Metrics and Reporting Working Group Meeting
TRANSCRIPTION
Wednesday 6 November 2013 at 1500 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Metrics and Reporting Working Group meeting on Wednesday 6 November 2013 at 1500 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-20131106-en.mp3
On page:
http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar#nov
(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)
The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page:
http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/

Attendees:
Mikey O'Connor – ISPCP
Cheryl Langdon-Orr – ALAC
Gabriel Vergara – NCUC
Theo Geurts – RrSG
Tony Onorato –unaffiliated
Mouhamet Diop – RrSG
Pam Little - unaffiliated
Jonathan Zuck – IPC
Jennifer Wolfe - NCA
Tom Lowenhaupt - ALAC

ICANN staff:
Lars Hoffmann
Berry Cobb
Glen de Saint Gery

ICANN staff:

Coordinator: Please go ahead. This afternoon's conference call is now being recorded.

Glen de Saint Géry: Thank you very much, (Tim). Good morning, good afternoon, good

                 evening everyone. This is the Metrics Reporting Working Group call on

                 Wednesday the 6th of November.

And on the call we have Mikey O'Connor, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Theo Geurts, Mouhamet Diop, Pam Little, Jennifer Wolfe. And for staff we have Berry Cobb, Lars Hoffman and myself, Glen de Saint Géry.

May I please remind you to say your names before speaking for the transcription purposes? And, Mikey, it's now over to you. Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks every so much, Glen. Welcome everybody.

Glen de Saint Géry: Sorry, Mikey, we've just been joined by Jonathan Zuck.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh, Jonathan. Good, good. Glad to have you on. So we'll just take a minute and take a look at the agenda and let people update their Statements of Interest. The agenda is in the upper left. I'm a dyslexic so I always have to think about that, upper left of your screen.

And basically a three-part agenda, we'll take a moment to talk about rotating our calls so that we spread the pain of 2:00 am calls for Cheryl and Pam across all of us.

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: Yeah. And then we'll work on the charter a bit and then we'll take a look at a work plan that Berry, I think, circulated to the list. He at least sent it to me. And that'll be our agenda for today. Any questions about the agenda or changes to your Statements of Interest? Berry, I saw your hand go up and then down, you want to jump in at this point?

Berry Cobb: I'll wait until Number 2.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. Cheryl, go ahead.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah, in reviewing my SOI for the GNSO I just want to note for this group that is does need updating and I will be doing it shortly. But obviously it's not reflecting two things that I'm - since I put that together now on - and in fact have been for some time - an individual member of the Non Commercial Stakeholder Group so I need to add that in. But I also then need to reflect my NomComm Chair for 2014 status.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh yes. Thanks, Cheryl. That's great. Okay I don't see anybody else's hand up so we'll move right on in to Section 2 which is the idea of rotating our calls after the Buenos Aires meeting. Berry, is that what you wanted to jump in on?

Berry Cobb: Yes, Mikey. This is Berry. Thank you. So based on the Doodle polls it was very clear - actually the first two Doodle polls that I've got unanimous selections but basically the 1300 UTC time and the 2100 UTC time was accommodative to everyone.

Basically we'll do an alternating pattern starting on the 4th of December. We'll start at 2100 UTC then the 11th we'll flip back to 1300 and then the 18th we'll go to the 2100. And around that timeframe hopefully we'll have at least concluded the chartering portion of our efforts and will determine what our schedule will look like in 2014 as we evolve into a working group from there.

One thing to note, and it's - I need to go back and look at our attendance list for the locations for everyone but we could possibly entertain just running the meeting week after week at just 2100 UTC. I just need to understand which of our members are in the European time zone and determine whether that can be done on a weekly basis instead of alternating.

I think that benefits a couple of reasons is mostly more predictable scheduling because it does get confusing alternating every other week with different times especially if one particular meeting gets cancelled then it gets even more difficult. And the secondary reason is just from a scheduling perspective as well.

But for now we'll go ahead and maintain this schedule and between now and December when, you know, at the beginning of December the 4th meeting we can ask the question again about just converting straight to 2100 UTC and if that's acceptable with both I think that might be the most accommodative.

And the interesting thing about it for me I think is it's probably one of the most - the latest working group sessions I've ever helped attend or anything. Usually they're all around 1400-1800 UTC typically. So hopefully the schedule is accommodative to everyone. It looks like it was based on the Doodle poll. We'll get those schedules and we'll go from there. So thank you, Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks, Berry. And thanks for putting that schedule together. Yeah, it would be nice to be on one time. I've been on alternating time working groups and it's pretty easy to get our skis crossed on that so let's indeed try to...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Nah...

Mikey O'Connor: Nah, Cheryl. Okay...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: A lot of working groups I'm on run three and four changes so...

Mikey O'Connor: Really?

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, ccNSO runs routinely on a three-time zone switch up.

Mikey O'Connor: Wow. You know, what can I say? Okay so here's where we're at, folks. I listened to the transcript from last week. And I think what I'd like to do is maybe let Berry and Jonathan kind of give us the high points of the emerging theme that seem to be emerging at the end which was this idea - well I'm going to let Berry and Jonathan sort of give us a quick summary of what we learned last week and try and work that into this revised mind map that's on the screen and then we'll carry on for the rest of the call.

Berry, do you want to do that? It looks like you're volunteering.

((Crosstalk))

Berry Cobb: Yeah, no, thank you. I'll take a quick stab at this and then Jonathan can chime in see if I missed anything. So essentially at last week's meeting we started kind of touching on the overall scope of what this eventual working group's effort will be like.

Our first part of our discussion is actually taking off to the left of the metrics and reporting circle there in the center. We did talk about other metric efforts that were going on in the community most specifically the consumer metrics. That was a working group that was formed last year and completed its work, passed their recommendations over to the ICANN Board for their consideration as to which a implementation advisory group is being formed of about 38 members across the community.

While their work definitely is attributable or directly connected to the GNSO it is much more targeted then for the new gTLD program and not so much - it's more at a macro level, for lack of a better word, than where we're - our scope is, which is more at the working group level and/or within just the GNSO.

And it's basically - not to say that we won't - not to say that we would ignore what's going on in that IAG group, in fact we might be able to leverage some of their activity but in general their scope is not aligned with ours. And so to put a bow tie on this after we had this little discussion then we refined the scope to understand that it was more at a working group level.

And in short summary it's basically - the first is to look at the policies that are developed out of our working group effort and be able to build a set of metrics around - well, first, trying to define a framework by which we seek metrics and reporting to help us better inform our decisions around policymaking.

The secondary component is to look at the policies that are - or the consensus policies that are created as an output of our working group efforts

and to be able to define what the critical success factors and metrics to measure how well those policies are being implemented.

The third component is roughly how - to basically build a framework in how we request metrics not only from ICANN but as well as external sources such as Spamhaus and different companies that help develop different types of...

((Crosstalk))

Berry Cobb: And then as well as part of that framework is also how do we engage with contracted parties and help define a framework or a boundary by which working groups can request data from contracted parties to make - to better inform the policy development process.

And then lastly is how any of these metrics can be - benefit the GNSO or the GNSO Council in general, which would, you know, be something along the lines of, you know, maybe that there would be end of year reviews from contractual compliance, consolidation of external resources our reporting that may help shed light on what the state of the industry is for the generic name space, etcetera.

All of which is still very loosely defined but in general, again, our scope is just predominantly around working group activities and how the GNSO Council itself can utilize or leverage better metrics and reporting platform.

And, Jonathan, do you have anything else to add to that?

Jonathan Zuck: Sure. I think probably one of the things that we should do is define a couple of terms. I think that fundamentally our task is about data and the

incorporation of data and statistics into the work of working groups and consequently the GNSO.

And that metrics are actually decisions about what data we want to track over time and set targets for in order to measure the success of a particular policy once it's been implemented.

So, I mean, so that's the thing. So we're going to try to develop frameworks for getting access to the data necessary to make informed decisions about policies going forward and frameworks for defining targets for the future of those statistics to determine what the success of the policy was.

I think that one thing that might be helpful is that we decided it was out of our scope for this working group to have a conversation about what metrics should be set for the organization as a whole but instead view this as establishing a process by which - from the ground up in a more organic way metrics become a part of policy development.

And so that's part of what makes it different from the Consumer Metrics project except insomuch as that Consumer Metrics project could have been an outgrowth of this process had it previously existed.

So I think it's about finding ways to get access to data and then coming up with a framework for using the data to set policy and a framework for establishing targets for that data so that there can be some statistical measures of success for policies once they're implemented.

Berry Cobb: Great. Thank you, Jonathan. And, Mikey, if I can just follow up? I missed a couple of items as well. Carrying on or attaching on to everything that

Jonathan said I think one of our tangible outputs from this effort would - to possibly include editing or modifying our work product templates that we use within a working group.

So for example, we have defined a framework about what metrics may benefit the policy process. We would want to introduce those into our templates like our charters, perhaps some of our issue reports, perhaps it becomes a required section for our final reports out of the working group and those kinds of components. So there's four or five different templates that are used within the GNSO that can perhaps be updated.

And then the last thing I would mention which kind of takes us back to the very original reason why this effort even got started to begin with and that centers around ICANN's contractual compliance.

There were two recommendations that the Council approved when this effort was launched. The first was that the GNSO Council will await for contractual compliance to complete their three-year plan before investigating any further actions that may or may not be necessary.

As I understand from Maguy Serad that their original three-year plan, started three years ago obviously, will conclude at the end of this calendar year. And so perhaps around January of next year to try to satisfy that original recommendation as of to invite Contractual Compliance to brief the GNSO Council on what they've accomplished over the last three years and then perhaps provide some insight on where they're heading for the next three years.

And then at that point the GNSO Council can make a determination as to whether there is additional policy work that may be required or be able to sign off on it.

So I think - and then our second recommendation that got this effort started, which is actually this eventual working group, and we just talked about the scope of that.

So when we start to hopefully finalize our final report to submit to the GNSO Council we'll try to marry back up with the first recommendation and collaborate with Contractual Compliance to make sure we're on the same page and then be able to present all of that to the Council roughly around the same time to close out this effort altogether. Thank you, Mikey.

Jonathan Zuck: Mikey, one more thing. This is Jonathan. Part of what I think is exciting about this particular effort is that it's not necessarily controversial. In other words, if we're defining frameworks for doing these things we're not - I don't think we'll have any knockdown drag out fights about - because we're not trying to come up with individual metrics and things like that in this effort.

So I'm kind of excited that it can be a working group that's devoted to brainstorming and improving processes and less about some of the ideological, you know, fissures that often crop up.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks, folks. That was very helpful for me; hopefully for others on the call as well. Let me just digest that last one a little bit so I don't forget. Okay so before I dive in does anybody else want to add anything to the understanding that we're at right now?

Mouhamet Diop: Mouhamet. I just have a question regarding - can you hear me?

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, yes. Go ahead, Mouhamet.

Mouhamet Diop: Oh okay. I just want to come back on the two items on this group regarding the deliverables and the approach. I just have a question regarding the assessment on where we are in term of - I understand that the goal of that metric is to be able to see if the opening of the new gTLD has changed significantly the way the customer trusts our system as a whole. And it's all about the consumer trust and competition in that area.

My question is do we have - do we have to work on the assessment on how we can - did the framework include the way we can capture the consumer opinions regarding the metrics that we already have (unintelligible) to people, to the GNSO and to the large - the (firm) parameters. And I really like the metrics versus data like what we want to measure. Do we have a good framework for metrics that already cover what you want to measure or not.

I think that this question of perception from the consumer perspective is something that we really need to address if it is - do we have any feedback from the audience that what we are measuring now covers the (feeling) of appropriate service or not or do we just work on a qualitative perception rather than a quantitative perception? So it's a question; it's really a question. And I don't know if it is part of what we should address or not in order to have a better understanding of the environment as a whole.

Jonathan Zuck: I can take a stab at that, Mikey, if you like.

Mikey O'Connor: Go ahead, Jonathan.

Jonathan Zuck: Yeah, I mean, I think that it's - it can be a little bit confusing because there's these parallel efforts. And so I think that Consumer Metrics project was one of the first metrics-based projects at ICANN.

And it's the result of a Board resolution that Bruce Tonkin introduced specifically to address one of the parts of the Affirmation of Commitments that sais that there would be a review a year from the first delegation as to whether or not the new gTLD program had successfully increased consumer - competition and consumer trust and choice.

So that particular group, you know, worked hard to figure out ways to measure those things some of which included polling, as you suggest. And so what of those things survives this next sort of winnowing process happening within that Implementation Advisory Group is still up for question, right?

Because the list of metrics that came out was too great and too extensive. And so it's going to be winnowed down and made smaller and more digestible so that they can be more easily tracked and portably tracked.

And so for the - answering those specific questions about that project are out of scope for this group but suggesting that some of the kinds of metrics - or let me eat my own dog food here.

Suggesting that some of the kinds of data that working groups have access to, have budget for, etcetera, into the future might include, you know, consumer subjective data - polling type data - I think is within our remit to suggest that there may be instances in which the best type of data is not

purely statistical but also includes subjective data. And that's probably one of the conversations that we should have here.

So I think we're trying to come up with a framework to make the job of future working groups easier to incorporate data and ultimately metrics into their work rather than commenting specifically or officially on the work of that other team. Although we can use some anecdotes - and Cheryl and I have plenty to share - that might inform the process.

But our goal here is a little more abstract in that we are trying to create a process by which data and metrics are more easily incorporated into policy development in the future.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks, Jonathan. Mouhamet, how did he did? Did that answer the question that you had or...

Mouhamet Diop: Yeah, and it was very helpful. In fact I did no try to (beat) into any specific area. The only thing I was trying to see is not necessarily to evaluate what the working group has done because this is a wonderful job that (happened) already there. But - and I really understand that the core of the job we are doing is really one year after the launching to be able to give, well, an idea about if the way that ICANN is doing cover what we're trying to do.

And I think that our scope will take on a framework and not necessarily going to - into any details on any evaluation of the existing group. But seem to me we have to add onto the questions regarding framework and the coverage of that framework. Sometime we just want to know if - where you're going to start and when you have to stop in order to avoid any confusion or any extensive work that we'll not be able to cover.

And I fully agree with Jonathan that we really have to be clear regarding the border of these jobs and the framework we just try to do. But some time we just need to answer the question regarding the actual assessment of the jobs if what - I mean, the subjects, the matter we're discussing, do we have a clear - a clear perception of the existing metrics we're using to show how data have been delivered and how, I mean, does this cover what you want to know?

Because evaluation means we come from somewhere and one year later what is the impact of the introduction of new gTLD in our environment? It means we're going to use metrics - existing metrics so we're going to use an environment at how well they have been defined.

So my question is to which extent we can just ask ourselves the question regarding how we're going to open up or just stick on the existing environment that we already have to be sure that we answer the proper question why we create that (team).

So I don't have the answer; I'm just asking if we really need to go and to try to put the existing assessment as part of this or do we think that we have to do a recommendation regarding periodically. It can be every six months, every two months. Do we - I mean, the existing metrics we have, do we have a proper feed of data regarding these metrics to get the output we're expecting to get?

Does that mean something regarding what we really want to measure or not? So I think that the working group have gone into details that we're not supposed to talk about but the framework, yes, but not the detail of it.

Mikey O'Connor: So, Mouhamet, I think you and I are struggling with the same puzzler and that is that it's hard for me right now to understand the - the edges between what this working group, when it turns into one, does and what that Consumer Metrics group does.

And there's some blur - there's a lot of overlap between those two. And I think that one of the things that we will all benefit from is trying to come up with very clear scope boundaries that describe what's in that project. Which, it's my understanding that a lot of assessment stuff, especially as it has to do with the new gTLDs, Mouhamet, lives in that Consumer Trust project and is thus outside the scope of ours.

I think one of the things - and perhaps the most important or at least one of the most important things for this chartering to do is to make it clear the edges of what this working group is going to do as compared to what the Consumer Trust...

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Zuck: I think the easiest way to think about the distinction is that that is an implementation of, you know, that could have been an example of an implementation of the framework that we're trying to create.

So the best way to think - to find the boundaries vis-à-vis that project is to say there's no relationship and that in fact take some future example like the debate currently surrounding thick Whois. So there's discussions about thick Whois being, you know, added to the big - and I don't want to get into the details of that debate; I didn't mean to give you a heart attack, Mikey.

But so you have a discussion about thick Whois. Had you gone in with a notion of once we come out with a policy it has specific objectives such as increasing Whois data accuracy, for example.

That - one argument can be made that in a thick Whois you're more likely to have a more accurate data in the system. And if that's true then that's measurable and that should have been incorporated into our work when we were in that working group.

And so I think the job of this group is to explore and set parameters and, as Berry said, develop a toolkit and worksheets, you know, and modify the ones that exist so that the output of future working groups are able to have the data they need to make the decisions up front and have a data bias introduced into the policy development process going forward.

So I actually believe there's absolutely no connection between the work we're doing and what the consumer trust project is doing except that it is an example of an attempt to incorporate metrics into a policy process.

So, I mean, it's an example. And in a way it wasn't implemented in the way - it wasn't implemented in the sort of working group-specific way that we're trying to work on here. But I think - I think there's - I don't think those projects actually even touch each other.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks, Jonathan. I'm going to go to Berry and then I have thoughts. Go ahead, Berry.

Berry Cobb: Thank you, Mikey. This is Berry. My interpretation is spot-on with Jonathan's. And I liked your use of the Thick Whois Working Group. I think we, you know, I consider that as kind of a use case that we might to study as well as PDNR and some other past working group efforts.

So I think we have plenty of materials there to understand what we could have done better, you know, almost a after-action report so to speak on, you know, what could have been some metrics going into it, what could have been some metrics coming out of it, again, those critical success factors.

So certainly I would think that one line item of our scope for our charter is to review these past efforts and determine, you know, the pros and cons of that effort in terms - from a metrics standpoint.

And then just to try to close off the whole Consumer Metrics component, again, Jonathan, you were spot-on. There really is zero connection between that effort and what we do here at the working group level because we're really more focused around the policy process whereas the Consumer Metrics stuff is more an implementation-based component out of the new gTLD program.

Having said that, there is, you know, I wouldn't want to say, again, that we just want to completely ignore what's going on there because that does impact the GNSO. And for those that are newer to this process or to the GNSO community it's not a won-and-done type of review.

In fact, you know, the AOC says that one year after first delegation the review will take place but it also says two years after the first review you're going to do it again and then it's every four years after that.

So I - while I'm not a part of that effort anymore I suspect that there will be a platform that is created that the GNSO as well as the entire community uses that platform as a tool on a daily, monthly, yearly basis for that fact as to how the GNSO begins to monitor the state of the industry.

And that is certainly something that we could potentially offer up as a recommendation, you know, to help guide the council in how they're going to potentially consume these metrics.

And as I pointed to earlier it's something that, you know, maybe we should discuss is, you know, does - is it worthy for the council or the GNSO to have this end of year review on the state of the generic namespace I don't want to use the term industry but at least the generic namespace.

And, you know, what happened in the past year? What are we looking to next year? And what are those metrics that are going to help us better read what happened and what's about to happen.

And so, you know, as a it's just a brainstorm at this juncture though I can see at the December GNSO council meeting there's 45 minutes set aside that says all right let's hear from contractual compliance and what their metrics that they've done for the year from a compliance standpoint.

Let's look at abuse metrics external to ICANN and see what's going on out there. And then let's take a look at the consumer metrics for the gTLD program and see what's going on there.

And that just at the very least will help to consistently inform the council and the GNSO about the direction of the industry.

So that's about the only connection I can really see with our effort with potentially what's going on with the consumer metric. Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks Berry. I'm going to give you in Jonathan a tip when you see me not typing very much what it's probably an indication of is that you're talking about things that I think the working group will probably be doing.

But from a chartering standpoint what I'm really trying to zero us in on is what's in and what's out of that scope.

And so let's all be conscious that we don't want to do the work of the working group here. What we want to do is give working group a good map as to what the work they should be doing is.

Let me try out an idea on the group here and see how close we are. I'm going to tell the story as I hear it right now which is that the charter is I'm going to start with the approach because I think somewhere in here it starts to emerge somewhere between deliverables and approach it starts to emerge that what that working group that we are developing a charter for would be doing is this framework development that there would be no actual assessment work done by the working group.

The working group would be and I think Jonathan said that entirely a process focused effort and not a content focused effort if you will.

So we this - the idea here would be that it would be zeroed in on the GNSO at least for now. It would enhance the templates that the GNSO uses in its policy development work both at the front and in what's supposed to come out the back.

Man: Yes.

Mikey O'Connor: But that we wouldn't actually populate any of these metrics with data. What we would be doing is describing the process by which policy developers would use metrics to guide their work and also define metrics as they're getting done.

Now somebody's got horns going in the background. So they need to mute. Whoever just heard a horn somebody else had a piano going earlier that was pretty cool. I kind of like the piano part.

But do be conscious...

Man: Did the horn stop?

Mikey O'Connor: ...muting.

Man: Right I guess it didn't stop but okay.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes I think...

Man: (Unintelligible) properly and so forth.

Mikey O'Connor: Well there are lots of ways to mute. So one way to mute is depending on whether you're on the bridge or on the Adobe Connect so you have to follow that path.

And if you're on the bridge if you have a phone with a mute button that's the way I do it. That's the easiest way.

The bridge itself to mute you use what Star 6 on this kind of bridge? Somebody help me out here. I can't remember. I think it's Star 6 to mute.

Man: Yes Star 6.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. Anyway so am I getting that story right roughly right when we say look this is all about a framework. This is not out actually doing it's not about developing metrics.

And the reason I ask that is because that eases us past this giant list of things in a pretty handy way because what we could then do is say to the working group in - through our charter we could say to the working group dear working group these are the kinds of things that you may want to include in this process.

And there may be some discretion required where at times some of these are more or less important. But again we wouldn't develop - again I don't want to get into the work of the working group.

What I'm trying to do is narrow the work of our working group...

Man: Right.

Mikey O'Connor: ...so that we don't, you know, task the working group with something that's so gigantic that they never get done. And so I'm (unintelligible) with...

Man: I think one way to look at it Mikey is we're going to do well for free what usually is paid millions of dollars to McKenzie to do poorly.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh good. That's our usual standard here at ICANN at least at the bottom of the bottom up process. Unfortunately as you rise towards the top...

Man: No but this is SL reform is what we're doing. That's my point. I mean that's...

Mikey O'Connor: Well I yes I don't want to go that far. You know, again it's easy for these kinds - and then it's part of the reason I'm being so cautious about scope is because it's very easy for scope on things like this to explode.

And so that's why I'm so interested in this scope discussion because I think once we get the scope worked out the rest of writing this charter is going to be very easy.

These charters for those of you who've never written one of these before are usually quite short. They're only a couple of pages long at least in terms of the meat of them.

I mean there's a big form they get filled out but in terms of the really core bit of the charter this isn't a great big document.

Now there's a bunch going on in the chat. Let me just see if I can capture some of that. (Gabriel) is asking just out of curiosity can we get any template examples and its resulting metrics and if they currently exist?

And Berry is saying we really don't have any. We certainly have lots of work product from working groups but I think Berry is right.

We don't have much in the way of examples of working groups PDP working groups either using pre-existing data and metrics or creating new metrics.

And I think that the framework that I think is emerging here is what will guide that work for future...

Jonathan Zuck: That's right.

Mikey O'Connor: ...working group efforts is that sort of tell the story right Jonathan, Berry?

Jonathan Zuck: I certainly think so.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. Berry's in with a check mark as well. And so is (Cheryl). I think that's very helpful. I think it makes the charter much easier and clearer to write.

And it may be that what we want to try and do I'm assuming that this is our maybe I should ask this question is this our last call before Buenos Aires?

I'm assuming...

Man: Yes sir.

Mikey O'Connor: ...next Wednesday is problematic it's certainly problematic for me.

Okay so we have a nice gap. Berry since you're the task the staff guy tasked at this would you like to take a shot at drafting sort of the approach and deliverable section based on this conversation to give us something to edit? Are we at the stage where you feel like you could do that?

Berry Cobb: Sure thing. I can this is Berry. I can put out or construct a first draft and send it out. And then we can modify it from there. I'm sure I'm likely to not be directly on target but that's the beauty of about collaboration.

Man: I'm happy to work with you on it too Berry.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. I mean I think that what we'd like to do is get as much of this work done on the calls just so we don't otherwise what we fall into is a drafting team for the drafting team. And it starts to get hard to keep people on the same page.

So what I'm thinking is that if Berry could just whack very quickly a rough cut and then push it to the list I think that the list could carry the conversation for a while on this and sort of move things forward.

You know, because at least for me the first few days down in Buenos Aires I'm probably going to have some spare time and then things are going to get a little crazy.

I sort of want to take a stop and check point here because I think what we've just done is dramatically narrowed the scope of what we're proposing.

I mean I agree with it. And I'm fine with it. But I want to check with the rest of you. And maybe the thing to do is just highlight that I think this is a fairly critical narrowing this notion that we are not going to be doing anything terribly specific we're going to be describing the process by which these metrics are developed, used, et cetera.

And that then subsequently working groups will use this framework that the - emerges from this to shape their work.

I think that's critically important because if people's expectation is that, you know, it's back to the conversation we had earlier, you know, about the consumer trust thing where, you know, there are assessments that need to be done on a schedule.

And it should be clear by the end of our charter drafting that the next phase of this work the workgroup is not going to do those kinds of assessments. It's going to define the framework in which those assessments get done.

Man: Right.

Mikey O'Connor: I think that's a good thing but it's a narrower thing. And I really want to dwell on that narrowing to make sure the people are okay with it. (Tony) go ahead.

(Tony):   Mikey hi yes this is (Tony). First off I apologize for being late to the call today. I was detained. But I just wanted to chime in on this and you may well have addressed this and this may well be a function of my being late so I apologize for that.

But in the narrowing here can you just talk a little bit about how you envisioned first of all I'm completely in favor of narrowing.

But when you talk about narrowing so that we are more simply describing a process of how the metrics will be developed are we also trying to provide what we believe are the endpoints that those metrics need to reach such that we're talking about the process and we're talking about talking also about the types of questions within the abuse universe that we are aiming for these metrics to get at or are we going to continue to leave that more undefined and allow the working group really to try and define what those metrics will be targeted at?

Mikey O'Connor: It's the latter at least in my view (Tony). And this is part of the reason I really want to dwell on this today and perhaps on the next call as well is that and we'll pick on Thick Whois since Berry and Jonathan have already started picking on that and since I chaired that one.

Thick Whois is a working group that just wrapped up or at least we hope it did. It just got approved by the GNSO and is now on its way to the board.

In our final report today there are no metrics there are no measures of success for that policymaking decision. So the decision was all registry should be Thick. I'm not going to go any further than that. If that's confusing don't worry about it.

The I think that that what I'm hearing is that at the end of the work that we're chartering there would be more requirements on me as the chair of that working group to say oh we're not done yet.

We as a working group in addition to recommending that all Whois should be Thick also need to describe some metrics by which we're going to measure the success of that effort.

And provide framework in which the working group develops those metrics, highlights them for the GNSO.

The GNSO then becomes aware of them in the approval process perhaps compliance becomes aware of those as well, et cetera, et cetera.

But we this next working group would not be defining the metrics by which anything is judged. It would be defining the process by which those metrics are developed.

(Tony): All right. I think this is (Tony) again. I mean that make sense to me. I wonder if there isn't a nuance there in the difference between defining the metrics that quantify the success of the effort versus defining metrics that allow for fact based decision making in the anti-abuse area.

So I guess I wonder whether there aren't broad target questions that we would want to indicate these are the types of questions that might need to be answered in order to facilitate fact based decision making in this particular area.

We're not going to try and tell you specifically what the metrics are at a more granular level in order to answer those questions.

But that's I think that's I think there's a nuance there and that's what I've been kind of hung up on in the narrowing discussion.

Mikey O'Connor: Right. And I think that where I'm landing and this is again part of the reason I really want to emphasize this discussion is that this working group would not be describing any metrics.

It would be describing the process by which they are developed in the policymaking process because in some cases the metrics would describe abuse, in some cases the metrics would describe quality of data, in some cases the metrics would describe purely process things like the ability of registrars to access certain kinds of data in order to make certain kinds of registrant transfers possible.

And so this working group that we are chartering would not touch any metrics at all. It would only describe the process by which they're developed and leave the definition of metrics at a high level or a granular level up to the process that's defined in this work. That's where I'm sort of seeing this conversation going.

Jonathan Zuck: The only Mikey sorry I'm not in front of the computer so I can't raise my hand. I apologize.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh Jonathan's there. Let me just circle back to (Tony) and make sure that I don't (Tony) I don't necessarily need you to agree with me I just need to make sure that I'm making myself clear to you is that clear?

(Tony): No, yes I think that is clear. And defining the process I think is critical obviously to this because that's I don't think that there's a lot of disagreement at the end about the day about the types of metrics the types of facts that would be useful in the decision making process, and the types of

questions that the contracted parties would probably themselves like to see answered and the types of informed decision making they would like to see go on.

So I think the root of the really where the nub of the issue is going to be is in accepting the process by which that data of that ilk is collected.

So I think you're exactly right that defining the process and carefully moving through the process is going to be where the hard work needs to get done.

And I think not confusing that by trying to define endpoints would certainly make sense. So I mean my question was more of a question rather than really a quibble with your point.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. Well then, you know, one of the things that as you're talking it occurs to me that once the process is at least sketched out by this next working group one of the things that may fall out of that work is a list of metrics that people want to see defined.

And...

(Tony): Yes.

Mikey O'Connor: ...in the case, you know, if we had a huge churn of working groups like Thick Whois on the GNSO calendar we could let the working groups pick off the metrics as they worked.

However we may not. In which case what we might want to do is say okay there's a Phase 1 that describes the process. And it's very purely process orientated and doesn't define any metrics.

And (Bo) charter is another working group or two or three to actually grind through that process and develop a series of metrics.

And in that case I think we would have to pay attention to what the consumer trust project has already done because then, you know, there are several projects at work developing metrics.

And in fact the consumer trust folks might be able to be an early consumer of our processes developed. So...

Man: So...

Mikey O'Connor: ...Jonathan over to you. Sorry I just wanted to nail that down with (Tony) before I...

Jonathan Zuck: No thank you, thank you, thank you. Sure and the only thing I wanted to amend to your description was that is that I think another part of our agreement is talking about how data gets used as a problem definition as well.

In other words, you know, this framework we develop I think will ultimately say that where possible use data in the definition of the problem you're trying to solve and therefore use that same data in determining whether in fact you solved it.

And so it's two parts. One is getting access to the data necessary to understand what the scope of the problem is and why we're doing what we're doing and then the backend of it is measuring it down the road again to see if what we did created a change in that data?

(Tony): Got it.

Jonathan Zuck: Does that make sense Mikey?

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. I'm just typing. Let's see whether I've got this right.

Jonathan Zuck: In high school debate they had this...

Mikey O'Connor: Right.

Jonathan Zuck: ...they had this structure harm, inherency, plan and solvency.

Mikey O'Connor: Holy mackerel.

Jonathan Zuck: You had to define what the harm was what was wrong. You had to demonstrate that the problem wouldn't solve itself that was inherency.

You had to suggest what you were going to do to solve it. And then prove what you said your plan would work to solve it.

And so it's sort of that kind of a structure of let's make our decisions about what to do based on data to the extent possible and the let's use that data again down the road to see if what we decided actually had the outcome we desired.

Mikey O'Connor: Right. And I think one of the dilemmas that the RAP the Registration Abuse Policies working group ran into is that we didn't have any data on which to base the conversation.

And so we have sort of the which comes first the chicken or the egg problem? And we may want to try to instruct the working group to try and figure out how to address that because we live in a bit of a data vacuum still.

It's better than it was because of many of the changes that happened in the compliance arena but we're still facing some gaps there.

Now I'm conscious that we're very close to the top of the hour. And so I want to quick jump down to (Gabriel) and perhaps...

(Gabriel): Hi.

Mikey O'Connor: ...perhaps go ahead.

(Gabriel): Now you hear me. I wasn't (unintelligible)...

Mikey O'Connor: Sorry.

(Gabriel): First of all well from my own experience and one of the things that I visualize always before we start to make any progress with data mining before making any kind of metrics and as I made whilst I mention it was these questions about why when and so on.

But one of the things that we should be always really be careful if you're going to hand over a set of instructions to everyone else to do it you should we should be really clear what we are going to do with this data and what is the standard that we expect inside organization within the boundaries of so that you don't forget that when you start to work with 20, 30, 50 groups different workgroups everybody will do as best they think they understand.

So you have to start with (unintelligible) instructions for those kinds of things that they are basic so that you in the end don't end with a lot of (unintelligible) data they don't serve the reason that you are doing it.

So you have to be really tight. What are the boundaries that you are going to set for the metrics so you don't have them in the end when you start to have - put together what you have in your vegetable basket that you have bananas and apples mixed together.

Mikey O'Connor: I think those are very good...

(Gabriel): (Unintelligible) and production line metrics we have many factories making a lot of things. I mean at the end we have to give to some managers to figure about the data and they were overwhelmed by the data.

And they were mixing bananas and apples. And let's try to be really clear what's the data for? Where are you going to collect any data you need to make - for decision making you should be setting boundaries.

And yes it sounds a little bit difficult in this kind of organization in the ICANN because we are global. And we have cultures. And we have some working.

And we have to making to start to think also how we are going to make training instructions?

Mikey O'Connor: I think those are great words to end on because I think that if we can accomplish that if we can accomplish a clear framework that working groups and the PDP process can use both for data coming in and for data going out of the policymaking process and write those processes, and instructions, and forms and so on clearly enough to meet that standard that we will have done a great good thing.

Berry it's two minutes after three minutes 3-1/2 minutes after the hour. You better speak fast because I think we need to wrap up.

Berry Cobb: Yes this is Berry. I will. So I will have a first draft of the charter out to the drafting team early next week.

And then we can try to work with that on the list up until we meet again on 4 December on our regular schedule.

And just a reminder we will have the face to face meeting which is scheduled for Thursday, 21 November its 8 o'clock local time to Buenos Aires.

There has been a note sent out to the list with the dial out details. So we will have remote participation available. And look forward to seeing everybody there. Thank you Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Terrific Berry. Thanks and thanks Jonathan for carrying the load last week. I really appreciate it. With that we'll end the recording call it a day. I'll see many of you in Buenos Aires.

For those of you who don't know me I'm the guy that wears a lot of stuff around his neck. I stick out because I keep every button that everybody gave me. And I would love to meet you all. See you soon. Thanks all.

Man: Thank you.

Man: Thanks Mikey. Bye-bye.

Man: Bye all.

END