

**ICANN**  
**Transcription**  
**Metrics and Reporting Working Group meeting**  
**Wednesday 11 December 2013 at 13:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of Metrics and Reporting Working Group call on the Wednesday 11 December at 13:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-metrep-20131211-en.mp3>

Attendees:

Cheryl Langdon-Orr - ALAC  
Tony Onorato – Individual  
Pam Little - NTAG  
Mikey O'Connor – ISPCP  
Jennifer Wolfe – NCA  
Jonathan Zuck – IPC  
Theo Geurts - RrSG

Apologies: none

ICANN staff:

Lars Hoffmann  
Berry Cobb  
Glen De Saint Géry  
Julia Charvolen

Coordinator: And the recordings are started. Thank you.

Julia Charvolen: Thank you (Rebecca). Good morning, good evening everyone and welcome on the Metrics and Reporting Working Group call on Wednesday 11 of December 2013.

On the call today we have Mikey O'Connor, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Theo Geurts, Jonathan Zook and I see that (Tony Onarato) has just joined us. We have no apologies so far.

And from staff we have Berry Cobb, Lars Hoffman, Glenn Desaintgery and myself Julia Charvolen.

May I please remind all participants to please state your names before speaking for transcript purposes. Thank you. And over to you Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Thinks Julia and welcome all. We are dangerously close to that magic point in a drafting team where the staff outnumber the participants. So I'm taking that as good news. It means that we haven't offended anybody too terribly.

We'll sort of wait for a few more folks to join. I see Pam just joined the - Pam Little just joined the Adobe room and undoubtedly will be joining the call soon.

We'll do our usual pause for taking a look at the agenda which is really simple. We're just going to work on our draft and set up a next meeting.

And also we don't have to do the statement of interest thing this time around because we're not a working group.

So unless there is violent objection I'm going to just plunge into the draft which is right in front of you. And you can at this point scroll independently. I may take control at some point but for now I think it's fine to leave it the way it is.

And I think that what I would like to do is sort of take a very general checkpoint of the group first just to see if there's anything in the draft that causes people a big problem.

I'd rather chew on the big problems first and then sort of go through with a bit more of a fine toothed comb with the goal of maybe having Berry take back the pen and get us out a close to done draft for review this week.

So with that I see that Theo has got his hand up. I'll hand it over to you Theo.

Theo Geurts: Yes Mikey I was looking at a draft and I was actually looking when I came to the point of the purpose of it. And well how to phrase it? It has a couple of points like end-users and registrants find it confusing and difficult to find the most appropriate problem reporting et cetera, et cetera.

And when I was reading through it I was going like that compliance, the compliance team (McGee) and her team they already addressed a couple of these issues.

I mean the ICANN Web site has been improved. It's now much easier to report a problem. There's a whole yes filtered so to speak to address your problems.

And when it comes to the compliance tools that the compliance team has to address all those issues they've been making some really good progress when it comes to that.

I mean they've got a boatload of tools to address their issues they get from registrants or other sources where compliance can come from.

So I was wondering if the whole purpose hasn't been bypassed already by current events that have took place already?

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks Theo. I think I'll let Jonathan, I'll sort of let the Q unwind and then circle back to this. This is exactly what I was looking for is sort of big issues with the draft and then we can kind of work on those for a bit and then get into the nits. Jonathan go ahead.

Jonathan Zook: Yes hi Mikey. I guess my big picture reaction is that it read like it was almost too different PDPs. and I guess that was the thing that struck me is that all this emphasis back on the specifics of a particular problem that I thought was going to be like one of the problems that helped us make general recommendations it feels like it's really dominating.

The intro even though it doesn't even so much dominate the purpose and approach and so my reaction came away going that there's whole specific thing and then the generic thing that felt sort of bolted on I guess is the feeling I came away with.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes I think both of you are reacting to the thing that I did. And let me tell you what I was trying to do with the drafts.

One of the observations that I came away from the Buenos Aires meeting with was that this effort had gotten a little bit decoupled from the reason it was started. And I decided to both that back on.

And if it turns out that everything is just fine in compliance that's great, you know, then that part of the work can be done very quickly.

I don't think it's as fine as people think. And so let me sort of tell a little bit of the purpose story with a different slant.

Where the RAPWG came from with this was that we don't close the loop between the compliance activity and the policy activity very well.

And in addition to that there is still a fair amount of frustration on the part of the contracted parties that we don't take advantage of the opportunities to reduce errors in reporting, getting people to the right place or encouraging the help from the right provider because sometimes compliance isn't the right place.

Sometimes the best place to get this fixed is your registrar or your registry or sometimes the best to get this kind of thing fixed is the courts.

And while there has been a lot of improvements to the compliance (unintelligible) I agree but we aren't done with this quite yet.

And by adding on the fact that sometimes the best place to get this problem solved then we segue into the other half which is if the best place to go to get things fixed is your provider your registrar then the policymakers need a mechanism to find out the kind of information that's being reported to them which right now is pretty hard for a working group to get.

And that's the segue into the other half of this effort which is the one that you are more familiar with and have been more zeroed in on.

And so my goal is to bring those two halves together in a narrative that flows well. And so I want to pause because I think there's two issues.

Jonathan I think you're raising a point about the way the narrative flows and it, you know, we may need to improve the narrative to get that point across.

But I think that the larger point is Theo's which is, you know, is this really the right problem to address still and I think, you know, I'm of the view that it still is but I'm but one of us I'm not, you know, I don't hold special rules.

So I'd like to circle back and take on that larger question first. Any thoughts?

I'm seeing an empty queue which means I've talked to you all to sleep...

Jonathan Zook: Well I mean I don't - I guess this is Jonathan again for the transcript. I - it's more that it's the issues related specifically to how compliance works feel like another PDP that would have benefited from better access to data and the

use of metrics in - and the use, not so much these of metrics in the PDP process but the incorporation of metrics into the policies that get developed right?

And so that's - I guess that's my feeling about it is that it feels like it's its own task go back and deal with those issues related to reporting within compliance whether or not they are - I'm not trying to make the pitch that compliance is perfect. Anybody that knows me knows that's not my point.

It's more that it feels almost like its own thing. It feels like its own PDP to do that and that the - where we were headed and where the recommendations from GNSO for - to form this evolve to a more generalized recommendation even though it was motivated by that.

I - and so I mean I know that that's how we got there. I - it just wasn't clear to me from the language of the recommendation that we were meant to go back and actually deal with that specific issue of compliance. That's all. It just feels like...

Mikey O'Connor: Yes.

Jonathan Zook: ...to...

Mikey O'Connor: Well I think the problem is that if we just go to the place where our thinking evolved we're liable to get shot out of the saddle by the council because the council's thinking hasn't evolved that far yet. And I think that's part of what happened with Jeff Neuman.

I went back and listened to the transcript and also reviewed all the documents that basically got us to that meeting and realized that we don't really have a mandate to just go off and do a metrics project on our own.

Some of that momentum came from the language that was in the little memo from the alumni group of the RAPWG that dislodged the council from a perspective that said oh, this is basically a staff thing. You know, let's have the staff just do this. You know, do we really need a working group to work on this at all?

And the alumni group said wait a minute, this was our unanimous recommendation. We feel pretty strongly about it obviously because it's a unanimous recommendation. And here's the core of it. And it's this closing the loop story that I just told you.

If we cut off the compliance leg and the loop we lose the fundamental reason that the RAP WG was so keen on it.

And I think then we'll then lose the support for the subsequent metrics piece as well.

So part of this is not to get too far ahead of the council on this. I don't think they're ready to do a full blown entirely metrics focused project just yet.

That's just my read of the council. I'm, you know, I'm not sure that's right but that's part of the reason that I'm putting this grounding back in is because I think that otherwise we - we lose our sponsor.

Theo, go ahead.

Theo Geurts: Yes. But like you just mentioned -- this is Theo for the record by the way -- you just mentioned that you did list - went back to the old transcripts. Are these the old 2008 transcripts that you are referring to?

Mikey O'Connor: No, no these are just the transcripts of the council meetings that happened in Buenos Aires.

Theo Geurts: Because when I signed up for this drafting team I was - I encountered this real old piece from 2008 where certain recommendations were made regarding the metrics.

And when I was flipping through the document I thought this is A, a real document. B, many of the issues that were encountered back then either by - well mostly that may focus on that whole piece is that contract compliance had some issues regarding the metrics.

But I have the feeling that it's all been water under the bridge now. It's all been solved or new procedures have been in place.

PDPs have been passed and are already implemented for registrars and also for registries in some cases.

So I was looking at that piece back then and I thought a lot has been solved already. And that circles back to the entire thing of setting up a metric solution for the GNSO themselves or other working groups. And as well we'll focus on the compliance part even...

Mikey O'Connor: Yes I'm not sure it was 2008. If you're looking at the RAP that Berry noted in the chat and I was going to say the same thing. The RAP Working Group started in 2009 so I don't know...

Theo Geurts: Oh yes.

Mikey O'Connor: ...where that one was from. But presumably I think your point is well taken there certainly have been a lot of changes in compliance since (Maggie) came on board.

But the issue that I'm really trying to deal with here is we don't have grounding for a pure metrics project. We have no basis on which to build that of whole (cloth).



We can take up the project that the RAPWG wanted the council to do and build out to a metrics project from there.

But if we don't stand on that foundation I just don't think we have sponsorship for it nor do I think that we have grounding in it.

I mean I - one of the things that is - that I think is tricky here is that I am a bit concerned that we'll get ahead of our - well I'm repeating myself so I'll stop. Berry go ahead.

Berry Cobb: Hi Mikey. This is Berry. So, you know, at the very least this Drafting Team has the basis of the issue of work to work on as that is the foundation for how the resolution got passed through the council.

But that said and having been a member of the RAP it - you know, we had nothing back then.

And to Theo's point, you know, the contractual compliance has come a long way not only in the metrics side of things so that if we need access to metrics from contractual compliance there's something there.

But in addition they've also implemented a three year plan that has implemented or I should say migrated the end user front end to submitting complaints to contractual compliance over to icann.org.

They've deployed processes based on the different types of abuse transactions that facilitate the metrics that the GNSO or Working Group could get to.

But at I think another fundamental gap during the RAPWG was access to data external to ICANN as well because I do recall the Working Group at that time looking for cybersquatting metrics.

And I think we were talking about UDRP metrics. And certainly within (Hedner) and other working groups which weren't a part of RAPWG but they were going on at the same time is that in cases where working group needed better (intelligence) on the types of abuse complaint being formed out there whether it be through expirations or transfer issues that's the fundamental aspect of where we're getting too.

And again I'm going to refer the group back to the two resolution statements they got this started at which I've pasted over to the left the first one being that it talks about compliance's three year plan and if they are still gaps after that three year plan and to have Jonathan mention it being a possible PDP if there are - if there are still perceived gaps there I mean that would launch that process.

But the second resolution is what was passed by the council that really is the basis for this effort. And that is to consider metrics and reporting from not only contracted parties but external.

Now if the drafting team chooses not to go so far as to defining a framework by which a PDP would be gauged or measured then, you know, that perhaps that can be shaved out.

But at the very least there does need to be a, you know, a piece of work here that focuses on what the boundaries are by which any future group could get access to data so that they have something more tangible and concrete to work with as opposed to kind of re-creating the wheel in determining whether certain data types are accessible from contracted parties or not or as well as other metrics providers out there such as Spamware -- whatever it's called or any kind of third-party providers that could provide metrics on Botnets or whatever issue is being addressed by a working group at that particular (time). So I hope that made things a little clearer.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes and I think that what I'm hearing is that if I look at the purpose section which is the point that Theo raised that I dragged a little too much of the RAPWG language into that and didn't modify it enough to reflect the motion.

Because I see that list of bullets as a staircase that leads us to where we are now, the first bullet being the one that's essentially at least the one we're mostly debating which is that end-users and registrants find it difficult.

And the key for me in that was to identify the most appropriate problem reporting venue which then staircases us into our metrics charter.

But the middle one is also sort of obliquely getting us to that same place because it's saying that it's a good idea to get to the most relevant provider which is in many cases either the registrar or a phishing group or whatever. It's one of those external data sources.

And then the third bullet is the payday bullet. That's the one that's really reflected in the resolution that policymakers find their work hampered.

So let's take that as something that needs to be reworked. I still want to leave it grounded a bit in that history because on that history was built the issue report and ultimately the work that we'll have to do.

But I'll take that as a friendly amendment that the emphasis is perhaps too low on the metrics part and too high on the historical precedence part and see if we can rework that a bit.

Because I think that the rest of the charter especially with (Jen)'s additions tends to zero in on metrics. And it's too bad that the purpose thing is such a distraction so with that back to Theo.

Theo Geurts: I just wanted to make a comment. This is the Theo again for the record. When we talk about external sources my question would actually or the

process actually should be in my opinion instead of developing a metric you the first question you should ask yourself are we actually - is ICANN able to request the information and what kind of information?

And I'm actually referring you here to the European data privacy laws that are in effect here and that are actually getting worse and worse from a compliance point of view. So yes this is actually a point I wanted to make.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. And that's not one for us. That's certainly one for the Working Group to figure out. That's certainly a problem.

In some cases there may be the need to define a mechanism to protect the confidentiality of that information.

We ran into this in a different context in the DNS security and Stability Analysis Working Group where we had to build a process to protect information provided by primarily registries in that case about security incidents relating to the DNS.

And we had to build that before we could even start to collect data because otherwise - oh this is spectacular. My cat's going to push a giant box off the counter so this is going to be really good. Sorry.

So I think one of the things that we're going to have to do when the Working Group is going is address that kind of issue Theo. And to the extent that that kind of puzzler is not reflected in the charter now we should make sure that it's listed somewhere. But we certainly don't want to address that right now. We just want to make sure that the Working Group does.

So would you...

Theo Geurts: Okay (unintelligible) Mikey. Thanks Berry.

Mikey O'Connor: Is there a place in this document that we could allude to that, just sort of scrolling.

I mean so one of the things that I stuck in somewhere oh, I guess it's down in the mission statement where we are looking for a mechanism whereby GNSO working groups can request information both internal to ICANN or external including GNSO contracted parties which support fact-based policymaking while -- and this is the key bit -- while at the same time providing appropriate safeguards with regard to the confidentiality of certain types of information.

It seems to me that that's the bucket into which that goes when the Working Group does its work. Is that clear enough Theo or should that be pulled up to be made more prominent?

Theo Geurts: No, no this is just fine. This is just fine Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay good. Good deal. But that's the kind of thing that on this - so far the one action that I got out of this draft is to sort of refined that purpose section to sort of bring it a little bit up to snuff on the story of how we got here and where we're going.

All right so we're still in the big issues piece. I'm going to see if there are any other big issues. And then if there are not we'll go into the refining at the more granular level.

We've got about a half an hour to zip through that. But before we go there I do want to just hold back and take one last call for big broad concerns.

And I've blathered on long enough that not seeing any hands I'm going to go ahead and go into details. But this is sort of the last call on that at least for this call. I think we'll always start with that but let's go into some detail.

And it's great to have (Jen) with us on the call because we're going to get in to some of the details in her draft.

I want to skip the background one because I'm going to give that a pretty major rewrite. And so rather than rewrite that as a group, you know, let's skip that and let's skip the purpose for now, at least the first part where I copied in that RAPWG language and start sort of in the middle to the bottom of that page. We start with the list of goals.

So it says the Working Group is encouraged to consider and refine the following tentative list of goals in identifying a framework for metrics and reporting.

And there you can see that (Jen) is doing sort of the work that Theo and Jonathan wanted us to do which is she's nudging the focus back on to the metrics and reporting angle.

And I'm okay with that. You know, just to make it clear I don't want to say that I'm against all that. I just want to make sure that we're grounded in something that the council can vote for.

So let's just look at that half of the page for a minute and see if people have any reactions to either the words that I stuck in which are in blue or the words that (Jen) stuck in which are in sort of maroon on my screen.

I'm not seeing anybody leaping through the barricade. I don't have any terrible problems with those and changes. I think they're good so...

Jonathan Zook: This is Jonathan. I'm a thumbs up. My computer just crashed so I can't do it in do Adobe Connect right now. But that's - yes but I like the changes as well.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. And Cheryl's in so that's good. We'll sort of move ahead until somebody throws their body in front of the bus and says wait that's wrong.

So then I'm going to go onto the mission statement.

Berry Cobb: Mikey this is Berry, sorry real quick. Just I'm going to highlight (Jen)'s comment on bullet number two about whether, you know, that should be listed as a potential goal here.

Are we going to really be set out to provide this education and knowledge to people wanting to report problems or...

Mikey O'Connor: I think that that's a carryover from the old one. I'd like to leave that one in because I think part of that education and knowledge is tied to the external data sources part of this.

Because we want to make sure that we've close the loop between where compliance is telling people to go when the problem isn't one that they can solve and the sources of data that we are encouraging be made available to working groups.

So I would be comfortable leaving that in not so much as a review of their, you know, I certainly don't want to review their Web page and say no that's not formatted right or anything like that.

But I do want to keep that loop closing notion in there. And so maybe this needs to be expanded just a little bit to address that.

I'm getting a thumbs-up from Berry and (Tony) on that. So Berry could you give me an action item to rewrite that bullet too so then I don't want to write it on the fly on the call. That's a pretty subtle point and I'll need to...

Berry Cobb: I just put it into the - this is Berry. I just put it into the chat that I'll extract what you said and from the transcript. And I think that would make a good footnote for - to that.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes maybe that will also help me rewrite it. I think the thing to do is rewrite it so that it's clearer. Because I think (Jen) raises the right point which is no, we don't want to be off fixing their Web page. That's not the point here.

(Tony) go ahead.

Tony Onarato: Mikey hi, good morning. One of the things I just wanted to ask about here one thing I'm not sure I'm seeing in this section of goals for the Working Group is the I guess the defining and refining of the process by which the data is requested and gathered.

I know that's sort of an overarching theme here obviously but isn't that really one of the tasks that we need to explicitly put on the Working Group which is the explicit setting forth of the process by which data is to be requested, data is to be gathered, data is to be maintained?

And then the second part of my comment is a question as well in that to what extent are we saying to the Working Group that this is - to what extent should this be an ongoing obligation in the sense of a goal of the Working Group and of later bodies that my deal with these issues is the continued refining of the process?

Is that something that's too attenuated to be necessary here? Because certainly once the process gets put into place over time it will be - it will evolve just by - as problems get worked through and the contracted parties continue to provide input in the best way for them to give aggregated data and so on if that's how this ends up working out.

So I guess those are my two questions. Do we - are we missing a piece here on the Working Group defining process and should there be a piece here on later goals concerning refining the process?



Mikey O'Connor: Thanks (Tony). I think that these goals need to get - well so I put in goals where we going? And then in the mission I put how are we going to get there?

And so if you look down to the mission section you're going to see a lot of the sort of mechanical stuff including things that I think are what you're looking for. So roll to the...

Tony Anarato: Yes.

Mikey O'Connor: ...very next section and see - and so the question there is do some of those how we're going to get their things actually need to be rolled up into where we going?

And that seems like a valid question is that maybe what we need to do is amp up in the goals the statement that at the end of the day what we want is a continuous improvement mechanism, you know, that the mechanism itself is a goal rather than just being a way to get to the destination? So that's...

Tony Anarato: Yes and this is (Tony) again. I mean I'm very - I think that the mission section is well done and I'm quite comfortable with that.

I guess I'm wondering just to sort of refine it a little bit whether or not it's duplicative of the goals and whether or not...

Mikey O'Connor: (Unintelligible) yes.

Tony Anarato: ...sorry, go ahead.

Mikey O'Connor: No, no you go. I'm sorry. I'm thinking aloud, bad habit. Sorry.

Tony Anarato: And I guess the other thing is that we just - it just sort of dawned on me here. Do we need to put in a point that says essentially there needs to be a metric

for sensing - for assessing the success or lack thereof of the mission itself, of the goals we set forth in the Working Group, a metric for assessing whether or not this whole process once it gets put in place is effective?

Is it acquiring the data? Is the policymaking behind the process? And this might be too far afield really for what we're talking about right now.

But does there need to be a bullet that says that part of refining this is the continued reassessment of whether or not this process is working?

But so it says two different things. I like which you done quite a bit with the mission. I wonder if it's not - might not be combined a little bit with the goals or if it is duplicative. I'm not sure because I don't know that rolling this stuff up into the goals is really necessary if we're going to say it here.

I think the content is there. And then the other question is whether or not we need to bullet on the continued assessment of the effectiveness of this process?

Mikey O'Connor: Yes Berry it looks like I get to rewrite this. So if you could just take notes for me for this. Again the problem with these goals now that I'm reading them through your eyes folks is that some of these are still left over from the original RAPWG stuff. And those need to get thought through again.

And way to go Berry, note taking fool so point taken. I think these two sections do duplicate each other a bit and need to go through another combination.

And the other point that you raised is there we should probably eat our own cooking. And see if we can come up with a way with a suggestion for a metric to measure the success of the Working Group itself.

It does get a little bit, you know, it turns into one of those infinite loops if we're not careful but it's not a bad idea.

Berry Cobb: True. And I'm not (unintelligible). I'm not trying to make this more difficult I'm really not by injecting some existential problem into the nature of it but...

Mikey O'Connor: Well but you know I think one of the things that's interesting about, I mean this is the among other things, this is changing culture. And, you know, the ICANN culture, it's always good to lead by example and so I'm okay with that. I don't think it's existential.

Berry Cobb: I think we're kind of an incubator in this sense if we can develop...

Mikey O'Connor: Yes.

Berry Cobb: ...a way in which to assess our own - the - assess the success of this process...

Mikey O'Connor: Right.

Berry Cobb: ...over time that might be a useful model to be applied to other processes.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. I think that's right. Now I may punt that to the Working Group...

Berry Cobb: Fine by me.

Mikey O'Connor: ...and say dear Working Group among other things you have to establish a mechanism to measure the success of this process.

I actually like your words a lot. So Berry type those words if you haven't already. And we'll work that in because, you know, I think that's one of the interesting and exciting parts of this particular project is that it is a culture changing thing among other things so cool, good feedback.

Any more on that? You know, we've started to slide from goals into mission and correctly identified the fact that they're very overlapping. But let's step along from goals for a minute. I have good instructions on how to rewrite that.

Let's take a look at we're about 15 minutes away from the call. Let's see if we can at least get through mission and scope because those are the two last most defining things.

And if we're comfortable with those then I think the rest will flow pretty naturally out of that.

So let's focus on the mission part. And again in my view that was the how we going to get there part. And not seeing anybody with course corrections on that but let's read it. It's always good to sort of slow these conversations down a little bit and just make sure that - miss something.

(Jen) so far your changes are obviously meeting with great enthusiasm so take pride in that.

(Jen): That's great. Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: So okay well I'm not seeing anybody leaping forward on mission so let's go on to scope. And you can see that our scope statement's actually consistent with the earlier part of the conversation where we said no, no, no. We don't really want to be tinkering with compliance's Web page. That's not where we're at.

And I think that may be one of the things that we will want to do - and Berry here's another note for you is down in the out of scope art we've got compliance and all their processes. Those are out of scope.

We may want to amplify that sentence as we back down the conversation about the intake. We may want to refine. And I think it's probably a separate bullet that says while the Working Group is going to be interested in closing the loop between intake and distribution of complaints we do not want the Working Group to be reviewing that process itself.

We are much more interested in this idea of where the appropriate data is eventually going to be collected. And that's why we're still interested in that intake process. But we don't really want to get into reviewing all the details of that.

So that might be a place to amplify that idea is in the out of scope part.

The in scope part at least for me reads pretty metrics and reporting. So I - you know, in terms of scope this is another important one folks. Don't be nodding off on me here because very often when a Working Group is at full gallop working hard they'll come back to this list for guidance on whether they should be pursuing a line of inquiry or not.

And so we want to make sure that we haven't accidentally put a fence on them that we don't want to. And at the same time we don't want to give them a job that so big that they can never finish it. And so scope is important.

Not seeing any hands I think maybe at this hour, ten minutes to the top of the hour oh, Jonathan go ahead.

Jonathan Zook: I'm just quickly I mean obviously it's back to the same issue of, you know, the whole problem reporting mechanisms and things like that. I mean so some of this might come out as part of another run, another pass that this is just where to report policy violations things of, you know, reportable problems et cetera, those again feel pretty specific. So that's I'm - they still worry me. So it's really a restatement of my earlier...

Mikey O'Connor: Yes so the one - the two that I see in there are the problem dash reporting one which is the very first one...

Jonathan Zook: Right.

Mikey O'Connor: ...and the problem dash report tracking one.

Jonathan Zook: Right.

Mikey O'Connor: ...and I - Berry give me a tick mark put beside those two to narrow those and refine them a bit again with this more nuanced view that we've got now because I agree the way those read they're pretty much right out of the RAPWG stuff. Actually the first three are. And so those first three probably I need to go through all three of those and tighten them up a bit so that we don't accidentally tick people off into a project that either doesn't need to be done or is already pretty much done. So I think that's a good tip.

And then if you kind of mentally take those three out then we're - the last two, external data and monitoring are really the main in scope things.

And Berry I think those need tick marks in the other direction. I think those are a little bit sketchy at the moment and need to be - I need to at least read those hard and see if they cover everything that we've got in the mission. So I'll do that. Berry go ahead.

Berry Cobb: Thank you Mikey this is Berry. I did make those highlights for you in this next draft. And I'd just like to, you know, I guess caution the Drafting Team as well and perhaps Mikey when you make another run at this with the pen I wouldn't necessarily consider these out of scope and I'll put it in this context is what, you know, I still believe that the RAPWG recognized way back then and that is carried through even up to today is that any kind of complaint that is submitted which to me again is it fuels the metrics by which we digest in

terms of trying to make better policy decisions is that only a very short or small amount of those types of complaints ever get to ICANN.

And again it kind of more or less dovetails back into, you know, perhaps contracted parties have this information that we can get to.

So I guess in terms of when you re-pen these first three bullets try and keep I guess the essence there because, you know, and this was strictly mentioned as a specific point in the issue report is that, you know, there's this vast universe of registrant issues out there pertaining to abuse whether it be again expiration transfers -- whatever -- that we don't have visibility to.

And a lot of these, what is listed here these first three bullets does I guess complement those metrics. And so I wouldn't want this to drop them all together. So I just I'm hoping to kind of remind people that that's still the same ballpark there we're in.

It is a registrant that has the issue that does contact either a registrar and/or ICANN and those types of events or those transactions lead to the metrics that a Working Group would look at some point in time in the future when they're addressing a particular policy issue.

I'll stop there. Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes that's well spoken. And as I read these I'll give you an example of what I'm thinking Berry and see what you think.

I think that what we're trying to get at if we took - the first one problem reporting, right now we say it's a mechanism -- I like that -- defined or updated during policymaking process -- I like that -- whereby those who are impacted can report and that's where I stop.

I think that violations of GNSO policy isn't necessarily the only thing that we want to make available to the policymakers because in some cases the issue is something that's not yet in policy and the data is used to decide whether there should be a policy and what that policy should look like.

So it's refinements like that that I'm thinking this needs to go through. Because I think I took these straight out of the RAPWG report. I may have touched on them a little bit but not very much. And given this conversation we've just had I think I need to touch these just a bit.

Jonathan's given me a thumbs up on that. It's the top of the hour. I think what I'm going to do is I'm going to take Berry's notes -- thank you, thank you, thank you Berry for all of that -- and turn the next draft into a black line for you so that we'll take this as a base and then move on from there.

So Berry is giving me a very subtle hint. You were so subtle. He's talking about our schedule confirmed next meeting which at this point is the 18th at 21 UTC so a different time of day, hopefully better for Cheryl than this one.

And let's see how are we doing on our - we've got another meeting scheduled --I'm reading now -- on the 18th, co the goal of trying to get a charter to the council for approval on the 13th. That's our deadline.

We're heading into the holiday season. I think we may be all right Berry. I think I will try and turn around the draft fairly quick again so that we can have a lively conversation on the list.

And maybe Berry we should set the expectation that we're going to try and land on a final draft next meeting the rigor with which we determine consensus isn't as high in this kind of a group.



In a Working Group we wouldn't be able to do it because we have to do a consensus call followed by week on the list followed by another consensus call.

But I think we could probably do a shortened version of that. So let's try for that anyway. Yes and Cheryl's in the chat saying let's call, try and sign off on the draft or at least give pretty detailed instructions on revisions.

I think that's a reasonable goal. And then because I don't think it's reasonable to have any meetings between that time and the end of the year. We might be able to sandwich another meeting in early January after the holiday season is over but I'd like to avoid it if we could so let's do that.

Berry's typing. You could speak. Yes right, 12-25 Christmas Day, perfect. That sounds like a great idea.

Okay right, and then Cheryl's saying we have got one sort of first week of January, even second week of January if we had to.

So we got a little echo on the line. I'm hearing myself speak back to me in one second delay, two seconds delay. Cheryl do you want to chime in before we go? I assume that's you that's causing the echo.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No that was me typing.

Mikey O'Connor: No it's not you. Oh about that? Oh well, how about that? Okay well it's top of the hour. Top of the day to you all. Thanks a million. This has been very helpful. We'll see you in a week at a different time. Do remember a different time. Talk you later. Bye-bye.

Man: Thanks everyone.

Man: Have a good one.

END