

**ICANN Transcription
Data & Metrics for Policy Making Working Group
Tuesday 18 November 2014 at 21:00 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 18 November 2014 at 21:00 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-20141118-en.mp3>

On page:

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

Attendees:

Cheryl Langdon-Orr – ALAC
Jonathan Zuck – IPC
Pam Little – RySG
Andrew Merriam – RySG
Sonigitu Ekpe – NCUC
Nenad Orlic – ISPCP
Janvier Ngnoulaye – Individual
Olivier Kouami – NPOC
Marinel Rosca – Individual
Kayode Yussuf – IPC
Benjamin Akinmoyeje – no soi

Apologies:

Graeme Bunton – RrSG

ICANN staff:

Berry Cobb
Terri Agnew

Terri Agnew: Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. This is the Data and Metrics for Policy Making Working Group call on the 18th of November, 2014.

On the call today we have Nenad Orlic, Marinel Rosca, Pam Little, Jonathan Zuck, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Janavier Ngnoulaye, Andrew Merriam and Sonigitu Ekpe. Joining us shortly should be Olevie Kouami. We have apologies from Graeme Bunton.

From staff we have Berry Cobb and myself, Terri Agnew. I would 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 to the DMPM call. And we've had a little bit of discussion on the list about the draft IRTP review data request. And we should try to finalize that on this call so that we can begin thinking about how we might circulate it to get some organic reactions to it for further refinement.

Before we go down that path does anybody have any changes to their Statement of Interest that they want to bring up, anything like that? All right well then I'm going to hand it over to Berry to go over this lovely project chart and review our work plan and schedule moving forward. Berry, do you want to take that?

Berry Cobb: Yeah, thank you Jonathan. This is Berry Cobb for the transcript. So it's been a while within the working group that we reviewed this so I thought we would spend a few minutes to kind of talk about where we're at and where we're going.

I think most of you have seen previous versions of this but it is an eternal plan that we track within ICANN. Essentially, you know, the top section was the chartering exercise that occurred way earlier this year, the second section starting around Row 20 is just to outline all of our actual working group meetings that we have and more specifically today is 18 November, will

basically have two more sessions as we move closer to the end of the year for the holiday break which will then carry over into 6 January when we would meet beginning in 2015.

Is the reason why I wanted to draw the working group's attention to this is primarily I think originally we had been kind of targeting what used to be Marrakesh now Singapore meeting to try to have a draft initial report.

I think at this stage, you know, it doesn't seem as though we have real concrete recommendations that would go into initial report so I suspect that while we can still target the Singapore meeting by no means is it a requirement that we have an initial report by then.

So just kind of plugging in the numbers and duration of the task we'll probably be aiming around mid-April to hopefully have a draft initial report, again all of which kind of has the dependency as to what recommendations the working group may come up with at that point in time.

And of course once we do have an initial report we'll put out for public comment, review those comments and then produce a final report and then eventually submit that to the GNSO Council.

After the meeting I'll make sure to send out a fresh version of this to the list so that you can see it. That's essentially over to the right is the ever lovely Gant chart that more or less highlights what task has been completed to date and then of course where we're moving in the future.

So with that, unless there are any other questions, I think we can go ahead and move onto the next item on the agenda.

Jonathan Zuck: So, Berry, this is Jonathan. I would love for the Singapore deadline not to slip entirely so maybe we can have a small discussion about what we might try to target for that meeting just because we've got to concentrate - a high

concentration of people and things like that. So some kind of draft documents or a part of, you know, a public version of this, looks like we're working on them.

Let's noodle something that we might accomplish for the Singapore meeting to put in front of other folks and get some feedback on so we can keep this conversation alive in the ICANN context. Does that make sense everybody? Yes? No?

Berry Cobb: So, Jonathan...

Jonathan Zuck: All right, I got a yes. That's enough for me. A vote of one is plenty. So let's just give a little bit of thought to maybe a revised goal set but let's make sure that we have some concrete output in time for Singapore. Maybe it's not ready for public comment but let's put something together that are ready for community comments, you know, at least informally at the next meeting.

Thanks, Berry.

Berry Cobb: Yeah, Jonathan just to kind of response to that, you know, I definitely agree that the Singapore meeting shouldn't basically be put to the side in terms of advancing the work forward. I'm just not so sure that we'll have solid recommendations to load into any particular initial report at that time.

Our two primary tracks, one of which we're working on now is, you know, the acquisition of data from various sources. I suspect that will probably take us several months from now to play out until we do try to come up with some concrete recommendations.

And then of course there's the secondary track that we tabled a while back in preparation for the LA meeting, which is - and hopefully this particular track will feedback in like in terms of reviewing and updating, you know, the template work products that are produced from working groups and any

suggested recommendations for updating them or in terms of meeting developing some sort of questionnaire/framework of what metrics should be asked for or the scope of metrics in terms of the issue that's being addressed at that particular time.

Jonathan Zuck: That makes sense. Let's coordinate to get something that we're passing out. Will make some, you know, DMPM handbags or something like that for the goody kit in order to get our work noticed in the community.

Berry Cobb: I'll pass along to staff to see if there's a budget allocation for that. That's a joke.

Jonathan Zuck: All right let's move on and take a look at some of the comments that came in on the draft data request and executive summary.

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Zuck: ...comments here. You there? I didn't hear who was speaking.

Berry Cobb: This is Berry. I think maybe that was some background noise.

Jonathan Zuck: Okay.

Berry Cobb: So if you don't mind I'll take the baton for just...

Jonathan Zuck: Yeah.

Berry Cobb: ...setting this off again. So I think as everyone on the call is aware from our previous session we came up with an action item or we basically reviewed some use cases as a result of the flowchart that we created about how working groups and/or staff at the issue report level may go about requesting metrics from various parties.

In that prior use case document there were three draft use cases one of which was what we see before us here, that is a derivative of a couple of recommendations out of the IRTP-D working group. The other two were based on other possibilities of future data metric-centric type of efforts; one of which is potentially the future UDRP URS review that would likely tee off probably around February or April of next year.

And I can't even remember the one other but more or less the working group decided to focus on a single use case and try to flesh out more details about what it is we're trying to accomplish hence the executive summary section of this document. And then as well as a more detailed as to what the actual request may look like and some of the requirements from that.

As Jonathan noted a draft was sent out week before last, there was a little traction and responses to the draft on the email list. Basically the version that we're looking at here and to which those in the AC room. You do have manual control to scroll through the document, but I believe Pam was the last person to provide comments for that.

So I think what's changed from our previous call is Steve Chan from staff had put together what I think is a very good kind of executive summary of what we're trying to accomplish, why it's important and some of the key findings to date from the working group which is pretty much centered around Pages 1 and 2.

The intent or I think the idea here or the original idea was that this particular request we would perhaps socialize this use case with the registrars and the registries, as Jonathan put it, to try to get some sort of organic responses to this particular use case.

I think that there's also been some discussion that perhaps we should probably share this across all the stakeholder groups and constituencies to try to solicit feedback about what this particular use case might entail. So for

lack of a better word you could almost kind of call it a preliminary public comment but obviously very targeted to the policy making bodies within the GNSO.

So as I said, Pages 1 and 2 are kind of an introduction to what we're trying to accomplish and then we move into Pages 3 and 4 which are the details of what the particular data request might look like.

So I think, you know, one of the main caveats that the working group should consider here is that this is a real world example based on recommendations from the IRTP-D Working Group but it should be caveated here that this is still just a, what's the word, you know, I wouldn't call it a real exercise at this point. And hence I think that's why we're trying to lean on the term of a use case because this is still a hypothetical situation.

These recommendations, Number 17 and 18, from the IRTP-D Working Group are still - need to be deliberated on and subsequently approved by the ICANN Board as well as then staff implementing the remainder of all of the IRTP policy recommendations, some of which from IRTP-B will be implemented I believe January 30 of 2015. Then there's IRTP-C that includes the change of registrant process plus a couple of other recommendations that will be implemented.

And then of course IRTP-D which had a total of 18 recommendations; 1-16 having much more direct changes to the IRT policy. So I suspect, you know, it's hard to specify when all of these recommendations would be implemented but it would likely be somewhere in the earlier timeframe of 2016 before any policy effective date is established and then of course that would probably at least be a year of implementation before the Council would either ask the community or ask staff to try to do some initial findings on the overall IRT policy and how well these recommendations change that policy for the good or for the bad.

So in that regard, it's still a hypothetical situation at this point. But I do believe that it's - it is the most - one of the most more useful use cases because it does have direct bearing on what we're trying to accomplish in this working group and it is a very tangible exercise in that regard.

So, Nenad, I see you have your hand up.

Nenad Orlić: Yes, can you hear me? Hello.

Berry Cobb: Very softly, if you can speak up louder. But you're coming in clear.

Nenad Orlić: Well, I'll try too. Well it's (unintelligible) here and I'm a (unintelligible) so sorry about that. (Unintelligible) about the physical meeting, I hope I will be able to attend this time. And I agree that we should have (unintelligible).

It's a good time that the more (unintelligible) it's not quite enough yet but it's (unintelligible) and with that I think everybody in the working group will be able to think about this issue and not just for this (unintelligible) meeting but (unintelligible) that should help to achieve all those timetables that we would like to meet.

I did consider about this (unintelligible) and I do work for a registry and I (unintelligible) registrar and I was in (unintelligible) registry and I do know about (unintelligible) personal level because personal relationships between people in the registry, registrar is what (unintelligible) somebody is dealing (unintelligible) data and that's (unintelligible) mandate of our group to recommend who should collectively (unintelligible).

What I'm trying to say is (unintelligible) collection data for purposes of the working group is it done through the members of the working group (unintelligible) or there is (unintelligible) inside ICANN (unintelligible) of collecting data from sources. Do you understand what I'm trying to say here?

Berry Cobb: Nenad, unfortunately not. Your audio was coming in very faint so I don't think hardly anybody on the group was able to capture all of that. And I'm curious if maybe you could just type in your comments into the chat and/or maybe perhaps fix your audio.

Nenad Orlić: Okay, I'll try to type and fix audio in meantime, I am switching off now to debug my microphone and I will type what I said. Sorry.

Jonathan Zuck: Thank you.

Berry Cobb: Great. Thank you. So at any rate with the document we have before us I think I'll just kind of start at the top. In terms of any of the feedback that we received from the group thus far there weren't any edits necessarily to the executive summary although I do invite members to help improve the content that we had there in case particular points were missed in terms of what we're trying to accomplish.

And then moving down into the actual request itself, I think the - and again I do admit that this is still in draft form so I do welcome other comments to help improve the sections that we have outlined here or more specifically if there's a kind of a section of this request that could perhaps be missing.

But I'll take note that in the policy or issue section being explored these were the recommendations from the IRTP report specifically as well as the issue to be solved which I would imagine probably can use some more content or details to help establish what's trying to be accomplished.

But one of the things to take note, Pam, I think your comment about each of the bullets here this was also extracted from the IRTP-D final report. And it wasn't meant to be an exhaustive list of things that could be considered but more from a high level perspective of some of the - some of the types of metrics or areas that could be reviewed when such a review of the transfer process actually occurs.

Some of them are at high level, a few more are at more detailed levels, especially when it gets into the number of incidents that a particular registrar may see in relation to any failed transfers or complaints that may have occurred in the transfers.

Again, this was created by the working group themselves. Then as we move down into the data requirements section wholeheartedly I think we need to work on the - in improving these sections to better finalize what the requirements may look like especially flushing out particular, you know, what kind of systems may be involved and certainly perhaps more details about the types of transactions that are being logged within the particular systems.

The one last point that I'll make about this, and we'll open the floor and I'll turn it back over to Jonathan, is, you know, I think the idea behind - or why this request seemed to have more support or at least more detail is that it covers the spectrum of parties or sources that we're looking for in data.

You know, it's kind of trying to take a holistic look at this particular issue if we were to conduct this review tomorrow. And I'm specifically looking at the responsible teams or data sources and the data requirements section.

Because, you know, I think that it would be very important for that future working group to first get a macro level picture of what the total number of transfers look like which is data that can be pulled from the registry reports that are submitted to ICANN. That is a contractual obligation by the registries to do that.

The only kind of possible issue there is that that data is three months in the rears but assuming that this would be done a year after the IRTP policy recommendations have been implemented there would still be a full year of data to perhaps take a look at that macro level view especially going back in time to look at the transfer volumes at least as how they're reported in those

transactional reports prior to when the IRTP policies or recommendations are implemented and certainly then a year after.

But then once that macro view has been established then it's about being able to drill down into the different, I would say, segments of the IRTP process and, you know, taking a close look at what elements of that transfer process were successful as compared to the recommendations that change the IRTP such as, you know, looking at the general notion of whether particular, you know, the number of successful transfers that didn't have any kinds of issues, the number of transfers that were abandoned and/or that had failed some of which is data from the registrars.

You know, then the other aspect is that taking a look at data from ICANN in terms of what their visibility is in terms of complaints about transfers that are submitted to ICANN and certainly the Contractual Compliance team has made inroads in terms of quantifying - or properly tagging and quantifying what those issues may look like.

And then of course then the third section would be approaching registrars about some of the data that the perhaps would have to help complete the overall data picture of the - what the transfer process look like through that timeframe.

And then lastly I think one of the things that the registrars have entertained using more recently as well as a possible way forward in terms of any recommendations this group may come up with that there are certain sensitivities to this data and that perhaps, you know, the use of a third party source to help aggregate any of that transfer data so that it is usable and that it does complement the issues being reviewed in the overall transfer process but without necessarily tipping off that, you know, this particular percentage is heavily flooded by - or heavily influenced by Go Daddy because they have the most registrations therefore conduct the most transfers and those kinds of things.

So those are some of the potholes that we want to try to avoid or would want to be avoided should a third party source be used to aggregate that particular data which, again, that directly circles back to the process flow diagram where one section of it is - there's budget available for such a request and those kinds of things.

And I think that that's something that should be expanded on here within this request is that we just assume for now that there is budget available and then we can advance this forward.

So with that I'll turn it back over to Jonathan and if there are any other comments or suggestions about how we can improve this please bring them to the table.

Jonathan Zuck: Yeah, and before we get to that I just note that Nenad did manage to type his question into the chat over a few messages. And I think you've raised a very good point that very often that some of these relationships are dependent on trust and who's requesting the data and how they're requesting. And those are some of the issues we're trying to address as a working group.

I think that it's outside of our remit to come up with a structural reform for ICANN in which data is always requested by the same body that instead these data requests with which we're tasked to bring about some reform would come from working groups but might actually begin in most instances with the issue report that has - that's written by staff.

So there will be an initial data request in many instances of either contracted parties or third parties, etcetera, in order to scope and better understand the problem being (unintelligible) by our working group.

So I think we're not tasked with data generally or new data policy for ICANN or anything like that but instead to provide a set of tools that working groups

might more likely use data in both determining the scope and importance of an issue and in measuring the success of the proposed solution down the road. That's our objective.

Does that make sense? And then, Berry, you had something you wanted to add.

Berry Cobb: Thank you, Jonathan. Yeah, just to I guess kind of reiterate what had been mentioned in the past as well because I think that this is a very important aspect is, you know, access to better data at the issue report level because certainly there have been opinions in the community that some - perhaps some PDPs shouldn't have even started had there been more due diligence and access to the data when trying to define the issue up front.

And perhaps that that would have in itself make a determination as, you know, when that issue report is passed along to the GNSO Council that maybe the issue isn't really an issue at all.

So I definitely that that's - I won't say that it's more critical then when we're at the working group stage and that working group needs to have access to data but I think it is definitely a necessary part of the overall puzzle that we're trying to solve that if that data is available at the issue report stage that perhaps that could be a better information aspect that would not only better describe the issue at hand but more importantly sometimes make it seem that there's really not an issue to be deliberated on.

Jonathan Zuck: That's right. And that comes up a lot in conversations inside the ICANN community is that we start down a path without sufficient evidence for the path that we're taking. And so, you know, data could be the thing that nips a discussion in the bud or the thing that brings it to the top of the pile depending on the scope of the issue involved.

And so I think data will enable us not only to make better decisions but better decisions about what policy to work on. Does that answer your question, Nenad?

Nenad Orlić: Do you hear me now? Is it better? I try to...

Jonathan Zuck: Yes, much better.

Nenad Orlić: Okay. So I managed to fix the microphone better. Okay well basically it does but do you not see any harm in maybe recommending who put - or making our group's opinion and putting it in writing should this be done in this or that way although it may be out of our scope.

Jonathan Zuck: Yeah, I mean, I think scope creep is a, you know, very probable and a - is a big pitfall for us because I know at one of the meetings that we had - it might have been in London, there began to be discussions about open data policies around ICANN and publication of data, etcetera.

And I think, you know, that in some ways runs counter to our objective which is simply to make it easier to get data for a very specific purpose and for a very specific discussion so that we have more informed public policy.

If no one has anything to add to that are there comments on the document itself, on the executive summary, on the issues that Berry raised? I don't know if everyone's had a chance to read through Pam's comments so - or, Pam, if you want to raise some of them for the group but they're certainly embedded in the document.

Pam Little: Hi, can you hear me?

Jonathan Zuck: Yeah.

Pam Little: Okay. So I think I made a couple of - just one change, it's not about the IRTP process so that's self-explanatory. But just going back - going down the document, scroll down the document, I - to me it just not very clear what we're trying to measure. I think once we try to sort of narrow down the specific policy requirement that we try to measure then will be more easy to identify what data we need.

And once we identify what data we need to measure that particular requirement or effectiveness of that policy requirement then we would probably easier to - it will be easier to identify where the data source might be.

So that's, I guess, my comment in general because at the moment as currently drafted it (unintelligible) very broad, we just asking data but what data or we just want to measure IRTP-B or IRTP-D but which part of the policy? Because there are various parts and the different implementation timelines, effective date of the implementation.

So I think we need to be very specific about which policy requirement we're trying to measure and what data we need to measure that and then where we're going to get that data. And the principle is also important in my view; if we can get the data from ICANN I think that would be our first port of call because I do believe ICANN compliance now has much more elaborate system so that can collect and analyze data and produce data.

And the other area obviously is the registries' monthly report. And in my email I think I pointed out we can also go to registries to ask them to produce specific data. And I say this because of the unique nature of IRTP and transfer related issues, because if you look at the gTLD landscape Com and Net would represent, I would say, 90% of all current gTLD registrations.

So I just want us to all think about that what it means in terms of data. If you go to VeriSign you could get probably 90% of all transactions of current gTLD registration. And that's a very powerful or useful thing to bear in mind.

And I believe VeriSign is very, very, very helpful and cooperative and responsive at least based on my personal experience. They have the, you know, superb capabilities of writing extra code on the back of the registration system to pull a lot of data that is not public available - publicly available.

Of course it's all contingent upon whether they are willing to do so for particular requests or whatever. But I think that it's just a very useful resource to bear in mind when we think about data especially for transfer related data. That's all for me for now. Does that make sense?

Jonathan Zuck: It does make sense. And I think definitely on the previous conversations we've had I think we've all agreed that data that's already in the hands of ICANN should be our first source of data. Now there are certain kinds of data that are handed over to ICANN under contract that might still require permissions or something like that to be shared with working groups. And so we'll need to be sensitive to that fact that not all data by - that's in the hands of compliance is public data.

But I think definitely starting from the data that's inside ICANN is something on which we all agreed for some time for sure. And so I guess the question is, is that you have some ideas for helping to make this data request more specific so that it's more easily digested by registrars and registries that might get this - their portion, if you will, of the data request.

Pam Little: Sorry, I didn't catch that. Yeah, that was my thinking. I just thought we can't just go out and ask for data, we have to be very specific...

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Zuck: Right, which makes perfect sense so now I'm asking if you have specific recommendations for changes we might make to make the data request more specific.

Pam Little: Yeah, that goes back to if you look at the document issue to be resolved basically we - there's a lot of bullet points. But that area or that section to me needs to be further - more work to be done to say, hey, Bullet 1 is linked to which IRTP requirement. So that's what you are trying to measure. Because at the moment I cannot make the correlation between the bullet points and which part of the IRTP requirement that it's referring to.

Jonathan Zuck: Berry, did you want to speak up here?

Berry Cobb: Yes thank you, Jonathan. This is Berry. I definitely agree with Pam that, you know, the current state of this particular request is very high level. As I mentioned, this was exported from the IRTP-D document in its current state. And I certainly wouldn't be comfortable submitting this in its present form to the SGs and Cs because it would cause more confusion than what we're trying to accomplish here.

That said, you know, I think that, you know, our next task is to improve this in a way that we are all comfortable in sending something out to the community for their input.

So perhaps what an approach that we can take is - I hope that this isn't considered a side track to what we're trying to accomplish here but let's pretend that we are that future review team and, you know, more or less Recommendations 17 and 18 that are listed from the report that were approved by the GNSO Council and likely approved by the ICANN Board are going to have to be implemented somehow.

So in terms of helping to evolve this particular document, that we spend some time to pretend that we are that future review team and that we are living in

2016 after these recommendations have been implemented so that if we were a part of that future team we would be tasked with coming up with what the exact requirements should be.

And I'd also agree that absolutely we should start with, you know, the documents that are immediately available to us that are all publicly available. So you'll see over on the right I've started some action items that I'll send out to the list if everyone agrees with this approach.

But first and foremost we'll have the working group on your own time review what the IRT policy is in its current form plus I'll also send the one that is - that has a policy effective date that includes some of the IRTP-B recommendations for the 30th of January.

So everyone become familiar with what the overall policy looks like as well as I'll make sure to send the final reports of IRTP-B, C and D. It is - these reports are rather lengthy but I think you don't need to read them in their entirety, I'll just highlight the main sections of the report that'll help you understand what that particular working group - was trying to accomplish with the issues that were being deliberated and why they came up with the subsequent recommendation.

And to Pam's point I think to evolve these requirements, you know, that there is some connection between those specific recommendations that were made by that working group as to the data that we might want to look at in the future.

And then, lastly, what I'll also look to - I'll reach out to Contractual Compliance, I think some of their reporting on the overall transfers is publicly available. I'll see if there's any other reports that they have handy that I can share with the working group because that would certainly be one of the original or initial data sources from Contractual Compliance.

And then lastly, I'll also send out links to this group where you can see the transaction reports that VeriSign posts on a monthly basis. It's really all the registries but I think as to Pam's point, Com and Net are the big ones and certainly will have the greatest transfer transaction volume that occurs.

But I'll point out to you in those particular sections of that report that highlight what the transfers are going. So again, it's - it is kind of a derailing from this particular working group's task but I do believe that it would be worth the time to help enhance this document should the group ultimately agree to send this out to the community for their input. Thank you.

Jonathan Zuck: Well again I think we're trying to send this document out for possible, you know, revisions to another document that'll be more and more templated in nature.

And part of what Pam may be requesting might find itself translated into a full component to a data request and to that template that does make specific ties between the data being requested and the issue being described so that it doesn't look like a fishing expedition, it'll look very specific to the issues that are at hand. So there may be some structural components and solution to the issue that Pam raised.

Does anybody else have a comment they want to raise about this? We should definitely keep the conversation going on the mailing list and - that has started. It's a good sign, we've just go to keep it going so that we're not just doing everything by committee here, we're trying to do things on the email list as well.

So I guess the next steps on this is to get a little more discussion on the list and come up with another draft of this that might be in the shape that folks can go back and share it with their various constituencies in addition to the action items that Berry has outlined here on the right hand side.

Let's still focus on trying to get this document in a form that might be appraised for - used and then templated for future use. I think that's still the next step that we're working towards is to circulate this among all the people that might be a part of this request for data.

Oh and then as far as the third party aggregate that I see down here, Janavier, I think the point is to look at what scenarios would dictate a third party. You know, there might be some in which that's necessary, in other instances in which it's not necessary and we want to build that into the process not hardwire bureaucracy into the process when it isn't necessary but have those options available and template out the request for the budget for those options when the data demands that that be the case. That makes sense?

All right and while you're typing I guess let's figure out what our next meeting is. Let's not wait and have this conversation - keep this conversation going on the list. Berry, what do you have for the next meeting?

Berry Cobb: So like I said I will take these action items out to the right and send that out to the list and so that we can maintain dialogue there. Our next meeting will be scheduled for the 2nd of December which is two weeks from now and then of course we'll have one on the 16th of December so - but it'll be the same time, 2nd of December for our next meeting.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Berry, Cheryl here. Just on the 2nd of December, I may or may not be an apology, I'm not sure. My husband is scheduled for surgery that day, just depends when that's happening as to if I'm able to take a dial-out but if I'm not there that's why.

Berry Cobb: Great. Thank you, Cheryl.

Jonathan Zuck: That's a pretty reasonable excuse. Pam, do you have something?

Pam Little: Yeah, I just want to add one more point. I know that the action items Berry shared there. I just wonder how many of us would have the capacity or time to read IRTP-B, C, D final reports. I still go back to the point I made earlier; to me we need to turn these requests into a kind of - establish the linkage between what the issue was initially and how that was addressed in the policy IRTP policy which part and which requirement.

And the third column will be then what data we need to measure the effectiveness of that policy so it's very clear from issue, policy and data and from whom we get that data so there's multiple columns and we can see the linkage between the whole chain. Otherwise, I'm just really a bit concerned we're going to read all these policy and the final report of this different working groups I don't have time to do that, I doubt other people on this call.

Jonathan Zuck: I guess there's probably not a definitive answer to that. But, I mean, let's all just try to do what we can and we'll work together with staff to revise the document structure to make more specific requests of data.

Okay.

Pam Little: Okay.

Jonathan Zuck: I think that's it for today unless anybody has anything else. So thanks, everyone, and let's try to keep the conversation going on our list. And we'll work on trying to set some specific objectives for the Singapore meeting. All right, thanks a lot everyone.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks, everyone. Bye.

((Crosstalk))

Man: Bye.

Terri Agnew: (Tony), if you can please stop the recordings.

Coordinator: Will do.

Terri Agnew: Thank you. Once again the meeting has been adjourned. Thank you everyone for joining. Please remember to disconnect all remaining lines. Have a great rest of your day.

END