

ICANN Transcription Data & Metrics for Policy Making Working Group Tuesday 14 July 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 14 July 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 on page: <http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar#jun>

Attendees:

Sara Bockey - RrSG
Cheryl Langdon-Orr - At-Large
Jonathan Zuck - IPC
Pam Little - RySG
Graeme Bunton – RrSG
Tony Onorato - Individual
Marinel Rosca – Individual
Sonigitu Ekpe – NCUC
Gabriel Vergara – NCUC
Rising John Osazuwa - ALAC

Apologies:

Janvier Ngnoulaye – Afrinic

ICANN staff:

Steve Chan
Berry Cobb
Terri Agnew

Operator: The recording has started. You may begin the meeting.

Terri Agnew: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. This is the Data and Metrics For Policy Making Working Group call on the 14th of July 2015.

On the call today we have Gabriel Vergara, Graeme Bunton, (Sarah Bakee), Pam Little, Tony Onorato, (unintelligible) and Jonathan Zuck. We have apologies from Janiver Ngnoulaye. From staff we have 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. Welcome everyone. I guess we forgot to mention Tony Onorato II who's also apparently on the call. So we might have to hear from him double today. So are - does anyone have any updated statements of interest that we need to know about or not have - have not yet filed one? If not, then we can move on.

So we're getting very close to trying to submit something for public comment. I'm very excited about that. And we're going to need everybody to kind of really spend some time on the homework the next couple of weeks here to look over this initial report. But why don't I hand it over to Berry to take us through the current draft of the initial report? Berry, go ahead.

Berry Cobb: Thank you Jonathan. Berry Cobb for the transcript. So yes, as Jonathan mentioned, I think we're coming down the home stretch here. I've made several changes for our proposed recommendations on the - from the previous version to this version.

Since our last meeting in Buenos Aires to now I've had a couple of different discussions with staff internally predominantly around the pilot recommendation, which we'll get into in a little bit.

But I think some of the changes that we're offering up will probably help enhance the recommendations and certainly hopefully alleviate confusion or questions from some of our earlier versions from the community when we put

this out for comment. And then of course eventually once we get this submitted to the Council for approval.

One thing to note that, you know, once we get to that point, you know, the scope of our recommendations are really in our own policy world. So once the Council does or I should say if the Council does approve the recommendations it'll be pretty much policy staff that will do the implementation for several of these.

So I'm just going to start kind of back at the top just to refresh everybody's memory about where we do - where we don't have recommendations and where we do. The structure, Section 5 is based on the order of the charter questions that are defined in our group's charter.

And I will also draw your attention to the right hand side of the screen. If you don't have the document up in front of you, we do have it in the Adobe Connect room but there's also links to the (Kavi) site to get either the Word version or the PDF version.

And also, more specifically on your own machine there's a third link for the GNSO operating procedures. And so some of the updates to these recommendations will point to specific locations within either the working group guidelines or the GNSO operating procedures themselves.

So especially, as Jonathan mentioned, when we turn this over for the homework assignments, you'll want to reference both and make sure that or help validate that that would be a proper fit in updating these guidelines.

All right. So starting off with Charter Question A again, this was kind of the chicken or the egg kind of question that the working group reviewed through based on some of the observations. You know, we reviewed through previous PDP efforts. We came up with various observations and findings from that particular exercise.

One thing I just wanted to point out here on Page 13. I had put a comment for a bullet here. I believe - when I was reading through this last night, I think (Steve) was the original author of some of these observations - (Steve) from staff.

And I didn't quite understand the meaning of this particular bullet. So I will get with him to try to flesh that out so that it makes a little bit more sense. Or if anybody else has any suggestions when you're reviewing through these in detail, please offer them up.

But for the most part for the Charter Question A the working group didn't come up with any recommendations and just noting that other recommendations are created based off of the other charter questions. And at any time if you have something to contribute or to interject, please don't hesitate to raise your hand and we'll call on you.

Charter Question B was mostly around what had to do with contractual compliance. The two main takeaways there is that A, from the original nexus of how this issue got addressed to where we're at today there was a substantial evolution in contractual compliant especially from a complaint intake perspective and a reporting perspective on the measurement of and/or resolution of those complaints.

And so we pretty much decided as a group to consider that out of scope for now and then as such didn't make any suggested recommendations. So that takes us into Charter Question C, which talked about some of the principles that enhance metrics and data available to better inform the GNSO policy development process.

You know, I think there was kind of a - there's two camps about these principles. One that kind of helped define what this working group was about and what we were trying to accomplish. And then you'll recall there was

another set of principles that were created early on in our work and one that - in regards to how data might be handled in - when it's of a sensitive nature and those kinds of things.

From a previous version we had a placeholder for a recommendation there, which was to maybe - we had a list of kind of some five high level principles. For those that may not be following in the AC room, I'm on Page 15, 5.3.3.2.

And those five principles in general having, you know, scrubbed the working group guidelines and the GNSO operating procedures there didn't really seem to be a natural home for these. And looking at them in more closer detail, the first three, as I mentioned, were kind of in camp one, which really kind of helped guide the purpose of our work here for this working group.

And the second were pretty much absorbed into some of the recommendations that are listed below. So this particular changes was essentially deleting these as a recommendation and offering up that there's no recommendations posted here. But I did make a substantial edit to the last bullet of the observations that helped guide the recommendations further down.

So when the group is taking a closer look at these, definitely look through the observations with a degree of scrutiny. If you do think that there should be some sort of recommendation to further establish some of these principles elsewhere, certainly we're open to ideas on how to accomplish that.

You know, I think probably three or four months ago we weren't necessarily looking at the GNSO operating procedures that closely. And as we have, you know, that's become kind of the de facto point of a formal home to document what the group has created here.

And outside of that there is no other home. You know, I mean for instance we could put up a Web page on the GNSO Web site. But it's all about trying to

find an authoritative area where a lot of the recommendations that we're providing here will reside so that they can be referenced and in cases where possible that it's kind of in your face. So certainly open to other suggestions there.

So just to conclude. So essentially the text has been changed here that no recommendations were made in terms of Charter Question C. Okay. Seeing and hearing nothing, I'll move on to - oh Jonathan please.

Jonathan Zuck: Yes. I just thought I'd speak up in support of this notion. And the more I read the principles, the more they seem pedantic. And the more that we can do to simply change the various templates and portions of the workgroup guidelines, et cetera, to be functional, I think the more seriously our work will be taken in the kind of rhetoric that was open to principles.

So I mean I'm a fan of letting them go in lieu of the real changes to templates and workgroup guidelines.

Berry Cobb: Thank you Jonathan. Yes. You know, the only other idea that I could come up with is that maybe we created t-shirts and put, you know, various t-shirt versions with the various principles on them and walked around during the ICANN meetings. But I doubt that that...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...coffee mug instead of those t-shirts.

Berry Cobb: Well we'll have to...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I get tired of people talking to my chest Berry. Yes.

Berry Cobb: Well I was envisioning that they would be on the back and not on the front.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh.

Berry Cobb: But I'd prefer, you know, the larger message to be on the back. But we'll have to do a pricing analysis of both to see which is...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...that we can study the metrics, see which is more successful.

Berry Cobb: Well, you know, Jonathan makes a good point. Metrics for alcohol consumption; maybe we can put them on pint glasses and we'll distribute them at the lobby bar.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And some on short glasses and see which works better. All right. Enough frivolity. Sorry.

Berry Cobb: No problem. I started it. So moving on to Charter Questions D, E and F. Just quickly is understanding little bits of ICANN policies regarding data measurement.

Again, that kind of circles back to some of the earlier use case analysis that we did, understanding mechanisms where working groups can request information internal and/or external as well as mechanism to ensure appropriate safeguards with regard to the confidentiality of certain types of information.

I do draw attention to these. And given the current state of this draft it's kind of misplaced especially with Charter Question F because when we reviewed through how we would handle confidential or sensitive information should it ever come to the forefront, it was pretty much absorbed into the decision tree that we have outlined in one of the annexes.

But that recommendation is actually further down in the next section. So I think there is a little bit of slight - the continuity is not there perfectly. I'm hopeful that - I don't think that it'll make that much of a difference because in the next section, which we'll get to in a little bit, the way these next versions of these recommendations are structured are almost kind of iterative and they're all closely linked to updates into the working group guidelines.

And that's why I left it down in that section below and not up here. But predominantly what charter - I think we're mostly looking to address Charter Question E here, which is about the mechanisms for request, which is also kind of tied to the metrics request form as well as the decision tree but mostly what the recommendation that we have listed here, which is 5.3.4.2. And this is the implementation of a pilot.

So the language that's listed here is substantially different than what we had offered up in the prior version. And having talked with Rob Hoggarth from staff, he's intimately involved in the community budget being a process that happens from one fiscal year to the next as it relates to how ICANN's finance department goes through their budgeting cycle earlier in the year.

And not being an expert in the process but, you know, three to four or five months out before a budget is prepared for the ICANN Board to approve, they begin that next fiscal year budget exercise.

The request is sent out to the community to start to formulate what any new budget line items that they would like to request for, you know, those are submitted, they're reviewed, there's interaction with the community, et cetera, et cetera, up until it's finally adopted by the Board.

But what mostly this particular recommendation is about was securing funds for any such future requests. And so in a little bit earlier conversation the idea of forming the pilot seemed pretty valuable as opposed to making a physical request upfront.

And I think the value there is because we really don't know what this is going to look like yet. It'd be one thing to maybe try to secure a bucket of money and then maybe see how that works. But it did seem very limiting. I think from our conversations back in Buenos Aires we had talked about trying to list a denomination amount.

And I think the - I think the number was something like \$50,000. But that seemed kind of limiting as well for one because we're not even clear about what the demand might be.

So with assistance with Rob Hoggarth, he helped to (sweet) structure this recommendation so that we put focus on a pilot and you'll see on - I'll just read this out real quick.

The working group recommends the formation of a small pilot effort under which GNSO community stakeholder groups and constituencies would be invited to submit proposals, ideas for fact based data and metrics collection and analysis topics.

A number of proposals, five or less -- and this is where we're trying to kind of put some scope around the pilot -- would be selected to assess the impact of fact based information on identifying potential or further - should be further exploration of existing GNSO policy development issues.

So what you'll notice here is that there is no bucket limit to these types of requests. But there is a kind of a scope statement to try to draw a beginning and an end to what the pilot's phase might look like.

And I have a couple of more comments and then I'll open it up to the floor. So this is the - kind of the simplified version of the recommendation that would eventually show up in the GNSO resolution. But there is a substantial -

additional information or kind of recommendation details to that particular recommendation.

An di won't read through all of this. But the general idea is that the pilot will be started. You know, it'll be five or so requests total. Again, we don't really understand what kinds of requests might be made from the community nor do we understand what the demand may look like. But again, there's kind of some kind of - at least a starting of a scope definition.

But the idea here is that this can be used in the front half of the policy development process. So - and this is where I think we're going to have to verbally explain to the GNSO Council should we get there - at least probably even respond to comments to the public comment period that the issue identification stage, you know, and make clear that it's, you know, an issue report hasn't even been formed yet.

And this is an opportunity for stakeholder groups and constituencies to make requests to a Council to better understand an issue before we even get to the issue report state, let alone before forming a particular working group.

But we didn't want to limit it to that very early first step of the policy process. Clearly what we - original mandate as well as our - what the group has discussed is should it be required in the middle of a working group? Are there some sort of aha moment where oh yes, this kind of data might become available. We didn't want to limit that factor either.

So it really includes the first three steps, issue identification; scoping, which is really the staff exercise through the issue report; and then the working group itself.

So again, I won't read through the details here from the recommendation details. But in short, there's a point at which the pilot phase comes to a close. And we'll need to evaluate how that pilot went.

And the other reason why I engaged Rob Hoggarth is there's another pilot that's currently just getting started that had been formed from the community. And for those that may not be aware, there's a resource available to help the community across all the SOs and ACs that staff supports from a policy perspective.

And that resource is to help these groups in terms of maybe formulating position statements or advice statements or responding to public comments or other general needs. It's in its very early stages so we don't understand the entire scope of that yet.

But it is a significant effort; probably larger than what we're trying to accomplish here with some tactically related metrics requests. But Rob had experience in terms of getting that off the ground as well. So that's why I felt it was valuable that he provide the input here.

But the point I'm wanting to make is that once this particular pilot concludes, it should be evaluated for success or failure. And upon finding the success, then we would try to integrate a more formalized request into the fiscal year '17 budgeting cycle where we do try to allocate that defined bucket of funds to handle such requests.

And so the other reason why this kind of makes sense is that, you know, we're a little bit too late in making the fiscal year '16 budgeting cycle and the purposes of this pilot should it be approved and then we get requests in, once those requests are received it'll be up to David Olive's group to, you know, figure out where to find funds to fund those type of requests.

And then again, should it be successful, then we make it a more formalized aspect when the fiscal year '17 budgeting cycle begins probably I think around the December timeframe roughly.

The last two statements that I'll make on this and this is where I could use assistance from the group when you're reviewing this. Right now the scope of this recommendation - the details below it is really kind of limited to, like I said, five or less requests. Maybe that needs to be adjusted. So put some thought around that.

Secondarily what I think we may need to add here is just a hint of language separating - it's still kind of a scope statement. But we need to - we need to make - somehow make a delineation that this isn't a credit card without a limit and that a Whois study request enters this pipeline. Because that - I don't think that that's the purpose of what we're trying to accomplish here.

That Whois study was I believe well above \$250,000 and that's a whole different avenue of gaining approvals and finding the funds to fulfill such a request.

These are really much more tactical in nature. So somehow we need to represent that in the recommendation details so that we can inform the community that when - if this were to be turned on for the community to access that all of a sudden the very first request we get is, you know, \$250,000.

So, you know, the other component to this is that, you know, when a request comes in, the scope of the request is something that can be accomplished within four to six weeks. It's less than, I don't know, you know, arbitrary \$20,000, somewhere in that genre of the request. So I think it'd be helpful to inform the community as well as the Council that that's the area that we're targeting.

And then the second aspect, which I think would be helpful from the group that is not listed in here, is what are the measures of success to this pilot. I think it's a little bit more than a simplified form of well we opened up the window. We got four requests and we fulfilled those four requests.

So we need to probably find some more tangible components that would help illustrate what success is like. And the primary reason for this is - I think this is a question that we'll probably get from either the community in - either in the public comments and if not, I imagine that the Council would probably ask us for that.

So I think it would benefit us to be able to kind of front run what some of that success measures might look like and just to kind of complete the aspect of this recommendation.

So I'll stop there. Any questions, comments? I see Jonathan has mentioned a couple things in the chat. Worry about setting a dollar limit. Perhaps limit to working groups rather than review teams. Who will be the judge of that success?

I suspect that primarily the community or at least the GNSO Council. And I would suspect that staff somehow will help provide some of the data or analysis to help gauge what that success might be. So any comments?

Jonathan Zuck: Yes. It's Jonathan. I guess - and those are two different things obviously. I guess restricting the context in which this pilot program is used might be the best way to contain it rather than trying to put a dollar figure on it or something like that.

But as far as judging success, I mean it - will this automatically be submitted as part of the budget process and it will be a question of trying to generate some sort of report along with that submission?

And I guess my first take on how it would be judged a success is if the data that was compiled was successfully used to scale the problem to define metrics for success and build a plan for continuous improvement.

I mean obviously we won't have had the chance to see whether or not the incorporation of data led to better policy or anything like that. But we can certainly see if the data request is used constructively with the new templates, et cetera, to better inform policy, you know, policy development. But what do other people feel about that in terms of metrics for success?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Helps if I come off mute. Cheryl here. Jonathan, I'm quite comfortable with that approach. Although I am a little concerned that an expectation on a pilot, particularly a small pilot, will have particularly outstanding metrics.

Most of these things take a little while to get significant traction. So I just want to make sure that it seems like, you know, the use of the metrics are reasonable measures but we don't want to over aspire because it's not going to be an overnight success.

I think it's essential. Otherwise I wouldn't be here. But I think that, yes, people have to be (levered) out of their traditional ways of doing things as well.

Jonathan Zuck: Yes. I completely agree Cheryl. I think the pilot project is a really good idea given how, you know, off budget cycle we are. I mean a part of me wonders whether or not it should be - the onus should be on those to prove it was a failure because I think, as you say, it will in fact take some time for people to really incorporate these things.

So I guess that's why I was trying to define it around at least going through the motions that we intended, which was that the data that was requested, you know, was used in some way to help scale - to find the scale of the problem being assessed; that the data requested formed the basis for success metrics.

So I mean it's not a question of successful metrics. It's more like was the data used. I think it's sort of the metric success for this pilot potentially. Was it used constructively in the policy development process?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Berry Cobb: Yes Jonathan. You know, I think kind of more specifically is, you know, should a request be submitted by the community, that's approved the Council, the resources are acquired, the data is collected based on the requirements of said issue and then based on those findings it comes back well, it wasn't really that much of an issue at all.

You know, it turned out that it was less than half of 1% that affects the universe of the generic names space.

Jonathan Zuck: Right. That would be a big (percent) to my opinion. Yes.

Berry Cobb: Agree. Now whether we get to that or not is, you know, I think unknowable because again we don't really know what kinds of requests we're going to get. So that's kind of the difficult part about trying to put a scope of...

Jonathan Zuck: Or what kind of workgroups are going to get formed in this time period? I mean right now we're so dominated by reviews I think, right. I mean once the...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Jonathan Zuck: ...accountability process, you know, gets handed over, we're going to be occupied by as many as seven different reviews this year. And so I'm - I have a feeling that there won't be a whole lot of workgroups and panels in that time. I don't know. How do people feel about that?

Berry Cobb: Well to respond to that, there are actually - there's at least two on deck. There will be EWG Whois Working Group. I'm not sure what kinds of data may be required that hasn't already been discovered in the earlier process. Secondly...

Jonathan Zuck: Right.

Berry Cobb: ...there will be the subsequent rounds policy, which probably won't really take off till fourth quarter of this year. And I believe there's one more in the pipeline but I can't recall that it's sitting on the - oh, the UDRP review. So that's the third one. Or did I already say that? Yes. No. The third one, the UDRP review.

Jonathan Zuck: Right.

Berry Cobb: But - and the...

Jonathan Zuck: I mean I guess I'm - I consider this a risk because it is a relatively short period of time to have some great success stories tell during the budget cycle. I wonder if we should default to this being a budget proposal and the pilot project is just for revisions of guidelines of how money is requested and how it's used to test that experience. But it's not some binary as to whether or not budget is requested. I mean can that be put on its head a little bit?

Treat the pilot project as a mechanism for refining the process by which the money is used as opposed to whether or not it's requested in the next budget cycle.

Berry Cobb: I think, you know, maybe how we can expand upon that is, you know, either A, we can increase the number of requests, you know, like I said, we're almost prescriptively placing five or less. We could bump that number up and then in conjunction with that make it fiscal year '17/'18 and/or '18 budget cycle. Because I do believe, you know, as Cheryl said, this is going to take a while to get absorbed into the community so that it's almost common practice.

But in terms of actually - at this very point and looking at where we're looking to deliver this, you know, we are off budget cycle. So I'm sure - I'm not sure how that would handle if we tried taking that approach.

At any rate, you know, I don't want to - we've got a few others to run through here. Welcome any edits to the language here or any other ideas. I think in general and I'll make sure to put this out in the email when we send out the version. All edits are welcome through Microsoft Word. Send them back to the list and staff will incorporate into the master. And we'll try to - we'll have that packaged up for our next meeting.

All right. So let's move on just for the sake of time, if anything. We'll worry about - you know, I think for the most part we're probably at levels of consensus. So I did remove the rough part.

Once after the first review of the recommendations themselves, I will come back and kind of modify the 5.3.4.4 expected impact of the proposed recommendation instead of keeping that a generic statement for the public comment so that there's at least some substance there in terms of what the impact would be.

I think for the most part at least at this stage the impacts are really going to be minimal should all of these recommendations be adopted or approved. There'll be updates to the workgroup guidelines or operating procedures. Probably the biggest impact would be this one that's, you know, there's some sort of budget implications to these requests. But we'll formalize those once we nail down the recommendations.

Okay. Moving on to the next section, Charter Questions G and H. G was a framework for distributing information to the GNSO policymaking community by informing and providing ongoing basis for identifying or correcting problems. That's AKA the decision tree as well as a request form.

And changes need to incorporate the processes described above and to the ongoing policy development process. And those are pretty much the updates to the working group guidelines.

Okay. So again, take another - that's really spooky. I had Google completely closed down. All of a sudden it opened itself up and then of course then the Norton kicks in and it's an update to Google. (Boy).

Definitely take a close scrutinization of the observations here. See if staff hasn't either misstated or if we need to - or if we may have missed some or - and some more additional observations need to be added.

So this next one is recommendation for - which I believe is still misnumbered wrong. It should probably be three. This has to deal with the early working group outreach.

The original recommendation I think was kind of a placeholder looking for a new location. Fortunately I did find existing language within the GNSO operating procedures, which is Annex 2 of the policy development process manual.

So what I'm suggesting here is that we make an update to Section 9, Page 63. And under the recommendation detail there is suggested language. So what I've done here is copied the original text - whoever has got their mic open, can you please mute your - thank you.

So you won't be able to see it in the red line version. So when you're reviewing this I suggest that you go to view without or just to review the final version. But what is listed here is two main updates that incorporate the two original kind of ideas that were created earlier on in our working group.

The first is the scope of outreach; what is typically limited to either stakeholder groups and constituencies or maybe a little bit further to

encompass all of the SOs and ACs. But it was determined that perhaps it might be even better to seek broader audience where additional expertise may be necessary.

So one of the edits encompasses this scope expansion in terms of the early outreach with, you know, it's not mandatory but where necessary and where working groups determine that that be the case.

And then the secondary change here is that any qualitative outreach should also include a quantitative complement to that such as the use of surveys. And the primary asset there again is just to attempt to help identify our - identify any possible trends based on the feedback that a working group would receive.

So again, just a couple of quick edits to existing language in the working group guidelines. They're highlighted with underline as to what the new suggested language would - what it would be.

I'm not the best writer in the world so please do edit away. Any thoughts or comments on this particular recommendation? I think that one was pretty straightforward as well as the next one.

So this is Recommendation 3, work product template. You know, prior or at least a couple of months ago you could almost kind of consider this outside of the scope of the working group. But some of our early versions of our draft recommendations did make suggested updates to the templates predominantly around the charter.

And we're making or suggesting two additional changes to that charter. I thought it would be best to help keep staff honest by just making a generic recommendation that we need to make templates for our work products in general.

And not to spoil details here but we're actually already working on this about creating true defined templates for the issue report. There'll be updates to the charter template in terms of look - or kind of a makeover and where most importantly what would be this report here is getting a dramatic makeover as well.

But the reason why - you know, I've mentioned the first reason why I thought it was good to go ahead and include this. And because we're hoping to submit a recommendation to the Council to add a template recommendation for the continuous improvement - or at least a measure; the effectiveness of any consensus policies being implemented, there wasn't necessarily a definitive final report template. So that was the first reason.

The second reason is just the working group guidelines themselves particularly Section 5 and Annex 1. It's very out of date. Half of those links are broken. They don't refer to templates themselves.

So what you see here in the recommendation details would be the suggested text that would get updated once these templates have been defined and then more specifically the work product example is a slight change to what is listed in the workgroup guidelines now.

Went ahead and made edits that we would point to IRTPD as examples, which is one of the most recent PDPs to have concluded. And then anything that's listed in brackets is what should be added or what should be updated or what should be removed. So when you take a look at this, do make sure you have the working group guidelines open as well and refer to that section. Okay.

Recommendation 4 is the charter template update. So again, there's kind of two updates that are going to be occurring through this particular recommendation. The first is creating - creation of that charter template and adding the two areas that the working group has defined.

And I do ask that the group take one really close strong look to Annex A of this report. And those changes are highlighted in red text. And we need to make sure that that makes sense as much as possible.

I'm slightly concerned that it's not mature enough and when we submit this out for public comment, that'll be too confusing and we may get a rash of comments that I don't understand what you're trying to accomplish here.

So do take a look at those suggested changes to the charter template itself. I we need to improve upon that a little bit, any help there would be appreciated. But secondarily there will also be an update to the working group guidelines.

There's a thinned down version of a charter that highlights the critical areas that should be considered when completing a charter within those guidelines. So we'll want to make sure to add these two suggestions into those guidelines as well.

Next Recommendation 5. Like I said, creating the final report template. And that new template there will be Section 7, which is either recommendations or - I don't know exactly how it'll look. But there will be a template recommendation there.

Should the working group choose - recommend any future consensus policy recommendations, the following template recommendations should be considered and submitted in the package of recommendations that one year post-implementation a review of that implementation will occur to determine if it was consistent with the policy intent or, you know, something along that language.

More or less it'll pretty much model what we have listed in the charter and Annex A of our report here. But that's what the idea of this Recommendation 5 is about. If it sounds confusing in the language that I have here listed in our

recommendation, please do offer up suggestions to try to make it as crisp as possible.

Secondarily is Recommendation 6. I just realized right before the call what is listed here on Page 24 I neglected to edit. This was originally Recommendation 2 that was part of the pilot program.

And the intent there is that because all of this content is new, there was no kind of introductory paragraph in the working group guidelines or the operating procedures that would introduce the work products that we've created here.

So it didn't fit next to the pilot recommendation. So I migrated it down here. Unfortunately I forgot to edit the Recommendation 6 text. It'll - the content will more or less stay the same. I'll remove like the issue identification and I need to update the location of the guidelines.

So I'll make sure to update that out this afternoon so I can send it out for you to provide comments on. But what I did do is include the suggested text, which is the recommendation details.

And so essentially we'd create a new Section 4.5, a metrics request decision tree and form. So I have the paragraph of the suggested language. Again, please - I'm not the best writer. So please enhance, change or add to to make this a little bit more clear when it would be uploaded into the guidelines.

And then this particular paragraph will point to the decision tree and the request form somewhere within the working group guidelines themselves, which takes us into the Recommendation 7, the final recommendation, which is to import the decision tree and the form into the guidelines.

And at this point I'm not sure exactly how that will be imported. The overall operating procedures is something like 80 pages long. Annex 1 is the working group guidelines. Annex 2 is the GNSO operating procedures.

I could probably envision a third annex being created that would contain the decision tree and form just because they're kind of awkward in size. And it wouldn't make sense that they would fit in the middle of the guidelines but that there would be pointers to it.

So I kind of left it in - as a kind of a yet to be determined statement. The last sentence of this recommendation that staff has the discretion of creating a link to complement these - or to point to these particular work products should they not necessarily fit in the guidelines.

But we want to make sure that wherever they're housed that it maintains the connectivity from the linking perspective and that it's still considered authoritative as connected to the working group guidelines.

All right. So that's a review of the changes of these recommendations. Like I said, I've got to make one quick update to the previous recommendation language. And I will send that out in the next hour or so.

And as I mentioned, all the group members are welcome to make suggested changes. I'll make sure track changes is enabled in the Word document. So edit away. Send them back to the list. I'll incorporate them into the master. We'll evolve this.

I'd like to try to have these suggested changes by 2359 next Monday. And I'll be able to fold those in and send them back out to the list so that we can review them next week.

So we are meeting on a weekly basis for the next two weeks should we need them. We'll definitely need next week's but hopefully we won't need the 28th so that we can open up and submit this for the public comment period.

I'm hopeful that perhaps by the 24th after our meeting next week we can set this up for public comment. If not, we do have a meeting scheduled for the 28th. And then we can shoot for the 29th.

The - I think the problem if we miss by the - if we miss later than the 31st then we won't make the deadline for the second meeting in September for the GNSO Council and then we'd have to punt to October for this to be considered by the Council.

So with that, I will be quiet and turn it back over to you Jonathan.

Jonathan Zuck: Thanks Berry. Great work on this document. So there you have it everyone. I think we're very close. And it's just really a question of going through the language and making suggestions and making it clear, you know, finding areas that might confuse people in the public comments and getting that feedback.

So please over the next week take a look at this document and propose any changes you see. This is the final stretch here for the public comments. So I really like the direction this is taking and let's just refine the language. Anybody have any questions? Pam, go ahead. Pam.

Pam Little: Hi Jonathan. Thank you. I have a question...

Jonathan Zuck: Yes.

Pam Little: ...about the quality of data or reliability of data. I don't know whether that is out of our scope for this working group. In the decision tree we have we don't seem to have considered the issue.

Let's say we get data from a third party source or contracted party or ICANN compliance. How do we ensure that data is actually accurate or reliable?
That's my question. Sorry. Hello.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: We can hear you. We might have lost Jonathan but we can hear you.

Pam Little: Okay. Great.

Berry Cobb: Jonathan, are you on mute? So I'll go ahead and maybe try to respond.
That's very good question Pam. You know, a definitive answer I think is probably a little bit impossible at this point because we really don't have an actual request.

But I think first and foremost that the primary component to this is that let's take for example that the BC submits a request to the GNSO Council to go get X data to conduct research on Issue Y. When that report is completed, it's not the BC that owns that request. It's the GNSO Council.

And so once the report is returned to the Council, it's distributed to everybody for the Council to deliberate on to make sure that that particular data is kept honest for lack of a better word.

If it's discovered in that process that it might be bad data, really then that kind of becomes a customer service issue, which I imagine that the Council would either kick it back to the vendor saying redo it or if it was in such a nature that it wasn't worth it, then we would just terminate the exercise and move on to the next request so to speak.

But I do believe that that is a valid point. And you're right, it doesn't necessarily - it's not necessarily reflected in the - it's not necessarily reflected in the decision tree. But perhaps if you'd like to take the pen on that, we can add that kind of stuff somewhere into the report.

Maybe it's kind of added into the recommendation details for the pilot for the community to consider about how that particular instance might be handled.

Pam Little: Thank you Berry. I will give it more thought. Really my concern is sometime it's all very well to have data to support fact based decision making. But sometime if your data isn't accurate or reliable, you might make the wrong decision or based on, you know, rely on wrong data or incorrect data. You might not make the best decision.

Berry Cobb: Absolutely. And, you know, certainly in a lot of cases we don't have any data. So we need to fix that part first. And then I think the other concern is even if the data is accurate or reliable, you know, there could be bias to the data. So, you know, that's a secondary component that we'll have to be aware of as this pilot matures through.

Pam Little: Thanks.

Berry Cobb: All right. I see that Jonathan's dropped. We only got a couple of minutes left. So I think we can probably go ahead and terminate the call. Same bat time. Same bat channel next week. And like I said, I'll get this next draft out to you all here in about an hour. And please send any suggestions or changes or edits or concerns by 2359 next Monday.

So take care and have a good productive week.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Bye.

Man: Okay. Bye.

Operator: The meeting has been adjourned. Thank you very much for joining. Please remember to disconnect all remaining lines and have a wonderful rest of your day.

END