From: Neuman, Jeff [mailto:Jeff.Neuman@neustar.us]

Sent: Thursday, December 10, 2009 9:47 PM

To: Gomes, Chuck

Cc: Glen de Saint Géry; gnso-ppsc-pdp@icann.org; gnso-ppsc@icann.org

Subject: Support for a PDP Work Team Face to Face Meeting

Chuck,

Please find enclosed a <u>request by the PDP Work Team</u> for a face to face meeting in January 2010 which sets forth the rationale for needing such a working session. This draft was discussed by the PDP Work Team on e-mail and during two conference calls. Although there was not a consensus on the request for such a face to face meeting within the PDP WT, there was strong support from the RySG, the IP Constituency, the ISP Constituency, ALAC and one of the two Business Constituency representatives for the reasons stated within the attached document. The Registrar representatives and 1 of the business constituency representatives were not in favor of the request. The NCSG generally believes that there could be a positive benefit from a face to face meeting with the caveats expressed below. The PDP WT offers no opinion in this document on the general role of face to face meetings, the Council's role in approving or supporting those face to face meetings, etc., but rather focuses on our specific request.

The <u>request</u> was sent to the full Policy Process Steering Committee on December 5, 2009, and although no comments were actually received from any person on the PPSC that was not already a member of the PDP WT, there were a number of e-mails on various mailing lists on this topic. The discussions are primarily archived on two lists: (i) the PPSC list (http://forum.icann.org/lists/gnso-ppsc/) and (ii) the PDP-WT list (the PDP WT list - http://forum.icann.org/lists/gnso-ppsc-pdp/). It should be noted that the PPSC as a whole has been inactive since the formation of the Work Teams early this year. In fact some members of the PPSC listed at <a href="https://st.icann.org/icann-pass/lindowsripe-pass/lindowsripe-pass/lindowsripe-pass/lindowsripe-pass/lindowsripe-pass/lindowsripe-pass/lindowsripe-pass/lindowsripe-pass/lindowsripe-pass/lindowsripe-pass/lindowsripe-pass/lindowsripe-pass/lindowsripe-pass/lindowsripe-pass/lindowsripe-pass/lindowsripe-pass/lindowsripe-pass/lindowsripe-pass/lindowsripe-pass/lindowsripe-pass/lindowsripe-pass/lindowsripe-pass/lindowsripe-pass/lindowsripe-pass/lindowsripe-pass/lindowsripe-pass/lindowsripe-pass/lindowsripe-pass/lindowsripe-pass/lindowsripe-pass/lindowsripe-pass/lindowsripe-pass/lindowsripe-pass/lindowsripe-pass/lindowsripe-pass/lindowsripe-pass/lindowsripe-pass/lindowsripe-pass/lindowsripe-pass/lindowsripe-pass/lindowsripe-pass/lindowsripe-pass/lindowsripe-pass/lindowsripe-pass/lindowsripe-pass/lindowsripe-pass/lindowsripe-pass/lindowsripe-pass/lindowsripe-pass/lindowsripe-pass/lindowsripe-pass/lindowsripe-pass/lindowsripe-pass/lindowsripe-pass/lindowsripe-pass/lindowsripe-pass/lindowsripe-pass/lindowsripe-pass/lindowsripe-pass/lindowsripe-pass/lindowsripe-pass/lindowsripe-pass/lindowsripe-pass/lindowsripe-pass/lindowsripe-pass/lindowsripe-pass/lindowsripe-pass/lindowsripe-pass/lindowsripe-pass/lindowsripe-pass/lindowsripe-pass/lindowsripe-pass/lindowsripe-pass/lindows

<u>ppsc/index.cgi?policy process steering committee ppsc,</u> may not be members of the Council or even active in the community. That is a separate issue that I plan on addressing in the next few weeks.

The NCSG arguments can be found in full at http://forum.icann.org/lists/gnso-ppsc-pdp/msg00241.html. To summarize, the NCSG has argued that there is not a consensus of the group in support of (i) the rationale for the Face to Face meeting, (ii) the appropriateness of holding such a meeting in the United States, and (iii) the resolution of how many people from each SG or constituency should be funded by ICANN to attend. The NCSG believes that there should be parity of representatives funded to attend face to face meetings by Stakeholder Group (as opposed to by Constituency). Finally, there was a question raised as to who makes the decisions on holding and funding these types of meetings (the Work Team, the Steering Committee, the GNSO Council, ICANN Policy Staff, etc.).

Whether or not we have a face to face meeting, each member of the PDP WT with the exception of one business constituency representative believes that the work of the PDP-WT is essential and should be of the highest priority of the GNSO Council and community. The work being performed in the WT was work directed to be done ultimately by the Board Governance Committee as part of the GNSO Improvements Process. The finalization of the Policy Development Process will guide how all future policy is made

under the new structure and as such should be resolved as quickly as possible. The review of the PDP is incredibly broad and complex. There are a number of difficult issues that we have been, and continue to be, tackling in order to come up with a process acceptable to the global Internet community. The core group of participants (including ICANN policy staff) are diverse, knowledgeable, passionate and highly respected members of the community and are fully committed to seeing this process through to the end regardless of having this face to face meeting. I have the utmost respect for each member of the team.

Please let me know if you have any questions. I would be happy to make myself available for the Council meeting to address any questions.

Thank you for your consideration of our request.

Jeffrey J. Neuman , PDP Work Team Chair Neustar, Inc. / Vice President, Law & Policy 46000 Center Oak Plaza Sterling, VA 20166

Office: +1.571.434.5772 Mobile: +1.202.549.5079 Fax: +1.703.738.7965 / jeff.neuman@neustar.biz /

www.neustar.biz