

**Transcription ICANN Dublin  
GNSO session Saturday 17 October 2015  
Data and Metrics for Policy Making Working Group**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio. 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.

On page: <http://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar#oct>

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page

Jonathan Robinson: We have lunch scheduled – rescheduled for 12:30. And we have one more session to deal with before that, which is to hear about the data metrics for policy working group final report if we have - and we do have. It's great. So we have Jonathan Zuck here to update us on that.

Hi Jonathan, welcome. And so let's go straight into that session and hear from you on the final report. I suspect you've been busy in a parallel session this morning but welcome to the GNSO weekend sessions.

Jonathan Zuck: Thanks for having me. It's always a pleasure to come back to this club. So I'm waiting for the slides to come up I guess but you've all heard from me before and my presentation today is not substantially different than it was in the past.

The data metrics for policy-making working group has been meeting and working on a set of recommendations. And we had a conference call where we talked about those recommendations. And we've since had a public comment period as well where we made some revisions to the observations and some tweaks to the discussion around the recommendations and the recommendations remain the same as a result of the public comments.

So the DMPM deliberated on the improved use of data in issue identification, scoping and prioritization. Key performance metrics for recommended policy and fact basis helps the outcomes. So the idea is scoping the problem at the outset, using data whenever possible, defining success, using data whenever possible and then introducing the notion of continuous improvement.

Go back and check using those metrics, whether or not the policy recommendation had the desired outcome. So those are sort of the three phases that we're trying to build into the recommendations. Let's go to the next slide.

You know, the idea here was to evolve ICANN culture into a better informed fact-based policy development, help ensure the most critical registrant/registry and registrar issues are addressed. That's part of the scoping issue. Let's make sure it's a problem before we launch a PDP on it.

Facilitate deliberations and decisions based on tangible evidence as opposed to gut feeling or anecdotal evidence and promote continuous improvement. And feel free to stop me if you've got a question along the way. But again these are mostly old slides. And next I tried to advance the slides with my microphone.

The CCW process - the CCWG process is really taking it out of me apparently. Okay so this is just a definition slide. When we talk about data we're talking about data sets, metrics. We're talking about particular measures of that data and so that's what we - we threw the definites in it so we know what we're talking about. Next slide please.

So our proposed recommendations – the first recommendation is initiate a pilot effort for SGs/NCs to make tactical based data and metric requests with the GNSO to enhance issue development of policy issues.

This is due largely to the fact that we're off budget cycle and that part of implementation of this would require some kind of a budget allocation to – in some instances acquiring data, in other instances into anonymizing data because it was sensitive data because of where it came from or its strategic value, etcetera.

So there's often going to be some budget allocation associated with it. And without specifically knowing what that would be, we thought that in the interim, allocating some resources to a pilot project that allowed people to initiate some of these smaller scale studies would give us some more informed position from which to make an ultimate budget recommendation at the time of the next budget cycle.

Recommendation Number 2, update the working group guidelines within the GNSO op procedures regarding every outreach to - early outreach to include quantitative measures and expand the audience beyond ICANN. So again a lot of what we're doing is changing the templates that are used when creating an issue report, when creating a charter, when defining the recommendations for a work group. So it's about a set of tools or worksheets that would be used by those groups.

Recommendation Number 3 is to establish and create formal templates, issue report charter and final reports and document accordingly in the working group guidelines. Recommendation 4 and 5 is update the charter and final report templates with standard recommendations to measure effectiveness of future consensus policies post-implementation.

Recommendation 6, create metrics request introduction into working group guidelines. And Recommendation Number 7, import metrics request decision tree and form into the working group guidelines. So the other thing we did was come up with some sort of process flow diagram to what a process the work group might go through to request data and to deal with issues and challenges as they come up with the request of that data.

One might be pushback that this data is sensitive so we can't give it to you. So then the option would be to explore a third party that might anonymize or sanitize that data in such a way that it could be used by the working group and not disadvantage the supplier of the data. Next slide.

So the current status is we're updating the GNSO council on preliminary recommendations. We completed the review of public comments. And we now have final recommendations so we'd like to submit the report to the GNSO council for its review in Dublin. And should they be adopted the policy staff will begin implementation. Next slide.

And here's some more information if you want to delve into some of the specifics of the documents we created. But again most of this is not new from the last time we met. Is there any questions that you have that - since the last time that we talked? So Berry go ahead in terms of process, what we need to do next.

Man: Sorry...

Berry Cobb: Yes I think (James) was up first.

Jonathan Zuck: Okay.

Jonathan Robinson: Go ahead (James)?

(James): Is that okay? Okay thanks Jonathan. And I may - we may have discussed this after the update last time but a lot of the data and statistics presumably would be gathered by - if it's not public - would be presumably gathered from registries and registrars. I think market data, customer data, technical data.

And one of the concerns or questions that I had - and I'm just wondering if you accounted for this - is that a lot of those providers are or had since become public companies, and that could be considered, you know, material non-public information that if somebody in a PDP had access to it even anonymized might make some inappropriate financial decisions on their own personal behalf based on that. I mean is this something that you guys are accounting for as part of your...?

Jonathan Zuck: Thanks for your question. We didn't account for that specific issue, so I don't remember the issue of it being a public company coming up in previous conversations. So again this is a set of recommendations. And ultimately, you know, if something is sufficiently serious like that the data might be refused by the provider.

There isn't a way to compel the production of data outside of what's already part of the contract, right? So this is meant to be a cooperative process. And the worksheet that we have in place is designed to facilitate addressing concerns that are raised by a provider of data.

So if we really can't address them then there may not be data, may not be made available and we don't have a means to compel it. So I think that problem would solve itself just by virtue of the fact that the fiduciary responsibility of the organization.

Obviously we would hope that any data provider, whether it's a registry/registrar would have a desire to have a good policy outcome and would do everything they could to facilitate fact based decision making on the part of the working group. To the extent that you can't help, you wouldn't be able to help I think.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks (James). Berry?

Berry Cobb: Thank you Jonathan. Berry Cobb. Just to kind of reinforce the previous slide, so the final report was submitted to the GNSO council and I believe Volker was the maker of that motion. I don't think it's been seconded. And this will be on the agenda for Wednesday's council meeting for a vote.

Jonathan Robinson: Berry, so that would be no bad thing to get a second on the list recorded as soon as possible. If anyone is willing you can make yourself known probably by e-mail on the list is the most convenient way to record it. So if you could do that, that would be great.

Anyone willing to second the motion right now? Avri, thank you. So if you could make yourself known on the list that would be great. Thank you very much. In fact we can simply record Avri as the seconder of the motion. I don't see why we can't just go ahead and do that. So that's great, thank you. Any other comments or questions in relation to this work? Amr?

Amr Elsadr: Okay thanks. This is Amr. Jonathan you mentioned that there were a few changes made to the final report in response to the public comment periods. But obviously the recommendations haven't themselves changed. Could you go over some of them, maybe one or two of the significant changes (unintelligible) different? For example, there was the decision tree, right? Has there been any changes to that in terms of how the group sees the - how the process should sort of...?

Jonathan Zuck: I don't believe so but I'm going to hand it over to Berry to go over some of the changes we made. They were mostly details.

Berry Cobb: Thank you. Amr yes that's correct. None of the recommendations themselves changed. However a few of the work products did that will be imported into the working group guidelines, the first being that decision tree. And I believe that it's based on a few of the comments that you had submitted about evaluation of the data before it's actually used by a working group to ensure that it's valid, that it's not biased and some of those aspects.

We also in addition on the decision tree and the request form for when an interested party is looking to request the data we'll be creating kind of a hints and tips page that has some of the questions that you had outlined and the comment in terms of, you know, trying to analyze that data to make what I just said as well as links to external resources of data.

And there's some other hits and tips. And you can find all of that in the final report. There is a redline of the report that's located on the Wiki page from

the initial to the final, but you also see some of those updates in the final - or you'll see all of those updates in the final report as well.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay so there you have it. Thank you very much Jonathan. As this made clear, this is a motion for the council meeting on Wednesday. So we'll pick this up however briefly or at whatever length is necessary after lunch. So we can close this session now.

END