

**Metrics and Reporting Working Group Meeting
TRANSCRIPTION**

Wednesday 30 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 30 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-20131030-en.mp3>

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

Attendees:

Cheryl Langdon-Orr - ALAC
Theo Geurts – RrSG
Tony Onorato –unaffiliated
Mouhamet Diop – RrSG
Pam Little - NTAG
Jonathan Zuck – IPC
Rising John Osazuwa – At-Large

Apologies:

Mikey O'Connor – ISPCP
Gabriel Vergara – NCA

ICANN staff:

Lars Hoffmann
Berry Cobb
Glen de Saint Gery
Nathalie Peregrine

Coordinator: Excuse me, everyone. This is the operator. Just need to inform you that today's conference call is being recorded. If you have any objections you may disconnect at this time. And you may begin.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much. (Lori). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everybody. This is a GNSO Metrics Reporting call on the 30th of October 2013.

On the call today we have (Mohammed Drag), (Cheryl Gibbs) (Tania Rotto) Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Pam Little and Jonathan Zook.

We have an apology from Mikey O'Connor. And from staff we have Berry Cobb, Lars Hoffman and myself Nathalie Peregrine.

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

Berry Cobb: Great. Thank you Nathalie. Before I turn it over to Jonathan I'd just like to announce that over the list was confirmed that Jonathan will gladly take on duties as co-chair for the Working Group or I should say the Drafting Team at this phase.

And so we do thank him for his contributions here in helping us out. And with that Jonathan I'll go ahead and kick it over to you.

We have the agenda up over on the left-hand side. And once we got to the second one I'll be happy to take over for that for a little bit.

Jonathan Zook: So on the - hi everyone. I'm Jonathan Zook as many of you know me and some of you don't from the Association for Competitive Technology.

And at the last ICANN meeting Fadi referred to me at metrics man because I've become a little bit of a harpy within the organization on the issue of metrics which led to another board resolution with respect to metrics that some of us worked on as well that had to do with the affirmation of

commitments requirements to measure somehow an increase in consumer trust, choice and confidence as a result of the new gTLD.

So one of the things Berry might be interested in potentially maneuvering into the agenda a little bit as we try to find scope is understanding how we dance around the other advisory group that's just been formed on that topic and figure out how we might benefit from cross polarization or how we might define our boundaries so as not to duplicate work -- something like that.

So that's something that I raise with you and I'm happy to describe a little bit about what that project is for people that are familiar with it.

But that's kind of my background. I run a trade association for mobile app developers. And but I've been harping about metrics inside ICANN for a long time. So I'm very excited about the work that this working group.

So should we do a - are there - I guess Berry you handed this to me sooner than I expected. Is there -are there outstanding statements of interest or anything like that from a bookkeeping standpoint or what does that mean on the agenda?

Berry Cobb: Hi Jonathan it's Berry. Typically, as per the PDP guidelines or Working Group guidelines at the beginning of every call we need to ask if there are any changes to statements of interest.

We're so early at this point I don't - I kind of doubt that there are any, but it's just more of formality than anything else. And...

Jonathan Zook: Were there any that we don't have yet or...

Berry Cobb: No. We do have everybody's SOI submitted and is admitted in our wiki room.

Jonathan Zook: All right well I guess then the formal question is, is - does anyone have any changes they want to make to their statements of interest? Do they just taken on a new job or inherited money from a wealthy uncle or something?

Man: I wish.

Jonathan Zook: All right. So Berry did you say you want to leave discussion on the meeting timeslots?

Berry Cobb: Yes. So in terms of agenda Item Number 2 there was some dialogue on the list last week about the meeting scheduled that we have set.

Originally I had anticipated that we would have a shorter runway for developing the charter. And so we didn't take on the notion of implementing like an alternating meeting schedule to accommodate a global time zone where participants reside in.

And it looks like that this chartering exercise will probably take a little bit longer.

We have basically two meetings or really one meeting prior to Buenos Aires. We do have a session scheduled in Buenos Aires. And then of course the meeting itself usually invokes a two to three week disruption from normal working group scheduled meeting.

So it's quite possible that this will easily push us into December in terms of completing the chartering exercise here. As well as with holidays that may be disruption as well.

So it is quite likely that we may be into January, before we can submit the charter to the GNSO council for their approval.

And so in the meantime I wanted to poll the group about what the possibilities are of scheduling the drafting team call in the meantime.

You know, of course, right now we're obviously scheduled for 1400 hours UTC. I believe that our European personnel have just entered into their Daylight Savings Time change or back into the Standard Time Change. And of course, the US will be moving next weekend.

So I just wanted to throw it out there first. In terms of how this meeting is scheduled is it possible for some to move this meeting forward I should - move the meeting backward to maybe 1300 UTC or 12 UTC? If that's possible that'll help our persons located in the Asia-Pacific region.

Or what we can also attempt is we maintain our 14 UTC schedule and then we create a secondary call and alternate on a weekly basis of what would be 14 UTC to the next week would be something along the lines of 20 UTC and then alternate on a weekly basis.

And I think Cheryl's hand is raised. Thanks Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you Berry. And Cheryl for the record I'm sure you're very surprised to see my hand raised on this one.

Two things, the second part that you were suggesting the 2000 and 1400 alternating cycle I think that's perfect because it shares pain more generally across us all including allowing for a more humane time in the Asia-Pacific region, or at least part of the Asia-Pacific region, seeing that we've got a huge spread.

But I do not on a principal agree with switching scheduled call times around to suit Daylight Savings, summertime, wintertime or my ordinary changes in mind. We should meet in UTC. We should stay with UTC.

As it turns out Pam and I have already been in Australia, summertime for I think what it is three or four weeks now. And it annoys the living daylights out of me one we know we have to keep chopping and changing calls, should just be down in UTC and no other correspondence should be entered into.

But in terms of rotating I'm more than happy to. Thanks.

Berry Cobb: Great. Thank you Cheryl. Does anybody else have any feedback about having an alternate meeting around 20 UTC?

And like I said, week one would be 14. Week two would be 20 UTC and then, week three we would switch back to 14.

And it - I think that that definitely helps spread the load in terms of our meeting times and accommodates most people.

However, I think the 20 UTC time is a new time. So what I will do for the list is I'll - I'm going to send out to Doodle polls just to make sure that we get the best optimal alternate timeslot. You know, perhaps maybe 19 UTC maybe a little bit better or a 21 UTC.

So after the meeting I'll send out to Doodle polls. The first will be just to confirm our 14 UTC timeframe for week one meeting. And then the second will be the poll around 20 UTC timeframe.

At the present time I think we'll stick to the Wednesday, I guess it's really almost Thursday in Asia-Pacific, but the Wednesday 14 UTC timeslots are for most of us it'll be Wednesday.

But the polls themselves won't include other days of the week. We'll mostly just be polling around the timeframe between 14 and 20 UTC.

So if there are no other comments or objections to that change I'll start getting working on that with the secretariat team as well after we get the polls filled out.

And one last item I'd like to mention to the group before we move over into talking about the charter is our session in Buenos Aires. And I'll be sure to brief Mikey at the end of this week when he's done with his travel.

As I've mentioned on the previous call we do have a session tentatively scheduled for Thursday. What's that date? It's Thursday, November 21 at 0800 hours local time to Buenos Aires.

Based on our previous polls, it looks like most of us will be in attendance at the meeting. And for those that won't be in attendance we will still have remote capability set out so we can continue our efforts in terms of drafting the charter.

And I think it's also a good opportunity for everybody to meet in person where possible.

So I'll ask this more formally again next week just to confirm with Mikey as to whether the team would like to meet in person. If we think that we won't really accomplish much other than meeting a person it's certainly easy to cancel this session.

I think fortunately for us is that it at least only start at 8:00 whereas previous kind of working groups would start at 7:30 or 7:00 so get a little bit more sleep time there.

At any rate again, I'll bring that up next week and we'll make a final determination whether we should meet in Buenos Aires or not.

So with that I'll turn it back over to Jonathan and we'll start talking through the charter.

And what I have listed up here in the AC room again is our - the same kind of draft charter that we've been looking at through the past couple of weeks but we're more focused on actual content.

So what I'll do is I'll go ahead and share my screen with the mind map that Mikey was using last week.

I'm not as proficient with the tool as he is, but I'll try to take the best notes that I can and certainly do Jonathan suggests then talking about some of the other metric ongoing in a community will probably help shed some light on what the scope of our effort may be.

Jonathan over to you please.

Jonathan Zook: Sure. So are there questions that are lingering with people having - from last week or having gone back over the mind map, et cetera that anyone has just to get things started? All right, I don't see any hands up.

So the - is there anyone on the call that because there are some names that I don't recognize but that doesn't necessarily mean anything.

Are there people that are unfamiliar with the other consumer metrics projects that is currently taking place as well that would benefit from some explanation of this?

Tony Alvarado: Well Jonathan this is Tony Alvarado. Yes certainly I'd love to hear about that. I think I have a general sense of what you're talking about. But how it's going to dovetail with this project I'd be happy to hear about.

Jonathan Zook: Yes. So the answer is I don't know how it will dovetail with this project, I guess. But there was a board resolution that was designed to implement one of the requirements of the affirmation of commitments document that ICANN signed with the Department of Commerce.

And that document requires a review team be formed a year after the first delegation of a new gTLD.

And the purpose of that review team is to assess whether there has been an improvement in consumer competition, choice and trust as a result of the new gTLD program.

In other words, it was the objective of the program to enhance those attributes. And there's going to be a review team whose job it is to figure out whether or not that it has in fact transpired.

And so after much harping (Bruce Hawkins) recommended that a group be formed to suggest some metrics to measure those things so that the review team might have some basis, a non-sort of anecdotal basis for performing that review, which is probably now a year from basically today since the first delegation has in fact occurred.

So the - there was a work group that was formed that spent quite a bit of time. And there are some veterans of that that were on the call today including Berry and Cheryl.

And the result was a series of data points that could begun to be - could begin to be collected and some potential targets for those data points, you know, year out and three years out, et cetera, as a means for potential review of those attributes with respect to the new gTLD program.

And so, you know, one of the issues was, you know, are the registrations creating new Web sites or are they mostly defensive for example? You know,

do they - and so it became a question of how to measure what was a defensive second level domain registration -- but those kinds of discussions.

Another words some discussion of polling, right? Should we take a poll now and take and then a poll later in order to see if there was some change in people's perspectives, some delta with respect to their confidence and trust in the Internet?

And so it led to a fairly exhaustive set of metrics, data that should begun to be selected by the staff now so that it would be available for the review team.

And there was a little bit of a dissension toward the end that led to some minority reporting into that work group so that the ultimate list that was presented to the board was quite long and according to the staff quite expensive to track.

And so there's now a new advisory group to the ultimate review team that has just been formed who's primary charter is in fact to trim back the list that ultimately came up out of that initial working group so to try and make that list a little bit more refined and really establish what metrics will be used by the review team.

And so that is just starting now. And they're working from a list of existing metrics and targets in trying to narrow it down again, together with the staff and, you know, with an eye towards, you know, feasibility to define what metrics should be tracked at least for use by the review team a year from now and in the future.

So I raise it because a number of the questions that are being raised in this, you know, that will be raised by this working group as far as access to data and what - and when in the process data should be collected and how metrics should be defined both as targets and reporting, you know, are sort of embodied in that particular process.

And in a way that effort -- Cheryl feel free to speak off if you agree -- is almost a kind of the beginnings of a prototype effort for something that we're trying to define in general terms with our work here.

Cheryl feel free to jump in if you have some thoughts on that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: (Look) Cheryl for the record. I - at the moment I did wonder about certain superseding of work done in this group by the other.

There is no clear hierarchy. And yet, you know, it's pretty obvious to me that anything that comes out of the affirmation is commitments the review team process is going to have some wide-ranging and particularly keen focus.

I certainly wouldn't be keen to have too much variability between the work products, however.

Jonathan Zook: Too much what? I'm sorry.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Variability.

Jonathan Zook: Oh right. Right, and so I don't know whether any level of coordination is interesting or necessary but it may exist as something out there. And we should probably just be vigilant for overlap and opportunities to comment on each other's work as we progress.

One of the things that I think is going to be important for this group to look at is the notion of data collection and target setting, you know, in advance of the time that the reporting needs to take place right?

I mean the - if you look at some of the, you know, project improvement process documents that Berry shared at the beginning of this group they begin to suggest that the real value of metrics comes from having established

them early so that you have baselines and targets with which to compare your progress and the ability to make adjustments because you're not hitting those targets or you're hitting some but not others, et cetera.

And so I think part of the complexity of what we'll be doing here is trying to figure out that in the working group, you know, trying to figure out what the entry points are for a metrics and reporting process in terms of different workgroups and PDP processes going forward.

Berry Cobb: Hi Jonathan. This is Berry.

Jonathan Zook: Yes?

Berry Cobb: So just to carry on with what Jonathan was saying. I think there's a couple of things to mention.

First and foremost the issue report for this net rep working group effort does briefly touch on the consumer metrics work that's ongoing.

And perhaps the work being performed there as we progress into our working group and start to work on the issues that we define in our charter most definitely we will want to be aware of what's being done over in the implementation advisory group because there are a lot of metrics that do pertain obviously to the GNSO.

So without a doubt we'll want to be in tune with what's going on.

And just to provide a hint more detail for those that weren't involved in the consumer metrics as Jonathan mentioned there was certainly a very big shopping cart of metrics.

Some of the metrics in a more detailed manner include service level debt that the registries and registrars are being bound, contractually bound to, quantity

of registrations across the generic PLD, terms of abuse in terms of UDRP and future URS components, a number of surveys that would tag or uphold registrants on their view in regards to trust choice and competition as well as various other metrics that would define better categorize across those three terms.

I included some links over in the chat at the bottom right that will take you to the original Consumer Metrics Working Group that was started or initiated by the GNSO. And we definitely enjoyed having the ALAC participation in that effort as we started to corral up all of those metrics.

I also provided a second link. That is the wiki page for the new IAG group that I believe is really going to start meeting. And they have had their first informal meeting in Buenos Aires. If not, it will be shortly thereafter. So they are starting to get spun up.

I believe that there were a total of 38 volunteers for that effort across both mostly the GNSO and ALAC. And I do believe there are a few individual contributors to that effort.

With that said, I think that what is going on in terms of the AOC review of the new gTLD program is a different scope than what we have here.

For those that weren't a part of the original Registration Abuse Policies Working Group that created the original recommendation for how we got here today, there is again during that effort, as well as I think Pender and IRTPD were going on at the same time what was recognized is that there was a deficiency in access to data to make much more meaningful and fact-based decisions in regards to policies that are being created within working groups.

And so that in and of itself defines, kind of helps define the scope of what we're trying to accomplish here.

And I think a good chunk of the work that we'll want to look at reviewing and help define our scope is metrics like when a working group spins up and they - and they're in their fact-finding phase how do we - you know, what's the framework for how we can request this type of information that we need?

You know, certainly there is a good amount of metrics that are available to us internal to ITM. There are metrics available to us that are external to ICANN, either through third parties such as Spamhaus or other providers that provide abuse type metrics as well as and I think what is most important and why we're interested in having one contracted party participation in this effort is sometimes there are metrics that registries and registrars they may have data as well that may benefit the policy development process.

And in the past there has been apprehension about sharing some of that data for very good reasons in terms of maintaining the competitive advantage and those kinds of components.

So one of the goals that I think will be important for this group is to help define a framework by how we go about requesting that data as well as again internally as well.

And then another component to accessing data to facilitate the policy development process is kind of one stream.

A second stream is going to be looking at the working group itself, tangible data as to, you know, what resources are being spent for that working group effort, when did it start, when did it finish?

What kind of policies were created out of it? Was there success or failure in the working group itself?

Once the policy was adopted by the council and eventually by the board and implemented how do we measure success of those policies being deployed out in a community and of course, across typically contracted parties?

And so it's kind of that framework that we might want to start looking at.

And then there's kind of a tertiary stream which is kind of stepping outside of the working group itself. And perhaps this is probably kind of dovetails back to the consumer metrics that Jonathan was talking about.

But how do we as the GNSO need access to data and metrics for - and in particular or is there a metrics platform that would benefit the GNSO Council as they deliberate issues and those kinds of things?

Other areas that we can consider is annual reviews of the generic namespace, for instance, you know, at the end of the year or perhaps the last ICANN meeting of the year would it benefit the council and the GNSO to have annual presentations from contractual compliance on the metrics that they and what they worked through in the previous year and what they expect to do in the upcoming year?

What other external metrics may benefit the GNSO? Should we start to try to coordinate like state of the industry type report that you see that are produced by VeriSign or PIR or something along those lines? Will it benefit the GNSO to corral Spamhaus and SSAC type metrics as well?

And so anyway, I'm kind of rambling on here. But in terms of the overall scope I think we're going to be much more focused around the working group and the PDP and that's kind of the end of the start of a very (unintelligible).

Jonathan, please.

Jonathan Zook: Sure. So I mean - and I guess as Chair I'm supposed to kind of corral my biases as much as possible so I'll try to do that, because certainly the second part of that is very interesting to me to try to encourage the use of data in the first place as part of a management tool within as the lovely diagrams you shared suggest.

But as I guess we should start this process and kind of identifying the problem that the working group is trying to solve and try to delineate that out.

So I mean the first issue that came up as Berry mentioned, or one of the first issues is the difficulty of getting data, for example, out of contracted parties. And some of that has to do with confidentiality and competitive considerations, etcetera, and so - but yet a lot of that data could be helpful in creating more fact based processes inside working groups.

So one question that might be within the scope of the working group is trying to define a way to marry those interests, right. How do we, you know, develop a framework for requesting data and for protecting that information or anonymizing that information in such a way that it can be still be useful to the working group but not damaging to the contracted party that shared the data.

Does that make sense? I mean I think that - so part of the scope could be, for the working group that's formed from this, is to define data sharing framework that preserves the - I don't know. It will depend I guess, but maybe it should be divided up, you know, to preserve the confidentiality or the anonymity of data that might be shared by contracted parties.

What do folks think?

((Crosstalk))

Berry Cobb: I think (Mohammed) has his hand raised.

Jonathan Zook: Okay yes, sorry. (Mohammed)?

(Mohammed Drag): Oh thank you. Actually I think that while - I have to confess that this is really the more removed and (unintelligible) is a very tough task and it's not easy at all.

Because - I mean I think that the most difficult part of our job is to be able to do an assessment regarding what now we're maturing and what metrics we are using, the relevance of the existing metrics, the missing parts, and what really people need to measure and to follow because ICANN and GNSO insights is becoming more and more - is getting - I mean eyes to what's going around the institution. And I think that when even if you talk about computer percent choice, we understand that the institution as a whole have to look at - I mean this perception from the consumer price, how this perception is increasing or not.

So it's not only related to our relations inside the GNSO which is like (unintelligible), but given - we have to look at the ICANN ecosystem as do we follow some metric that help us understand that if you are fulfilling our mission to increase the consumer and to improve consumer choice inside our environment.

Even if the goal is really to follow-up (unintelligible) this new gTLD program, I think that this exercise we're doing will help the institution look at more carefully about the existing metrics and do really a framework that's going to help them do a new assessment regarding the metrics they are following up.

Do we have enough, you know, indicators to look at and look to after what's going on, and do we need more or do we have some more coming or new issues that have been raised that the institution needs to look at?

I mean this thing will make us more focused on the framework rather than on the different things that we need to look after. And I think if we come up with a good rational regarding what are the different big issues that we need to

carefully look at and follow, it will become a permanent exercise that we can update every six months or every year with new indicators raising up or some others that we can let them out.

I mean - and this is really a lifetime that we really need to look at. And I wonder if, you know, seriously, it's a huge task because it's not something only related to the GNSO in (trimuis) environment because anything we're talking, I mean, will impact the consumer choice and the consumer trust as a whole organization as a whole.

So that's really my - the feeling I get, the more removed and the - I really feel that we really need to spend more time to do an assessment of existing framework for maturing the different indicator that helps us understand if the organization is performing well or not.

Because we talk about really increasing, but do we better serve the institution, do we better serve the community, are we doing what we have to do to help understand if these things are increasing or decreasing? Do we have a good perception of how this perception (unintelligible) of this perception on the community side?

I mean these ask things really that comes up my mind and I'm just asking myself, do we do the proper assessment of the mix working group because these things regarding the consumer trust and consumer choice is a good area that we really need to define this (unintelligible) of this area. Thank you.

Jonathan Zook: Thanks (Mohammed). You're definitely a man after my own heart and so I appreciate your comments. But I think part of what Berry was trying to do was walk us back from our aspirations associated with restructuring ICANN as a function of this working group. And that's the - changing the management practices of the organization and things like that.

And so I guess one of the decisions we have to make is if there's some consensus that we would all like to see some indicators and things for ICANN generally to come into being. We can try to put them into the scope of this working group and it will be at the - and note with the knowledge that the Council may strike that out, right.

It seems as though 75% of our initiative is really to determine ways to get at information when we need it without knowing now what information we will need in the future, but to smooth the path to the use of data on a case-by-case basis through some patterns and policies for requesting it and protecting its use.

That seems to be at the core of our charter that we're trying to develop with sort of a locked on addendum at the end that, you know, you and I are both very interested in which is looking at a process by which various plans are executed. In other words, what happens when a decision is made by a working group or a PDP in particular and how do we measure the success or failure of the policies that were developed as a part of the PDP process, right.

But I think those are the halves to this. One is a far more tactical exercise and trying to make smooth that tactical process of making smarter decisions about what to do in the first place. And the other is putting processes in place to track the success like execution of those policies that are put into place.

Does that sound right to you Berry?

Berry Cobb: Hi Jon, this is Berry. Yes, that definitely does. I'll almost type those words up when I go through the transcript.

And to put kind of a real world example to what Jonathan said it, you know, a perfect use case was that the (Pednar) working group. When that effort got started, again we were starving for data out there about the expiration of domains. And at that particular time there certainly - the expiration of domains

is not necessarily a - there are components to the RAA that discuss expirations, certainly grace periods and those kinds of components.

But typically, any registrant complaints with regards to expiring domain names, very few, if hardly at all, complaints ever wound up at ICANN. Most of the center and the realm of any complaints regarding the expiration of the domain names were at the front line with registrars.

And so it was very difficult to get information about, you know, what is the world of expiration of domain names? How often are domains going so far as they enter into the grace period? How often were registrants actually losing the name due to bad contact versus information versus a network to expire to expire versus they were on vacation? You know, that kind of detail to really understand how big of a problem we're actually dealing with. So access to the information to make a better informed policy decision was absent.

But eventually the working group was able to define the scope of the problem they were trying to address. They labeled out all the different issues through the moment and name expires all the way to the moment it becomes available in the zone for registration.

And there were, I think it was probably about, 15 different recommendations that were eventually adopted by the working group, eventually approved by the Council and then by the Board, and then ICANN staff implemented it. So that's a formal name of (ERR Now), I think its expiration - I'm not even going to try to guess. But there's a formal name, it's a formal policy that has been adopted by the registrar community.

And now what we're needing, not that this is the exact task of this working group, but one year from now is to go back and get data based on the deployment of that policy and how it was implemented, and discover whether it was a success or failure change that perhaps the GNSO needs to address.

If everything is a green light and rosy, then it's something that will probably, you know, we did a good job implementing the policy; it was the right change. No action is necessarily needed from this point forward. If it's yellow or reduction in terms of some kind of data that we can get to about that, then perhaps it needs to come back to the GNSO and get a better understanding of where we failed in terms of implementing the right policy and look to improve.

And thank you Pam, that was the Expired Registration Recovery Policy; ERRP which was formally (Pednar).

So that's kind of a typical use case. And what we're finding with higher PPBC and especially even B which Lars from ICANN Staff is helping to manage. Again, there's this deficiency in the access to the data out there.

And that's what we're really wanting to focus on, is how do we put this general framework together that says, "What data is being requested, when do you need it, how much may it cost us to get through that data, what are some of the got-yous or challenges in acquiring the data, should it remain anonymous or not? You know, will it divulge any competitive advantage or anything along those lines?"

So we definitely have several use cases for us to review as move into the working group that we can really try to lift a foot up and uncover what the processes were. And then again secondarily is, you know, once policies have been implemented, what are some metrics that can help us determine whether it was success or failure.

And I think what is something I haven't mentioned in the past is another component that we'll look at is, you know, we have a series of templates that we use for in every PDP, the charter being one of them. And when of the things that you'll notice that is absent in the charter is asking, you know, what

metrics are needed to know whether your policy process is going to be a success or a failure? What are the critical success factors...

Jonathan Zook: Right.

Berry Cobb: ...of what the data may need, etcetera?

Jonathan Zook: And so (Mohammed), that kind of gets to the points that you were trying to raise. So I think we probably will have the best chance of getting something through the Council if it is - if the vector to metrics and measurement are individual PDP processes and working groups so that, you know, our goal might be to make sure that charters include a mention of metrics that should be tracked as part of the implementation of a particular policy once it's decided upon and planned to review the success or failure of that policy at some future time. And that the, you know, building even the suggestion of that end of the charter would probably be a dramatic, you know, of each working group would be a dramatic change.

As opposed to this working group taking on the task of trying to figure out all those things now that the ICANN - might benefit from tracking, right. I think that's the part that will get struck from the scope of the working group simply because it would be such a gargantuan task.

Let's make it our goal to introduce the notion of metrics into the work group in PDP process, and then one by one begin to track metrics associated with the success of implementation of policies once they're put in place.

Does that make sense to folks? Cheryl seems to think so, that's a good sign.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Not a green tick from me, that's for sure.

Jonathan Zook: I know; I appreciate it.

So I think that, you know, I think some of the - one of the things that we ought to think about is what will the work of this working group be? And you know, at the top end of that is probably looking at the, as Berry put it, use cases.

But look at the historical examples that we have in front of us. And probably the very first tap of this working group once it's formed will be to look at these prior working group processes and the challenges they faced as a part of evaluating what the challenges were in the past that we might be trying to address. So I mean it seems to me that a possible scope of this working group is going to be a study of those previous examples that are the inspiration of this working group, right. So I mean I think that's the kind of thing that might start the work of the working group.

Another thing that might start the work of the working group are some interviews with some of the parties in those processes, and particularly the owners of the data that had difficulty sharing it at the time, and discussions with them about what interests were at stake so that our working group might begin to formulate processes to protect those interests in the future so that the fluidity of the access to data is what we need it to be for policy development.

Does that make sense? Tony.

Tony Onorato: Yes, along the lines of what you just mentioned with regards to interviews, I know that there was a call for more participation from contracted party representatives in the drafting team and probably the working group as well, (unintelligible) into that.

I know we had some folks who indicated that they have a representative capacity, but I'm wondering along those same lines whether we are still feeling that we are underrepresented on that front such that we're not making fully informed decisions.

And are the interviews a way to try and address that problem or - I mean these are really two questions but the second flows from the first.

Jonathan Zook: I'm going to hand that question over to Berry. How are those conversations going?

Berry Cobb: Yes Jon, this is Berry. Theo is representing the registrars and had that confirmed, and I'm still waiting to hear from the registries about whether they are going to be able to dedicate a representative or not. We sent an email out last week and haven't gotten a response back yet.

And I should also state that once we, you know, right now there are more or less going to be single representatives as we move through the drafting team. Upon the Council approving our charter and we evolve into a working group, we will do another call for volunteers to definitely entice more membership from all parties but especially from contracted parties as well.

I think one of the issues is, in terms of more large scale participation, that we just have so much going on right now. It's hard to - everybody's getting spread a little bit thin in terms of participation. But I will announce to the working group once we get confirmation from the registries as well. And then hopefully when we do evolve into the working group, we can at least get two or three members from registries and registrars to participate as well.

Jonathan Zook: Yes thanks Berry. I mean I know that Mikey was suggested that we might need to really hold this process up for that participation and we haven't had a chance to talk about that. But I think given the fact we're just in the process of drafting the charter for the working group is that, you know, no one's in the dark; we're not doing anything that's completely, you know, out of the ordinary here.

I think we could probably get through a charter drafting process that would involve, you know, the working group obtaining information from contracted

parties, and hopefully through a direct participation, but might also require, you know, interviews or discussions with folks that were particularly involved. So I mean there may be people we need to involve in the execution of the working group on a more temporal basis that doesn't require their commitment long-term to the entire working group.

And I think we need to leave open the possibility that there are going to be people that have war stories to share and that we bring them on as, you know, guest speakers within the working group process rather than force them to participate in the whole working group or lose their information. I think we need to be willing to find some middle ground in order to move forward, and I think that's more than true with the drafting process.

So let's - I think we should try to forge on. You should, you know, keep your efforts going Berry, but let's try to forge on in this drafting process so that we can get to the work of the working group, and then in that context we'll find a balance between represents and guest speakers if that makes sense.

Berry Cobb: This is Berry. Yes definitely Jonathan. We'll definitely continue to carry the torch in that regard.

And I think what's important, at least at this stage, is that once we get close to finalizing the charter, the main intent is that there are no surprises in the charter when this is presented to the Council so that there aren't any delays in getting it approved by the Council so that, you know, all stakeholders are involved and they're aware of what's contained in the charter so that once it's there it can be quickly approved and then we can get to our real work.

Jonathan Zook: That's right. So I think that, you know, in some ways we have quite a bit of information already as to what's expected of us. And so it behooves us to stick as much as possible to those expectations because that will minimize the surprises of which Berry spoke that would otherwise lead to delays in approval by the Council.

And so I think that what we seem to be corralling around to is the notion of integration of metrics into the work group and PDP processes, and that's about a process by which we can request data and a process by which data can be integrated a measurement process for policy success of an individual work group or policy as it's implemented.

Does that make sense to everyone? Does anyone have an objection to that point, that way of framing the work of the work group? Is that - we're going to try to be the working group that suggests mechanisms through which data and metrics are injected into a working group and PDP processes, and review of that data becomes a common practice through the execution of those policies.

Does that make sense?

Man: That makes sense.

Man: That makes sense.

Jonathan Zook: Everybody?

Man: Yes, Tony.

Man: That makes sense.

Jonathan Zook: All right, so I think that that will help with our scope definitions. And (Mohammed), we will go drown our sorrows in the bar that we have not been tasked with defining metrics for the organization as a whole, but we will keep waiving that flag until we're given the opportunity to do so.

But at the very least, if we can start to do it on a policy-by-policy basis, I think that what will evolve from that are some metrics for the organization that get

measured over time. And I think we'll see some success as new policies are put in place and begin to be measured which, as Mikey repeated the old adage that "What gets measured gets done," in the last meeting and I couldn't agree more.

So I think that that's a good place to stop. I think we've defined a scope in large measure today, and perhaps in our next meeting we should talk about breaking down that into a set of tasks that the work group will perform, you know, within that to execute on that scope.

Does that make sense?

Berry Cobb: Hi Jonathan, this is Berry. Just one point real quick. So we'll meet again next week - sorry. It will be at 14 UTC as scheduled. As I mentioned, we'll get the polls out and probably post (unintelligible) when we'll start integrating our alternate meeting schedules.

And last point is I sent another version of the work plan. Really it's just more or less updating the meetings that we have kind of scheduled. What we're concerned about is really up to Row 15 until we get the charter approved and then we'll flush out the work plan in more detail when the working group gets started. So thank you everyone.

Jonathan Zook: Thanks guys.

Man: Thanks Berry, thanks Jonathan.

Berry Cobb: Have a good day; appreciate it.

Man: All right, bye all.

END