

**ICANN Transcription  
Data & Metrics for Policy Making Working Group  
Tuesday 03 June 2014 at 1200 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 03 June 2014 at 1200 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-20140603-en.mp3>

On page:

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

Attendees:

Marinel Rosca - Individual  
Cheryl Langdon-Orr – ALAC  
Pam Little – RySG  
Tony Onorato – Individual  
Jeremy Beale – Independent  
Theo Geurts – RrSG  
Janvier Ngnoulaye – Individual  
Farhat Abbas – NCUC  
Olivier Kouami – NPOC  
Rising John Osazuwa – At Large

Apologies:

Andrew Merriam – RySG  
Rudi Vansnick – NPOC  
Jonathan Zuck - IPC

ICANN staff:

Berry Cobb  
Lars Hoffmann  
Steve Chan  
Terri Agnew

Coordinator: Good morning, good afternoon. This call is now being recorded. Please go ahead. Thank you.

Terri Agnew: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon and evening. This is that Data and Metrics for Policy Making Working Group call on the 3rd of June, 2014.

On the call today we have Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Marinel Rosca, Tony Onorato, Jeremy Beale, Theo Geurts and Pam Little. We have apologies from Rudi Vansnick and Andrew Merriam.

From staff we have Berry Cobb, Lars Hoffman, Terri Agnew - and myself Terri Agnew - and Steve Chan.

I would also like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and back over to you

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Hi, Terri. Cheryl here. Janvier has also joined and if you could just note others into the chat as they join that might help.

Terri Agnew: Certainly.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Do you mind if I just, you know, run the (administrivia) and then hand to you, Berry? Because after all I am. Any statements of interest to be updated or attention drawn to any changes? Not seeing anyone in the room waving and not hearing anyone on the audio. Let's assume that there are no updates to statements of interest in which case I am going to hand over to Berry to start the discussion on the add grace period. Over to you, Berry.

Berry Cobb: Thank you Cheryl. This is Berry for the transcript record. So basically what we have in front of you is our next use case to be reviewed which is referencing around to the add grace period. At the time they were addressing an issue what is known as domain tasting.

I think before I get started in to some of the contents of the use case of it self we did make a change from our previous version in terms of the template and I reorganized it in a way that where the first two fields are basically, you know, determining whether this was a PDP or not a PDP, were there consensus policy recommendations made and then just a summary of the issue trying to be addressed by that particular working group.

The following sections are just basically divided up by the work products that the working group created and essentially trying to ask the same repeated questions of, you know, did this work product and the working group that was delivering it, did they have any metrics to create, were they directed to find metrics, how did they use the metrics and as such what was the result of those metrics in terms of the deliberations.

And then of course the last section is more or less the outcomes from that working group. And per Jonathan's suggestion I tried to distinguish it between what took place at the Council versus what took place at the Board level and staff implementation.

So hopefully this is a little bit more clear or at the least streamlined in trying to reduce some of the repetition that we had with our previous template. And again I think, you know, at the least with the first two that we have done we seemed to circle on the fact of the key work product which was the final issue report, the charter which directed the working group's efforts as well as the final report which was a compilation of everything prior to that.

And then of course we start to extract out what was actually done with those recommendations towards the end. So if anybody has any additional feedback for this new template please let me know.

And I think, you know, while we're only on our third one and it will require means to go back and slightly modified the previous to that we've done when we get to a point after we've reviewed five, six, seven of these or whatever

the working group determines that done is done I'll be able to try to dump this into a spreadsheet so that it kind of all roles in together and we can try to do more side-by-side comparisons of each of these efforts and move from there.

So, with that said, I will also just briefly run through the report that I put together here. I'm not going to go into as much detail as I have on some of the previous ones. And as I have mentioned in the note, if anybody has any additional input for these, let me know and I can incorporate your comments.

So all right, this one was about the add grace period and domain tasting. Essentially that add grace period was a particular phase within that domain name lifecycle that was added by several registries. It was not a consensus policy at the time.

What registries were trying to accomplish is that they were seen a number of customer interruptions or mistakes with registrations and as such some registrations needed to be undone or credited back to the registrar so if a registrant made a spelling mistake with their domain name it was a bigger hassle prior to the AGP to make that correction.

It was essentially a new registration, they had to cancel the old one and it was about the payment mechanisms or credit mechanisms between the registries and registrars that feature or - yeah, I'll just say it as a feature, had it been in existence for quite a while, even from the early 2000s, depending on which registry or which gTLD the registry you were working with, and certainly there were some instances of AGP existing in the country codes side as well.

But eventually what started to crop up was the aspect of what domain tasting was. And so the feature of add grace period means that from the first minute that the name is registered there are five days in which a name can be credited from its original registration.

And apparently what had happened starting around 2006-ish, maybe a little bit before 2005 is that registries especially in the generic space were starting to see an increase in the number of drops on a daily/monthly basis. And as it turns out what was occurring was that registrants were looking for ways in which to monetize the registrations of names.

And in more detail they would be able to test the name and if they thought that it had traffic they might be able to keep it; if it didn't have traffic than they could easily drop it or delete the name and still receive a credit for that registration. And then of course on the backend there's the credit occurring between the registry and registrar.

So I won't get into any more details about the abuse, if you want to call it that. There were identified some legitimate uses of names being churned like that, as I mentioned, for when registrants make a spelling mistake. But other than that that pretty much encapsulates what the issue was that they were trying to address.

Now I think in summary here is this was a very good example of how data and metrics were used to identify the problem and to help come up with solutions. And I think most importantly that what we've been lacking or haven't seen in our previous two use cases, and I think what several veteran community members are aware of, is that there has been this lack of checking the intent of the policy being implemented by having data and metrics prove that the policy meant the original intent of the recommendation.

So at a very high level this working group, or this PDP effort, seems to do that. So in short, what I'll just say is that this particular issue was identified by the ALAC. I think it was also about the same time or at least the same mechanism that we reviewed in PEDNR.

They created a report about the issue, they asked the GNSO to have staff create an issue report on this. That issue report was created by staff and delivered to the GNSO Council for their consideration.

I think in general the issue report itself did not contain a lot of metrics that really describe - or have shown the extent of the problem. And it was hard to understand exactly what the shortcoming was here.

There were reference to the use of a couple of monthly registry performance reports to at least try to quantify or initially quantify the amount of deletes that were occurring. And essentially what you're looking at is the total number of adds versus the whole number of deletes for a given period and if you're seeing a really high spike in the number of deletes that's what they were really focusing in on.

So, like I said, it didn't really expand into great detail about trying to quantify the data. I did touch on the legal components and the qualitative aspects of the issue. But I think most importantly is that the key message that staff delivered to the Council was that much more data needed to be collected to really fully understand what the issue was.

And which, of course, that led into the Council in its deliberations - and this is in terms of the policy process, you know, the rules that we are operating under today in terms of launching a PDP vary quite differently than what happened in 2007 and 2008 under those older guidelines.

So when staff recommended that a PDP be formed on this I think there was - I didn't go through the transcripts at the GNSO Council but there seemed to be some hesitation of making this a PDP right out of the gate. And so what they did differently was form an ad hoc group.

So I'm now on the charter section which is the green row. And unlike our previous efforts that we reviewed and versus what some efforts that we'll be

reviewing in the near term, there was no formal charter assigned to this group other than what was included in the resolution statement.

And - but basically what the ad hoc group task was to do exactly what the final issue report mentioned was to go get data to put some substantial proof around this issue and perhaps, you know, try to understand what could be done about it.

So essentially the ad hoc group was formed. As I mentioned, their mission was to go collect data. And what you'll see differently from our template of our use case analysis form versus this version is I did insert a new section which is the outcomes report.

That's not a typical deliverable within the PDP process but that's not to say that a lot of working groups create a bunch of various different documents but in essence you could almost think of this outcomes report as being an annex to a final report or at least an interim report from the working group perspective.

So before I go into the details of the outcomes report essentially what happened from the working group is the ad hoc team was formed, they did their due diligence to go discover data where possible about the issue, they conducted surveys, etcetera. They created this outcomes report, sent that back to the GNSO Council. The Council deliberated on that and determined that a PDP working group should be formed.

That PDP working group was a formally assigned, although because so much work had done a charter was never still concluded or created I should say. Then the working group completed their final report.

So the - as I said, the outcomes report contains most of the information on a data and metrics analysis gathering exercise. And so at a very high level they created a request for information or a glorified word for a survey.

They did launch the survey out. It contained about 10 or 12 different questions about the issue. They received most of - well over 200 responses mostly from intellectual property and registrants.

I think one of the things that I noticed in reviewing the outcomes report is that it was all very text-based. So when they were referring to the results of the survey it was, well 67% of respondents did this and 32% did this and X did that. And so they were very descriptive details of the results of the survey but there were no graphical representations of those results.

And, you know, sometime that's easier said than done when you're dealing with static single questions of a survey. But often it's been my experience at least that you need to marry them both so that you get the quick visual to see what the most quantified response is and then a description with that stating, you know, some kind of insight into that particular graph.

The secondary part that they - of information that they garnered was an extensive analysis of monthly registry performance reports. And for those following, if I haven't lost you, I apologize - I'm on Page 2 of the top row just reviewing through the outcomes report - that's Page 3, my bad, Page 3.

So fortunately or basically registries are contractually obligated to provide performance reports to ICANN. Within these performance reports they are a series of data based on service level metrics that have been defined in their contracts. Other operational measures such as access to zone files, the number of transactions within Whois, etcetera, there is a pretty extensive amount of information.

The service level information isn't as - it's not as - what I'll say is I've never hardly seen a registry miss a service level but nonetheless they're contractually obligated to provide that information.



And then a secondary component to these reports is the actual transactional data of what occurs on a registration basis. So essentially the registry is required to provide this data of the number of registrations that occurred over 1, 2, all the way to 10 year period by registrar as well as the number of adds for that periods, the number of deletes for that period and a couple other columns of information that I can't recall off the top of my head.

But it's essentially this registration data that the working group had used. Now when a registry submits this data it's three months before the general community is allowed to see this so they were - this working group was operating about three months in arrears but they were still able to use this data to graphically quantify, and I think at least in my opinion, easily show that there was an excessive trend being formed in the number of deletes across the top three or four gTLDs, Com, Net, Org and I think they looked Biz as well.

There was mention of a zone file data study but that did not seem to occur at least within the outcomes report. And I never saw it on the final report. And there wasn't much detail as to why this didn't happen; they just both basically mentioned that was from unseen circumstances.

In collaboration with staff they also reached out to the ccTLD community to understand any experiences in regards to the add grace period or domain tasting. They did receive 20 responses. Most of that is listed in Annex 3. And I think for the most part there were a couple of country codes that had issue with this and they were able to implement some sort of policy to try to navigate around the issue.

But, you know, it wasn't as - it was mostly more for reference in terms of what was occurring between the generics and the country codes. There was also a UDRP provider questionnaire that was given and completed by the UDRP service providers such as WIPO and NAF.

They were pretty extensive questionnaires, I'd say about 20 or so questions both completed by each of those service providers at the time. So their comments were analyzed.

And then as well the Intellectual Property Constituency also conducted its own request for information. Essentially what they did was took the original RFI, changed some of the questioning and the format and structure of that survey and then just surveyed their internal community about some of the issues that we're seeing. And certainly it was more tailored to the IP community but they wanted to make sure that their voice and position was heard.

Then we move on to - there was also a submission to the registrars to help understand any impacts if the add grace period were eliminated. It looked like that there were about 38 responses from the registrar community in regards to AGP. And I think - there was some discussion in the report as to whether the registrars wanted to be identified with their responses or not.

And the reason why I make a note of this is, you know, this will kind of dovetail back to a future task of our workgroup when we start to discuss what a framework might look like for engaging contracted parties for data.

There are certain sensitivities to the data from a contracted party perspective. And in my own experience and others that I've encountered there's always especially been sensitivity as to divulging who a particular registrar or contracted party might be. So this was identified within this particular working group and certainly that their responses were basically anonymized to prevent identification to any particular contracted party.

And then basically there was also I guess really lastly is there was a reference to PIR's action at the time. Before this request was submitted by the ALAC to the GNSO Council I think there had been some previous sessions at ICANN meetings that started to talk about this particular issue.

And PIR's usually been pretty proactive in trying to curb abuses within their TLD. So what had happened in parallel to this effort getting started is that PIR recognized the issue and they submitted and RCEP in June of 2007, some time after the - I'm sorry, in April of 2007, some time after the issue report was created but before the outcomes report was concluded.

And essentially what PIR did was to adjust the fees on their transactions, their registration transactions, to try to mitigate the quantity of deletes that were occurring. And there was a brief reference to how this definitely bent that curb.

So they pointed out in May of 2007 they had about 2.4 million deletes; by June of 2007 it was below 150,000. So it definitely - it was pretty (proof-full) that the implementation of that pricing adjustment corrected the issue that they were seeing.

Okay so I'll briefly touch on the final report. Basically the final report here in terms of any data and metrics analysis always referred back to the outcomes report. And that's why I really consider the outcomes report an annex to the final report. Because of its length they determined that it wasn't necessary to try to incorporate into the final report.

The only thing to tease out here is that there were - most of the final report was structured in a way around the response to a draft resolution that basically contained a set of recommendations to correct the domain tasting problem. And most of the final report is a compilation of all of the positions about that particular draft resolution and the subsequent recommendations within that.

So if you haven't looked through it what you'll see there is that, you know, the IPC position stated this; the business community position stated this. Within

those submissions there were a couple of additional metrics that were referred to.

Again, most of them went back to the outcomes report but the individual constituencies also provided a couple of other additional data sets just to help reinforce the data that was found in the outcomes report. But outside of that essentially, as I said, it was mostly tailored around this draft resolution that the Council would be considering.

And so that takes us into the GNSO Council adoption of the recommendations. So essentially in April of 2008 make reference - or I'm sorry - yes, so the draft resolution was put together as basically two segments. The first segment is the contractual changes that were to - that were being recommended by the GNSO Council.

I won't go into the details of those. But again it was basically kind of a fee structure change based on a percentage of quantity of deletes that would occur over a given period. And if that percentage threshold was exceeded then that's where the pricing mechanism would kick in.

Then there was a secondary part to the resolution which I think is the most important for our purposes which is on Page 4, the first column. And I highlighted and bolded this is that staff shall monitor the implementation of this policy in terms of understanding how effective the policy was and whether it met the intent of the original recommendations.

It didn't go into details as to exactly how staff should go about doing that. But I think the win here is that staff was asked to go do that which of course then staff did do it. Once the Board approved consensus policy recommendations in June of 2008 the formal AGP limits policy was implemented in December of 2008.

And then from there were a series of three reports that were created. The rumor was that there was four or five but I could not find the fourth or fifth one so if it exists it exists in [archive.icann.org-land](http://archive.icann.org-land) which is not pleasant to navigate. So I'll keep searching for them.

But at the very least the first - so I'm on the very last row of our document. There was a report showing compliance from all registries. Essentially this is a table formatted report saying that each of the gTLD registry operators were in compliance, that they had met the extent of the policy by I think updating language or I'm not sure what the mechanism was by how they confirmed that they were in compliance - with the policy. But that's what the first report shows.

And then the trend charts showing the reduction of AGP deletion trends those are the next two bullets. And those get into a very graphical and quantitative analysis of where you can see pre policy implementation and post policy implementation.

And very similar to how the growth of the issue was uncovered prior to the working group the very same opposite happened after the policy was implemented. There was a great reduction in the number of deletions that were going on out there. And so I think in terms of reviewing this information you could essentially say that the intent of the consensus policy recommendations were met and that it did actually do as it intended to do and correct the issue of domain tasting.

And to be honest I think since then I haven't really heard of the issue being discussed or blogged about up until we knocked the dust off here. So I'll conclude there. And if anybody has any questions I'll be glad to answer them or any other comments in regards to add grace period.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks, Berry. Cheryl for the record. And that's probably the most comprehensive yet concise review of all of that work that I've ever heard and I went through all of that so I really appreciate it.

If we can open for any questions or comments now even just jump right in; there's not that many of us. Anybody want to ask any questions? I know (unintelligible) had a couple of questions about the level of ccTLD responses at the time. Berry, did you have - I made a minor contribution to suggesting why 20 responses is all they got from ccTLD world. But you might want to embellish if you'd found anything in your research.

Berry Cobb: You know, the ccNSO component to the outcomes report was - it was very limited. It didn't really describe the nature by how staff reached out to the ccNSO community. I think - and I'm guessing here - but I think I'm fairly accurate is that at the time staff, when they're encountered to go reach out to a particular SO or AC they'll try to reach out to the chair of that particular SO or AC and receive direction as to how or gain approval as to how they can reach out to members of that community.

And so I suspect that that was the initial avenue traversed to gain access to the ccNSO. And then from there I think it's more about who's the most available and who are the bigger ccTLDs by which gain the information from. So I know that DotUK, DotUS and a few of those DotDE, I think, they were all respondents...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah.

Berry Cobb: ...to some of the questions about the ccNSO. So it was really outside - it didn't go into detail as to who or how they went about conducting the analysis. It was mostly saying hey yes we reached out to these, 20 responded and here's their responses.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah, Cheryl for the record again. It is a little of part art and part science getting material back from the ccNSO membership because of course all the ccNSO Council can do is request that the members, at their leisure and if they're motivated provide them with the information.

And we have great diversity in terms of local rules as to how they operate their TLDs that in some cases, including in this case, it would be deemed by the operator as a nonissue and therefore no reply or no response is going to happen.

So you've got in the non-repliers that have elected to state it is not a issue but they don't give you that data and it's not therefore analytically a data set that you can work with; they just don't respond because they know it's not an issue or they deem it's not an issue.

And of course the usual group that don't even if it's an issue respond for whatever reason. So perhaps this workgroup should look at greater capability to dig into this material. Some of the larger TLD operators, of course, have local requirements for fairly decent agree of analysis to go between the registries and their operators or managers so it may be that even if data points exist we need to find the mechanism to access them without offending anybody of course or compromising their commercial competence.

Yes, Berry.

Berry Cobb: Pretty sure, yeah, just to tack on to what you were saying, you know, I think now versus back in 2007 when this was occurring as, you know, at least from a staff perspective the ccNSO policy staff team is much more mature than it was at that particular time as well.

So if there are future working groups that require interaction with the ccNSO we have that conduit from a staff perspective to ensure that we have a better relationship with the leadership of the ccNSO as well as, you know, I'm not so

sure that - unless the circumstances of the issue warranted for those that don't know not every country code is a member of the ccNSO.

So our scope of reach would probably only belong within the ccNSO membership community if we needed to reach out for whatever due diligence or information gathering purposes that we needed unless the circumstances warranted otherwise. But I do believe that channel is much more mature in terms of any kind of RFIs that we might have from a policy perspective.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Berry, Cheryl here. Excellent points. And of course since then there's been considerable growth in the ccTLD operators joining the ccNSO in the formal sense. That said, a number - the ccNSO operate in a very open fashion and you don't have to be a member to be engaged. But they're running at around - I think around 145, maybe - close enough to 150 but certainly, you know, higher than 145 - country code operators as members at the moment.

And considering all of the potential ccTLD operator members that's not too bad a percentage. So that's had significant growth since those days. And it's more valid I think to get meaningful results out of RFIs now than there ever would have been back then.

The other thing of course there is, during the same time, the GNSO review had spawned off a number of policy development program requirements which meant we had guidelines being developed, the concepts of charters, being far more formally defined and decided. There was a whole lot going on in the wonderful world of policy development. And it was a very dynamic point in time.

Berry, I want to ask a question; do you think there would have been - thanks, Tony, I noticed you've got the 8:30 call from Europe be back shortly, yes, that's noted you're taking a small leave of absence.



Do you think it would have been as successful a result, and it was a successful result (unintelligible) knowledge, in as short a period of time - because this was not a terribly long running process in the scheme of things, if the example and the markedly successful example of PIR putting in some change to give a very clear and measurable change in metrics, was this good luck or good management I guess is what I'm asking.

And if it is good luck then how can we avoid hoping for good luck in the future?

Berry Cobb: Thank you Cheryl, this is Berry. You know, I think it's really a combination of multiple - absolutely, the execution of somebody addressing an issue in the marketplace and parallel to the working group deliberating the issue, you know, without a doubt is helpful.

And certainly if that didn't occur maybe it would have tacked on a little bit more time about this. You know, and I think it is fair to point out that this particular effort while the start and end date on Page 1 show from May 2007 to 2009, the actual working group didn't last that very long. I'd say it was probably one of our shorter ones.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah.

Berry Cobb: But there's the other attribute that I think is the reason why this was also successful is that the issue itself was fairly - it wasn't very complex like others that we've had to address. And we have the luck that data was right there and easily available to point to the issue.

Again, you know, I guess the silver bullet here was the delete information that's quickly accessible and compilable from the registry performance reports.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It was already there, we just needed to access the appropriate dataset, yeah.

Berry Cobb: Exactly, and to draw attention to it.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah.

Berry Cobb: So, you know, those marketplace factors, not such a complex issue and quick access to data, you know, I think were all three components that made this a successful outcome.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl for the record. Thank you very much for that, Berry. Is there anyone who wants to raise any other questions? Comments are welcome. If not, Berry, I guess in the time remaining for this call it would be appropriate to move on to part three of the agenda which is the next efforts for review. You suggested IRTP-A, would you like to talk to us about A, B, C and D? No, sorry.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Now come on, you know me, I've got to have some fun or what's the point of doing all of this? Would you like to share with us a little bit about why the next effort to review is suggested as IRTP-A?

Berry Cobb: Yes thank you Cheryl. So, you know, I'm just kind of - if the working group doesn't mind I've picked this one just because I think that this is probably - there's a couple reasons. So the IRTP is the Inter Registrar Transfer Policy. It was a policy that was designated back in 2001 or 2002 when the marketplace of domain names was evolving and the number of registrars was increasing, the registrars being the retail channel for registrants to register names.

There needed to be a mechanism by which if you were unhappy with Registrar A you could transfer your name to Registrar B.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah, without...

((Crosstalk))

Berry Cobb: Right. The transfer policy was created. After a number of years in operation there were several - they were called work parties at the time but they were called working groups. There was another term used for these groups that were formed. This is stemming off the DNSO days to the early GNSO days.

But essentially they functions just like our working groups do...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Study groups.

Berry Cobb: Study groups, yes. So they started to recognize there were several issues around the IRTP. And eventually a working group was formed to try to quantify and qualify all of these particular issues.

It turns out there was a very long list of issues and so when the GNSO Council started deliberate well how do we tackle this, they said they basically divide and conquer approach or I should say divide, I don't know about the conquering.

((Crosstalk))

Berry Cobb: They didn't launch - they basically split all the issues into five buckets and then they started with IRTP-A, B, C, D and E. For those that aren't in the know, and Lars Hoffman's on the call he leads our IRTP-D effort that is still ongoing today, it actually consolidated some of the issues from E so we're hopeful that D is the last IRTP that we deal with for a while.

But the point is, is that basically it was an interest approach to start tackle these problems. And I believe that there was some logic in - associated with

well there's buckets of issues seems to be the most pressing, let's attack those first and then in terms of kind of like in order of priority.

So I picked IRTP-A because it is a consensus policy or was a PDP. It has been implemented and I would definitely think it would be of interest to see from the working group's perspective any metrics that we can derive about from its original implementation to what we're seeing in the marketplace today.

Because I definitely think, you know, that's one of our shortcomings that we are dealing with now is, you know, several policies have been implemented but we aren't the best at measuring...

((Crosstalk))

Berry Cobb: ...those so that's why I picked that one. After the call I'll put together a summary of the links to the archive page, the work products that were derived from Part A can send that out to the member list for you to start to review. So that's pretty much all I have on Number 3.

And, Cheryl, I think - I didn't include a work plan copy this time so we can really bypass and...

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: We can - skip over 4, fine. I notice Jeremy - Cheryl for the record here - is asking a clarification or a statement here. He's saying, "Unlike the others," the other case studies, "...we've looked at this is an ongoing project." The answer to that is yes and no.

Each of the slices, A, B, C, D - D/E now, are relatively discrete in the way that the GNSO has handled them. And Berry and indeed Lars, perhaps you'd like

to share with us the differences between what is the A, what is the B, C, D, etcetera.

Berry Cobb: You know, I'm not going to be able to answer this in detail...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay, no high level.

Berry Cobb: But basically, you know, I can't even remember what issues were being addressed in IRTP-A. I can tell you about some of the ones in D just because we are in the here and now which is more things around the change of registrant, with FOAs are still required in the transfer process - I'm sorry, IRTP-C was change of registrant...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah.

Berry Cobb: D is whether registrants should have access to TDRP, which is a transfer dispute resolution mechanism as well as whether FOAs should still be used, and a couple of other issues.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah.

Berry Cobb: I think Part A, I'm not even going to try to answer until I review...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah, no, I didn't mean to put you on the hot seat there, Berry, I was just trying to indicate to Jeremy the slices were still relatively discrete. So it's not really a continuing; they should be seen as several threads of any recognized issue.

Berry Cobb: Yeah, and I guess I would answer Jeremy's question specifically. IRTP-A was completed. It did have consensus policy recommendations.

((Crosstalk))

Berry Cobb: They were adopted by the Board. They have been implemented by staff.

((Crosstalk))

Berry Cobb: Most of those recommendations have been - it again was approved by the Board. Most of them have been implemented by staff. I think there's one or two remaining. And then IRTP-C essentially there were three primary recommendations out of that working group.

One of them is just about to be implemented. The other two, which is in regards to the change of registrant and, what was the other one - anyway those two are still on deck to be implemented. And then of course we still have IRTP-C that is still on the policy side of the house.

They are hopeful that they can create their final report in time for London as which there are a series of recommendations in there that if adopted by the Council will be likely adopted by the ICANN Board and then turned over to staff for an implementation.

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah. Cheryl for the record. Thanks Berry. And, Jeremy, you are asking again can we consider this in the same way as the others. I think what we can do, and this is purely personal opinion here, is not only consider them in the same way, we can look for the differences in approach and maturation of approach.

Because these are run from - correct me if I'm wrong, Berry, 2009 through to current times. If we were to look at the IRTP suite we would see, I suspect, some differences in terms of the way charters are put together, the specificity and particularly the use or desirability of recognized advantages or not of measurables.

And so that in itself could be very, very interesting to run whilst the suggestion is on today's agenda that we make our next analysis effort to review the IRTP-A. It may be that running the IRTP suite would be of particular benefit.

I know Tony's back. We are just looking now at our next efforts and...

Tony Onorato: Okay great.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...we have had a little discussion in terms of the wonderful world of the IRTP alphabet. And there's an awful lot of work gone into a lot of stuff there.

Berry, you got your hand up but just before I go back to you I just want to ask is there any other questions that anyone has on the relevant merits of putting IRTP-A as the next thing we'll be looking at. Because if not then I think speak now or forever hold your peace, the consensus will be that we will be doing that next.

Back to you Berry.

Berry Cobb: Thank you Cheryl. Just to put a bow tie on this is I think what, you know, after we complete the review of IRTP-A - and again it does have a definitive end period like the previous efforts that we've reviewed. So we'll be able to distinguish whether there was, you know, appropriate monitoring of the implementation of that policy or not.

But after that another action that I'll be taking to send out to the list is which one are we going to review next after this? We are starting to exhaust the primary ones from, you know, 2008-ish to now, that were at least PDPs and some of the more complex topics that the Council has - or the GNSO has dealt with.

So that action that I'll have to send out to the group is which other reviews do we want to go through? I don't know that we want to tackle something like the new gTLD program PDP or any of those.

((Crosstalk))

Berry Cobb: These are some previous Whois type efforts that we can touch on...

((Crosstalk))

Berry Cobb: The point is is that we need to determine which ones we're going to do next and how many do we need to do to kind of consider our analysis done. You know, I think at this point we've determined that, you know, there is one that didn't work so well, there's one that worked okay and there's one that worked really great.

And I suspect as we get through A and I think there was one other on the back of my head that I can't recall that...

((Crosstalk))

Berry Cobb: ...could have went a lot better than it did.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Probably C.

Berry Cobb: So, you know, I think in general our picture is starting to form here that, you know, we've got a full spectrum of things that worked and things that didn't which is to me no real surprise.

But anyway to close this off I want to send out to the group, you know, which efforts should we review first, second and third from here. And then let's start to have a dialogue about how many of these we need to do before we understand, you know, before we move on to our next steps.



Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well, Berry, Cheryl here for the record. I'd like to thank you for a perfect segue to your Item 5 in the agenda, which is the session for this workgroup in London. And it seems to me like you've just articulated a primary topic for the agenda.

I would like to propose that a significant amount of the agenda time is in fact dedicated to exactly the discussion of what you just articulated. Perhaps 1/5 of the total time to be dedicated to a review and bringing everyone in the room up to speed, because you will have audience there that is not as - as, say, with those who've been attending all the calls.

And then getting to the how much more do we need to do before we start moving to drawing conclusions and indeed getting to recommendations. With that I also want to note Janvier's contributions into the chat, he asks what prevents one ICANN staff to fail while monitoring progress? Is there any strict process mechanisms that may follow a staff member?

That's a very good question and in fact it goes to the extremely ad hoc way that even when metrics and measurables are being sought there appears, at least from my outsider's point of view, and I'd value Lars and Steve and Berry's input here, to be very little standardization on the methodologies and the approaches that are being promoted for the collection of statistically relevant data sets and materials.

And to that end I think Pam may have a little bit to contribute from having lived on the other side of this where both anecdotal information has been provided from compliance, or should I say lack of compliance issues, that are probably very hard to measure because of the lack of quantitative analysis and data sets would be a little fuzzy.

It shouldn't be staff-dependent, in other words, Janvier, but it may indeed be historically the case that it can be. We may wish to draw recommendations

which suggest that some standardization and expectations on the types of data sets and how they should be collected should be part of the standard operational procedures. But clearly you know where my biases are going to be when we get to that part of the conversation.

Berry, you do know I won't be available for the meeting in London but I wondered if right now we might want to just check with everyone on the call how many of them will be either able to attend face to face, because they will be at the London meeting, or remotely because I'm assuming you'll be also arranging remote participation. So, did you want to...

Berry Cobb: Yes, Cheryl...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah.

Berry Cobb: ...so I did send out a Doodle poll. And right now we've got eight responses and then four will be there, five including myself. I think if history is any indication of the future, you know, we'll probably have about 1/3 of our total members physically there in London.

In the past we have had remote facilities set up although nobody has taken advantage of those. I hope that this is different this time around otherwise we're pretty shallow of...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah.

Berry Cobb: ...achieving quorum to even discuss anything substantial within the working group.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah.

Berry Cobb: That said so we are scheduled for Thursday at 0800 hours local time to London. The schedule was released yesterday and I have a very big concern

that this collides with the GNSO wrap-up session on Thursday. Normally that's around noon or 10:00 to noon; it's now 8:00-10:00.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Everything's moved forward on Thursday, yeah.

Berry Cobb: Right. So what little participation we get may even be less than the types of conflicts that we're dealing with and so part of what I wanted to ask - and I'll take this to the list with Jonathan as well is, you know, that is exactly we do want to accomplish there.

You know, we're not at a stage where there is really much to share with the community other than...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah.

Berry Cobb: ...just tell them that we've analyzed this effort and here's what's on deck next, week again is, you know, maybe a five-minute presentation. So anyway the concern I had is that, you know, we're probably going to be competing with little time, very little quantity of folks there on the ground...

((Crosstalk))

Berry Cobb: ...so I'm almost wondering whether we make it a closed session. You know, that means people can still show up if they want but it more or less just gets taken off of the to schedule, I'm not sure.

So, you know, I had to the action to send the note out to the chairs and co chairs to figure out exactly what we want to do and...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Sure.

Berry Cobb: ...go from there.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I note that (unintelligible) has mentioned that he'll be able to participate remotely in the London meeting. And I'm assuming you'll add that to a tally if it's not already in the Adobe Connect.

And welcome Olevie but we're just about to wrap up the call. So perhaps your timing was off a little. Berry, I guess the other thing you could raise not only with the chair and cochairs but with the list in general is relative merits of actually running the meeting at all in London. It is as you say early on in the scheme of things.

But if it does run I certainly support your suggestion that it should be a closed meeting and off the main schedule which doesn't mean it's, as you say, is unwelcoming to the public, it just means it's clear that we're not making a major report as it is early days.

In terms of next steps and confirming the next meeting, Berry, are we planning on squeezing another meeting in before London, please let us know.

Berry Cobb: Yes Cheryl. I did want to try to have a meeting on the 17th before people start to travel. Although some people start to travel early on that week so that was something else I wanted to chat with the chair and cochairs about.

And I guess it really depends on how much we intend to get done the week of London whether we had that meeting on the 17th or not. But we'll get that resolved by the close of this week...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: On list.

Berry Cobb: ...so if we do we can make sure that we get it on peoples' calendars.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah.

Berry Cobb: So I did tentatively say there is a meeting on the 17th. And I'm not sure which timeframe it's going to be yet.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I must say, Berry, from my perspective - and it's Cheryl for the record again - I'll be traveling on the 17th and arriving in London on the early 18th going pretty well straight into meetings because there's pre-meetings before I can as well.

Berry Cobb: Right.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: So we will need to probably think about London timing for some of this. But it'll be fine for Europeans. So that will be a work in process. We'll do that online. There's a couple of action items then to work with the admin and leadership and of course get back to the list. We started about five past the hour and we're now six past the following our.

And to that end I want to wrap up the call now. So I guess it's time to ask if there's any other business or comments from anybody?

((Crosstalk))

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Not hearing anybody - go ahead yes.

Berry Cobb: I think we're good.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: We good? Fantastic. So we will get back to the list first of all as the commitments that - let me try that again - IRTP-A will be our next review piece. And we will look at what happens in terms of a meeting on or about the 17th at whatever time works for most of us before London, and of course confirm the nature of the meeting on the Thursday morning in London as well.

And I notice, Terri, you're telling me that other people are joining. And it would appear to mean (unintelligible) that we do have some issues with time

going out. Berry, is it possible that we could explore - because I notice we're getting more people joining both later in the call and at the end of the call. Nothing we can do about this now but perhaps for our next meeting, and more importantly the meeting after London, can we perhaps consider sending out iCals or similar where if there is some sort of UTC to local time zone conversion it's minimizing the risk of people turning up an hour later than start time.

Berry Cobb: Those are already being done.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. All right well we can only make best efforts and I believe best efforts have been made today. Thank you one and all for joining us. This is Cheryl Langdon-Orr who was standing in for Jonathan whose apologies we will note to the record.

And we will get back to you all - and there may even be a Doodle about the exact timing on a meeting on the 17th, that is a meeting before the London meeting, and concerning the nature of our call and meeting on the London on the Thursday morning local London time at 0800 hours.

That said, we will have homework to do in terms of IRTP-A. And, Berry, thank you very much for the new format. I find it extremely easy to follow this new template and I know the amount of work that would have gone into that. So thank you very much. Thank you for everyone who's joined.

And at that let's closed off the call. Bye for now.

Berry Cobb: Thank you. Bye.

Man: Thanks, Cheryl. Thanks, everybody.

Terri Agnew: Once again that does conclude today's conference call. Please disconnect all remaining lines. (Anna), if you could please stop the recordings.

END