

**ICANN Transcription
Data & Metrics for Policy Making Working Group
Tuesday 15 April 2014 at 2000 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of Data & Metrics for Policy Making Working Group call on the Tuesday 15 April 2014 at 20:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

The audio is also available at:

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-dmpm-20140415-en.mp3>

On page:

<http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar#apr>

Attendees:

Marinel Rosca - Individual
Jonathan Zuck - IPC
Cheryl Langdon-Orr – ALAC
Nenad Orlic – ISPC
Graeme Bunton – RrSG
Jeremy Beale - SOI
Magaly Pazello – NCUC
Rudi Vansnick – NPOC
Gabriel Vergara – NCUC
Klaus Stoll – NPOC
Pam Little – RySG
Kayode Yussuf – IPC
Andrew Merriam – RySG
Olevie Kouame – NPOC

Apologies:

Tony Onorato – Individual
Janiver Ngnoulaye - Individual

ICANN staff:

Mary Wong
Amy Bivins
Glen De Saint Gery
Berry Cobb
Lars Hoffmann
Terri Agnew

Coordinator: And the recordings have started.

Terri Agnew: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. This is the Data and Metrics for Policy Making Working Group on the 15th of April, 2014.

On the call today we have Gabriella Vergara, Marinel Rosca, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Rudi Vansnick, Klaus Stoll, Pam Little, Kayode Yussuf, Jonathan Zuck, Andrew Merriam and Graeme Bunton. We have apologies from Tony Onorato and Janiver Ngnoulaye.

From staff we have Berry Cobb, Glen de Saint Géry, Amy Bivens, Lars Hoffman, Mary Wong and myself, Terri Agnew. I'd like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and over to you, Jonathan.

Jonathan Zuck: Hey, welcome everybody. Thanks for being a part of the call. I guess is there anybody that hasn't gotten their Statement of Interest in? Do we need to address that? Or is everybody up to date with that? Berry, go ahead.

Berry Cobb: Hi, Jonathan. Yeah, we're still finalizing the member list. I think we still have four or five SOIs outstanding but we'll get that list and get it out to the mailing list so that people can see who all's on the group and we'll follow up completing any short SOIs we have.

Jonathan Zuck: Okay. Great. So if you haven't done your SOIs yet then get them in. But I guess we'll be coming after you directly shortly.

I guess, Berry, I'm interested in maybe turning this back to you on the next topic on the agenda as well which is what transpired in terms of your call for volunteers and things like that. I mean, I sort of know what's happened anecdotally but what's the story?

Berry Cobb: Yes, Jonathan. This is Berry Cobb for the transcript. So based on the activity over the list there seemed to be overwhelming support for you taking on the chair role if you're still willing to accept it. And then the only other outlier is also asking Cheryl if she'd be interested in taking on the - one of the three slots in the vice chair role because there seemed to be support for that as well.

So it's really I think just a matter of accepting them and we can move forward. And as I noted in the agenda I can update our charter and Klaus can notify the Council of the change.

Jonathan Zuck: Okay so do we put Cheryl on the spot now then? Is that the idea?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well that'll be unusual won't it?

Jonathan Zuck: Exactly.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl for the transcript record. And, yes, I'm happy to give a hand with some administrative as a co. I would just suggest, Berry, that you remove my nomenclature as ALAC specifically and change it to At Large; ALAC being of course just the 15-person leadership group.

Berry Cobb: Most certainly. Thank you for the correction.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That's all right, thank you.

Jonathan Zuck: Okay.

Berry Cobb: Okay. Well I think we have that decided and I'll send out a note just to the list to confirm with those that aren't on the call. Thank you.

Jonathan Zuck: All right, that sounds good. So should we dive in and look at this template document, this case analysis framework or do you want to take a step back

and just look at the - that flow diagram, that's the one that's actually going to be the hardest to look at on this screen probably. But has everyone on the call had the chance to take a look at this initial draft framework?

And I see, Berry, you've got the people's comments and suggestions included in what you've got on the screen. Is there anyone that hasn't seen this or had a chance to look at it or have questions? Berry, go ahead.

Berry Cobb: So to give the group just a hint of background this was an action coming from the - from our call last week. And I started the first draft based on some just initial conversations within the call. That started out as a bulleted list and then I matured it into this table.

Three different members did provide feedback some of which are edits in Column 2 that you see as well as comments over to the right. And we can incorporate those into the next version as we move through this.

I think overall we've got a good start here on the list and maybe after we do a dry run of one particular past effort we may uncover some other questions that need to be included into this document. But I think we've got a good start here.

Jonathan Zuck: Yeah, I think so too. This is Jonathan again. Does the chair need to continue introducing himself as well? I don't know how that works here. So I think we do have a good start here on what we need to do. Are there additional questions about this document or its purpose? Is it clear what we're trying to do here?

I mean, obviously this is meant to be the toolset with which we'll go out and split into groups and look at the various case studies that we think would be useful to look at as we begin to build our framework for data-driven policy making.

Are there questions about this document or additional comments that you didn't get a chance to make on the list? And then Glen is communicating from the - from space I think as far as I can tell. Rudi, do you have a question?

Rudi Vansnick: Jonathan, no, thank you. I just was sleeping with my mouse on the wrong button. Sorry for that.

Jonathan Zuck: Okay. Berry, go ahead.

Berry Cobb: Thank you, Jonathan, this is Berry. Just to kind of expand on this as I was putting this version together, you know, and I recognize several of our members are relatively new to the PDP or working group realm. As I mentioned I think on the previous call we're going to start generating a list of possible candidates for review of past efforts.

On the GNSO Website there's definitely a very good archive list that has been generated now as well as we may want to review other activities outside of the GNSO, you know, such as Whois, I think which Pam had suggested on the list. So we'll start - I'll send that out after the call just to kind of start building a rough list of what efforts that we would start to review.

But circling back to my original point recognizing that many of the members weren't probably involved in a number of these past efforts after, you know, I think it sounds like we're going to split apart into sub teams and try to do a divide and conquer approach to reviewing some of these past efforts.

And after we, as the working group and/or sub teams, kind of do some initial research I think it might be a pretty good idea that if possible that we reach out to the former chairs of those efforts or those that are - that were heavily involved in there.

And if we have certain questions that we weren't able to reveal in our analysis that perhaps we could invite them to the call, you know, and have a prepared

set of questions and/or do it off list and, you know, come up with a set of questions that we would like to ask those particular members just to help kind of complete the picture.

Jonathan Zuck: Oh yeah, I definitely think, I mean, that's an excellent idea, Berry. And I definitely agree that I think there's two parts to each of these, you know, analysis efforts. The first is going to be to examine the documents generated, the charter and then ultimately the policy recommendations to see if there's evidence of a data based perspective in either of them.

And then I think the next is to get the, you know, feedback of those involved whether it's the chair or somebody that was deeply involved that's willing to talk about it to see if it had come up and if it was - if the reason there wasn't any data involved was because it was difficult to get or if it just didn't come up in the first place I guess.

I mean, I think that definitely should be part of the analysis effort to look at the documents that were generated first and then move on and ask those involved what actually transpired.

Cheryl, go ahead.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks. Cheryl for the record. One I wanted to suggest we add but that we may not necessarily want to treat in exactly the same way so I'm sort of bringing it to the table as a proposal that I'm also proposing that we may want to deal with it separately albeit not a terribly different way but because it is slightly different beast and that is the DSSA Working Group.

Admittedly it is one that it - as a cross community working group I thought it was particularly well structured and it was very much data driven. So I think there's probably some good learnings from that. But it's one that sadly truncated itself because of another Board-derived project which basically, you know, made it a non-event. That's the politest thing I can say.

So it'd be worthwhile looking at but not probably in the same first run but I think we should definitely take some time at some point to do that. And there's plenty of us that can help with that discussion and analysis thanks.

Jonathan Zuck: That's a good recommendation. And I think part of what we're going to try and broach within the context of this working group is the process of review of policy implementation from a data-driven perspective as well. I mean, you know, in the ideal, you know, universe the one that they only teach us about in economics class the problem would be defined by data and a solution would be proposed that had data based objectives and then a review would take place to see whether those objectives were met.

And so, I mean, that would be the perfect template that will never happen in real life. But, I mean, I think that's - that outline would be what we would be seeking both in past, you know, case study analysis and then potential future recommendations.

Berry Cobb: Yeah, just to tag onto what Cheryl was saying about the DSSA and for those that were on the list at the time I think it was mentioned as a line item from Singapore.

But Mikey had also made reference to one appendix of that DSSA report that I think will be very useful for the working group when we get around to the task of establishing a framework for gathering data from contracted parties or, you know, data external to ICANN that may be sensitive and the like as well. So and that's definitely going to be a good fodder for us.

Jonathan Zuck: Excellent. Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah, if I may, Jonathan. Cheryl for the record. Yeah, that's one of the particular learnings that extraordinarily useful. And because there are some new people on - in this working group I just want to mention that it was

exceptional because we were dealing with and going to continue to deal with in the DSSA which was all about analysis of security and stability of the DNS; a lot of (proprietel) and highly confidential if not downright scary information.

There was also a trusted third party put into place in the person of (Paul Dixie) who could act as the repository of the gory details and pass on the anonymized facts. And that's something the I think might be a very useful thing to explore again a little later on in our process.

Because on a number of times in GNSO working groups the question of how one can deal with what could be considered commercial in confidence or proprietel (sic) information comes to hand. And I think what DSSA did in that specific instance could be very useful. Thank you.

Jonathan Zuck: That makes perfect sense. I mean, again, you know, defining some role that, you know, we later call a data intermediary or data liaison or something like that may be part of the recommendations that we make for PDP processes in the GNSO in the future. So, I mean, I think that's a perfect example of where something like that happened and then trying to find a way to generalize that I think is part of our task.

Are there other questions or comments? I guess one of the things that we might - I don't know the best way or the best politically correct way to address the fact that there's a number of people that are new to the PDP process in our group and whether we should try to - if we divide up into sub teams do we try to pair people together or something like that so that nobody's sort of left rudderless in this analysis.

And I don't know if anybody has a particularly good suggestion for how we might divide up into teams to kind of divide and conquer these case studies. All right pin drop.

So - oh Berry, go ahead.

Berry Cobb: Thank you, Jonathan. This is Berry. You know, a couple of things there I think - I think it'll be wise that we baby-step our way into this and that, you know, we don't look at trying to create four or five sub teams. You know, let's maybe start off with just two and start slowly. And as we mature through our analysis process and we can maybe divide further and divide and conquer even more.

Because what we do have documented at this point in time, you know, I think there's about 25 or so past efforts. And I'm not saying that we'd want to do all of those, maybe only a subset.

But the other challenge with working with sub teams is managing the varying schedules that everyone has as well as even from a staff perspective trying to coordinate all of that. That's certainly been a lesson learned from previous attempts at that.

So if anything I'd recommend we start small maybe with just two sub teams and make the sub teams, you know, rather large; in the five to seven range or somewhere in there. And then as I mentioned as we move forward we can look at creating more sub teams to finish through the list.

Jonathan Zuck: Yeah, I mean, I'm just - I mean, it's interesting that you raise those points, Berry. Because, I mean, I'm a little more concerned about coordination with large groups of people than I am with smaller ones in terms of, you know, having this broken down more granularly feels like people could go off and find amongst themselves a time that they could talk and then a smaller number of people are being asked to read a particular document and fewer of them as a result.

And, I mean, I'm more concerned I think that we're going to have a lot of folks that won't have read the document because of a, you know, because the group will be big, right. And so if we try to do this sort of in a conference call

fashion, you know, with larger groups on the sub teams I don't know how that will go. But I'm again open to suggestions about it.

Cheryl, go ahead.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks. Cheryl for the record again. I am more inclined to agree with Berry. And of course having a non-weekly but a fortnightly or more widely interspersed committee of the whole group meeting does allow I think for better logistics of smaller groups to find time to do their meetings.

And I think where that's been baked into the DNA of working groups which has only happened recently in my experience that has helped. So I think Mary's had a bit of experience with that and certainly Maria has as well.

But to what you're saying, Jonathan, the reason I am siding a little more on Berry's points here is because I fear, not just the logistical challenges and to the free riding opportunities that you outlined but I think I fear a little more at least in the beginning is a lack of uniformity in approach.

And so what I put my hand up to suggest is to do one or two as a committee of the whole exercises so that whilst it won't be cast in concrete a set of expectations for analysis and style opportunities for how these smaller working groups could self organize and go through could be run through.

And so I think I'd be happier to sort of have a dollar each way I suppose if I was a betting person and do one or two quite different hopefully work group experience analysis as a committee of the whole. And then make sure that we have, as you've also said, a good mix of experience sets in each of the sub teams. Thank you.

Jonathan Zuck: Yeah, thanks Cheryl. I mean, I think that's all a good recommendation. And I guess institutionally I'm not concerned about the free rider problem as much

because I think we welcome everyone to be a part of the workgroup even if it's just as an observer and I think that's fine.

And maybe subcommittees is going to be the wrong way to divide up and it'll be more along the lines of champions or something or owners or something like that to where someone is taking principal responsibility for the analysis of a particular case study. And then people can kind of form around that person to provide input etcetera.

So, I mean, I'm less worried about a free rider than I am about a no-rider in the context of too big a groups, other than not being ownership in that environment. And so, I mean, maybe it's about finding four champions or three or something like that and then letting people glom on to the reports that they're interested in and provide what feedback they can.

But maybe make somebody responsible for a particular component of, you know, for a particular report. Because otherwise I, you know, free rider is the wrong term but, you know, if everybody takes a by on a particular report then no one will have read it or something, right. So that's all.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'm sure you'll have enough people with a vested interest and experience to at least be putting at least a draft out I suspect. But that was Cheryl for the record by the way.

Jonathan Zuck: Berry, go ahead.

Berry Cobb: Yes, Jonathan, this is Berry. And just to tag onto that I've pasted a couple of links into the chat over here the first being the full list of what we've got archived from a GNSO perspective. And then secondarily also included a specific example, fast flux, which I think will be really a good candidate...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh yeah.

Berry Cobb: ...because it didn't have post metrics and reporting to kind of prove whether the policy change was effective or not. But my point to this is - and again I'll send this out to the list but when you look at the particular fast flux page and the way all of these pages are structured they're more or less structured in a chronological, you know, chronological fashion.

And I think what's important is that when we review some of these past efforts it's not just going to be about the final report it's actually going to be reviewing the final issue report that staff created and that the Council approved to launch the working group effort whether it be PDP or non-PDP.

We'll also want to take a very close look at the charter document and look for any instances of where metrics may have been identified that kicked off that effort. And then of course the most obvious is the final report which hopefully, in some cases and probably not in others, you know, how metrics were used and coming up with the final recommendations.

Jonathan Zuck: Right. No, I mean, I think that makes perfect sense. And we do want to look at all those different phases so that, you know, how data could be used at each sort of milestone within the workgroup process including a review after the fact.

I mean, do you want to remand fast flux as the one that - because it looks like it might have all the components in it as a candidate for a group review? and potentially it's a homework assignment for everybody to, you know, we'll come up with a reading list for the next call and make that kind of the group activity on our next call is to go through that particular case study. What do you think Berry?

Berry Cobb: If no one objects I think that that would be a perfect one because it'll give us a little bit of everything, if my memory serves me correctly. You know, the

original issue to be addressed was occurrences that were going on in the market place, for lack of a better term.

Jonathan Zuck: Right.

Berry Cobb: But there wasn't any data to necessarily support it. The issue was reviewed thoroughly. I wasn't involved in this one; I'm not so clear about what metrics they may have used to make their policy recommendations. But most definitely the close of the recommendations themselves and post reports I think it'll be a good model of something that worked quite potentially.

And then, you know, then maybe I can try to find as a secondary candidate for us to use is, as Cheryl noted in the chat, has PDNR, and there were, you know, some gotcha's there in terms of trying to acquire certain data to make better policy...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh yeah.

Berry Cobb: ...decision. So that would kind of give us both flavors for what worked, what didn't work so well and then we can branch out from there.

Jonathan Zuck: Yeah, my sense of the fast flux is that more that information may be contained in the report. And PDNR may have required, you know, the...

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Zuck: ...of the group to share some of the off-the-books - off-the-record conversations about where to place. So maybe if we identify who that person is...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I was there.

Jonathan Zuck: So well maybe it's you then. I was going to say do we want to involve a guest speaker that chaired that. Do you feel like...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Actually Alan Greenberg as chair as an invited guest would be - sorry it's Cheryl again - excellent reason being you'll get both the high level and the background information from Alan. And that would then allow someone like myself and others who were involved, and there was plenty of us, to then do more of that nitty-gritty ongoing analysis based on that.

Jonathan Zuck: That makes sense. My - and that was Cheryl for the record. This is Jonathan. My guess is that these will each take the length of the call.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah. Yeah.

Jonathan Zuck: And so we should maybe do fast flux first on the next call and then planned to do PDNR on the succeeding call. Does that make sense?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Absolutely.

Jonathan Zuck: And then we will, you know, try to solicit a guest speaker on that call - not the next call but the call after. Cheryl, do you want to make the ask?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Sure, happy to. Yeah.

Jonathan Zuck: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Berry, can you just give me a confirmed date when you've finished this call and I'll pass it on to Alan.

Jonathan Zuck: Right, I don't know if we have not scheduled yet. We're going to be alternating times right?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah.

Jonathan Zuck: And there was an overwhelming, you know, favor, you know, overwhelming vote in favor of biweekly meetings at least in the short term while we are trying to divide up to do this work.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah.

Jonathan Zuck: And then maybe it intensifies again as we approach the London meeting for example. Does that plan of action makes sense to folks that we will do these two case studies as a group on the next call and the call following? Okay.

And so I guess Berry and I we can powwow to put together a kind of a reading list for the next call so there'll be a little bit of homework before the next call to familiarize yourself with the materials so that everyone's kind of conversant about it in time for the next call on fast flux.

All right so that's something to check your inbox for as a little reading list and look at the chartering documents and resolutions etcetera associated with that, what the follow-up looked like. And we'll try to find all those different components so that we can structure a conversation.

And we will then use that, these two efforts as further refinement of this questionnaire as well so that we have a fairly fleshed out template as we didn't try to divide up the responsibility of looking at these case studies. Okay? Thanks, Berry, I see your notes.

And so and, Rudi, we will - I think if we find them valuable be looking at non-PDP examples even though our net result is just for inside the GNSO. I think if anybody has got a recommendation for a - as Cheryl did, for something that falls out differently then our remit, I think it's still valuable as a case study

even if our - the boundaries of our mandate fall within the GNSO. Does that make sense, Rudi?

Berry, go ahead.

Berry Cobb: Yeah and just to follow up with that, again the list that I had put into the chat - and again I'll send that out to the mailing list - is there's plenty of non-PDP candidates that are within the GNSO that are worthy of review as well as the true PDP that resulted in the consensus policy changes. So I believe we'll have a fair amount of both to choose from and review that'll help us out.

Jonathan Zuck: And so we should also probably, over the next two weeks, provide feedback on the draft list of case studies that Berry has circulated to see if there's additions or reasons that something is not worth while or duplicative as well as come up with a refined list of case studies that we want to review.

It may be that we'll come up with enough of a kind of categories, if you will, that we only need to get a couple from each category as opposed to doing a thorough analysis of all of the ones on the list because there's quite a few as Berry said, like 25. All right, any other questions about that?

And so that will be the - yeah, so those would be the two initial case studies that we'll do in order to refine the list and the process and then we'll divide up from there to - once we've established our final list we'll divide up in some way whether it's sub committees or, you know, champions or whatever the right answer is in order to move forward.

So Berry has put up a initial schedule from some sort of project management software. What do you guys use, Berry?

Berry Cobb: This is Berry. This particular tool is called At Task. It's basically an online version of Microsoft Project. And...

Jonathan Zuck: Okay.

Berry Cobb: ...personally I'm loving it so...

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Zuck: Cool.

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Zuck: ...other group as well. Is there way to grant access to these outside of staff or is it all completely staff-driven?

Berry Cobb: As far as I know I believe it's all internal to staff. The...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah.

Jonathan Zuck: Okay.

Berry Cobb: ...there are external components that are listed out on My ICANN but they're very high level at the goal and - I can't remember the other term...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...just complete, I think, Berry - Cheryl here - is the other thing that comes through.

Berry Cobb: Correct. But they're more at a portfolio level...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Berry Cobb: ...and you can almost drill down to project level. But at any rate I'll always be creating this particular work plan and distributing it to the mailing list on a weekly basis so that we can keep track.

And so really the only one thing that I just wanted to point out here is in the middle of the page, Rows 30-33, basically started extracting these out of our charter and trying to put rough timeframes of completion. I think I either used two to three weeks or 15 business days for a duration. Given our alternating schedule these may expand more.

But my own selfish goal out of this is to build a solid template that we can start to use in other working group efforts. Because you'll notice that there are some sections that are denoting when we're actually having working group meetings whereas there are other key tasks and milestones that we need to accomplish as we traverse the working group process, or the PDP process.

So I'm still working on flushing out more of the tasks that I think that the working group will want to accomplish here. Of course I'll tag back to our charter and we can course-correct and build the airplane and so we're flying.

Jonathan Zuck: Yeah, I mean, obviously some of these dates are aggressive. If we don't have a fairly granular splitting apart, if you will, of the group to go over these case studies. Because, you know, two week - meetings every two weeks means that, you know, we're, you know, if we're trying to draft an initial report at the beginning of July then that's two and a half months from now, right, so it's five meetings worth.

Berry Cobb: And this is Berry. Yeah, that's a very good point. What I haven't adjusted for in here yet is this assumes that we would be meeting on a weekly basis so the next version will have the alternating schedule set out plus there will be additional line items added in here between the initial report section and the final report section.

But I think in general certainly I don't think an initial report by London is nowhere even close to possible.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No.

Berry Cobb: So most likely we'd be targeting the Los Angeles meeting to at least hopefully have an initial report accomplished by then. But, again, it's up to...

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Zuck: And I think we might be in a position to create an interesting report at London to talk about for Council and others, right? But, you know, at the meetings over the first weekend. But, yeah, we won't be drafting a report by then.

Berry Cobb: Agreed.

Jonathan Zuck: Yeah, no and I'll be curious, I mean, to play with this with you because I don't know that working group meetings are really represent milestones in a project management system.

We'll have to see what that - we need to make those substantive tasks and those are just one of the ways that we convene to accomplish the task I think, right? Anyway so we don't have to discuss it now but maybe we can hash out this project management model at some point if you're up for it.

So I guess that is our work plan. And as far as the items you pulled out of the charter and put there as tasks I'm in complete agreement. And that may have gotten lost in this conversation about scheduling. Did everybody see the items there in the low 30s that he was discussing and does everybody agree that's a good set of tasks and a good representation of what we said it is we'd be doing sort of 30-33?

One of the things that we might want to add, Berry, is the creation of - and again that might be - I mean, it's sort of part of the drafting of the initial report but the creation of materials, you know, the - for future working groups, right? That in addition to a report there might be some, you know, some revisions to the chartering and workgroup templates that currently exist to make better accommodation and expectation of data. Does that make sense, Berry?

Berry Cobb: Yes, absolutely. And we can go as deep as we need to within this. The tool is perfectly capable of doing that. Just to provide some background, I'm not sure how familiar you are with previous efforts where a work plan has been used, but it was much more higher level than what we have here. It was Word doc based.

Again, from a selfish perspective it was a pain to keep updated especially as you traverse the plan itself because older tasks would have to be cut and paste to the bottom; a whole myriad of things.

But, absolutely, I would very much appreciate and enjoy getting into the detailed sub task of what content is required for us to build into the initial report other than just having, you know, drafted this big initial report. But certainly the key milestones here are involved and that is the initial report, the public comment period, the final report, creating the final draft, submitting it to the Council. And then we can deep-dive within each of those as necessary.

Jonathan Zuck: That makes sense. Are there any other questions from other folks about those - at least gross milestones? And we'll refine them further as we go. Okay. What else do we need to do on this call? This might have been a very efficient call. Am I ignoring something important?

Berry Cobb: Yes...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Meeting schedule...

Berry Cobb: ...there's one more - yes.

Jonathan Zuck: Oh right. Sorry, I didn't meant to ignore the logistics but so yes you sent this around earlier. Do you want to talk this through? It sounded like it - what...

Berry Cobb: So...

Jonathan Zuck: ...it looked pretty specific in its outcome but go ahead, Berry.

Berry Cobb: Thank you, Jonathan. This is Berry. Most definitely I wish all Doodle polls were as nice as our meeting frequency one. It's definitely clearly obvious that we're going to be on a biweekly schedule or twice per month and that'll be an alternating week.

Hopefully, again, as we do review some of these past efforts in our exercise, you know, we aren't limiting ourselves to work being done behind the scenes as we meet every other week. So I'll definitely start working with the secretariat team to get these scheduled.

Now what is a little bit more elusive to us is the timeframes at which we're going to meet. Without a doubt the Week 1 interval is pretty much overwhelmingly at 0800 hours local time to me which is 20 UT - I'm sorry, 1400 UTC, 1500 UTC. So that one's fairly established across the members although it doesn't accommodate everyone.

Whereas and then the Week 2 version...

((Crosstalk))

Berry Cobb: ...it's a little bit more distributed across all three. And I'm almost inclined to maybe try for a different set of times on that Week 2 interval and/or we maybe try to find a different day. But I'm semi-against trying to have different

days as well as alternating meeting times because it becomes even more complex for person's schedules. So Cheryl...

Jonathan Zuck: Yeah, a lot of people will be caught off guard by that I think.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah, Cheryl here. I agree. Speaking to the day and alternating the time certainly does work. I was one of the stick-in-the-muds on that second run. The only reason being the particular week in the month that that fell because it clashed with the ALAC meetings.

So there may be some work-around which I did put in my comments. So for example just with the biweekly's time choices would solve that problem for people like me immediately. So I think there's ways around it, Berry, without doing the awful thing of having too much confusion.

So six day, alternating time, that people can probably manage especially if we put the calendar out in enough advance. But we do certainly need to try and minimize clashes with preexisting and ongoing commitments.

The only other thing I would suggest is in the ccNSO world there has been some success, now I do put that in inverted commas, with a not alternating over two times but alternating over three times. And that probably because they are more specifically required to have regional balance so that activities can be (quorate).

If we need to go to that I guess that's there to explore. But at this stage I think it's just flipped the time choices to the different biweekly options you might get a more affirmative response certainly from me. Thanks.

Berry Cobb: I think, Cheryl, just to respond. This is Berry. So if we were to schedule our next call for the 29th, which is two weeks from now, the - what would be 14 UTC is not doable because of conflict with the ALAC call, correct?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Correct. Under normal circumstance ALAC meets at that ungodly hour in my day on the fourth Tuesday of every month. In this current month, because of NETmundial it is actually meeting on the 29th. But if, in your biweekly option just flipping those around would solve that problem. Thanks.

Berry Cobb: Okay great. Well for sure - just to put a bow on this - for sure our next meeting will be on the 29th. And I'll work with the secretariat team on trying to find the right time kind of based on this. I can't promise everything. To Gabriel's point in the chat the secretariat team is sending out attachments, iCal attachments to the meeting invites so those are also handy where working group members can...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yay.

Berry Cobb: ...now have those added to their personal calendars.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yay.

Berry Cobb: And so we're making strides; slow but we are getting there.

Jonathan Zuck: Yeah, no how old is iCal technology?

Berry Cobb: No comment.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Oh vicious, vicious.

Jonathan Zuck: Very excited to see it adopted. So...

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Zuck: ...Cheryl is probably flip these...

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Zuck: ...Week 2 Week 1 or something like that, right?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That's correct.

Jonathan Zuck: So let me know if I could be helpful with that, Berry, if you work that out with the secretariat. But...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Berry, Cheryl here.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Gisella of course knows whose meeting everywhere in the known universe so if Gisella gives you the tick of approval I think you're pretty safe.

Jonathan Zuck: All right.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I don't know how she knows who's meeting everywhere but she does.

Berry Cobb: I'll be sure to get with her.

Jonathan Zuck: Anything else that we need to address related to the schedule? Any other people have questions they want to raise? Okay. Then that may be it. Does anybody want to speak to this open house, newcomer open house sessions? Is it something...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Other than encourage people to do it. I think it's particularly useful.

Jonathan Zuck: I see it down in the notes. So encourage people to do it. And I guess let us know if you need old hands to participate in that as well.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: We probably do because that was - it's Cheryl here. That was one of Mikey's babies. And in his absence, I mean, I've certainly not got involved because I didn't think we needed too many dinosaurs in the room. But we might need a couple of more dinosaurs in the room now.

Jonathan Zuck: All right well, I mean, let's take that offline but as that evolves then let me know if I can be helpful. All right, Berry, is there anything else that we need to cover?

Berry Cobb: I think we're good today.

Jonathan Zuck: All right...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Ten minutes of my life back. Thank you.

Jonathan Zuck: Oh, (Mohammed), you have a comment? (Unintelligible). Are you on mute maybe?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: (Mohammed)? You might be muted. Star 6 to un-mute. You could type. Is...

Jonathan Zuck: Type something in the chat.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Suggestions for NETmundial. I think that's something to take offline. If I may, I would suggest, (Mohammed) - Cheryl here - it - that really is outside of our remit. I'm sure many of us have quite strong opinions on it but it is not in fact a working group activity.

Jonathan Zuck: I concur. This is Jonathan. Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Zuck: Well we'll give some thought to that. But I think what we're just doing is working on making ICANN a stronger organization so that's the best contribution we can make to the conversation...

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Zuck: ...NETmundial I think.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah. I must admit however, it will make it a more accountable organization if we have, dare I say, some facts to...

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Zuck: And Berry reminds us it's just the GNSO and not ICANN in its entirety. But...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: True.

Jonathan Zuck: But GNSO is a very big part of the process. All right, everyone, thank you so much.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks.

Jonathan Zuck: And we'll pick this up, we'll have a couple of pretty lengthy meetings the next one so enjoy your 10 minutes this time because you won't get it next time. And we'll have fun going over those case studies in the next two calls. And we'll try to circulate a reading list in the next few days.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Bye all.

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Zuck: And, Berry, let me know when there's something you want me to look at. Thanks, guys.

Berry Cobb: Thank you.

END