

**ICANN Transcription
Data & Metrics for Policy Making Working Group
Tuesday 14 April 2015 at 20:00 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 14 April 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-14apr15-en.mp3>

On page:

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

Attendees:

Cheryl Langdon-Orr – ALAC
Olivier Kouami – NPOC
Sara Bockey – RrSG
Graeme Bunton – RrSG
Nenad Orlic – ISPCP
Sonigitu Ekpe – NCUC
Tony Onorato – Individual
Rising John Osazuwa - At-Large
Jonathan Zuck - IPC
Olevie Kouami - NPOC

Apologies:

Pam Little – RySG

Guest:

Ryan Casey - Kavi

ICANN staff:

Edman Perez
Steve Allison
Steve Chan
Berry Cobb
Nathalie Peregrine

Coordinator: Excuse me, the recording has been started.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much (Marcel). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everybody and welcome to the DMPM call on the 14 of April 2015.

On the call today we have Jonathan Zuck, Graeme Bunton, Sara Bockey Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Nenad Orlic, Tony Onorato.

From Kavi we have Ryan Casey. We've received apologies from Pam Little.

From staff we have Berry Cobb, Steve Chan, Steve Allison, Edman Perez and myself Natalie Peregrine.

I'd like to remind you all to please state your names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you ever so much and over to you Jonathan.

Jonathan Zuck: Yes, thanks Nathalie. Is there anyone else it's on the phone that isn't on the Adobe Connect? And does anybody have any updates to their statements of interest?

All right, excellent. Well welcome back everyone. I know a lot of you have been on a lot of phone calls of late. We all have Edward Snowden to thank for that.

But let's forge ahead and learn a little something about the Kavi pilot that we've agreed to participate in. Who's leading that discussion? Is that you Berry?

Berry Cobb: Hi Jonathan yes. So this is Berry Cobb for the transcript. So welcome everyone.

Just to kind of recap from the close of our last call two weeks ago there were basically two main agenda items.

The first was discussing the update of the charter template which we'll get into in a little bit. And then the second portion was a demonstration of the Kavi toolset.

And we do appreciate the Kavi staff attending the call to help us out as well.

So this particular agenda item won't take too much of the call other than to maybe just talk about some of the basics and get any other feedback that for those of you that have signed on to the call now if you have any, you know, initial comments or responses to your experience.

I'll just remind everyone on the call, you know, there's kind of two main components of this pilot.

The first is these management of working groups which will at some point includes signing up for working groups but then once (unintelligible) they're started how we manage the countering and scheduling the attendance taking and as well as any other kind of management components for the working groups.

And then the secondary component kind of touches more into the document management/document collaboration that's prevalent to many of our groups as well.

So in general, you know, I think that there's kind of two main aspects going on here. And I'm going to share my screen. And hopefully you can see somewhat of what I'm sharing my screen for.

The first component is the roster for the group. So I believe we're about right now we show that there are 56 members. Four are observers which are members from the GNSO council as well as two managers which I believe are designated more from Kavi than what we would have as an actual working group role.

And we have recently upgraded Jonathan and Cheryl as chairs which is a specified role within Kavi itself.

I'm not sure how detailed we'll get into some of these role definitions and uses through this pilot. But we did want to elevate those particular roles to see how that feature may or may not work out for us as we move through the pilot.

So as you'll see, you know, we have 65 or so members. I believe about ten to 14 of the working group members have registered their profile with Kavi and are active.

There are some other screens that I'll show you on a different aspect that will basically log the activities of what users are looking at, you know, if they're predominately using the calendar or if they've accessed a certain Word document that's within the dashboard and those kinds of aspects.

At some point probably, you know, a good month from now we'll probably spin the roster down to those inactive members of the working group.

Of course we'll go through proper protocols to have them confirm whether they still want to be a part of this group or not because - and the reason, rationale for doing that is to make sure that we right size the list that is of through participants that are interested in the topic as well as the demonstration.

But the reason for doing this is on the backend of what you would see from a calendaring and scheduling perspective.

I believe for those that have logged in you'll notice that we do have today's call logged into the calendar.

And from the secretariat team perspective they will be starting to take attendance which you can see just above the title there's a track attendance feature.

Essentially it's a very simple form at this point of yes this person attended and then the box doesn't get checked if the person didn't attend the call.

There is also this aspect about of sending apologies. And, you know, in today's current affairs it's kind of a hit or miss tool.

Many of the veteran working group members are pretty good about sending apologies to the list, others not so much.

But it is, you know, it is a courtesy for not only the group but it also is helpful from a chair's perspective and from a staff management perspective because it helps to understand if especially for some of the more heated types of issues that are being discussed in terms of whether quorum can be achieved prior to call and those kinds of aspects.

So there is a feature that we haven't used for this particular calendaring entry which is the ability to RSVP for a particular meeting.

For the next scheduled meeting we will enable that. And we will include it in the messaging. But ideally it would be good for members of this group to try to attempt to RSVP for the call and as well as there's a Decline feature or Unable to Attend feature on that tool itself as well.

Because it is very important that we not only track attendance but that we do track apologies as well because that is a course of function of attendance.

So with that the only other thing that I'll share before I kind of open it up for any general questions over the weekend I also have attached three documents that the group is working on right now.

The first is kind of our draft charter template that we'll talk about here in a few minutes.

There was a set of draft recommendations that when this group restarted I believe at the beginning of February or end of January -- I can remember when it was -- that we - well I guess it's post-February now or post Singapore when we reconvened that we basically just had a starter draft document that contained some higher level recommendations to try to help guide our work.

So we did load the document in there. And the third one is kind of an older template if you'll recall from we were attempting to perform kind of a use case analysis or exercise for the higher TPD component.

We won't be pursuing that use case. However, that document can act as a starter for our eventual deliverables within our final report should a future working group need to request metrics either from ICANN or from third parties or contracted parties, et cetera.

And the general process would be that the form be filled out by the leadership of that particular group. It's coordinated with staff and the GNSO counsel. And more or less we'll try to attempt to follow that flowchart that we created a while back which we'll need to work on as well.

So as I mentioned today we're going to focus just on the working group charter template and would be interested in hearing member's feedback or input into that document.

And where possible I would ask members to if they do have any suggested edits to the draft to make those on your own machine and then make sure you upload it into the Kavi toolset.

Because the second part of this particular pilot is again, you know, test out the document management document collaboration components of this toolset. And what's of interest is the versioning control.

So what was kind of cool that I can see from what I've posted now that at least six members of the group have viewed or downloaded these three documents seven for the draft recommendations and the working group charter template. So that's encouraging in terms of being able to track activity there.

But what you'll will begin to see which was a part of the pilot from last week is that Kavi does seem to have a pretty good handle on version control.

So, you know, when person X decides to upload the next version of the draft charter template you'll begin to start to see revision numbers in this column over here which will be intriguing to see.

So, you know, in general how you would go around uploading a document is typically from your dashboard home page. And there's a section here for documents that gives you a quick add or add a document.

I typically use the add documents instead of the quick add because I think it's important to be able to start to assign not only the proper title to that particular document as well as including any descriptions but then ensuring which folder it belongs to.

And a predominant amount of our drafts will be worked - will be assigned as a working drafts folder.

And then there are some other features about the particular document. And then, you know, the state of the document of course will always be maintained as a draft as well.

And then there's some other email notification features that you can play around with.

So we're looking forward to being able to play in the sandbox so to speak in that regard.

So with that I will stop talking and Jonathan I see your hand is raised.

Jonathan Zuck: Yes, just a couple of Kavi questions. The first is about document revisions.

Is this something where it can handle multiple people making revisions to a document and uploading them or is it more of we're going to upload them, you know, one at a time sort of official drafts and it will keep track of versioning between them?

So, you know, I - because you seem to be sending make changes that you'd like to see and then update them. But I don't know kind of the answer whether it's multiuser in that way?

And then I guess my second question about calendaring and RCPs, et cetera does the calendaring feature of this result in, you know, standard invites out to Outlook and Google calendar and things that people will be able to use except in decline functionality to do their RSVPs or it will be a separate process?

Berry Cobb: Thank you Jonathan. I'll - in a second I'll turn the first question over to Ryan. I can answer the second question.

From a calendaring and scheduling perspective it's a double feature. And Ryan and/or (Steve) can correct me if I'm wrong.

For this particular meeting we ran in parallel because we want to make sure that we fully communicated the next meeting out to the list per the status quo

process as well as we also created an entry within Kavi that was sent from Kavi.

In both cases an ICS file is attached to that invite. And the end-user can use that ICS attachment for whichever client of their choice that they're using.

So that will allow the calendar entry of course then to show up on your own personal calendar. And like I said what we didn't enable this particular time is the ability to RSVP.

And this is where I may need Ryan's help. But my understanding to RSVP for a particular calendar entry that capability is not loaded into the email/ICS attachment that you would see in your Inbox.

The RSVP occurs through the Kavi tool when it is enabled. And then from there you can perform whether you plan to attend or whether you will send your apologies. So...

Man: Because IFC files do I mean when you open them you do get the option to accept tentative or decline. So it's just a question of whether they communicate back to the system or not but I guess that question's for Ryan.

Ryan Casey: Well and that's something that we'll definitely want to work the kinks out or try to further understand exactly what's happening which is the purpose of this pilot.

But let me actually turn it over to (Steve). And I think he can probably shed more light on the CNS part and then he'll also answer your first question on document management.

(Steve): Sure Ryan. If you want to quickly talk to the RSVP and how it functioned at least in this meeting that would be good.

And then if we - if there's like an issue we can just log it off-line and then see if we can work through it over the next week and then I'll get to the document management right after.

Ryan Casey: Sure absolutely. This is Ryan Casey with Kavi. So the way that the RSVP works for the calendar event and workspace is if it is enabled for the event there will be a link in the email body itself that will say RSVP.

And so you can click that link. And that will take you to a page and workspace where you can very quickly say that yes you will be attending or say no you won't be attending.

So you can do that that way. And when you accept or decline the event in Outlook that will add it to your calendar or not add it to your calendar. But that's not sent directly back to workspace.

You would use the RSVP link in the email body instead.

Man: Is that a loaded link or would we need to login when we do that?

Ryan Casey: I - it will usually have you login. So when you click the link it will take you directly to the page in Workspace where you would RSVP for the event.

If you haven't login in a little while then it will ask you to login first and then take you directly to the page.

Man: Thanks.

(Steve): So related to the document versioning it's probably something we'll have to explore a little deeper internally, work out some of the scenarios.

It's going to have to be process driven. So the company isn't going to merge all of these documents into a single document on a, you know, version by version basis.

So Berry and to the rest of the working group if the intent is for us to now start thinking about almost the document collaboration features that are necessary to facilitate the working group we're going to have to think about it a little more deep level and think about it from the process perspective.

There's things that document management can do in Kavi to support us along the way. But one of them is not, you know, the merging of all these versions into the next, you know, product.

So it's something we'll have to explore a little bit off-line. And that said there's another tool that we're working with.

We're doing a similar pilot with SSAC around just the document collaboration process. So the process of authoring a first version of a document, having people come into the document and provide their feedback potentially to call out where they have disputes among other comments and/or changes that are made to the document proposed changes and then the ability to merge all of that and have transparency through that process.

So there is another tool that we're looking at that will facilitate that part of the collaboration. And then we'll, you know, and then the thought process is something like Kavi could integrate with that product so that, you know, each major version of your document can be stored within the document management tool of Kavi. And you can even, you know, track conversations around those finished products.

So it's not going to get us all the way there. If what you're starting to look for is people to upload their versions of the document they could easily start stepping on each other's toes.

So what I would recommend is for us to look at that process a little bit this week Berry and figure out an approach that works for us so that we don't lose each other's work.

Berry Cobb: All right thank you (Steve). And again to that point, you know, I the main thing that I picked up on is the process components.

And, you know, in terms of how we work today, you know, essentially staff will send out a version of a Word document and seek or solicit feedback from the group. And typically it's kind of a mixed bag right now.

Sometimes we're lucky from a manager of the document perspective that person A will make some edits, person B will make edits on top of person A's all of which are sent to the group.

But staff can see through the email list that the update by person B is the most recent and use that as a master document to work and ready for the next meeting.

Where it breaks down is when person A and person B submit edits to the original document but independent of each other at which point staff will then merge both of those into the latest version.

So (Steve)'s absolutely right. There - this isn't a Google forms kind of component where everybody collaborates on a single document in a single place.

But what I would like for the group to and of course we can talk about this more and I'm sure there will be some growing pains with it.

But instead of just sending your version of edits to a particular document to the list I'd ask that you try to upload the document into Kavi so that we can at least start to track the revision state of those particular documents.

And what will change in that process is again staff will maintain or track what is the latest and greatest document and ensure that all changes are in that master document so that it can be ready for the next cycle of review when we get there.

(Steve): So it might be helpful for us Berry this week to hash out some guidelines on how you want that process to work so that people know how to execute on it.

So maybe we could take that as an action and that we'll post that into the Kavi workspace how to go through this process.

Berry Cobb: All right, sounds good. Yes thank you.

Great. The only other question I had for those that are on the call today do you have any or at least from the calendaring and scheduling perspective of this previous week did you experience any issues other than more or less getting barraged by duplicate entries where you I think if you're on the call then you somehow got the calendar entry.

Is there any kind of initial feedback about that experience? And do keep in mind that again when we schedule the next call it will be completely through Kavi that the calendar invite is sent out.

Okay silence is good for now.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Hang on, hang on. I - you don't away with it that quickly. I was - Cheryl here. I've got too many windows open to get back and put my hand in time. I hope that's all right Jonathan.

There you are. I've put my hand up now to make it all neat.

One of the great advantages of the way that our extremely helpful staff organized my calendar with the invites that come out is that when I open up the reminder which rules my life the Adobe Connect room or collaborative space is in the actual in (inverter coms) location of the meeting.

And that means it's a live link. I click it and I'm in the Adobe Connect room.

Nathalie eventually realized that in my absence the Adobe Connect rooms, the first few minutes this morning I was running around trying to find what bloody AC room I was supposed to be in instead of just clicking the box on autopilot.

Is that something for example that we can fix when it's coming out via the invitation system which yes I did receive and actually I did think I actually it might have been my calendar that's RSVP'd. But when I look in those entries in my calendar they both say yes I'm attending.

So may be that the yes, Google calendar somehow, you know, just managed to RSVP me anyway in a more manual sense.

But can we do things like make sure that the links to any Adobe Connect rooms are collaborative spaces are up front and very much live in a - in the invitation, not in the body of the text? Because particularly if you're using mobile devices that's an absolute pain?

Berry Cobb: Thank you Cheryl. Yes that is one of the, I think the growing pains that we're going to need to work through.

You know, there are several bits of information that are provided in the calendar invites. One is the dial-in instructions themselves. Then we also have the Adobe Connect link and as well as the ICS attachment.

And there are a couple of formatting issues in terms of how that information is populated into the Kavi calendar component.

But we're working on a template that will make - that should make all of that legible. And we will ensure that that information is in there. And then we'll also be testing the ICS file that gets generated from that calendar entry to make sure that that same information is populated in.

So if that was a little rougher on the edges this first time around it probably will likely be a little bit rough, maybe hopefully not as rough as the second time around. But by the third time I think we'll have it in shape.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. Thanks.

Berry Cobb: Thanks Cheryl. (John Pierre)?

(John Pierre): Yes hello?

Berry Cobb: Yes. We can hear you.

(John Pierre): Are you hearing me? Hello?

Berry Cobb: Yes. We can hear you.

Man: Yes I hear you.

(John Pierre): I want to make - yes okay. I just want - okay, thank you.

I just wanted to know more about some many item like (bar loads) comment and sitting because when I look for setting this look like that administration (unintelligible) or items sitting.

I don't know if we have to maintain it or maybe if it's a reserved tool and we said or maybe remove it the, items setting. And then I want to know more about how to use (bar loads) and comments. Can I have more information about these items? Thank you.

Berry Cobb: This is Berry. I'm not sure that I caught every bit. It sounded a little bit like you were breaking up. But if I understood in regards to the comments that you were mentioning are you referring to the Kavi tool itself?

I see (John Pierre) is typing.

(John Pierre): Maybe yes I'm trying to type my- maybe the network is not really very good. I'm trying to type my question.

I made a comment on some item on like (bar load)'s comment and settings.

And I the comment I'm making is that sitting, the sitting is it for everyone or it's only for the (unintelligible) of the platform?

Berry Cobb: Okay. Now I think I understand what - okay. So in regards to the settings what you're allowed to set is based on the role that's been assigned to you.

So if your rights to adjust settings of the workspace isn't as elevated as it is for (Steve) since he super administrator. But you can adjust settings that are relevant to your user profile if I did capture that correctly.

In references to comments and ballots, you know, I don't believe we're going to be using the ballot feature all that much although I'm not going to say that we won't use it.

But depending on how the ballot is set up it's a simple yes no. There is the capability by the author of the ballot to include a comment field should you want to provide rational why you chose yes or rational why you chose no.

And there is also a comment feature for documents that are posted into Kavi as well. So for example the draft of the charter that I posted in their there is that comment capability against that particular uploaded document.

(Steve): And Berry maybe I can hop in there for a second. So just so you know if you click on settings when you're in the group you're not going to break anything. It's only going to show you how this group is set up.

And if you happen to have some elevated privileges it might give you some abilities to edit it. But you shouldn't be concerned about clicking on it. You're welcome to click on it and see how this group is composed.

And then the only other comment is on how the comments section works. We purposely didn't get into it too much in the demo.

It's something that you're welcome to also explore. But just to like give everyone a heads up it doesn't work exactly the same as just writing to the mailing list.

If you write to the mailing list everyone can see the responses back and forth and you can have a back and forth dialogue.

The way the comments work is that you actually have to log into Kavi to have that thread. But there is some benefit to actually using the comments in place of the mailing list.

So I would encourage you guys to at least explore it enough to see how it functions. And the intent behind the comments is really to start a threaded conversation, usually issues and issue resolution on documents.

So if you go to comments you can actually say I have a comment about a particular document within a particular version.

And it gives us this ability to see for each version of the document what comments were made and what conversations took place and what were the solutions that ultimately came out of those conversations?

So there's a little bit of power there and just happens to be the case that it's not tied into the email thread so it's not like you could just respond to someone's message without logging into Kavi.

So take a look at it and see, you know, what the pros and cons are to that and that way we can start gathering some insights from you guys on it.

Berry Cobb: All right thank you (Steve). As you saw just as I...

(John Pierre): Okay thank you.

Berry Cobb: Thank you (John Pierre). So in the - while (Steve) was mentioning if you did see it in the screen share I tried to create a comment against the first one. And as Steve said, you know, try to go in and break this.

You know, we want to try to explore as much as possible and really understand what the full feature set is and what works and what my might not or won't work for us as we explore through this pilot.

All right any other comments before we move on to the next agenda item?

I, you know, I think probably for every meeting that we have leading up to Buenos Aires we'll devote a little bit of time to discuss the tool how we're using it any feedback that you have for it.

Around mid-May or so we will have Steve come back and ask for more formal kind of input into, you know, your user experience as a tool and any

suggestions that can help make this better as we move along through the pilot.

(Steve): Yes Berry this is (Steve). Just one more comment on that.

Probably for the next call I'll try to kick it off with a couple different types of scenarios that we want to start thinking about formally so that through the call, you know, the following call you guys have some time to think about some of those things that I'm going to ask about.

And then it will give you time to become a little more familiar with it before we start asking for feedback on what your thoughts are.

So I'll try to spend some time and keys those up for the next call.

Berry Cobb: All right great. Thank you (Steve).

So Jonathan if you don't mind I'll go and move us into the third agenda item.

Jonathan Zuck: Perfect.

Berry Cobb: All right thank you. So I sent this out to the list as well over the weekend. There's not a whole lot of major change from what we discussed on the previous call.

But one of the deliverables that we're working towards as I mentioned in some of the draft recommendations that we reviewed several calls back one of those is to make possible recommendations or suggestions about how the working group charter template can be updated to, you know, more or less change the culture of how these are constructed and what content is being loaded into this particular template that go to the issues that this working group is trying to address which is, you know, to - how to invoke the acquisition of what kind of metrics that may be useful for not only issue

definition and understanding but more so or as well as on the backend of understanding what metrics and types of measurements that can help measure the success of any policy recommendations that are implemented.

So what I did send out to the list and I'm thinking this so everybody has full control within Adobe Connect but this was also sent so you should be able to look at it on your own machine if it's not too readable here.

You know, the first section on Page 1 is standard fare and structure for, you know, what the title of the working group is, the chair and the types of roles, mailing list.

Most of this information is filled out or completed after the GNSO council has approved the charter for the working group and then the working group in of itself is initiated.

Then we move into the second page which gives to the core content of what the mission purpose and deliverables are of this future working group.

What I did here is I took an older I believe this was the IGO, INGO curative rights template which is one of the more recent ones that have been used and approved by the council and stripped out all the content.

But essentially, you know, it's pretty standard structure from one charter to the next. There's usually a background section that identifies why these issues are being addressed.

Then it gets into the mission and scope of what the working group is supposed to accomplish, the types of issues that should be discussed which are typically connected to the issues identified in the initial - I'm sorry in the final issue report as well as any other topics that may be in reference or aligned to the issues being discussed.

There is typically a standard statement in there about how the group should invite participation and input from the other SOs and ACs.

If you'll recall a few calls back there was some earlier work done in regards to the outreach or the early outreach by working groups to SOs and ACs.

And there's typically a form that's distributed that contain typically are a lot of what you find in the charter like, you know, here's the issues that the working groups that being addressed. Here are some high level questions that the working group is considering and they're seeking that early input from the SOs and ACs.

And a couple of possible recommendations that the group might consider is one that any early outreach like that should include qualitative as well as quantitative components to that outreach where possible.

Not every issue or topic being discussed perhaps suits a quantitative component but at least where possible to have some kind of polling mechanism to help determine the trend of towards what issue is most important or what issue is the most relevant to be discussed.

And then the secondary component of that was to increase the outreach that it shouldn't just only be necessarily be SOs and ACs of ICANN but where possible to consider broader outreach that extends beyond the ICANN community where possible and where it is meaningful certainly that has a separate set of challenges and how that gets communicated, et cetera.

But the point that I'm trying to make here in terms of diving into that kind of detail is that there is a true connection from the issue report stage all the way to the final report that are submitted to the GNSO council.

So from issue identification, issue discussion, you know, possible recommendations that may address the issues, the public comment

components and then the initial report, final report leading up to delivery to the council.

And so hopefully some of the output from this particular working group will seize on that continuity across the process and will hopefully interject where metrics can be meaningful at each stage along that process to make it for a much more informed deliberations.

All right so what is new to this particular template is staff's first iteration of a new section that would be added.

Typically what you would normally see is after the scope or mission and scope are defined and the issues are defined there's typically and objectives and goals section and then a deliverables and timeframe section.

Again these are typically kept in template form. As you can see I forgot to remove IGO, INGO in the objectives and goals section.

But there's really not a substantial departure in these two sections from one PDP or working group to the next.

But what you see highlighted here in red is some suggested starter for how we might try to enhance this for the collection of metrics.

So I added a section in here called key metric considerations. And again the idea here is to try to create some sort of fence or guideposts that this working group or the drafting team when they're the considering what the working group will do is, you know, what kind of metrics that may be useful for them as they deliberate through the issues.

And I do want to make one point that's kind of very necessary at this stage. Drafting teams are not responsible for deliberating the issues per se although

it does happen from time to time for the cc to discuss, you know, some of the more emotional topics.

Sometimes it is needed to flush out what the scope, particular scope may be. But the idea here is to not be overly prescriptive in that you're actually doing that future working groups work but more trying to define what these guideposts are that will help form their work definition.

So what I included here again is just a very starter general of what the group or the drafting team should be concerned with. And what was listed here is to define goals for that working group and help define a set of metrics that will help measure those goals.

So this should flow out of the issues or the topics that should be discussed. And when they had that thoroughly define they shouldn't start to establish what some of the goals to achieve the deliberations of those issues should be.

And again the attempt here is to try to formulate a set of questions that the drafting team that is determining the content in the scope of this charter of what are some high level questions that they would ask themselves that would pertain to them as they're discussing what the issue or the scope of the issue should be.

And again I'm not trying to be prescriptive that from a template standpoint we shouldn't say you need to go ask contractual compliance to get the metrics on transfers.

That shouldn't be, you know, that question won't be in a (templified) form to address every future charter but we need to find a set of generic questions that would make them think oh it would be good if the working group engaged ICANN contractual compliance to obtain a set of metrics around issues that they see with transfers.

So that's kind of trying - I hope that's understandable in what we're trying to achieve here. And so I look forward to the group's input on that. And then I'll close with just the deliverable and timeframe section.

And I believe pretty much everybody will agree that this part does need to be included. So without a doubt the deliverable of every working group is some sort of a report at the end.

And depending on the issue that's being explored, the complexity, et cetera, dictates the outreach to the community either through early outreach or other mechanisms or multiple public comments. It all varies from one group to another.

But starting in or around (Pedner) which is now EDDP and certainly what we found in IRDPT is kind of closing recommendations for the group that force the working group to define some sort of method and/or metrics that will help determine the success of any policy outcome should those recommendations be approved by the council and the board and then implemented by staff.

It really coincides with the continuous improvement kind of methodology by, you know, we've measured the issue. This is the set of results. We've made a change and here's the new set of results. Was that good or bad?

And that's what the intent of this last section highlighted in red here that we should try to expand upon and make that better.

So I'll be quiet now. Jonathan has his hand raised so over to you sir.

Jonathan Zuck: Thanks Berry. That was a great summary. And I'm - I want to open the floor for conversation.

But I guess one thing that jumps out at me for deliverables and time frames is it might be divided into three parts.

One is the identification of data that might be used to measure the success of the recommendations, potentially some targets for that data so the sort of aspirational goals and a recommended time frame in which to measure it because I think that will vary from workgroup to workgroup based on what they imagine the implementation time would be and how long it would take for that recommendations to have an effect.

So but it seems like in each case you'd want those three things. Here's the data that ought to be measured. Here's what we would like it to say. And this is when we think that it ought to be measured to look at whether or not the recommendations had the desired effect. Does that make sense to folks?

This isn't deliverables and timeframe section. Berry go ahead.

Berry Cobb: Thank you Jonathan. So I absolutely agree with the structure I'm just curious whether this should be saved for part of the template for the final report?

Again at this point of the chartering exercise I'm not so sure that we want to be that prescriptive for - and I'm not saying this is right or wrong. It's totally up to the group.

But to suggest the timeframe that should any recommendations be proved by the group that one year post X which would typically be after implementation that we would choose to measure it I think that these types of questions should probably be answered and thought through thoroughly by the working group submitting the recommendations.

Jonathan Zuck: I agree. I guess I thought that what the charter essentially amounted to was instructions for the workgroup.

So in other words the deliverables and time frames are not deliverables of the chartering group but are in fact deliverables of the working group.

So what that - those instructions would include identify where possible data that could be used for an objective measure of success include a aspirational goals for that data and a potential timeframe.

In other words those are the chartering team was as part of their charter include the instructions to come up with those three deliverables. Am I putting that in the wrong place?

Berry Cobb: No.

Jonathan Zuck: Does that make sense?

Berry Cobb: You're talking about the template itself where the - this would be loaded into the charter but it wouldn't be defined until the working group - and this forces the working group to define those three components.

Jonathan Zuck: Exactly.

Berry Cobb: Is that what I understand?

Jonathan Zuck: Yes.

Berry Cobb: Yes.

Jonathan Zuck: That's what I'm saying.

Berry Cobb: So I'll be sure to add that into the next version.

Jonathan Zuck: I mean because they could very well be that really identifying the - I mean the other issue is one of scope which in theory is going to be a shared job

between the staff and the issue report and ultimately the working group to determine whether or not the problem deserves recommendation.

That's the other question that sort of goes up in the defining goals for the group. I mean one of it is to as part of your set of questions which are threshold questions for the severity I mean part of the reason you're using the data is to figure out whether or not there's actually a problem to be solved right?

The issue report will address that to some extent but the working group I think will have final say on that.

((Crosstalk))

Berry Cobb: Agreed. Yes, no I definitely agree with that as well which I think what we'll be tackling after we complete one or two rounds on the charter is then we'll move over to the issue report kind of conduct the same exercise.

And again I'm trying to - or my - the desire is to maintain the continuity of the metrics request with the continuity of the issue being defined and deliberated and resolved along the process.

Jonathan Zuck: Right. But correct me if I'm wrong. Ultimately it's the workgroup itself that decides whether or not the issue merits recommendations right?

Berry Cobb: Absolutely.

Jonathan Zuck: So the chartering group's instructions to the workgroup should include using data to make that assessment?

Berry Cobb: Absolutely. Okay.

Jonathan Zuck: I don't want to hog - and everybody's on call burnout but do other people have ideas that this is inspiring because we're talking about it?

Berry Cobb: Well and, you know, I think to that point which again when we go to tackle this exercise at the issue report level is, you know, when the issue report is submitted to the council, you know, it should be able to answer some of that question as, you know, should this even be a working group to begin with?

You know, is there enough substantiated data that warrants the creation of a working group to address these issues? If not then let's not create a working group. But if there is...

Jonathan Zuck: Right.

Berry Cobb: ...then yes, let's move into the chartering exercise.

Once the charter has been defined and the working group formed then they pretty much re-ask the question based on this additional data that we found.

This does or doesn't warrant recommendations. If it does warrant recommendations then, you know, we should identify what data is needed to measure the success the targets and aspirational goals to determine if that success is accurate and then a timeframe which that success should be measured.

Jonathan Zuck: Right.

Berry Cobb: Right, so I'll make those updates to this particular document and I'll send that back around. I'll make sure that this occurs in the next day or so, so the group has plenty of time to submit any of their other suggestions to this.

And depending on any activity in the list we will probably review through this once more on the next call.

And I'll also try to put into the holding pattern or least on deck a couple of homework assignments as it relates to the issue report as we go through this exercise as well.

Jonathan Zuck: And Berry is it your hope that folks will make comments on this document using the comment functionality associated with the document rather than sending emails around to the listserv? Is that the idea?

Berry Cobb: This is Berry. My preference would be to make edits to the document itself whether it be through a pink comment form box over on the right or direct edits the document itself.

That way we can keep track in one document as to who's saying what and why. But I won't - I won't I shouldn't say prevent but I will discourage people from making comments in Kavi or on the list as well. In fact as much activity as is desperately wanted.

Jonathan Zuck: All right. Cheryl, go ahead.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Hi. Thanks. It's not actually related to this particular template but rather back to a ability to deal with this template or anything else from a Kavi perspective.

So do you want to come back to me at the very end? I know it's close to the very end, three minutes to but...

Jonathan Zuck: It is. So go ahead.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. All right there's the good news and the bad news. If I am locked to my desk - and sorry let me get my mic in a better (mode).

If I'm locked to my desk and looking at a Windows-based machine which is one of the screens I have open all is well in the world and there is no problem.

If I'm using any of the tablets or mobile devices that I operate on -- and I'm not the only one in the world who does this -- I am unable to either download or view other than in raw text or HTML which is not all that exciting -- well it is bit on a different level -- this document or anything else.

So from a Kavi point of view unless we can upload things as PDFs which of course is going to meet its somewhat more static and I think we would like to be seen were going to have some ability to view comments and ability to other than input to a raw text file for editing issues for anyone who's certainly using any of the open source software I've been testing it on this morning.

So I just wanted to let Berry know I've taken a bunch of screenshots that I'm going to just bore him with by emailing it at him so he can get back to the Kavi guys and see if that's just an issue.

And if it is one then we have to tell people if you use open source software it ain't going to work.

Jonathan Zuck: All right.

Berry Cobb: Okay thank you Cheryl. Yes please do send that to me and I will pass it along to the...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It may be that we need to just say things as other than Doc x. It could be something to do with Doc X. You might need much clever little techy brains to work on that.

But it seems to me that if we're - I'm relatively confident that if you upload a PDF and could you upload a PDF so I can test it please Berry it might be all right.

But right now I, other than by using a Microsoft-based machine cannot get to any usable documents by the Kavi tool. Apple might be different obviously but I'm going to be testing things with open source as you might imagine.

Jonathan Zuck: I mean there are obviously open-source tools that can read Doc X formats.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well I'm using OpenOffice so I figured it should work.

Jonathan Zuck: And it's not working to open them.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That's exactly what I'm saying. And...

Jonathan Zuck: That's strange.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It has not been working. This document issue has not been working with documents downloaded from the wiki since Singapore.

So this is not limited to the platform of the tool. It's got something to do with Doc Xes I believe but IT is supposed to be looking at that for me.

They might need to be looking at it for us with Kavi as well because I thought it might have been just something to do with the wiki but it looks like it's not. That's why I tested this morning.

Jonathan Zuck: With the documents? Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Berry Cobb: Cheryl you're spoiling my...

((Crosstalk))

Berry Cobb: ...attempts at world domination with Microsoft products.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And I will be happy to continue to do that. Okay Berry you'll know what this bunch of images are.

And sorry to just raise that at the end but I didn't want to go on to much further because once again well, for example I would be able to - I'd have to be, you know, locked to my desk to edit on or uploaded a meaningful document from this charter template we're looking at right now.

Okay. Thank you.

Man: And can I remind you to use (unintelligible) office.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I have one screen opened on that one. And I have another screen opened on Open Office. Trust me this is not a matter of just the software choice.

Berry Cobb: All right...

((Crosstalk))

Berry Cobb: Thank you. We are two minutes over so just remind people that we'll have a call. Our next call will be on the 28th at the same time 20 UTC. And expect calendar invites out through Kavi this time.

And if you don't see anything be sure to send me a note on the list or directly and we'll take care of any issues you see.

Jonathan Zuck: Thanks guys.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Bye.

Man: Thanks everyone.

Berry Cobb: Operator you can stop the recording now.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you (Marcel). Thank you for your help. You can now stop the recordings. Bye-bye.

Coordinator: You're welcome ma'am. Thank you.

Man: Okay thank you. Bye.

END