GNSO
Post-Expiration Domain Name Recovery (PEDNR) drafting team teleconference
27 May 2009 at 18:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Post-
Expiration Domain Name Recovery (PEDNR) drafting team teleconference on 27 May 2009 . 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-pednr-20090527.mp3
http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#may

Participants present:

Alan Greenberg - ALAC GNSO Council liaison
Avri Doria - GNSO Council chair
Tim Ruiz
Mike O'Connor

Staff:
Marika Konings - Policy Director
Gisella Gruber-White - GNSO Secretariat

Coordinator: The recording has been started.

(Marika):   Okay thanks. Thank you.

Avri   Yes, just I want to start out by sort of explaining the confusion about

                 the vote over having a task force on that. And that's something that we

                 really need to get fixed up in the bylaws.

                 That since the vote didn't complete on the other until the absentee

                 ballots were in and by that point it was no longer possible to have a

                 vote in the same meeting, then it became a meaning question of do we

                 actually need to have that vote especially since we were explicit about

                 calling for a working group.

However, there's no problem with - and I was reading (Tim)'s motion. I see no problem with putting one of those on, you know, record, you know, just for safety's sake.

And in that case it doesn't matter whether we do it, you know, three weeks later at this meeting or six weeks later at the next meeting. Because I don't have it on the agenda for tomorrow because I didn't think it was necessary. You know, I could put it on the agenda for the Wednesday meeting (Unintelligible).

(Alan): Yes my only concern was how soon could we put in a call to members in the working group?

Avri Well we...

(Alan): I was less worried about the formality than...

Avri (Don't have) to have it charted to have a working group. That has nothing to do with the vote for task force or not task force. Because if we had taken the vote on the task force then that means we have no task force.

When committee as a whole the first thing the committee as a whole does is decide to have a working group.

So until there's a charter for a working group that vote isn't taken.

(Alan): Okay. My recollection was it goes in the other order. But that's fine.

Avri   Right. You have to have a working group charter to have a working
            group I believe.

            We may have...

((Crosstalk)).

(Tim):   This is (Tim). I...

(Avri   Yes, hi (Tim).

(Tim):   I guess when we voted on by - I thought we were - I was just assuming
            that we had decided to do the working group and that we were just
            incorporating it all into one motion but...

Avri   Yes.

(Tim):   ...maybe that's not everyone's impression.

Avri   Yes that was my impression and that is an acceptable way to read it.
            It's just that if there are those that believe we really need to take that
            vote, you know, the other possibility that I have checked with legal
            counsel is to include in the warehouse motion for this partner, you
            know, whereas the council decided to create a working group instead
            of a task force in its vote of, you know, that'll work.

            But as I say, if it's strict adherence to the sequence is important and as
            I said, for legal counsel, that I've got a sort of initial, you know,
            impression that it's not necessary because we said formal working
            group.

(Tim):   Yes I don't think anyone is saying that the strict order, you know, following that order is important.

My only - my recollection and perhaps is wrong is we normally, when we normally vote on it to have a working group we then ask someone or some group to go off and write the detailed charter for approval. And in parallel we put out a call to members.

And it was the call for members that I was trying to get off the ground as quickly as we could so perhaps there could be a meeting.

Avri   I see no reason why there couldn't be a call for members in parallel with the charter because there has been a few but two or three weeks one way or the other, is that going to make a lot of difference?

(Tim):   Only that perhaps there was an opportunity for some face to face discussion in Sydney.

Man: Right, yes.

(Avri   I don't see a reason not to start the call for members and say the discussion is still being, you know, the charter discussion is still ongoing in the group. They can be added to this group.

I kind of see these groups as sort of the beginning of the working group.

(Tim):   Right. Well if that can be done tomorrow and, you know, ask staff to put up a call in parallel with all this I'm tickled pink.

Man: Yes it's the motion...

((Crosstalk)).

(Tim):   I think the motion that we passed, you know, is pretty informational if anyone, you know, wants to know what the working group's about. I mean it's pretty explicit so...

                It has had pretty literal, all the words for the charter without having the, you know, the frame around it.

(Tim):   Right, right.

(Marika):   This is (Marika). Just to add to that, I think that the workshop that we're planning for the city meeting probably would be a good or hopefully this is a good opportunity to actually attract new people to this group because as we said, we've put out or Glen has put out a call for volunteers a number of times.

                And we're hoping that more people would get in. But so far no luck. But hopefully, you know, getting people around the table and talking about this issue will get more people excited about it. And that might be an opportunity to have the first informal meeting of the working group in that workshop and get more people to sign up.

(Tim):   Right. I think they'll be more excitement about actually trying to address the issue rather than drafting teams to write documents.

(Marika):   I do too.

(Abry):   I think that someone, the call that is sort of both saying that this (unintelligible) and that the working group's sort of together that that might also be a useful thing that in advertising the meeting also mention the working call group being formed.

(Tim):   Okay.

Avri   And any number of ways, I don't see anything in what the council did or any process that would stop us from trying to collect the people for the working group. It's just we have to say it hasn't been chartered yet. It's still in the chartering process.

            But as long as we say that and point to the motion of what the charter will contain, I think we're fine. We just can't say it's chartered yet.

(Tim):   Then let's do it and we don't have to talk about it anymore.

Avri   Okay.

Man: Yes, agreed.

(Avri   (Unintelligible). So we've got two charters on the table. You guys take on (unintelligible).

(Alan):   There are two charters on the table?

Avri   Well isn't their yours and then I actually only opened (Tim)'s but I thought you were...

(Alan):   Oh, I hadn't seen anything from (Tim) yet.

(Avri   Oh, okay yes.

(Alan):   Maybe I - when did it come?

Avri   He sent one and then shortly thereafter (Tim) sent one. So I'd got two.

(Alan):   Okay. I need to collect mail then.

Man: I was just finishing mine up when yours popped in so I kind of grabbed a couple things from yours and stuck it in mine just to...

(Alan):   Oh good.

Avri   So which one do we want to go through first? If (Tim)'s is aggregate would it be worth going through that one first and then (Alan) if you take it?

(Alan):   As soon as I can find it.

Avri   Okay. Then you could talk us through it. And by the way I'm just doing my normal bit of talking a lot in a vacuum. But I'm not pretending to be responsible for this.

(Alan):   Oh too bad. We were - I was sort of hoping.

(Avri   I'm not presuming. (Unintelligible).

(Alan):   Okay. Do we have - there we are.

Avri   Okay (Tim), as soon as everyone's ready the floor is yours.

(Tim):   Okay. If I just use the - pretty similar to what (Alan) did. I just took the
              transfer of TDPA charter and then just modified it. So the first part of it
              just refers to the original motion that we did. I couldn't remember the
              date so I just stuck in the placeholder for that. That calls for the
              initiation of PDP. (And we tied) to that motion in there.

              And then under the charter I included the potential that we would have
              a motion on forming a working group instead of a task force.

              So (Alan) had already drafted that. So I included that motion as the first
              part of the charter to set up the fact that we're actually forming a
              working group.

              And then the rest of the charter is pretty much just taken from the
              original motion with - I added a couple of things about what the working
              group should do as far as research and information gathering, has the
              motion called for the information from the compliance staff on the
              current (R80) provisions and consensus policies on the lease and not a
              renewal and then how those are - in the RGP and how those are
              enforced.

              Two, to review and understand the (condominium) lifecycle and three
              to review the current registrar practices regarding the (unintelligible)
              exploration renewal and post exploration recovery.

And on the second part the working group should then consider the following questions. And those are taken straight from the motion, the five questions from the motion.

And then the final paragraph there is just again from the motion that the working group should consider recommendations from best practices as well as instead of recommendations for consensus policy.

And then the working group process is just strictly taking copies straight from the RA TPA.

(Alan): Which is where I took it off from.

(Tim): Which is what (Alan) had done as well. So...

(Alan): All right. So the only - I'm on a tiny little screen here. I'm trying to see...

(Tim): Yes, you know, I mean that's...

(Alan): I have no problem with that.

(Tim): It could be debated. I just thought it would be good for the group to understand is...

(Tim): Well to be quite candid if any working group is going to look at this without trying to look at - understand all those things there is no hope for anything coming out of there. I have no problem including the detail. I guess I took it as sort of a given but that's fine.

Avri You also added milestones which was a good thing.

(Tim):   I had - I have cut out that section because I really didn't know what kind of timeframe. I thought at this meeting we'd look at what kind of timeframe is likely possible.

Avri   And I think that's a good thing to talk about. I do (unintelligible) I think we (unintelligible).

(Tim):   This is (Tim). I didn't put a lot of thought into those milestones. They're just basically copied straight out of the IOTPA charter so...

Avri   Right. And those are the basic steps that we have to have. We have to have the templates (unintelligible) initial report, the first comment and (improvement).

             We can also have other milestones if we wish. For example, you know, start the research, you know, gather the questions for research, things like that are content-wise significant to this group if that'll be helpful in helping the group do its work.

             And as I say this is one place where I'd like to put a lot of reliance on policy staff in terms of helping figure out what milestones are useful to have and reasonable times.

             For example, a template for constituency comments three weeks after the meeting in Sydney is probably challenging. That's (first clue). And so that's all I wanted to say on that.

             Are we pretty much accepted that the rest of the content up to then is fine or (Alan) did you have...

(Alan):   I really need to read it...

Avri   Okay.

(Alan):   ...you know, quietly after I can get a printout of it...

Avri   Okay fine.

(Alan):   ...which I can't at the moment.

(Avri   We'll talk about that.

(Alan):   But there's nothing that leaps out at me right now but...

Avri   We've got the list.

(Alan):   I'll get it printed out later this month the next couple of days.

Avri   We've got a list and for a motion. So first of all I need to know to put this motion on the public meeting for the cycle (of motion) open mic discussion and then the votes.

(Alan):   Okay.

Man: But if we decide as a group, you know, if the council's all pretty much in agreement that, you know, the intent was that we form a working group through the original motion then we don't need that at all.

Avri):   Well we do need a motion to vote on to approve the charter.

Man: Yes.

Man: Oh yes, yes. I see. Right.

Avri   So that vote we need. So whatever votes we do we absolutely have to have a charter approving votes and hopefully an approving of someone to chair the group and someone to be a liaison from the counsel to the group.

           And (Tim) you're looking like you're in a really good position to be the (counsel) to the group.

           And in terms of the care of that group, you know, (Alan)'s been chairing it so long so maybe but I don't know. I'm just positing it. It ain't me is the only thing I'm certain of because I just don't believe that a member of the counsel should be chairs. They should be liaisons. And certainly a chair, a counsel should be the chair accepted in an emergency situation.

(Alan):   And I suspect and since I being the lead proponent in this I shouldn't be the chair either because I'm not likely an unbiased observer.

Avri):   (Unintelligible) others showing up. And we can have a interim chair while we're selecting a chair at the time.

           So if you don't want to be chair (Alan), maybe we should consider whether you are an interim chair.

(Alan):   Well I certainly have no problem with that.

Avri   Anyhow...

(Alan):   My recollection is right now we're trying to look at chairs who are
                relatively unbiased and not active participants in the discussion. Is that
                correct?

Avri   (Unintelligible) are able (unintelligible). And obviously all of us have an
                opinion on just about everything. And even if we don't when we start
                we form one along the process what a chair has to do and the balance
                we've sort of been playing with which is a tough one which is a chair
                can certainly state his or her view on something, maybe just leave it on
                the table and other people pick it up and it goes with. But you don't end
                up a protagonist or an antagonist (unintelligible).

(Alan):   We can certainly set me as the interim chair and then decide what to
                do next.

Avri   (Unintelligible) what happens with the group once we have more
                members. But the group (unintelligible). And that would be fine. You
                know, I mean obviously the counsel needs to approve that. And then
                the group would pick it's chair. And then in a following council meeting
                we would just endorse our choice as we've done in the past.

                And then unless we didn't endorse that choice then I don't know how
                that would work but pretty much we've endorsed that choice afterwards
                just for finalities sake.

                Okay. In order to have this and as if this group - and I think it be a good
                one to have on the agenda. I don't know what (Marika). But if we want

to have this on the agenda in Sydney -- and I think it is a good one -- I also think it's a good one where, you know, we may actually get some public comment on the work that needs to be done. And it acts as somewhat a lead in to the session being held or unless the session is held before it. I don't know.

(Alan): I think it's Wednesday afternoon isn't it (Marika)?

(Marika): Yes. Correct.

(Abry): So it's a perfect lead up...

(Alan): Yes.

Avri ...for the workshop.

So, you know, if this group says yes, we'll be ready with a charter at least two weeks before the meeting which I guess is the 9th June, you know, obviously on the council we can go as late as a week before the meeting but it'd be good if we had two weeks, try and do what I can, get your stuff done by two weeks before the...

(Alan): I mean if this group is representative I find it hard to believe we can't have it done by then unless we drop it and forget about it

Avri Yes. Right. What do you think (Tim)?

(Tim): And I agree. I think we should be able to do that.

Avri Do we have - what do you think's best (Marika)?

(Marika):   Yes, I don't see any issues.

Avri   Okay. So then it would really just be looking at the milestones and perhaps coming up with some - do we want to talk about that now or...

(Marika):   Just one thing I would like to mention there is that as long as we can keep enough flexibility in there to adjust to current workout and just seeing in the other working groups that there's a real struggle in getting people to commit time and to do things. So just want to make sure that we have realistic expectations as to when this group will be able to deliver.

Avri   And that's basically kind of what I'm asking you to tell us. In other words you - the staff at the moment probably because you're looking at all the working groups and you're looking at our behavior patterns in aggregate are probably best at predicting, you know, whether if it makes any sense at all to have a template in 21 days for example and such. So but it's...that's on the milestone target.

(Marika):   It would probably be a question as well for those that joined the working group. Because a big difference for example is if people want to meet weekly or biweekly. That makes a huge difference in how quickly work can be delivered.

                The last working groups (I have set) up is the request from the volunteers to have it biweekly to kind of cope with the amount of calls and work that's currently ongoing.

So and from a staff perspective that's one of the defining factors in how quick we can deliver. I think, you know, we can keep up but we really see that from the community side it's a real challenge at the moment

Avri): So we could probably assume that we do have a biweekly meeting period accept for when a something is being done as an emergency, we had to do this quickly because, or a group finds itself getting behind and decides on its own.

(Alan): But or we're out in a comment period or something.

Avri Right.

(Alan): I'd like to work backwards and I mean in an ideal sense I'd like to have some suggested outcomes ready for fall. And the question is are there enough days to realistically do that or not?

Avri (Unintelligible) this September. What is Seoul?

(Marika): I think that's highly unlikely. Having seen the registration of (use) group that basically kicks off after Mexico City and was supposed to delivered by or at least an interim report by the Sydney meeting there.

I mean it's difficult (subject) as well and it's, you know, taking a long time to discuss the same issues. But it's taking a long time as well. And (unintelligible) some calls need to be canceled due to holidays or people, you know, can't make it having biweekly calls. So I think that will be a very optimistic timeline. But the question is well if people are willing to put the time in it that makes all the difference.

(Mike):   This is (Mike). I'd just like to comment on the biweekly meeting thing.

Being on that workgroup, the biweekly meeting really slows stuff down. So I think maybe what we ought to do is change it around and instead of saying it's biweekly by default say it's weekly.

And if you can't keep up then don't join the working group. Because I agree (Marika) because that working group is really slow. It's so slow that it's hard to keep the conversation going.

Avri   Yes but it's also part of it that we also haven't trained ourselves to use any between meeting working tools.

Man: Yes but I'm not sure we're going to say we're changing that.

Avri   We're not sure that we're going to change that. But other question that I have when we get beyond the biweekly is if we've got full world's spread -- actually two issues. If we've got full world spread on the meeting there's really only one or two of reasonable time slots a day. So we end up with somewhere between five and ten possible timeslots a week.

And as we start to have more working groups the (unintelligible) are all going to be weekly becomes (unintelligible).Now we may not have full world spread.

The other thing is - and this is in the nature of bottom up consensus building processes is it just takes time to reach the edges of the conversation and come back to the people inside the meeting.

So trying to move too quickly sometimes is - doesn't really work. I mean, you know, when you're looking at this whole process of bottom up consensus (producing) fast is not at the top of the list of things we can (achieve). We can in some places where we really need to. But so is this one that we really absolutely have to get it done as soon as possible?

(Marika): Just (Abry) just to add something else to it, I mean just looking for example another working group like the IRGP who did meet weekly but you only have three issues to look at, it still took them eight months to get some - or more than eight months from start to finish.

So and you'll see here there's a longer list of issues looking at maybe even, you know, less straightforward than some of the IRTP issues or maybe possibly less consensus around it.

So just to give you an idea of how we're working with that, would meet on a weekly basis are you're still looking at a, you know, definitely beyond Seoul I think as we get into something functional.

Avri So even an initial report by Seoul is that. The other thing, if we looked back as this chart, constituency comments though, is that something that one could say it's easy by Seoul.

(Marika): Because you need to take into account as well that I think according to the bylaws we normally start out as well with a public comment period just saying that we're launching the working group, are there any insights people want to share at this stage?

Man: Is that off of public comment or constituency comment?

(Marika):   No, that's a public comment.

Man: Oh it is, okay. Really?

(Marika):   Yes there's - I think we - I'm not sure what has been done in all the different working groups. But remember I think we did do it for the IRTP where it's just like putting it out to the community if anyone wants to share any views, you know, say it already now.

Avri   And it certainly, you know, if it's - if one - I think there's no fixed pattern on it. The thing that we're required to do before initial report is the constituents on it.

(Alan):   Oh, okay, before the report.

Avri   Before the initial report...

(Alan):   Okay.

Avri   But while we're in the information gathering, now in some cases (unintelligible) comment is also (unintelligible). But also previous groups have gotten into a pattern. Again, this is not a bylaws requirement.

              They're producing a template so the constituency comments sort of have a chance of coming in where they can - you know, where they're at least apples and pears and not apples and rocks, you know, for points of comparison. But of course it's up to this group whether it wants to do a template.

Now (Chuck) I guess is going to be on the call. I've certainly been one of the champions of templates and I think this staff is (like that).

(Marika):   (Abry) just one thing to come back to the public comment period, it is actually prescribed in the bylaws. It's called the Public Notification of Initiation of the PDP. A public comment period shall be commenced for the issue for period of 20 calendar days after initiation of the PDP.

Avri   Well that should happen now.

(Marika):   Yes.

Avri   That probably should have already happened.

(Marika):   It should.

Avri   But we haven't initiated the PDP.

(Marika):   Well unless we say we initiated the PDP with the adoption of the charter and forming of the working group.

Avri   Now we still haven't figured out how we're doing the work but we have figured out that there's a PDP.

(Alan):   But remember in the bylaws all of that is instantaneous and it clearly isn't...

Avri   Yes.

(Alan):   ...in the real world.

(Marika):   Yes. I know with the IRTP basically working group (matters) do we think it's a good idea indeed to, you know, already put it out there so people know about it and (provide it)? I mean in all honesty I think we only got one comment which I think even turned out to be (span) so...

Avri   And I think it's good because it could give us if it's a good one it could give us some of the information and (unintelligible) for a template.

(Alan):   Say that again? I didn't...

v   It could also if it's a good public comment and other people actually take it up and respond, it could actually give additional information or questions that one would - how would one phrase the template for constituency comments.

(Alan):   Okay.

(Marika):   Or maybe the group could as well take into consideration the feedback received during the workshop as part of the public comments and take them to calendar or at least recognize that for example in the reports during the public comment period I also had a workshop and that provided this kind of input or something.

(Alan):   I think the input of the workshop should be included. I was thinking of kicking off the 21 days as soon as we have the freedom to it essentially once we approve the charter.

Because that means if we create any documents for the workshop we'll have those available so people can make intelligent comments on the subject.

Avri   That seems to make sense.

(Marika):   Yes.

Avri   Or it can span, I mean especially since we've already sort of said the public comment periods go into sort of a ban or for...

(Alan):   During the meeting, yes.

Avri   ...and having that public comment period. But before the meeting and gives people time to think and get up to speed on the subject at first. But there's all kinds of different ways we could look at it.

            I think starting that public comment period one it can start and making sure that it doesn't end for at least a week after the meeting is probably a balance.

            One of the things we have not worried about too much in following the bylaws obviously because we can't because of timing but we do have to get all (unintelligible).

(Alan):   Yes I would - if it's going to go past Sydney it really has to be more than a week because an awful lot of people aren't going to get home until a week after the meeting.

I mean I prefer to err on the side of getting more comments than trying to rush at that particular stage.

(Marika): Wouldn't alternative be to actually like open it or announce that we'll be opening it at the workshop so it actually focus people on that as being the...

(Alan): That's what I was suggesting.

Avri I'm fine with that.

(Alan): Which essentially says it opens at the time that we approve the charter which...

(Marika): Okay yes.

(Alan): ...and, you know, formally create a working group which is almost the same as starting the PDP sort of.

Avri Well no, actually it's not.

Man: Does that mean we would also put out the request for the constituency views?

Avri I think we would invite constituencies to comment. But this wouldn't be the formal constituency comment based on template unless you want to do it that way and say no template, just get the constituency comments at the beginning too which is sort of an older way of doing it.

But some day, I mean from experience, a template isn't quite useful as well as especially in, you know, summarizing at the end because you get people like focusing on the same kind of issues.

And I think it makes it easier for finding similarities or, you know, disagreements. But I mean that's just my opinion having seen some of those...

(Alan): That presumes the template can be inclusive enough to include what people want to say.

(Marika): Yes I mean you can always have of course have the other comment box. I mean I don't think any of those (said) you can only fill in this template and we don't accept anything else.

So I mean I think we've always put it as well this is a tool that might help guide, you know, your discussions in your constituency in phrasing the views. But, you know, not everyone has always followed it all. People have added on things as well. So...

Man: Would the template just be comment from each of the five questions, the constituency views on each of the five questions. And if that was the case we can put that together pretty quickly at least in...

(Marika): It's probably for the working group to discuss whether there are any sub issues they would like specific views on. I mean maybe the group would very quickly decide well actually these are the, you know, they're the key issues and we don't need to delve deeper.

But from past experience it seems, you know, the group does like to discuss. And at least are there any particular points that they would like more information on that are - that we feel we need to ask sub questions to really dig into the substance of it?

(Mike):   This is (Mikey). To (Tim)'s point, these templates generally don't take a long time to put together. Once you're past that list they usually come together awfully fast.

(Alan):   Yes, I mean given we do have these five points which are pretty explicit, it's certainly a start.

(Mike):   Yes.

Man: But I suppose we could wait till after Sydney and see what else comes up through the workshop and then decide if there's other...

Man: Yes.

Avri   That would be marvelous.

Man: ...that you want to include.

Avri   But basically if the working group could be ready to send out for constituency comment within a few weeks of the open comment period having ended that would probably be the most useful.

So the workshop would've occurred. If there were any public comments the constituencies could take those into account. There would be the templates that had taken the workshop into account. And

that would be sort of the maximum scope to be able to pick up information.

(Alan):   That sounds doable.

(Mike):   This is (Mikey) again. In terms of constituency comment, does that imply that there are two? Because generally later on in the process once there is a preliminary draft of a report there's another round of constituency...

Avri   Yes. So is it that there's a required constituency comment before the initial report?

(Marika):   The second one is basically part of the general public comment period. Constituencies can then either re-submit or change some of the comments they've made before or...

(Alan):   There's actually nothing stopping the working group from working in parallel with the constituency comment period, a first one.

(Marika):   No that's what actually happens or that's what happening with most of the working groups in (unintelligible). They discuss the issues while constituency go in and discuss it as well.

                 So that's normally reflected then in the reports as a part where we report or document the working group deliberations and discussions and or conclusions or interim conclusions. And (then in a) separate section that focuses on the constituency statement. (unintelligible).

(Alan):   Yes.

Avri   But there'll be several threads that - for the working group to carry through. But we still need target milestones.

And milestones, I think we need target milestones. We need to come up with them. And then working groups, you know, once they've been working for a while can look at the milestones and say these are ridiculous. We understand something about our working methods and how long it's going to take now.

And then basically, you know, present an update to the council that the council will then discuss and, you know, manage either by approving or asking questions back.

So milestones are something to give guidance to get started.

You want best to meet. But when you can't meet them, as long as you negotiate their change that should be fine. But I still think we need some first estimates.

(Mike):   Well this is (Mikey) again. One approach would be just to double all the numbers in this.

Avri   If doubling is enough.

(Mike):   Well it's a start.

(Alan):   Well except the order is not quite the same. We're not going to do a constituency comment period here at the beginning. So just doesn't really address that.

Avri   Actually, the templates are constituencies so it almost works because we're going to as the group is formed, we're going to do the 21 day comment period or actually it'll start after the meeting because I don't think it actually starts during the meeting.

            So the comment period will start at the end of the Sydney meeting. That will be (21) for the template. So

            Once that's over then it goes to constituency. So now that constituency gets three weeks. As norm we can give it more if we want.

            But the first one, the T and the T plus 21 and then the T plus 56 is actually how long have for the constituency comment.

(Marika):   Thirty-five days.

Avri   Thirty-five days are pretty much fixed.

            Now what's not known then is after that to the initial report 14 days is...

(Marika):   Very short.

Avri   ...very short.

Man: Not likely.

Avri   So at that point, so the first three bullets are actually probably okay.

(Marika):   This is a question for (Tim) actually because I've noticed that when we get a constituency statements from the Registrar of Constituency it always mentions something like, you know, we haven't really had time to vote on (business) of our position. But it hasn't been officially voted upon due to lack of time.

Would that be different if more time would be added here or is it more standard approach?

(Tim):   Well if we can get a template by - we have 35 days, you know, after we receive the template. That's enough time according to our bylaws to put something together to actually have, you know, from both a constituency-wide discussion and vote from...

Avri   But the problem is the meeting cycle right, because you have regular meetings.

(Tim):   Right.

Avri   So the 35 days of the meeting cycle could force it to two weeks longer. Is that correct?

(Tim):   Right, right.

Avri   That's what I think often messes things up is people can theoretically get the work done in 35 days. But if they meet every month end votes happen at a meeting and that 35 days ends, you know, a week after meeting (unintelligible) can actually take a vote. And I think that's where we end up with problems on a 35 day period.

In absolute terms it's enough. In meeting cycle time it's not.

(Alan):   (Abry) back on your earlier question that is 14 days enough, I - for this particular PDP I don't think any - it's anywhere near enough.

I think we have an issue here where there's going to be horse-trading involved to try to come to, you know, closure on something that's acceptable to all parties.

Avri   That's why I...

(Alan):   And I don't think it's - I don't think that's going to happen in 14 days.

Avri   Yes that's why I kind of (unintelligible).

(Alan):   Sorry, say that again. I - my line cut out.

Avri   I was wondering whether an additional report cycles is a reasonable marker.

(Alan):   By initial report you mean sort of summarizing the status...

Avri   No I mean...

(Alan):   ...as opposed to an outcome?

(Marika):   I mean and just to give you an example in initial report like some working groups have basically worked by the initial report it just produced interim conclusions or some of - don't even produce interim

conclusions but they just produce like ideas for next steps that they then put out for public comment.

So and the (unintelligible) is not on the process of working group like how much of a -- how many recommendations they already want to put in there or whether they just want to put in some ideas that they want to test the waters with, you know, in the community and then basically start the negotiations between the initial report and the final report on what the actual recommendations are going to the.

So it depends a bit as well I think on the approach taken, you know, what state the initial (clause) might have or to your question of would you already do the horse trading at that stage or does...

(Alan): I'm asking the question more than giving an answer. I'm just saying that certainly as the final report is not going to - you know, if you - again, if you look at the timeline that was in the example it says 14 days, initial report 14 days after the comments are received.

Avri Right. Well we know that's really quite enough. But I'd...

(Alan): And then another comment period and then 20 days from the end of the second comment period to the file report. And that's not likely to happen unless...

Avri Now the end game here...

(Alan): ...the skies open up.

Avri The end game really is where a lot more (unintelligible).

How many - you know I'm saying 70 days and then I'm saying oh maybe it could be longer. We could do it by Seoul. But how much is further - I mean how many days is it between the end of Sydney and the beginning of Seoul?

(Alan):   I don't know.

Avri   We're actually two weeks before the beginning of Seoul.

(Alan):   End of November, beginning of November?

Man: Not quite four months I don't think. It's something close to that.

(Marika):   I think it's end of October.

Avri   So anyhow, we need to think through these. I think it'd be cool personally if the initial report is something that could be available by Seoul.

(Alan):   I would hope so.

(Marika):   Would you like me to look back at the different working groups to see how much time it actually took for (unintelligible) the IRTP, the fast flux just to have an idea that we put in something there that's realistic?

Because to be honest I mean I think this was taken from IRTP but I don't think it was ever updated with the actual time it took.

Avri   Yes I think that'd be great. I think that's one of the (unintelligible) learning how long it takes (unintelligible) know it best.

(Marika):   Okay. I'll look that up and get that to the managers.

(Alan):   Yes. I think you have to differentiate between PDPs that are really trying to come to common ground between large parties that are on opposite sides and ones where everyone is just trying to find a good answer to a problem.

(Marika):   I'll leave that for you to decide when (unintelligible) which ones fall into these categories.

Avri   I'm not sure I could tell the difference.

(Alan):   Okay.

Avri   But what I've - if it's at all (close), I hope we can push forward - we can try and get an initial report by Seoul. But if we can't, we can't.

(Alan):   Yes. I mean that goes back to what I was saying originally is I'd like to have - I have something to report at a public meeting in Seoul.

(Marika):   I think that's extremely optimistic. But I'm here to be proven wrong.

Man: I agree. I just think it's outrageous...

Avri   Okay, I'm sorry I was outrageous. I apologize.

(Alan):   You're outrageous and I am optimistic.

Man: If we're talking about the initial report being more or less a compilation of the initial public comments, the constituency comments and then perhaps any, you know, proposed ways forward or solutions that might have been discussed in Sydney or otherwise since then without any real conclusions...

Man: I mean...

Avr   Yes...

Man: ...and it seems like that - you know, that's not doable by Seoul...

(Marika):   Normally the initial report (carves) around like the deliberations of working around all of these issues and trying to really dig in, understand and everybody trying to think, you know, outlining what could be potential avenues to be explored.

                And that normally takes quite some time especially when they start with a group, you know, that's really new to the issue.

                So I mean having seen it in the IRTP and the fast flux, I mean digging into each of these questions can - sometimes need to bring in experts to explain like how that certain things work or what are they practical manners of doing things or, you know, so that is, I mean maybe a year will go by fast and people will catch it very quickly, will be able to meet midweekly and share a lot of information between mailing lists. But it would be really something new compared to the current status.

Avri   What I'd like to recommend, you know, that perhaps if you're willing (Marika), you take this away and do the research that you were going

to do in terms of what are reasonable and then sort of flow down on the list what looks reasonable based on past behavior.

(Marika): Okay.

Man: (Unintelligible). It's kind of based on some of the things we were talking about of course (this outside leader) already, that discussion about Seoul. But I just submitted what I thought might be a good draft milestones that...

Avri Great.

Man: ...and, you know (unintelligible) we go from there.

(Alan): I guess my feeling is it would be really nice if we had something to have face to face discussions about in Seoul whether there's a formal paper on the table or not. That's target I think we want to try to hit.

(Alan): Right. I think if you call it the report, it's possible to do talking points (unintelligible) like that.

But an initial report often it's pretty close to the final report. And getting that done, it's - that's not going to happen by Seoul.

Avri You're right. That's just a summary of comments received that came from the staff.

(Alan): Right or even, you know, most contentious issues. I mean there's all kinds of things that could be put together by this.

(Marika):   And (Rob), coming back to the current situation, I mean looking at working groups like the PDP work team which everyone feels really strongly about (very point) right, large group of volunteers, I think we'll have to cancel the last three calls due to lack of participation.

Having to go weekly calls - well now I think we're switching to biweekly so, you know, the (mine are) very committed that if you have two or three people on the call, you know, you cannot really take any decisions or move forward.

So I think we really need to take into account that there is - there seems to be community overload and we're willing to be realistic about, you know, what we can expect from people and what are going to be the commitment they can make to actually doing the work.

Avri   Actually it's going to be an incredible amount of time spent or ways depending upon one's perception in finishing the restructuring between Sydney...

(Marika):   Yes.

Avri   ...and Seoul. And at some point we have to put an amazing amount of energy into the endgame on that. This is it. So at a certain point that is truly going to exhaust people.

(Tim):   This is (Tim). You know, I always have to read, you know, what we're working on (redefining all the policies) all the process and stuff. So that's kind of ongoing work.

But one of the things that it seems to me that these interim reports or initial reports or permanent reports -- whatever you want to call them, come out of the working groups should do would be not necessarily, you know, this is close to final but more, you know, FA as an interim report to the community so that they know where the working group is at at that particular point, sort of, you know, we're reported on our progress and where we're at.

Here's the community additional opportunity to see where they may be headed and to make comments or, you know, express disagreement or agreement or other ideas about, you know, how things could be resolved or redirected.

(Alan): Let's be candid. People don't tend to comment until they think this is their last chance.

(Marika): Yes and the comment is as well that the - there is no common period at the final report stage. So you would like to give people, you know, a fair idea of what you think, you know, to a certain extent the discussion is leading so they can actually make comments on what they think the outcome might be.

And if you leave it too much, you know, we're somewhat halfway. We still have a long way to go. But here's already the initial report. You miss a, you know, you missed opportunity to ask people really what they think that the potential outcome that you're looking at that stage.

Man: There's also the problem that term interim report I think is woven into the bylaws. That's part of the reason for some of this.

Avri   Initial report is, yes.

Man: Yes I just think though that the downside of that is when we wait until the end, then, you know, a lot of deliberation's been done. The decisions are pretty much there. And now, you know, the community then becomes a (lid) of where things are at.

            And if they're not happy or they don't like it or they think there's something that needs to change its just gets difficult because you're towards the end...

Man: I think...

Man: So I don't know what you want to call it but I think that in a lot of cases, you know, even though the constituents - the participants, you know, are expected to keep their constituents informed, et cetera, et cetera, it's difficult to do for the entire community.

            And that's why...

Man: Calling it something else is helpful because then you can consider each (unintelligible). You could say something like community update or pick a title. I don't care what but...

Man: Right. So hopefully, you know, if nothing else, at least by Seoul it would be nice to have something that could actually be published...

Man: Right.

Man: About where we're at so that it can stimulate further discussion of the workshop.

Man: Right.

(Marika):   I mean something new we're doing, I mean not at PDP but for the registration of (use) the policies working group is indeed to have that status update that provides, you know, where did this come from, what have we done so far, what are some of the things we still need to do and, you know, where do we think we're heading.

So and that might be something for the group to put out if they see that they indeed don't make it to initial reports okay. I mean I don't think there's anything preventing them from producing something else that they want to share with the community or put up for discussion. I mean I don't think the bylaws prevent something like that, having that as an intermediate between getting to initial report and go over public comment and things like that or a more stated update kind of thing.

Avri   Although I think that's something that we do is want to put...

(Alan):   Yes I agree. And maybe what we do is we put one of those in at that 70 or 80 days mark -- whatever it is that gets us ready for Seoul and then drop the initial report back another notch.

And up who knows, we might come in early.

Avri   The other possibility is that there really is - well there has to be initial report and there has to be a comment period based on that.

There's nothing saying that when you put out the - that final report one can't have a comment. And that is the bylaws do not prevent additional comment period.

So if an initial report goes out, whether there's been a lot of discussion tied to it or not and the world change (unintelligible) final report and the draft final report is absolutely (unintelligible).

(Alan): I think we're going to need to be flexible. We don't know how this is going to unroll. I mean at this point we have a fairly large split in where various parties would like to see this come out.

If it becomes apparent as we start talking that neither is going to get their extreme wish list, we may well come to closure on this moderately quickly.

Man: It's mostly just the mechanics, you know. It's not even necessarily that there is a lot of dispersion in their points of view. It's just awfully hard to turn the crank at best. We need a new (stall crank) perhaps.

Man: If you're saying no matter how straightforward it is, it takes forever to do, there's something wrong with the process.

Avri But part of it is that we (unintelligible) work that well.

Man: Yes.

(Avri (Unintelligible) how to use these tools that allow sort of a sending continuous asynchronous, I don't know, workings where then when

we're face to face or voice to voice we really only have to (unintelligible).

We haven't learned to do that. You know, we need to. And I think that's part of the solutions base that, you know, one can't mandate that. One has to keep doing that.

(Alan): Yes, and I'm not sure that we want to take that on in this particular working group.

Avri I think we have to take it on in every working group to do as much of it as we can.

(Alan): Well then we ought to add it to the scope of this charter.

Avri It's not a charter scope. It's part of how things are done not, you know, you don't have - I mean the charter doesn't say this will all be done by phone calls. I mean we're not putting that kind of detail in charters. What we're trying to do is provide tools and incentives for people who use things, trying to some set dates that sort of say gee, if we're going to meet this date what we need to do is work a little bit smarter and a little bit this.

We have staff to help us use tools and to help us get this over the learning of tools.

But I certainly don't think we need to put in charter and then all the time use online tools. That's...

(Alan): Well then we have a contradiction because if we don't do something like that we're never going to hit the kinds of dates that we're going to put in these schedules.

Avri Well you put the...

Man: Well I think part of it too is that we need to recognize the realities of our community. And that is that no matter how hard we try to increase participation and include others, there's still going to be a core group that are going to want or need to be involved in a lot of these different work processes that are going on either because they're so directly affected or for whatever reason.

So, you know, we either have to accept that. We're going to have a lot of things going on, then they're - than each of them are going to take longer to get done.

Either that or we need to be, you know, to do fewer things and we can focus more directly on them and get them done in a shorter period of time. That's just the reality of the resources that are available.

Avri That's part of the reason why we're trying to sort of change the organization to one where a lot more people are doing stuff. I mean that's the whole change that we're being put through at the moment.

Man: Right. And I think we can get to that to a certain extent.

Avri Yes.

Man: But I think from a registrar's perspective for example, you know, a lot of these probably (they) affect their businesses directly. So they're going to want to be involved.

                It isn't like well this group of register will be involved in this one and this group will be involved in that one.

                They all wanted to have some participation in every one of these things are going to end up, I mean, you know, policies that they have to (unintelligible) mandated.

(Alan):   The sum total of people who are active in any given group is not all that large, you know, who people are willing to delegate the work to and both trust them and will really actually deliver.

Avri   And that's part of the things that people learned to use online tools that (Unintelligible) space. It just takes a while and it takes having schedules that try and force us to complete things to sort of use those methods, you know?

(Alan):   Yes. And it using schedules to force progress that I can (walk in).

Avri   That you what?

(Alan):   It doesn't work. It's shouting at a problem but it doesn't actually solve it.

Avri   You and I have - I think we disagree on that one.

(Alan):   Yes. We do.

Man: I think deadlines are the only thing that gets people to work given that so many things are competing for their time.

(Alan):   Yes but arbitrary deadlines so...

Avri   Well that's why we're asking (Marika) to put in reasonable ones. And when they turn out not to be reasonable now people can renegotiate them. I mean that's the whole point, you know, asking somebody that has a view of the reasonable world to tell us and then still readjust.

Anyway, I'm suggesting that perhaps we take (Tim) as a way of continuing, take (Tim)'s version of the charter with milestones, put that on the wiki that we may or may not have yet so that we can all take a crack at reading and wordsmithing before we talk again. And we should probably talk again next week shouldn't we?

(Marika):   There's no Wiki yet.

Avri   I know.

((Crosstalk)).

Avri   I went and looked. But I wasn't sure whether I was missing it and wasn't a member or something. But...

(Alan):   I mean if it doesn't conflict with something else next week that would be fine.

Avri   Yes we could if it doesn't conflict with something else then we could meet at the same time, otherwise meet at a different time. But we do need to probably do it next week to...

(Alan):   Yes.

Avri   Does it make sense for people?

Man: Yes, absolutely.

(Marika):   And if people could maybe comment, I know (Ann) had already provided some suggestions for, you know, how we should structure the workshop in Sydney. I'm happy to put some ideas together with (Alan)'s comments and paper that we can maybe discus at the next meeting...

Avri   Okay (unintelligible) Wiki page on that too. I mean, you know, it's part of our Wiki here start doing that.

(Marika):   Okay.

(Alan):   The only issue on that is whoever's going to do work for that board job is going to have to start real soon.

                Most of us have other things we're doing also.

(Marika):   I'm happy to drive that (unintelligible) next time to get people involved at (unintelligible). I know you suggested approaching (Rob Hall). I saw on the list that he's at least signed up. So I mean if people think that he could be a good candidate to speak on this, you know, I'm...

(Alan):   Well (Rob) tends to be able to, you know, if he decides to give a relatively unbiased, you know, view of things and, you know, over, you know, go over the mechanics and that sort of stuff. And there's not many people who know it better than he does so...

(Abry):   Okay. So we've gone an hour.

(Alan):   If he's willing to do it of course.

Avri   We've gone an hour. (Alan) I want to ask - I mean I have to sort of jump in and, if you're going to do interim chair, are you interested in starting it as they continue this process?

(Alan):   You mean starting next weekend?

Avri   Starting now.

(Alan):   Oh. Yes, I'm willing to.

Avri):   Does anyone object to that?

(Alan):   I'm not quite sure what it means to be the interim chair at this stage in the project but I'm willing to do it and be tutored by somebody.

Avri   (Unintelligible)

(Alan):   Okay, I'll do my best.

v   Thanks. Is that it for today?

(Alan):   I think so. I'm getting hungry.

Avri   Anybody else?

Man: (Unintelligible).

Avri   Okay, thanks a lot.

(Alan):   Okay.

Avri   Bye-bye.

(Alan):   And let's try to continue this alive, not just wait till next week.

Avri   All right. (Unintelligible).

(Alan):   Bye-bye.

Coordinator: Thank you. This concludes today's call. You may disconnect at this
               time.

END