Transcription ICANN Singapore
GNSO Data and Metrics for Policy Making Working Group
Thursday 27 March 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/#mar
The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page

Mikey O'Connor: Go for it.

Okay. So we're recording. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. If you live on the moon whatever time I mean my body has decided that it doesn't need sleep.

This is the Data and Metrics for Policymaking Working Group. My name is Mikey O'Connor. I'm one of the co-chairs.

And we're getting off to an early start here in Singapore. And I've been so busy chatting up my co-chairs and the folks in the room. I don't have my Adobe Room open.

I'm clueless about the agenda. But why don't we take a moment and Berry if you could help me out and read the agenda and let people digest it a little bit while I - do we have slides rolling? Lars do you have - can you roll one forward maybe - oh there we go. Okay.

So we haven't got...

(Heather): Mike?

Mikey O'Connor: We're going to go through the...

(Heather):   This is (Heather).

Mikey O'Connor: Go ahead.

(Heather):   They sent me to into the wrong conference.

Mikey O'Connor: Pardon me? Can you say that again a little bit slower. The room has somewhat unclear sound so that was just too fast for my ears. Try again.

(Heather):   I say I apologize. It appears that the remote dial-in folks have put me into the wrong conference.

Mikey O'Connor: Well it was lovely having you while you were here and you can stay if you want. We're a very open group but you probably will find it a little bit boring so thanks for joining us. We'll see you the next time.

(Heather):   They expect me to lead the thing I'm in so I better (unintelligible).

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. Thanks for joining us even a little bit.

(Heather):   Thanks.

Mikey O'Connor: Berry why don't you hit it on the agenda and take us through statements of interest and all that good stuff and I'll catch up.

Berry Cobb: All right. Thank you Mikey. This is Berry Cobb with ICANN staff.

                    So our agenda is a little light for today but in general we'll kick off with roll call of members, update any statements of interest then Mikey will take us through a quick introduction to the session.

Then we'll kind of dive into some of the - within this presentation that we have for set up here today is review some of the details of the working group charter and discuss, you know, what are basically next steps and our approach is going to be over the next couple of months.

And then lastly we'll just kind of a general discussion of how the working group activities and like I said next steps.

And I don't think we have enough members to discuss what our meeting schedule will be like but towards the end we'll have just a brief update on when our next meeting will be probably in about two weeks or so.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks Berry. We have the unusual luxury of being here face to face so instead of doing a role call the way we usually do why don't we just work our way around the room and put names and faces together.

That's one of the big opportunities of a meeting like this. We often know each other for years without knowing what we look like. So Pam why don't you kick us off on that.

Pam Little: Sure Mikey. Good morning everyone. My name is Pam Little. I work for (Zodia) Registry which has recently become a registry operator. We applied for a number of streams.

I'm representing the Registry Stakeholder Group on this working group and look forward to working with everybody and nice to meet you all face to face.

Jay Daley: Yes. My name is Jay Daley. I'm the Chief Executive of the .nz registry. So I'm not a member of the working group possibly yet.

Mikey and I were speaking yesterday and data is an increasing part of my business. And we always think it's nice to have people from the CC community come along to these things so he invited me along. Thanks.

Klaus Stoll: Okay Klaus Stoll, NPOC NCSG and your friendly GNSO liaison.

Jonathan Zuck: Jonathan Zuck from ACT. And also a member of the Intellectual Property
                    Constituency and co-Chair of the Working Group.

Mikey O'Connor: Long-suffering co-Chair. This is Mikey O'Connor. I'm another co-Chair. I'm in
                    the ISP constituency. And depending on how you count I think. I have been
                    working on this for 130 years haven't we? Something like that?

Rudy Vasnick: I'm Rudy Vasnick, NPOC and another co-Chair.

Berry Cobb: And as mentioned earlier Berry Cobb with ICANN staff. And yes to Mikey's
                    point this topic has been around for quite a while since 2010.

                    And around October of last year is when we finally got the acknowledgment
                    to start chartering and establishing the working group in January of this year.
                    So we're still just taxiing on the runway but we'll get things flying here soon.

(Nana Dublich):   Hello everybody. And my name is (Nana Dublich). I come from Serbia. I'm
                    from ISP in Serbia. And this is a subject I've arrange the meetings so I can
                    see what's there.

Mikey O'Connor: We'll do the secret ISP handshake afterwards. That would be great.

Graeme Bunton: Hi. I'm Graeme Bunton from Tucows. When not doing a small amount of
                    policy for Tucows my main job is running our business intelligence
                    department so this is an issue that's right close to my heart.

                    And I have a particular bee in my bonnet about this ICANN so pretty
                    interested to see what's going on here. And I have not formally joined the
                    working group yet but I suspect that's in the cards.

(Caleb):   Hi. I'm (Caleb) also from Tucows. I'm based here in Singapore and this is my first working group so please be kind on me.

I generally handle our reseller relationships here in Asia and I'm based in Singapore.

Jeremey Beale: Hi. My name is Jeremy Beale. I'm an independent consultant and have done sort of metrics and data completions for ICP Internet-based services at the OECD and the UK government and also in the investment banking sector.

And I'm not a member of the group yet and Mikey just dissuaded me the other night over a few drinks that I should come along. So I can still run away hopefully.

Mikey O'Connor: You may think you can run away but I have his business card. He's not getting away.

David do you want to chime in I think - well know I'm sorry I went right by Lars. And then those, you can stay in the chairs. It's perfectly safe but do walk up to the table and punch on the mic and just let us know what you are so that I can tell whether we want to recruit you.

So while Lars is talking - come on, get up to the table. Don't be sitting there like you think I'm crazy otherwise I'll go get the mobile mic and stick it in your face.

Lars Hoffman: This is Lars Hoffman from ICANN staff. I'm supporting Berry on this working group.

Mikey O'Connor: All right. We have one gentleman who's already made the move. Go ahead.

Steve Sheng: Steve Sheng, also ICANN staff.

Mikey O'Connor: There we go.

(Rory Cellan):   Hello. I'm (Rory Cellan) from Nominet a .UK registry.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh, you know, for all of the ranting that I did at the GNSO meeting we've suddenly got lots of contracted parties and registries here. It's really cool. David go ahead.

David Cake: Yes. David Cake from noncommercial from Electronic Frontier Australia and also Curtin University. And I'm a GNSO councilor and pretty interested in this stuff.

Mikey O'Connor: I think we've got everybody covered. Thanks Steve for putting up with all the rumpus but...

Man: And Mike...

Mikey O'Connor: I've missed one?

Berry Cobb: Mikey just for the record we also have Paul Redmond in the AC room from ICANN Contractual Compliance. I'm not sure if he's dialed in to the phone bridge or not but just for the record.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh are you on the bridge?

Berry Cobb: (Unintelligible).

Mikey O'Connor: Probably not.

Berry Cobb: But Id' also does like to apologize to our newly joined first working group from Singapore. We're seldom kind to people in this time zone.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes, you know, I was thinking about you and Pam who are routinely on our call at some ungodly hour in the morning. And you're probably just chortling with glee that you're in your native time zones or at least close to it.

Oh Sebastian's here. We're just doing our introductions. You can sit down and punch on the mic while and - we'll get underway. You know, this is way better than I thought it was going to be. This is outstanding. Yes.

Lars Hoffman: You see Mikey...

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. Go ahead Lars.

Lars Hoffman: This is the argument for the other meeting I guess ITP at 10:30 we are - we had nobody.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. We had crickets. It was 10:30 in the morning. We thought we'd break the long tradition of having IRTP meetings at dawn and nobody showed up.

Sebastian? Just - we're just doing around the room introduction.

Sebastien Bachollet: Sebastien Bachollet. For those who don't know me I am still gold member for two more week, two more meetings. And I am - I was selected by At-Large. And if I can be of any help I will try. Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks Sebastian. Okay I think we're set. Here's sort of the thought that I had in mind. And I'm counting on my co-chairs to put rails on me if I do something really crazy or stupid.

But we basically have two slides of charter questions. And it seemed to me that the best use of this time would be to just brainstorm our way through those charter questions today, not put a whole lot of limits on the discussion raves, wild ideas, issues, concerns whatever.

Normally on a call when we're on the wire I would be describing it in front of you with a mind map. But I found that when I tried to do that in a live meeting there's too much going on and I lose track.

So I'll describe out of the transcript but that was the thought because, you know, for those of you who've been in working groups with me before this is one of those ones where we've come up with crazy looking notes and that turns out to be something really handy down the line.

So the first slide is really more advertisement than charter question. But this is the reason that Berry Cobb and I have been working on this for 130 years is that what we're really going after here is his underpinning this foundational thing, a fact-based policymaking.

And it's really tough to do that without facts. So that's what this group is all about. It's primarily oriented towards facts and data for GNSO policymaking.

And Jonathan I don't know we I want to take you into the other working group that you're working out for metrics but you can chime in on that when I finish my little spiel if you want.

So that, you know, then the next two are pretty straightforward. And one of the reasons that I am so pleased to see contracted parties and registries from the CC community here is that a lot of this data is going to come hopefully from you. And we need to figure out a way to do that that doesn't drive you crazy.

It seems to me that that's probably the key focal point of this is to figure out a graceful way to get useful data out of organizations that clearly have limits on how much of that they can share and how much of it they want to share.

And the good news is that we ran into this problem in the DNS security and stability analysis working group that I co-chair I don't know a year or two ago.

And we've got a protocol that we wrote for that said, you know, I'm not going to preview today.

But when we get to that issue we've got some pretty good work done already. We aren't going to be starting that from a clean slate.

So for those of you who are coming here to defend your data, don't panic. It's not as bad as it might be because we've already had a lot of that discussion on the DNS data side.

And I'll be curious to see if the protocol is good enough for you all but I'm acutely aware that that's an issue and it's going to be a big part of the discussion.

And then the other half of this along with, you know, the policy part is clearly the implementation side. You know, I guess it's also good to have facts to underpin that sort of thing.

So Lars if you bump us to the next slide here we go into the questions. And this - there's eight questions. This is the first half.

I'll take us through those just to give you the list. Jay can you - you're on the Adobe Room so you can see these?

Jay Daley: I think so.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay because we can turn this monitor. Okay. So basically this is the first half and then there's a comparable set of four more questions.

So as you read these the reason I want to run through them all in a hurry is so that you know which buckets to throw which comments into.

But as I said this is a very free flowing brainstorming session. And, you know, don't feel like you have to be terribly precise because I'll pull the documentation on this out of the transcript.

The first one is a question that sounds kind of existential especially for me at this hour in the morning. But, you know, you do have sort of chicken and egg problem and that is which comes first?

And I think that the answer that is my favorite is the consultant's standard answer which is it depends. And I think one of the things that we want to do in the Working Group is put a (unintelligible) on the table.

Klaus Stoll: (Unintelligible) Mikey I'm sorry.

Mikey O'Connor: Oh I thought maybe you are buying me off. That was - I'm so disappointed. I've got a...

Klaus Stoll: (Unintelligible).

Mikey O'Connor: ...dime from Klaus Stoll, really it's pretty. Sorry but I'm running on little enough sleep that I really easily distracted Klaus.

Klaus Stoll: (Unintelligible).

Mikey O'Connor: Oh okay great. So anyway interesting question to brainstorm about this is how can we tell which comes first? And is there anything useful we can tell the community about it?

The next one is sort of a leftover. There's a long history which I won't repeat but there is sort of another piece to this charter that talks about the people who are coming into essentially solve a problem, you know. And this is sort of left over from that so it's not a very data oriented one. And I think I'm going to leave that one at that with that for now.

The next one is, you know, how to better inform the GNSO policy development process but that's the narrowing down.

The title of the Working Group is - implies broader brackets. This is really oriented towards GNSO policy process.

But to the extent that this kind of data would be useful elsewhere, you know, for example in the cc's terrific.

And I don't think that there's an issue in sort of nudging this in directions that make it more useful for the CCs for example.

Lars Hoffman: Yes. I'm one of those Cs that thinks the GNSO CCO - ccNSO's get is entirely artificial and the things that we are talking about have so much in common like Whois.

For example all name collision or .list domains or any of those things I mean they affect all of us. And the idea is that CC somehow on is just silly. So yes no, I understand that it is really just intended for GNSO policy development but I think over time that's going to impact on CCs far more.

Mikey O'Connor: Go ahead John.

Jonathan Zuck: Yes I do want to disrupt your flow Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: No, no in fact I should let - I'm sorry I've been up really late and I'm not at my peak. So Jonathan and Rudy if you want to do some sort of, you know, launch speech go ahead.

Jonathan Zuck: Well I don't know if I have a launch speech but I guess there's two components - two broadly two components to this one. One is I think Mikey described the idea of access to data.

But the other I think is trying to begin to establish a culture of data decision making. And I mean that's really the broader question.

In other words when a working group is convened is there an expectation that they will be using data whenever possible or at least, you know, factual information as a means of determining what their path forward should be?

And when they develop a path forward will they have an expectation that the results of that new policy will be measured down the road using similar data, updated data as a result so that we can decisions they made for the purposes of fixing something actually fixed it?

And I mean I - I mean this almost seems chronological to say but I mean that culture has been largely absent here at ICANN. And I - that's what excites me most about this.

I consider the idea of how to get access to data, et cetera, a challenge to be overcome and something to be finessed and make sure that the interests are aligned when that happens and to make sure we don't step on toes or create competitive disadvantage and things like that.

But the real underlying issue here is getting the GNSO to data driven decision-making and data driven review of those decisions I mean so that we can make course corrections if in fact what we're - whatever we put in place to fix the problem isn't fixing it.

And I appreciate your comment about the distinction between ccNSO and the GNSO.

And the other thing that's delightfully fun about this is it should be largely noncontroversial right? We're not setting policy. If at best I think we're

creating a toolkit of worksheets, you know? How should you define your problem when you go in?

There's nothing that's going to be blessed here or imposed on anyone or anything like that. But maybe we can begin through the creation of a toolset to begin to change that culture. And I think that's what's most exciting about it.

So there's literally nothing in here that would prevent ccNSO to use these tools because we're not going to be setting controversial policy or having controversial policy debates.

I mean what's exciting is everybody's really just having a brainstorming activity about how best to facilitate the change in culture. And I think that's what's really exciting about this particular working group is that we can set politics aside and really focus on process.

Woman: Go for it.

Rudy Vasnick: No, no politics, Rudy for the record. Well, being a co-chair and a PDP working group translation and transliteration we are needing a lot of data.

And it's clear that it is not very used in I would say in the whole ICANN and that data is exchanged between different constituencies which makes it very often difficult to gather the right information and make the right decision.

And I think this working group is a perfect platform to bridge what is needed for good policy taking for good policymaking for drafting rights recommendations across the constituencies.

Because ICANN isn't just a number of silos but it's a complexity of structures that has to work together and especially with the decision of the NTAI.

We have to demonstrate that we are not silos but we I big group, a team that works together whatever our mission is. And I think that is the perfect occasion to - for this working group to enter into this debate.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks Rudy. I'm going to shortstop Sebastian so hang on just a second.

One thing I forgot to mention and is that this is not a PDP working group this is a non-PDP working group.

In other words we are not going to set consensus policy in here. And I'm just amplifying something that Jonathan mentioned in passing but it dawned on me that we have new folks in the room so I just wanted to hit that.

Sebastian on to you.

Sebastien Bachollet: Yes thank you. First of all when Mikey talked about that yesterday about your meeting I was in my mind putting together this working group but a working group where (unintelligible) is sharing about the data we need to collect about the new gTLDs.

And I still...

Man: That was yesterday.

Sebastien Bachollet: That was yesterday.

Man: Yes sorry.

Man: We've changed (unintelligible). And if it's helpful I can talk about...

Mikey O'Connor: Yes I...

Man: ...the difference between the two.

Sebastien Bachollet: Yes but my - yes you will - it will be useful. But I want to express my - in fact I have the impression that you have tweaked the topic to answer within the GNSO needs to do something.

My impression Mikey that what ICANN it's needs how ICANN handle datas full stop. And when I say that I have some historical non-data record. I want just to share with you I hope I will not be too long.

Yes 2001 first round of the new gTLD seven new gTLD evolution process. And we say we need data. There is no datas.

Then the decision is taken to add instead, test bed three. It's under 210 STLD S for sponsored TLD. At the time it was a name.

And we were supposed to gather data with those ten TLD coming to the route which was implication for the route and so on and so forth.

I was at that time in charge of process to gather what we need for the evaluation. And we explained what we will need as data for the next round. It's never happened.

And we are with a new round of gTLD now blind because we don't have data from the previous round. And its very important that we gather data about this specific issue who is a new gTLD.

But frankly speaking we may find useful to have data with a new IDN ccTLD. We need to have data with and so on and so forth.

And my point is that in gathering data we may know what we are looking for but we may find something else.

And then if we can find a way to gather data already taken or organized by CC, errors, root server operators, ISP or whatever and be able to have them in - why we are not able to be used by others maybe we will find nuggets in that.

But if we start saying okay I want this data because maybe it will be useful for that from my point of view we will miss the next data will not be useful for that but for something else but nobody knows now.

Then my eye - I all for your working group but I would like so much to have this becoming a non-PDP global ICANN data what we can do, how we can open that (unintelligible) organization.

It's written in the strategic, there's somewhere on that on one of the strategy but like just okay that's a good idea, take it and deliver.

I was with someone yesterday at dinner and they explained to me how we gather data for political party in one country using tweets to know what will be the result of the elections.

I don't know but I would never thought about putting those types of things together to get the result.

Then you may have some very good ideas some good tools, some to gather data that we don't know what we will take out of that.

And it's why it I am sincere all for open data disaggregation and the community will figure out what to do with and will come with something that we are not even able to elaborate today because it would be the result of a - of the data search.

And that's the reason I was - I came here to give you that. We will do what you want. I am not here as board member to say you need to do that.

But it's my dream that one day we will be able to (unintelligible) the data.

Just an anecdote, when I tried to know - can you tell me how many registrars there is in Africa? If you know you can tell me a number. But in the ICANN database maybe it's another member, but how you can search above that?

Today you have a like PDF list unsearchable and copiable and you can put it on a Excel sheet and it's very, very complicated.

And then you - it's almost impossible to have the (unintelligible). I have to (Pierre) and ask him and I am not even sure that he will have the right answer at the right time.

Then it's all that we need to be able to change, not to talk about the financial data who could be also useful one day.

I hope I was not too long and thank you for listening and I hope the best for your group.

Berry Cobb: All I can say is hallelujah.

Mikey O'Connor: See that's why I didn't want to (unintelligible).

Berry Cobb: All I can say is hallelujah. I mean I feel like every meeting I go in I end up making the same point that you're making.

I mean when (Maggie) came to head of compliance here at ICANN was for just a few years ago the compliance, the database was a folder in Outlook.

I mean I - when I found that out I mean I almost fainted right? I mean this - that was a fairly mature organization that, you know, three years ago and to

have a folder in Outlook be the way that we maintain data about the entire compliance operation in the organization to me was an unmitigated travesty.

I mean I - it was the height of ridiculousness. And so I agree that we need to find ways to insert data into almost every aspect of this organization.

The other effort that's going on with respect to data is actually directly a function of the affirmation of commitments, requirements for a Review Team to assess whether or not the new gTLD program had resulted in the increase in consumer trust and in competition and choice in the TLD marketplace.

And so Bruce Tonkin put a proposal before the board in Cartagena about let's actually try to use - this is an opportunity to dip our toe into the world of metrics and establish a working group to come up with data sources that would be useful for that Review Team when it convenes which is probably in about a year, 18 months from now and what's the potential uses of that data might be.

And so the part that was most controversial about that exercise is there was some value judgments associated with, you know, an increase in this metric is a good thing and a decrease in this metric is a bad thing, et cetera and that's where the nature of a lot of the discussions came from.

And it's a very imperfect exercise right? I mean like, you know, we could suggest that if the new gTLD program is dominated entirely by defensive registrations then it's probably not a good thing.

But how do you actually determine if registration is defensive is it's pretty difficult. But one of them is looking at whether or not is just pointers instead of a new site, et cetera.

So those are the kinds of conversations that took place and so we're now in the implementation phase of that. And that will result in the collection of data

so that it's available at the time of the review and some recommendations for how the data might be treated.

It'll ultimately be up to that Review Team to make a decision which of those data sets will be used and what numbers to associate with them. But at least the historical data will be in place at the point at which that review process begins. And to me that's an enormous change over the past and a good step in the right direction.

Sebastien Bachollet: I just wanted to add one thing. I hope that it's not just will be the Review Team who well put their hand into datas.

But the other thing is do you get in your work any inputs from what was the data gathered after the first round of TLD in 2000?

Mikey O'Connor: This is the reason I'm not taking notes live because I'm going to take notes off this transcript because there are all sorts of nuggets like that that we will pick up because it's a terrific idea.

Got a little bit of a queue, go here first and then to Chris and then to Amr. Anybody else? David? Anybody else? Holy mackerel, go ahead while I figure this out.

Jeremy Beale: Hi, for the record Jeremy Beale again.

Just to drift from the first point there I'm not sure it's such a, you know, dichotomy as - that it's presented there.

As you said Mikey it depends but it depends really on the quest for the way I've always, you know, had to go about it is it depends on the questions you're asking.

And in terms of the policy process wouldn't it be possible to sort of go through the policy process and just sort of say okay of the standard kinds of questions for which you need standard kinds of data are in the process, just map that out.

So, you know, and then you can just see is that data available or what will be specified the kind of data that you would need for that?

And then you look at the kind of questions that are more variable depending upon the actual nature and content of the specific piece of policy or the categories of different kinds of policy and map out data that is either available or that where there isn't data available we might be able to develop proxies because if you have proxies the advantage of properties everyone wants to challenge them.

And as (Christie) said this is the data from - that we've been able to find from these XYZ sources which aren't direct but indicate what the answer might be people who have data. Then some say well we don't quite think it's that. It might be in this kind of ballpark instead.

So it's quite useful as an indicative exercise. And then you might then get - divert - you have to develop the relationships with people based upon confidentiality that they would in future provide data anonymously. But at least it gives you an opening for that.

I think that would be just very useful but I also think that's useful to address the kind of sort of more general issues about ICANN and its databases because from my experience there's actually quite a lot of data generated both by ICANN by registries and registrars, et cetera.

But it isn't standardized and we don't really know what the relationship a lot of times or where the overlaps are and is it addressing the same thing?

But maybe we should do some kind of or get ICANN staff to do some kind of a mapping exercise of the databases that exist what they cover and then we could look at them and say what would be useful in terms of the schema I just mentioned?

And that includes I should say there we see - dare I mention this to Mikey. There we see that he has the statistical working party on Internet and ICP related issues.

And it might be possible when we've identified the nature of the problem that we want to look at or that we think needs addressing and the kind of data that is needed to address that we could ask them to - or ask various members in the GAC if they can get the OACB to take a look at it.

And dare I also say the ITU which the OECD and its data collection often works very closely with they leave all the politics aside and just sort of say well this is the data we have and data you can get from a developing country.

So that might be a hopefully useful way of going forward.

Man: Being a bit housekeeping, co-chair please state your name before your speaking. It would make it easier when we go into the transcript.

Mikey O'Connor: I love this group. Chris go ahead.

Chris Gift: Hi. This is Chris Gift with ICANN staff. I'm very, very pleased that I came to this working group because about nine months ago staff had the idea of start - of beginning to work on open data.

                  You know, we do have a lot of staff collects, a lot of data from a lot of different points in the community. And, you know, whether it's compliance data or other data. And you know, we wanted the concept which is as much as Sebastian had discussed and much was the strategy panel also brought up

was we really ought to put that up in a machine readable form, you know, publicly accessible by anybody so that they can use it for whatever means that they need it to do research for working groups like yourself to use the data for analysis.

I'm for work reasons just we had too much on our plate. We put that aside for several months.

But we recently picked it back up because of a lot of reasons. We had work beginning to have a little bit of bandwidth.

B, it's very important as you'd pointed out for accountability and transparency that having this open data is vital.

So we're literally just picking this work back up. And to be frank I'd very much like leadership from this working group because I think it would be a perfect fit for you to tell us well A, what kind of datas you want? How should it be accessible, just well the whole project in other words? So we'd very much welcome that. Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: I love it when a plan comes together.

I want to head back to Jeremy's point just a minute. I rolled the slides because as you were talking I wanted to get to the second half of our charter question because a lot of what you're talking about is in this second half.

One of the things that we really want to do is tune the policy development process a little bit because that's a malleable thing.

And, you know, the PDP is not set in stone. And the GNSO has mechanisms to tweak in that process to accommodate both the collecting side and the defining side of the data process in various parts of its work.

So let me just hit these. I'm short stopping the queue and I apologize for that. But let me just hit these real quick because we're having a terrific conversation and I don't want to slow you down.

But the second half in their front of you now is this business of how the working groups go out when they need new information, how do they, you know, this is - the next one is to Graeme's or I manufactured Graeme's problem but, you know, the issue of confidentiality. We need to handle that.

You know, the distribution framework is right down your alley. And then the last one is the one that I wanted to highlight which is how do we wire this into process so that we're back to, you know, not a one-time thing but is wired into the culture? So I just want to do an advertisement for that.

And now I think Amr you're next. And then it's David and then it's you and then it's Graeme.

Anybody else want to get in the queue? I'm - I was thinking it was going to be crickets today. This is terrific.

Who, what? You're pointing at somebody but don't have their hand up. Who is - okay carry-on. Sorry.

Amr Elsadr: Thanks. This is Amr Elsadr from the Noncommercial Stakeholder Group. I think this non-PDP Working Group is a terrific idea. And I would like to make a few comments.

I think one especially on the mechanisms present in your charter also not just internal, data internal to ICANN but also external.

And I cannot stress the importance of that. And what we've seen recently is the commissioning of some studies. And I personally think those are great.

These - this is sort of evidence-based that we need to base policy development on and perhaps not take it blindly but I'm from a healthcare background and we love evidence-based medicine. And I think the same could be applied to policy development in the GNSO.

But the word mechanism is very important here. And I think Jeremy touched upon it because data is collected for a specific reason if you're going to use it in a specific context.

So the mechanisms used to collect data whether externally or internally and how it's used needs to be defined. And this is the mechanism that this working group I feel needs to really work out.

Then the mechanisms by which they're collected assumes the terms of reference of any study conducted.

We have two Whois studies that we've that have recently been published. And then we've had a chance to look over the working group that Rudy mentioned a little earlier.

The translation in transliteration of contact information is also looking at a study on available solutions to display international registration data or contact information.

So this stuff is really great but the community needs to be involved in the terms of reference of how the state is going to be collected, how it's going to be used.

And there needs to be a mechanism on how this - these studies will be analyzed critically, analyzed whether from a qualitative or a quantitative perspective because this is the nature of research and the use of data in different forms.

There's no one study that will ever get everything right. And it's just really a - an iterative process of study after study after study. And the more you conduct these, the more informed the community will be on the evidence available to support policy development.

And I'd like to wish you all a lot of luck. I'm not on this working group but I will try to pay attention to it. And I think you guys can do some really great work. So thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: There's room for more. There's plenty of room...

Amr Elsadr: Not on my schedule.

Mikey O'Connor: Okay. Let's see I've got David and then you and then Graeme and you're coming up on the top of the hour so there's a little room if anybody wants to get a last word. Oh and Berry wants to get in. Anybody else?

Okay so David go ahead.

David Cake: Yes. Actually I was going to mention there Amr mentioned the evidence-based medicine movement. And I remember hearing about that many years ago and going well that sounds like a great idea. Hey wait a second what are you doing now?

And it - this idea the moving to really trying to inject a little more data into policy as we go forward is a great idea.

But and also hopefully I think it was John that started talking about the, you know, cultural change is what we've got to drive here but we've got to make sure that, you know, the data is just there and you don't need to, you know, go through, start collecting it, start trying to see if it can be collected and what the process of that would be every single time.

We've got to get a - the (unintelligible) data culture is something we should (unintelligible). A woman I know back in Australia a woman in (Piawar) I've been trying to get her involved in Internet governance stuff.

And she says well I want to but I'm I've got to finish my current project. And her current project is converting the culture of the entire Australian federal government open data.

And she's on track for that one. She's a on track for that one so she is the sort of person you want when to get things done.

And a lot of what you're doing is convincing them that you don't - that you don't have to make the case for why the data should be there. You just - you have to make a case why it shouldn't be. You if you've got it we can try and put it out there in a useful format and collect it and people will find things to do with it.

She runs I think her (gov hat) where she sits and gets a bunch of hackers together and look we've got all these data sets. Make me some, you know, make things that are cool.

And although I don't think we're maybe, you know, a little way off, we're all quite away off that in ICANN. But getting a bunch of data sets that are just there that might come in useful in a place where we can all find them would be really, really a big step forward I think.

Mikey O'Connor: So this is often how we start. Carry on.

(Nana Dublich): This is (Nana Dublich) speaking. Well first of all it's good this is non-PDP group in terms of outside pressure.

But in fact you're talking about a change of culture and so on culture's something has to be enforced. And I don't see how you will evade forming a

policy in the end not into this working group but it will have to recommend some policy that will be implement throughout the whole organization.

Mikey O'Connor: Let me just jump in because we do have language in the charter about that in that...

(Nana Dublich): Okay.

((Crosstalk))

(Nana Dublich): And I read it and I see it and I...

Mikey O'Connor: So if...

(Nana Dublich): ...(unintelligible) those parts I can see it happening.

Mikey O'Connor: Right no I - but the point is that this working group will not make policy.

(Nana Dublich): Okay.

Mikey O'Connor: It's specifically constituted...

(Nana Dublich): Yes.

Mikey O'Connor: ...that way. If it turns out the policy is needed or we think it's needed we will then launch a policy process.

(Nana Dublich): I understand that okay. The end result of this you have to be a policy if you - if we are talking about all the conditions - constituencies applying this sort of behavior in policymaking benchmarking.

The thing I like for you is how to also going see I don't know if there is a special unit or operational unit in ICANN staff or anything that's in charge of collecting and processing data.

Because you if you want to collect data from the outside I think it will have to be done through a single point of contact because who - if somebody comes to (unintelligible) for data or we are from this working group. We're from here. I think it will need to go to single point of contact for this.

And I think that they - also we need to see are there any institutional other institutional organizations like statistical, national statistical or euro constituencies that we can incorporate it and maybe help them help us by instructing them what data they should collect and this could be used here?

And also the process for example in my company everything is recorded, everything from conversations what users does -- everything. We collect everything.

But the problem is the kind of problem that we have now is that all that data is in usable searchable format especially for example for sales. We know what every customer said and what he did and what he wants but we don't have it in a format that's easily usable.

So somebody said data is already here yes. But just the process of changing the format of the data and translating it into something useful is huge, just that one part.

So this is not a small test group. The test that's on this group is substantial.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes. This is done by (unintelligible).

Just some thought just some thoughts.

(Nana Dublich): Thanks for those thoughts...

Man: Should be (unintelligible) took 17 years to get it done.

Mikey O'Connor: Yes it shouldn't be any problem. (Unintelligible) I note that you're in the queue but you're not next so if you want to sit down I'll call on you.

We are running really close to the end and I see other folks coming in so we're going to - I'm going to ask you to sort of push...

Graeme Bunton: Speed up, get going.

Mikey O'Connor: Push to be brief.

Graeme Bunton: Fired up? Am I next?

Mikey O'Connor: Yes you're next.

Graeme Bunton: Great. All right this is Graeme Bunton. Let me echo a lot of the sentiment I'm hearing especially from Jonathan about data-driven decision-making is hugely important and something that really does need to become pervasive in the ICANN culture I personally would love to see. There's a couple other things that have been floating around that I'll touch on very briefly.

One is clearly data is immensely powerful and valuable. And talking about a big open data is probably going to scare some your contracted parties because that data is valuable.

Those are the keys to our kingdom. And so we do need to be extremely careful about how we approach sharing data.

That said sharing data I think is going to benefit contracted parties more than it's ever going to hurt them. There's an awful lot of elements within the ICANN community that approach issues with gut instincts.

And contracted parties are sitting on mounds of data that frequently I think is of the opposite opinion.

The other thing that I think is worth pointing out here is that we sort of treat data very abstractly in this conversation and that's fine but it's not a panacea for everything.

As someone who works with data on a daily basis in a single company there's lots of it. It's frequently messy, it requires huge amounts of efforts as you were saying to keep clean and provide in useful fashion in a timely fashion.

And so imagining that sort of pan ICANN data warehouse where people can dip in and attract that crucial bit I would say is extremely folly and when and is a project that would cost billions of dollars and basically never work.

And so as we think about moving forward the idea of injecting this as a process is a piece of the policy development process in a working group where you start to figure out what data you need and collect it a very focused and narrow fashion is something that I can see working for contracted parties and getting you closer to your end result.

And it does mean that you're going to have far more narrow data sets available within ICANN which is great but you're not going to have this sort of pan database of, you know, every domain and every issue and everything.

So, you know, I guess, you know, try to imagine the reality of what that data looks like when you think of these sort of broad terms. Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: Graeme is no fun. We're down to the last minute so I'm actually going to rigidly enforce time limits. I'm - Berry were you going to do wrap up stuff? You're actually going to do content stuff. Go for it.

Berry Cobb: So I'll be very brief and just as Graeme said and everybody else, you know, this is a great conversation to have but I'm going to kind of be a wet blanket here.

There is other slides on here that will contain our scope. And our scope is very limited. So while, you know, there is cultural changes that need to happen at ICANN at the macro level and those kinds of things we are very focused in only how PDPs and working groups function within the GNSO.

And certainly we'll be taking a look at internal and external data sources, establishing a framework for how we collaborate with contracted parties to get, you know, to see what types of data may be available, what are the boundaries by which we could ask for that data and those kinds of things, so definitely very targeted. Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks Berry. (Marila)?

Marie-Laure: Good morning. My name is Marie-Laure Chair of NPOC. I just wanted to remind that greater transparency in handling data leads to greater accountability. So for ICANN it would be good news if this happens. Thank you.

Mikey O'Connor: Jay you get last word.

Jay Daley: All right, thank you. I'm all in favor of open data and the kind of things that I think Dave was talking about having in (gov hat).

But I think we need to make that a much later goal. For the moment we have two very serious constraints when it comes to sharing data. One is the physical size of data.

We have terabytes and terabytes of it, you know, and we're at the other end of one cable very far away. You can't get our data.

The other one is sovereignty okay? So what we should be focused on is access and availability of data to people to do research.

So a recommendation I made to the SSAC yesterday was that in their data wars that are going on there about, you know, domain name collision we need to avoid the position where somebody is making a claim based on a set of data that only they have access to.

And they need to ensure that other researchers can access that while maintaining their sovereignty. So that means that the people that are going to do that has to keep - so for example we have a Hadoop cluster deliberately because that has processing and storage on it so that if we need to give someone else access to it then they can use our storage, our processing. We can control what's going on. We don't lose sovereignty and they're don't have to try to get huge chunks of data.

So I think that's the kind of thing we need to focus on much before we get to the open data bit because that will be actually a really hard problem to solve. Though I do agree it's something I would like solved at some point.

Mikey O'Connor: Thanks all. We are right at time and so let me just wrap this up. For those of you who are interested in the foundational work that I'm referring to if you go to the DSSA final report, the DNS Security and Stability Analysis Working Group it's searchable on surely DSSA but also that longer string.

There's a section in that report titled something like the treatment of confidential data. That's not quite right but there's a whole appendix. And especially for those of you who are treating this correctly as a really important topic if you could go look at that really hard because we vetted it pretty well in that working group.

We had registries and registrars look at it really hard. But, you know, if we find a big hole in that it's not implemented anywhere and we can use that as a start.

With that if you could end the recording and we'll wrap this meeting up. Thank you all for coming. It was fabulous.

END