

ICANN Transcription
Data & Metrics for Policy Making Working Group
Tuesday 26 May 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 26 May 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-26may15-en.mp3>

On page:

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

Attendees:

Sara Bockey - RrSG
Cheryl Langdon-Orr - At-Large
Jonathan Zuck - IPC
Pam Little - RySG
Benjamin Akinmoyeje- NCUC
Graeme Bunton - RrSG

Apologies:

Tony Onorato - Individual
Janvier Ngnoulaye - Afrinic

ICANN staff:

Steve Chan
Berry Cobb
Nathalie Peregrine
Ozan Sahin

Coordinator: Excuse me, recording has started.

Ozan Sahin: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is a Data & Metrics for Policy Making Working Group call held on Tuesday, 26 of May

2015. On the call today we have Jonathan Zuck, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Graeme Bunton, Sara Bockey, Pam Little.

We have received apologies from Janvier Ngnoulaye and Tony Onorato. And we have Steve Chan, Berry Cobb, Nathalie Peregrine, and myself, Ozan Sahin, as ICANN staff.

I would like to remind you all to please state your names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you and over to you, Jonathan. Jonathan?

Man: Jonathan, you may be on mute.

Jonathan Zuck: ...about - I'm sorry, go ahead.

Berry Cobb: There we go. So Jonathan, would you like...

Jonathan Zuck: (Unintelligible)...

Berry Cobb: ...me to go ahead and kick things off? Or did you want to have any...

Jonathan Zuck: Yes, on the copy. Yes, go ahead.

Berry Cobb: All right.

Jonathan Zuck: I don't. Thank you. Go ahead, Berry.

Berry Cobb: All right. So just quickly, you know, our agenda today is pretty much almost identical to last week's. So we'll talk about the KAVI just for a second, review through our work plan. And then we'll kind of convert over into discussing the first draft of principles that was distributed out to the list.

And then lastly we'll take a quick highlight review of the draft initial report. And then we'll conclude. And our next meeting I think will be on the 9 of June.

So real quick with KAVI. The first thing I'd like to announce is that we met with the pilot team late last week and made the decision that for the purposes of the pilot toward this particular working group we'll at least carry it forward up until the delivery of the draft initial report available for public comment.

At that time we'll make a decision whether the pilot needs to continue further or not. And in parallel I believe At-Large or some smaller group within At-Large is also going to be doing a pilot with the KAVI tool as well.

So we'll actually have a secondary set of eyes in terms of the use of the tool.

The second thing I'd like to mention is while we're still having some email routing issues it seems as though -- or when I sent a few emails out over the weekend I've been using both addresses.

And for those that had responded back, we were getting duplicates. Or at least I was getting duplicates which isn't necessarily a bad thing. We know that both of those channels are routing.

And the most important aspect is that the email that is being posted to the DMPM archive -- our production aspect or the mailman archive that's out there on the Webs for openness and transparency purposes -- those messages are being posted there.

So we'll still have to maybe suffer through duplications for a little bit until we can nail down more of the mail routing. But I think what's - what we have discovered though is for some reason ICANN staff with an icann.org email address are not getting anything.

So that's one of the things that we need to still nail down -- especially since we're going to continue the pilot into July. So if you have anything bad to say about staff email now before it - before we get it fixed.

That's pretty - yes, that's pretty much all that I had in regards to KAVI aspect. If there's no other questions then I'll go ahead and move on into the next agenda item.

So basically the work plan that we reviewed last week is still pretty much the same. Obviously we're meeting today on the 26th. In two days we're going to send out the first draft of the initial report to - for the group to start reviewing.

We will meet again on the 9 of June -- which will basically be prominently - or really our work from that point forward will be looking to refine the initial report and prepare it for public comment sometime in July.

Between now and then we'll be preparing presentation materials for the Saturday session to update the GNSO and as well as prepare for our face-to-face meeting on Thursday -- which is at 0700 hours.

After which when we're - when the group is ready with the - to deliver the public comment that'll be for 40 days. And the idea with the work plan is that we're targeting the middle of September to complete our final reports so we can submit it to the GNSO Council and move it on from there.

In light of that, that really also takes care of the fourth agenda item which is just to discuss the Buenos Aires meeting. Steve Sheng and I will try to have some draft materials in preparation for Buenos Aires in time for our 9 June meeting.

We won't spend a whole lot of time reviewing them because we'll still have almost - at least a good week and a half to finalize those over the list. But that way we can get it in front of you and start to get it socialized and ready for delivery time for Buenos Aires.

So with that let's move on into the agenda. From our call last week we had a discussion about some of the principles that kind of guides the worker at a higher level that can kind of more or less help begin to change the culture in how data and metrics are used for policy development.

What I sent out to the list was kind of a boiled up version of two documents that the group had created in the past. The first was a kind of a more detailed set of principles that was mostly targeted around if a data or metrics request was submitted to contract parties and what some of those principles are around that type of request.

And then secondarily we had a use case exercise that we didn't follow through with. But the executive summary laid out very eloquently about what we were trying to accomplish.

So I kind of merged those two together to come up with this five-bulleted list that we have before us. And it sounded like that there was support that somehow this ought to be presented in our initial report.

Right now we have a placeholder in the initial report that's kind of targeting this as a recommendation. But having sent this out and thought about it for a while, this is not something that we typically recommend per say for the council specifically to take any action on.

Certainly there are no principles in reference to the policy process as it's documented in the working group guidelines and in the bylaws.

So I think the group needs to think about how we want to A, you know, improve - enhance this list because I do believe it is worthy of listing into the initial report.

But we then decide how kind of these principles are, you know, loosely adopted or socialized across the community as opposed to actually creating a

recommendation for the council to face for some - for them to somehow figure out how this is going to be implemented.

If there were hypothetically a principle section in the working group guidelines document, you know, perhaps that could be a recommendation. But they aren't.

So I think in our deliberations here we just need to figure out what the best way is to incorporate this into our overall work. Is it really more principles that just guide the DMPM and the submission of its recommendations?

Or are they greater principles that need to be absorbed by the community? And if so, what is a mechanism by which we can do that? So I won't read through these in detail. But I'll just open it up if anybody has any comments about these or suggestions.

Jonathan Zuck: Yes. Thanks, Berry. It's Jonathan Zuck for the transcript. I guess that was my only - I like the principles a lot. And my reaction was similar to yours which is, you know, how do they fit into the deliverables?

And so just - I just wanted you to go back to what you said. There isn't a place where we could propose them being added to working group guidelines or something like that?

To - I mean it would mean changing the text of this a little bit and the voice that it was in. But there isn't a possibility of recommending a change to the group guidelines themselves?

Berry Cobb: This is Berry. I - you know, there's - the working group guidelines are very prescriptive. The chair will do this. Vice chairs do this. If there's - a charter will be built. You know, calls will be scheduled on a weekly basis.

Code of conduct guidelines - there is no section that is kind of principles-based. I guess in some way this is more than likely out of the scope for this working group.

But that wouldn't necessarily prevent us from making a recommendation to a larger topic that, you know, maybe PDP guidelines or working group guidelines do contain some sort of principles section at a higher level that, you know, working groups strive to achieve consensus-based policy outcomes within a certain timeframe.

You know, I'm really grasping at air here for some ideas. But as it stands right now there is not necessarily a principles section that govern that process document together. And obviously ours...

Jonathan Zuck: Right. It's...

Berry Cobb: ...right here are very targeted as it relates to data and metrics.

Jonathan Zuck: Pam, I see your hand is up. So I don't want to monopolize the time. But I guess I want to throw out the possibility that we poll three of these or something like that and instead of praising them as principles -- which runs the, you know, the risk of being a little bit condescending potentially, I don't know -- is actually we phrase them as expectations so that they are worded something very similarly to there will be - this is the role of the chair.

The working group shall -- whenever possible -- incorporate data into its analysis. It shall whenever feasible, you know, implement a, you know, designated timeframe after which the efficacy of a proposed solution should be tested.

You know, something like that that's a set of expectations for a working group as opposed to being something as vaguely worded as a - it feels like with a

language change we could create something that does belong in the working group guidelines.

Pam, go ahead.

Pam Little: Thank you. Hi Jonathan and Berry. I just want to sort of provide a bit of further explanation as to why I was a bit ambivalent about whether we call it "principles" to be integrated into the policy development process.

I don't have any objection to the bullets that's been drafted here. And Jonathan, you say you like them a lot. I'm neutral. And to me they almost given, you know, whether we state them or not.

For example, the bullet point second one is backed by policy development. That in fact is a AOC commitment. You know, ICANN is committed to fact-based policy development and so should we -- those who participate in the PDP.

So to me these are given. And - but I was just trying to sort of point out that that specific deliverable under the mission so trying to sort of bring aspect to the more focused topic if you like rather than a very broad these high level principles of PDP rather than principle of - principles that would enhance metric and data available for informing PDP.

So to me they're different. And one is larger in scope. So that's my thinking. And as I said earlier, I have no objection to what's stated here. But I'm just not sure whether that is what we are supposed to deliver. Thank you.

Jonathan Zuck: Thanks, Pam. Berry, go ahead.

Berry Cobb: Thank you, Jonathan. I mean I guess I agree with what Pam was saying because some of this does borderline kind of outside of our scope of what we were originally tasked to do.

You know, a possible way forward - or I guess, you know, the way these particular bullets are worded right now is really more about what this group is trying to accomplish.

Perhaps what a recommendation can be is that, you know, there is an upcoming GNSO review that will take a more scrutinized look at the policy process and the, you know, the working group guidelines and those kinds of things.

And while it's not directly in our scope, we can make a kind of a separate recommendation that the council should consider that principles at a higher level are - should be created or formed to help guide the policy process.

And if such an exercise were to do that, that, you know, some of these kind of more metrics-based or a little bit lower-tiered principles could be applied because Pam's definitely right, you know.

That second bullet is surely a part of the affirmation of commitment. And so we probably ought to make sure that we're not overstepping something else in that regard.

But I would just like to close with again it's - if the group chooses to accept these we've got to figure out a way that it's something tangible that we can implement.

And we'll talk a little bit more on this when we review through the first initial report. But, you know, there's got to be something kind of concrete that either instructs staff to do something, instructs the council to do something, or some kind of combination between those.

Jonathan Zuck: So I - and I agree with that completely. I see some of this as good introduction - introductory language to the initial report and that if possible --

with a change of wording and the loss of the idea of a principle but instead be something that's much more specific expectations of working groups -- we could make a recommendation.

You don't - I guess that's the question I'm asking is do you guys consider it outside of our scope to recommend an update to the group - working group guidelines to have a couple of things that say wherever possible working group should use data to define the scope of the problem wherever, you know, wherever feasible, you know.

The solution that's proposed should in, you know, include target metrics. And the working group should attempt to determine a period after which the efficacy of the recommendation is measured or something like that -- some points that like that are actually you should do X.

(Unintelligible) like things that might go into the working guidelines. Does that make sense? I don't know, Berry, if that's an old (unintelligible).

Oh, Berry's line dropped. What other - I mean, do other people - Pam, I don't know if it's - I kind of agree with you that principles are - partly because they're not actionable, you know, might fall outside of our scope.

But I feel like it's within our scope to make recommendations for, you know, how working groups are instructed to do their jobs. That feels within our scope to me.

Berry Cobb: Can folks hear me now?

Jonathan Zuck: Yes.

Berry Cobb: Sorry about that. My...

Jonathan Zuck: Did you hear me?

Berry Cobb: ...phone never does that. So what I was going to say I'm going to update the action to send around a link to first, the relevant section of the bylaws that govern the policy process -- which is surely outside of our scope.

But I think it'll help provide context to where we're heading - for where this group is heading. And then secondarily I'll send a link out to the working group guidelines so that members can take a refreshed look at that.

If the group chooses to modify this language - because I think a few of our other - a few of the other draft recommendations in here could potentially target changes to the working group guidelines.

And if that is the case -- as with this particular one with these draft principles that we have listed here -- then we're going to need to suggest specific edits.

So Section 3.2 something should have two statements that state how metrics should possibly be used in the policy process. I'm not - I haven't memorized the working group guidelines.

But off the top of my head I'm not so confident that there is a specific place within there. Perhaps maybe it's even creating a new section. But again, I think the goal from this point forward -- whatever the group decides to recommend -- has got to be very prescriptive about what we - what needs to change and how it should be changed so that it's tangible enough that staff or the council can implement.

Okay. So I think that...

Jonathan Zuck: I certainly agree, Berry.

Berry Cobb: Yes. All right. Thank you, Jonathan. So I think that's all that I had for now as it relates to at least these principles. They are loaded into the draft initial report.

And when we send that around certainly that's going to be our authoritative source to edit from this point forward.

And so I guess with that I'll go ahead and move into Agenda Item Number 6 - - which is to provide a highlight overview of the initial report.

As I said earlier, under the milestones schedule we'll send this out on the 28th -- which is just a day and a half from now. Staff wants to - we want to apply some comments -- not change any of the text -- although staff wrote most of the text here minus the draft recommendations that we worked from, from the beginning of this year.

But we are going to make some comments out to the side for the group to consider -- which again goes back to this actionable aspect for some of the - for some of these recommendations because some of them are - they're not fluff but there's a lack of tangibility in terms of exactly how staff would implement some of this.

So when we reconvene on the 9th -- and certainly some of our discussions in Buenos Aires will - the group will need to figure out how we can meet the same idea of the recommendation as we have it drafted now but then look to modify it so that it is somewhat more actionable.

I think from the previous kind of draft recommendations page we had totaled up to five. In the draft report we have seven. And that was really more to try to align or separate out the recommendation that aligns with one of the deliverables that we have loaded into the annex.

So to not keep you in suspense any more, ta dah, here it is. Typical GNSO document for - well all of you are pretty much veterans here in the policy process.

I did meet with staff earlier today. And we're taking an internal action to give these reports a makeover. It won't happen for our particular group. But it is time to get these updated.

As I had mentioned in the last call while we do have a template for the charter we don't necessarily have an authoritative template for initial reports and final reports.

Typically what happens is the next issue that comes along staff will take the one that was created for (IRTPD) as an example and edited out all the (IRTP) stuff and put in data and metrics for example.

And from an author perspective it's painful because a lot of the formatting has changed over the years. How the section numbering and subsection numbering works or really doesn't work is very painful as well.

So we're going to start working with the communications team such how they've defined more new, update and relevant PowerPoint presentations -- not only for the Buenos Aires meetings but as well as for standard presentation templates.

I want to take that same principle - I don't want to use the word "principle" anymore. I want to take that same idea and apply it to final reports here -- which I think is kind of long overdue.

So at any rate I'm going to maintain control just to walk through this document real quickly. Again this is only meant to provide a quick overview. We'll allow the group to look into the details when we send it out to the list.

And then we'll start ripping it - we can rip it apart over the list as well as in preparation for our June 9 meeting.

So I did mention in prior calls we want to keep this short and sweet. It's still at 33 pages -- although really it's only about 24 or so if you were to move table of contents and some other kind of information.

But at least it is smaller than prior reports. The three annexes that we have are essentially our deliverables. But they're too big to necessarily fold into the heart of the initial report. So they're just references made to those particular annexes.

Executive summary, I won't go into too much detail here other than it more or less mimics the structure of the report. And again, it'll just have a quick read of the recommendations.

As I mentioned, there's one through seven and they're aligning back to our charter questions. And that is of course subject to change as we continue our deliberations.

Section 2, typical standard fare of just objectives and next steps. That really leads up to delivering the final report to the GNSO Council. Section 3 is background.

We've really tried to keep this thinned out at about 2 1/2 pages. We've mostly taken some of the background information that was found in the prior issue report that was created back in 2013 and then touched a little bit on the process -- but for the most part tried to keep it pretty thin.

Section 4 is the heart of the report. And it's the combination of the working group's deliberations as well as connecting the charter question with the observations that the group deliberated on and then of course then the recommendation.

If you'll recall, last call we walked through each one of the charter questions. And it more or less sounded like we had touched upon all of them with

exception of Charter Question B -- which there was agreement that that was really no longer in scope. And we'll get to there in a second.

But for Charter Question A, there was a fair amount of content as it relates to the deliberations and then coming up and then - or listing the specific recommendation to that particular charter question.

So when you see this next version where Recommendation 1 is listed under 5.3.1.2 there will be comments out to the side essentially asking the group is what changes can we make to this recommendation to make them more actionable or implementable?

You know, it's good from a higher level perspective. This - it kind of touches back to the cultural change that we're trying to effect here. But how do we keep staff and/or the council and/or the GNSO honest by this?

So we need to restructure this recommendation in a way that shows that something is delivered or there's been some sort of documentation change that forces that honesty so to speak.

There is a placeholder section after each recommendation that talks about the level of consensus. Right now this is - it's very template. We've more or less left a placeholder here as for rough consensus.

I think when we actually - we'll have to see where the group sits with each one of the recommendations as we get closer to the public comment period. But we may - instead of actually listing a rough consensus per say it might be better to just put a placeholder as "to be determined" during the final report -- which this more or less kind of does but in a little bit longer perspective.

So we move into Charter Question B. As I was just mentioning essentially the takeaway here is that this - that there are no recommendations made in relation to this particular charter question and that it more or less had been

addressed by ICANN contractual compliance and a lot of what they've implemented.

Charter Question C which kind of touches on our principles aspect which is where you'll see how we have it loaded into here. Right now again, you know, this - in its present form this was kind of the placeholder for it.

That's why it has the recommendation there. But as we just discussed a little bit ago we'll be making changes in this regard.

And I think there's really kind of two actions that are coming out of this. One is to incorporate this language in the introductory part of this particular report. Secondly look to -- as Jonathan mentioned -- look to modify this language so that it is something perhaps more actionable or implementable.

And then the third aspect, as I mentioned I'll send the links out to the working group guidelines to help determine if there is a spot within there that some of these may fit.

Charter Questions D, E, and F were pretty much lumped together. Again, typical observations and I think there were three recommendations here - or no, just one recommendation here.

This is the one about staff and working groups should be given the resources to perform such an analysis including but not limited to - for one I think staff will recommend editing the streamlined access to compliance data.

That already has happened or it's already there. It's just a matter of making that request which kind of more or less coincides with our decision tree workflow as well as the request form.

But secondarily -- as with some of the others -- I think this is something that's going to have to be adjusted to make it more (unintelligible). The original

intent of this was earlier in the group's deliberations we were trying to determine whether there was budget available for these types of metrics requests, et cetera.

And that's what this is trying to accomplish. We've got a couple of ideas that we'll include in comments here about how to make this a little bit more actionable because as such it would be pretty difficult to - for staff to implement in its current form.

Moving on to Charter Question G, which I believe gets into a couple of the recommendations that we had in regards to the working group early outreach. Similar to what we talked a little bit I know that there is a section within the working group guidelines that do speak to the early outreach mechanisms to the SOs and ACs.

And so perhaps these particular recommendations will be modified slightly to say that the working group recommends that the GNSO update the working group line Section 2.3 -- where it mentions early outreach -- and provide maybe draft language of what could be inserted into that particular document -- again so that there is something to check off that this has in fact been implemented.

And then lastly, Charter Question H about how to incorporate processes described above. And essentially this is - we created a series of recommendations here. There's three of them that are listed.

Recommendation 5 goes to working group charters -- which is Annex A which is a good example for us to follow of making something tangible to implement.

You know, here's the template. Here's the section that we're recommending being added. And the secondary part is the deliverable that we're recommending be included along with final reports.

So where possible we're going to need to try to model off of that. And then as well as Annex B and C which again is our decision tree as well as the metrics request template.

That kind of takes us through the main body. We get into conclusions and next steps -- which highlights what the group has - is recommending to be - or it includes our deliverables as well as what stage in the policy process that these apply to. I'll have to work on the graphic a little bit there.

And then we get into what is familiar to everybody else - or familiar to the group is we've imported the draft charter which contains this section -- the key metric considerations.

There was an action to include a hypothetical situation for future drafters of charters. So this is slightly changed from the version you've seen before. So I ask that when you get this that you take a more scrutinized view of the hypothetical situation.

I used the transfer policy as an example and provided, you know, the - what the type of metric might be - an example and how that will help - how this answer will - how it will answer the question to meet the goal.

So I'm hopeful that we'll get some more specific feedback from the group so that we can make sure that this is a little bit tighter before we present it out to the community.

And then secondarily in the deliverables section, as I mentioned none of this has changed. But the idea is that when the drafting team is putting this charter together this should instruct - or formally instruct the working group that they need to include this kind of continuous improvement or measures of success recommendation should any future recommendations be implemented.

Annex B is the decision tree that we've talked about. This has not changed since, I believe, November of last year. So I also ask group members here to walk thru the process and make sure that we're - we've covered all of our decision trees.

If the logic is sound or if we need to make any adjustments where it might be too confusing. But, you know, in general is asking some of the higher level question. You know, is the data publicly available or not? Is there a cost associated with it? Are there any confidentiality type concerns?

Again as we talked before that some of those original requirements that we had mentioned had been folded into this decision tree. But ultimately the typical process is the working group determines that they need the metrics they fill out the form, define the requirements.

The liaison -- and this is something we'll probably need to add into this -- is a kind of a text-based process flow. But the working group creates the metrics request.

The council liaison to the group will deliver the request to the council so that it can be approved there -- which is then asked of staff. If there are no budgetary concerns -- for example a request into compliance -- and we manage that track - if there are budget aspects to this then staff will have to figure out how to find the funds appropriate for the particular request so that it can be fulfilled and the like.

And then lastly, Annex C is just the metrics request form. And I also ask you to take a little bit more detailed look into this to make sure that Column 1 is basically the title of what - of the request attribute.

And then Column 2 is the actual answer that the working group or drafting team -- really the requester -- should be providing to help define the requirements of that particular request.

This will probably be an iterative process. You know, the first run may be a little bit more generalized. The second run provides a little bit more detailed requirements.

And then the third - and then it'll be kind of a more of a shared aspect especially when it gets down into the lower parts which gets into resource estimations or budget considerations.

So that's the overview of the initial report as it stands now. Again, we'll mail this out on the 28th. And we look forward to having some good feedback to help improve this a little bit more before we ready it for public comment. Any questions or comments on this aspect of the agenda?

Hearing and seeing none...

Jonathan Zuck: It looks great, Berry.

Berry Cobb: All right. Thank you, Jonathan. So we'll go ahead and just - we've only got about 15 minutes left. I didn't want to spend a whole lot of time on this Agenda Item Number 7 which is the issue report stage.

Just as - like we've spent some time discussing at the chartering stage and at the working groups I think very early on in our deliberations we did spend a little time talking about how metrics and data could be useful at the initial report stage.

And I believe for the most part from, you know, the seven draft recommendations we have now are applicable to that stage of the process. But what we need the group to think about a little bit more is how do we

enhance that? Or is there anything more specific that the group would like the direct staff to do at that stage of the issue?

I think in general most everyone on the call will agree that if, you know, in a perfect world if we had access to all the data that we ever needed that was, you know, basically right at your fingertips at the issue report stage, if you had the proper data to help define the issue in some cases -- or maybe even in many -- but at least in some cases the issue may not necessarily be an issue at all.

And I think the idea at that stage is to have access to the right data that can help describe the issue well enough that when the issue report is delivered to the council that the determination as well - it's not significant enough or clearly the data shows that this isn't a problem at all -- those kinds of aspects.

And I think, you know, one of the main benefits to that is in terms of our lack of resources to work all these different PDPs -- find out we're not just creating working groups out of thin air just for the sake of creating working groups.

And I think that that's what's the most important about this stage of the policy process.

So I'll stop there and open up any comments or suggestions. I think for us to flush out, you know, this aspect of the policy process we'll be able to - the group will probably be able to make edits and suggestions via the report and not get too much into an extensive discussion here because again I think some of the ideas behind the recommendations that we have apply to this aspect early in the process.

Jonathan Zuck: Berry, this is Jonathan for the transcript. I guess I have a couple of - thanks - first of all thanks a lot for the presentation and thanks Steve and the rest for the work on this. I think it's looking good.

As far as the issue report stage I don't know that I understand well enough whether there's a template for that or a standard language the - that's used when requesting an issue for it from staff that would enable us to make specific recommendations to making use of data in that.

I mean I guess that's a question we have. But we certainly have it built into the recommendations here. But is there any kind of a deliverable or transactionable component to use here?

And then I guess my only other comment is just a political one which is that right now sensitivities are very high about top-down decision making within ICANN and things like that.

So I think we'd want to be just very careful in our wording about what an initial report might - from staff might suggest and that it's, you know, that it's ultimately presenting the facts. And presenting more facts is better than fewer facts. But that the - that ultimately the decision rests with council whether to proceed with forming a working group or something like that.

So again that would just probably come down to how we phrase things. But I could see inadvertently, you know, creating another cry for people's heads that we've been seeing quite a bit lately. So those are my two questions I guess. Berry, go ahead.

Berry Cobb: Thank you, Jonathan. In relation to the template -- as I was describing with the initial report and final report -- there is no authoritative source. So the same kind of - applies to the issue report.

It does have pretty much the same structure of - from one issue report to the next in terms of providing background and staff recommendations to move forward. You know, there - so as I mentioned...

Jonathan Zuck: Who is it that...

Berry Cobb: ...(unintelligible)...

Jonathan Zuck: What's - go ahead. Sorry.

Berry Cobb: No, please go ahead.

Jonathan Zuck: I was just - is there part of the process in which a piece of paper gets delivered though? I mean when - who is it that requests that the staff produce an issue report on a particular policy area?

Berry Cobb: This is Berry. It comes from multiple directions. In short a issue is discussed on the council. The council, you know, agrees that the issue should be explored further.

Let's hypothetically say that it came from, you know, the IPC sees a particular issue. They bring it up to the council. And there is a form that I believe the - not the chairs but the councilors for the IPC would fill out to deliver to the council saying, you know, "Here's the issue we're confronting. This is why it's important. And we think that this should be explored further for the following reasons."

And that is deliberated on the council when - and if the council approves it's the council that directs staff. So technically it's only the council that will direct staff to create the issue report.

Jonathan Zuck: Right.

Berry Cobb: But the input to that...

Jonathan Zuck: And what...

Berry Cobb: ...can come from...

Jonathan Zuck: ...do they do to do that? Is it a resolution? I'm just wondering if there's a way to say something along the lines of "And we recommend that in future requests for issue reports made by council that the following language is included" or something like that? To get back to the transactional point.

Berry Cobb: It is a formal resolution that instructs staff to deliver an issue report. And so - and here's the other complexity around that is there is a 45-day time period by which staff must return the issue report back to the council.

You know, there have been delays for various reasons. And staff will advise the council accordingly. But that's the more or less the SOA in terms of turning around an issue report based on the request from council -- which does provide kind of a conundrum because A, if it's a complex issue that takes a lot of time to do the research.

But as it pertains to what this group is trying to accomplish, getting access to certain types of data may not be as easily - may not be easy enough especially to get it right and to research it appropriately within that 45-day window.

So that's kind of one of the conundrums that we have here. But...

Jonathan Zuck: But there are established mechanisms for pushing back on those dates, right?

Berry Cobb: That is correct. So essentially staff will - at one of their council meetings will advise the council that we, you know, that staff needs another four weeks to complete the particular issue report. And so far there hasn't been any real - I don't think I've recalled any push-back from the GNSO Council for staff taking longer to deliver on that.

But what I did want to say is that...

Jonathan Zuck: Specifics to, you know...

Berry Cobb: What's - I don't, you know, I guess kind of maybe this goes back to the culture but - and the limited access to data or resources. But in some cases I would say in the past there have been issues with - or I guess the more common denominator is that the issue is defined. It's not necessarily fully researched. But there's at least identifications of what a future working group would want to seek out in deliberating the issues further.

So it's kind of the chicken or the egg kind of syndrome. You know, at the issue report stage we're limited by a minimal amount of days to deliver on and the research behind that as well as access to certain types of data.

But at the very least it's identified so that the drafting team of the charter and/or the subsequent working group that has more time to further refine the issue and - during its deliberations, you know, that's kind of what's happened in the past.

The idea here is well, how can we front run some of that particular data acquisition to make it more informed for the council. But I agree the flipside of what you mentioned is the sensitivity of it being top-down, you know. Could the data -- if there was even access to it -- could the data always result in that there's basically no more PDPs or - because there's never any issues found? Or the opposite side is that regardless of the data there's always a PDP.

And if there's - either way it has a very sensitive aspect to it. And perhaps that's why the overall nature has been that it's really up to the working group and the community to make the decisions about how real a particular issue is.

Jonathan Zuck: And I think that's exactly right. And I - the idea here would be for staff once again to empower council to make a good decision by providing sufficient

facts, right? I mean I think that's the way to talk about it and so it's not about the staff making a decision whether something's worth pursuing.

It's about doing sufficient research so that council can make an informed decision based on whatever their own criteria are. But at least be well-aware of the scope of the issue when making a decision to do a PDP.

I see that (Steve) put in the chat that there is in fact a part of the PDP manual that has a recommended format for requests for issue reports. So that could in fact be a place where some additional language could be recommended and our recommendations.

Steve, I see your hand is up.

(Steve Musef): Thanks, Jonathan. This is (Steve Musef). Yes. So you just brought the point I was going to bring up that there is a format for requests. And one of the criteria is actually defining the issue but also if at all possible quantifying the issue to the extent feasible.

So it does have some elements of - I guess in an ideal world before the request for an issue report is even submitted the research has been done before it gets to staff for the issue report drafting. So I agree. I think if we can to...

Jonathan Zuck: I don't know what would cause that research to happen though.

(Steven Musef): What would cause it?

Jonathan Zuck: Well I don't know how the research would get done prior to an issue - I mean the issue report's the first thing that happens isn't it?

(Steve Musef): So I guess I was just saying that in an ideal world this is actually where it would happen. The person or the party that is raising the issue for research

they would actually have identified the issue and understand the extent of it because it's not necessarily the case that staff is going to be an expert on whatever topic is being brought up.

So ideally - it may be not possible. And, you know, maybe it needs to go hand in hand that the issue - the party that raises the issue has to do some of it. And then maybe we also carry on and carry the work forward as well.

Berry Cobb: And this is Berry. Just to add on to that I mean, you know, that technically no, the issue report is not the first in the process. It is this issue identification aspect here. And that really does coincide with what (Steve) just presented to us with the request.

I think in a perfect world if the IPC had a particular issue that they wanted the council deliberate that if the IPC had the adequate resources and access to adequate data to show justification of why they believe that it's the issue, then that would be perfect because you would already be coming to the council armed.

"Well this is the issue. This is how bad it is. And here's all the quantification behind it that shows how bad it is." But I think what typically happens up to now is the issue is just deliberated at the council level. And, you know, it's, you know, resource availability is thin on the community side. And it's recognized that there is resource capability on staff with the issue report side.

So, you know, perhaps that is something that we should take a look at at our meeting and take a look at this request form in more detail and, you know, and look at this even more earlier stage before the request even gets to staff to further define the issue.

Jonathan Zuck: Yes. That's interesting. I mean obviously resources are a bigger issue for - in theory to the ISP than they are in - and then there's just this - I know that

there's a feeling inside the ISP that if we provide the data it won't be considered objective and that it'll be a waste of our resources to produce it.

So I mean I - that's the complexity there I suppose. But it might be worth figuring out how it might happen earlier in a way that is still sufficiently objective that it won't become a bone of contention downstream.

So let's put that on the agenda to talk about. But meanwhile I think this is a good initial report. And I'm - (Steve) if you'd make a note it'd be great to look at where we might update this issue report template format to include some - to expand the language a little bit about quantifying the problem.

I mean maybe there's enough there now. But let's at least review that portion of the document.

Berry Cobb: And...

Jonathan Zuck: All right.

Berry Cobb: And I know we're one minute behind. But since you mentioned it I think that this really kind of goes back to Recommendation 3 that you won't recall. But it's about making resources available. And one of the things that...

Jonathan Zuck: Right. That's right.

Berry Cobb: ...has been discussed is, you know, perhaps that there's a community budget allocation of x number of dollars per year that follows a standard process by which the different groups request x amount of funds for travel for the year, et cetera.

Perhaps there is a pilot program that is initiated that has a small incremental budget amount whereby at this early identification phase the IPC could utilize some of those funds to get particular research or, you know, specifically data

and metrics to further explore the issue so that it can be better presented to the council. So I just wanted to go with that.

Okay. So...

Jonathan Zuck: Thanks, Berry. That makes sense.

Berry Cobb: ...there were a few action items. You'll see some more emails. Like I said we'll get this report out to you. We'll also send links to the PDP manual and bylaws. And we'll meet again on the 9 of June.

Jonathan Zuck: That sounds great everyone. Thanks a lot, guys, for all your good work.

Berry Cobb: All right. Thanks all. And Ozan, you can stop the recording, please. Thank you.

Ozan Sahin: Thank you. This is...

END