

**Policy Process Steering Committee (PPSC) Policy Development Process (PDP) Work
Team (WT)
TRANSCRIPTION**

Wednesday 23 April 2009 14:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Policy Process Steering Committee Policy Development Process (PDP) Work Team (WT) meeting on Wednesday 23 April 2009, at 14:00 UTC 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. The audio is also available at:

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-ppsc-20090423.mp3>

<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#april>

(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

Participants on the Call:

Jeff Neuman - Work Team chair - Registry c.
James Bladel - Registrar c.
Paul Diaz - Registrar c.
Alan Greenberg - ALAC
Liz Williams - CBUC

Icann Staff:

Margie Milam
Marika Konings
Glen de Saint Géry - GNSO Secretariat

Absent apologies:

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen - ISP
Bertrand de la Chapelle - GAC
Brian Winterfeldt - IPC
Sophia Bekele
Zybnek Loebel - IPC
Jean-Christophe Vignes - Registrar

Coordinator: Your recording has started, please go ahead.

Okay, thank you very much. This is a recording of the (PDP) work team meeting on; help me with the date here, April 23, 2009. At least I knew the right year. And if I can turn it over to Glen to just read who's on the call.

Glen Desaintgery: Thank you, Jeff. On the call, we have yourself, Jeff Neuman, Alan Greenberg, and (Liz Gasster). No, Liz Williams.

Liz Williams: Liz Williams.

Jeff Neuman: Hey Liz, are you in a place where...

Glen Desaintgery: (unintelligible).

Jeff Neuman: I'm sorry what was that? Liz, are you in a place where you can sign onto a computer and there was an Adobe link? That came with the media invite?

Liz Williams: I'm not in front of my computer. If you just want to send the link to me, I can just log on to Adobe.

Glen Desaintgery: Okay, I'll send it to you Liz.

Liz Williams: Thanks, Glen.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, obviously we have a small crowd today, so I guess, you know, we'll try to move on with a little bit of work and then we'd like to hear from you guys as to what you think we should do.

We've also had an issue with getting people to participate on the list and make comments.

So the first thing I want to do is kind of go through the notes of the last call to make sure you all are in agreement with what we discussed on the last call.

And these were notes that were drawn up by the policy staff. And then I guess (Margie) and then I looked through it and added a couple things.

So I just want to make sure we capture the gist of it. And then we can, you know, start on the next few things or have - I'd asked Alan and Alan sent out an email and maybe you can kind of go through what you sent on the email.

So in looking at the notes, hopefully you guys have had some time to read it but this seemed to be the gist of what we discussed on the last call. Does anyone have any comments on that?

Liz Williams: Yes, just a quick one. Is there any - this is a really dumb question but is there any need for a quorum like things? Is there a minimum for participation? (Cause) I didn't realize there was so few people on the call until Glen read out the thing.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, you know, it's a good question and that may be an issue the working group work team is looking at. I've never - there's nothing in our formal rules about a quorum but...

Liz Williams: It was actually more of a concern of, you know, is it sensible to go ahead with things when there's so few people, rather than a formal quorum question?

Jeff Neuman: Yes. No and I was thinking the same thing. What are your thoughts?

Do you think we should just try to encourage some more participation on the list and then find another date maybe next week, you know, towards the end of next week if people can join?

Glen Desaintgery: Jeff, this is Glen, may I say something?

Jeff Neuman: Sure.

Glen Desaintgery: I think it would probably help if we could come to some sort of agreement to have a standard day and a standard time because then people would get it into their calendars and they'd know to put aside the time.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, I think that's a good idea. I mean I kind of like, you know, I kind of like - what, is it Thursday today? I mean it's just - you know, let's turn and doodle for the next few weeks.

Glen Desaintgery: Okay, and then I'm looking for...

Jeff Neuman: Let's try for - I mean what day is good for - I know, Glen, you have calls every day with different work teams and things - what's a good day or that there aren't any other meetings or fewer other meetings?

Glen Desaintgery: I don't have one of those days.

Jeff Neuman: So, I mean, Fridays are bad because that's really late for Liz and the people in Europe and, you know, by the time we have it, it's Friday night. So I'm thinking Thursdays are probably a good...

Glen Desaintgery: Well I would say Thursday too with the exception that when we have a council call, we perhaps don't have a (PVP) call because they are more or less at the same time.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, I think that's good.

Glen Desaintgery: Okay...

((Crosstalk))

Glen Desaintgery: (unintelligible).

Jeff Neuman: Yes, so why don't we do that? Why don't we reschedule then?

Liz Williams: Yes and, Jeff, what I suggest we do, just to add insult to injury, is to say, you know, what are the things that need to be done by which particular time and what's at risk if people don't participate? Because if we don't meet the timeline, then what happens?

Is there any problem, is there any difficulty, is there any whatever? And because we need to get people to participate, otherwise there's no legitimacy in the process.

Do you know what I mean, like what we come up with? It's not that people have done a bad job but that, you know, there's just not enough of us to have done it.

Jeff Neuman: I think worse than that is if we try to do something and actually make decisions and move on, it gets reopened at the next meeting anyway if there was no more participation.

Paul Diaz: Jeff, can I make a point?

Jeff Neuman: Yes.

Paul Diaz: Hey, it's Paul Diaz. I'm sorry I'm late. Jeff, just speaking from experience from the transfer-working group that I chaired, I echo everything everybody is saying here.

You know, moving forward making decisions without the full group raises legitimacy questions and concerns.

Having to re-go over things in the next meeting or on the list because people weren't there, don't have time to listen to MP3s is just burdensome on everybody. And fundamentally, having a standard time is key.

Our transfer-working group did very well because we set a particular time and everything was fine. Once we had our draft report, then the meetings weren't regularly held

And thereafter, attendance fell off dramatically because - not dramatically, but there was always concerns about attendance because if it wasn't a regular time and date, people just out of sight, out of mind.

Jeff Neuman: Right, I agree.

Paul Diaz: So I strongly agree, yes, you know, this time is fine or whatever works for people but try and lock in a particular day and block of time. That

way everybody just assumes okay, it's Thursday, let's do the policy work.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, let's do that. Let's plan for Thursdays at this time.

Paul Diaz: Let's schedule every week except for the council meetings.

Jeff Neuman: Right.

Paul Diaz: And then we'll hold them - we'll hold them or not as we decide.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, I think...

Paul Diaz: I think at this point, we need one every week.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, I think that's a good idea.

Paul Diaz: Or two or three anyway.

Jeff Neuman: I think what will happen is I'll send a note out later on today, maybe tonight, talking about this and who attended and we're just going to regularly schedule it so people can put it on their calendars and that we need more discussion on the list.

And, you know, one of the things that I know the BC, IPC and IFPs have submitted several statements and one of them is, you know, to the restructuring committee that they don't think any of this should go into effect until the (PVP) is finished.

And I think, you know, putting aside whether I do that is correct or not, I mean that's just certainly a legitimate point of view. But it would seem to me I'd hope that they'd at least show up (unintelligible) here.

Man: There may be a message there, Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Right, I mean, like that's true too, right? You know; if you're going to make that argument, then please, you know, make every effort to come.

I thank you, Liz, for showing up as you're a member of one of those constituencies but, you know, maybe that's - anyway, something to consider.

So I'll send out a note later on today or tonight about attendance and that we're going to schedule for this time, 10 am Eastern. And I'll do a world clock as to when it is UTC for future weeks.

Alan Greenberg: My only comment to that is since so many people didn't show up, this maybe a bad time.

Liz Williams: Yes, just as Jeff said - I wasn't going to say it but I don't think, Alan, it's a bad time, I think anytime is a bad time to be, you know, to be doing this kind of stuff.

For example, for me every second Thursday there's a nominating committee meeting, some of which I don't attend.

But I'm not going to say I can't do it at this time because it's just too difficult for Glen to find a time that's common and I hate wasting time filling in the doodle polls and then having nobody turn up...

Jeff Neuman: Right.

Liz Williams: ...that's what we've done before. I mean that's just a waste.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, because I do think there are people who filled in the doodle polls that said they were available for today and that aren't on this call.

Liz Williams: Yes.

Glen Desaintgery" Okay, so Jeff, you just want to do that? But I do want there to be some risk analysis because we're running - we've got eight weeks until the Sidney meeting and there is some output that needs to be done before then.

Jeff Neuman: Agreed, agreed. So if I can ask the people on this call and then I'll send out a list, make a read of (Bertrand) sent around of the Birds of a Feather (RFC).

And let's see if there are things that we can draw from that because I know the IETF has had that pre-working group process for several years now, for a number of years and it kind of seemed to work well.

We did it actually once. I think that's what we called our Birds of a Feather group for the ad grace period (unintelligible) group before there was a formal (PDP) and I think it actually worked well.

So if people could read through that and just post their ideas, that would be great.

Glen Desaintgery: Okay.

Jeff Neuman: All right, thanks everyone.

((Crosstalk))

Jeff Neuman: Sorry ICANN for making you get up so early.

Glen Desaintgery: That's all right. Talk to you later.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks, bye.

Glen Desaintgery: Bye.

((Crosstalk))

Liz Williams: Hey, Jeff, are you still there?

Jeff Neuman: Yes.

Liz Williams: Will you have a chance to look at the document I send you because I think there might be some elements that might be helpful in going forward?

Jeff Neuman: Yes, I will have a chance hopefully in the next couple days.

Liz Williams: Okay, great.

Jeff Neuman: Thank you, everyone.

Liz Williams: Thanks. Bye, Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Bye.

END