly what we will be dealing with is the pilot effort itself. And I suspect that there will be valuable lessons learned out of that process and some of the outcomes that occur with it.

Jonathan Zuck: Make sense.

Berry Cobb: All right, let's go ahead and move on to the very last one which is early outreach. This is also submitted by the ALAC. And establishing a framework for distributing information through early outreach to other SOs and ACs and related organizations will facilitate broader qualitative input and support a culture of collaboration between our organizations.

This will not only contribute to continuous improvement being fully integrated into the PDP but also encourage the potential of an open data culture across ICANN.

I'm going out on a limb here but this sounds like this is in agreement with the recommendations...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah.

Berry Cobb: Thank you, Cheryl.

Jonathan Zuck: It's Jonathan. I guess the one caveat obviously is that there are some holders of data that are a little concerned about the terminology of open data across ICANN. And so I mean, I don't know if they would reject to these comments. But we just need to be careful the terms we use since a lot of the data is considered to be -- a lot of the data in question is considered to be commercially important. So we want to not create a slippery slope into making a recommendation for open data because that will make some of the people from whom we would be requesting data nervous.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Jonathan, I think that's understood and it's probably just a terminology perhaps reading it as openness in data might be easier. But, yes, the classic definition of open data would probably terrify a few data holders in the mix. But you'll note that the earlier comments from ALAC were very much along the lines the anonymization and the removal of commercial and confidence issues from the data set.

Jonathan Zuck: Well right, Cheryl. And I think that's right. The anonymization of data doesn't necessarily remove the commercial utility of data. It removes the privacy implications but, I mean, again if people are making valuable data available even in an anonymized form that only - that they're the only ones in possession of are really big registrars, something like that, maybe willing to share it to the working group but not want to share and, you know, more generally if that data has any value. That's all.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And we always risk, you know, that some things will have to continually (unintelligible) commercial and confidence.

Jonathan Zuck: Yeah.

Berry Cobb: All right, thank you.

((Crosstalk))

Berry Cobb: Yes. And just for the sake of caution I will note an action just to review the report that we aren't making a reference to open data as we just kind of discussed just to be safe.

All right so that takes us through all the comments. That was fairly painless in my opinion but exceeded expectations about what this group might get back from the community so I think that's a positive outcome given, you know, are very small group of help from the community here.

So with that, as I mentioned at the beginning of the call, I'll go to the transcript, create draft responses and actions and make sure those are appropriately highlighted and do the best we can to make sure that connection is maintained and highlighted in the next version of the final report.

Once this is sent out to the list again, please review through them, make sure we characterize the responses and actions appropriately and as well as begin to review the final report. And we will have a call next Tuesday at the same time, 21 UTC and we will start to discuss what those changes may look like.

And I kind of envision just kind of starting at the top of the document again and we will just review through each one of the call of comments and discuss how any language should be potentially changed. And hopefully we will also give some feedback from Graeme from his homework assignment as well. So...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Berry, just - Cheryl here. On next Tuesday's meeting I probably won't (unintelligible) at the time of the call so please note my apologies in advance. Thanks.

Berry Cobb: Great. Thank you, Cheryl. So with that I'll turn it back over to you, Jonathan, for closing comments. And I think we can probably close this at the top of the hour.

Jonathan Zuck: Okay well, I mean, I like you, am excited that we got the level of public participation that we did. So Google and others I think it's great that we got these reactions from people that didn't participate in the group. And I feel like just for the most part they really affirm that we're on the right track for what we're doing so let's keep at it and get this in front of the Council.

So I'll see everybody next week except for Cheryl.

Berry Cobb: All right great. Thank you, everybody.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Bye for now.

Jonathan Zuck: Thanks, everyone.

                              END