

**Transcription ICANN Singapore
Data and Metrics for Policy Making (DMPM) Update to the Council
Saturday 07 February 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://gns0.icann.org/en/calendar/#feb>

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

(David) Next on our agenda is the data and metrics policy making working group.

Jonathan Zuck I see is already here ready to speak to it. But this is say, look we've got about ten minutes before we're scheduled to stop and one more item after this.

So please everyone be aware that we will be running a little bit over time but I'll be trying to keep us to not too far over, okay thank you, Jonathan.

Jonathan Zuck: Yes, welcome everyone back to Singapore. I guess I take some small solace in the fact that this room in its absence of windows looks hauntingly familiar to its counterpart in Morocco. So we should all feel at home.

So we should be able to get through this fairly quickly because we've decided to kind of put a pause on this working group for the purposes of this meeting because of so much going on with accountability but I'll quickly run through kind of where we are and what we're talking about and take any questions that you have.

With all this talk about accountability that has been going on I'm reminded of this quote from Gandhi to be the change you want to see. And I think one of the things that's interesting about this particular working group is it's about increasing the accountability of the community itself.

So with all these efforts of trying to make the board and the staff more accountable to the community this effort is in some ways about accountability

in the policy development process itself and that accountability comes through more fact based decision making use of data.

Next slide whoever is running them. So there is sort of three major opportunities for the use of data in policy development. One is in the scoping and definition of the problem.

So this comes up as early as the issue report done by the staff and how the problem is scoped as part of the chartering team. Then in developing success measures a way to decide what data will be affected by the policy that's in place and what - how we would define success in a quantitative way.

Obviously not everything can be defined in a quantitative way but an amazing number of things can. So the idea is to come up with success measures. And then also start to be able to build a cultural review.

So that a year down the road, a year and one-half down the road you're actually measuring those numbers again to see if they brought about the change that you predicted with the policies that you put in place.

Next slide, so this working group is exploring opportunities to review the standard methodologies of the working groups and to basically put some goals and enact a kind of a cultural change by setting expectations of the collection and use of data in both the scoping definition and ultimately the measure of success of particular policy development processes.

So coming up with what the processes might be for requesting data from outside agencies or firms, how to interact with ICANN staff in the compliance department to get data.

How to interact with contract parties and to facilitate access to data from, you know, those that might have limited resources to cull in the data or anonymizing the data and creating sort of template documents if you will to facilitate the acquisition of data for the workgroup.

Next slide. So what we did and I reported this at our last meeting as we evaluated a number of PDP and non-PDP metrics and how metrics could have enhanced the workgroup processes.

And from that developed a draft framework for requests of data and third parties and contracted parties et cetera. So that it's a kind of script if you will, a decision tree or a flow chart that allows you to follow a set of steps to request data from whomever who has the data that would be relevant to that workgroup.

So we're going to as we progress refine that data metrics framework and then also look at the worksheets that are used. So that when a group is being chartered the Q&A associated with writing the charter will include issues related to data.

And making sure that if data is applicable to the problem at hand that it becomes a part of the charter, becomes a part of the working group report and then also the notion of scheduling a review down the road becomes a part of the recommendation of that working group as well.

So from that we will create a set of template documents if you will, worksheets that help to imbue the culture of policy development with the notion of making it more fact based and less anecdotal whenever possible.

And we will take that bundle of things together with a recommendation to make that cultural change back here and submit it for public comment. So that's where we are. I'm happy to take questions about it. I think it's pretty uncontroversial in a lot of ways the way that I've described it.

Man: Yes.

Jonathan Zuck: Michele.

Man: This is important.

Michele Neylon: Michele Neylon for the record.

Jonathan Zuck: Now you're going to make me do this all over again in Irish.

Michele Neylon: Maybe but that would be an interesting challenge for you I'm sure you'd be happy to rise to. One of the things that I think some of us have been discussing is around the economic impact of some policy work.

I mean and just the question poses is that something that you're considering and bringing into this because it's very easy in some ways to come up with a wonderful policy but, you know, the economic impact of some policies is huge, the economic impact of others probably isn't.

So I don't know let's say for argument sake if you were to specify a policy that people would use a larger font size the economic impact might be, you know, a few more dead trees but nothing beyond that.

If you asked us all to translate all our contracts into Chinese then obviously it's going to cost us a lot more. And it's just that in some cases we're seeing policy development processes kicking off and being allowed to go quite far along without anybody ever stopping and saying hold on a second how much is this actually going to cost, is there a benefit, is there a downside.

And maybe somebody needs to actually pull the brakes on some of these before they get so far along that you can't stop the train, thanks.

Jonathan Zuck: Michele, I can't believe I'm saying this but thank you for your question I think it's a perfect one and I think it's well addressed by the work of this working group.

Remember the work we're doing is hypothetical in nature right, we're not dealing with a particular policy objective other than trying to improve the policy development process itself, it's a reform effort.

And while we did some basic research on previous working group PDP and non-PDP efforts I'm sure it's not comprehensive. So the solution we have to come up with has to be flexible enough but the idea is the introduction of facts into the policy development process.

So those facts hopefully will take the place of anecdote both in the definition of the problem and in the expectation of the results. So the very things you described like an adverse effect to a policy proposal also currently comes up but remains unquantified right.

And so the question is to quantify both of those things at the time to see if the problem is worth solving and if the harm is worse than the cure is worse than the disease if you will, which is something you were raising are the very discussions that hopefully this reform would inspire.

And allow us to measure down the road to see if in fact the predictions for the success of the proposal were overestimated and that the effects of the harm were underestimated and revise the policy accordingly.

So those are all things we don't currently do and while I can imagine lots of refinement to this the idea is to edge the culture if you will into a more quantitative state that I hope would address both issues you raised.

Michele Neylon: All right thank you.

(David): Do we have any other questions for Jonathan about the progress of this group?

Jonathan Zuck: And I would love for you all to come up but we don't be having a meeting at this meeting because everyone is so busy. So please see me if you're - write to me if you're interested in being on the next call or something as we're discussing this. Like I said I think we're just building a toolkit.

(David): And a useful toolkit it will be once you've produced it. Okay so thank you Jonathan and much obliged for your report.