Transcription ICANN London
GNSO Data and Metrics for Policy Making Working Group
Thursday 26 June 2014

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://gnso.icann.org/en/calendar/#jun
The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page

Barry Cobb: Thursday June 26th, 2014. The room is Cadogan. This is the GNSO Data and Metrics for Policy Making Working Group.

                Welcome everyone to the Thursday morning session for Data and Metrics for Policy Making Working Group for the 26th of June, 2014, at 0800 hours. So I think we'll go ahead and get things started and we have a pretty simple agenda for the day with a very well attended crowd. And...

Jonathan Zuck: Pipe down everyone.

Barry Cobb: So basically, I'll go ahead and introduce myself. My name is Barry Cobb. I'm with ICANN staff, and why don't we go ahead around the room and introduce everybody and then we can jump into the agenda.

Jonathan Zuck: Jonathan Zuck, Chair from (ACT).

Rudi Vansnick: Rudi Vansnick, NPOC.

Pamela Little: Pam Little, Zodiac Registry from the registry stakeholder group.

Man: Edgar Allen Poe, Baltimore.

Barry Cobb: And we do have one remote participant in the room, Jeremy Beale, and Jeremy, I don't know if you can hear us or not, but if you do have a question or anything, please feel free to raise your hand.

So with that, basically our agenda today is we're going to - this is more or less a face-to-face meeting continuing our working group efforts at - we're in the phase now where we're trying to bring a close to a review of our use case review of previous working group efforts to help inform our deliberations on how data and metrics can help and promote better informed decision making within our policy processes.

So we'll review through our next item, which is kind of using the time machine of the very beginning of IRTP, which is the Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy. So we'll go through that briefly, then we'll talk about some of our next steps in terms of bringing our use case analysis to a close. Then, we'll just talk about when we'll be meeting next and reconvening our normal sessions after London.

So before we get started into the IRTP-A, Jonathan, do you want to have any - a few comments to say before we jump in?

Jonathan Zuck: Yes. For the record this is Jonathan Zuck, and we're talking about how the phases of this program and we're nearing the conclusion of the case studies. The purpose of which was to come up with a set of scenarios for which we could develop frameworks and protocols for the use of data going forward.

And so we did have a meeting - a report that we gave to Council on Saturday, and there were a couple of recommendations that came up that - one was to look at Whois, and so we should explore whether or not that amounts to another scenario.

And then the other recommendation that was made recently is to find a way to push the data - the need for data all the way to the staff-created issue

report prior to the decision by Council to actually form a working group so that we know that we have some better sense of the severity and volume of the problem before a work group is even formed.

So, those are some of the things I just wanted to get on the table to make sure we have them down so that you know we're doing - going forward.

And I thought there was one more thing, Barry, from Saturday, but I don't remember what it was that somebody brought up, which I'll go back and check as well. I guess we - I know that Alan Greenburg expressed some interest in heading a report as well, so let's put that in front of him.

Barry Cobb: Yes, thank you Jonathan. Yes, that does remind me - in fact, I did speak with Alan and we'll be sending him a copy of the form that we created and have him provide input, and he said that he would be - you know, after he reviews it and if we feel that he'd like to come on a call and talk about his experience, we said more than welcome to attend.

And I think when we get into the next phase of our analysis, that's when we'll probably see some - you know, at least shorter-term participation from him as well to carry that case forward.

And this is Barry that's speaking.

Just real quick for the record as well, we do have one slide up which is just a quick summary of where we're at. So as I mentioned, we're getting ready to review through IRTP Part A today, but we have reviewed fast flux (pedner), which is now the ERP policy as well as the At Grace Period Working Group, which dealt with front running of the - during the At Grace period.

So with that, the I guess we'll go ahead and jump over to reviewing the IRTP-A use case.

So again, my apologies for not getting this sent a little bit sooner for the working group to review, but it - we did run through it, or I did create and fill out the form.

I think overall this one was kind of surprising, so the IRTP, as I think most people know, that's the Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy. That policy was created in 2004, which again is for - to allow registrants to transfer their names from one registrar to the other.

And shortly after that, I think there were a series of issues that had occurred that prompted a series of PDPs to be formed, some of which are still going.

So you know, I think in terms of the details around this particular working group effort, the first takeaway that I got from this is that this initiative actually started in 2005 and there's the last - the series of working groups, IRTP-D that is still running, they do have the final report in site or on the horizon with their recommendations.

So to - you know to throw out the (atticus), that was about ten years ago that a lot of these issues were identified, and I think once D completes its recommendations, and assuming that the Board and Council - or the Council and the Board will pass those, you know it'll be into 2015 before they're implemented.

So lightening speed, and you know, I think that was a wakeup call for me in reviewing this. I was kind of under the impression that this had started around 2008, but you know add on another three - you know, it was already long at 2008, and now it's even longer at 2005.

So you know, there are other efforts going on within the GNSO about working group and PDP improvements, so you know kind of understanding this. Even think there was some discussion this week about the duration of PDPs and how we can expedite that.

I think what we're dealing with now, I think this is a pretty good use case that while there were some very complex problems being addressed, and my understanding at least with IRTP-B and C, and very shortly D, there's some pretty beneficial recommendations that are coming out of these groups. But you know clearly, the market and the environment has changed dramatically over the last ten years.

So you know in some case, everybody jokes about, "Well, let's have IRTP Part E or F, or Z." You know, it wouldn't surprise me that we get another transfer issue pop up very shortly to either rehash some of our old recommendations or you know even a whole new set...

Man: Volume.

Barry Cobb: Right.

Okay. So with that, you know I don't want to spend a whole lot of time on reviewing the IRTP-A for the very reason that there were zero metrics used for this.

IRTP in general, it - back in 2005 about a year after the policy had been implemented, there were a series of high profile hijackings that occurred, or I should say high profile names that were being hijacked, and you know I think - it's hard to say from the media and attention perspective, but it did get attention.

And in parallel to that, it was - became aware by the GNSO as well as the SSAC that also wrote a report that kind of sparked off this review of the transfer policy and its process.

With that, the GNSO did take action. They formed a couple of - I think at the time, you were - in today's language, they would be non-PDP working groups to help identify what those issues are.

Once they created a laundry list of those issues, they recognized that you know this was a pretty long list. I think it was in the number of 29 or so, and they need to prioritize them and then they came up with the rationale to divide and conquer or at least split the work apart and they made it an iterative process. So IRTP-A through D.

But the working group didn't actually form until the mid-June of 2008 and in particular IRTP-A was the first of this series.

In short, you know there were basically three issues that this working group was tasked with, and the first one was the potential exchange of registrant email information between registrars. And I think around this time, EPP was being deployed. I don't believe it was 100% like we see today in the generic name space.

But in terms of conducting transfers of names, it was very important for the gaining registrar to have the registrants email address in terms of FOA transfer or FOA activity, Form of Authorization, and those kinds of elements that are specific to the transfer process.

Secondarily, they were also looking at whether there were other possibilities for electronic authentication over the FOA.

And then lastly, they also wanted to consider whether there should be any provisions for partial bulk transfers.

So all of the efforts leading up to when the working group formed, whether it was the SSAC report or the 29 issues report that generated. There were zero metrics at all in any of these.

The SSAC report predominantly focused on detailing each - you know, almost use cases of each high profile hijacking. I believe there was something like ten different names that were hijacked and all of - you know, the entire story around each one of those, and as well as the - what the GNSO work did, they you know took a very hard look at the process itself. And I don't want to belittle their efforts, but there was no data captured as to the macro level of what was occurring in the environment.

So you know, how many transfers occur within a given period? You know, how many are successful? How many failed? How many were fraudulent? So there was none of those metrics to try to put this into scope at the time, which you know I think are pretty important and certainly that data I think is fairly easy to get to, especially from the registry performance reports.

You can see in that detail how many names I believe were transferred. And if not, then you know you could also make the case of reaching out to the contracted parties to try to get that data as well.

So just to continue or to move into the issue report, because there had been a fair amount of work generated prior to the issue report, there wasn't a whole lot of substance in the issue report. You know, SSAC had detailed their issues. The preliminary group that identified the 29 issues. There was a fair amount in there. So there wasn't a whole lot of details in there.

And again, just reiterating that there were - there was no data that I could find at least in any of the - any of those work products that could've informed the scale and scope of that problem.

What wasn't clear to me up to this point, and I might as well go ahead and say it, through the final report is if there was an attempt made to collect this data. I couldn't find anywhere whether the working group tried to contact contractual compliance to see what their view was on transfers based on

other - based on the working group that started this one. It was quite a challenge to get quality data from contractual compliance, and this was 2009. So I can't imagine that things were that much different from 2005 to 2008.

And it was also unknown whether there was any request to reach out to contracted parties to obtain any real data metrics as well.

The charter, just like what we've done with our other use case analysis activity, didn't request a study for data at all, and what you'll see if you're looking into the Adobe Connect room, you probably won't be able to see it well, but I did send this out to the list last night, I highlighted in yellow, you know just like some very basic questions around each of the three issues that they were - that the working group was trying to address.

And so again, the first one was about the email being made available to the gaining registrar. You know, they could've asked some very simple questions. There was a lot of deliberation about you know, not having that email address or gaining access to it could slow down the process or complicate the process, especially for registrants.

But, there was no quantitative data to understand the good versus the bad. You know, so how long did it take? You know, what was the average duration of a transfer? How often did the registrant need to overrule their admin contact? So for example, I think the policy still states today that the administrative contact can initiate a transfer but the form of authorization still goes through the registrant.

So you know, there's some really very simple kind of questions that could've been asked for each one of these issues. You know, even like with the second issue is - which was dealing with the electronic authentication and whether the FOA should be used or not. And is you know - you know, at this particular time again, not everybody was EPP, so I'm not a transfer expert.

But - so I'm not entirely certain whether the FOA was 100% used across the registrars at that time or not and whether it's required just within EPP.

But you know again, some very basic questions as to how often is it used? How many times we're - how many of the transfers that did use FOAs, how many were successful versus how many were unsuccessful? You know, did it slow down the quality of the transfer process? Did it aid it? And, was it - did it intend - you know, did it do what it was intended to do?

Jonathan Zuck: I don't want to interrupt you, but if you took a step back from this, is it your impression that there just wasn't the impetus to collect data, or that there was any barriers to acquiring data? Did there appear to be any effort that was stymied somehow, or is this scenario sort of boiled down to had we had this working group first and established data as an essential practice that it would've been fairly easy to acquire in the case of IRTP-A?

Barry Cobb: Thank you, Jonathan.

You know, I - it just didn't seem like it was asked at all. All of the previous research leading up to the issues were all very qualitative type components. There were - you know, the members of the working group were you know as expert as you can be in the industry that understood the process, so I really don't think that they asked at all. And if they did, I don't - I didn't see any cases of where there was resistance if they did ask.

So Graeme?

Graeme Bunton: Good morning. Graeme Bunton for the transcript.

Working on IRTP-D, we did gather some data around -- man it's too early -- transfer-related stuff. But rather than give out sort of detailed numbers, it ends up being rolled up to a pretty high abstract level and then it's just shared on a call. So we're talking about how many - like as simple as how many

introverted - like transfer - TDRPs have been actually filed? And you know, the number was like 1000 or something like - and there has been some sort of data gathering like that I suspect probably in many of these things too.

People go out and figure out sort of the details and they roll it up for a call, and then you only end up with it in a transcript from eight years ago. So you're never going to be able to track down these sorts of things that exist.

Pamela Little: Pam Little for the transcript.

My recollection is IRTP Part B will be the first time that a PDP working group requested information from the compliance team. Of course, the Part A will be before my time with compliance, so I cannot confirm that, but that is really my recollection.

And I remember how painful it was. We had two staff members sifting through emails trying to gather the data for the working group at that point in time.

Thank you.

Jonathan Zuck: (Unintelligible) compliance had data at the time, and I think it's probably a stretch. It was an inbox, yes, exactly.

Barry Cobb: Thank you Pam, and Graeme, and Jonathan. I think a couple of points there. Graeme, you know, your mention of IRTP-D, we'll come back to this, but I think when we try to wrap our use case analysis stuff up, I'm going to sneak Part D into our matrix even though that effort isn't completed because you're right, they did - in terms of the PDRP, which is one of the issues that they're - being explored. They did acquire data.

That data will - if it's not in the report now, I'm going to make sure that it gets in there. Unfortunately as it is a very low quantity of cases that almost are you know not significant at all. But at least the attempt was there.

And just a bow tie on Part D, there is - they're still dealing with the issue, whether the FOA is still required or necessary in the transfer process. And I think - you know, there's consensus that the FOA should remain in-tact within the transfer process because it provides two things. One primarily an audit trail in case of bad or fraudulent transfers.

And the secondary part of it is kind of a - to factor authentication component. But at the last minute there is some members of the group that have started to state that the FOA is causing more harm than good and it's forcing the working group to circle back and try to acquire data.

So, we are reaching out with a few registrars to get a better understanding of that issue. And you know, if it does turn out that you know - hypothetical numbers here, but let's use the 80/20 rule that 20% of the transfers are failing due to the FOA, then we need to dive in a little bit deeper. Is it by design because it was a bad or you know maybe a potential fraudulent transfer? Or, was it just because it was very confusing for the registrant and the process got messed up, which is probably more likely.

But anyway, it's kind of shedding a little bit more light that the working group didn't have and I think we're going - you know, we're delaying our final report because of that, so - which is good news because we definitely want to make sure we get the right thing going.

And then Pam, in terms of yes, you are correct. I did participate, and I think about the - after the first third of it is when I joined the Part B working group and we did get - ask for requests for - from compliance about that data, which was somewhat informative, but I think that was also in Part B where we did attempt to try to collect some data from contracted parties and there was a little bit of resistance at that time as well.

And then just to put a bow tie on Part A, so the final report didn't have any data or metrics in it either, and as I've mentioned, it was unknown whether they tried to attempt to collect that or make that data - I'm sorry, collect or try to reach out to collect any data. As I had mentioned, you know, they think that there could've been some macro level type of metrics in there to really understand the extent of the problem.

And my last statement in this, and I'll turn it over to you Rudi, is that there were no consensus recommendations out of this working group either. The first one, which was basically about the exchange of email addresses. They basically believed it was in the scope of Whois, which was out of the scope of the working group, and so it was passed on to IRTP Part B to look at it a little bit deeper.

The second issue about the FOA, that was also passed on to what is now Part D.

And then the last one which is - where's my notes?

Oh, about the bulk transfer or the - what is it called? The partial bulk transfers. They basically agreed that there was - shouldn't be any change to the existing policy. So, there were no consensus policies provided to the Council. The Council pretty much closed the effort and then reinitiated the Part B.

So that's the basically note for this use case.

Rudi Vansnick: Rudi for the transcript.

A question that pops up in my mind is when the working group was started up and later on when migrating into the different versions of it, was it well documented in the sense that it was (unintelligible) was expected being produced as specific data? I'm actually in translation and transliteration PDP

working group, and what I discover also is that we don't have a form - we don't have a template that helps us in defining the way you're communicating with other groups - with other working groups - with other parties in ICANN. There is no standard form. There is no template that helps you how you're communicating and how you are getting data back and forth between the groups.

Is that something that in this specific working group has been handled? Has it took so long maybe that there was an experience that we could take from that?

Barry Cobb: Well I can't speak for the working group, but personally I hope that that's one of our outcomes. That we - you know, we do - when we get to the point we will be taking a look at the work products that are produced to start a PDP and that are the outputs of the PDP, or I should just say working group, not just a PDP but any working group.

And, I certainly hope that that is one of our deliverables that we identify the weaknesses in those work products and try to (templify) to the best we can - I mean, we can't foresee every possible question that needs to be asked. But the simple ones can be. You know, what are the critical success factors for this particular policy? What are the metrics to meet those CSFs? You know, and so just - I'm hopeful as an example like in the charter that there's a small subsection somewhere in there that's called metrics, and it has three or four key questions that forces them to ask and then -- and Jonathan's touched on this many of the times -- if it is truly elevated to a consensus policy, is the continuous improvement aspect of it. The - you know, going back six months or a year later to see if the policy that was approved was to be (unintelligible).

Jonathan Zuck: Yes. I mean I'm not - this is Jonathan again. And I think on that note, I think what's important for us to remember is that we haven't been empanelled to judge these previous working groups at all or to be critical necessarily of them, but instead to just look forward and use these case studies to come up

with scenarios that we might encounter in the future as we try to move the ICANN working group process to a more data-driven exercise whenever possible.

I mean obviously there are going to be some working groups that are more qualitative in nature but what we've discovered is several that really would've benefited from a quantitative approach and almost all would benefit from some kind of a look back after the fact to see if what policies were put in place actually address the problem that was raised.

And I think that if we can - you know as Barry created a new word, (templify) that so that you know there's a framework that makes it easy for working groups to follow and then some protocols for requesting data from people that might've been otherwise challenged to get data from, then I think that we'll have done our job there.

And, I think it's just a question of very slowly just trying to change the culture toward one that's more quantitative in nature. I think that's really the - you know, as (unintelligible) has tried to do.

And the compliance I guess as (unintelligible) said. So we're trying to do that across-the-board and - but I don't think - the only reason for looking back, this is - is to see the categories of challenges that we may face in the future as opposed to judge the work that they did because we weren't there.

Pamela Little: Pam Little.

I was at a compliance session yesterday and they were presenting the statistic of the work they've been doing in terms of the compliance they've been processing each trimester.

So I was still very surprised to see nothing really seemed to have changed in terms of types of compliance that are occupying the top two buckets. One is

Whois inaccuracies, right. We can all get that. That represents over 80% of the compliance they process. And the other one is IRTP. That represents over 13%.

So if we can resolve or reduce the compliance from these two issues, we actually can substantially reduce the amount of work compliance has to do.

So what I'm trying to say is IRTP over the years we have many working groups, but it doesn't seem to have reduced the number of complaints, disputes, or issues that still linger on. So maybe that's a witness in the way we didn't actually measure the effectiveness of the original policy in subsequent working groups A, B, C, whenever it's been implemented.

Jonathan Zuck: I think that's exactly right. I think that's very right. And we just need to build into the process culturally basically, going back and looking at the policies to see if they work is part of the task. You're not done at throwing some things at the wall and saying, "Let's try this," and then we move on.

Pamela Little: Yes. So the exercise becomes perpetually making new policies and enforcing compliant or handling complaints so it doesn't - it just seems to be not really going to the root of the cause of the problems right.

Jonathan Zuck: Right.

Barry Cobb: This is Barry.

So you know, I think to add on to that, you are right. You know, the Whois inaccuracies are the biggest chunk of the number of complaints they receive. Understanding that many of those are from big brands that are doing bulk submissions of Whois inaccuracy complaints, that's one aspect of it.

In regards to the transfers, you know, I would - that - based on what I have seen, and I don't know - I haven't - I wasn't at the compliance, but I've seen

some pretty more - well detailed analysis about some of those transfer issues that ICANN receives, and the first point is that you know that's only a very small percentage of the complaints globally. You know, it's only those that get to ICANN that ICANN sees.

You know, at the registrar level, on the frontline of the retails aspect of it, you know there - I'm sure there are tons of complaints in that regard. You know, because it is a complicated process. It's hard for registrants to understand exactly what's going on.

But the point is I think that compliance has done a better job of categorizing those complaints and even more so - and I don't know if this is a part of their presentation or not, but when they execute or review those complaints and then they close them out, they're reconfirming what the true cause code was for that complaint.

And sometimes - you know I think in the past they used to get miscategorized, and that was one of the big issues back in Part B is that - you know, it was originally classified - the user could input what category they thought it was, which was often a mistake. But then when it was closed out, it didn't get reclassified as the right category. So, I think that that's been cleaned up.

And then again, the closure codes - so you know, it would be interesting - and I'm not sure if contractual compliance is evolved to this, but to get into the minutia of that 13% of those transfers that they see, which my understanding I think they're more complicated components. You know, it's - a registrar's not responding or those kinds of issues.

But anyway, they can get to more granularity as to what the distribution of those complaints are, which I think is a good thing. And I'll stop there.

Okay. So let's - I think in terms of these - reviewing these use cases, the last thing I'll say about this is there's a couple of points to be made here. Clearly after London we'll reconvene our normal working group at our various times, and I was talking with Jonathan about when we would meet again next. And what we're contemplating would be around the week of the 14th. So about two weeks or maybe the week of the 21st.

But the point I'm trying to make here is you know we've done a decent analysis in our use cases now, and what I'm proposing is that staff - we're going to go back and pick maybe one - at most two more efforts and kind of do this same exercise here. But, we won't necessarily go further into the details with the working group. I'll probably pick like Part B, even though it's not completely implemented, and maybe one other working group. I need to figure out which ones that are good candidates.

But I want to compile all of our work here into a spreadsheet so that it's in one document so we can do side-by-side comparisons.

And I was talking with Jonathan about trying to - ranking is probably a wrong word. He had mentioned categorizing - you know, that there's four or five kind of components that - to try to detect the theme out of this. Have that prepared all into one document spreadsheet of sorts. Be able to summarize the categorization of what our findings were of this use case so that it can be something usable within our report. And, more or less draw this part of the - of our effort to a close in terms of the past.

With that said, if I - did we already talk (pedner) on the call, or was that our own conversation?

Jonathan Zuck: What about that?

Barry Cobb: ERP?

So I can't remember if I'm repeating myself.

So one of the things is the (pedner) use case that we reviewed through, which is - you know, they did have a lot of data in terms of surveying the community and registrars, but there was some friction about getting data from contracted parties on the expiration. I'm going to be sharing that use case with Alan Greenburg that Chaired that working group. He was going to provide input and he's also...

Jonathan Zuck: Getting some color commentary I think.

Barry Cobb: Getting some color commentary. And if - he offered to join our group to brief a little bit more in detail as well, because I think that that one's kind of on the pedestal that kind of reinforced how this effort got started.

That said, you know, know it is a consensus policy ERP. And just to repeat from several weeks ago, some of the - of my initial dialog with contractual compliance actually shows that that policy, despite the challenges, is very positive. That there's some positive results out of that. And, I'm working with the compliance team to get data pre-policy and then post-policy.

And in fact, it was actually a resolution from (pedner) that ICANN staff report back to the community about the effectiveness of this. And it's kind of I guess - you know, it only got implemented last year, but it's kind of been - I don't want to go as far as forgotten. I forgot it personally, but - and so I was glad that I came across it.

At any rate - so at our next session I want to hopefully have enough information that we can wrap up the use case analysis and move on to the next section of our work, which is kind of starting down the road of defining the framework by which we can engage contracted parties for data metrics for policy making protocols.

You know, and that particular activity again is not necessarily focusing on any type of data, but again defining a framework, but for a future working group in which they may need to engage a contracted party for that. So you know like what are the boundaries by which data may be made available? What are you know cost implications? Are there any issues with transparency? You know, competitive areas?

Jonathan Zuck: Competitive issues or access to the data.

Barry Cobb: Exactly. Right. Some of those things.

And so having talked with several registrars, they're - it sounds like they're interested in participating in that. And certainly what I will say is - in parallel to me trying to finish up the use case analysis aspect, I will also be sending a note to the chairs of the registry and registrar stakeholder groups because I think you know this is - it'll be important for them to attend and attend largely.

And, it sounds like there's some interest. So when we get to that point, then we can bring it up.

Graeme?

Graeme Bunton: This seems like a good point to mention that we were talking about this working group in the registrar constituency day, and there is a strong recognition within the registrar within that - our constituency that there's - this is interesting. It's important. Data is helpful.

I think the reality of how things may work is that because our industry is so competitive and we have to be so careful with our data that it could be that working groups end up doing something like requesting the results of analysis rather than raw data, and registrars end up compiling and sharing our data with a third party who then does that analysis because we can't share data between each other very well.

We just did an interesting job of that to release the number of domains that have been suspended. I don't know if everybody saw that. That was quite a process, and the numbers we ended up sharing are rolled up so high and so extracted from the actual like domain level transaction that's happening that you know we're sharing a single field basically amongst each other.

And even then, in that scenario, we can give the number of domains suspended and you know the approximate percentage of registrations that have gone through the process, but then you can't say the number of registrars that participated because now I can do the math and tell you who those registrars were, and it's not hard.

So what was all that rambling about? All of that rambling was about we're interested - we're really interested especially because it helps our case a lot I think. Registrars know a lot about how things work. How customers interface with all the stuff that ICANN touches. And, we really want to participate. We're nervous about how to do that the best way, but we want to start for real working on that because it's going to strengthen our position in many ways within the ICANN community.

Barry Cobb: That's great, Graeme.

I mean, and I think that this process should be open to all of those different scenarios. Data going to a third party to be rolled up and analyzed and anonymized at some level, and just finding the most effective way and finding the pathways, how do we ask what timeframe is needed to get data, et cetera, to build that into scheduling?

I think having those conversations so that - and it's not just you know registrar data or registry data. It's third party data. It's sources - I think we're going to look at all of them. But definitely in the case of registrars, figuring out how to

navigate those waters so that it's not a new discovery process every time there's a working group I think is the point of this conversation.

So I think that's - I think that'll be really productive.

Rudi Vansnick: Rudi for the transcript.

I'm just wondering if the idea would be good of trying to define what data can be expected getting from the different groups and which type of form ups would be used in order to be able - like for instance, a trade matter, a translation and transliteration working group would have some issues in getting data back from some SOs and ACs? But it was not clear to us neither what kind of form up we could use to ask for the data.

So I think it would be good if we could define some types of format of data that can be expected so that the other group knows also what is required and what we expect from them in order to avoid that you have to go back and forth and lose time and at the end not get the data - getting the data, you produce a recommendation that doesn't fit in the whole program.

Jonathan Zuck: Yes. I mean, I think I - I think what we're going to try to do rather than try to predict every type of data is look at categories of data. So data that has competitive aspects, data that has antitrust aspects, whatever the variables might be, try to find those categories of data and come up with frameworks for requesting it going forward.

Does that make sense Graeme?

Graeme Bunton: Totally. Sorry, this is Graeme.

The 8:00 am session is after (unintelligible) are not good for me.

The thing I am seeing as someone who deals with data every day in their day job as we talk about within their - our constituency and in working groups have participated in, and then I think will be extremely challenging for this group is that the people who participate in working groups are policy people for the most part. And, asking them to look at a problem and translate that into a data request is extremely difficult.

And then, pass that back to somewhere inside a contracted party or whomever it is into what then ends up being a database query usually, it's a really abstracted process. And you know until you can get the - you know, the BI person in the room to understand what the actual business problem is and they can translate that and understand how that you know is a concrete thing that you can pose is extremely difficult.

I think we're going to have to spend a lot of time thinking about how to help people bridge that gap.

And I would say as well that you know staff needs to be doing a better job of that as well. You know, to help translate some of those requirements from the policy component to the other side of it as well. You know, mentioning the BI - - business intelligence -- is very important. You know, I think at least amongst the four or five of us, you know we do live that every day, and unfortunately we can't attend every working group to force those questions, which again kind of goes back to the nature of what we're trying to accomplish here. There's at least some form of template and consistency by which this is requested that you know we can hopefully streamline it and then make it a - you know, a - that they ask for it by default.

Sorry, this is Graeme again. It occurred to me I have an interesting example of this sort of thing I'm talking about here, where (Dave Piscatello), who I've never met and may or may not be ICANN staff -- is that correct -- published a - I think it was him, on security steps. Is that him?

He published this blog post yesterday about this unprecedented opportunity of data sharing that a number of you put (unintelligible) suspended domains is - listed all of these wonderful things that you know researchers could do with this data and it really sounds so much about the data that was shared and collected.

It's an entertaining read, and he - it really is sort of a presumption that we're pulling these sort of transactional database things and all of the registrars have compatible systems and you know, it's one clean, perfect dataset and it's not.

It was a single number between - like literally you know a single field that was shared between a number of registrars and collected through a third party. There's no granularity there.

Rudi Vansnick: Rudi for the transcript.

While having some experience with EPP, already what I see is between different registries, you see that there are different EPPs implemented having other fields to use. So already, you start having different data if you just go back to the raw data based on the fact that protocols are not implemented in a unique form, which doesn't allow you to compare either how good or how bad your operation is.

So if at operational level, you don't have a clear view of transparency of data between groups between groups, how difficult it is to implement policy already at that level. So I'm thinking about - would it be a good idea to try to give some information back to the EPP world in order to get away from the differences that they are creating themselves by implementing protocols based on policy that doesn't have the same outcome at the end?

Barry Cobb: Thank you Rudi.

You know, it's interesting that you mention that. I had dinner with Scott Hollenbach the other night which defined the RFC for EPP, and you know my background is from the IBM days, and I always look at this as you know whether it's ICANN or IATF.

But the general concept is you have an enterprise architecture board and they define the standards by which the lines of business use databases, and messaging systems, and electronic chat systems, et cetera, and it's always kind of surprised me that there wasn't some kind of like Whois or an EPP czar and that there is some component of - you know, because I look at every contracted party whether it's the registries or registrars almost as a line of business under ICANN.

And, I know that there's a fair amount of customization required on these systems based on their business model and those kinds of things. But you know I get to the point where you know as EPP evolves and it starts to mature, but it's overly customized and it becomes even more difficult when you need to go to upgrade to the next version. So it's kind of digressing in that regard.

But I see where your point is.

So we only have about six minutes left, and I think we've pretty much more or less accomplished our agenda, although it didn't seem as straightforward. But, we did talk about when we meet next. And like I said, I'll either target the week of the 14th or the week of the 21st. We'll wrap up the use case analysis and then our second meeting, which would probably be towards the end of July.

And then, we'll get into more the interesting work that we have planned ahead of us. And as I mentioned, we'll also be reaching out to the Chairs of the stakeholder groups to encourage their mass participation in (unintelligible) teams.

Jonathan?

Jonathan Zuck: All I would say is that the work product of this phase is a set of use cases going forward. I'll ask Graeme in particular if you look at that to see if there's use cases kind of that we might've missed from the case studies that we did. In other words, things that you recall or anticipate happening in the future that we should build into our analysis going forward.

Because I think the next piece of this is actually pretty - this product is pretty small. It's just like you know, there was this - we wanted this type of data, but there was just kind of a challenge how should we approach that challenge in the future? So if you can - if you would take a special look at that, the use cases themselves, that's what we need to be as strong as possible for the next steps.

Graeme Bunton: Sure.

As IRTP-D winds down for me, I (unintelligible) to wind up a little bit more over here.

Jonathan Zuck: Yes, it's more of a thought exercise (unintelligible).

Graeme Bunton: Sure. I don't...

Jonathan Zuck: One we could do (unintelligible).

Graeme Bunton: No. No. I have been sort of hanging out on the fringes of this particular working group as I free up some time.

Jonathan Zuck: Perfect. Thank you.

Barry Cobb: And speaking of action items, I forgot to tell you, but several meetings ago, I think you had tasked (unintelligible) New York - you tasked one of the working group members, and I'll leave it at that, to - when we were reviewing through one of the use cases, we were talking - I think we kind of zeroed in on - there's a required step of the working group guidelines that in the initial stages of a working group we reach out to the SOs and ACs to get their input on the issues.

And I think we were usefully loosely using the term surveying because it's often just a series of questions based off the charter questions, "Hey, SO/AC, how do you feel about this issue?" And, we try to get some initial input.

So, I did have a sidebar - talked to (Tony Arnado). You had gave him an action item to kind of look into the survey aspect of it. So we did have a sidebar conversation and talked through the components of that, and I think the outcome of that discussion was that you know it is a required step of the working group process or the PDP process. But that it shouldn't just be limited to SOs and ACs.

You know, I think if anything, one of the main recommendations that was brought to light from the multistakeholder innovation stuff was that you know we should be reaching out to more experts beyond just this community.

But I think that - so that would be kind of one mini recommendation and I'm documenting that to send to the group so we can talk about it at some point in time.

And then the secondary component is that that particular outreach also include a - sorry a quantitative component so that we can...

Man: (Unintelligible)...

((Crosstalk))

Barry Cobb: Yes, exactly.

                   So I owe you that action item. I just wanted to let you know.

Jonathan Zuck: Yes. I guess we all have to go. I just remembered the other thing from the -
                   from Saturday was a request for us to coordinate with - was it GNSO review
                   team or was it another - right? There was a request for us to cross-pollinate
                   that Jonathan made, right?

Barry Cobb: Yes. I need to look. I think he did add that as an action item for the Council.
                   You know, they're just getting started with that, so we'll keep an eye on it. But
                   yes, that's right.

Jonathan Zuck: Okay. Thanks.

Barry Cobb: All right, well I think that wraps up our session for today. Again, thank you for
                   the mass participation. Go team. And we'll make it more interesting in the
                   future.

Jonathan Zuck: No morning after (unintelligible).

Barry Cobb: You can stop the recording, so thank you very much.

                                        END