

Transcription ICANN Buenos Aires Data and Metrics for Policy Making WG

Wednesday 25 June 2015

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/#fjun> The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page

Jonathan Zuck: Good morning, Buenos Aires. And welcome to the DMPM meeting at ICANN 53. We'll go around the room, have everyone introduce themselves and them - but let's start with the phone. Who do we have on the phone?

Man: Hi, Jonathan, it's (unintelligible).

Jonathan Zuck: Go ahead, Pam.

Pam Little: Pam Little.

Graeme Bunton: Graeme Bunton from Tucows.

Steve Chan: Steve Chan from staff.

Berry Cobb: Berry Cobb assisting ICANN staff.

Jonathan Zuck: Jonathan Zuck from ACT and the IPC.

Sara Bockey: Sara Bockey, Go Daddy.

Jennifer Scott: Jennifer Scott, ICANN staff.

Jonathan Zuck: All right, thanks everyone. Berry, you ready to tell us what we're doing?

Berry Cobb: Yes. Berry Cobb for the transcript.

((Crosstalk))

Berry Cobb: So I sent out an agenda a couple of days ago which is pretty simple in that we are going to just be reviewing the initial report that was sent out about a week and a half ago. So I think that's really all we're going to be doing.

So what I recommend that we do is call this meeting to a close and go back to bed. No seriously, so I have loaded into the Adobe Connect room. I'll go ahead and unsync this for everybody so you can scroll through on your own.

So I think when we had our last call there was a previous version of the initial report that had a lot of suggestions, basically comments to the side or to the right of the document. So I since then created a different version that incorporated those comments and adjusted the proposed draft recommendations that we have in here so far.

So what I'm going to do, really not, is we'll just basically start with Section 5. And actually I'm going to take back control. So Section 5 of the report is again the deliberations and recommendations of the group. And if you'll recall from our previous version, there were a series of observations that had led to a more general recommendation.

And I had the -- I just can't think this morning.

Jonathan Zuck: No problem, I wonder if -- I mean I feel like the recommendations at this level were pretty uncontroversial. What might be worth delving into if the pilot project and the proposed budget because we'd want to try to quantify -- I think those are things to maybe work out. Those are great topics for discussion maybe. I don't know, if there's something that folks in reading this have had an issue with then let's definitely discuss it.

But it seems to me those are the big topics that have mostly come out of staff at this juncture, right, I mean thought might be worth some kind of...

((Crosstalk))

Graeme Bunton: What is there anything out of the GNSO update that we should mull over too?

Jonathan Zuck: Yeah, that's a good question as well, Graeme. I was thinking I should do some kind of reporting on that. But that update went pretty well. I would say that there were a couple of issues that were raised at Council. Anne Aikman - was it Anne Aikman-Scalese or - no, there wasn't that -- no, it was somebody from NCSG, I'm probably forgetting the names, was concerned about what we might be trying to do to prevent bias in the data that we received.

And I think that that's a legitimate concern. But in most instances and metrics we're talking about don't involve complex regression analysis or something like that. It's like how many transfers are requested in how they failed? Let's try to cut that number in half, it's not going to be higher order math for a lot of bias enters in, right, it's not an interpretive mathematical exercise or an exercise in economics.

And to the degree that it is I think that will more often result in a study or something like that rather than the group attempting to do anything particularly sophisticated. So that was one issue.

And then, Berry, do you remember what the other issue was? I mean I guess it was more about can you get -- will you be able to get all the data or only some of the data? And that's an issue that Graeme raised at one point that some folks will be in a better position to supply data than others. And if you have only some of the data it may reflect one business model over another and then that may skew the data.

And I don't have a ready answer to that question either except to say that presumably that would encourage people to submit data to make it as objective as possible and that we have to deal with that on a case-by-case basis. People would probably raise that, you know, when it happened. I'm not sure there's anything we can do to inoculate our process to that problem.

Because we're not in a position to change registry and registrar contracts for example, to compel the production of data. You know, so I think that'll just be a discussion on a case-by-case basis I think. But beyond that people seem pretty positive about it and excited about the recommendation so. Anything to add, Berry? Do you remember?

Berry Cobb: The only one thing that I'll add...

Jonathan Zuck: (Kavi), that really turned people on, that was - that's what got people out of their seats.

Berry Cobb: What was?

Jonathan Zuck: (Kavi), the (Kavi) update.

Berry Cobb: Oh yeah, yeah. You know, I think the one thing which I believe you had responded to at the Council update was that, you know, in terms of the bias to data is well we don't have any data now anyway so let's, you know, let's acquire some first and then worry about the bias later.

But for sure, you know, I think in general what's important here, and I guess I really need to just revert back to the recommendations that we started here which will maybe hopefully increase some of the dialogue.

So for the Charter Question C, I believe, which kind of gets into first putting together a pilot program. There were two recommendations here, one is the pilot program itself and then the second is seeking a community budget request.

I originally, you know, as it's put in this version of the document I split them both apart because it seemed like the appropriate thing to do but I'm starting to second guess that because the pilot program is the budget aspect. And so right now we have it listed that that community, or really the GNSO, that community members in the GNSO would make a budget request.

What I don't know yet is the exact process by how that gets accomplished. There is a current pilot program that is just starting to take off and it has to deal with -- I think that the overall community had requested assistance from the SGs and Cs - or for the SGs and Cs help with those groups documenting or helping to write their position statements.

For example, the BC chose to submit a public comment that they would have some kind of assistance and not necessarily a Secretariat perspective but drafting assistance. So if you're not aware what you'll probably see shortly is, and they're trying to collaborate with the different SGs and Cs as to what that assistance might look like. So it's I think a one FTE person that has experience in this regard.

And they will collaborate with various stakeholder groups or constituencies to help them draft their public comment response. It'll be an iterative process obviously, the end result is the voice of that particular group that's being assisted with.

At any rate, the point is is that there was some community funds that were allocated to provide or to, you know, to find that particular resource. So I need to understand exactly how that request was made because what is familiar to everybody here is, you know, each fiscal year budgeting cycle each SG and C submits how much they think that they're going to need for travel support. And they will ask other requests.

So somehow in that process is what Recommendation 2 is about. So I want to try to get some more details on what that process looks like so I think it'll better inform the GNSO Council when they go to review this particular one. Because I think currently it's up to each SG and C to submit their own budget request not all the SGs and Cs together. So that's what I need to understand.

The secondary part that I want to touch on in terms of, you know, getting funds for this is how we -- how much do we ask for or how much does the community asked for. And certainly it's not going to be an unlimited budget, you know, it's not going to be anywhere in the ballpark of like the Whois studies that were \$250,000.

So I think the group needs to understand or try to help shape this recommendation to make it reasonable because it is a pilot program. So you know, do we keep it at or do we explicitly say \$25,000 or leave it generic because we don't know what kind of future metrics requests might be made, which is kind of the chicken and the egg thing.

You know, let's foreshadow to September when the Council were to approve this group's recommendations, you know, I don't see anything in the pipeline right now that would where we start to test the pilot right away. So that's a couple of things to think about in regards to these two recommendations.

Jonathan Zuck: Yeah, I mean, I guess the amount, if we start with the - oh sorry, thank you. I guess it's going to really depends year-to-year on what comes through the pipeline as you say. You know, I don't have a sense of what that cost. I don't

know if it's something that Graeme or Pam could speak to in the context of contracted parties or if somebody's had some experience grabbing data from a third-party source.

But \$25,000 feel very low to me as a year's worth of data for the workgroups. But I agree that we can't make the number feel too heavy just given that it's kind of like a reserved budget for workgroups that haven't been formed yet or something like that. I don't know what the best approach is.

In my, you know, sort of rough calculations in my head I feel like that number is closer to \$100,000 but I don't know. Yeah.

Graeme Bunton: We were...

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Zuck: ...for the record.

Graeme Bunton: Oh sorry, this is Graeme for the transcript. We were looking at sort of a top-tier analytics company to do some consulting and the rate was in the range of about \$12,000 a day.

Jonathan Zuck: Yeah, no, a top-tier analytics company is a little bit a different issue.

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Zuck: Because you're trying to get them to think about the data and saying -- I guess what I'm thinking is they would probably be -- if I came to you with a data request and it was data that you didn't want to share until it had been scrubbed, right, and so we hired an outside firm just to do the scrubbing of the data.

And so their primary purpose was not even doing anything particularly difficult by taking the rest on stability of turning confidential data into data that could be shared with the working group. I mean, what do you imagine that cost would be? I mean maybe it's...

Graeme Bunton: Certainly considerably less than that but I don't think it's wildly cheap.

Jonathan Zuck: Yeah, I don't think it's wildly cheap either. So I mean, I don't know. I mean, so the question is do you think we could put a number out there like \$100,000 or is that just going to blow everybody's mind?

What's the process been in the past for workgroups to request budget on a case-by-case basis?

Berry Cobb: This is Berry. I don't know that there have been. I mean, to my recollection the only request that I remotely familiar with was the main Whois studies that were, you know, pushed several years ago that took several years to complete and that was well over, you know, \$250,000 that was allocated. You know, so that I've only been involved in working groups since around 2009 and I don't recollect any kind of request.

Jonathan Zuck: In the IAG for the CCT review prep did an off cycle budget request via interim board recommendation from the workgroup for this survey of the public on consumer trust and all so this economic study on pricing in the TLD space. So, I mean, that ended up being framed as an interim recommendation, it wasn't a final recommendation but it was an interim recommendation so that something could get started.

And the board was able to approve it and the study was able to happen and both of those things got you know, discussed at this meeting. So I guess it's possible, I mean, we did that in the IAG. That was a pretty high-stakes AOC review obviously and not just some random working group. But I don't know.
Pam.

Pam Little: Yeah, doesn't sound to make a lot of sense to put a dollar value to me without knowing the scope at this point. Because we just said we're going to set a flat cap and without, you know, the specific of a data request to me it doesn't make a lot of sense.

Jonathan Zuck: So are you advocating each workgroup making its own request for funds?

Pam Little: Yes I am.

Jonathan Zuck: Yeah, that'll just be slow. I guess that's going to be the difficulty associated with it because it will require probably -- they might require a board meeting or at least the Council meeting.

Berry Cobb: So this is Berry again. You know, I think what's important about this part of the recommendation is that it's not the working group. The nexus for how this really came about was looking at prior to even the issue report is the issue identification stage.

So that if the community starts to deliberate on a particular issue, and I'm just going to use privacy proxy as an example because it's quite emotional right now, and my example is probably not real world but before it became a twinkle in the GNSO Council's eyes, so to speak, and Graeme, correct me if I'm wrong but, you know, I believe it was either the IPC or that BC that was saying that this was quite an issue.

It became deliberated on the Council, the Council then requested or got the issue report approved. The staff created the issue report then it became a PDP. And I've heard from community members in the past well, was this really a big enough issue to even warrant a PDP? So the real idea here is that the stakeholder groups and constituencies can request funds to get access to particular data to validate whether it's really a big enough issue or not.

So in the grand scheme of 200 plus million registrations that the revealing of privacy and proxy is only 1%. And again, this is a bad example but, you know, does that 1% warrant all this time, effort to even get to an eventual working group? So that's I think where we're really trying to attack that part of the process so that for example, so that BC does say that this is an issue.

You might request funds or you put forward the issue, the Registrar Stakeholder Group says well no it's not an issue, they would actually request the funds to provide the data and metrics for that particular issue. And then to avoid the bias that was brought up on Saturday is that, you know, the request is made. Obviously staff is there to assist in that process.

We get some sort of data back but it's done in an open and transparent way to try to avoid the bias because if the Registrars made the request they're the ones driving it, you could easily add bias to say oh no, there's not a problem. So, you know, we've got to make that that it's shared across all the stakeholder groups and constituencies.

Once that report is complete should it be, you know, get to that stage and is used to be discussed at the GNSO Council level, then of course that report would accompany an issue report should it be determined that it truly is an issue worthy of further exploration.

So I think when we start to try to socialize this with the community and certainly the GNSO Council that's kind of the premise of where this budget allocation should be coming from. When we are in a more formal working group stage, you know, as was pointed out, there have been -- there's already processes in place for the community to more or less request to staff that we need funds to do additional research such as you pointed out for the IAG.

Jonathan Zuck: It's Jonathan for the transcript. Absent our recommendation, if there was just a motivation, would it normally be that somebody would make a motion for Council to request that a study be done for scoping a particular problem? I mean, is that kind of how this would go down generally, that I would just send my IPC councilors to the Council meeting and say, we'd like to propose a motion that a study be done on privacy proxy because we think that it's a bigger problem, we in the IPC think it's a big problem and it deserves a workgroup to look at it.

And then the group would just vote to find the money to do it? I mean I wonder if that's necessarily a flawed -- is that a flawed mechanism?

Berry Cobb: This is Berry. No, I mean, that's basically the process. And the decision tree that we created was really kind of just documenting the obvious, you know, that's more or less what does happen. I think the only thing that that particular instrument doesn't provide or that -- in the real world is how slow that is, which kind of comes back to trying to have some kind of funds that are allocated.

The whole point of this is that you get to, you know, make an immediate request and there's a credit card sitting there so to speak, you know, that we can just run it and hopefully get, you know, the results of some sort of report within six weeks or something and not six months. So, you know, that's definitely one of the other aspects to this.

But to your -- to answer your question, yes, I mean that is the general process. You know, whoever has the particular issue, you know, they put that forward to the GNSO Council and then of course there needs to be agreement at the Council that more research should be done. Once that is approved as a formal resolution then it's passed along to staff to figure out where the funds would come from.

And at least as far as I know today, within the GNSO realm there is no budget allocated directly, you know, that's just sitting there. And like -- and I'm sure you're all familiar with, if you have a little bucket of money sitting there and it never gets used then it goes away the next budget cycle because, you know, or if it's not used enough it's reallocated or somehow requests come in that tap that budget for what it wasn't originally allocated for.

So that's probably not likely either especially from the community budget request. But that's more in the finance world.

Pam Little: Pam Little. So, Berry, just on what you said, would it make more sense that we make some sort of recommendation to have some fun reserved for the GNSO for collecting data purpose as a general views rather than working group specific amount? Say in ICANN's annual budget there would be an amount for that purpose.

Berry Cobb: Yeah, that's basically what the recommendation should do. Exactly how staff will go about implementing that recommendation I'm not quite clear. You know, since we're -- again, I'm trying to think into the future so let's assume that we have a recommend -- the working group's recommendations are approved by the Council around September time frame will have already passed the fiscal year '16 window for the community to submit any kind of budget request.

So in terms of implementation of some sort now we're looking at fiscal year 17...

Jonathan Zuck: When is that?

Berry Cobb: That usually starts around December-ish I believe. But that's not to say that in terms of the pilot program...

Jonathan Zuck: The fiscal year starts July, right? (Unintelligible).

Berry Cobb: That's correct.

Jonathan Zuck: We've already missed it.

Berry Cobb: Correct, right.

((Crosstalk))

Berry Cobb: Right. But again, you know, what we're talking about again is this imaginary bucket of money set aside for that. That's not to say that come September or October 1 the recommendations that have been approved, staff starts to implement and the IPC realizes oh, we need to have some kind of research done. You know, I'm sure one way or another staff, ICANN will be able to figure out how and where there could be some budget or monies allocated to that particular request.

And this kind of goes back to why I'm almost of the opinion that the two recommendations that we have listed in the report be combined as one so that there's true connection to that because otherwise if it's - I mean, it's ultimately up to the working group but just to have a pilot program without any kind of funds allocated or connected to that than we're already really talking just steady-state, not some kind of pilot program. Does that make sense?

Jonathan Zuck: It's Jonathan. I mean, a pilot program could end up testing -- if the, you know, data pizza fund is not approved, the pilot project is then the pilot project I guess could try to go through normal channels to get data. It occurs to me that, I mean, the actual process of this, with that in fact be an issue report or just something prior to even an issue report being done there would just be like a scoping analysis or something like that?

And if that's true do we need to actually try to noodle changes to see - issue report request process that introduces - I suppose the IPC requesting it, do

we need - a scoping necessarily going to come before issue report do we need to introduce as we are in these other process documents. If there a Council process document in which we should be trying to insert something about data prior to an issue report request of staff?

Steve Chan: Thanks Jonathan. So this is Steve from staff. So the request for issue report, I actually just filled one out for the new gTLD subsequent rounds one. And it actually does ask data-driven questions. I think what this pilot and the budget would do is actually make that gathering of data and scoping of the data more feasible. So it actually asks those questions it's just, it might not be reasonable for the party identifying the issue to actually get the data. And so I guess we'd be facilitating it but it does ask the questions, I think that should be asked.

Jonathan Zuck: Okay, so you feel like the issue report request form already has the requisite data? So the question though is, that being we're talking about is something that happens prior to an issue report or is the issue report process the best place to do it and it just gets short-circuited by a scoping analysis that happens first and then the issue report is, hey, this is not an issue. Do you know what I'm saying? That question make any sense procedurally?

Steve Chan: This is Steve again. So the request itself is what goes to counsel. So ideally you're doing the research beforehand and then, you know, the responses are the data into that actual form before it gets to Council.

Jonathan Zuck: So the request - isn't a request that data be part of the issue report, the request for an issue report includes questions about data that are assumed have already been gathered?

Steve Chan: Exactly.

Jonathan Zuck: Okay.

Berry Cobb: But in that case a discussion group had already been formed. You know - no, no I mean, it's -- it is a good example but it's a good example for that stage of the policy process. And I think this kind of goes back to what you were mentioning, Jonathan, about the process itself is how does this request become materialized before even a discussion group get started?

Jonathan Zuck: I still haven't gotten clarity on what a discussion group is.

Berry Cobb: You know...

Jonathan Zuck: A coffee klatch. But, I mean, so the question is, is there -- are we trying to introduce another process in the Council which is a scoping request and that might happen prior to initial report request? And if so, is there something we need to do to formalize that new stage in policy development?

Berry Cobb: And I would say yes. So, you know, again let's kind of go back to the example. The IPC, through its deliberations, determines that there is some kind of issue that they need more research on. And because we aren't at a working group or discussion group or issue report stage, you know, does the Council even need to be involved at all? And should it be that the IPC fills out the form and submits it directly to staff. We are interested in finding more data about this particular issue. And somehow, you know, again that...

Jonathan Zuck: I mean, that sounds great but that does require finding money in advance probably.

Berry Cobb: Right and that's why, you know, that's why I was thinking, you know, again there's this allocated budget, this credit card that exists out there, within reasonable means. You know, if the IPC were to come forward with a request and we, you know, part of that request is you define the requirements, you define some of the scope of the data that you're looking for, you've already helped identify who might have that data...

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Zuck: So this is another document we probably need to create too.

Berry Cobb: Well I think we have that, right, you know, that metrics request form. That's, you know, that's the request that you would submit either to the Council or to staff, probably at this point would be staff instead of the Council. Staff would take that request, question you on it, you know, and, you know, are these requirements valid? Is the scope of this request appropriate?

You know, again you might already have an idea of who has the data. Then the question is well how much is it going to cost? And if it is within, you know, a \$20,000 range or something then, you know, I don't think that that would be a huge concern. You know, when it gets above \$50,000 or something then that's a fair chunk of money and that's where things would break down.

So - but, you know, I guess we're debating into a future that we really don't know what some of those requests look like. And that's why - I'll just stop there.

Oh and now I remember. You know, that's why earlier back, you know, I wanted to use IRTP-D as the example. Now granted, that's a very far out into the future because those recommendations need to be implemented and a year needs to go out. And it's likely more staff-driven as a result of the implementation of those recommendations and not necessarily a use case for here.

But at the end of the day it is a real world example of how data is going to need to be acquired. But, again this is at the tail end of the policy process and what this is about more is at the very beginning. So, you know, and trying to think about the future - let's assume that it's not a pilot program but there is this credit card that exists out there, you know, three years from now is there

going to be 15 requests every month for, you know, well I need access to this type of data from the BC.

The Registries are requesting this kind of data. Or is it going to be just a one-off kind of thing that happens every six months? So it's really hard to predict what that might look like. And I think what we need to do, at least in terms of these recommendations is shape some kind of fence around that so that it doesn't get out of hand and that everybody is asking for this report and that report and this data and that data and then all of a sudden we've got a \$300,000 credit card bill.

So we need to figure out some kind of control mechanism around that so that it's meaningful...

((Crosstalk))

Berry Cobb: So. I think we've kind of talked enough about this. Let's just quickly run through some of the other...

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Zuck: How do we - sorry, I didn't want to go on the record. This is Jonathan. Should we just come up with a number and that we throw over the transom at Council and just see what the reaction is to it? Should we just say \$50,000 or something like that?

Graeme Bunton: This is Graeme. I would go \$50,000. Fifty days of \$1000 a day consulting to do that seems like enough days to get something done in a pilot project or two.

Berry Cobb: And at least it's something tangible other than saying...

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Zuck: The following year you can say we need more and it's working well or people are abusing it and we need to do, I mean...

Sara Bockey: Sara Bockey. Yeah, I completely agree with what you all are saying and what Graeme said. I think at this point we just have to pick a number, see how it works and go from there. I mean...

Jonathan Zuck: See, that's the benefit of a small crew here early in the morning. We just make decisions like that. I love it. We've got multistakeholderism and a desire to go back to bed.

Berry Cobb: So let's go ahead and move on. We only have 15 minutes left - just to kind of quickly talk about some of the other recommendations. So in Adobe Connect room I have viewed - we had discussions prior to about the principles that had been created. And I think in terms of this version of the report I'm still kind of in a quagmire as to how we deal with this. And I do need your help to figure out what we're going to do.

The way these principles are outlined now there's no home for them and there's nothing to specifically implement. You know, so, you know, after we get back home I need assistance from the group to figure out what to do with these. And do we sunset them in a way or do, as Jonathan I think you had suggested prior to do we figure out how to reward these and find a home for them in the Working Group Guidelines?

And so for sure what the group needs to do is read every line of the Working Group Guidelines so that we can try to find a home for some of these. I did make a suggestion which is still in the comments for some of these around Page 50 of Section 4.4 of the Working Group Guidelines. But again we still need to figure out what to do with these so that we can wrap that part up.

Jonathan Zuck: Berry, I'd certainly agree. I mean my sense on principles is that we either need to find a way to actualize them in the Working Group Guidelines or you throw them in the introduction. I mean, I don't think principles make sense as part of a recommendation.

Berry Cobb: All right great. Thank you. So again please take a look at those and let's figure out a path forward to get those resolved. So the next kind of part of recommendations is in Section 5.3.5.2...

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Zuck: ...on the phone or (unintelligible).

Berry Cobb: All right so within this section there's two recommendations. The first, again, this kind of goes back to the early outreach of at the working group stage. So just to jog your memory, at that point of the policy process or shortly after a working group gets initiated, it's basically reaching out to stakeholder groups, constituencies, SOs and ACs to ask for additional input to help better informed the issue as the working group begins its deliberations.

And so there were a couple of recommendations that Tony and myself had come up with prior to. So I think the first one, Recommendation 4 is that staff be directed to update the Annex 1 of the Working Group Guidelines. As I tried to point out or what the comment mentions to the right there, is that there didn't seem to be anything specific in the Working Group Guidelines that talk about this. So the, you know, more or less the recommendation here is to kind of create a new subsection somewhere within the Guidelines.

And then the secondary part is work product templates. This one I'm, you know, I'm kind of glad that we were that the group is going to hopefully put this forward because of this has been kind of a pain in the backside for a while, having to draft some of these documents, that there's not a full-blown templates out there but in general what Recommendation 5 is about is

creating an issue report template, final report template and then of course a charter template.

And specifically within the Working Group Guidelines on Page 50 various Sun outlines or pointers to previous work products. And I even clicked on a few of the links. They're broken, you know, and they refer to work products that were created in the last century. So at any rate the reason for that particular Recommendation 5 though is ultimately the further recommendation down is about the continuous improvement recommendation if consensus recommendations are created out of a working group.

Recommendation 6 is the charter template recommendation where, which is in Annex -- one of our annexes within our report but has that particular section. So that's what that's about. We'll go ahead and move on down.

Then we have the conclusions and next steps. I feel like I've missed some somewhere in this report and it's really hard to navigate within the Adobe Connect room. So anyway I think I'll stop rambling other than to say that the group needs to have some homework done. Know it, learn it, love it, live it, with the Working Group Guidelines so that we can find appropriate places for staff to make the implementation of these recommendations. The work product templates, believe it or not, is actually happening right now.

And I'll stop there. So actually I won't stop there.

((Crosstalk))

Berry Cobb: In light of that, you know, once the working group has -- or I'm sorry, once the meeting has concluded here, you know, we usually take the typical week off post meeting to decompress. So I imagine that we will be meeting again -- our next meeting will be the week of July 13. So that should give the group plenty of time to digest this.

Please review this draft of the initial report, make any edits. I'll make sure to send out a track changes version but you're more than welcome to start editing the report and we can incorporate that into a master, or any other suggestions you might have on the recommendations themselves and we'll continue to evolve as we move forward.

Our time...

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Zuck: Thank you. This is Jonathan Zuck for the transcript. Is there a particularly good way to divide up the Working Group Guidelines task? Or are people going to just throw suggestions about, how about this and how about this? What's the best workflow for us to do this homework in a non-duplicative and inefficient way I guess -- what's the best way to make recommendations with respect to that document?

Berry Cobb: I actually preferred duplicative. I think everyone here it needs to be very familiar with the guidelines...

Jonathan Zuck: Just be per pair to discuss it?

Berry Cobb: Be prepared to discuss it, offer up suggestions because right now everything that we have right here is staff led basically.

Jonathan Zuck: Right.

Berry Cobb: So really need help from the group to get something more tangible here. And I'm hopeful that, you know, when this does get submitted for a public comment that there will be more input from the community instead of just the five or six that are involved here.

But anyway, yes, I'm definitely open to suggestions on, you know, should a new section be created? Should we edit a current section or maybe - I doubt we need to make a recommendation to remove a section in the Working Group Guidelines, that could probably be contentious.

But the other aspect is, you know, based on whatever charter question is being addressed we -- I just lost my train of thought -- oh, that we could also use help in drafting the actual content of what would go in that. So if, you know, I recommend that we create a new section on early working group outreach, all right, so that's going to be Section 4.1.2 of the Working Group Guidelines.

And here is what the actual wording or content of that would be that we could also use help with that so that -- because I think that that would help with context to the recommendation when staff goes to implement it.

Jonathan Zuck: Yeah, this is Jonathan again. I guess I'm saying some of those things feel like they could be volunteered or voluntold. Like for example Tony was the guy that thought of that and he's on the call, if he's still awake.

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Zuck: Should we just - Tony, do you want to take a shot at that one in particular for example?

Tony Onorato: (Unintelligible).

Jonathan Zuck: The section on making early outreach to other -- it's Recommendation 4, early word group outreach, for example. In other words, I find a home and propose some language.

Tony Onorato: Yes, that's fine. I'll do that.

Jonathan Zuck: And is there a way for us to sort of figure out what other beings need to be -- an easy way to list the things? I mean, maybe you and I can kibitz and we can circulate this on the list, maybe we can turn this into a set of assignments that people can volunteer for one of them instead of everybody thinking about possible text for that paragraph for example. I mean, I'm happy to work on these templates.

So let's resolve to come up with an assignment list basically of what needs a home and what needs to drafting. And then I'll start whipping that on the list over the next couple of weeks.

Berry Cobb: Sounds good. So I think that's really, I mean, we only have three minutes left. We can see the mass pouring of crowds coming in because they were late. So without any other comments or suggestions like I said, I'll send out a revised version of this report that at least has a track changes in it and then I'll definitely do some kind of assignment matrix maybe.

Jonathan Zuck: Yeah, so, Steve and Berry, let's plan a call maybe the three of us next week - early next week. All right? All right everyone, anyone else have anything they want to add or anything like that, any other business, before we close the meeting? I appreciate everybody coming out early and getting on the phone even earlier.

And we're just into the details now but I'll share that the Council as a whole was pretty excited about, you know, what we were doing and a lot of people came up to me afterwards and said, finally, and so I mean, I think that's all a good sign. So I appreciate all of your efforts. Let's call this meeting adjourned.

Tony Onorato: Terrific. Enjoy Buenos Aires.

END