



**ICANN**

No. 49

23-27 MARCH 2014

*Singapore*





# Data & Metrics for Policy Making Working Group

Thursday 27 March 2014 – 08:00

#ICANN49



# Why is DMPPM Important?

---

- Explore opportunities to review reporting and metrics and standard methodologies that could better inform fact-based policy development and decision making.
- Allows for a review in how the community can collaborate with contracted parties and other reporting service providers in the sharing of metrics and data that may compliment the policy development process.
- WG may produce recommendations that identify critical success factors and key performance indicators to facilitate consensus policy implementation.

# Recent Developments

---

- The GNSO Council approved the WG charter at its 23 January 2014 meeting
- Two calls for volunteers resulting in 25+ members joining the WG (more than 2/3 outside the USA)
- Two WG meetings hosted prior to the Singapore ICANN meeting mostly focusing on Working Group Guidelines and new-comer training.

# Next Steps

---

- **WG to meet in Singapore – Thursday @ 08:00 local time**
- **Continue WG session post ICANN meeting**
- **Create Initial Report**
- **Conduct Public Comment(s)**
- **Brief GNSO Council as necessary**
- **Create Final Report**

# DMPM Charter

#ICANN49



# Objective & Goals

---

- To develop, at a minimum, an Initial Recommendations Report and a Final Recommendations Report addressing the recommendations outlined above, following the processes described in the GNSO Working Group Guidelines. These recommendations may include proposed changes to the GNSO Operating Procedures and/or relevant sections of the ICANN Bylaws.

# Mission - to provide the GNSO Council with recommendations addressing:

---

- The question “which comes first, policy-process or definitive data describing the problem?” along with suggestions as to how data can be gathered when it hasn’t yet been included in the reporting process.
- How processes can be continuously improved, simplified and made more consistent for people wishing to either report a problem or learn about their options when their problem falls outside ICANN policy;
- Principles that enhance metrics and data available to better inform the GNSO policy development process;
- Improved understanding of the limits of ICANN policies regarding data measurement and tracking and other options to pursue if an issue is not covered by policies that gather data
- Mechanisms whereby GNSO working groups can request information (both internal to ICANN or external, including GNSO contracted parties) which support fact-based policy-making;
- Mechanisms to ensure appropriate safeguards with regard to the confidentiality of certain types of information;
- A framework for distributing information to the GNSO policy-making community with the intent of both informing those groups and providing the ongoing basis for identifying and correcting problem-reporting and data-collection problems;
- Any changes needed to incorporate the processes described above into the ongoing Policy Development Process.



# Scope

---

- Mechanisms, defined or updated during the policy-making process, to continuously improve the linkage between the problem-reporting, problem-analysis and policy-making processes
- Mechanisms whereby standards are established, or updated during the policy-making process, as to:
  - Where to report policy violations
  - “Plain language” definitions of what constitutes a reportable problem
  - “Just in time education” describing reporting or action options that are available when the person’s problem falls outside ICANN policy
- Data availability – transparent processes, established or updated during the policy-making process, that define how data (on valid policy-violation reports as well as complaints that are not violations of current ICANN Consensus Policy or contracts (e.g. phishing, or spam)) relevant to the work of policy makers can be made available by ICANN, contracted parties and others
- Monitoring – ongoing mechanisms to identify issues and improve metrics and reporting process

# Out of Scope

---

- Compliance – processes to provide due process and sanctions applied in the case of ICANN policy violations
- Problem-report tracking – transparent processes to collect, analyze and publish the root-causes of the problems and their final disposition
- Metrics and reporting outside the scope of GNSO policy and ICANN contracts with contracted parties

# Assumptions

---

- This is a non PDP working group and as such is not creating new policy, but rather building best practices for consideration. If recommendations inherently contain new policy, then a formal PDP process would be recommended in conjunction with that recommendation. This should not preclude considering recommendations that include substantive policy changes for consideration.
- As the domain name system expands with the new gTLDs, standardized processes and methodologies will become more important to provide stakeholder groups necessary information to set policy.
- The WG will have access to persons and materials utilized in previous PDP and non-PDP efforts
- Processes, methodologies and frameworks identified may be currently in use or may be improvements that are based upon alternative or new data gathering strategies.
- Data does not have to be currently available to be considered. New ways of capturing data and methodologies for tracking data that can achieve the stated goals could be considered.

# Approach

---

- Any such recommendations will be developed through a process of community consultation and input modeled on the GNSO PDP Working Group Guidelines. However this is not a PDP working group: it is thought that the working group will recommend changes to internal business processes for ICANN Compliance and the GNSO PDP rather than changes to Consensus Policies. If Consensus Policy changes are required, the working group will act as the RAPWG did and recommend PDPs to be initiated to make those changes.

# Suggested Tasks

---

- **Develop a projected work schedule that contains:**
  - Frequency and scheduling of meetings
  - Estimated time targets for each deliverable
- **Establish a baseline of current practices, capabilities and plans with regard to; problem-reporting, complaint-submission notification, problem-report tracking, external data use, and associated process monitoring and improvement**
- **Develop preliminary recommendations, models and documentation that can be used as the foundation for subsequent work**
- **Evaluate previous PDP and non-PDP Working Group efforts as use cases to explore where metrics and reporting enhancements would have better informed the outcome. Suggested working groups include; RAP, IRTP (A-D), PEDNR, UDRP Lock, Thick WHOIS, IGO-INGO, etc.**

# Suggested Tasks - Continued

---

- Evaluate GNSO PDP documentation templates to determine how they may be enhanced to better inform PDP and non-PDP processes
- Evaluate possible external DNS data sources that may benefit GNSO policy-making. Examples of such sources include contracted parties and other entities that track spam, phishing, botnets and cybersquatting. The working group may wish to define a preliminary matrix of what is available and any associated costs if specific types of data were requested by a WG
- Prepare recommendations, obtain community input and publish a final report for approval
- Coordinate and collaborate with Contractual Compliance to close out resolution #1 of 2 that initiated this effort.

# Deliverables

---

At a minimum, the Working Group is expected to:

1. Develop a work plan per the GNSO Working Group Guidelines that outlines the necessary steps and expected timing in order to achieve these milestones and submit this to the GNSO Council.
2. Reach out at the beginning of the process to the different GNSO Stakeholder Groups and Constituencies to obtain input on the issue.
3. Produce an Initial Recommendations Report for community review and comment, including a report on the community feedback;
4. Produce a Final Recommendations Report, addressing the comments received on the Initial Recommendations Report, for submission to the GNSO Council.

# Discussion & Questions

DMPM Project Page:  
<http://tinyurl.com/mc45lyr>



# DMPM Background

#ICANN49



# Background

---

- The 2010 Registration Abuse Policies Working Group (RAPWG) identified the Meta Issue: Uniformity of Reporting which it described as “need for more uniformity in the mechanisms to initiate, track, and analyze policy-violation reports.” The RAPWG recommended in its Final Report that “the GNSO and the larger ICANN community in general, create and support uniform [problem-]reporting [and report-tracking] processes.”
- The GNSO Council recommended the creation of an Issue Report to further research metrics and reporting needs in hopes to improve the policy development process. The report created by ICANN Staff outlined accomplishments regarding reporting and metrics by the Contractual Compliance function and it also reviewed other reporting sources that may be of relevance.
- The GNSO Council subsequently adopted the recommendation to form this non-PDP Working Group tasked with exploring opportunities for developing reporting and metrics processes and/or appropriate standardized methodologies that could better inform fact-based policy development and decision making.

# DMPM Resolutions

---

- Resolved,
  - The GNSO Council does not initiate a Policy Development Process at this stage but will review at the completion of the ICANN Contractual Compliance three-year plan expected for 31 December 2013 whether additional action is required;
  - The GNSO Council further approves the creation of a drafting team to develop a charter for a non-PDP Working Group to consider additional methods for collecting necessary metrics and reporting from Contracted Parties and other external resources to aid the investigation.