GNSO
Post-Expiration Domain Name Recovery (PEDNR) drafting team
04 January 2011 at 19:30 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 04 January 2011 at 19:30 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-pednr-20110104-en.mp3

 On page:

http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#jan

Present:
Alan Greenberg – ALAC – Chair
Jeff Eckhaus – RrSG
Cheryl Langdon-Orr - ALAC
Ron Wickersham – NCUC
Berry Cobb – CBUC
Mason Cole – RrSG
Paul Diaz – RrSG
James Bladel – RrSG
Michele Neylon - RrSG
Olivier Crepin-Leblond – ALAC chair
Oliver Hope – RrSG   Mikey O'Connor – CBUC

Staff:
Marika Konings
Margie Milam
Glen de Saint Géry

Absent apologies:
Tatyana Khramtsova - RrSG
Shiva Muthusamy – At-Large
Ted Suzuki – IPC
Karim Attoumani – GAC

Glen DeSaintgery:Thank you, good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone, this is the

PEDNR call on the 4th of January. Operator?

Coordinator: That's coming from Olof's line, I did mute that line and I'll go ahead and pull

that line out of conference.

Glen DeSaintgery: On the call we have Alan Greenberg, Berry Cobb, Jeff Eckhaus, Michele Neylon, Mikey O'Connor, Olivia Hope, James Bladel, Mason Cole, Paul Diaz, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Olivier Crepin-LeBlond and Ron Wickersham and for staff we have Margie Milam, Marika Konings and myself Glen DeSaintgery.

Thank you very much Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Thanks Glen and I will open the floor for Marika who has her hand up.

Marika Konings: This is Marika, I'm not sure why I have my hand up, I'm taking it down.

Alan Greenberg: You just wanted to try to get our attention.

Marika Konings: Wanted to wish everyone happy New Year.

Alan Greenberg: Well thank you very much. All right, what I'd like to do today is go over for hopefully the last time in a general manner the list of recommendations that we're looking at and their status.

And very quickly do that and then come to some understanding about how we're going to set the consensus level that we have.

As you will note or recall we cannot - the working group rules say we cannot restrict the polling as it were to just those on calls and we need to involve everyone on the mailing list.

And I'm assuming what we'll do is a simple poll of the yes you agree, no you don't agree on each of the items as we come up with more detailed wording of them.

Michele?

Michele Neylon: Hello?

Alan Greenberg: Yep, Michele, go ahead.

Michele Neylon: I'm sorry, I don't know whether it's the phone line or my phone that's acting weird. Just a question to satisfy my own curiosity, and possibly to see if I'm losing my mind.

Has Olivier joined this group as a new arrival or where did he come from? I know who Olivier is obviously but...

Alan Greenberg: I will hazard a guess that as the new chair of the ALAC he is enlisting himself in pretty much all of the working groups, but I'll let him speak for himself. Olivier are you here?

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: And the first thing he's going to have to try and find is the unmute button and he has found it. Yes Alan, thank you. I am here indeed yeah, to well immerse myself I guess in all of the working groups and find out what's going on, on the floor.

And find out by myself so I won't be saying much but I'll be listening if that's okay with you. Thank you.

Alan Greenberg: That's fine with me.

Michele Neylon: Just as a point of process though Alan, if Olivier has joined the group shouldn't he be providing an SOI and a DOI?

Alan Greenberg: He most certainly should and I'm assuming he will or has.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: I most certainly will. If you just send me - do I just send it to Glen?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah, and it's Cheryl here Olivier, if you're going to spread yourself as thinly as I've certainly tried to do, it's a really good idea just to get Glen and

whoever else is running them in the other SO's to just repopulate the one you do across the board and modify it as need for any particular work group that has a slightly different requirement.

Because you're going to have to be living in a goldfish bowl now.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: As I understand Glen has already got a copy of my SOI for other working groups so perhaps she can get it off file?

Glen DeSaintgery:I have indeed Olivier if you want to keep that one, I'm happy to publish it for this group as well.

Olivier Crepin-LeBlond: Fantastic, thanks very much Glen.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you Glen. All right, back to where we were a moment ago. So does - in terms of the process to arrive at the level of consensus is that agreeable that essentially as we finish with the item within this group that we'll do a poll, we'll try to group them together so it's not too annoying and to assess the actual formal level of consensus with the new group.

Does that sound reasonable, Ron?

Ron Wickersham: Yes, this is Ron Wickersham, my only concern is if you limit it absolutely to yes and no, we will get into the same thing that we did prior where someone has a minor issue with the way the question was worded and then skews the voting to where it almost doesn't represent the consensus.

So I think we need to with you know understanding that it makes the chairs work a lot harder to have the comments it's almost necessary to have the comments for each question in order to assess how close and if there is a compromise way offer available.

Even though that may involve even more than one vote, but it may be the fastest way to get to consensus.

Alan Greenberg: Okay, Marika?

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika, something that we've done for one of the other working groups was polled members on draft recommendation was to add the option and I don't agree but I could agree if the following change would be made to allowing people to you know indicate whether indeed they disagree completely with the recommendation or whether they have a suggestion or alternative that would allow them to accept the recommendation as is.

And then that way we can just start at that change or it's added to the recommendation where you know these are acceptable to everyone or whether you know minority position needs to be created.

So that might be a way of not having just yes and no but allowing for some flexibility and input while taking the poll.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, thank you Marika. Yes, Cheryl agrees on Adobe. I certainly have no problem with that and I support it. I will hope that to the extent that people are on these calls that we will try to hash out the variances ahead of time.

But I would not want to lose consensus or lose a general consensus because of some specific wording which might be acceptable to others as well.

So yes, to the extent possible given that we want to complete this in a relatively limited time but we don't want to jeopardize the quality of the work either.

I can certainly see that we should give that a go and see how it goes. Any other comments on the consensus process? It will require that we be pretty

diligent about answering these things so that we can move forward with them and not take too long.

Any other comments on that?

Jeff Eckhaus: Alan, Jeff here.

Alan Greenberg: Yes Jeff, go ahead.

Jeff Eckhaus: Okay, yeah I think maybe you pointed it out in your email and I just wanted to - just discuss it is - or maybe you have it planned and I'm jumping the gun but the different levels and just the fine terminology for it?

Alan Greenberg: We will do that - you know I'm not going to try to do it now off the top but we will be identifying what those levels are.

Jeff Eckhaus: Okay, you don't want to do - okay, I thought it was something you wanted to do on the call, okay, no problem.

Alan Greenberg: No, I don't think it's necessary since we're not going to be taking a consensus call on this call. I think we'll need to identify them and make sure everyone has them.

They're right out of the working group rules so it's not a secret handshake that we're developing ourselves.

Jeff Eckhaus: Can that be sent then to the list because I always think about that, there's - maybe I've missed because I think there's always been sort of ambiguous about you know consensus, strong support, unanimous consensus, all those different terms.

So could I just ask that that could be sent to the list?

Alan Greenberg: I'm sure we can and Marika has her hand up so let's let her speak.

Marika Konings: Yeah, this is Marika, actually the charter of this working group and identifies that the lead work is going on, on new working group guidelines but this working group is still supposed to work under the old definitions of consensus which are unanimous consent position, rough consent position where a small margin disagrees but most agree.

Strong support but significant opposition and minority viewpoints, I'll post it now as well on the Adobe Connect, so unless the group feels strongly that they would want to work under the new working group guidelines but these are still - they have just been submitted to the GNSO council and they haven't even been approved yet.

And they'll probably go for another round of public comments so it might be premature to work according to those but if the group would want to do so I think the appropriate thing would be to you know take that back to the council because it would require changing the charter.

Alan Greenberg: To the extent that right now the only ones we have are the ones in our charter I think as you know if the GNSO approves the new ones very quickly we can seek guidance as to whether they apply retroactively to us or not.

I'm not quite sure about that. I think our charter sites that they will. Go ahead.

Marika Konings: Just on the quickness of the thing, as it's looking now the motion has been submitted after a time today, 21 day public comment period that would open after the next council meeting which is on the 13 of January provided that the motion gets adopted.

Then after that 21 days we need to review what comments have been received. If there are substantial comments these probably would go back to

the KPI team and if there are no substantial comments then it would go to the council for discussion and adoption.

So it might still take a bit of time so.

Alan Greenberg: Okay, you're saying if we meet our deadline we will not have - we will not be using the new rules.

Marika Konings: Right.

Alan Greenberg: Well there's a target for us then to complete before we have to think about the new rules. There's some discussion going on, Cheryl do you want to say anything or do you just want us to read what you wrote when we have a chance?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I'm just in rabid agreement with what Marika was saying, that's what we said in the charter. We went with what was in the charter, personally prefer the new ones, I was instrumental in writing them, obviously I personally prefer the new ones but we have what we have.

As long as we all have a shared knowledge of what we have, we should be able to move forward.

Alan Greenberg: Okay, anything else on that part? Marika if you can send us a link in any case on the list just so each of us can pull them up readily when we need them over the next few weeks it will help.

Jeff apparently it wasn't clear to any of us or at least to most of us so thank you for bringing it up.

All right, what else do we need to do other than go through the list, was there anything else on our agenda?

I did ask for volunteers and so far I got one to work with me on wording of recommendations as we go forward.

If there's anyone else that would like to put if possible a registrar and another user as my sounding board.

So if we could have volunteers as we go along I'd appreciate it, it doesn't have to be done now. James?

James Bladel: Volunteering.

Alan Greenberg: Okay.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I must help you with that at some stage James, you seem to be a lot lately. There is a queer.

Alan Greenberg: Mikey.

Mikey O'Connor: Same here, volunteering.

Alan Greenberg: Okay, then we have our full contingent at least all we need although others are welcome. But I think we have everyone represented at this point now. All right, is there anything else on our agenda as I mentioned in the email I would like comments from people preferably by email but they could also be vocally at our next meeting next week.

On the statistics and the essential proposal that James put out during the Cartagena meeting but I don't want to discuss that right now. And is there any other issue that we need to talk about regarding the overall schedule that was suggested?

That is to try to have the final report ready in essentially six weeks from today? It's a very aggressive time schedule, I think we can do it but we may end up with some snags.

But I think our target should be to try to do that. To that end I believe Marika have you distributed your current version of the draft final report? I know I saw a copy and I don't remember who was posted on our wiki or not.

Marika Konings: This is Marika, yes it's posted on the wiki. But I can put it out again to the email list because it's - I think in some of the previous meeting agenda so I'll resend that to the list.

Alan Greenberg: Okay, if you could and try to remind people as pointedly as possible that this is the time we should be reading it, not the day before it has to go to press. So for the parts of it that are either already finished but still need a review for the final version of that, is everything except the actual recommendations.

It would be useful if people read it carefully ahead of time. Last time we had a large number of changes that were being suggested at the very last moment and this is a far better time to do it then at that point.

So I would appreciate that.

Marika Konings: This is Marika, do you maybe want to give people a deadline for either to the report to put their comments on there, that of course their recommendations, it's a separate part and it's kind of a separate effort?

Alan Greenberg: We probably should and I would say no, if we say no later than three weeks from today or two and a half weeks to give you a chance to do any comment, any changes.

Does that sound reasonable to people Cheryl?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: More than reasonable, in terms of that I was just wondering what Marika might have thought about also asking people as we did in some of the work teams that we broke up to in the work group guidelines together where we encouraged people to put comments on a wiki on the draft as well.

So it was easier to aggregate them, that's really up to Marika, I just wanted to ask.

Alan Greenberg: People in this group have felt - seem to have felt more comfortable doing comments in a Word document and I have no particular - you know I don't have a real strong preference either way.

So whatever Marika can work with but more important I think is to make sure that people actually do it.

So I'm happy to be flexible in terms of how we get things if Marika is also. Marika go ahead.

Marika Konings: This is Marika, I'm happy to be flexible on that. I mean my preference as well, Word documents or in emails. What I'll do is include my numbers as well in that draft so people can associate - I don't agree with what is nine, you know five, or four, line 200.

That makes it easier for me to track that down. If people want to you know post back on the wiki, that's fine too. It's more - sometimes more difficult to find the right spot then as well because it doesn't have the formatting or the strategy changes that are made, makes it more challenging.

Alan Greenberg: If I can suggest then - go ahead Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Long numbers is an excellent way forward, that would be fantastic, thank you.

Alan Greenberg: And I would add a version number on the front page of each document and preferably on the footing so we don't have to you know put along you know the document of February 12 19 whatever, 2000 something, just a version number makes it much easier to definitively identify a specific line.

Okay, if we can go onto the actual - let's see, I guess I'm going to ask for some - is there merit in actually going through the recommendations now or do people feel generally comfortable with them?

We're nearing our half hour mark where we lose a couple of people and I had originally suggested that we go through them.

I'm not sure that there's a lot to be gained at this point since most of the people on this call have generally participated in the previous calls which resulted in the general agreement and consensus that we had.

Strong feelings, worth going through it now, or not, yeses or nos? no one cares.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: We care. Do I need to remind you what hour it is in my world?

Alan Greenberg: Sorry, I didn't hear that Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Or do I need to remind you what hour it is in my world?

Alan Greenberg: Okay, fine. You do, it's been a month since I've been on a call from you so I forget.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That's my other call coming in Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Okay, my inclination on this point unless someone feels there's a great merit in going over them is to simply ask people to read them again.

And if you strongly disagree with any of the items put something on the mailing list really soon, otherwise we're going to assume that the items that we generally thought we had consensus on we do and I will start working on final recommendations and wording on them.

Seeing no disagreement and knowing that James also has to leave in a moment, I'd like to thank you for attending and we will start working in earnest at our next call.

I'm sorry I had to call this one a rather short one due to other commitments and I love the turnout we got and I hope we can maintain it for the next couple of weeks.

Any other issues to raise? Seeing none then I'll look for comments on email on any of the items in our recommendation list if people do have specific comments.

And on reactions to the data, the statistics that James sent around last month. I thank you all for coming.

Marika Konings: Thank you.

Man: Bye.

Glen DeSaintgery:(Cheryly)?

Coordinator: Yes, one second please.

END