ICANN
Transcription
Metrics and Reporting Working Group meeting
Wednesday 04 December 2013 at 21:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of Metrics and Reporting Working Group call on the Wednesday 04 December 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-metrep-20131204-en.mp3

Attendees:
Cheryl Langdon-Orr - ALAC
Tony Onorato –unaffiliated
Pam Little - NTAG
Tom Lowenhaupt – NARALO
Mikey O'Connor – ISPCP
Jennifer Wolfe - NCA

Apologies:
Lars Hoffmann

ICANN staff:
Berry Cobb
Julia Charvolen

Coordinator: Remind all participants this conference is being recorded. If you have any

                  objections, you may disconnect at this time. You may begin.

Julia Charvolen: Thank you, (Kelly). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone,

                  and welcome to the Metrics and Reporting Working Group call on

                  Wednesday, 4 December. On the call today we have Cheryl Langdon-Orr,

                  Pam Little, Mikey O'Connor, Tony Onorato, Jennifer Wolfe.

                  We have from staff, Berry Cobb and myself, Julia Charvolen. And we have no

                  apologies for this call so far. May I please remind all participants to please

state their names before speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you, and over to you.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks Julia and thanks, (Kelly) -- my buddy, (Kelly) from Verizon. It's great to have old friends on the call. This is Mikey. We'll run through the usual deal where we check statements of interest. We don't really need to do that on a drafting team call, but we'll do it anyway.

And then also the agenda's pretty short. We're going to fly through the slide deck that I sort of haplessly pitched in Buenos Aires, and then mostly focus in on the draft charter that Berry so kindly put together for us. So anything on statements of interest or the agenda that people want to raise at this point? Okay.

On your screen is a slide deck, and I'm just going to turn the pages very fast. It talks about what we're - the drafting team for.

This is pretty much a review, and so I'm not going to go into a whole lot of detail except to say that we had a pretty lively discussion with the GNSO Council in which especially Councilor Jeff Neuman was very curious about sort of how we got from the origins of this project in the Registration Abuse Policies report, to this state of affairs.

And I can't say that I did a terrific job of drawing that picture for him, and that's gone into our thinking in this draft charter a little bit, just to sort of trace those steps a little bit more clearly than I did. And I think Berry's done a pretty good job there. So you can see that this is basically a one-pager, and I think that's really all I want to say about this.

If you would do me a favor, Berry, and flip the draft charter that you've put together into the Adobe room for a minute, I think I really want to focus us on that today. And it may not be reasonable, but our thought is that we may be able to get this done by the next call. We'll see how we do today.

And so I'm just very quickly going to take - the first section is very mechanical. There's almost nothing in there to review. The section I really want to spend time on is this Section 2. I think I'm going to take command for a minute, and just a little bit bigger, now leaving you. I'll hold onto command for a minute.

So I just want to walk you through what we've got so far and see what you all think, and then engage you in about ten minutes. After I get through this quick review, I want to engage you in how we can flesh this out a little bit if it needs to be.

So the background section, I normally don't pay a lot of attention to. It's usually pretty straightforward. But on this one, the genesis of this project was a little tricky, and the path to today was a little tricky.

So I'm going to spend a little more time on that than normal, and start out with that first sentence that says look, the Registration Abuse Policies working group zeroed in on this need for uniformity in the mechanisms to initiate, track and analyze policy violation reports.

That was an observation of the working group, but then the working group went in the next sentence and recommended that this project get underway to create and support uniform reporting processes.

And that was the first of several steps from the place that Jeff recalled to where we are now, is that what we said was - and a little bit further background and maybe something we want to stick into this background, Berry, as I think about it, is one of the things that the Registration Abuse Policies working group came up with was a notion that there were some meta issues that were broader than the things that are typically handled in a PDP.

And that the GNSO would probably be well advised to learn how to handle discussions about issues like that, and this was one of those. And so we're sort of feeling our way through a different kind of process than normal for the GNSO, and I think that's another thing we may want to touch on in here.

Then the next paragraph or sentence - the third sentence is the GNSO in collaboration with the community deliberated all this and gathered a bunch of information which ultimately resulted in an issue report that again slightly moved the ball. The key part of that sentence is further research metrics and reporting needs in hopes to better aid the policy development process.

So that's another small step away from that original RAP report. Then the staff created a report and described some of those accomplishments, and did some research.

And in May last year, the GNSO Council approved that report's recommendation to wait a little while, primarily because Contractual Compliance is in what is now the final stages of their three-year plan. And the thinking was that that might be a good event to wait for, and then the GNSO Council would consider what to do after that.

So meanwhile, the Council also adopted this recommendation to form us, or at least the non-PDP working group that we're writing the charter for. And again, things changed just a little bit. We are tasked with exploring opportunities of reporting and metrics recommendations that again could inform policy development via fact-based decision making where applicable.

And so that's how - those were the steps that took us to here. I just wanted to read through those with you partly as practice for the next time I have to pitch this report, because I'm going to have to do it again.

And unfortunately Jeff has gotten very busy and has dropped off the Council, so I wouldn't be at all surprised to find him in the meeting when I pitch this,

but he won't be on the Council. So I'm sure he'll still be there to keep me honest. Berry, go ahead.

Berry Cobb: Thank you, Mikey. Just to kind of tag on to what you were mentioning at the bottom of the first paragraph about the issue report, in between the RAP WG recommendation and the Council passing the issue report, there was an alumni group report that was created.

And you had mentioned about change from the original RAP WG recommendation, but what was noted in the alumni group -- which I think is what is very crucial to how we've gotten to where we're at -- was taking note of the reference back to the AoC, and in specific language pointing to, you know, more fact-based policy decision making as it's listed in the AoC.

So essentially what we tried to do with the issue report was expand upon, you know, that primary notion. Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: Let's slide that thought into this, because I totally forgot about that, and I wrote that alumni report. Shows how much you can rely on my memory. But that's a really important link in the chain. Thanks, Berry. Pam, go ahead.

Pam Little: Thank you, Mikey. I just - sorry, that page is gone. Did I just lose that page?

Mikey O'Connor: No, no. Berry disappeared it.

Pam Little: That's okay. So I can read the Word document. The first paragraph under background, it says - sorry, the last sentence of the first paragraph says the report created by ICANN staff further outlined accomplishments regarding reporting and metrics for the contractual compliance function.

I'm not sure whether that is intended to mean what I read, because they are not - there's no reporting and metrics for the contractual compliance function.

This, to me - there was reporting or metrics available from Contractual Compliance. It's data they have been collecting.

So it's not a measure of the contractual compliance function, but it's the data and metrics they are collecting. So my question is whether it's for - the word for should be replaced the word from.

And the other thing is this notion about contractual compliance that's really a plan. I'm not sure whether we understand exactly what will be the deliverables at the end of that three-year plan. Contractual compliance currently just collect data, you know, all sorts of data reported by third parties in terms of potential alleged violation of contract.

This could be about registries, or mostly registrars-related. And so is that the three-year plan? Or what three-year plan are we talking about? I also understand or know Contractual Compliance has a three-year audit plan where they audit certain obligations of the registrar or registry agreement.

So if that three-year plan, the audit plan, would not complete till 2015, not the end of 2013. So there seems to be some timing issue here as to what data Contractual Compliance is collecting.

And have we, as a drafting team or (GNS) Council - actually could we take a look at what data they actually is collecting, and make available to the drafting team or working group in the future at the end of that so-called three-year, which is the end of 2013 or 2015? Not clear to me. That's all I have.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks, Pam. Let's take the - what I think are two thoughts, primarily, in chunks. I think the first issue you raised is the issue - the changing of the wording which - let me get that draft to the right.

Pam Little: The last sentence of the first paragraph, in the first paragraph under background.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, yeah. There we go. And I would think that either from or by would be better replacements. I agree with you. I don't think that the intent was ever to zero in on metrics aimed at the performance of Contractual Compliance. It was metrics that could be used in policy making. And so, Berry, I'd view that as a friendly amendment, if you do. Are you tracking what we're talking about here?

Berry Cobb: Yes, I'm taking notes in the current draft.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, okay. So from would work for me. By would work for me. Pam suggested another word which I didn't grab, but any of those that short of shift the focus of that sentence is fine.

Now onto the more substantive - well that was substantive, but the other one is let's take a look at this three-year plan language a little bit. Let's see. Where is it?

Pam Little: It's at the beginning of the second paragraph, so the conclusion - until the conclusion of the three-year plan, towards the end of 2013.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh, yeah. Yep, there we go. Berry, can you fill us in a bit on sort of where that came from and your thoughts on that? Because I think Pam's question made sense to me, but I don't know the answer.

Berry Cobb: Okay, this is Berry. So I think essentially -- and, Pam, you may recall some of this -- but either shortly after she started or maybe a year into it, (Maggie) had put together a three-year plan which essentially, I think, started at around the end of 2010, that is going to be concluding at the end of this year.

And, you know, part of it was the three-step process by which to work different complaints that were received by Contractual Compliance, you

know, mapping out the process to that. Other parts of their team had taken the next version.

If you recall that the complaint system that was part of InterNIC, they migrated that to ICANN dot org. They've also created a new database that allows for much more robust tracking of the complaints that are better categorized, all of which is documented in the issue report. So I think Sections 4.1 through 4.4 outline what they've accomplished to that point.

And the reason for why this first part of the recommendation that initiated this effort is that when we were writing the issue report and collaborating with (Maggie), she had stated that they haven't completed their entire three-year plan.

They suspect that it's supposed to occur by the end of this year, and so essentially the Council will be awaiting for the flag, notifying us that they've finished their plan.

And essentially how to satisfy that first recommendation is that they'll come to the GNSO Council, explain what they've done over the last three years to get us to the point of where we're at now, most of which, I think, has satisfied a lot of the original intent of the RAP WG recommendation in that, you know, at that time we just didn't have any clear metrics at all, from a compliance standpoint.

Whereas now with what they've built up to now with the process, the database, even with some of the front-end metrics, most of that has been satisfied. So, you know, I think to close out that first recommendation, again they'll come to the GNSO Council, brief them on what they've done and maybe where they plan to go over the next couple of years.

But for the most part, I think from any future working group perspective, if there was an IRTP Part F, for example - I know that that hurts, Mikey...

Mikey O'Connor: You're hurting me, Berry.

Berry Cobb: But if there's a future PDP that, you know, surrounds certain types of abuse metrics or complaints that ICANN monitors even through their audit program as well, we have a much greater capability of getting access to more meaningful metrics in that regard. And so that's the idea of the three-year plan that's listed there in the first sentence of Paragraph 2.

Mikey O'Connor: So, Pam, does that align with your understanding of the three-year planning cycle, now that Berry's...

Pam Little: It is and it is not. What I was going about this thing is really I've read the transcript from the interaction with the (GNS) Council - GNSO Council during Buenos Aires, and Jeff Neuman and others' comments. And I - unfortunately my understanding is more kind of aligned with their understanding about this initiative, to be honest.

So my question is this. What is the Contractual Compliance department now collecting? Do we know what they're collecting and what data and metrics will be available at the end of that three-year plan? The end of 2013?

And the other question is, because that is sort of a data, but I don't think they are abuse related. They're basically just collecting all sorts of information or complaints -- any general public made to ICANN. So my question is, do we need to know or look at what data they're actually collecting, and whether that's really useful or what a future PDP needed?

Is there some gap, missing data we need to collect from other parties rather than Contractual Compliance? Because I thought Jeff was driving this message that the whole thing is about getting data from ICANN staff - I mean ICANN Contractual Compliance and maybe other functions as well. So that was my point, trying to make - to connect the dots.

Mikey O'Connor: Let me take a try at that. I think that there's always a confusion to be found in the metrics evaluating the performance of Contractual Compliance. You know, how big's the backlog? How long do complaints take to get processed? Whatever metrics are used to evaluate that function.

And at least in my mind, that's never been what this is about. I mean I think that would be useful stuff. But from a person - from the standpoint of a person who makes policy, I'm much more interested in the metrics about the contracted parties that Contractual Compliance collects -- the availability of that data and, as you say, Pam, the gaps between that data and the data that's needed to make policy.

And so let me set that one dichotomy out there, and make sure that we're all in agreement that this isn't really about evaluating the performance of the Contractual Compliance function. Can we just draw a line under that and make sure that we're right on that one?

Because if we are disagreeing on that, then we've got a little more work to do. We have to figure that out, too. So, Pam, are you okay if we don't include performance review of Contractual Compliance in the scope of this?

Pam Little: Totally agree. That's why I suggested change of wording from for to from.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, okay.

Pam Little: And so that's not a question at all. Yeah, that's totally in agreement.

Mikey O'Connor: All right. So then, the second half of what I heard you just say is, I think, a pretty good summary of what we're about, which is to take a look at the data that Contractual Compliance has available now, and find the gaps between that data and what policy makers may need.

And so it may be that this first sentence then needs to be sharpened up, just so we don't - I'm not sure, Berry, that we actually need that second half of that sentence.

Berry Cobb: This is Berry. I mean let's not get hung up on the background. You know, all of this was meant to just try to paint a path of how we got to this point.

Mikey O'Connor: Right, but I think if we confuse people with our background, as we just did ourselves, we need to get that fixed. So what I'm suggesting is that actually the first two sentences could go away in this background. And then carry on with the story with the third sentence in there, because that whole discussion does tend to get us into the weeds about the difference between evaluating Contractual Compliance and evaluating data for policy.

So my suggestion there would be let's just drop those first two sentences and carry on. Now having done that, we've got lots of hands up. Everybody okay with that? If you're okay with that approach, lower your hand and off we'll go. Okay.

This is really the interesting bit that's come up here, which is the mission and scope. Let's just stay on that for now and, I think, just essentially read it together. I'm going to make it a little bit bigger. Let me know if I do anything to you that rolls it so that you can't see it.

Berry Cobb: I think you need to hit the Sync button, Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh, I thought I had it synced. Okay, so now it's synced. Now I've got control, right? Right. And now I'll release it. No, maybe I won't. Now I can't unsync. I don't know what I did. There we go. Okay.

So the four bullets start to get us to the essence of this charter, and this is the part that I really want us to zero in on, which is that we would come up with - we, the working group, would come up with a set of principles that may

complement any GNSO policy efforts related to metric data requirements to better inform the policy development process.

I can see myself beginning to wordsmith this, so I'm just going to blast through these real quick. The next one is the process for requesting metrics and reports. And I think that there again what we want to do is add the clause, perhaps, a process for policy makers or the GNSO to, you know, this sentence needs an object, I think.

We need a framework for getting that data to the working groups, the Council and the GNSO as a whole. And then we may need to see some process changes to the guidelines.

Then we have a little mission that talks about how we would do this. We'd go out to the community, and so this is pretty straightforward PDP-style stuff. Part of the reason that we need to repeat all that is because this is a non-PDP working group, so we sort of have to tell the working group how to work.

And then the recommendations would raise awareness; make data more available; make metrics and reporting more useful and understandable; take into account existing initiatives within ICANN -- and this is essentially a nod to several other initiatives that are going on that this working group's going to have to coordinate, including the Consumer Trusts one.

And I think there's another one which I can't put my finger on at the moment. But anyway...

Jennifer Wolfe: Mikey, this is Jen. I'm sorry. I'm not on my computer, so I can't raise my hand. But the other one is the potential review of the GNSO, the self-review.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, I knew there was another one. Thanks, Jen. Way to go. And do do that again. Jen is in her car driving, so she gets special permission to leap right in.

And then finally this notion that this would introduce continuous improvement principles into this metrics process. So I just want to stop there. This is a pretty meaty chunk of the recommendation, and I want to pause here and let the rest of you chime in on these.

I'm fine with them in theory. I hesitate to wordsmith them on this call, but we can do that if you want. But does this, in general, align with what the rest of you think we should be doing, leaving wordsmithing aside for the moment? Because if it's close then, you know, we're nearly done.

If we either missed some big piece of what you all were expecting this charter to instruct the working group to do, or if you think it's wrong, this is a good time to influence where this is going, because this is really the heart of the charter for them.

I'm not seeing a lot of hands go up, which means that, Berry, you did good. You got - there's some hands. Good. I flushed out hands. I love that. I think since Tony hasn't spoken yet, I'll let him go first. It was a virtual tie between Tony and Berry. Tony, go ahead.

Tony Onorato: Thanks, Mikey. It's Tony. I'm wondering about the first recommendation here, and the vagueness of raise awareness; and perhaps the - or I should say (unintelligible) and make data more available. Isn't one of the - aren't we recommending - I guess first of all, I guess I'm not certain what raise awareness is supposed to relate to. So that's Part 1 of my question.

Part 2 of my question is, in making data more available, wouldn't the recommendation be better phrased if it focused on the fact the recommendations are designed to outline -- I hesitate to say processes, because that might be pushing us too far -- but protocols or parameters or processes for requesting data with one of the assumptions being that more data would be more valuable?

But so I guess focusing on that second part, the question being whether or not the recommendation shouldn't be directed to more of a process-related focus.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, I'm going to amplify your question a little, Tony. I think one of the things that we need to wordsmith a bit on this, Berry, is, you know, answering the question for who or what in a lot of these. We're sort of missing an object.

So, for example, just to take Tony's question about that first recommendation, raise awareness of what and who's going to be more aware, and why are they going to care? And then the second clause, make data available, to whom? So that they can do what better? I think that's the kind of wordsmithing that kind of popped into my head. And with that, I'll throw it to you, Berry, and let you carry on.

Berry Cobb: Thank you, Mikey. This is Berry. I guess first and foremost, this little section is, you know, these aren't recommendations. They're expectations of future recommendations. Most of these were extracted from the mind map, so that's why I included them in here.

I will agree that we do need to probably enhance this with who, what and whom. And I tried to capture that a little bit lower under the working group task Number 3, which now maybe we need to revamp.

But the last thing I'll close with is all of the wordsmithing up to this point has been staff, which I don't think that we're technically supposed to really be doing. So that's why we need to really lean on the drafting team to come up with exactly what's going to shape the scope here. So I'll close with that.

Mikey O'Connor: This is like the professor or the student who writes a paper and purposely puts an error on Page 40 to check if the professor actually read it.

Tony Onorato: Well, Mikey, can I ask a follow-up here which is - this is Tony again.

Mikey O'Connor: Sure, go ahead.

Tony Onorato: Couldn't we have the - it seems to me that the assumptions should precede the recommendations here, because it reads backwards to me. On the one hand, it would be clearer to me, I think, if the assumptions said things like the acquisition of more data, just sort of off the cuff here...

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah.

Tony Onorato: Would serve a valuable purpose, that data being of various sorts; the data being directed toward ends such as abuse monitoring. There is currently an inability to access certain data, so on and so forth.

And very methodically kind of breaking down the assumptions which lead into the recommendations that, for example, awareness of the lack of data or the inability to access certain data needs to be raise or ought to be raised, that greater availability of certain kinds of data would be beneficial. And then, as you said, to whom and for what.

So maybe a structural change here to the document might help with thinking through the wordsmithing in the recommendations.

Mikey O'Connor: I like that idea because a lot of the - yeah, I think that's a good one, because the assumptions are a little bit thinner than in fact I think they are. I think we've got a fair amount of ideas that we could put into those assumptions, sprinkled around in all these documents that we've got in front of us.

And by resequencing it like that, then the punch line would be the mission. So here's the mission, after you've laid all that groundwork.

Tony Onorato: Right, right.

((Crosstalk))

Tony Onorato: One final point and then I'll cede the floor, because my understanding has increasingly become that our goal here is to not even so much define the processes or the types of data, but to recommend that certain processes be implemented to give sort of a broad parameter to what kind of processes they would be; how they might be structured; what kinds of data, I guess, might be solicited through those processes, without getting into the specifics of it.

So anyway, I'll turn it over to you.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, I think that's right.

I think one of the things that probably needs to be amplified a little bit here is the difference between actually getting into the metrics, specifying which kind of data will be collected for what purpose, but rather putting processes in place so that the PDPs, as they complete -- so, for example, IRTPF, which Berry will be staffed for, he said, getting even -- one of the things that would be required of the PDP working group would be for the working group to specify the metrics by which the success of that policy would be measured.

We sort of have a chicken and egg problem, and that is that it would be nice if all policies up till this time had had those sections, so that we would have good data for further policy making. But we don't. So one of the things that we have arrived at is to say look, let's make sure that the metrics defining is built into the policy making process itself.

The other part that kind of gets to the point that Pam made earlier is that there may be times when a policy making process needs to request data, not just from Compliance, but from other places as well. And so we also need to define the process by which a PDP does that.

But again, to your point, Tony, in that view of what this working group would do, the working group wouldn't specify the exact kinds of data. It wouldn't say anything much about specific data that's either being collected now or in the future, but rather would be almost all process-focused as to how that data would be identified, collected, et cetera.

And I think it's about that point in the discussion at the Council meeting that I got into the weeds and Jeff came right in and set me straight. So let's take that restructure as a friendly amendment. Berry, do you feel like you can take another pass through this?

Or are you sort of saying look, you drafting team, it's time to start acting like a drafting team and actually touching this document? In which case I'd be willing to run through and do a draft, if that would be helpful.

Berry Cobb: This is Berry. You know, I guess first and foremost, absolutely I'm, you know, ready for the drafting team to take more of a pen on this, you know, especially given some of the history before this got formed.

But secondarily, I'm going to, you know, I'm okay with any kind of restructuring, and perhaps maybe what is confusing is the paragraph that precedes the recommendations are expected to, and maybe that should be part of that paragraph up above.

But those four bullets are not recommendations. They are expectations on future recommendations that the working group will make. And it's specifically tied back to that last sentence that a final report with proposed recommendations will be delivered to the Council. These recommendations are expected to boom, boom, boom, boom.

So now whether assumptions needs to precede any of the mission and scope part of it, absolutely, as well as perhaps getting more granular into the working group task, which is the next section. Maybe some of those need to

be floated up more generically into a mission and scope. So but let me know which changes need to be made and most certainly I will welcome any input from the drafting team.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, well let me - I'll take the pen for the next try. I'm happy to do that. It'll get me away from the cosmic issues that have been visited upon us by our CEO for a while. Let's take, in the last 15 minutes, I think we've only got a couple more sections.

Let's just take a look at the tasks, especially I'm leaning on some of you who have done projects like this before. Now what this is emerging to be is, you know, if I were in a corporate setting, I would be saying this is a project to define how metrics will be described, requested, processed and built into policy. It's not - so it's a process definition project. It's not the work that that kind of process would actually do, if that makes sense.

And so as we run through these tasks, the first one's fairly mechanical. It's the work plan. The next one, Number 2, is take a look at prior work -- PDPs and non-PDPs -- to explore how metrics were gathered and used and so on.

I think that it may be useful to insert a task somewhere in this list that says something like describe a preliminary model of how we envision these processes would work, both at the beginning of the PDP, when the PDP is trying to determine whether it has the data and metrics that it needs to do its work; and also at the end of a PDP, when the PDP is describing the metrics that will be used to measure success in the implementation of the policy.

So one task we may want to add is some sort of modeling. And we might want to do that before Task Number 2, so that then when we went to look at the previous PDPs, we could see whether they did any of the things differently and would give us ideas.

Then clearly Number 3 is figuring out how, what, why, where the data would be used in the front part. And then I think another piece is probably how the data is used on an ongoing basis after the PDP has been implemented, after the policy's been implemented. We might want to add that.

I think by that time - well Number 4, I think, could then go quite late in the work plan, because Number 5, it looks to me, gets to the point that Pam was raising earlier, which is external sources of metrics. And I think, you know, that needs maybe to go a little bit higher in the work plan.

And then the last one, I don't know. That's sort of inside baseball. Coordinate and collaborate with Contractual Compliance to close out Resolution Number 1 of 2 that initiated this effort. Berry?

Berry Cobb: Yeah, so again there were two recommendations regarding this effort. The first is what Contractual Compliance has done with their three-year plan, and they still owe the Council resolution on that. The intent by this bullet was hopefully around the time this working group completes its work, it can dovetail back in with this first recommendation for Contractual Compliance and it can all be delivered at once to the Council.

But the idea here is to not lose sight of the very first recommendation or the resolution that started this initiative, which is again we're waiting for Contractual Compliance to complete its three-year plan and report back to the Council.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay, got it. All right, so that's the list as we have it today. And I've sort of nattered on a little bit about some things that I think I might add as I go through. For those of you who've done projects with metrics before, where you're trying to change the process by which an organization builds and uses metrics in its work, are there some other tasks that strike you as missing at this point? Or is this close enough?

If it's close enough, I'll go ahead and wordsmith it a bit. I don't want to belabor this. But I am feeling like this is a project that I've never done before. And so if somebody else has done this kind of a project before, I'd be really interested in hearing about things that make that kind of a project go better. Berry, is that a new hand or an old one?

Berry Cobb: Old.

Mikey O'Connor: Old, okay. All right, so I think we've got this sketch o'work plan that we can hammer on. And then the last two chunks are the objectives and goals, and the deliverables and time frames.

I think I'm going to skip through these really fast, because I think with the changes we're making higher in the document, we may change these just a little bit, too. Pam, you've got a question in the chat, and then I see Cheryl's hand up. Pam is asking compliment should be complement with an e. Where did you see that one, Pam?

Pam Little: First bullet under mission and scope.

Mikey O'Connor: Under mission and scope.

Berry Cobb: I found it in the document and made the change.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, good deal. Okay, Cheryl. Take it away.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you. And I was prattling along when you were asking questions earlier, and it was exactly when you didn't actually respond to me that I was being cheeky that I realized I was on mute.

Mikey O'Connor: There you go.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I muted myself, Mikey. I will now respond at least to your last question. The rest of it is lost in the sands of time. I think this is close enough for a draft for a charter. I mean we are talking charter here, which is guiding ourselves and there will be obviously some flexibility within the work group to embellish. So that was just my last attempt to intervene. I'll ignore all the other ones because they really aren't important anymore. Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: Well I'm sorry that you were muted. Your interventions are often really helpful, dang it. Oh, well. I think that I've got a pretty good - this is a good spot for me to grab the pen because I've got a pretty good sense of the flow of the document, and some things that will, I think, help it a bit.

And so I'll dig in, I think, probably tomorrow, and because the weather here is going to be dreadful, and really go through this. Berry, if you're not - if I hammer away on your document a lot, you've done a fabulous job and given us a great place to start. And as many of you know, Mikey's first edit is often a pretty exciting event. So let me take a crack at that.

And I do, you know, to Tony's point, I do want to take one last checkpoint on this notion that we're going to - I'm going to try to figure out a way in this revision to very clearly instruct the working group not to try and pick metrics on any topic, because I think down that path lies madness. And I just want to make sure everybody's okay with that.

Man: Yep.

Mikey O'Connor: Because I think, you know, one way to think about this is to imagine that we're writing a document that will be useful for 20 or 30 years, or at least the working group is. And who knows what metrics will be needed 20 years from now? But what we want is a good process for the policy makers to acquire that data and build that data collection into the policy that they write.

And I guess to that end, can anybody think of a model? You know, I was thinking of, you know, at least in my local government -- which I'm a lot more involved in than my national government -- I can't even think of a model where a legislative body also includes metrics to measure the successful implementation of their legislation, which I think is essentially what we're heading towards.

So if anybody can think of a model of that, that might be very helpful -- not necessarily now, because we're at the end of the call. But this is kind of a new critter that we're working on. Enterprise boards of large IT shops. What's an enterprise board, Berry? Maybe that...

Berry Cobb: This is Berry. Essentially an enterprise board is responsible for dictating the technologies that are to be used. So for example, Company A needs a database solution, so they'll define what technologies should be used to meet that requirement, such as maybe it'd be an open source MySQL with a Microsoft platform.

But what it's supposed to allow for is that the organization in a very large IT shop doesn't have five database solutions paying five different types of monthly fees for, you know, maintenance and licensing, et cetera, and they come up with one pre-defined policy that our database solution is going to be Product X. And here's why, and here's how much it's going to be cost, and here's how you can use it through the environment.

And the enterprise architecture board will then develop metrics on how that policy is being used. And I use the term policy loosely, because obviously it's a function of job security, not true consensus building policy. But they'll utilize metrics on how they've defined that standard, and how it's being used across the organization from quantitative perspective, financial perspective, as well as qualitative as well.

Mikey O'Connor: I'll get Cheryl in a second, but could you find an example of how they do that? That might be really interesting for us to take a look at, if you can, you know, not the whole shebang, but the part where they define those metrics. We might...

Berry Cobb: I'll try to drum something up.

Mikey O'Connor: I might hand that on to the working group. Cheryl?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks. Cheryl, for the record. Just following on from Berry (unintelligible). As I was listening to you, and unfortunately this is a defunct model, but that's not because the model was wrong. It was because of policy and politics. It is actually in a local government environment, and Mikey said you might find that interesting.

But within Australia, about ten years ago when Agenda 21 organizations were quite far more prevalent and 14,000 environmental solutions were particularly keen to be pursued, aggregation of local government councils came together to act in a very similar way on unifying solutions by recommendation.

So it was more than just buying grouping here. It wasn't just everyone's going to use the same, you know, the same brand of paper in their photocopiers, and that would make it cheaper. It was, you know, bigger picture-type stuff. And that had metrics designed into it, obviously, to say whether or not the recommended solutions were actually achieving any of the outcomes.

And unfortunately these regional groupings -- which particular were working in waste management, interestingly enough -- called regional waste boards, no longer exist. But I'm just saying that there are some models in that enviro-world that at least were tried.

I'm not faulting the model. It's just, you know, they cost money and politics changed, and it was no longer, you know, flavor of the month. But they lasted for about seven or eight years, about ten years back.

Mikey O'Connor: So here's a thought, right at the top of the hour, and then we'll have to scoot. So I'll lay this on and then run away. Should we be thinking of metrics for the outcome of this working group? In other words, should we eat our own dog food?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Why not?

Mikey O'Connor: And then the question is, what would those metrics be? Ha, ha, ha. It's one minute after the hour. Got to go.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Bad man, Mike.

Mikey O'Connor: Sorry.

Berry Cobb: For the working group?

Mikey O'Connor: Well, you know...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It is...

Mikey O'Connor: It's an interesting puzzle, you know? Because it may help us shape the charter that we give the working group, you know, and it may also shape the work that the working group does, because I know that - the one thing I know about metrics is that it's really easy to do them badly. And you get metrics that drive crazy behavior on the part of organizations.

And so I've always been on the receiving end of bad metrics, and repairing damage done by that. And so it would be interesting to hold ourselves and hold the working group to the same sort of standard. So there's a puzzle. I'll

try and think through that as I do my drafting. But I'll let the rest of you do that, too.

That's it. I think we can wrap this call up. Thanks all. This time worked out really well, I think.

Berry Cobb: Mikey, just real quick, so next week's meeting will be at 1300 UTC, and if we should need a meeting after that, then the 18th we'll be back to whatever today's time was. So just so you know. Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: How's 13 UTC for you Australians? Is that...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh, it's shit, but that's okay. We'll share.

Mikey O'Connor: It's less bad, isn't it sort of...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No, it's shit. And that is for the record. Cheryl, for the record, it's a shit...

Mikey O'Connor: Cheryl, for the record, how would you spell that?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: S-H-I-T.

Mikey O'Connor: All right, just checking.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh, yeah. Yeah, yeah. You let Australians on the call, this is what you'll get.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, okay. Part of the package. All right, thanks all.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Julia, can you make a note that I'll need a dial-out at that ungodly hour?

Julia Charvolen: Absolutely.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: After 6:00 am, might as well.

Mikey O'Connor: See if Julia's on the call. Julia, are you there?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: She's in the room.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh, there she is. Way to go, Julia.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay, thanks, Mike.

Mikey O'Connor: All right, I think we've got it covered. Tony's typing. Wait a minute. Tony's typing. Oh, he's not typing. Never mind. All right. Going once, Tony. You get your last chance before we wrap up. Ah ha, our first metric.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh, read it out loud because I was locked out of the room there. Come on.

Mikey O'Connor: Well it just, you know, Tony just said, "I think that's a metric, Cheryl."

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well it can be measured. That's for sure.

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah, that's for sure. And then how deep.

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: How deep, is the next question. Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Careful, I have a son who actually did scatology at University as a course...

Mikey O'Connor: Oh, my God.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: So I could really bore you with...

Mikey O'Connor: Oh, my God. That's what happens when we get the Australians too frisky in the morning. Geez, Louise. Look at where we're at. Okay, see you in a week. It was great.

((Crosstalk))

END