**ICANN Transcription**

**Data & Metrics for Policy Making Working Group Tuesday 28 April 2015 at 20:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of Data & Metrics for Policy Making Working Group call on the Tuesday 28 April 2015 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-28apr15-en.mp3  On page: http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar#apr

Attendees:
Cheryl Langdon-Orr – ALAC
Olivier Kouami – NPOC
Sara Bockey – RrSG
Graeme Bunton – RrSG
Nenad Orlic – ISPCP
Sonigitu Ekpe – NCUC
Tony Onorato – Individual
Rising John Osazuwa - At–Large
Jonathan Zuck - IPC
Olevie Kouami - NPOC

Apologies:
Pam Little – RySG

Guest:
Ryan Casey - Kavi

ICANN staff:
Edman Perez
Steve Allison
Steve Chan
Berry Cobb
Nathalie Peregrine

Coordinator:        The recording has been started you may now proceed.

Nathalie Peregrine:     Thank you very much (Chase). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everybody and welcome to the data and metrics and policy making working group call on the 28th of April 2015.

On the call today we have (unintelligible), Cheryl Langdon-Orr, (Graham Bunton), (Nanette Orek), (Sara Buckey), (Tom Little), (Lorena Ruskel) and Jonathan Zuck has just joined the AC room.

From (Kovai) we have our guest (Ron Casey), welcome. I received no apologies for today's call. From staff we have Berry Cobb, (Steve Chan), (Steve Allison) and myself Nathalie Peregrine.

I'd like to remind you all to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and over to you Jonathan (unintelligible) thank you.

Man:     Great thank you Nathalie.

Jonathan Zuck:     Hi I'm here on the audio I think if everybody can hear me?

Man:     Yes we can hear you Jonathan.

Jonathan Zuck:     I, we're switching back and forth a little bit because the CCWG call ended at the same time. But the - I'd just launch into the (unintelligible) discussions that people have had a chance to play with a little bit and Berry do you or Steve want to start that conversation?

Berry Cobb:     Thank you Jonathan. This is Berry Cobb for the record. Yes we're just going to spend a few minutes on this. I just wanted to ask members of the group first and foremost in terms of use of (Kovai) based on our last call from a working group management perspective we were able to work through components of taking attendance from the last call as well as reviewing through the attendance list.

Granted it was really only one calls worth so there's not a lot of data there but it does look promising in terms of thinking about how if all working groups across ICANN were functioning in the tool how it could be rolled up.

There are a few things that we'll have to consider down the road in a production environment should this move forward. Such as ensuring that user profiles are appropriately attached to the affiliation that they're with.

For example if they belong to the GNSO and those kinds of things. The user profiles that are set up in the sandbox right now don't delineate which group you belong to.

It's not crucial for you to make that update here in the sandbox unless you would like to do it. But anyway positive signs on the back end management in regards to taking attendance.

Regarding calendaring and scheduling. For this call this is the first time that we fully relied on (Kovai) to send out calendar invites. I know that at least I myself had received the calendar entry and I just want to ask a quick question of the group.

Did you in fact receive the calendar invite through (Kovai) and do you have any immediate feedback with that experience? Cheryl I see your hand is raised.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:   Thank you, Cheryl for the record. Yes I did receive it and yes I do have the problem that I alluded to that I thought I might have anyway and that is the absence of the Adobe connect link anywhere intelligible or sourceable at least in my calendar for me to find the link.

Now I happen to know the link by heart so I typed it in but that isn't really helpful it does need to give the link to whatever collaborative space or whatever we're using as our meeting place as well, thanks.

Berry Cobb:     Thank you Cheryl. Yes I just happened to notice that before the call as well and we'll make sure we get that covered for the next round of invites. Jonathan please.

Jonathan Zuck:  Yes I was going to say the same thing as Cheryl that it seemed to be missing. You could log in to (Kovai) and look at an expanded meeting profile. And that expanded meeting profile included the link.

So I don't know if that was a question for the administrator like which of these things do you want included in the text or if you need to manually include that in the text of the email.

But I do know that to see if it was the case I went ahead in the more button which then required a login to (Kovai) and then I was able to see what the link was there.

So it's in the system it's just not in the email or the calendar invite that got generated. Related to that and there may not be any solution to this, this just has to do with the insanity of my inbox is that when I receive a Outlook invite, which I think is just a variation on an (Itel) it actually creates like a ghost hold in my calendar so that I can see it even if I haven't accepted it or rejected it yet.

It's just there and it draws my attention to it when I look at the day. Whereas with just a straight (Itel) attachment as was the case of this one it just got by me altogether that administrative email with the (unintelligible).

So there may not be anything that can be done about that I just know that when you send an invite manually as you've done before, I end up with something more powerful or more integrated I don't know what the right word is than I did when it came from (Kovai).

Berry Cobb:     All right thank you Jonathan. In response to that the first part what we're trying - the calendar and scheduling from the way we do it today versus what we're trying to accomplish here in the pilot as you're aware, you know, all of the mailing lists are archived through mailman are publicly available.

And it may or may not, you may or may not pick up on this but there is actually two lists that are created for every group. One is the primary traffic email list where all of the deliberations are occurring.

And then there's a second list that's classified as notify. And the reasoning behind that is the call information, the ICS calendar invite that's now attached as well as the Adobe Connect room.

They use, the Secretariat team uses the notify account to send out that calendaring and scheduling notification so that it doesn't get populated on the primary list.

And so that's one of the kinks that we're working out right now is how do we ensure that the group gets the appropriate calendar invite with all the appropriate information while at the same time preserving or ensuring that that information doesn't just show up randomly on the list.

Granted these calls are open to anyone to join but there is a reason for that delineation.

In response to your issue about the Outlook calendar invite, yes you are correct. As long as one of those invites show up in your inbox it will show as a ghost entry on your calendar until you either accept it or decline it or delete it from your Outlook versus what you would normally get with an ICS.

But if you I guess in general if anybody from the client end is seeing something that's funny or something that you're not used to please try to take a screen shot of that and you can send it to us and we'll explore it with the

team to make sure that either it's working as designed or if there's an issue that needs to be resolved.

Okay the last part of the (Kovai) component that I wanted to ask, you'll notice this time around through some of the information that was sent out earlier in the week that we started posting the documents to the (Kovai) workspace as well.

And you'll notice that what we're trying to do is to ensure that we upload a Microsoft Word version as well as a PDF version. And because their file types are different they're actually showing up as separate documents in the overall view even though they're basic, they are basically the same document.

I'm not sure if that's something that we'll overcome but maybe as we evolve through our little pilot here that we can look at creating other folders based on document types so that it's a little bit more intuitive.

But for the most part the use of documents on the workspace seems to be working fairly well. I do like the fact that we can monitor, the entire group can monitor but see how many times a particular document has been downloaded.

And then the version control which is something that is kind of new at least for us in this regard is something that we'll continue to watch out for and when updating or uploading the next version of the document there is a little bit of extra process involved to ensure that it's associated with the right document and that the version control is maintained but I think overall that's a pretty good feature as well.

So that's about all that I had to say for the (Kovai) pilot. Any other general feedback before we move onto the next agenda item? All right very good, yes Jonathan.

Jonathan Zuck:     (Unintelligible) Jonathan.

Berry Cobb:     Yes please.

Jonathan Zuck:   Sorry the only other thing I was going to ask is I wonder if there is any kind of a - I know for things like salesforce and stuff like that there's plug ins for Word that smooth that integration so that I'm not having to log in and do things.

It can do that directly. Do you know of any of those kinds of tools? This for (Kovai) that allow closer integration. I mean it might not help Cheryl the rebel who is trying to use something off brand.

But sometimes there is these kinds of tools have plug ins that smooth that interaction.

(Steve Allison):   Maybe I can answer that. This is (Steve Allison). So definitely with our IT department starting to explore some of those future integrations that would, you know, look into single sign which would, you know, integrate the profiles more seamlessly.

You know, which would allow people to join working groups from potentially like icann.org as a Web site so that the entire onboarding process is a lot tighter.

But it's a little outside of the scope for at least the testing element of this pilot but it's definitely something we're exploring on the side.

Berry Cobb:     All right thank you (Steve). And I think more specifically Jonathan there is also another pilot going on I believe with the SSAC which gets into more of the document management side of things and the collaborative aspects as well.

So I'm awaiting output from some of their testing that they're doing because it's possible or likely none of this is set in stone but that, you know, both of these solutions will merge together somehow or something along those lines.

So thank you for the feedback and I'll also work with the team behind the scenes to see if we can better understand some of the document versioning capabilities within (Kovai).

Okay, let's go ahead and move onto our next agenda item, which is basically to review through the charter template. So I think about a week ago I sent out the next version based on response or I'm sorry based on the group's deliberations at the call last week.

There are basically kind of two major changes to this document. The first is a dedicated section that will talk about key metric considerations. We had some good input from Jonathan about kind of a set of questions to help key up what kinds of or how a group might go around seeking the data.

And then as well as under the deliverables and timeframes which is more of a concrete component that when the working group is spun up and through their deliberations as well as any final recommendations that they start to utilize this method in their work.

We didn't get any feedback yet on the list so we'll after the call we'll send these around again today. And as a side shoot or kind of side topic to this I'll save that for the end.
But basically from the last version not a whole lot has changed. Like I mentioned there is this dedicated section. I would be interested in getting feedback from the group as to how to better enhance this particular section the key metric considerations.

You know, are there more specific targeted types of questions that we can be asking this particular drafting team to, you know, to help flush out the type of

metrics that they should be considering or is it going to be better served to keep it at a more high level or kind of a generic template sent just to invoke the thought process.

And then so lastly in the deliverables and timeframe section this is where Jonathan's input came in specifically with, you know, the identification of data used to measure the success.

All of this is tied to measuring the success of any recommendations that a working group might offer up but identification of any targets or aspirations and goals, the goals of course linking back up to the dedicated section.

And any kind of time frame in which the measures should be performed for example, one year after a policy implementation or the policy effective date et cetera. Jonathan. Jonathan you may be on mute.

Jonathan Zuck: Sorry, usually I can speak long enough, loud enough that the mute doesn't even matter. But the - I turned off the muted. The, thanks for the work on this I'd like to have this document come together.

You asked about specificity and I wonder if and I'd be interested in people's notion that this document might contain a hypothetical a real dumbed down version of one of our test cases or something that's reworded to be kind of a hypothetical.

So that people see an example of, you know, very briefly of what these things mean when they read them, you know. If you had situation X and you decided that you had defined the problem by using this data then use this and then part of your work is defined how you would like to see that number changed.

And, you know, by setting a goal for the time period to check back on it or something like that that sort of got to the core of it. I almost feel like it could be done in a single paragraph to kind of like, yes all right I get that.

Like if this is how you used to scale the problem the same way you should use to test whether or not it's improving and you need to think about when to revisit that.

And then on that same line I guess the other issue is from a formal standpoint how - the workgroups responsibility to just how that might happen or is it just that they're making a recommendation that it should happen and then how that data gets tested and by whom.

You know, a year out or six months out or whatever defines did that workgroup that reconvenes is it something staff does, you know, is that something that the workgroup thinks about or are they just making a recommendation it should happen and then if that recommendation is accepted by the board it ends up on a staff calendar.

I guess that's what I mean is how does that get operationalized when they make that recommendation and is that the workgroups responsibility to think about that?

Berry Cobb: Thank you Jonathan. The consultant answer would be it depends. No I'm joking. No I would definitely agree that the working group having defined the recommendation should spend time as much as that is feasible to help define what data, what metrics should or could possibly be collected.

They don't need to go as far as actually attempting to try to collect any of the data because at that point in time none of the recommendations are approved. But further to that once those recommendations are approved by the board and it is handed over to staff to implement I believe that staff would likely play the most instrumental role in taking the requirements that were

originally set by the working group once it is handed over let's just say for example to the GDD team, which would be responsible for implementing the consensus policy.

They will take those requirements and try to mature them but before really any action is taken and this is the work that's coming out of the policy implementation group is that typically an IRT and I think probably in the future more often than not an IRT will be formed for staff to engage with through the implementation phase.

And that would be a good collaborative moment to finalize those requirements for any metrics capture. And then once that is performed then, you know, to see the results and course correct as appropriate based on what those goals that have been made, you know, set by the original working group.

And then at such point once the policy is implemented and like I said earlier in that example if the measurement of success occurs one year down the line from the policy effective date that's when staff would take the initial data or the results of that, determine what the format of that output would look like.

And then of course that would then be shared back with the GNSO council and the community for that matter to share the results of that so that the community can deliberate as to whether the original policy implemented was the intent they tried to accomplish.

But so, you know, to the original idea I do agree about, you know, we can highlight a hypothetical situation to help spark the creative process when the drafting team is documenting the charter and highlight it in a way that it can easily be deleted as they come closer to distributing the proposed charter through the council to consider and I welcome any little two or three sentence examples from anyone.

Jonathan is that...

Jonathan Zuck: But (unintelligible) the station between the - I just thought I would talk. I guess there's a distinction between providing a template to the group creating the charter and a template to the working group for their report and which should go where.

And so maybe yes so I mean it could be that what I'm talking about is actually part of the template for the working group recommendation document as much as anything else.

Berry Cobb: All right thank you, understood and absolutely that is after we remove, after we go through the metrics request template that we reviewed in the past then I think we'll turn our attention quickly over to the initial report and then conclude on any possible changes for the working group final report template as well.

Great, so that's all I have now for the charter template. Again we'll send these out after the call and any other input will be helpful. So now I'm going to slightly divert from the agenda just real quick to establish a quick roadmap of where all of this heading and then we'll circle back to the metrics request template.

So as mentioned on the previous call or two we will be - our staff is already working on a draft initial report. As I mentioned our mission, our goal for this is to implement a slimmed down or thin version of the initial report to ready it for public comment.

So we're targeting definitely no more than 15 pages or so for the primary substance of the body of the report. And of course there will likely be a couple of indexes.

And in particular or I should say appendices not indexes. In particular the changes that the working group is suggesting here for example this charter template will be one of those appendices.

And we'll make sure that we maintain the same highlights so that readers will be able to understand what part has changed. But predominantly on page 4 of the report would be something along the lines of, you know, key recommendations by the working group.

Recommendation 3 is to update the GNSO charter template to include metrics, refer to appendices A for details of what has, what are the suggested changes. So in general that's kind of the format that we're looking at.

I can see that, you know, there's at least three or four appendices that are possible. One is what we'll discuss here in a little bit the metrics request template for future working groups to use.

The second will be the process flow chart that we were using a while back which we'll circle our attention to that at the next meeting before we try importing it into the draft initial report.

And then as we mentioned our discussions will also circle back to the issue report and the working group final report and if we determine that there are any suggested changes to those templates.

So all in all there could, you know, these actual work products will be loaded in as appendices to the report but then primarily the body is strictly just a brief background.

A section that will list the charter questions and how the group has addressed those charter questions, the key recommendations by the working group and any supporting materials to those recommendations and then a string of appendices from there.

All right next and we're moving through this pretty quickly so we may be able to get some time back. I just want to share this with the group. This wasn't sent out in the distribution of content last week but I just wanted to remind the group.

This document is kind of our working draft or the groups working draft of recommendations and deliverables. It hasn't changed much since the last time we fit this version, which was March 10.

But I just wanted to remind the group that we still have these hanging on the sidelines here and this will be a part of our initial report and as you can also tell, you know, there's a last section down here about the draft deliverables.

So we're kind of using this as our checklist to make sure that we cover through these. This document is loaded in the (Kovai) room but I'll also make sure to send a link out to it just so that you can review it.

And also welcome any other feedback on the text of these recommendations or if any of them don't belong or if there's possibly any new ones that members would like the group to consider. So that's just for your information on that link.

And next we will review through what has been deemed originally as an intent by the group to submit a use case based on our metrics discussions. So we haven't updated this document yet and this is, this shouldn't be new to most of the members of the group.

But what we want to accomplish here and before we send this next version out to the group we'll remove through this executive summary and some of the content that was loaded in the template.

But I think what we're trying to achieve here is to create a repeatable or a fill out form template should future working groups need any kind of metrics request.

And again this would be, this should be or should encompass any request for data and metrics from ICANN as well as any third-party vendors that might be necessary and as we've also discussed should the need arise to request data from contracted parties as well.

So the template is meant to try to satisfy all of the particular requests and just as a recollection this is again kind of tied back to the process flow that we talked about.

But in general if a working group recognizes that they do have an immediate need for any types of data or metrics then they would complete this form. The working group's council liaison as well as the chair would take that request to the GNSO council.

The council will process that request and pass it along as necessary working in conjunction with staff to figure out how the request can be completed. So but in general the highlights of this particular form as to, you know, who is submitting it, when are they submitting it, what are the issues that they're exploring, what are they looking to solve.

Then moving on down as to what some of the requirements would be for that data request and who they believe the responsible teams and/or data sources would be for that particular request.

As well as including an expected delivery date and any kind of information that they may be able to provide from a resource estimation. You know, that fields probably likely not to be filled out so much by the working group but perhaps more by staff in terms of facilitating the request.

And certainly as well the other implication if there's any particular budget considerations that are important here.

So again as you'll see, you know, this right now is populated with what we originally tried to do with the IRTPD. We'll send out a clean version and also send out links just to this example.

But would appreciate feedback if there is any other sections that we should add to this request and/or any other kind of like hints and tips that we should add to the form that would assist a working group in the future.

Any questions or comments about this particular form here? All right, so I think that will take us onto more or less our last agenda item and this is up for the group to consider.

Everyone is aware that Buenos Aires ICANN 53 is around the corner. You'll recall that we did not have a meeting in Singapore given the bandwidth restrictions for some of the other groups that are functioning across the community.

That same kind of bandwidth may be an issue or will likely be an issue for Buenos Aires as both the CWG and CCWG are basically coming - well the CWG is trying to come to a conclusion in Buenos Aires.

They're in public comment now. It's expected that there will be at least three sessions predominantly on Monday and Wednesday for them to consult with the community on their findings and overall recommendations.

The CCWG is about to release its first draft proposal for public comment and then post public comment they'll be considering those comments and preparing materials to also consult with the community on their findings.

So the question to the group is do we feel it's necessary to have a face-to-face meeting and if so it would likely be on a Thursday. And keep in mind that we'll also be likely competing with some other GNSO working groups such as the policy and implementation and a few others that are looking to submit milestones for a consideration there at the group as well.

So I'll open up the floor and any feedback or concerns or green checkmarks if yes that we should or red x's in the Adobe Connect if we shouldn't. The one thing that I'll close with, approximately and as we'll have a better idea about the initial report but tentatively we're hopeful that we can try to submit this working groups initial report by Buenos Aires for people to consume as to whether we'll have entered our public comment period or not is probably a different story.

And in terms of details about delivery of the draft report so we have a meeting scheduled on May 12 and then May 26. I'm hopeful that after our May 12 meeting the end of that week which would be around May 15 that staff will submit the first draft of the DMPM initial report for the group to review.

That will give the group almost a week and a half and then when we meet on the 26th we can talk about that report in more detail and try to improve that draft up and through until the second week of June approximately so that we can try to have that delivered on or about the time of Buenos Aires.

And then I would probably recommend that we not open up the public comment period until the conclusion of the Buenos Aires meeting so that members of the community have time to decompress and properly consider any findings that we load into the report here.

So back to my original question should we have a face-to-face in Buenos Aires or not? If yes then staff will start the process of requesting a room. And (Graham) is correct the PPS the privacy proxy working group will also be in a comment period. Cheryl please.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes just if you have (unintelligible) the likelihood of me actually getting into the room is extremely small.

Berry Cobb: Not a problem perfectly expected given the other many hats that you're wearing at that time. (Graham) please.

(Graham Bunton): I enjoy having face-to-face meetings for working groups in ICANN meetings. I think they're not always productive but it, there is something intangible about how it helps people figure out who people are and, you know move forward on issues.

But like Cheryl it's going to be a challenge to make sure that I can be in the room as well between privacy and proxy and the IANA stuff. So I don't know how to structure that in a way that makes sense for the group though where it's like, yes maybe we'll have one if it's convenient without also undermining, you know, the work we're trying to do.

Berry Cobb: Right thank you (Graham). How about I propose this, we can submit a request for a room and we'll see what time slots are going to be available. Likely there's a decent change that we'll be the back of the bus kind of kids and get the nice 7:00 am or 7:30 am start time which isn't the most opportune.

But anyway staff will submit a request, we'll see what available times that there are and we'll move forward with the paperwork. We'll bring this back to the working group for your consideration.

And if it's easier to cancel a meeting as we get closer than it is to try to find a slot if we do. Okay, I'm not sure what happened to the room here. So that's basically all we had for the agenda today.

I did already talk about our next meeting schedules. Again May 12 and May 26. Try to have a draft, first draft initial report for the group to review by the 15th and continue our deliberations for our next meeting.

We'll move onto talking about the issue report that's completed by staff and try to understand if there's anything that should or could be added to that in regards to data and metrics collection.

And then we'll also briefly talk about the final report which more or less I think we've kind of accomplished with what we've discussed either through the metrics request template or some of what we have loaded into the charter document but we can look to mature that as we move on through the meetings.

So then of course then we have our first draft by roughly the 15th review through that. The 26th we'll have time to collect input from the group on that particular draft and then I believe we'll be able to squeeze in a meeting on the 9th of June, which is about one week prior to when people will start traveling for Buenos Aires.

So that gives us three meetings. One thing that I'll also add, on the 26th of May we may have (Steve Allison) spend a little bit more time on (Kovai) with some of the findings and we definitely would like a little bit more input about the use of it.

And on or around that time he may reach out to working group members individually to solicit any kind of input as well to help assist the pilot. I believe I can't speak for (Steve) but it is possible that some of the findings from this pilot may or may not be shared in Buenos Aires but I know that that was kind of the original target.

(Steve Allison):     Yes this is (Steve) just real quick. That is the goal it's at least start a dialogue of things that we've learned and maybe some open question or best practices

of benefits that we think we would get out of this experience so that we can have some of these more rich conversations in Buenos Aires and guide us to the next steps.

Berry Cobb: Thank you (Steve). All right Jonathan I'll turn it back to you if there's any other discussions otherwise I think we can try to end this call a few minutes early, give people a few minutes back.

Jonathan Zuck: Yes I'm all in favor of giving people their time back. So I just wanted to kind of recommit everyone. Let's see if we can get a document out for public comment right after BA.

So what that means is I'll probably be sending some nagging emails especially prior to those last two meetings, you know, at the end of May and the 9th of June to just put this back on people's radars.

I know sometimes we all just wait until the day the meeting comes to look at some of this stuff but I think if we're going to get some final recommendations to put in front of the public that we'll probably need to do some stuff between our calls. So just look for a few extra emails from me in these last couple of weeks.

Thanks everybody for the call today.

Berry Cobb: Great thank you Jonathan and thank you everyone and see you on the email list until the 12th.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much, (Chase) you may now stop the recording, have a good day bye.

Woman: Bye.

END