

Attendance:

Cyntia King
George Kirikos
Griffin Barnett
Kathy Kleiman
Kristine Dorrain
Martin Silva Valent
Philip Corwin
Roger Carney

Audio Only:

Rebecca Tushnet

Apologies:

Michael Graham
Susan Payne
Sara Bockey
Justine Chew

Staff:

Ariel Liang
Berry Cobb
Julie Hedlund
Mary Wong

AC Chat:

Andrea Glandon:Welcome to the Sub team for Trademark Claims Data Review call held on Wednesday, 30 January 2019 at 17:00 UTC.

Andrea Glandon:Wiki Agenda Page: https://community.icann.org/x/oAj_BQ

George Kirikos 3:Hi folks.

Martin Silva Valent:Hi all

Martin Silva Valent:3943 is me

Andrea Glandon:Thank you, Martin!

Martin Silva Valent:agreed

Martin Silva Valent:agreed

George Kirikos 3:I understand, but that was last Wednesday (5 days to produce the document, but then we're only given 2 days to review it).

Kathy Kleiman:I object too - day jobs, guys :-)

George Kirikos 3:2 days where it has to jump to the top of our mind, while still doing our day jobs.

George Kirikos 3:Congrats, Kathy.

Martin Silva Valent:Congrats!

Cyntia King:Congratulations, @Kathy!

Kathy Kleiman:Tx!!!

George Kirikos 3:Workload, work plan, and Thursday's documents.

George Kirikos 3:(document singular, but 2 sub teams)

Julie Hedlund 2:The process document is in the Adobe room and unsynced

Mary Wong:@George, with respect, that is not what staff intended or meant.

Kathy Kleiman:Agreed, goal here is crowdsourcing...

Kathy Kleiman:yes!!

Kathy Kleiman:(personal opinion)

George Kirikos 3:@Mary, see: <https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/gnso-rpm-wg/2019-January/003608.html> " it seemed clear that this was a huge task for which a significant amount of Working Group (or Sub Team) time would be needed."

George Kirikos 3:So, that "huge task" is now being reassigned to the individual members, with 9 days left.

Kristine Dorrain:I think that would help, thanks.

Kristine Dorrain:@Phil, I understand and appreciate the intention.

Philip Corwin:Thx Kristine

Kristine Dorrain:As I said in my rambly comment, I don't think there is a "hidden gem" of definitive information out there - if people have links bookmarked, send them around.,

Griffin Barnett:Agree with Kristine re additional sources

Kristine Dorrain:Also, one option is to have a question in the initial report for the community to submit information they think we should consider for the final report.

Griffin Barnett:If our aim is effective crowdsourcing that would be a good approach

Griffin Barnett:I admit I was overwhelmed with the most recent original HW assignment and couldn't send any time working on it

Griffin Barnett:*spend

Kristine Dorrain:Also overwhelmed which is why I suggested a truncated reading list.

Griffin Barnett:Agree we need to be realistic about the timeline. We cannot overwhelm members with HW solely to meet an unreasonable deadline/timeline

Griffin Barnett:It's just unfair

Kristine Dorrain:And I am really torn on the timeline. On one hand, this has the potential to just go on forever, which I am deeply opposed to. On the other hand, the work does have to be manageable.

Griffin Barnett:+1 Kristine

Kristine Dorrain:I appreciate staff's efforts to be responsive and make it so.

George Kirikos 3:Bite-sized pieces. If you assign 60 hours of work, don't expect it to be done in 3 weeks.

Mary Wong:Please note that the overall timeline is not fixed in stone - it was an estimate. If one or both sub teams (or indeed the full WG) believe they need more time, the timeline can be adjusted and the reasons reported to the Council

George Kirikos 3:Did anyone even attempt looking at the Analysis Group and INTA reports? (revised HW) I know I didn't.

Martin Silva Valent:(can we change the screen to the "Previous Data Analysis" sheet?)

George Kirikos 3:I just looked at the first 4 data sources, and last week's assigned charter questions.

Kristine Dorrain:I propose that the subteam co chairs review the materials and propose a reasonable extension that is aggressive enough that we can get this done, but also manageable.,

Ariel Liang:Link to the tool here: https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_docs.google.com_spreadsheets_d_1SzvdmVhY8dZ4I-5FZGVon5IOSueHNzbm1jQErssAJI8QQ_edit-3Fusp-3Dsharing&d=DwlCaQ&c=FmY1u3Pjp6wrcrwlI3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=k7uKdjSb7_ZjItyVqrCYH_o_rKms9SFxlmbYEJqG-y9I&m=o_GqbcxTfrc2avTs4vQiRyDdjTFbVvh7FAMR4Fm7FE4&s=VLbGBLoChB9tZN30kktcBKlSd26EpYLmRpiV75-b6nl&e=

Kristine Dorrain:I have looked at both previously, but not recently

Kathy Kleiman:are we looking at the right document on the screen?

Ariel Liang:Sorry we cannot display that in AC as it would be extremely small to look at

Martin Silva Valent:ok

George Kirikos 3:The sub team co-chairs should attempt the homework themselves, before assigning it. i.e. if they do 2 or 4 hours of work, get through a certain amount, and then assign it, that's fair.

George Kirikos 3:But, there's a disconnect, simply assigning documents with no idea how long it would take to cross-check relevance to each charter question.

Martin Silva Valent:George, there is not phisical time to do the test, is not linear

Martin Silva Valent:we need your feedback

Kathy Kleiman:(The early Analysis Group Review of the TMCH -- before we started and revised after our WG commenced)

Kathy Kleiman:It was requested by the GAC -- in part, with our then-future WG in mind...

George Kirikos 3:@Martin: did you or Roger even try to do any of the assigned homework? If so, how long did it take you for this week? (i.e. look a the documents,they are mostly blank, as no one bothered to try!)

Martin Silva Valent:of course we reviwed what we propose....

George Kirikos 3:I posted to the lists the names of folks who even submitted any comments to the Google docs for past weeks. Much smaller than the total number of members.

George Kirikos 3:@Martin: if you reviewed, where's your input in the Google docs?

Martin Silva Valent:as Chair I preffered not to put my input

Griffin Barnett:I don't think it is the role of the sub-team co-chairs to provide written input on the HW

George Kirikos 3:3 business days, how many staff members, though?

Martin Silva Valent:I chose to colaborate by chairing

Martin Silva Valent:and be neutral

George Kirikos 3:24 hours of work! Times how many staff, though?

Kathy Kleiman:Apologies, All, I have to leave for a presentation.

Kathy Kleiman:Looking forward to continuing to discuss the charter questions, documents and data next week....

Griffin Barnett:@George I think we all agree the workload for the past week was not well calculated. No need to continue harping on it.

Griffin Barnett:I would suggest givnig folks another week to try and complete the HW from the previous week

George Kirikos 3:@Griffin: but, there's been no resolution....i.e. all that was said was that we have 3 weeks to finish, period.

Griffin Barnett:And then reassessing next steps from there

Mary Wong:@George, as noted upthrad, if the sub team(s) and/or the WG believe more time is needed, the Phase One timeline can be adjusted. It will be a decision for the various co-chairs (including the WG leadership) based on feedback from the sub teams and WG. The GNSO Council will then be informed that the timeline has been extended.

Kristine Dorrain:@George, I made a written request above for the subteams cochairs to re-evaluate the timeline. I expect they will. :)

George Kirikos 3:If I left no comments (as I did leave no comments), I found nothing relevant in the first 4 documents, as per the first 2 charter questions.

George Kirikos 3:+1 Kristine.

George Kirikos 3:The "newly revised" homework --- I don't think anyone tried to even do it.

George Kirikos 3:This week was a disaster, sorry.

Griffin Barnett:Agree with Kristine and George... seems there was a lot of confusion given the set of data that was determined to focus on despite the overarching HW workload issue and that folks who did attempt the HW did not necessarily focus on the docs identified by co-chairs/staff

Kristine Dorrain:I know Kathy is gone, but she did the docs I suggested also.

Kristine Dorrain:and I didn't mean to step in with a suggestion, but given that the deadline was looming I felt it was more helpful to make a proposal than to just complain. didn't mean to step on staff's suggestions. :)

Kristine Dorrain:FWIW, from a process standpoint, I found it helpful to print the subject doc and then compare to the charter questions across the board. That way I only needed to review a doc at once each.

Griffin Barnett:The obvious solution here is to stop this call, give members more time to actually do the HW and then try and return to discussions next week.

Kristine Dorrain:+1Griffin.

Griffin Barnett:And no new HW until we finish the current set.

Griffin Barnett:If that delays the timeline then so be it

George Kirikos 3:If it took staff 24 hours to do it (or more, if multiple staff did 24 hours each), how many weeks should we as volunteers get to do it?

George Kirikos 3:24 divided by 3 = 8 hours of work per week? Unreasonable.

Griffin Barnett:Perhaps we identify a smaller chunk from the current HW that we should agree to tackle by next week

George Kirikos 3:I reviewed the first 4 documents.

George Kirikos 3:(I had "nothing relevant", but didn't type it, as I was waiting to review the other 8)

Cyntia King:+1 @Griffin

George Kirikos 3:The first 4 documents were small, too. The Analysis Group report is 67 pages (first 38 are most relevant).

Kristine Dorrain:to summarize: HW this week is first 4 docs.

Kristine Dorrain:If people can, move on to AG and INTA.

George Kirikos 3:But, we should expand it to all 5 charter questions.

George Kirikos 3:(instead of just the first 2 charter questions)

Kristine Dorrain:YES George, review each doc once.

Griffin Barnett:Yeah agree it now is a more document-first approach, across all the questions; then next document etc.

George Kirikos 3:+1 Griffin. I only figured that out after trying it the other way first.

Kristine Dorrain:can't hear you

Andrea Glandon:Roger, you are cutting out

Cyntia King:Sound just tanked?

Kristine Dorrain:you're cutting out badly

Kristine Dorrain:better

Griffin Barnett:I am against further division of the sub-team

Kristine Dorrain:+1Griffin

Cyntia King:Agree @Griffin

George Kirikos 3:Dividing the work is tricky, as there's perhaps a lack of trust that all the points will be documented properly, if they're adverse to one's position.

Roger Carney:No worries, just wanted to throw it out there

Griffin Barnett:Agree - not assigning blame here, jsut a miscalculation; it happens, let's just regroup give an extension of time and try and be in a better position next time

Griffin Barnett:Appreciate the efforts of staff and co-chairs

Kristine Dorrain:thanks all

George Kirikos 3:Right, no bad faith intended. Just badly miscalculated.

George Kirikos 3:Bye folks.

Griffin Barnett:Thanks, bye all

