

**Metrics and Reporting Working Group Meeting
TRANSCRIPTION
Wednesday 23 October 2013 at 1400 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Policy & Implementation Drafting Team meeting on Wednesday 23 October 2013 at 1400 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-20131023-en.mp3>

On page:<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar#oct>
(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Attendees:

Cheryl Langdon-Orr - ALAC
Mikey O'Connor – ISPCP
Gabriel Vergara – NCA
Theo Geurts – RrSG
Tony Onorato –unaffiliated
Jennifer Wolfe – NCA
Mouhamet Diop – RrSG
Pam Little - NTAG

Apologies:

Tom Lowenhaupt - At-Large
Jonathan Zuck - IPC

ICANN staff:

Lars Hoffmann
Berry Cobb
Glen de Saint Gery
Nathalie Peregrine

Coordinator: Welcome and thank you for standing by. I'd like to remind all participants today's conference is being recorded. If you have any objections you may disconnect at this time. You may begin.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much (Tonya). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everybody. This is Metrep conference call on the 23rd of October, 2013. On the call today we have Theo Guertz, Gabriel Vergara, Tony Onorato, Mikey O'Connor, Jennifer Wolfe, and Pam Little. We have received no apologies for today's call. From staff we have Berry Cobb, Glen DeSaintgery, Lars Hoffman, and myself, Nathalie Peregrine.

I'd like to remind all participants to please state their names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and over to you Berry.

Berry Cobb: Thank you Nathalie. And I see that Pam Little just joined us in Adobe Connect as well. Thank you everyone for joining today. We're picking up from where we left off last week, which was our first session to kick off the drafting team and define the charter for this new working group - or eventual working group for GNSO Metrics and reports. We basically have a pretty short agenda for the day - or a simple agenda. I wouldn't call it necessarily short. We'll go ahead and bypass statements of interest because I believe everybody has posted theirs.

We will be sending out an update to all the members of the working group for everyone that's joined and I think we may have one member that hasn't posted their SOI yet, but we'll get that taken care of. So our second agenda item is really our last item to clear up all of the formalities of taking off an effort like this. And this is to elect a chair to guide us through the chartering phase. And if you'll recall I sent out a couple emails to the list late last week and early this week.

There was - Mikey O'Conner had graciously volunteered to help lead this effort and it was also seconded by (Sheryl) and also by Tero as well. I'd also like to open up if anybody else is interested in taking on this role. So please state so now. Else, if we don't...

((Crosstalk))

Berry Cobb: If we don't have any other objections to Mikey being chair, then we'll gladly hand the reigns over to him. And Mikey, if you're (unintelligible) please go ahead.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. This is Mikey for the transcript. I would love to see a co-chair or a two. For example -- I'm not going to be able to be on the call next week because I'm going to be on a flight. So I'm happy to carry on with chairing, but it would be nice to spread that out a bit. So if anybody would like to join me on that -- that would be terrific. I may do some arm twisting if nobody volunteers, but not on the phone. But if anybody wanted to try their hand at co-chairing, that would be great.

Berry Cobb: Great. Thank you Mikey. I do believe there was some possible interest from Jonathan that's not on the call right now. So after the call today I'll send out another message to the list looking for a possible secondary co-chair or third if we need one and we can get that straightened out.

All right. So if nobody objects to that - at least Mikey taking the help today, then I'll turn it over to Mikey for the remainder of the call as chair of the drafting team and we'll move forward in trying to get the charter completed over the next couple of sessions. So Mikey, let me know how I may help and you have the help.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks Berry and thanks all. This is Mikey again. I think that what I'd like to do today is essentially a brainstorming session. But before we get into that - Berry one action item is for you, and that is did you get any response from the contracted parties? Or are we still a non-contracted parties working team - drafting team right now?

Berry Cobb: So far you are correct. They have not received any word back from the contracted parties. I'll send another note out to the - at least the registrars chair and -- of course -- the registries chair to...

((Crosstalk))

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. Why don't you send another note - why don't you copy Jonathan Robinson on that one too - chair of the council? Because I think that if we don't get representation from the contracted parties pretty soon we sort of have to wait until we do. Otherwise we're sort of out of compliance. Not compliance formally, but out of whack in terms of what we're doing here because there is a sort of balancing that needs to take place.

And so on this call I'm going to sort of advocate what I would guess to be the position of the contracted parties, but that's only because I've spent a lot of time with them on this issue. And we really need to get real representation from them. So if you could take that action, that would be great, Berry.

Go ahead Tero.

Tero Mustala: Contracted parties - you are referring to the registries or registrars if I heard correctly. So if somebody from the registrar group would be present here then that party would be represented?

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. That would do it. We really need representation from both kinds of contracted parties because the impact -- I think -- on registries and registrars is going to be different for the metrics and reporting. So I would be happier if we had a registrar, but I'd be happy if we had registrars and registries.

Tero Mustala: Well, I do represent a registrar and I'm a member of the registrar group.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh, good.

Tero Mustala: So from the registrar perspective I would be able to cover that. The registry side I'm not aware of.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes.

Tero Mustala: And it should be somebody on the world group emailing list. Forgot his name (Muhammad), who is also a member of the registrar group and is also represented a registrar. So there should be two people at least.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh, that's fantastic. Okay. Thank you Tero. That's good to know. Jennifer, go ahead.

Jennifer Wolfe: Yes. I just had one question as we get started and moving into the drafting process. As I was looking through the materials I wasn't quite clear - is the scope of what we're trying to create on the charter here just the process and the framework? Or are we actually trying to create a template for the substance of what's in the metrics and reporting?

Mikey O'Connor: Oh, that's a great question. And that -- I think -- is something that we'll revisit several times -- I'm sure -- as we go. That the role of a drafting team is we are essentially a group that's assisting the council in drawing up a charter. And as you can see in that form that Berry's got on the screen in front of us -- one of the things that the drafting team does is we come up with a draft of what the scope of the project of the working group is to be.

And I think -- at least on most drafting teams that I've been on -- that's one of the key products of what we come up with. But then that document goes to the council as - the council is really where the final decision gets made. And the work that we do goes to them as a draft and the council can -- and often does -- then change the final charter. And so I think what we do is we sort of tease out as many of the interesting issues that we can think of in terms of scope and sometimes approach.

And then the process of the working group itself is fairly predetermined, you know. We're largely -- sort of -- if you've chartered a project before, we're a lot like the group that develops the charter for any project, you know. What's

the scope? What's the problem we're trying to solve? Etcetera. And the more that we can flesh that out and give a pretty clear description of what's in scope and what's out of scope, the better we serve the council when they ultimately pick this up. So that - great question Jennifer. Does that give you the answer you were looking for? Or did I miss?

Jennifer Wolfe: No. And I understand all that. I guess what I was getting at is because this is about metrics and reporting and a lot in here in terms of the draft mission and scope was about process. I guess I'm just wondering, you know, how - I guess I'm asking the question more substantively to us as a group is how deep do we think we need to go? And the scope - is the scope for this working group to really dig into what is the substance of the reports that are provided or is it just about what's the process for the contracted parties to provide the reports? If that makes sense.

Mikey O'Connor: Right. Okay. So I misunderstood your question. And let me try again. I think that the first step for us as a drafting team is to frame the question, "What's the problem we're trying to solve?" Now one of the problems I know we're trying to solve -- because Berry and I were on the registration abuse policies working group that was the genesis of this -- is that ICANN's affirmation of commitment says we should be doing fact based policy making. And in many cases there aren't very many facts on which to base those policies.

And so one of the things - one of the problems that we are trying to solve is get better facts. And to that extent - and to that end -- I think, Jennifer -- that we do a little bit of both. I think we define, okay, what facts -- not we the drafting team, but the working group that ultimately picks up this work -- I think the working group needs to figure out which facts and what's the process to collect those facts. I think it's a bit of both.

Our job as a drafting team is simply to describe that - that working group process. We -- as a drafting team -- don't get into that. We simply say, "These are the kinds of things that the working group ought to explore and here are

some of the things that we think the working group probably should not explore." And then push that off to the council for approval. Does that - I think that's better.

Jennifer Wolfe: Yes. Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: (unintelligible). Yes. Okay. Thanks. And thanks - let me emphasize that when I swing and miss like I did the first time, please feel free to come back and ask me again because this business of what a drafting team does versus what a working group does trips everybody up -- including me. So don't be shy if I confuse you. Tony, go ahead.

Tony: Yes. I guess it's along the same lines in the sense of the substance of what is fact-wise we're trying to develop a framework for request. Let me ask that differently. I know this a registration abuse working group that led to this current project and I know we're focusing -- to an extent at least -- on how to develop and request data on abuse related issues.

But I guess my question is are we focused on abuse data specifically or are we trying to develop a framework for requesting data that doesn't just relate to abuse but might relate to other information that the contracted parties have that would assist in fact based policy making?

So it's kind of a longwinded way to try and get at what is the data that we're trying to develop a framework for requesting.

Mikey O'Connor: That's another...

((Crosstalk))

Tony: ...different depending on the type of data - what we think about. So sorry. Go ahead.

Mikey O'Connor: I think that's right. No, no, I think you're absolutely right. And I think that what we do as the drafting team is we explore that scope question. What I was rattling off at the beginning was the genesis of the project -- which did come out of the registration abuse working group. But I think as we go through some of this background material - what we're going to find is that in fact the scope can get broader. And to a certain extent I think that the biggest challenge for the drafting team is going to be to put the limits on the scope.

Tony: Okay.

Mikey O'Connor: And then the biggest challenge for the working group is going to be to live within those limits and I think that really the most interesting discussion is going to be what's in and what's out of scope of this because the registration abuse policies working groups scope was actually fairly narrow compared to the possible scope.

Tony: Right.

Mikey O'Connor: And so then the tussle and the reason that we need good representation across all the stakeholder groups is that there's a tension between what the non contracted parties may want and what the contracted parties may be feeling comfortable providing. And that tension is not something that we solve as a drafting team -- except in the most macro ways. I mean if we can find some things that are clearly out of scope, I think that would be helpful for the working group to follow.

But the nuance -- I think - will be an issue that the working group will have to deal with all the way through its whole process because that was a difficult - not difficult in a bad way, but a complicated issue for the registration abuse policies working group and other working groups -- was trying to figure out the line between facts required for policy making and too many facts that divulged confidential information or proprietary information that the contracted

parties either don't want to reveal --- because its proprietary -- or feel that they can't -- in the case of some kinds of privacy issues and stuff like that.

So it's a very interesting needle to thread and I think the most interesting part of the work that we're going to do. I think once we've got the boundaries of that -- at least described and framed -- then I think the rest of the work flows fairly matter of factly out of that. Very good.

Tony: Thank you. Yes. That's very, very helpful. Thank you Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: (Gabrielle). Carry on.

(Gabrielle): You hear me. Yes.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. Hear you fine.

(Gabrielle): I was wondering -- I've been working with a lot of workgroups in my company and global companies about metrics and doing some metrics. And emergency response centers and so on. And the first question it was when I have been sitting with these teams to develop the policies - what to do, when to do it, and what data will be provided -- is to ask to whom, when, what, and where. And most important of that is why. So when we know to whom the data is - it will be collected -- and the policies that we are going to make? When are we going to send it -- or where? And what kind of data?

And we probably - we can start to find the tracks to provide those (policies) correctly and locate them in the forms or kind of flags or whatever we have to do to provide information - complete information and valuable information to the end-user or the person who will be using this data.

So my main question is when we are going to make policies and we are going to try to figure to whom the data would be collected would be the first question. And then when this data and where it's collected and what we are

going to do with that data? Because -- for instance -- we have (an action) against any flag that we have to raise - let's suppose that somebody is abusing of DNS and so on -- and we have to send to an immediate action response team or whatever, then we have to also provide the information to the developers or something - the persons who are making the reports -- what to do with that data and where to send it? So that the metric that we call, like they are not lost in the (big) space. And the most important of them is (why).

Mikey O'Connor: As you can see on your screen now -- I hope.

(Gabrielle): I see it. Yes. I see it.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. Okay. It's showing up for the rest of you. This is -- I think -- precisely the kind of work that we -- as the drafting team -- can do to help the council. We don't answer these questions, but if we can frame the questions well, then the working group that picks up this work has a much higher chance of success. So as you begin to go through that - it suddenly jumped over into note taking mode. And we'll -- I think -- probably do that for the next call or two. Unfortunately I can't be on the next call because I'm going to be traveling back from Washington D.C. that day. But, you know, maybe we can figure out something to do there.

And now let me go back to Jennifer's question. And I think Jennifer's question is scope. And the question is, "What kind of data and what is the process?" And I would put this one, but I want to check with you (Gabrielle).

(Gabrielle): Yes?

Mikey O'Connor: Would you put that in that category or would you split these between these? See what I'm trying to do? Because my thought is that...

(Gabrielle): They go hand in hand.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. They're hard to split. So given that that's hard to split and also since you've done this sort of thing before, how do you resolve that? Do you pull this up? I mean one to do this is to pull this up like this and let these.

(Gabrielle): Yes. Probably will be.

Mikey O'Connor: And then let - yes. Then this one goes down there so I get rid of that altogether. And the process one is also down in here. So maybe we've already educated me a bit. And what we might want to do is in terms of scope - pull those up a bit.

And say that - certainly we as drafting team should probably try to answer the why question.

(Gabrielle): (unintelligible) because that will bring you where...

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. Maybe then what kind?

(Gabrielle): (unintelligible).

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. Somewhere in here I think there's a clump between the - I don't know.

(Gabrielle): That's something we can brainstorm.

Mikey O'Connor: That's a wonderful list. Let's leave that list for now as our first starting framework because I think if we could rattle off quickly some - Jennifer's -- I got to start paying attention to the chat.

(Gabrielle): Yes. You're right.

Mikey O'Connor: Data. Especially true with the privacy issues. So that's a good one (Mahomet). Go ahead. And tell me how to pronounce your name. I tried that

on my own. Please carry on. So it's (Mohammad), (Mahomet)? And if I'm talking over you, it's because you're muted and we can't hear you. (Gabrielle) has got what action. So (Mahomet) we're still not hearing you. Oh, he's not on the audio bridge. Ah, oh dear. Nathalie, can he come in through the Adobe room or are we only doing the bridge today? Sorry (Mahomet).

Okay, so (Mahomet) I'm going to jump around and leave you in the queue and you and - okay. So I'll leave in the queue and then when you get on the bridge you can just let me know you're there and we'll come back to you. But meanwhile (Gabrielle)'s got another one in the chat. And I'll give you another brainstorming tip. If you type your statement just like Gabrielle did, then I can just copy and paste it in and that makes my life a lot easier and gets your stuff into the list a lot quicker.

Any other - I mean this is fabulous. Let's keep doing this. If there's anything else that people think of in terms of this. If not, what we can start doing is we could start way back up at the top and start brainstorming while...

Why would we collect this? (Gabrielle), go ahead.

(Gabrielle): Yes. The question will be when you're talking about why -- which probably who can answer those questions to list? Why and then where we can get those answers?

Mikey O'Connor: Yes.

(Gabrielle): (unintelligible) specifics or it's a policy or - but we have to get these why answers, but who is answering and where we can find this information. So we can dig and try to brainstorm the rest of that.

Mikey O'Connor: Right. So I'm going to start in on the why - just because that's one that I already threw out there. But, you know, I think it was Tony who said, well, is

that it? And the answer is no. That's not it. It's just the reason that this thing got kicked off in the first place.

So let's see. Berry, you're going to have to jump out. Oh, somebody is listening on their computer. And they have their computer speakers turned out, but they also have their computer microphone turned on. And the result is echo. So the way to solve that echo problem is easy. If you want to have your - if you want to use your microphone on your computer -- which is fine, works great -- use earphones. And that way the speaker echo problem goes away. The echo problem is really bad when you use your computer microphone and the speakers because then it does that long slow feeding back.

And the point I was going to make to Berry is -- Berry, you're coaching me in private chat, but I can't keep all those chats going because there's enough going on in the main chat. So if you want to jump in and just share your thoughts either in the chat or via the bridge, by all means feel free to do so.

Berry's carrying kind of an unusual role on this working group because was very involved in the RIP working group as a policy person -- not as a staff person. And so Berry, I'm going to give you special license to be a bit more opinionated than we typically expect from staff folks on these calls. But I just can't keep all the windows straight. So why don't jump in the queue and add your ideas as we go.

(Mohammed) are you on? Can we? Yes. You're on the bridge. Carry on.

(Mohammed): Hello?

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. We can hear you now. That's great.

(Mohammed): Good. Excellent. I really apologize and I was following online. And I missed the first meeting so if I can suggest one minute to introduce myself because I

listen to the audio report of your last meeting. And just to say that I joined this working group because I think that it's very important for the whole community -- especially when we talk about the metrics and the reporting. I think that if I follow clearly I just want to jump on what you're trying to describe here.

I think that we can just split it into three different categories. The first one is a (unintelligible). The second one is the indicator because we try to do (unintelligible) or something. Makes it - you know what? Trying to make it something. So we need to define the indicators we're trying to measure because we want to show something - a trend to back something and we want to inform people about some trend and something happening in the whole market.

So the second aspect is how we're going to collect that. And I think I did not see - the trend is regarding all about the data collection - I mean process. How we collect data. This is a very important issue because it will impact all of us after that.

And the third part is about daily available, how are going - what is going to be able available to people in this is the reporting site. But in fact when we talk about the matrix, we need to define first the scope, why we measure this task? What are the different indicators that we are using to measure this task? And to avoid overlapping between indicators and the (unintelligible) how we are we going collect this kind of collection process.

And the last part will be really the deliverable that's going to be the reporting, what we are we going to make available internal to the organization? What are we going to use for the world wide? What are we going to make available for our (unintelligible) because we always have internal report, external report and how are we going to make these things available for the different stake holder and (unintelligible).

So for me we are leaving - we are working in an area where we have many data that will not really systemize how we're going to use them and that's really the first thing, is the scope of our work. How are we going to help the institution follow the main (unintelligible) they want to measure, because when we talk about the matrix interest first. What people want the system to make it as a core thing that we need to follow and I think that this part of the job has to be; we need to spend more time on it. Try to (tell you) what we want to measure before we come to how we measure it and how we deliver the results on time.

So my background is I've been in the address and support organization, I have been in the ICANN board for over four years, 2001 to 2005. I'm working now in Boston (unintelligible) and I have good influence in trying to raise - to increase awareness about this dominating (unintelligible) and you can not do that without data and without systematic data. And I think that the institution like ICANN comes to a point that it needs to make this data more understandable and more comprehensive for government or all stakeholders and I think that is really something challenging for us.

I think this helps because I missed the first time to do a presentation for all the members and I'm really honored to be also part of the (unintelligible) or just try to practice debate and bring back our knowledge and just try to get another inside or another perspective on the working group and I'm really proud to be part of this group and I asking that there are many talented people who have been involved in working group for (unintelligible) for many years.

And so it's going to be my humble participation to that working group that is very important and critical to the job, thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: Wow, I think you get the best introduction award for the drafting team, (Mohammed) help me with the pronunciation of your name, is it (Mohammed) or (Mohammed)?

(Mohammed): (Mohammed), (Mohammed)

Mikey O'Connor: (Mohammed) okay, thank you, I will mess but please correct me when I do, I hate it when I mispronounce peoples' names. Let me return because you weren't on the first call, mostly as reinforcement for all of us to bear in mind, that we as the drafting team will not answer all of these questions.

Our goal is to have a document done in a matter of weeks that charters the working group that answers these questions. And so our job is primarily to make sure that the scope of the charter is right and that the kinds of things that we are brainstorming now get addressed by the working group, but there's no way that we can take up that work. We have to make sure that they have a good framework to do the work in, but then a working group picks up the work and so I just want to re-emphasize that, Tony) back to you.

(Tony): Yes hi thanks Mikey, this is (Tony Andorato) again one of the questions that I wanted to throw into the mix here is whether or not this is envisioned to be a voluntary participation by the contracted parties types process or whether it's going to be some sort of opt out participation? The reason I raise this is I think it has ramifications for a lot of the questions we want to try and answer here.

That is if we put together some parameters on this that are based on the assumption that the contracted parties will be required to in some manner -- and I don't know how that would happen -- since I guess this is not going to be a contractual requirement imposed on them in any way, but if we put together some parameters that are based from the assumption that contracted parties are going to participate.

I think that that might lead us down some - to some conclusions that are different than if this is ultimately a purely voluntary type participation process and contracted parties can "You know what I'm not going to respond to this

request, I've got concerns about the data given and the aggregate -- for example that is being requested -- or for whatever other reason it might reflect poorly on me as a register or registered entity because I've got certain amount of use and so on and so forth."

So I think one of the questions that needs to - to my mind it needs to be an over-arching question is how is this going to be implemented via these contracted parties? How are they going to participate or are they going to opt out?

And another reason I raise that is because I think that there are issues that have yet to be settled with (Gack) advise for example and whether or not regulated sector entities or sensitive sector entities are going to be required to provide certain information so that down the road issue of participation and whether it will be required and so on, and I don't know we answer that right now, because I don't think we can know the answer right now in light of some of the unsettled issues out there. I think has some bearing on how we think through these ideas, and I know that's kind of a vaguely formed notion, but I just wanted to throw that out there.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks (Tony) and as you see from Berry we've got the beginnings of an answer to that in his comment in the chat in that the working group that follows us is a (Non-TDP) working group, which means that the results do not go into consensus policy. If this were chartering a PDP working group, the answer to your question would be easy.

(Tony): Got it.

Mikey O'Connor: The upshot would be - would go into consensus policy and consensus policy is included in all the contracts between registers and registrars and so it would not be voluntary. In the case of this working group, the one that's to follow our work, it will be non-binding but TDP's may result out of that and those would then find their way into the consensus policies and then by

inclusion into the contracts that govern. So, great question and a great way to shape the work that we do as the chartering group because it means that we can be a little less careful about the scope of what we put into the charter. Because these aren't going to necessarily result in binding stuff, unless some of those results ultimately turn into TDP's. So, great question, thanks (Tony).

(Tony): Okay.

Mikey O'Connor: And (Pam Littleton) the Q - (Gabrielle) if it's okay with you I want to jump the Q, and the reason is because Pam worked in compliance and I bet she's responding to what we just talked about, so if it's okay with you I will jump forward to Pam and then circle back to you, Pam go ahead.

Pam Little: Thank you Mikey, okay I was just going to follow up the comment made by (Tony) just now, yes...

Mikey O'Connor: Yes.

Pam Little: Mikey you were right. So we were - (Tony) was raising this question whether it's going to be voluntary or mandatory, so I just want to throw it out there to me the landscape has changed a little bit, it's not a lot, thanks to the advent of the 2013 (RAA) and it is my understanding and if you look at the 2013 RAA, it's not going to be mandatory.

A contractual obligation for registrars to report abuse and provide data to ICANN, so I just want us to think about how that will impact our work and the scope and whether its mandatory or - because I noted in the final issue report on Uniformity of Reporting, I think it was pointed out collecting data abused data from contracted parties was a challenge. But with this change, I think it may not be such a challenge as far as registrar data is concerned.

Mikey O'Connor: That's really helpful, thanks Pam.

Pam Little: No problem, thanks.

Mikey O'Connor: Because we should that's definitely something that we want to include in this charter, is an acknowledgement of that changed landscape and (Tony) that circles back to some of the, you know, that's a perfect response to your question, which is some of this may be more mandatory than I thought. Because I haven't been paying attention to the new RAA as carefully as I should, so we've got some research to do there I think. (Gabrielle) go ahead.

(Gabrielle): Well, back into your questions if where are going to define acknowledge, infuse and security so that for instance if we were going to provide a guideline the kind of guideline that you should use this kind or that kind of reporting and this kind of interface for us and to the reporting tool or whatever we are going to do to provide to them that they start with (program) and the security policies that we - that they should follow. As privacy is concerned well yes it's one of the security issues to be taken into account.

But also the technology used for the security, so that we make a definition that we need this kind of report and it will be secured in this kind of environment, in this kind of rules set. We think there's boundaries so in the end my question will be that if so, who will be giving advice for this? How is ICANN defining this kind of security issues and privacy and so on? Should it be then sent to another party to go and walk through the rules of ICANN for that?

When you're starting to make reporting, one of the problems is that it's a web, and you step in the feet of everyone else when you make reports. So probably for one group - team will be not an issue to make public some information for another team will be or for another policies.

So in that sense we have to be careful when you define because it's really easy that developers they start to make their interfaces and so on and they

make everything one way and they oversee the needs of other teams and in the end then you'll start with the so called all equivalent in the definition there.

So are we going to work with other teams and who will be working with them or who will provide the feedback to us?

Mikey O'Connor: That's a great question and I don't the answer. So I capture the question and I think that one of the things that we as a drafting team will want to do is think about that question and provide a preliminary answer to it. One of the differences between a PP working group and the working group that's being formed here is the PDP working group only worries about policy.

It's not clear that this working group that we're chartering necessarily has to limit itself to that and thus if we were chartering a policy development working group, I would say no we do the policy and others do the implementation, but given that this is a slightly different kind of working group that's being chartered and given the obvious expertise that we have on this drafting team, which presumably will carry forward to the working group, we might want to think about going a bit deeper into the implantation than normal.

That's kind of a long answer that says I don't really know. Let's leave that as a question to think about see where we wind up and try to answer that for the counsel before we complete our charter. I think that's a great question.

(Gabrielle): Well because in that sense we can defined who can be working together with us and then we send work with them and don't step in anyone else feet and they need to make an approval or something like that then it can be handed over to the other team. But we define a good alignment so that nobody gets back to this drafting work again.

Mikey O'Connor: Capture a couple of those to remind us. And, you know, I split your question into two pieces because where I was originally headed was that this is more of a policy kind of question and so my PDP reflexes took over, but in fact

these two are related and probably need to be re-combined at some point. So that's just an acknowledgement that I may have arbitrarily split that. And (Gabrielle) is saying yes to that in the chat. Let me just do that right now so I don't forget, hold on a minute.

You'll also note that the typing is sometimes not too good on these so if you see something that is really confusing in what I'm typing please correct it and what I will do when ever I do one of these mind-mapping exercises is I will send the mind-map as it stands to the list right after the call.

The software that I'm using is called (Three-Mind) and it's open sourced software that runs on Mac Windows Unix is available for free on the net so you can download the mind-map itself and you're welcome to do that. It's a good way - I found it to be a good way to very quickly sketch out and capture a complicated discussion like the one we're having today.

I think this is a terrific discussion and our goal is to I think continue to expand and keep asking new questions and clarifying right now and then eventually our goal is going to be to try to bring this down into something that's fairly compact and fairly clear, but it's also fairly easy to do that in mind-mapping. (Gabrielle) go ahead.

You may be muted I'm not hearing you.

(Gabrielle): The end of the road is all work. Do you hear me know? (unintelligible) I was on mute.

Mikey O'Connor: There you go, go ahead.

(Gabrielle): At the end of the road our work have an impact and the need for instance - let's suppose just wonder but some specific report will raise a flag, like suppose a red flag that we need to create response teams or emergency response teams or I don't know groups to decide what to do with certain kind

of problem to solve it as soon as possible and will these work after we do these will this work will be handed over to someone else to review and go through and try to seek, seek for voluntaries and so on.

Or there will be a tool just to show information, what are the properties of this, have an immediate response or just to see nice talks?

Mikey O'Connor: You know, I think this gets at some point we as the drafting team set boundaries around that but let the working group arrive at some of those answers. That would be my immediate reaction to that. I am enthusiastic about the phrase "That which gets measured gets done" because I used to work in manufacturing before I retired and so the defining of that which gets measured is bound-up I think in what gets done and yes to let's do a clump that says goals because I think that's...

(Gabrielle): You have it already.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes I have it already, okay thank you sir, take that off of there. And maybe add a few. Is that my phone doing that? Somebody got their phone on and their cell phone is ringing I bet or their data is coming. Might be mine, I don't think it is though, anyway.

(Gabrielle): (Mike)?

Mikey O'Connor: (Gabrielle) go ahead.

(Gabrielle): Yes, who will be this speedy action reaction group? Is it our definition or someone else?

Mikey O'Connor: I'm going to change hour to work group just too high-light the difference.

(Gabrielle): Because I don't know if we provide a basis for speedy action reaction okay it will be probably going to need, the new requirement will make a think group for this and it will be redundant.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes and then you get to the question of is this a one time thing or is it the beginning of an ongoing process where the data, yes, and clearly at some point there's probably the need to make that distinguish clear for the work team group. I think there is a graphic like that in some of the background material that Berry provided us and we may want to go back to that. Oh (Sheryl) is on, (Sheryl) are you with us?

(Sheryl): I am it's (senioritis), but I'm actually back in the hotel room so hopefully it will start being a little more stable.

Mikey O'Connor: Well I'm deep into the usual mind-mapping thing that you're familiar with so there a lot going on the screen but it's great to have you with us.

(Sheryl): I'm probably going to boot up the other machine and get into the Adobe connect room now I'm home based anyway.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh good, well welcome to the gang.

(Sheryl): Oh I have been listening Mikey don't you worry about that.

Mikey O'Connor: Well I think were cooking right along. I'm thinking that this is a pretty effective potent group of drafting team members and it's getting close to the top of the hour so I'm going to draw this one to a close, not because you're on the call (Sheryl), but because it's just time.

But I am going to repeat my frantic request for a Co-chair. The reason being that there's no way that I can make the call next week, I'm going to be right in the middle of travel, if we could have bumped the call plus or minus an hour I would have lobbied for that, but I can't it's just right in the middle of stuff. So,

please do consider taking up the Co-chair job, I see (Barry's) hand is up so I'll jump over to Berry and then we'll rap this one up, Berry take it away.

Berry Cobb: Thank you Mikey just real quick connected with (Jonathan) over at (Hemel) he sent his apologies that he couldn't make the call today but he did express interest in acting as Co-chair to help you out and I'm confirming that he'll be able to make that next weeks call if no one objects to him acting as Co-chair.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay that's (Jonathan Zook) of the Association for Competitive Technology I think, (Jonathan) apologies if I got that wrong. So tentatively let's at least leave it in his hands next week and that's great because that gives us a chair that can carry on.

Berry how hot are you on mind-mapping? Could you be the mind-mapping scribe for (Jonathan) next week?

Berry Cobb: Sure thing.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay, that's great that way we've got all that covered and I apologies it's just not going to happen for me next week. So with that it's about a minute to the hour, if there's nothing else, last chance for final thoughts, I thing we've moved the ball forward and I appreciate all the help and we'll see you in a week. I'll send this stuff out and instructions on how to get the software. Yes Sir.

Berry Cobb: This is Berry real quick I just let everyone know we have two more calls scheduled between now and Buenos Aires, again we kind of targeting to have the charter rapped up by the 10 of November so we can submit it to the (G&XO) counsel by then. If we don't make that date, it's not the end of the world, having a good charter is priority number one, but I just want to make members aware of what we're shooting for.

Mikey O'Connor: Thank you. Yes, you know as this call progressed I am almost ready to declare that deadline unrealistic, we'll give it another week, but I think the chartering exercise has just this call has brought enough nuance that we don't want to just bash this out, so just to set the stage for the possibility that we don't hit that date. I think this is interesting enough that we don't want to rush it, (Tony) go ahead last word.

(Tony): Yes, if I could just ask along those lines, could you talk a little bit about the process by which we're going to take all this fantastic information that you sent out, as it develops and synthesize and distilled of into an actual written product and are we each going to come with our bullets of assumptions and what not and then they get forwarded to charter? I guess I'm just a little unclear on how the process of actually memorializing all this is going to work?

Mikey O'Connor: Yes that's a great question, one of the things that happens at some point is that this, you know, you can see how sort of bushy this has already gotten and that's fine for this stage of the game because we're sort of brainstorming and we're coming up with ideas and we need to get all of them in there.

The next phase is to, sort of, once we feel like we've got all the ideas we sort of put them in clumps, we do all that, or at least I do that in the mind-map still, we settle on what we think is the right thing to do in that stage and then at some point this gets transformed into a word document and goes through a more traditional editing cycle with red-lining and so on and so forth.

(Tony): Got it.

Mikey O'Connor: And it's trivial easy to turn it into a word document so if people are uncomfortable with the mind-mapping thing and would prefer to see in Word, by all means, let me know, it takes about 10 minutes to push it over to word document, right now, it will be very tall and it's probably easier to look at in the mind-map, but I'll think about getting in the habit of just turning it into a

Word document pretty regularly. Yes eventually we get the traditional text that, you know, we have to get to there.

(Tony): Okay.

Mikey O'Connor: All right, I think that's it for us. We'll see you in a week except for me I'm going to see you in two weeks. Thanks all and thanks for letting me be your Chair, I love doing this kind of stuff.

Group: Thanks everyone.

END