

ICANN Transcription
Data & Metrics for Policy Making Working Group
Tuesday 10 March 2015 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 10 March 2015 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-10mar15-en.mp3>

On page:

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

Attendees:

Cheryl Langdon-Orr – ALAC
Jonathan Zuck – IPC
Pam Little – RySG
Olivier Kouami – NPOC
Sara Bockey – RrSG
Tony Onorato – Individual
Graeme Bunton – RrSG
Janvier Ngnoulaye – Individual

Apologies:

None

ICANN staff:

Steve Chan

Berry Cobb
Terri Agnew

Woman: Recordings have started.

Terri Agnew: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening. This is the Data and Metrics for Policy Making working group on the 10th of March, 2015.

On the call today we have Jonathan Zuck, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Graeme Bunton, Tony Onorato, Sara Bockey, Pam Little and Olivier Kouami. I show no apologies noted for today's conference. From staff we have Berry Cobb, Steve Chan 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 Terri. Thanks everyone for being here on board here. Good morning, good evening, whatever the case may be.

I guess let's just dive in and take a look at this document that Steve circulated. And I guess I'd like to open it up for any questions or discussion as a kind of straw man for some potential recommendations. So take a second to read back over it if you haven't read it in a little while.

Berry, go ahead.

Berry Cobb: Thank you Jonathan. So I think a few of you weren't on our last call, so I figured I'd spend a minute or two to bring everybody up to speed. The intent

here - the document you see in the AC room as to which Jonathan mentioned being distributed last week is to attempt to get some draft recommendations down to - more or less try to guide our work effort for the next few months leading up to us developing an issue report.

This list is certainly not closed off. All of these - the four recommendations that are listed there are in draft form. So that shouldn't scare anybody that we can't add to this or alter some of the existing ones.

A couple of things that I'd like to point - it is divided up into two. One is - the first section is more or less the formal recommendations, and then the second portion being kind of a list of our deliverables to help us meet those recommendations.

And so when you look through them you'll see that for instance Recommendation 3 which discusses about working group charters, we actually had that listed as Deliverable #1 as to update the template for a working group charter. And kind of diving into the specific of that, there is more or less a standard template that staff uses to develop a charter. It's pretty bare bones in terms of what all is included with it.

Some of you may be familiar that in the future there's kind of a pilot going on where an issue report is submitted to the GNSO Council, and where appropriate a draft of that charter that would initiate a working group would also be included.

So for the purposes of what we're trying to accomplish here is when the stage of the process is exiting out of the issue report but looking to spin up a working group, the idea is that the drafting team would have a particular section included in this charter for which we're going to develop that will change the culture - enhance the culture to ask the right kinds of questions from a quantitative and perhaps qualitative perspective to inform the grouping work's deliberations.

So as we progress over the coming weeks, what we're going to do is particularly spend individual meetings where we'll just talk about the charter. We've done some of this in the past before - I think it was before our London meeting. And then we shifted gears kind of more towards the use case and the data request template which we'll talk about in a little bit.

But the idea here is to brainstorm with the working group to try to define some, you know, high level but targeted questions that the working groups - or I should say that the drafting team itself should be asking when they're developing the charter and what the scope of their deliverables are and the issues that they're trying to tackle.

The same will also apply in terms of Recommendation 4 which gets into the stage of the working group that is developing recommendations. And before they submit their final report to the GNSO Council, there should be a complimentary component to those recommendations that will attempt to measure the effectiveness of those recommendations for eventual measurement down the road once they have been implemented, of course after the board has approved any of those particular recommendations.

And we're starting to see some of the fruits of that labor as we talked about with IRTPD. And they attempted to do that with a couple of their recommendations coming out of that.

The other types of deliverables - I think we've more or less started on, you know, the data request template which again is connected to our IRTPD use case. The GNSO funding for outside data request template is probably more or less included in Number 3. There is a section devoted to that that we probably will need to enhance. And then of course I think everyone is familiar with the overall workflow template which we should probably need to polish off. But I think that that would be something worthwhile to include in the initial report.

The last thing that I'll mention in terms of recommendations and to my notice of saying that this is not a finalized list - just before the call I did remember that some of our early on work when we were reviewing the prior working group efforts that had occurred in the past, Tony and myself had spent some time taking a look at the stage of the working group process where there is early input into that process.

And essentially what occurs there is the working group will develop a set of - a series of questions and other aspects of input that they're looking for the issue that they're looking to resolve. And a formalized request will go out to the stakeholder groups and constituencies as well as the SOs and ACs. And each of those are structured slightly different based on the group that is looking to provide input to.

But so this was back in July and August of last year. But there were a couple of draft recommendations that we had posed to the list that I'll make sure get added into here. So what we do ask is that other members take a good, close look at these, help us edit the current ones, and certainly potentially ask or add some new ones that may be relevant to our work here.

And as we from this point will, you know, this will kind of give us something to work with to help guide our work over the next few months or several weeks from now I guess. Thank you.

Berry Cobb: Jonathan, if you're trying to talk, you may be on mute.

Jonathan Zuck: I'm trying to figure out what to say. That's a lot to absorb. So I mean I guess the question is really next steps for this call. This document was circulated to the list or the people that had specific reactions to it when they took a look at it.

Tony, go ahead.

Tony Onorato: Yes, thanks Jonathan. Yes, I mean if we want to get into some of the specifics of the document, I had a couple of comments. But I guess more appropriate perhaps right now is maybe a conceptual comment I guess about the draft recommendations or a conceptual addition.

Jonathan Zuck: I'll take either.

Tony Onorato: I'm not sure what it is. But so I guess one thing that struck me as missing was an indication that we the proposed metrics and really the metrics that are ultimately decided upon, that once that review is done - and I think we should tweak the language perhaps to say something along the lines of to assess the performance against the metrics.

But are we contemplating then taking that set of metrics and some synopsis of that assessment of the success against the metrics and centralizing that information anywhere, creating some repository essentially of the metrics selected and how performance is assessed against those metrics and how close the correlation was?

Because one of the things I think that of course will happen over time is the metrics will be refined. And any particular, you know, anytime a working group is - especially at the outset of course of this general initiative - selecting metrics, I suspect that there will be a good deal of uncertainty as to how the metrics might ultimately match up. But over time they'll of course become much more refined.

So I thought one of the recommendations we might add here is to the effect of saying that a synopsis of that assessment of the performance against the metrics would be submitted or centralized somewhere in order so that later working groups can look at that repository of information and say well that metric seemed to work particularly well. That one didn't. Maybe we ought to revise it or something along those lines.

Jonathan Zuck: So let me make sure that I understand you correctly Tony. Thank you for your comment. I think the basic idea is that a work group would develop, you know, do a data analysis to try and understand the problem. I mean I don't know what the most simplistic example be that there's this Whois data accuracy, right? And that results in a number that there is, you know, 50% records are inaccurate based off some study, okay, and some measure.

And then here's the three things we think we should do to improve Whois data accuracy. And then there would be a review. And we get those things - those records. The work group makes those recommendations. They make it through council, through the board, and they get implemented.

And then some period of time after that - let's say a year after that there would be a review of that same data that was used to meter and scope the problem initially, and see if it had changed, as an evaluation not so much of the metrics but of the recommendations that were made to address the problem that the data had helped identify.

So that's the sort of basic structure of these recommendations. And so is your recommendation more about reviewing in a more general sense the use of metrics or just making sure that that data as it's collected can always be gotten to? I didn't completely understand what your recommendation was. Sorry.

Tony Onorato: Sure, no problem. I certainly see where that wasn't clear. I think that what you're talking about which I think is also quite intriguing is more of a meta-analysis. It's more of a how are we improving from a policy standpoint or improving in the direction of a given policy goal over time based on the efforts to implement certain policies to achieve that goal whereas really what I was talking about here is the efficacy of the metrics themselves that are selected in order to scope out the problem.

So for example, in the IRTP example they've selected certain metrics as part of their report requirements for acquiring successful, abandoned and failed transfer data for example. So in order to assess that data point, they'll have to request certain types of data. I mean in this case of course it's pretty straight forward what they're going to be requesting.

But they've also given it a definition for failed transfers. So what I'm talking about here is more so after they go through this process, then at the end of the day the way that they define their metrics -so requests from registrars for example, data on failed transfers. Did that definition ultimately work to achieve - yield a metric that made sense I guess essentially?

And then moreover, did the data that was acquired - did that data - was it the best data that could have been selected essentially in order to see whether or not they had achieved the goal? So I guess I'm talking about something that's a bit more pedestrian and really direct to whether the metrics selected by the working group were actually the right metrics to figure out whether or not the recommendations that were selected were successful.

Did the metrics correlate to the showing of the success of the recommendations? Does that make sense?

Jonathan Zuck: Yes. This is Jonathan again for the transcript. I definitely think that it makes sense. I mean I think it makes sense to try and craft an additional recommendation as part of the downstream review to look back at the metrics being used.

I mean, you know, my only hesitation is that becomes the argument for why there, you know, wasn't improvement in that, you know, to justify a policy recommendation that didn't improvement in a data measure that was chosen as a metric, right - that while it's the metric that was wrong, not the policy.

So I guess that will be the heartache of the policy review team that looks at the effects of policy recommendations, right? But I mean it's still a legitimate question. So we should try to craft something that looks at the choice of metrics as well as part of that review process.

Graeme, go ahead.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks. I think that was Tony that was pushing that forward, correct?

Jonathan Zuck: That's right.

Graeme Bunton: I'm sorry. This is Graeme for the transcript. Yes, I think that sort of meta-analysis is important for continuous improvement. We're going to in theory iterate and get better and better at using data for policy and, you know, improving the way we ask for that. So that is a good point that we should try and capture and integrate somehow.

The only thing I caught in there maybe was we just want to make sure that the storage of data is not permanent in there, and that it's an assessment of the efficacy of the data and not a continual reassessment of the data itself because that then makes me nervous. Thanks.

Jonathan Zuck: I think that makes sense. Again the - I'll pass it back to Tony. I think there will be this notion of looking back at that data in some period after to assess performance of the recommendations. And I guess what we need to figure out is whether or not - what timeframe or period that we put on assessing the work group in terms of its choice of metrics or data, and whether that's the same review period. Or is it really the next version of this work group some period down the road like ATRT that goes and looks at things historically to see if guidance needs to change or something?

I think Berry's next.

Berry Cobb: Thank you Jonathan. This is Berry Cobb. So a couple of things to unpack here. First I think is a process element about how this will traverse through the grander working group process all the way up through implementation and beyond. And then the second part, we'll circle back to what Tony was mentioning.

So that everybody is clear about the process, when the working group does make its final recommendations - and let's hypothetically assume for the moment our Recommendation #4 was approved by the GNSO Council. One of their tasks will be to define what those metrics of success are. And those will be carried forward with the recommendations of that PDP.

They get approved by the council, by the board, and then turned over to staff for implementation. During that process there is or it's about to be formalized that pretty much every PDP type recommendations will have some form of IRT - an Implementation Review Team - to work with staff in the implementation of those recommendations, as well as in this future case to be able to further refine any of those metrics of success.

The moment which is anywhere from six months to a year that the policy effective date becomes real, the contracted parties are then, you know, obligated to have those in operation. And we'll have the metrics in place to start measuring the effectiveness of that policy. But you're not going to know right away or probably in most cases you're not going to know the very next day whether the recommendation was effective or not unless it really broke something.

But the idea - the intent is a year after those - maybe even be six months - but six months to a year, some reasonable time after implementation that that data is being gathered along the way. And at some point in time when it's time to actually conduct that review, it is my understanding the current process would be that staff will put together the initial framework or the document or proposal that measures the effectiveness of those

recommendations along with any data to support the effectiveness of that that has been shared back with the GNSO Council.

And depending on what the outcome is, you know, if the policy recommendations that were implemented did in fact intend to meet the nature of the policy change itself, you know, gold stars and thumbs up. If there was something that was actually produced in a negative fashion, then of course then it would probably either be kicked back to staff to look at another issue report or some other course of action, depending on the nature of what that negative outcome might would have been. But, you know, that's pretty far into the future.

So now to kind of circle back to some of Tony's comments. I definitely agree, you know, at these early stages of just designing the initial recommendations, and then the possible metrics that may have that measure of success will be a definite exercise because we may not know for sure if we are finding or have at least determined what some of those metrics might be.

I'm hopeful that we'll do a pretty decent job. But for example, if something as complicated as Whois, we may not know until sometime down the road. But that analysis would be a part of the analysis of measuring the actual policy recommendations themselves. So when staff would go to do a review of the particular recommendations, and we identify a gap or a deficiency in the metrics that helped us measure that, we'll take either hopefully the action to try to go get that data to correct the gap before sharing the final result. Or if not, that will be one of the findings that would happen in that review of those policy recommendations.

And then the last comment that I'll make in reference to Graeme, I would agree that, you know, some data that perhaps is external to ICANN that is let's just say a hypothetical data store that was received to conduct that analysis, only the output of that analysis would necessarily be retained. Nothing that - it wouldn't be a forever living database. I don't think that's the

intent of what we're trying to accomplish here. But it would be kept only up and to the point that it wasn't necessary in terms of the review.

And of course then the very, very last thing that I'll say about this is every PDP is different. So I suspect that, you know, maybe over time we'll start to have some kind of like metrics that can be used across different kinds of PDPs. But in the near term, you know, maybe there is a group of transfer related metrics that - who knows, maybe some portions of that can wind up being an actual dashboard whereas other metrics that are related to Whois may be a one and done kind of thing. So the consultant answer would be that it would depend on the PDP itself.

Jonathan Zuck: Cheryl, go ahead.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: No. My hand shouldn't be up. If it is, I'll put it back down.

Jonathan Zuck: Go ahead Tony.

Tony Onorato: I (unintelligible). I think that that helped quite a bit Berry. I think that was really useful. I wanted to just see if I might raise a point or two about some of the language that we use here or really questions about it - the kind of questions I assume we would be confronted with, in particular, what it is we mean when we're saying streamlined access. The compliance data - what in particular do we mean by that?

And then I wonder if we might want to give an example of what it is we're referring to when we talk about sensitive data, especially third party aggregators of sensitive data. I suspect that both of those would be points which would raise a question to us.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Is it just me? Can anyone else hear Tony properly because I can't?

Jonathan Zuck: I hear him fine.

Berry Cobb: Sounds reasonable to me.

Jonathan Zuck: Be proud that it's just you Cheryl.

Berry Cobb: And so if I may respond to Tony's question.

Jonathan Zuck: Yes, sure.

Berry Cobb: So first and foremost, you know, these recommendations are drafts. And the streamlined access would probably be something that I think staff would want to redline out. The GNSO or really the ccNSO or the entire policy team for (David) have that direct access to contractual compliance.

I think if anything it's more about formalizing what a request may look like should one come from a working group. And I wouldn't want to go as far as saying - of putting service levels behind it or anything like that, but understanding that...

Jonathan Zuck: Right.

Berry Cobb: ...as a part of that request that there are certain expectations that it will be met within a certain timeframe or something a little - as loose as that.

And then secondarily I would also agree - I think you were - in response to your sensitive data, I do believe we should further define that or put a footnote behind it as to exactly what that means. Thank you.

Jonathan Zuck: I certainly agree, right? This was just to get down these - to get something down as a straw man. So, you know, it could be that the need for streamlined isn't even there in the context of staff, right, because that's in the initial staff report on the issue report. And so if they already have easy access to (Brian)'s data, then it may be a redundant recommendation.

And I don't think we'll have any trouble coming up with an example of sensitive data. It could be that we'll want to have a - either a footnote or some explanatory text that goes behind these recommendations rather than making the recommendations themselves seem complex. We can sort of just create legislative intent if you will through some examples and some of the things we went over in our case studies.

But the bottom line is that data that's not free, either because it comes from an outside source or because for example a contracted party has a need that that data be anonymized before they can share it back with the working group are both things that incur a cost. And so that particular recommendation is about, you know, those work groups - the initially staffing in the work group be provided with the resources necessary to get to that data. That's the real issue.

Berry, do you still have your hand up? Or is that a new hand?

Berry Cobb: Yes, just one more comment to close this out. So as I mentioned we'll make a few more edits to this document. Like I said, I'll add the other two recommendations from a while back, make some slight edits, and we'll send this back out to the list. So we definitely welcome input just about either. I'll make sure tracked changes are kept in order and/or use the comment tool to highlight any suggestions that you might want to add to bring back to the group.

The other thing that I'll also mention - so in parallel, Steve or staff has started on kind of creating a mini draft of our initial report. What we are attempting to do with this is to keep it a very - I don't want to use streamlined since we just killed it in the second recommendation - but a thin version of the initial report based on - as compared to other previous working groups where sometimes those can get a little bit lengthy.

And I don't want to put a limitation on the overall length of it. But somewhere, you know, hoping no more than 15 to 20 pages at most including any of the background material that we, you know, might be necessary. But we do want to try to make this report much more targeted and focused for when we send it out for public comment.

Jonathan Zuck: Indeed. All right, so I guess keep reading that document when the new version comes out, and let's keep the conversation going, you know, on the list serve to make improvements to that document. So Tony, I recommend your - I look forward to your edits.

Graeme, go ahead.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks. Sorry, let me get, you know, not on mute on the various places. Graeme for the transcript. Something that came up in ICANN Singapore that was raised within - I think it was the registrar community that we need to be careful about. And this isn't for anything specific within the document. This is just an idea to put in people's heads and to think about is that it's quite possible that sharing data amongst registrars if not done carefully is contrary to anti-competition law and could get some of us in heaps of trouble. So that was just another fun thing to ponder. Thanks.

Jonathan Zuck: And how to we ponder it? What's the best way to...

Graeme Bunton: Those of you who are lawyers and know anything about that, opinions would be worthwhile. It's just something that came back to me now. So I'll go and see if I can do a little bit of research. But yes, Berry has mentioned that she's mentioned this in the past.

So I don't know. We just need to I guess capture that when we're doing a data request that we need to make sure that, you know, contracted parties aren't in breach of national law when they're providing data. Thanks.

Jonathan Zuck: Right. Berry, you had - go ahead.

Berry Cobb: Yes, just real quick. You know I think that goes into the aspect of looking to, you know, if there is a requirement that any data be anonymized. And that was one big reason for it was to avoid any potential anti competition/antitrust kind of issues that might be involved with that.

Jonathan Zuck: Okay. All right, Berry or Steve, do you want to introduce this document?
Berry, go ahead.

Berry Cobb: So what this - this shouldn't be new to anybody. We've seen this before. And there's two kinds - you'll have to forgive if you hear noise in my background. There's two kind of components to this document.

The first is a use case that we've attempted to try to use in the past which as I mentioned was based off of IRTPD recommendations 18 and 19 I believe or 17 and 18 - one of the two - which eventually get into the aspect of a review taking place at some point in time in the future to review all the recommendations that have been implemented in B, C and D. And as we just discussed, to do the very thing that we want to instill as a recommendation for future work to measure the effectiveness of those policy recommendation outcomes and make sure that they did what they were intended to do.

So the first aspect of this is to do a use case. And the reason why was that it was a, you know, kind of a real world example as something that, you know, future working groups may encounter at some point in time in the future. But the secondary aspect of it which is the (Buenavart) deliverables which I think is even more important is trying to create a template by which working groups will need to request data.

And what's trying to be applied here is that it's, you know, it's a group and platform agnostic or at least that's how we're starting it out to be. So if a future working group only needed data from compliance, they could still use

this form. If there was data needed from a third party, the same form could be used or likewise if something was to occur with - or a data requirement from contracted parties such as registrars.

So a couple of things went out on the list. You know there seemed to be some apprehension about actually pushing this use case out to the community for a few various reasons. One, that it wasn't mature enough and that more requirements definition needed to be required. And I would certainly agree with that.

I wouldn't want to share - it would be too confusing to try to share it in its current form within anybody in the community. And then - but there was some apprehension about doing this all together, and hence why we sent out a quick poll either late last week I believe, only which four people had responded. All four were yes with one with a reservation. And I think some of what I just mentioned is probably what some of the reservations (Pam) has that it needs to be matured and cleaned up a lot more before we move forward with it.

I think what we also stated on the last call is that us moving this use case forward shouldn't necessarily have any particular impact on our current draft recommendations that we're putting together now that, you know, perhaps the only real benefit was twofold - one that it will help bring in some of the community around this issue. But then secondarily perhaps maybe uncover some things that we may have missed when we were putting together some of our draft recommendations, especially with the deliverables when we go to look to update templates like the charter or the issue report and those kinds of things.

So if anything, I'd like a final decision or I think it would be great if the group could decide - and it doesn't need to be on the call. But we can send out a final email about whether we should move this forward or not. If not, then, you know, nothing will be lost because I do believe that the template itself will be

a decent deliverable to have with our initial report and for use by future working groups.

Jonathan Zuck: Anybody have any thoughts? Or do we need to just make this a homework assignment to read this to speak to it definitively? Homework for Graeme. So can we add this to the work and get conversation going on the list? I'll try to be better to be right in reminding people of things between calls. I think it's easy to just take it off the call and move on. So I'll try to be a nag this week on the calls. Berry?

Berry Cobb: Thank you Jonathan. Just - I preempted that. I don't think you were on our call last time. Should the group choose to move forward with this, the idea is that, you know, we would try to mature this document to the best of our abilities for now. But it would be an iterative process.

In fact what - especially around some of the requirements relating to transfers. And I know that there's definitely several aspects to this request that will be challenging. You know there are different registrar models, you know, for instance retail versus reseller types of models. Different types of versioning and systems and transfers are accounted for across registrar systems. So there's some of those aspects.

But the idea would be to perhaps send this back to the IRTPD list to help them - have them help us try to refine some of the requirements a little bit further as well as the template. And then once we were all comfortable with it, then we could perhaps send it out just to the SGs and Cs to see if there's any input from other community members that A, aren't necessarily close to this but B, they just try again to communicate what it is that we're trying to accomplish out there given our little - how small our visibility footprint is in the grander scheme of things going on. So that's kind of those particular next steps should the group choose to do that.

Jonathan Zuck: Tony, do you want to speak up verbally or (unintelligible).

Tony Onorato: This is Tony. No, I've - my comment was fairly minor. I mean I thought the document was generally fine. I thought we could add into the post implementation benefits back that metrics can be adjusted for future projects. But other than that I thought that the executive summary was fine and that other than those interesting - certainly the IRTP document in getting pretty close I think to the types of things I expected to see here at least for a more data driven policy process.

Jonathan Zuck: Excellent. Okay. Well so this is another document. We get everybody to read over it to make adjustments to so that we can also gain some consensus about whether or not we think it should be part of the final report. So let's look at that some more. And I do - I join Steve in congratulating - join Berry in congratulating Steve on an excellent document. So let's get on that this week and make some decisions about where it should go.

And then now Berry, do you want to discuss the member management pilot announcement?

Berry Cobb: Yes. Thank you Jonathan. So I'm sure maybe some will recall Friday's announcements in Singapore. And I can't remember if it was the Monday morning session or one of the smaller sessions where they talked about participation from community and trying to grow that participation rate. And I'm doing a horrible job trying to remember all of those speaking points.

But more specifically he did mention a pilot that would be occurring for working group management. Certainly the higher goal is to increase participation from persons in the community that don't normally participate on a weekly or daily basis as several of the veterans do, but to try to increase that participation pool.

And part of that initiative or the goals and objectives behind that are tied in with the secondary project I thought he was referring to which is the key

performance indicators, one of which I believe or maybe even two of which are really measuring our reach participation, not only by numbers but by region, etc.

So this quick announcement is for one of the projects that are going to help reach those particular goals and objectives which is the working group membership management pilot. We don't really have an awesome name for this yet. I'm still trying to brainstorm what it might be. But the general announcement is at our next meeting which will be scheduled for the 24th I believe.

I will spend about 30 minutes of that call doing a small demonstration of a possible tool that ICANN may implement to help with working group management. The tool set is named Kavi -that's K-A-V-I and either .com or .org - I can't remember - I think it's .com. So you can at least go check out their corporate site to get an idea of what the tool is about.

But it's specifically built around types of organizations like us that work in a more or less pseudo parliamentary style. And it has a full range of features that allow for participants or members to sign up for different groups of interest. It has a communication platform such as email. It does have calendaring and scheduling components.

It has, you know, kind of a - right now it's classified as a voting feature. And we don't really like to use the word voting within our area. But it has a lot of the light features that we use Doodle for as well as the ability to start to take attendance of our participation which again is tied back to a member's profile.

And so teams like DMPM would be a natural fit to conduct this pilot. I'll definitely have more information for you before next call. But in short what we're hoping to do is to use the DMPM as our pilot group to measure at least the original or I should say the upfront components when a new working group gets spun up. And that involves getting your profile set up, some of the

calendaring and scheduling components so that the secretary team can take attendance in the background, and a couple of other more administrative functions.

Once we get the pilot going, outside of the calendaring and scheduling aspect, I'm not sure that you'll see too much of a difference in terms of acknowledging that whether you're going to be at the meeting or not or sending apologies. But there are other tools that we'll be welcome to use during the pilot such as document sharing. I had mentioned the polling mechanism that it had.

But the idea - the in state goal is whether it's this tool, Kavi, or I think there's one other on the short list in terms of meeting the requirements. The general idea is the future state is you'll have your profile on ICANN.org. You update that profile from there. You'll be presented with the possibility of selecting which working groups that you're interested in signing up for.

There will be a component - a new form of how you manage your statement of interests. And then depending on the type of group that you're signing up for, whether it's just a non-PDP or a PDP or a cross community working group or a drafting team, we're working on all the logic in the background about various requirements that occur.

For those that are members in the CWG or CCWG, you'll know that there are distinctions between members and participants. So there's a lot more work that is going on behind the scenes in terms of properly defining role definitions that will play into the logic of this overall tool.

But at any rate I just wanted to announce that at our next meeting we'll do a 30 minute demonstration, primarily based on the working group members' perspective of what you can expect to see. Such will be as, you know, notification to - we'll have to create the IDs upfront for you. But you'll be able

to log in, change your password, update your profile, respond to calendar and scheduling requests and those kinds of things.

And we hope that you have a positive experience with it. And I'm not sure at this point how long the pilot will last - I suspect for at least probably at least eight weeks or so. And we'll certainly welcome any feedback that the group has to help us see whether this is the right direction to go. But like I said, much more materials and a bigger announcement and a demonstration at our next call.

Jonathan Zuck: Thanks Berry. It's very exciting to be - very exciting to be guinea pigs. Graeme, go ahead.

Graeme Bunton: I'm going to add my two cents that I, you know, being part of the CWG and this, and I did IRTBD. I'm doing privacy and proxy. Email is the worst for policy development. It is terrible. So I think we should all really try this earnestly because getting us out of 20 year old technology for collaboration would be awesome. So I would - I'm very interested in this new tool and ready to try it out and hope it fills this yawning chasm of tools for policy development. Thanks.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Jonathan, Cheryl for hand up.

Jonathan Zuck: Yes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thanks Jonathan. Can I come in behind Graeme? Thanks - Cheryl for the record. Can I come in behind Graeme on that? Yay team. Happy to - hell yes - happy to be a guinea pig. I've obviously got a few questions. I'm actually driving at the moment. And I guess because that's a frequent thing and I'm in a whole lot of working groups - PDP and on BDB.

Yes, the mobility of the system is also something I'm very interested in. I'll keep my powder dry on all the Q&A Berry. But I'm very, very excited for

looking at this at the next call because we've certainly got to work a whole lot smarter and a whole lot less harder. And yes Graeme, get away from that bloody only archived email this world of people seem to be trapped into the time warp of.

We will get some questions if not resistance from those of us who are reasonably converted into Wiki world. But I'm assuming that there's going to be a whole lot of Adjunct and Nexus and, you know, stuff that will be complimentary. So I'll keep my powder dry on all the excited questions I've got. But just wanted to say hell yes and looking forward to it on this. And I'll go back on mute because trucks are passing me.

Jonathan Zuck: Yes. Cheryl, we're working on a special interface that you wear a stylus on your nose so that you can click the interface on your steering wheel as you're driving. So that should improve your functioning considerably.

Berry, go ahead.

Berry Cobb: Yes, thank you Jonathan. Just to respond back to both those comments, I agree 1000%. Death by email is definitely a worrisome component. I don't enjoy logging in in the morning. But I guess initially at least for this pilot I won't promise that this will reduce email for any of us.

In terms of kind of getting over the initial learning bump, there might be a few more because of this in terms of calendar notifications and those kinds of things. What I will forewarn members is that we're actually going to have to run in parallel. So, you know, in terms of any email traffic, if the group does choose to use the Kavi tool to communicate with, we'll need to make sure - we'll be carbon copying into the system our actual DMPM mailman list so that we still maintain the public record like we had.

The sandbox that we had was not on an ICANN owned system. So unfortunately the downside is that we will have to run things in parallel. So

that could be a hint messy. And then the other thing I'll say is, you know, the primary purpose of or I guess the scope of this particular pilot is really phase one which gets into the membership management of the tool.

That's not to say that we can't go ahead and try to look at some of the phase two things which gets into the document collaboration and some of those other components. In fact a few members on Chris Disspain's team would be even more happy about that. But for that initial six to eight weeks, it's all about the membership management component.

And then we would like to look at our Page 2 which does get into dot collaboration. You know I think we have a small enough team that we could even potentially use it to write our initial report. And as Graeme suggests, you know, when we're looking at documents that we need to respond to, it's better to respond in line on that master document than to put it out to the list kind of activity. So we can certainly try to play around with some of that which is very much closely aligned with Google Docs to a certain degree.

So more to come at the next meeting. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And that's another big plus - thanks Berry. The only other thing - Cheryl for the record. I just - I was a big fan of Google Docs. I mean I (unintelligible) and happy to help get this in as well or anything that works like it. But we do have to make sure that the global aspects of accessibility are also there. And that's a huge downside of the Google Docs because from Asia Pacific there's whole blocks of my people who literally cannot access Google Docs because of what it is.

So if we can get around that and get the collaborative stuff up and running, I know (unintelligible) and not straight away but as soon as possible, that could be really, really useful. I'll go back on mute again and I'll stop interrupting if I can.

Jonathan Zuck: All right. Thanks everyone. I guess the next steps is we have some homework. And then what's our next scheduled meeting Berry?

Berry Cobb: It will be the same time, 20 UTC on the 24th of March.

Jonathan Zuck: Okay. Any last - go ahead.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes. Despite my intention of not interrupting, some of us will be in Istanbul on the 24th of March. So we just need to - Berry, if you could just look to those of here in that...

Jonathan Zuck: Oh, me too.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: ...CWG and CCWG. There may need to be a small time shift depending on the agendas there. And those agendas are not published yet. So Berry, if you could have a look with the lead staff, might help avoid issues.

Jonathan, you and I could sit in the room and dial in. But it would be best if we don't have to be in too many rooms at once. Thanks.

Berry Cobb: Yes, this is Berry. You know that's a very good point Cheryl. I'm the one that kind of helped create those dates, so I should have known that it was that week. Perhaps we may look to pushing to the 31st just to avoid - because I know that that week is going to be extremely intensive for both cross community groups.

Jonathan Zuck: Yes.

Berry Cobb: So Jonathan, if you don't mind, we'll shift it to the 31st.

Jonathan Zuck: Let's do that because I'll be in Istanbul as well.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, that's a hell yes.

Jonathan Zuck: And it will be intense.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes indeed.

Jonathan Zuck: If Frankfurt is anything to go by, it will be intense.

Okay. Well thanks everyone. And take a look at both of those documents over the course of this week and send lots of emails to Graeme.

Graeme Bunton: Thanks all.

Berry Cobb: Thanks Jonathan.

Jonathan Zuck: All right. Bye-bye.

Berry Cobb: Thanks everyone. Take care.

Tony Onorato: Thank you. Bye.

Terri Agnew: Once again the meeting has been adjourned. Thank you very much for joining. Please remember to disconnect all remaining lines and (Mickey), you can stop the recording.

END