ICANN Transcription
Data & Metrics for Policy Making Working Group
Tuesday 24 February 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 24 February 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-24feb15-en.mp3

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

Attendees:
Cheryl Langdon-Orr – ALAC
Jonathan Zuck – IPC
Pam Little – RySG
Olivier Kouami – NPOC
Marinel Rosca – Individual
Mouhamet Diop – RrSG
Sara Bockey – RrSG
Tony Onorato – Individual

Apologies:
Graeme Bunton – RrSG
Janiver Ngnoulaye - Individual

ICANN staff:
Steve Chan
Berry Cobb
Terri Agnew

Coordinator: The recordings have started. Speakers you may now proceed.

Terri Agnew: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. This is the Data & Metrics for Policy Making Working Group Call on the 24th of February, 2015.

On the call today, we have Mouhamet Diop, Sara Bockey, Olevie Kouami, Jonathan Zuck, Marinel Rosca, Pam Little, Tony Onorato and joining us in just a few minutes will be Cheryl Langdon-Orr. I show apologies from Graeme Bunton.

From staff we have Steve Chan, Berry Cobb 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.

Jonathan Zuck: Thanks a lot. I appreciate it. I guess next to the roll call, we had confirm existing members and introduce new members. Steve, do you have a way to proceed with that?

Steve Chan: Sure. Thanks Jonathan. This is Steve Chan from staff. So I think we have one new member on the call today, Sara Bockey, so I want to welcome her. I think everyone else on the list has been an existing participant to this group so I think that's all we had for that one.

Just to welcome Sara and say that we're looking forward to reinitiating this group. Thanks.

Jonathan Zuck: Sara, do you want to take a second to introduce yourself and talk about your interest in this and whatever else (unintelligible).

Sara Bockey: Sure. I'm Sara Bockey and (unintelligible) and I work with (JB Slattle). And I'm new to the policy world. (I joined this year). (Unintelligible) and trying to get involved and doing as much as I can as quickly as I can.

Moderator: Verizon Transcription
02-24-15/3:56 pm CT
Confirmation # 1331173
Page 3

Jonathan Zuck: Great. Well welcome. Okay, so next on our agenda is a recap of our efforts to-date and I recently provided a recap for Council while at the ICANN meeting in Singapore.

I don't know Steve, if it's worth putting up the slides from that but basically we talked about what we had done to-date which was through a number of scenarios and that have come up in the past.

You know, a set of case studies based on previous working groups and where data might have proved useful in creating a better outcome. And from that, trying to derive a set of scenarios or circumstances in which data would be useful going forward.

Beyond that, our next task was, we began to look at defining a process map or flow chart for the requested data by the interested party which is initially staff and the issue (of the) report and then ultimately the work group.

Whether that data came from inside ICANN in the form of compliance data, outside ICANN in the form of service party supply data for which money would need to be spent to data from contracted parties such as registries and registrars for whom some subsidy could be provided so that data could be more easily anonymized, et cetera before it's made use of by the work groups.

So those were the principle steps that we've taken to date. Steve or Berry do either one of you want to supplement that summary? Or do we want to go in any greater detail? Show the things that we did, for example for those that were new?

So thanks for putting up the slides. One of the things that we outlined for Council was that the importance of the MPM working group was about kind of changing the culture of work groups to be more fact based and data oriented

as well as creating a culture of review for decisions downstream that had been taken from the workgroups and then ultimately implemented by ICANN.

And so that's why we set out to do what we're doing and those were the documents and the work that we've done thus far. I don't know, do I have the ability to scroll this? I do. So you can see the progress report. We did some, as I discussed, looked at some previous PDP and non PDP efforts and how much enhanced work was processed and did a draft framework of the requested data.

Berry or Steve, do either one of you want to supplement that? And (Cheryl), welcome. I know you just got off the other call. Okay, so does anyone have any questions about that? I don't see any hands raised.

The next thing that I thought we might do is reorient ourselves around a possible set of recommendations that this group might make and a possible set of deliverables that might be a part of those recommendations. So I see sort of two different aspects, an aspirational recommendation and then some tools associated with those aspirations.

And so what I was hoping to do on this call potentially is brainstorm about what some possible recommendations might be. And I'm not sure they need to be overly complex or involved but instead be about reoriented work groups around use of data where appropriate and the notion of review of policy implementations downstream from their implementation.

So I mean does that seem like a way, a good way to proceed to everyone? Does anyone have any questions about that? Okay, we have a pretty small group so we move expeditiously. So I mean for me, for example, an example of a recommendation from this group for review by Council is that staff should be directed to make use of data in the, in the issue report phase both in terms of defining and scoping the problem to be addressed by our work group.

But to me that's a potential recommendation but it's, there's an expectation that staff will make use of data where available and where appropriate to the problem being discussed in this, in this issue report. That make sense? I'm going to start spinning records. I feel like a late night radio DJ. But, so I think that would be one example of something that could be a recommendation.

And then another recommendation would be that ICANN would provide the resources necessary for staff to accomplish that objective when appropriate. So if it meant buying data that ICANN would come up with the funds for purchasing outside data. If it meant requesting data from a contracted party for which, contracted parties for which they needed help anonymizing it through a third-party consultant. It would mean providing funding for that.

It might mean providing compliance providing, you know, open access to data in the sense it doesn't exist today. So a second recommendation would be ICANN providing the resources necessary for staff and make use of data in their issue report.

A third type of recommendation then might be around the drafting team that, the charter drafting team should make use of data in determining the scope of the problem to be addressed and should include as part of the charter use of data where appropriate and a review phase, if you will, for a policy, if implemented, based on a work group review.

So in other words, change kind of the worksheet, if you will for chartering team to include the use of data in the scoping of the problem, the definition of success and also a review of that policy downstream, if an when it is implemented.

And then ultimately the next effective party, if you will, would be the work group itself and that would need to issue its own recommendations at the end of its work and, you know, the, a recommendation would be that workgroups make use of data where appropriate in the formulation of policy, the definition

of success and also call for a review of policy, if accepted and implemented by ICANN.

And I think we need to add to those cases a part of our deliverable of the MPM workgroup might be is updates to the templates and documents used by chartering teams and work groups to produce their reports. You know, to kind of include placeholders for these new expectations.

So what do folks think about that? I'm just sort of brainstorming off the top of my head but I'm interested in hearing others or if people have refinements that they'd like to see. Or, do these sound reasonable and we should try to divide up trying to draft them and move forward to making some recommendations and coming up with some deliverables.

I'd love to, you know, put something concrete in front of Council the next ICANN meeting, if we can. Any thoughts from anyone? Is everyone hearing me? Can you all raise your thumbs up if you think this is a good way to proceed? Check boxes. Pam, are you with us?

Pam Little: Hey Jonathan, sorry I was on mute.

Jonathan Zuck: Okay.

Pam Little: I just have a question about the, we were going to do a case study or trial or a data request so are we keeping with that now (at this state)?

Jonathan Zuck: Well I don't know. We can be. I mean it just occurred to me that we don't necessarily need to do that in order to make some recommendations.

Pam Little: Okay.

Jonathan Zuck: If we do do it, I think it's still worthy of the exercise because it could be another one of our deliverables which is, if you will, a kind of enhanced

template of our data request. I mean I, in some ways, we'd be doing these things in parallel. In other words, if one of our deliverables is a data request template in addition to the sort of data request flow charts that we worked on, then doing that case study is still, is still worthwhile.

Pam Little: Thank you.

Jonathan Zuck: But what are your thoughts?

Pam Little: I'm neutral whether we want to do that. It just, previously I was looking into how we can actually run a test case or do a trial data request.

                And to me....

Jonathan Zuck: And what did you find?

Pam Little: I just found the questions were quite broad and I think I said that on one on our calls because when we are going to request data especially from contracted parties or even from ICANN compliance, I think the key is to actually be very specific. Because, for example, that particular metric the working group is seeking may not have been captured by ICANN compliance because they have certain tools and it's kind of hard coded to capture certain data.

                So I was thinking how that can be addressed or overcome when by the end of or during the process of a working group, the working group says hey I need X,Y,Z data but then you then find that data has actually not been captured by ICANN compliance or the contracted party. Then how do you, it's like, you know past data and it's gone past.

                How do you then produce that data out of the blue? Do you understand what I'm saying? It's kind of you have to design the data upfront before you capture the data, collect that data.

Jonathan Zuck: I certainly understand your example and certainly I think we will be challenged by requesting data that does not exist. I'm not sure that's a problem that we can solve through specificity of our request, however. Right. In other words, we need to make specific data requests and that's something with which I agree.

So I mean maybe the issue is, maybe perhaps you can help to refine the draft that we had data request to make it more specific so that we could try to run that trial run. But certainly if the data has not been captured, a working group or staff will not be in a position to go back and find it retroactively, if it doesn't exist.

So I'm not sure that particular problem is one that we can solve.

Pam Little: Okay.

Jonathan Zuck: Berry. (Oh sorry).

Pam Little: In terms of, okay Berry, go ahead.

Berry Cobb: Okay, this is Berry Cobb for the record. You know, I guess that was the idea of the use case that we were trying to push forward beforehand because while, you know, there were criticisms that it wasn't complete enough which, you know,

I think we need assistance from the community to refine it and make it a more complete and comprehensive type of request, the idea behind it was that it is a real one and it does involve real data. It doesn't involve necessarily that compliance can get. You know, so that was the intent.

So, you know, to your point Pam, you know, the chicken or the egg is what comes to mind when I hear that, you know. As working groups move forward

with certain policy recommendations, they certainly need to try to find the data to make a more informed policy decision in the future and if they come across a point where the data doesn't exist or it does exist but there's, you know, limited aspects to it, those aspects need to be identified in the policy development process.

But where I think the third and fourth recommendations or I shouldn't say recommendations but kind of ideas that Jonathan was putting forward, you know, point more towards the tail end of a working group where, you know, we are putting forward these types of recommendations, let's identify what metrics can be garnered to measure that success and make a determination whether that exists or not.

And so in terms of the use case that we tried pushing forward, a lot of that data does exist but, you know, again, we're kind of coming back to the conundrum of well how do we get access to that.

And the idea of the use case was to begin to test that scenario where ICANN or working groups will need access to that data and how do we go about doing it. So whether this group chooses to advance that use case forward or not, again, it is again ups to the working group but at some point in time, you know, it will be a year-and-a-half, two years down the road, you know whatever drafting team or whatever PDP working group that's tasked with doing a review of the IRTP will be faced with this problem.

So that was why we were trying to push it forward. Thank you.

Jonathan Zuck: Pam does that help?

Pam Little: Yes. Thank you. So can I just respond to that, Jonathan and Berry, thank you for that? So my question will be this or my comment will be this. So we need to run that test case to be able to produce the deliverables that Jonathan just outlined earlier.

Or it's not really that important or essential. And if that's the case, then I'm neutral whether we do the use case or not. I guess it will be up to members of this group as well. So that's my comment. Thanks.

Jonathan Zuck: Well Pam, as I said, I think it's not necessary for the recommendations that I outlines but I could envision a very useful additional deliverable that could be the result of running that use case which is some sort of a template data request. In other words a kind of a survey or a form or something like that that workgroups could use to request data. Could be the output of doing that scenario test.

So it really has to do with the appetite of going through the hypothetical test and if you're up for it, I think we could gain from it and I think it would improve our delivery to have some kind of a data request template. But that would be the outcome, is to try to get to some kind of a generic document that workgroups might use to make a data request. Or it might be a set of documents that they use, right. One for compliance or one for (unintelligible)

But if there isn't something unique to create there, it isn't necessary for the recommendation that I just came up with off the top of my head. Does that make sense?

Pam Little: Yes, thank you. And if (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Pam Little: Sorry. If the group decides to proceed with that use case, I'm happy to work with the members or even Berry or other, maybe I think someone from (unintelligible) side. Graeme is on the call. Because I think a lot of that will be kind of a registrar related data.

Jonathan Zuck: That's right. And our general recommendations aren't specific to the sources of data but are actually about changing the expectation of staff and workgroups in the work that they do. So the only thing that's kind of specific to sources of data is that workflow diagram in which we tried to determine, you know, what the though process might be in terms of deciding what data is necessary, who it's needed from and when to go out and make requests for support, you know, from ICANN in the acquisition of that data.

So in other words, if I ask a question from a third-party. Please give me data X and they come back and say sure, that will be $2 thousand. Then the next step is to go and ask for the work group is to ask to go for that funding to get that data, right. So that's what the purpose of the flowchart was.

So then the question is whether or not you and Graeme are able to work with us in such a way as to refine the scenario in such a way that it actually could be something that is executed at least in a hypothetical way by a couple of registrars and registries. So that's where the real, the rubber hits the road with doing a scenario is whether or not we can use it to gain experiences to what improvements could be made to a data request.

Does that make sense Pam?

Pam Little: So I guess we have to decide whether we want to do that and if so what resources we have or volunteers we have to work on that and I can reach out to Graeme or someone else more appropriate. I think he's very much tied up with the...

Jonathan Zuck: I will do it. I will, after this call I will reach out to you and Graeme...

Pam Little: Okay.

Jonathan Zuck: ...about that and see if you guys are up for refining that document, that initial draft document.

Pam Little: Right. Thank you. Thanks.

Jonathan Zuck: Okay. Berry do you still have your hand up or is that old?

Berry Cobb: Yes, Jonathan. So, you know, two point really. I think, you know, the other reason for the use case which I almost consider even a more important reason was that it was a mechanism by which we could start to provide some visibility of what we're trying to accomplish here to the greater GNSO.

And hopefully get some kind of input and feedback from them or maybe for lack of a better word that they may want to come help us out, you know. So that was kind of one aspect to that use case. You know, the second point I'll make and where that use case sits in the draft today is far from perfect and, you know, I guess the notion of, you know, don't let this stop from at least advancing forward to be good.

You know, we only need it good. It doesn't need to be perfect. It's not a real request. We're just looking for input as to how the community would respond on some kind of request like that and to get it to a good level I do agree that more of that data is registrar focused although it does touch across all of our, most of the data sources except like third-party sources such as (Band House) or any of those kind of types.

You know, but it does touch on compliance. It does touch on registrars and it can touch on some of the registry data which is already publically available. But my point here is, you know, as to what Pam had mentioned, kind of, you know, in terms of improving the requirements of what that data request might look like, we certainly need more registrar input as to, you know, what kinds of data might be requested, how would we go about getting it and those kinds of things.

And that's the kind of input that we're looking for. There's one other point that I wanted to make and that regards, oh, so you know, I think maybe what we can even try in terms of an outreach is to, you know, once we kind of at least advance the template or the draft that we have at this point a little bit further, that we can even try sending it back to the IRTP Part D list and those members which were mostly registrars that participated on that, perhaps they could provide input into helping us shape those requirements.

So that it is closer to good before we do send it out to the community just to get some input on it. But again, it's really a question of whether we choose to go forward with it. I also agree with what Jonathan says that, you know, in terms of some of these initial recommendations or draft recommendations that we've just discussed and possible deliverables, that may not shine a whole lot of light as to advancing our own work but it may uncover one or two things that we may not have considered had we not gone through the use case. Thank you.

Jonathan Zuck: That makes sense. Okay. So does anybody have any additional ideas for recommendations or possible deliverables for the group beyond the ones that I just came up with randomly off the top of my head here? Okay, so what we'll do is we'll, is anyone interested in tackling some, well what's the normal process?

Berry, do you and Steve want to tackle turning these into something for people to review? Or should we divide that up? I mean I guess they're pretty straight-forward?

Berry Cobb: Hi Jonathan. This is Berry. So, you know, I think what we'll, okay I'm having network issues right now so I can't really type or raise my hand effectively. What we'll do is review the transcripts of this call to tease out, I tried taking some quick notes of like these draft sort of recommendations.

We'll put that to the list and we'll try to list out some possible deliverables that the group would need to, you know, that we would want to target to advance our work forward. Under separate email, we'll send out of an initial question.

You know, based on, you know, some of these high level recommendations and also asking the group for others on the list, if there are any other possible recommendations that will help guide our work, then under separate email we'll send out the use case and ask the group first, you know, is this still worth doing?

If there is support for it, then, you know, we definitely need some volunteers to help kind of put it into a little bit better form and, you know, once we at least get it close to good, then we can look at sending it out to the higher (PDP) and maybe Graeme can just send it to the registrars for just some initial input.

And, you know, then we can move forward from there. But I think the group needs to make a decision as to whether we want to spend time on that or focus more on some draft recommendations, what deliverable components we want to try an attack. Let's create a new work plan around that and in parallel, Steve will also be putting together or starting to build a skeleton or an outline of our initial report where we can start to plug these things into.

And on that very topic, you know, given the issues that we're dealing with certainly aren't as meaty or as involved as like privacy proxy or some of the other PDP's that have been going on. So I think what we'll be experimenting with is kind of a slim down version of an initial report.

Of course, it will always contain a small executive summary but the ideas that, you know, perhaps this initial report can be no more than ten, no more than ten pages unlike some other lengthy ones that are in the 50 to 80 range.

Jonathan Zuck: I think that would be great.

Berry Cobb: Exactly. But, and then the last thing that I'll mention, you know, I think what's very important here is that whatever recommendations this group decides to put forward is that, you know, there are, there's some teeth to them that when they are presented to the community not only to public comment but eventually once we review public comments and of course correct any recommendations or content of the report, I think it's very important that whatever recommendations this group decides to put forward that they really have true grit and are truly actionable by the Council that either staff or the community can take this forward.

You know, so I think that's definitely the most important aspect. Thank you.

Jonathan Zuck: Yes, and I certainly agree with that. I mean I guess we just don't want to spin our wheels trying to hunt down every hypothetical. What we want to do is put some practices in place. And establish some teeth associated with those practices (unintelligible) for staff and for working groups that are formed in the future.

Does anybody else have any questions? I think that sounds like a good plan of attack. And if the group is interest in pursuing that use case, then we'll form a little sub-committee perhaps with Pam and Graeme to refine the work cases (unintelligible) but otherwise, we'll move forward with these recommendations and circulate them and get other people's ideas on the list.

This is a pretty anemic call. So there will be other people that are in the workgroup that might have feedback that they want to share. Anybody have any questions because if we, we may be through our call today. Berry, go ahead.

Berry Cobb: Thank you Jonathan. So in terms of, you know, I pretty much outlined what staff will do, send out to the list. There will be at least two separate emails but we will send a third one. I think what's important here is to, you know, once

we kind of reestablish what our work plan is that we try to take a little bit more aggressive steps here.

So our next call will certainly be two weeks from now as what has been originally scheduled but this third email, I'd like to have Steve and myself will put together maybe a possible schedule or at least a doodle pole again, not so much asking what days are available.

This time seems to be the most conducive to everyone meeting but I would like us to consider to start meeting on a weekly basis once we have reestablished our work plan. I think it will be very important for us to at least try to have a stretch goal of having our initial report open for public comment, you know, certainly before going to Buenos Aires, if not sooner.

So I'd like the group to consider this as well because it would be good to get some recommendations that do have teeth and get this closed out, get it moved forward to the Council.

Jonathan Zuck: I agree completely. I'd love to get this going. So let's get it going on the list and we will also circulate some questions about meeting schedule on the list as well and see if we can get some momentum going here and increase the number of meetings, if we need to with an objective to try and put some recommendations in front of Council in Buenos Aires. All right?

All right. Well thanks everyone. Oh, Sara (unintelligible). All right. Great. All right. Thanks guys.

Woman: Thanks.

Man: Thank you all.

Woman: Thanks a lot. Bye.

Coordinator: Once again, the meeting has been adjourned. Thanks for joining. Please remember to disconnect all remaining lines and you can please stop the recording.

END