Fast Flux PDP WG Teleconference

TRANSCRIPTION

Wednesday 3 September 2008 15:00 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Fast

Flux PDP WG teleconference on Wednesday 3 September 2008, at 15:00 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-ff-pdp-20080903.mp3
http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#sep

Present for the teleconference:
CBUC
Mike 0'Connor - WG Chair CBUC
Mike Rodenbaugh - CBUC - Council liaison George Kirikos - CBUC

Registry Constituency
Adam Palmer - PIR (registry constituency lead) Greg Aaron - Afilias

NCUC
Christian Curtis - NCUC

Registrar constituency
James Bladel - Godaddy
Paul Diaz - Networksolutions
Eric Brunner-Williams - CORE

Beau Brendler - ALAC

Observers - (no constituency affiliation) Joe St. Sauver Rod Rasmussen - Internet Identity APWG
Dave Piscitello - SSAC Fellow Marc Perkel

Staff:
Marika Konings
Glen de Saint Gery

Absent - apologies:
Rodney Joffe - NeuStar
Wendy Seltzer
Kal Feher - MelbourneIT

Coordinator: The conference is being recorded at this time.

(Mike):   Thanks very much. Glen, do you want to call the roll?

Glen Desaintgery: Yes, I'll do that with pleasure. We have on the call (Michael
                 O'Connor), leader of the group, (Mike Rodenbaugh), (Beau Brendel),
                 (Paul Diaz), (George Kirikos), (Rod Rasmussen), (Adam Palmer), (Joe
                 St. Sauver), (Christian Curtis), (James Bladel) and (Greg Aaron). And
                 from staff we have (Marika Konings).

(Mike):   Thanks, Glen. For those of you that want to follow along, the link to the
                 agenda is in the chat window. I sort of wanted to skim through this
                 quickly. I thought what we would do is take a look at what we plan to
                 do and then spend most of our time on the last two items.

                 The first is one is reviews of the working group schedule. I'm getting a
                 little edgy about whether we can stuff all of this work into the remaining
                 time before Cairo and I want to talk a little bit about that. And then
                 spend most of the time on (Marika)'s fabulous job doing the report. And
                 (Marika)'s got another document that she's put together to help us sort
                 of track the changes and track what we want to do with them and I
                 want to talk a bit about the process.

                 I feel like the process I started yesterday sort of misfired and I'd like to
                 take another run at that. So that's sort of the agenda for the call today.
                 Anything people want to add to that?

                 Okay, what we said last time is that we would spend sort of the last
                 half - not we - (Marika) would spend the last half of August extracting
                 material from the email archive and she has done that right on
                 schedule. And I've gone through that draft and edited as well.

And the - so I feel like that part is defined - we're on schedule for that. I wanted to put to the group the question about anything that folks would like to add to the appendices. We've got at least one appendix from - oh, I just blanked on his name...

Man: (Eric).

Man: Yeah, from (Vaughn).

Man: (Randy Vaughn).

(Mike): (Randy) - there I go - is getting pretty close to done. I think he's got a Word version of it that has been pushed along to (Marika) and so that will get into the appendix. But we had a whole bunch of sort of data-gathering, data-crunching activities underway and I was curious, (Rod), if you or any of the others had any luck getting the, you know, getting some of that data pulled together in any sort of format that we could put in the appendices. You got an update on that for us?

Rod Rasmussen: Well, yesterday I finally got the summary data out of the (Fluxor) project - obviously not pulled together at this point. Some of the summary pages really...

(Mike): (Rod), I'm going to interrupt you and say, this is an opportunity for you to shout.

Rod Rasmussen: Okay.

(Mike): You're speaking quietly enough that you're dropping out.

Rod Rasmussen: Sorry - not that's probably my phone here. I have to have one that has a mute button on it.

(Mike):   Oh, good deal, that made it a lot better.

Rod Rasmussen: Thank you. Well, that's because I took my hands-free off. All right, I was just saying that yesterday I finally got in the report/summary data from the (Fluxor) project in Italy. I haven't had time really to go through it. But there's a lot of interesting data there.

It's not, you know, obviously ready to drop into the report right now but there is - the summary stuff is simple enough we could probably translate that over pretty quick and drop in there. And I'll send a link around so people can take a look at it - at least the summary stuff.

(Mike):   Is it secret stuff or is it stuff we could put out on the public...

Rod Rasmussen: I think it's stuff we can put out on the public - the public actually set up a summary report interface here and it's not a secret project or anything like that, it's a university project.

(Mike):   Great.

Rod Rasmussen: It shouldn't be a problem. And they've got summary statistics of data from the first of the year through the end of August, it looks like.

(Mike):   Oh, that's wonderful.

Rod Rasmussen: Yep.

(Mike):	Do you want to take a crack at an appendix that sort of - I mean, maybe it's just a one-pager that sort of says by the way, he's a cool project, here's the link.

Rod Rasmussen:	Yeah.

(Mike):	Here are a couple of factoids. I think that'd be important to get into the appendices.

Rod Rasmussen:	Yeah, I'd be happy to do that.

(Mike):	That'd be cool. Are there any other data kinds of projects that we want to sort of hold the place open in the appendix for?

Rod Rasmussen:	I have the data from RSA as well, I still haven't gotten their clearance on what - how it can be published - gotta ping them again on that. That would also be a good appendix because they've got some pretty good data too.

(Mike):	Okay. Well, let's try - let's hold those two slots open at a minimum in the appendices and make room for you to drop something into those, (Rod), because...

Rod Rasmussen:	Sure.

(Mike):	I think those are, you know, a terrific addition to sort of snapshot of the work accomplished to date.

Rod Rasmussen: Right - I had a couple other that we're promised that haven't been delivered. So, you know, if we have a couple of generic spots or if anything shows up in the next week or two that can be distilled, I'll be able to throw that in there.

(Mike):   Well - and save that week or two thought for the discussion in a few minutes about the schedule.

Rod Rasmussen: Okay.

(Mike):   Because we might be able to hold that door open longer than that. It sort of depends on how we approach Cairo at this point. So save that thought and then let's revisit that. We might be able to hold that door open a little longer.

Rod Rasmussen: Okay, that's good.

(Mike):   Great - thanks, (Rod). Anybody else got any data updates that they'd like to share or project or hypothesize about?

Has anybody visited with (Rodney) about the giant pile of data that he produced? Does anybody have a chance to run that through? It sounded like it needed to go through a pretty big database in order to be manipulated. Did anybody succeed at that?

Glen Desaintgery: (Mike) - sorry, this is Glen. There's a note that came through from (Rodney) that said that he's on a DHS critical infrastructure call related to the Harrington (unintelligible) and he will be on the call a little later.

Man: Oh, wow. Impressive that he's breaking away from that to join us - that's great. Well maybe we'll circle back around to that question when he joins. Any other data projects that people want to let us know about or have a place in the appendices for?

            Okay, I'm going to move on then.

Man: Let say - (Mike), just real quick I would say that one of the appendices should probably aggregate and summarize all the different studies and things that haven't been put to the list.

(Mike):   Yeah, that's probably a good idea. (Marika), do you feel comfortable taking that one on or do you want an assistant for that project?

Marika Konings: I think I could use some help and basically the question is to list all the studies that were mentioned, you said?

Man: Yeah, I think been four or five different studies that have been circulated through. I think it would just be good in an appendix to briefly one paragraph summarize them and provide a link to them.

(Mike):   Yeah, I think that would be good. Does that - does somebody want to volunteer as an assistant for (Marika) in that drafting effort?

Marika Konings: Maybe those that are circulated, those studies, could either - send me again what they originally sent and if they indeed have a few lines in the summary and otherwise I'm happy to have a look at them. But of course, if anybody one could help with that, that would be great.

(Mike): That's a great idea. But again, if somebody would like to join (Marika) in the drafting effort? Okay, I tell you what, (Marika), why don't you send a note to the group - to the email list, encouraging folks who circulated draft - or circulated research studies to just remind you of them and perhaps summarize them in a paragraph. And that'll help - that'll at least help you get the draft done.

Marika Konings: Yeah - I'll do some.

(Mike): Terrific - thanks.

Glen Desaintgery: Hello - excuse me - Mr. Marc Perkel is joining.

(Mike): Hey, (Mark), welcome to the gang.

Marc Perkel: Sorry I'm late.

(Mike): That's all right, we're right in the middle of the agenda. If you can get into Adobe Connect, the agenda - a link to the agenda is there. We're just wrapping up the review of stuff that we'd planned up until now and we're heading into a couple of new business items.

Marc Perkel: Okay. I'm looking for the link to get me in.

(Mike): Use the latest one - don't use the earlier one because the latest one is different.

Marc Perkel: Right.

(Mike): Okay.

Marc Perkel: I'm looking for the email that had the latest comment. If we could re-email that to the list it would help me find it quicker.

(Mike):   Glen, could you send that link out again? Just send out the announcement again.

Glen Desaintgery: (unintelligible)/

(Mike):   Thanks a lot.

Glen Desaintgery: To (Mark)?

(Mike):   Yeah, to (Mark) or to the list - either way.

Glen Desaintgery: Okay, (unintelligible).

(Mike):   Okay, anything else in data land. That was a good idea, (Michael), thanks for the idea. Okay, if I could turn your attention to our home page which I'll put the link in the chat area. I want to spend a few minutes sort of talking about - here's the link to the home page - if you look at the schedule, I went through and revised it, given where we're at right now.

                 And as you can see, it gets a little tight to get the final report done by Cairo. Cairo really starts effectively on the 30th of October - or maybe the 31st - I can't really remember.

                 And so I wanted to spend a few minutes stepping us through this future history and see if - see what our sense as to whether we're

comfortable in trying to hit the schedule or whether we ought to back off a bit. If you look at where we're at right now, we're on September 3 - our target right now is to have an initial draft reviewed an approved by a week from today and complete by the 17th.

That's also when the template is to go out for two kinds of review - it's one public comment period and the other being the formal constituency review statement cycle. That's when that starts, effectively the 17th. And I left in the schedule a month to do that. And I made them both a month, although according to the bylaws the public comment period really should only be 20 days long. So if we want, we could shorten up that one a bit.

But in order to accommodate especially some of the constituencies where their bylaws pretty much require a month turn around, I felt pretty uncomfortable shortening that much less than a month which give us basically two weeks to get a final draft approved and to (Marika) and then for (Marika) to get it out, you know, that's pretty crisp timing.

Now one approach to this would be to say that it's unlikely that the draft that we're working on is really going to change a lot, partly because of the degree at which people commented in the first round and partly because there really isn't a lot of policy in this draft to change. Essentially the short version of this draft is we had a mis-fire on our charter, we've got pretty broad lack of consensus on the questions, we do have consensus that we think the next step should be a more narrowly focused research project.

However, we don't have consensus on what that research project ought to be about and we don't have consensus as to whether ICANN ought to be doing that research project.

So one way to treat this is to say there isn't a lot of policy, why don't we stop at the initial report, go back to the council with the - essentially the dilemma that we present in the next steps and not flog the process through the next round of reviews at all.

And that's really the question I wanted to put to the group today, is what the appetite is for taking us through another round of constituency and public comment and trying to get to a final draft versus essentially finishing the initial draft, presenting that to the council and letting them determine next steps from the initial drafts?

And with that, I'm going to through it open to discussion.

Man: (Unintelligible).

(Mike):   Go ahead.

Man: I think you are jumping to a lot of conclusions, what you just said right there. I think as a process manager it's initially getting to the substance of what you - as the process manager, we need to send this report out to the constituents with our best efforts at consensus around the questions that was asked.

                It was partly there on some of these questions - my initial - or the questions were made about some of the other questions that I - well, so bottom line, I think we need to continue working on this report and

get it out for constituent statements and public comment because that has not yet been done with all those questions.

(Mike): Other thoughts?

Beau Brendler This is (Bo Brendler). I think the (unintelligible) as a group would like to see in essence in agreement with the previous speaker which is I think the - I'd be hesitant to make any comment thus far because it doesn't feel like there's enough to comment on. So perhaps the results of - unless I've missed some of the results of the poll that was taken with the health poll which I shared with (unintelligible).

So if there's something out of that that seems to indicate a more clear direction, that would be helpful to us.

(Mike): Did you get the summary of the poll that I sent out yesterday?

Beau Brendler I don't believe I did. But if it's done, that's great.

(Mike): It went to the list.

Beau Brendler I might have missed it. I'll find it - I don't want to hold anybody up by...

(Mike): No, no, that's fine. I think the summary of the poll is actually the basis of the comments that I just rattled off.

Beau Brendler Okay.

(Mike): So essentially what I was summarizing was what came back in the poll.

Beau Brendler   Okay.

Man: The problem is the poll is not as - admitted, before you sent it out, (Mike), the poll is not really intended to be making, you know, judgments on what we're supposed to do here because it frankly is not a fair poll. You know, there's a lot more members in this working group from the registrar constituents, for example, than from anywhere else.

(Mike):   Yeah, although I'm not sure that the registrar constituency was overly - heavily represented in the poll results. I'd have to go back and look. The poll is fairly thinly replied to, it wasn't...

Man: Well all the more reason, really. First of all ,the poll is just outside the scope of the group's work anyway. It really should be focusing on the question the council asked.

(Mike):   Yeah, the only problem with that, (Michael), is that we've basically got no basis to answer those questions for the lack of the fundamental research that's not been done.

Man: The allusion that you've made that a lot of us disagree with.

(Mike):   I'm not sure that I've got a lot of disagreement there but, you know, we can certainly beat me up on that. I mean, one of the options, folks, and one that I'm teetering very close to the edge of is for you to find a new chair because I am quite dispirited with this process to date and don't feel that we have any basis for answering those questions at this stage of the game and would be quite cheerful in being replaced.

Essentially when I talked to (Aubrey) and (Chuck) about this, I said our charter was terribly flawed. We really need to go for re-charter. And their suggestion was not bad plan - summarize what you've got to date, come back for a re-charter, we'll re-charter.

And so with that approach in mind, I'm comfortable with the report we've got saying, you know, look we don't have the basis to answer those questions. There's a clear path forward as to how to get there and that's to do a much more narrowly focused study that extends and expands on the research that we started, you know, the conversation we had with (Rod) a few minutes ago.

Well, you know, we've got no facts, people. And so to answer questions without facts is essentially, in my view, not as chair but just as a person - (unintelligible). And I'm very uncomfortable with the idea of putting answers to questions out there because it's truly conjecture. It's almost personal opinion across the board.

So I mean, one option - and I would be quite cheerful about an outcome where you have a vote of no confidence in your chair and picked a new one.

(Christian Curtis):   This is (Christian). I don't that a new chair is actually going to solve anything.

(Mike):   I think that's probably right.

Beau Brendler   Yeah, this is (Bo Brendel). I mean, I hope whatever we said was interpreted as a call for, you know...

(Mike):   No, no, no - I certainly wouldn't want to say that. I was really reflecting my own personal view right now. You know, I just am quite frustrated because I really feel like we got a dreadful charter and I'm doing the best I can to sort of drag this one across the finish line. But I am getting tired and so certainly don't interpret any comments that's been made in that regard but would be quite delighted to be relieved of this duty.

I really think, people, that what we've got is a process failure, not a failure of will, not a failure of design, not a failure of expertise. I think that this group is great. I think that there are no malevolent players in this working group. I just think we got handed a bad charter. And I think that the thing we ought to do is acknowledge that and, you know, to quote the old cliché, when you're finding yourself in a hole the first thing to do is stop digging.

And I think we're just badly chartered. We just need to go back, get a new charter, reconstitute the group with the right players, narrow the focus and carry on. But I am very uncomfortable trying to answer those questions because A, I think they're badly framed and B, I don't think we've got the facts to support the answers that we put out there. That's why the answers are so thin.

Man: Yeah, I agree that the charter's bad, you know. You're on the right track but I don't think we should replace you because you're doing a good job.

(Mike):   Thanks.

Man: It would also be helpful, (Mike), if you think a new charter ought to be posed on a group or on another group, why don't you circulate a draft of what you think it should look like?

(Mike):   Well that's essentially what's in the next step section of the report, (Michael). Basically what I tried to do is present what I think our choices that the council needs to make as to what the charter ought to look like. I think the first part of the charter is what's the problem that you want the working group to solve? And I think that we are divided as a group as to whether that problem statement ought to be narrowly cast as fast flux or more broadly cast as something along the lines of the role that is appropriate for ICANN to play in disrupting malicious use of domain names and numbers.

                And I don't really think that - well, I don't feel we have consensus around one or the other of those and felt more comfortable with essentially presenting that choice to the council. I think what we do have consensus around or at least near consensus - I don't think we have 100% consensus on the poll results on anything but very close to consensus around the notion that we need more information, we need better research on which to base a policy discussion.

                And so in the next step section of the report, I present that as a recommendation from the group that says really the next thing that we ought to do is dig into the research cycle, give the process that we started here - especially with (Ron) and (Rodney) and (Dave) and, you know, all that, give that process some time to really get going. You know, that's a very difficult set of research projects to do, especially given the nature of the problem.

And I think that one of the additions to that research which I would expect we have consensus around although I'm not sure, is the notion that (George) brought up earlier is that in addition to sort of the fact-based research, it would be good to do a little process research to see where the choke points are.

But you know, there seems to be pretty solid consensus around that notion, that, you know, research is the right next step. There is not consensus that our scope of work ought to extend beyond the research. A fair number of people say that we really ought to stop at the end of the research and take a check point and see what the research has told us to do before we go into describing solutions, defining requirements, etcetera, etcetera.

And there is also not consensus as to whether ICANN is really the right place to lead or charter that research from. So essentially, that's what's in the next steps, (Mike), is a series of sort of choices for the council to make with a little bit of discussion around the pros and cons of each.

But it's really kind of a set of tinker toys rather than a proposed charter because to write the proposed charters, I'd sort of - I started writing them and realized that I would have to write five or six or seven in order to accommodate all the different permutations of those questions and it might better to simply go back to the council and say look, rather than present you with five or six permutations, why don't we just answer these questions one at a time? And let that drive the direction of the charter.

(Christian Curtis):   This is (Christian). If I can apply to that question at hand, I'd really like to see a public comment period and another round of constituency

statements particularly because I don't think we - the last - I think the charters that we were given was deeply flawed because of flawed assumptions and flawed understanding of what questions needed to be asked.

And I think that we need to offer the council as much guidance as possible on that and not merely say, you know, the question.

(Mike): I'm not adverse to that and thanks, (Christian), for sort of getting us back to the question at hand which is, do we think we can crash that into the time remaining? Now one way to get ourselves some more time would be to essentially stop trying to revise this initial report which would shorten, you know, which means that we could get - instead of waiting all the way out to the 17th, you know, we could pull in the launch into public comment and constituency comments - we could pull it in to the 10th, let say. Or even the 2nd - today - and say this is where we stand. We are anxious to hear from you, the public and you, the constituencies and rather than spend the time editing now, give ourselves some time at the end to edit after we've gotten the constituency statements and the public comments back. That appeals to me a fair amount, actually.

What do other people think?

Man: I feel very strongly that this report is not ready to go out anywhere. It needs work on it as a group, get more consensus submissions. We've only been looking at this thing for two days and nobody's comments have been input to it yet. And there should be a lot more comments coming shortly once people get a chance to digest it.

(Mike):   Could we split the difference and call it - shoot for getting it out by next week? I mean the difficult...

Man: It's very unreasonable. This report is 30-something pages long.

(Mike):   Sixty two - yeah.

Man: Well that's including the annexes.

(Mike):   Yep.

Man: But I mean, it's like 30 pages of text - 35 pages of text, I think - 30. You know, and we need a little time to read it, think about it, make suggestions to change, talk about those changes. It's going to take a little bit of time. If we don't get this done by Cairo, who cares?

(Mike):   Oh, I care. I'm not going to do this after Cairo. Cairo I am going to step off the bus. I would really like to get something in front of the council by Cairo.

Man: So would I but not this, personally speaking. I think speaking on behalf of our constituents.

(Mike):   Well folks, what do you want to do? (Greg), go ahead.

(Greg Aaron): Well I would like to get something done by Cairo. However, as I read through the document, I do see some things that need some work. And even if you factor inaccuracies which is inevitable given the complex nature of the work and all the summary that has to be done. So I guess the issue for you, (Mike), is to keep on schedule as much as possible

but also make sure that we do a good job creating an accurate and balanced end product.

So if that means herding the cats to a certain deadline, then that's what we've got to do.

(Mike):   Well, thanks (Greg). What do people think of the schedule that's sitting there and - oh, (Dave), I saw your hand go up. I'll get to you in a second. Do we - I mean, I could leave the schedule sort of the way it looks now. That would give us essentially a week for us to hammer on it and then a week for (Marika) to hammer on it and maybe we could steal some of (Marika)'s days, even though I bet we can't steal many. She's got a pretty Herculean task. Does that seem like a realistic schedule?

(Dave), go ahead.

(Dave):   I'm not certain whether I'm on-mic. Can somebody...

(Mike):   Yeah, you're doing fine.

(Dave):   Okay. Well, I think that abandoning the work is not an option. I think that that's, you know, this is not a reflection on anyone in the committee but I think that that, you know, that reflects very badly on, you know, the process and, you know, opens the window of opportunity for lots of criticism that the GNSO frankly doesn't need right now.

I think one way to move forward would be to turn in what, you know, what we've done, explain why we can not complete, you know, and

answer the questions we haven't. And as I've said before, I honestly think the right thing to do is to leave people - we - whoever succeeds us with as much of the information that we have collected as possible.

You know, we've talked today about the lack of data. But in fact, (Rod) and I and (Greg) have put data in front of people and, you know, we haven't received an awful lot of scrutiny on that data nor have we been told what other data to fine.

So I think that one remedy to that in the next iteration would be to, you know, to refine the data questions and sharpen the data collection process. That would be a recommendation that I would, you know, welcome because having somebody tell me, go prove that (fast flux) exists from all the data you can gather is, you know, is tilting a windmill.

(Mike):   Yeah, that's true.

(Dave):   So my suggestion is that we do finish the report, say, the committee was unable to answer this question, the committee was able to answer this question, the committee did come up with alternative definitions for these, you know, for (fast flux) and here they are and let the next group at least have some basis to start anew.

(Mike):   I love the sound effects in the background.

(Dave):   Sorry - there's three phones going on - we're in a hurricane evacuation state here so...

(Mike):   Yeah, I know, I can - it does sound like you're in an EOC, for sure. I think that that's a great suggestion. (Dave), you may not have been on the call when we talked a little bit earlier about some of the tendencies. (Rod)'s got a couple of tendencies, they're on the way and we've also got an effort under way to gather up all of those suggested studies and stuff and make an appendix out of those as well for exactly the reason that you stated which is that we do want to capture as much of the work as we did as possible for the next group.

(Dave):   I mean, if you want to look at the glass half full here, I'm sorry - I didn't raise my hand again - but if you want to look at the glass half full here. We started with a PDP and, you know, an initial set of questions that were really off target. And when we actually came close to agreeing on what the target might be, it was definitely larger in scope and I don't think it's inappropriate for us to say, you know, we waded into this water with everyone thinking it was two feet deep and we're in 35 feet of water.

And frankly treading with, you know, water has not proven to be fruitful. So, you know, we need to rethink how we're going to cross this river and maybe a boat would be in order.

(Mike):   Right on. And you know, I think that's essentially where we're at with the next step. I think the difficulty we're having is in the issue that (Michael) is bringing us back to which his whether or not to try and answer the, I think, flawed questions that we were presented with or not.

I am going to voice a personal opinion and say, I think it's going to be really, really hard to come to any kind of consensus around an answer

to those questions and that in so trying, we may exhaust ourselves so much that we can't throw ourselves into whatever the next thing is because we'll all be so tired from this one.

Man: But (Mike), if we can't reach consensus, that's fine. Let's just lay out what the different responses were.

Man: Yeah, I agree - one of the things that has frustrated me is that the past, you know, 24 hours as I'm reading the report is I had said back around August 18, it's absolutely wrong for us to assume that we have to have a consensus out of this committee in order to claim we made some progress on the topic. This is research, this is, you know, there's an awful lot of different perspectives and an awful lot of different areas to explore.

And the fact that we can't come to consensus on certain things shouldn't be viewed as failure. I mean, it should be viewed as legitimate debate and interaction with people who are seeking consensus.

You know, if you always insist on consensus, then you create wonderful opportunities for obstructionism and I'm not claiming that this working group does that but that's the downfall of the consensus process. If you don't seek consensus and constantly work to put alternatives on the table until people can agree on something, you're failing.

And I think where we've fallen short is that we constantly think that we have to have everybody smiling when they room and everybody happy. And that's, you know, I mean, a lot of the topics that we're

looking at aren't going to make everyone smile when they're leaving the room.

So lay it out and say, okay, this group of 20 people have these perspectives and there are some views that are minority - views that are majority, views that are held by equal, you know, equal numbers of parties. And that's what we did. I don't think that that's wrong.

(Mike): Okay, (Rod)'s been patient. Hang on, (Michael), I'm going to let (Rod) jump in - he's got his hand raised and has been for a while.

(Michael): Sure - I would just say, I apologize, I'm not raising my hand, I'm not able to get into this Acrobat. I don't know what's going on with my Internet.

Rod Rasmussen: I've got a similar problem. My connection is something on my end and it's very slow. I raised my hand a long time ago.

(Mike): You did - well never mind then.

Rod Rasmussen: That's all right - I was - at the time I was just going to concur with (Greg)'s comment and I think what we're coming to is - at least some of us are coming to is that we've got to both respond and set up where we're going to go from here and it's important that we do respond to the initial PDP in a way that is at least close what they asked us to, even if the answers aren't what they were looking for.

So there's that from a process perspective. And then creating an environment for success moving forward is, I think, the most important thing to do. So I'm just going to leave my comment at that.

(Mike):   Okay. Well let's - I'm going to beat the schedule question one last time and then we'll get on to the last agenda item which is a process that (Marika) has proposed and that I like for getting those into the draft.

                 Should we just schedule it the way it is on the (Wiki) right now and do our best to hit that?

Man: Can I ask for that we just draw a poll of whether or not people buy into the proposition I've put on the table about, you know, laying out all of the views as opposed to try to have consensus? Because I don't - I'm not comfortable that everybody agrees on that yet.

George Kirikos: (George) here - I would agree with that.

Man: Let me put a little yes/no up on the thing and open up the poll and that should be up there.

Man: I can't see your poll but I agree with (Dave).

Man: If I can ask real quick - are you asking for consensus on the question on whether we should abandon consensus?

Man: To make the question clear, I'm asking whether we believe the report should only contain consensus opinions or whether it should contain majority views, minority views, views shared by equal parties if not consensus.

(Mike):   Oh, I think that I can answer that one from our charter. I don't think that our charter demanded that consensus in the report. What I arrived at

was that was because we got so far off the rails, we never really discussed the question. So when (Marika) went through and tried to summarize the email, there really was nothing there for her to summarize. But I'm not trying to say that we need to only have a consensus review in the report. I just don't think that we have anything in those because we got stuck before we got out of the blocks on a lot of that stuff.

Man: I actually think that that's not - well from my perspective, it's not quite an accurate characterization. I think that there are, you know, there are topics where I would suspect four or five people who contributed fairly regularly agree and there might be two or three people who have an alternative view - or five, for all I know.

And both those views ought to be expressed because they weren't just the opinion of one person who's an outlier, they were opinions shared by multiple participants, you know, in, you know, the committee.

(Mike): Okay. Let's see - does anybody got their hand up or anybody want to talk because I'm going to drag us back to do we think we can get that done in the schedule that's out on the (Wiki).

(Christian Curtis): This is (Christian). I think that that's actually the most realistic schedule given the amount of time that we have.

(Mike): Yeah, it's a compromised schedule for sure. I mean, we had that hard stop at Cairo. And the sense I get is that people would really like to get a final report by Cairo, not delivering interim reports. And if we sort of align around that notion, then I think that's kind of the schedule we got to do which means that we - well let me stop and just give people a

chance to stick their hand up and say no, I don't think that schedule's right.

George Kirikos: (George) here. Doesn't - I haven't read the PDP rules in a while but are there specific time guidelines that we have to follow?

(Mike): Yeah, the major one that we as a working group have to follow is that the public comment period has to be 20 days long.

George Kirikos: Oh, okay.

(Mike): And I've left a longer period in there because some of the constituencies have bylaws that really make it almost impossible for them to turn a constituency statement around in 20 days. So that's why it's essentially 30 days that are there.

George Kirikos: There wasn't a time limit, I guess, on the start to finish on the PDP. It could go on for...

Man: We don't have any limits like that, (George).

George Kirikos: Oh, okay.
Man: If there are any, they're just widely ignored.

George Kirikos: Right - that was my question.

(Mike): Yeah. It does seem pretty easy to - I think that really we're up against more of a practical scheduling constraint than a bylaws one.

George Kirikos: The only PDP that we've ever really had experience on is the tasting issue and - at least (unintelligible) to completion.

(Mike): Yeah. Well, let's - we've got about 40 minutes left and I think what I'll do is I'll take that schedule as at least our tentative approach. That's still pretty aggressive. We're going to have to work really fast to get proposals out and edited into the report. So let me shift your attention now to a document that (Marika) has prepared for us. And I'll just paste it into the chat.

Oh, boy - that's ugly - see if that works. Wow, that is a very long URL. If you go to the agenda, I'll give you the agenda again - and you look down at the bottom of the agenda, there's a draft (fast flux) initial report comments received to date dot doc link on that page. That's the document that (Marika) prepared and it's a Word document. I've got my fingers crossed that ya'll can open it.

And basically what (Marika) is doing is capturing - I agree, (Dave), by the way, with your thought that the last 24 hours has been a misfire in terms of the way to get stuff into the report. So this is Take 2 on that.

(Marika), maybe you can walk us through this report and then we can sort of talk about how we could use this to very quickly get a lot of opinions or a lot of statements developed. And then I don't know, maybe next call what we do is we sort of float our way through this pile of statements and see which ones represent rough consensus, view - if any - and then which are minority views and go like that.

But are people - is anybody having trouble getting to (Marika)'s document? Okay.

Rod Rasmussen: Hey (Mike), this is (Rod).

(Mike):   Yeah, go ahead.

Rod Rasmussen: I just wanted to let you know, there's the APWGIPC call starts in five minutes and I'm going to have to leave at that point.

(Mike):   Oh, rats.

Rod Rasmussen: And probably a few other people. So I just wanted to give you a heads up so I'll still have another five minutes to go.

(Mike):   Well let's spend five minutes on process and not content then and see if this is an approach - I guess my thought is that what we could continue to do is same email based approach that we launched yesterday with one huge change which is instead of me playing traffic cop, (Marika) will play recorder and clump these by perhaps questions. Right now, they're not clumped by questions but we can tweak that.

Marika Konings: Yeah, or maybe section reports and when we actually go through the list in a chronological order, all the reports so maybe we can through it indeed by sections but in a chronological order.

(Mike):   And essentially spend the next few days building this document. Do we feel like if we spent - what I'd really like to do is spend a few days building this document and then a few days essentially voting on it over the wire via email before we got together on the call next week so that we didn't wait all the way until the call to start determining the degree of consensus around the replies.

So could we sort of arbitrarily say that we'll work until close of business Monday in building up the choices and then spend - or maybe - and then spend Tuesday in some sort of preliminary voting cycle to get a preliminary sense of which ones people supported. And then use Wednesday's call to essentially drive that to whatever conclusion we arrive at?

Marika Konings: If I could maybe make one suggestion (unintelligible) - it's (Marika). There's something that had happened at the end as well is people have explained they feel certain text needs to be in there and that's difficult to capture in this, something that could be done as well that in the call we have, you know, basically people can pitch their proposal and say look very briefly because otherwise we'll be hours on the call but saying this is why I think this should be added. And people will have seen what text they proposed but they can as well give some additional suggestions.

(Mike): What if we did both? What if we - let rationale continue? You wouldn't - you would not pick that up into this document but that would be at least be - give people a chance to read the rationale. And that might shorten the pitch version during the phone call so people could sort of speak in shorthand.

(Christian Curtis): This is (Christian). If we do that, I think that we'd need to either do the poll after the call or allow for some change in the poll. Otherwise, the pace on the call would be pretty meaningless.

(Mike): Say that another way?

(Christian Curtis):   If we're going to have people vote before the call but...

(Mike):   No,no...

(Christian Curtis):   Okay.

(Mike):   No, I guess I wasn't thinking - oh, I see what you're getting at - yeah, yeah, yeah. There is a logical flaw there, isn't there.

Man: Do people even have enough time to answer the first poll? I'm looking at the number and looking at 11 people responded even though on some questions, there are only like 8 responses.

(Mike):   Yeah.

Man: A few people might...

(Mike):   Yeah, there were actually eight responses and some of us voted twice.

Man: Oh, okay.

(Mike):   So that's why there's 11 sometimes.

Man: Because there's more than 8 people on this phone call, like if people that didn't vote could explain, you know, if they need more time or something.

(Mike):   Maybe what we do is we spend up through Monday dropping things in the bucket with rationale, spend Tuesday wrapping up the date and give (Marika) a little time to finish off her document and then we get

down to the - a very concentrated call where we're all very conscious of time where we do all the voting on the call next Wednesday. How about that?

Man: Sounds good to me.

(Mike):   I'm going to take that as a yes. All right, (Rod), thanks for hanging in with us, best wishes for the call. Anybody else who has to scoot, go ahead.

Rod Rasmussen: Thanks, (Mike). Keep the faith, brother.

(Mike):   All right - and I think maybe what we'll do, I hate continuing calls without a lot of, you know, when folks has had to drop off. So maybe what we'll do is wrap this one up and get to the business of writing contributions and rationales.

Man: Is that other meeting, by the way, always going to come - or is it...

(Mike):   I meant to ask him that and forgot. Does anybody know if that APWG meeting is standing...

Man: It changes between - so it's basically once a month at 9 am.

(Mike):   Oh, okay, so it might - (Rod) might be able to stay on for the whole call next time.

Man: Oh, yeah, we don't have anything (unintelligible).

(Mike): Okay. Well why don't we wrap this one up and we'll write us a bunch of emails and present (Marika) with the challenge of organizing that into a series of things that we vote on and then we'll do a heavy duty call next Wednesday.

Marika Konings: I was just going to advise everyone then to follow maybe the structure of the document in providing those responses and indeed adding a little bit on rationale so that I can work that into the document as well. That would be really helpful.

(Mike): Thanks, (Marika), I think that's a great thought. Okey-dokey - that concludes my report, folks. Thanks for the participation, I think we made a lot of progress today and I think we've got a pretty tight schedule but I'm willing to give it a shot. Thanks - see you in a week.

Oh, are you still on the call?

Glen Desaintgery: No, he's disconnected, (Mike).

(Mike): Dropped off - all right. I'll get to him later.

Glen Desaintgery: Yes.

(Mike): Okey-doke. Thanks folks - bye-bye.

Woman: Bye.

END