

**Transcription ICANN Los Angeles
Data and Metrics for Policy Making (DMPM) Update to the Council
Saturday 11 October 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/#oct>

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

Jonathan Robinson: All right, is Jonathan Zuck in the room? Jonathan Zuck are you here?

Jonathan Zuck: Yes, I am.

Jonathan Robinson: Great, welcome Jonathan. So the next session, as we commence the second part of the morning sessions here is a report back from the Data and Metrics Policymaking working group. It's an update, and that will be presented to us by Jonathan Zuck. Welcome Jonathan - over to you.

Jonathan Zuck: It's a pleasure. So yes, this is formally called the Non-PDP Working Group on Data and Metrics for Policy Development. And I went ahead and checked the free dictionary in there. In fact 87 different acronyms for PDP, and so I'm just thinking we should just add Process Development Process.

So, we're renaming this particular working group the Non-PDD, PDP for PDPs because we're trying to make it sexier, you know, so that more people come. So I think that has accomplished that today, and I appreciate your indulgence.

Who's operating the slides? Can I just say, next slide to someone? Thank you.

So this work group is basically focused on the increased use of data in both the evaluation of problems to be resolved by PDP processes, issue reports generated by staff, and then also the use of data and also trying to change

the culture around the review or the outcomes of PDPs down the road a year later or something like that.

So those are the different; if you think about it, the three different instances in which we're trying to infuse data into the process. One is the Issue Report, one is the Policy Development process itself, and the other is a review process after the fact.

And just at some level just trying to make a kind of cultural change in the set of recommendations and come up with a set of tools that would facilitate these changes. Next slide.

So we've done a number of evaluations of previous work group efforts to come up with a set of use cases, you know, types of situations where data would have been more useful had it been used. It would have made the process more fluid; it would have made it more effective. And we'll review after the fact, it would have been valuable.

And so the result of that as I said, is a number of use cases which what geeks call them. But you can call them scenarios in which data will be useful so that we could come up with a framework for how to get the requisite data infused into the process given each of those scenarios.

So the next step is to develop a framework for data use and metrics in working groups. And as I said, I think what it's going to boil down to are still sort of sourcing this out as a kind of flow chart or a decision tree for, you know, is it Scenario A? If so, then do, you know XYZ.

And these are questions like is the data available from already inside ICANN? Is it already part of data that's, you know, existence by compliance or it's been collected for some reason anyway.

Is the data available in public sources? Is there a cost associated with it? What should the process be to get approval for, you know, the money necessary to get that data?

And the, you know, a final sort of large scenario is, do we need to make a data request to contracted parties, either some subset or all of the contracted parties for a specific type of data for a particular PDP?

And given the wide range of sizes of registrars in particular, and the what should I call, the sort of non-standardized way in which the data is stored inside of those organizations, we're trying to develop again, a set of questions and processes.

So it could very well be that there will be a cost associated with getting data out of contracted parties so as not to unduly burden, in particular the smaller ones.

And so that's the process that we're trying to develop. We have a meeting on Monday where we're going to put out a kind of a strawman for requesting data from contracted parties and what that process might look like.

So anybody that has the opportunity to encourage folks in the Registry and Registrar community to come be a part of that meeting, that would be the meeting to attend in particular, if you can do it. Next slide.

And I guess that's it for slides. So I mean that's basically our work and where we stand with it, and I'm happy to take any questions.

Jonathan Robinson: Comments, questions. Input for Jonathan? James?

James: Hi, thanks for the update Jonathan. Just a question and something I think that may have come up in your work. Have you discussed that some of the data requests, how to determine whether or not those might be sensitive or proprietary data from contracted parties, and how you could either modify the

data request in case those objections were made or even perhaps aggregate and sanitize those steps?

Jonathan Zuck: Yes, good question, and that is again some of the scenarios that we encounter. So a data request, you know, if you looked at this as a flow chart, a data request is made of a contracted party or subset of the contracted parties. And there's pushback on that request for reasons XYZ.

One of those might be, you know, a confidentiality issue and one of those might be a competitive issue, etcetera. And so another one might be that this is too burdensome for us to produce for you.

So each of those then would have, in the framework, a way to be handled. So one instance might be anonymization by a third party; anonymization by ICANN staff. In other words there are different people that can see different things.

And so each of those would represent a different scenario. And hopefully there would be a kind of a flow to follow in each of those cases. That's what we're hoping the work product to be.

James: That's good. Yes, and I'm just - I would just want to point out that that it makes contracted parties nervous, and I'll give an example. I think several years ago there was a note of transfer problems and it was listed - there was a top ten most offending registrars, and GoDaddy was of course at the top of the list.

But when you adjust it by the number of transfers that were successfully processed, it fell out of the top 30. And so it's one of those things - you know, its lies; damn lies, and statistics.

It's one of those things where if it's not done carefully it can send, not only, you know, negatively affect a contracted party in the market, but it could even

lead a policy development effort down a dead end if they're chasing - you know chasing after a phantom.

Jonathan Zuck: That's a really good point and thank you. And again I think confidentiality of data, single use of the data, and non-persistence of the data; there are things like that that are again, we're trying to build in which is a very - underscores the fact that we want as much contracted party participation in that particular component, right.

Not all data requests are going to go to contracted parties, but certainly some of them are. And we want to make sure that we develop a press that makes contacted parties feel comfortable and open to sharing the data that would make those policy development processes stronger.

James: Color is good.

Jonathan Robinson: Yes Jonathan, how is this work related to the recent request for proposals for the competition and consumer trust study? There had mentioned two sets of indicators - a long one and then a short one by a working group which I found only in a draft.

I don't know if it has been approved or not? Is it coordinated or is it a different set of indicators?

Jonathan Zuck: Well funny you should mention that. I'm Chairing that group as well. But the CCT is specifically trying to inform the Review Team that was - that's going to be created according to the AOC, probably a year from now, to look specifically at consumer choice, trust, and competition and how they've been promoted by the new gTLD program.

So it's a very specific review, and it was a very specific Board mandate for the community to make recommendations for metrics that might be used by that Review Team when conducting that review.

And so what was recently completed was the work of the Implementation Team for that effort, and where we looked at what data, if any, would be gone at the point at which it would be needed, and made a request to the Board for a survey and an economic study, specifically to handle the data that we thought would in fact erode by the time the review took place so that there would be a baseline for comparison for a delta when the review took place.

So it's a separate and specific effort. Whereas the work of the, you know, PDP on PDP for PDPs is a process development and a set of tools so that a future hypothetical PDP effort could make greater use of data in the future.

So one is very specific by the Board for that review, and the other is a general set of tools to be used in the future PDPs.

Jonathan Robinson: Any other comments; questions? Thanks Jonathan.

Jonathan Zuck: Thank you.