

**ICANN Transcription
Data & Metrics for Policy Making Working Group
Tuesday 05 August 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 05 August 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-20140805-en.mp3>

On page:

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

Attendees:

Cheryl Langdon-Orr – ALAC
Jonathan Zuck – IPC
Graeme Bunton – RrSG
Marinel Rosca – Individual
Mouhamet Diop-RrSG
Nenad Orlic – ISPCP
Sonigitu Ekpe – NCUC

Apologies:

Rudi Vansnick-NPOC

ICANN staff:

Amy Bivins
Berry Cobb
Steve Chan
Lars Hoffmann
Terri Agnew

Coordinator: Recordings are now being recorded.

Teri Agnew: Thank you.

Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. This is the data and metrics for policy making working group call on the fifth of August, 2014.

On the call today we have Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Jonathan Zuck, Graeme Bunton and Marinel Rosca. We have apologies from Rudi Vansnick. From staff we have Berry Cobb, Amy Bivins, Steve Chan and myself, Terri Agnew.

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 Jonathan.

Jonathan Zuck: Thanks a lot. Welcome everybody. This is as Graeme said a cozy little group. So we should be able to be very efficient with this chart. And maybe we'll get off the call early before the chart causes any snow blindness on the part of Cheryl.

And I'm just, you know, I'm thinking Berry, I've looked at the product that you're building - your data analysis product. And, you know, I'm aware of all of the drop down lists and charts and graphs here. You know this feels like a step backward for you man.

But I think this is great and a great way to organize the data. And I thank you. I'm actually going to mostly hand this call over to Berry to run because I'm pretty distracted with family stuff today. But I wanted to make sure and make this call because I think it's a pivotal one from the analysis phase to the - don't know what to call it - the solution phase or the work phase.

So I think this is a very pivotal (unintelligible) should be on it. But I mean with that I'm going to hand it over to Berry to basically take over the call.

Thanks guys.

Berry Cobb: Thank you Jonathan. This is Berry for the transcript.

So I guess first and foremost before we dive into the details of what you see in the AC room, if you'll reminisce from our last call we had talked about trying to distill our use case analysis into something a little bit more tangible or more easily digestible for lack of a better word, and something that, you know, will easily fit into our eventual final report.

The problem I had with the last call is my memory went blank on me in terms of trying to help define a categorization of what the use case analysis was telling us about. So late last week Steve and myself met with Jonathan and managed to jog his memory to tease out these higher level types of questions that we should be asking that's kind of providing the results of the analysis. And what you see before you in the AC room is the first take on that.

With that in mind I also sent out the overall compilation matrix last night that now includes IRTP B, C and a brief version of Part D, all three of which are still - well I should say that B and C did produce consensus policy recommendations or I should say consensus recommendations that will eventually become consensus policy.

Part B is just about complete with - I think there was two outstanding recommendations that will take effect January 15 or 30 of next year. And then Part C is really just starting to take off about now which is predominantly the change of registrant consensus policy to which there was a pretty good working session in London to kind of work through some of the process flow diagrams on what that policy would look like.

And I suspect that it won't really have a tangible or policy effective date until probably, you know, middle of next year or something along those lines. But we decided to go ahead and include those to just kind of complement IRTP Part A since there wasn't technically any consensus policies that came out of Part A.

And then lastly we included Part D, and the reason why even though this is still a current PDP working group, there are targeting to complete their final report by the LA meeting or probably before that. And I think in there they have - I think there's about 20 or so different recommendations that will be presented to the GNSO Council at that time.

But the other reason why I think that it's important that it was listed within our use case matrix is for the fact that some of what is being discussed in that group is kind of the very nature why this particular working group got started, and the fact that they're searching for data and metrics to help support some of the policy decisions.

It kind of came in - for those that aren't a part of that working group - it kind of came in at last minute specifically surrounding whether the form of authorization or the FOA is still required in the transfer process.

Up until I think it was pretty much right about the London meeting, the recommendation was that the FOA would remain intact for several reasons, predominantly centered around the use of an audit trail in case there was an unauthorized transfer that occurred, whether it be through high jacking or any other kind of issue like that.

However there was some public comments and other members of the working group that joined that started to question whether the FOA should be retained or not, predominantly because I think pretty much all of the registry systems and the registrars that connect to them are all EPP based. And it has its own method where you acquire the appropriate code to conduct the transfer, but at the end.

So we've had several deliberations about this particular recommendation. I do believe that it's still going to remain intact - that the FOA will be continued. But there was a question as to how many failed transfers had a root cause of the FOA, and more importantly there needed to be an understanding of

whether the FOA was working as designed, or was it actually causing more problems than what it was meant to do in terms of the transfer process.

So there was a request to try to obtain a little bit more or some actual data to answer that very question. But given the late nature of where the working group is at, it doesn't seem like that there's going to be access to the data predominantly for some of the same reasonings that have been encountered in other previous working groups.

But the good news is that there was a new recommendation that is being discussed right now within that group that the overall transfer process be looked at, and that it definitely become very data driven. Through the series of the IRTPs there have been a number of recommendations. Some have been implemented. Some are in the pipeline to be implemented.

Part D will complete this overall review of IRTP. And kind of the takeaway message is well, let's first take a look at the changes that we made and see whether there was positive or negative impacts to those changes as well as noting that the transfer process is still a very complicated process, especially for registrants.

But the good news about that is that it specifically touches on the acquisition of data to make a determination as to what steps should be taken next.

And Graeme, I see your hand is up.

Graeme Bunton: Yes. Thanks Berry. This is Graeme for the transcript.

I am on the IRTP D working group. And I think you characterized that situation quite well which is we did want to figure out if FOAs were causing problems. You're right, that came up pretty late in the working group in that process.

But also that data was sort of impossible to gather. If an FOA worked, there's no - like because it wasn't a requested transfer, you don't necessarily hear about it or have a way of confirming whether the FOA served its purpose or not. So it should be discussed and thought about in there. But it turned out not to be a measurable thing which was too bad for that group.

One of the other things that group did do is look into how often the TDRP - the transfer dispute resolution process - was kicked off amongst registrars and at the registry level. And it turned out to be so few times that there was not a lot of data that could be had from them.

I think it was, you know, there's been less than like 30 since the dawn of man. So there wasn't, you know, sort of statistically relevant stuff we could get out of that. I knew - that's just what I thought I would share. Thanks.

Berry Cobb: Great. Thank you Graeme. Yes, that is correct. In addition to the FOA there was data acquired from the service providers that have - and I believe Verisign that had dealt with some of the TDRPs in the past. And yes, it was kind of unfortunate that it wasn't used very much to be statistically valid.

But I think another - and I believe this is a recommendation in the report - that since the TDRP will still be intact, there are some major changes that will be coming. The first is essentially taking the registries out of the loop in terms of the TDRP.

There was also the question raised as to whether registrants should have direct access to the TDRP. And right now the consensus of the group seems to be that no, they shouldn't. However it will be monitored in the implementation of the change of registrant consensus policy that's implemented. And so once those are in fact implemented, there will be a data gathering exercise to better evaluate the TDRP aspects of it.

So anyway, I don't want to spend any more time on Part D. But again it was still kind of a repetitive cycle that we're seeing in some of the previous use cases that, you know, it's all about getting access to the data to make a better informed policy decisions, etc.

So you'll see that in the additional columns to the right in the master spreadsheet, and now getting into the summary here. And the first tab - I'm not even going to bother sharing my screen because nobody would really be able to see it on the AC room.

But in Rows 22 through 33 is the first take of trying to distill that use case analysis into a more tangible summary of what it is that we're finding. And in terms of making it easier to read, I created an additional tab that just had the summary.

So with that said, like I mentioned we met with Jonathan and came up or brainstormed some high level categories that would try to distill this down. Originally it wasn't divided by the work products. What we see on the far left is the (distinguishment) between issue report - the charter and the final report.

As I started to try to answer these questions for each of the use cases, I started to realize that some of these questions weren't necessarily applicable for the type of work product that was being reviewed, especially since the three were kind of the base of what we were analyzing in the use case.

So what I wound up doing is basically copying and pasting the set of questions that we had defined, and then pasting it across the three different work product types, and then removing those where they weren't applicable for a particular work product.

So the first - the issue report - there's basically five for the charter since it's mostly, you know, it is just a chartering exercise that dictates what the group

is supposed to review, what issues need to be determined and thought through, as well as, you know, the final direction of what the working group should try to accomplish which is typically the final report - so really only one of that set of questions was relative to the charter. And then of course the final report basically has the same repeated questions. It's very similar to the issue report.

So now this is where I could probably use help from the group. As I was working through these - when I first tried to put this together I was thinking well, maybe I should try to make it a little bit more quantitative and put it on a scale of 1 to 10. And then that didn't seem to work.

And then I thought well, let's try to keep it binary - yes or no. But even that doesn't work because there's a sometimes in between the yes and the no. In other respects as you're kind of tracking through fast flux for example, you know, whether quantitative analysis was provided despite the action or the request, sometimes it was a little foggy as to exactly what the yes or no answer should be on that one.

So in terms of kind of a homework assignment for the working group - and I'll follow this up with an email - is, you know, I'd like some help in maybe determining whether this binary application is worthy or not. Or should we try to make it more to a scale?

And then I'll also conclude before I hand it over to Jonathan that, you know, I did think about highlighting, you know, if it was a good outcome that they used data in their analysis that it would be green. And if they didn't, then it would be red.

But the way the questions are structured, a no answer is sometimes a positive one whereas it wouldn't - you would think that it would be highlighted in red because it is a no answer. So it's kind of the confusion where I was tripping up on. With that, Jonathan - please.

Jonathan Zuck: You all had me on mute there. Thanks Berry.

I guess we should participate in trying to make this chart as readable by others as possible. But I think it's important for us to also take a step back to what our intended purpose is and what the purpose of doing these case studies was which is to come up with a set of scenarios that we might encounter in the future, and then come up with a framework, you know, if it's this situation how should we handle it, you know?

If it's a data that's of a sensitive nature, how do we go about requesting data? What kind of processes do we need to put in place to protect the data, etc.? And so I have to think that we shouldn't spend too much time trying to perfect how we represent the specifics of these previous case studies, but instead use this an exercise to determine whether we've extracted from them all of the possible permutations that we'll want to address in the future.

And so I think there's another interim work product here which is what are the scenarios, and that's sort of what's on the left - is, you know, what are the things that we'll encounter so that if we drew the chartering documents - the chartering workbook if you will - suggests that where possible a quantitative analysis of the problem is suggested and that that data is then used to make that quantitative analysis of the problem, and then is used again later on to determine whether or not the solutions that are proposed led to a resolution of the problem that was identified and quantified at the beginning of the working group.

And so that - we're going to be doing that as part of the chartering processing, and then part of the (unintelligible), you know, provide a kind of tool kit of hey, if this is the scenario, this is the processes that we've agreed on with which to proceed.

And so I think the real product of this exercise is making sure we've extracted all the possible scenarios that we could from these case studies. Does that make sense?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It does Jonathan - Cheryl here. You mentioned one thing that made me remember an earlier conversation that we had when you were talking about sensitive data or data that in some cases could have commercial limitations which we certainly came into in (unintelligible) as well.

But I remember that we also discussed how the use of a third party trusted filter/vehicle had been utilized in the DSSA activities where particularly sensitive materials were being handled. And we had an individual allocated who was a trusted expert who all parties were happy - commercial and otherwise - to share their, you know, workings with.

So I think...

Jonathan Zuck: Right.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...we need to add that it - pick that up as some sort of subset. That really has to be established at that chartering stage. You may be able to identify in an issues report phase, but that is a highly likely, moderately likely or less likely outcome.

But you won't know until you've got the people who are going to be dealing with these (unintelligible) in that chartering group as they're drafting. So I think what we might do is - I just want to get back to some of these tabs and tables I think - is have some drill down...

Jonathan Zuck: But again Cheryl, I guess the very next step - I think the real product of this case study analysis is the scenarios. And then one of the scenarios will in fact be that there is data available, but it's commercially sensitive or competitively a sensitive data.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And then how do we do...

Jonathan Zuck: That scenario - we'll call that Scenario D, right? And then we'll have a kind of a workbook for how to handle Scenario D. And so I think what we want to make sure we've accomplished from the case studies is that we've sussed out all of the scenarios that we can. And then the next step after that is actually to figure out what to do with it.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes Jonathan, Cheryl again. And I think adding in things like how to deal with those, that comes as very important. To answer Berry's question though because people will look at tables. And I think that the table aspect is still going to go into the reports.

Read my text. Berry, I wasn't being glib. I do think some shading and color coding can work. It means you can still have a binary table, but a graded response to the color key. I was thinking not dissimilar to a weather chart where different shading means different things.

But just coming back to where do we go from here, I had an action item from a previous meeting which I wanted to - I was going to bring in under any other business, but I know we're going to wrap up pretty quickly today - to take the question of how we did it.

The work from this group may have an interface with the work from policy and implementation work group. I've done that. And there is - the staff on that work group should be talking to you because we see that there is one in fact.

So we need to also make sure we pick that up as well Jonathan because in our flow charts we are going to have particularly around chartering a couple of points where the desirability of metrics and analysis is going to be staying important and will come into play there.

I'll put my hand down now if I can make the machine work.

Jonathan Zuck: (Unintelligible). Do you have your hand up? (Unintelligible). Are you on mute? You may be on mute. We don't hear you.

Okay. So I think that that's, you know, I think crystalized the question which is - the next question is whether or not we have in fact extracted all of the (unintelligible).

You can go ahead.

Man: Yes. And I was saying how can we get ourselves to deduct our bids. Who is really (unintelligible) to a level where maybe easy ourselves to use working in the working group. That was a question I have.

Jonathan Zuck: Yes.

Man: Was it clear?

Jonathan Zuck: I think it was clear. Maybe mute your microphone now because you have a lot of ambient...

So that was clear I think. (Unintelligible). And we're just trying to get there in a structured way. And so I think this exercise here with this table was about seeing if we had found a home if you will for all of the things that we had identified in these various case studies and whether or not these scenarios are sufficiently granular to capture the different types of situations that might be encountered in the future.

And so part of I think Berry's challenge is in trying to put them all into these boxes may be that there aren't enough boxes. I don't know. But I think we want the ultimate work product from this to be, you know, the step beyond

analysis is to say okay, now we've identified these are the ten scenarios that we want to make sure and create a pathway to success for each of those scenarios, one of which is that data wouldn't be useful for example, right, in certain working groups.

But more often than not there is some way to do a quantitative analysis of the problem. And then we'll just have various challenges that would be faced by the working group attempting to do that. And our job is to provide the tools to those working groups to surmount those challenges.

Does that make sense to people?

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Zuck: Does that make sense to you Berry?

Berry Cobb: Yes it does. I guess as long as the, you know, some of these scenarios, you know, are I guess - they can span multiple work products at least as we have defined here. Because like you mentioned, one is that certainly, you know, maybe data won't be useful - that the nature of the issue is strictly only a qualitative component which I haven't listed here in terms of an actual scenario per se.

Jonathan Zuck: Yes. And I think you're right. It could be that there's this - either a table of scenarios and work products or something like that. Or maybe it's just that - maybe one scenario is you're writing the issue report or you're in the chartering group. And you want to do a quantitative analysis. And yet the problem occurs.

I mean maybe that just means there's more scenarios that are specific to the work product. But I think that's our objective - is to come up with worksheets for each of these scenarios so that a new work (unintelligible) comes across one of them has a plan to move forward.

Berry Cobb: Okay, great. Cheryl?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks - Cheryl for the record. Just getting back to what I alluded to with the crossover for the implementation and metrics is that they're working on a very flow charted and decision node model. And it is going to be I think inevitable that one of the decisions - the questions for the groups to challenge themselves as they go through those various phases of work.

The issue report or the charter is also going to be what data and what metrics and indeed what use of the metrics can be made? But we also probably need to recognize - and this is where it's important I think that at least the leadership team and the staff and leadership team of the other group have a crossover in the not too distant future - is that they're going to be more than just a (unintelligible) decisions as well.

So as we move into future situations where a bunch of critical control points and decisions will be made, it's probably going to be more easy to (unintelligible). And I think it's a good thing that we have the - can there be data collected? Is the data available and what do we do with those metrics?

And I can't stand the echo (unintelligible).

Jonathan Zuck: I certainly agree Cheryl. I mean I think we want to make sure that we don't create a silo for this work that gets ignored by other folks that are doing things that read on this or that inform it.

So is that best handled at the staff level? Or should we try to do some kind of...

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Zuck: Or what's the best way to do that?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I think Berry and the staff that are running that group need to share some of what each of us are doing, and then maybe, you know, the leaders of that group and this could perhaps have a crossover and then bring it back to this group because it's already been injected into the processes of the other group because I'm owning that.

But I'm not - I would want to say that it comes back to us as well.

Jonathan Zuck: Okay. So Berry, can you take that as a to do - to coordinate with the staff in the other group and then determine how best, you know, whether or not that should escalate a few people from each group talking or if it's just a staff coordination effort?

Berry Cobb: This is Berry. It looks definitely (unintelligible) pleased for those that are...

If you're on the line and using the Adobe Connect Room, please mute your Connect Room.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: (Unintelligible) on deafening.

Berry Cobb: Check one two. All right, cool. Yes, so I'm not listening to every call for the policy implementation working group. I am very closely connected to the work that's being produced there. And Cheryl is right in terms of some of the process stuff that she was outlining in terms of how the council would respond to policy advice versus launching a PDP, etc.

There are some of those connections that are being made. So to answer your question Johnathan, I think it's really more, you know, mostly a staff coordination at least up to this point. And if we do see any reason why there needs to be a meeting of the minds between the two groups, we could probably try to arrange something. But at least staff will be able to coordinate that.

What I will say about kind of circling back to the scenarios, you know, if you look at the second and third row from the bottom of the summary chart there, those two aspects are a future framework that we will be building. So the first one is, you know, what is - was data available that required purchase from a third party?

Probably a few months from now, you know, I think this group intends to actually have that conversation of understanding what that would look like, you know, from a budgeting perspective - what the scope of data may be, what the process is like if a group determines that they need access to third party data - those kinds of components.

So, you know, that scenario, you know, I think we have tagged as well as the second row from the bottom is in terms of conflict about revealing competitive advantage which ties into what Cheryl mentioned about some of the DSSA work that was completed which I think actually outlines a very good framework for us to expand upon as well as even the most recent component when I think the registrars released some initial data about the issue with the who is validation and some of the numbers they came up with.

I believe that that was passed through into a third party that anonymized that data that I believe will be shared in London. But anyway, we've got those kind of concrete scenarios that will certainly be, you know, that's kind of on our roadmap for our work.

I think the biggest thing before I turn it back to Cheryl is, you know, I'm hopeful from a staff perspective - and this is where we definitely want community input - is that at each one of these work products - and I think that this does directly tie back to the process work being done in the policy implementation working group is that.

And in fact I'm hopeful that this starts on an agenda item for our next call is that we take a specific look at the issue report - the work product that gets produced out of it. And we help define a series of questions that will force staff to attempt to answer them.

And maybe it even materializes into its own definitive section that says, you know, that describes the data and metrics that supports the issue being discussed. So the first would be, you know - and I'm thinking out loud here. But what are the qualitative kinds of data that help represent why this is an issue now?

The second question, is there quantitative data that may help the issue - define the issue? If so, you know, where is the source? And building this series of five to ten questions or whatever it is that staff is required to fill out - and I don't know if I should say required - but that it's a, you know, I think Jonathan you mentioned that, you know, it changes the culture about making it automatic that these kinds of things are asked.

It's a helpful tool to try to force us to implement that. And then the same would apply for the charter. You know we don't need to necessarily say what types of quantitative or qualitative data, but that in the charter it says, you know, the working group will look at qualitative and quantitative data regarding the issue X.

And as a result of this chartering exercise, the final report will contain critical success factors for measuring - encourage, yes - that will force the working group or encourage the working to define those critical success factors and what metrics may be used to measure the effectiveness of the policy recommendations that are being created.

And then of course in the final report, you know, I would think that there would be definitely that standalone section that in of itself, you know, here is

the qualitative, the quantitative data. This is how it was used to define the issue further and then of course the small subsection,

Based on these policy recommendations the working group recommends that this policy be measured this way, this way and this way one year post policy effective date to insure that it actually accomplished what it tried to do.

Cheryl?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks Berry - Cheryl for the record.

You said a couple of things that - I could have put my hand down at any time - but I haven't - including those wonderful (unintelligible) change because we are doing this work at a point where there is an opportunity to submit even cultural change.

And part of it has come out of things such as these (unintelligible) in who is which is a far more public exercise than what DSSA did, but obviously some very good reasons. But also the MIA ability to talk about let alone have the budgetary support to procure data from third parties is a relatively new comfort zones for us all in some of these earlier - historically earlier activities.

That was actually, you know, the fact that we know we've got budget to that was a barrier. And since we've had in part of this - at least some of the who is stuff, but also the preparatory work that's gone in from reviewing a success - the effect on consumer metrics for example in the (unintelligible) work. All of that change - that culture - and it's more a matter of look for where we can find and get even at cost relevant data as opposed to oh we can't get that because it might cost us something.

So there's a lot of cultural change going. And I think that's where the work products here are not only important but they're probably happening at the right time.

Berry Cobb: Agreed - thank you Cheryl.

Yes and, you know, I guess in previous months and years, you know, I guess you could almost question not whether there was too little budgeted but, you know, is it even budgeted to begin with.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Any.

Berry Cobb: And have to scramble to find some bucket that has a few extra bucks to share. And so that's definitely a challenge as well.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes - stick to under ten questions in Survey Monkey because we're going to use the free one - that's right.

Berry Cobb: Exactly. Okay, so I think that's all that I had for the summary chart. We've got about 18 or so minutes left. I wanted to go ahead and move over to the next agenda item which is to discuss the PDP process diagram real quick which will lead us into our next work.

But I will take the action of I guess sterilizing this summary chart. In fact maybe what I'll do is try to create a solution column like as I was referring to earlier about data from third parties and where we as a working group intend to discuss it or in terms of, you know, revealing competitive advantage that, you know, we can start to highlight what the possible solution may be for us to work forward with so that it kind of creates our own roadmap as to what we hope to accomplish, and as well as I'll work on making this friendlier to the eyeballs as well.

Okay. The next on the agenda items - I sent this out late last week or the week before which kind of carries us into the next phase of our work. So if it wasn't obvious, I think we're trying to put a bow tie on our analysis phase, especially in particular the use cases themselves.

So we're in this transition phase that Jonathan mentioned about, you know, defining the scenarios and the possible solutions. But I'm hopeful that our next leg of the work will be that we take a very close look as I mentioned from a work product perspective.

And Cheryl had asked for this at the last meeting is to basically highlight, you know, where the possible opportunities that we can potentially create some recommendations or suggestions about which work products would be - could be influenced by this framework of metrics and data collection.

So on the first page here is a high level summary of the policy development process. And then you'll notice that there are boxes highlighted in red, the solid ones being tangible work products that are submitted through the PDP process.

And then the dashed lines basically represent draft versions of those work products, typically after they've gone through public comment and revision of any recommendations or the issue report, etc. that it becomes the final work product.

But in particular I'm hopeful that for our next meeting in a couple of weeks that we'll just start off with the issue report and we can touch on previous examples of issue reports that did or didn't have data. And I think we can discuss future possibilities, you know, what if there is an IRTP Z, and that's dealing with transfers, you know, and start thinking about it.

Or maybe a more real world example is the next round GTLD group that's spinning up, you know, hypothetically let's pretend that they determined that the objection procedures for the new GT or the next round of GTLDs needs to go through a PDP, you know.

What would be the kinds of questions that we would want to ask in that particular scenario that would help describe the issue better? You know

things like how many objections were filed, how many were successful, how many failed - those that failed, why did they fail, you know, those kinds of things.

But anyway I'm hopeful that as we step through each one of these we've got the final issue report. We have the chartering exercise. We have the request for input from SOs and ACs which we talked about a couple of calls ago - that we've got a couple of preliminary recommendations from.

And then finally we have the final report. And so I'm hopeful over the next series of calls that we can talk about each one in detail and try to start to develop some draft language of a framework that will encourage the use of data and metrics.

So I won't spend much more time on this other than to again just, you know, highlight that we've highlighted these work products. The following other pages or break the process out into detail, and I tried to do the same thing is just highlight where these work products occur - at which stage of the process.

And I think that's pretty much all I had to say about that, if there are any questions in regard to this. Hearing and seeing none - so I think that was pretty straight forward.

So with that I believe we've exhausted our agenda for today. I will in terms of the last one our next steps in our next meeting, I think it looks like based off of the most recent Doodle poll that we still will continue with a meeting every other week.

And for now it does seem that the 20 UPC time is the most acceptable in terms of participation. So we'll continue on this. Our next meeting will be the 19 of August at 20 UTC. And as I mentioned we'll roll up the sleeves and try

to get into some of the details around the work products and what we want to try to accomplish there.

And then keeping that in mind, I expect that two maybe three meetings at most we'll get through the review of those work products and hopefully again try to define some of that draft language. And then that will take us into the next phase of beginning the work on the scenario again of kind of the DSSA framework for keeping data anonymized - most certainly start to engage with how data and metrics can be requested from contracted parties within the PDP process, I think probably the more interesting work of what we want to accomplish here.

Jonathan Zuck: That's the fun stuff.

Berry Cobb: Indeed.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes.

Berry Cobb: So if there aren't any other questions or comments, then I guess we can go ahead and close the meeting unless Jonathan you have any final things to say.

Jonathan Zuck: No. I think that's it. I think what we may do is we dive into these particular scenarios. Is the group specific folks who, you know, from contracted parties, etc. - if we can find an efficient way to make use of more people in those particular brain storming sessions, then we can try to insure that the recommendations we come out with are, you know, compatible with the eventual recipients of those data requests.

So when that time comes we'll look for ways to maybe broaden the group temporarily to include some of the parties that would be involved in those future data transactions.

Berry Cobb: And that's a very good point John. And absolutely it is on my to do list as we get closer to that timeframe. I do want to reach out to the registry and registrar stakeholder groups - well really all of the SO or all of the SGs and Cs at least that yes, we can try to increase that interim participation to further discuss the issue at hand as well as, you know, establish that framework of what it would look like being used in the future.

So yes, I'm very hopeful that we can acquire especially more veteran voices in that regard as we work through that particular part of our work effort.

Jonathan Zuck: Great. I think that's it. Thanks a lot Berry.

Berry Cobb: All right. Thank you everyone and I think we can close the call out and see you in two weeks.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks Berry. Thanks Jonathan. Thanks everyone.

Berry Cobb: Take care.

Coordinator: Thank you for participating in today's conference. All participants may disconnect at this time.

END