

**PDPFeb-06 Task Force Teleconference  
TRANSCRIPTION  
19 April 2007, 18:00 UTC**

**Note:** The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the PDPFeb06 task force call on 19 April 2007. 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://gnso-audio.icann.org/PDP-Feb06-20070419.mp3>  
<http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#apr>

**Participants on the call:**

Avri Doria - Interim Chair - Nom Com appointee GNSO Council  
Philip Sheppard - CBUC  
Marilyn Cade - CBUC  
Jon Nevett - Registrar constituency  
David Maher - Registries Constituency  
Greg Ruth - ISPC

**ICANN Staff:**

Liz Williams - Senior Policy Counselor  
Glen de Saint Géry - GNSO Secretariat

**Absent apologies**

Alistair Dixon - CBUC  
Ken Stubbs - Registries Constituency  
Kristina Rosette – IPC

Avri Doria: Okay, thanks. So – Glen, could you go through the roll the call please.

Glen Desaintgery: Certainly Avri.

Avri Doria: We'll start off in a few moments, thanks.

Glen Desaintgery: We have got Avri Doria, the chair on the call. David Maher, Registry Constituency. Philip Sheppard, Business Constituency. Jon Nevett, Registrar Constituency. And the two staff, Liz Williams and myself.

Avri Doria: Okay, thanks. So that's what this is missing representatives from three constituencies – IPC, ISP and (unintelligible).

Did anybody need to update and enter a statement? I'd like to ask, Liz have you gotten them from everybody now, so that the record keeping on that is clear. Or is that Glen I should be asking?

Glen Desaintgery: Yes.

Avri Doria: Glen.

Glen Desaintgery: I should – I would check that for you Avri.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Glen Desaintgery: As far as I know, yes.

Avri Doria: I believe that's the case but I just want to confirm it myself.

Glen Desaintgery: Believe it's the case to you.

Avri Doria: Okay. In terms of the agenda, I basically had three items – I'm not sure that we'll get to the third. The first item was last comments on the final draft or the penultimate final draft. I guess it's the last of the moment. And Liz basically I've asked her to cover what has changed since the last review – since the last version, then a resolution of any issues. I had asked anyone with issues to post them to the mailing list before the meeting.

But if anyone has one that they didn't post, please bring it up in the meeting. (As I say), I don't want to reopen any of the (subjects) of issues that have been decided. But if there's something in the report that does not reflect accurately on what we did, then, that should definitely be covered.

Then basically, agreement on the final process which was basically I sent around the text of a vote to review the text of that. So – and make sure that people understand it and that it is what we, as a task force want to do. And then, review the schedule for that vote and that is dependent upon whether any issues came up that need to be resolved.

Then the third one was initiate the vote. But as I say, we'll decide in the second item when we review the schedule of the vote whether initiating in active meeting is the right thing to do.

Any comments on the agenda or changes, addition?

Man: It's okay.

Avri Doria: Thank you. No, this is okay. So let's start with that.

Liz? Okay. I know I never give enough time for getting off mute. It takes about like three or four seconds for someone off on mute to get off, but now I have.

So, going on, Liz, can you discuss what has changed since the last published version.

Liz Williams: Yup. And I was off mute, if you'd be pleased to know Avri.

The couple of changes, one is, everything that we've done in the Lisbon meeting has been incorporated - that includes commentary from Dan Halloran about the requirements under the by-laws for including the impact statements. So you'll see that in the first part of the report. The – that includes the financial analysis which none of the constituencies responded to. It included the time to represent policies.

So, that is all being done. So the report meets the requirements of the by-laws as they stand. The other changes are, with respect to the reorganization of the majority supported recommendations except for – and I thank Philip for picking this up 3.8 which just needs to be shifted into the majority supported recommendation. And that is my error, and I apologize for that. I didn't pick it up and I – Avri didn't pick it up, and Dan didn't pick it up, and Sue Jonklaas didn't pick up. So, I apologize for my missing it. That is a fairly simple task to do that.

The participation charts are now fully accurate and I have to say that those participation charts and the mixing of a number of different elements into the report caused significant technical details for our web master which was the delay on the posting of the report. And again, I

apologize for that. There seems to be nothing we can do about that. And it keeps happening every time, but you'll be pleased to know that I've got a web master meeting this week to try and resolve it for the future.

So the participation charts are all complete and accurate. Any (toppers), any edits were minor. Nobody submitted anything apart from Avri on the last draft of the report. And as Avri called her comments, they were minor and I made each and every one of them. And that's it.

Avri Doria: Okay. Are there anybody have any questions on what was covered?

Glen Desaintgery: Avri, excuse me, it's Glen. Greg Ruth has just joined the call.

Avri Doria: Okay, great. So now we have one more constituency attending. Fantastic! (Unintelligible), thank you. And welcome Greg.

Greg Ruth: (Great).

Avri Doria: So, does anyone – going back, does anyone have any questions or comments on what Liz just brought up or just covered?

Philip Sheppard: Philip here. Just to say, I'm satisfied with the report description as Liz gave it.

Avri Doria: Okay, thank you. Anyone else?

Okay, counting for people (getting on).

Okay then. Moving on, does anyone have any issue with the report that are not dealt with any outstanding issues – anything that should be looked at before we move on to talking about how to do the vote on this.

(Leaving) time for people to mute or un-mute.

Okay. I'll assume that we have no open issue and that's great.

Liz Williams: You bet. It's great, Avri.

Avri Doria: I'm quite excited. Now, in terms of final process – I guess there's one thing that I didn't have. I had reviewed text of votes and review schedules for vote. One thing that – since there is that last change that you made that needed to be done to the text, and I'm sort of (loathes) to ask people to vote on a text that is not the text and other service. There's still to be a change pending in what they see. I guess the first question asked is Liz, how long does it take to make that change and get it out to everyone in the task force? Whether it's sent as a PDF or it's put on...

Liz Williams: Everybody...

Avri Doria: ...but I know it's a problem. Five minutes. Five minutes and you can have it in everybody's mailbox. And as for – this is not too likely to go out.

Liz Williams: What it will – let's just be real – let's just – sorry, let's just be realistic. It will take me five minutes to make the change, which is fine and I accept that. And I'm supposed to go to change the spelling of Philip's

name. And Philip I apologize for not picking that up. I just – I'm going to substitute (Elpresa) just to annoy you.

What I will do though Avri, is the size of the document crashes the email service, so I'm not going to post it to the list. It means it would have to be sent to everyone individually, like I did last time because we're running out of time. So that takes me...

Avri Doria: Okay, so let's assume that takes a day.

Liz Williams: A bit. Yeah.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Man: What was that with you is it (Justin).

Avri Doria: Okay. So that settled. Go into deciding...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Avri Doria: Somebody should go on mute please.

Liz Williams: So I know that you're talking.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Okay. So then, I included in an email sort of the background for the vote and I'll read out what I wrote. To see if that's agreeable to everyone. And then, I wrote a statement on what I'm going to ask people to vote on and I wanted to – the background for the vote included: point 1, this is not a vote on whether to send the

recommendations to council. The final report will be going to council regardless of the results of the vote.

Two, this is not specifically a vote on accepting or rejecting the term of reference – does the issue is documented in the report. Three, this is not a constituency vote, but a vote of the individuals who are members of the task force. Four, this is not a weighted vote. Each participant will have one vote. Five, the list of voters can be found in Section 1-8 of the report on page six. The final report - I guess the URL, the ALAC Liaison participant in the task force will have a vote.

The vote is specifically about approving that the report accurately reflects the work of the task force and accurately reflects discussion, comment and recommendation – including those that we see strong support, those that we see some support, and those that just not have support.

A positive vote indicates support of the report's accuracy. A negative vote indicates disapproval or report's accuracy which is kind of an awkward phrase, I think.

So, the statement of the vote is: the final transcript of policies for contractual conditions existing registry PDP 506, dated 10 April, that I'll have to change to date if whatever it is. And sound at – which won't exactly be true. Well, will you be putting it up, Liz?

Liz, are you on mute?

Liz Williams: Avri, I'll put it off after the vote's taken, so that the – what I'll do is I'll send it to everyone individually. If that's, if everyone agrees to this view

because I'm anxious that I don't expend with master resources unnecessarily. So, what if I send the report to everybody individually, everybody votes on it. And then I – they can see that the amendments are made to their satisfaction. And then I'll post it and with a notice that says, "This is the final task force report to be sent to the council and the vote with XYZ." How about that?

Avri Doria: Is there a possibility of sending it at least to the archive?

Liz Williams: It – well, I have to ask (Kent's) special permission because the size of the document, like most of the email archive documents is it crashes the email server...

Avri Doria: Wait, but sometimes it...

Liz Williams: ...unless I get (Kent) to open the server and we'll slice it into two and then shut it again.

Avri Doria: All right. But sometimes it is possible to just send this something to the archive address, I don't know. Because then it's public – it's now publicly.

Liz Williams: Yeah, I know. I know.

Avri Doria: And I'd like...

Liz Williams: Glen, perhaps we could work on that swiftly.

Glen Desaintgery: Yes. I was (then) to say, send it to me as soon as it's finished to this and I'll get on to the public.

Avri Doria: Okay. And I will amend this and sound at and if it's possible, I'll refer to a message on the archive.

Philip Sheppard: Okay. But Avri, you didn't very – who would concern yourself with that – so long as every member of the task force is going to vote on the report and deem it accurate. See this placed on this and that.

Avri Doria: I understand.

Philip Sheppard: Then, job's done. I won't go...

Avri Doria: Right. We'll I...

Philip Sheppard: ...subsequently – go public subsequently.

Avri Doria: I understand. It's just that, in terms of doing everything transparently, if it's possible to do it transparently and if possible to have the vote pointing specifically. So yes, everyone got it personally. But everyone could see that it is indeed the thing that everyone's told. And it's just part of the whole transparency, accountability type things that if it's possible, I'd like to do it.

But I understand that if I can't, we should go ahead anyway. It's what I'm taking from that, if that's okay.

Okay. So the final draft of policies for (unintelligible) conditions, existing registry, PDP 506, dated XX April 2007, accurately reflects the work of the task force and accurately reflects the discussions held during the meeting. The comments received on previous draft and the

recommendations made in discussing the task force. And then I'll ask people to basically agree or disagree.

So, having gone through that, are there any issues, any corrections, additions that I should make to that?

Philip Sheppard: I think that sounds fine, Avri. Are we then suggesting that that version is going to take place by email?

Avri Doria: Yes.

Philip Sheppard: Yeah.

Avri Doria: That's – trying to get everybody – all the voters...

Philip Sheppard: Uh hmm.

Avri Doria: ...on one phone call at one time, it is not possible.

Philip Sheppard: It's hurting (caps), exactly.

Avri Doria: It's not even that easy.

So, any issues with this being what the vote is and how it's basically termed. And next, I'll talk about the schedule if there are no issues with the content.

Okay. My suggestion is that we do the vote basically. Is it sufficient to do it one day after the – start the vote one day after the report has been sent to everyone? Now without it going public, we're not

absolutely sure that everyone got it unless they all ask Liz which may be reasonable to have Liz ask to say that, yes, they received it because sending something is no guarantee of received.

But I'd like to give everyone a day to just do their last check. Is that a reasonable amount of time?

Philip Sheppard: Yes.

Avri Doria: Okay. So one day for people to review. And then, the email vote. How long should be allowed? My first instinct says two days, but I think that might be too short. So, anybody have any recommendation of what's the right amount of time for us to run the vote and for Glen to (unintelligible) to get everybody to vote?

Philip Sheppard: Yeah, exactly. I think is there any policy I think it is that you need to consider. I think of two things: one of which is time zones of course, so that tends to reduce you 24 hours anyway.

Avri Doria: Right.

Philip Sheppard: And second thing is absences, so you need to sort of factor that in. But either thought longer than two days, shorter than a week would be about the order magnitude and Glen is probably the best person to advise us what the perfect figure is.

Avri Doria: Okay. Glen?

Glen Desaintgery: And with the...

Avri Doria: Would you like to take that?

Glen Desaintgery: Next week will probably be all right. So I would say within a week is a good time because otherwise, as Philip says, taking absences into account and time zones, it's a bit ambitious to think that you're going to get the votes in before.

Avri Doria: Okay. So in other words, we maybe – so we can – in other words, we can start the vote Monday and we end it – are you suggesting we end it on Friday or end it on the following week, Monday?

Glen Desaintgery: No. I think we should end it on Friday but can you start tomorrow?

Avri Doria: I guess if Liz gets it sent out today so that we have that one day for review.

Somebody's tapping the table.

Glen Desaintgery: So, if that works...

(Marilyn): Hey.

Avri Doria: Yeah?

(Marilyn): I'm sorry I'm late. I know it's very noisy. It's (Marilyn), and I'm going to go on mute.

Avri Doria: Okay. Let me just give you a recap. We went through a list of everything. We spoke about two editorials that need to be taken care of. One is listing 3.8 in the correct place and what is spelling Philip's

name correctly. We have also and though no other issues with the report. You should know that we have four out of the six talking, six constituencies represented and to you see an intellectual property or not.

We had no other issues brought up. We agreed on the text of the vote, pretty much what I sent out yesterday. And now, we're talking about the schedules of the vote. Liz is going to update the document with the two editorials today. And she is – and then, we're going to give it a day for it to settle. Make sure it's been received by everyone and then we'll start the vote. The vote we were at would last a week.

So, considering that we start the vote today, on Friday, we would end it on Friday. Correct, Glen?

Glen Desaintgery: That's right.

Avri Doria: Okay. Liz, does that's being reasonable in terms of you getting it all out?

Liz Williams: Yup.

Avri Doria: Anyone have any comments on that as a schedule?

Liz Williams: Yes Avri.

(Marilyn): Avri, it's (Marilyn). Can you hear me?

Avri Doria: Yeah. I can hear you.

(Marilyn): Okay. Could you just put me in the queue after Liz comments?

Avri Doria: Okay. I think Liz commented, right? You said yes.

Liz Williams: Yup. I'm done.

Avri Doria: Okay.

(Marilyn): I'm sorry to do that. I just need to point something out and thank you for that quick summary. I have several places and I just want to give a couple of examples. They're not – there's even one that I started working here. Listen, I apologize, I can't find it right now. I haven't had the chance to send it to you, but I wanted just reference.

So, an example of where more clarity is needed, but it's not a substance of change, but I think it's – maybe you could look at under three, page 11. Under 3.9 which - instead of places, you used the reference that says, "The remainder of the proposed recommendations, do not have the majority of support." But here, at the top of the page, it actually has recommendation 1A, recommendation 1B.

There were subsets under 1A but when you read at the bottom of the page, I think it could be confusing for people to think that the recommendation 1B is being addressed, when actually it's addressed on – well, I'm just – I just want to point out, it's a little confusing, not that it's an error. That's one example.

Then let me just give you one other one, just as an example. And then I can send them to you in writing and you can figure out if it makes

sense to address them on. Oh, I'm sorry. I found the typo in it. I'll just mention it. On 9.1, there's a reference to working group 1, as opposed to working group A or working group B.

I do have a problem with the characterization in 9.2 that I'm going to quickly mention. It reads, in the second sentence, "On those calls (unintelligible) on about the nature of the problem should be solved, by considering the question or registry data – chance agreement on what the problems actually were. And what kinds of information the registry committed to provide to the group to assist with the discussions?"

I think that middle chance – I think there's a bit of pejorative of reference there. Inevitably great disagreement but, you know, I just want to point out that that's not a – that's one example of – and you may not be open to taking any changes about it.

The one other acceptance the thing I want to point out, you may have addressed it. It's on 9.4, there's no acknowledgment the fact that Avri voted.

Avri Doria: That's because at that point it's just listing the...

(Marilyn): But...

Avri Doria: Oh. It says a list of additional support from (Becola), yeah.

(Marilyn): Yeah. And it mentions. And on the chart list on PDP 06 straw poll indicated on page 29. Dear, you've just got a consistency issue on how you show the registry votes where in 3A1, 3B1, 3B2, they do – you

have DNV that on 4B14 of 5A1, you have this little code that you put down in your – on your legend.

So that's just a consistent – sort of the consistency issues that you just might want to – it's such a simple change. You just might want to take a look at that.

Avri Doria: Liz, do you want to address this?

Glen Desaintgery: Excuse me Avri, while this is getting off mute. (Carrie Copton's) just joined the call.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Liz Williams: Now, and so – I'm just coming off mute, this is quite noisy where I am.

So, I'm very disappointed that these rather important things have not been brought up before. Because the report has been out, it's been available, it's – our last calls are made for edits. Avri has reviewed this document and provided me as the chair with her, as she characterized them. And I said at the beginning of the meeting, only minor edits.

What you've described is not minor edits at all. So I'm quite anxious about that. And also, the general council's office has reviewed and approved the document. There was one error which was brought up, which was an error as opposed to the clarification thing which (dawn) never (unintelligible). So, (unintelligible) have brought up today, which will be immediately addressed because it is indeed an error.

I could appreciate that she want to make the report as clear as possible, but that is not what you describe. It's not going to happen within the time frame that the group wants to actually take the vote. From what you've described, it's – they're not sub-standard changes. They might be desirable to have but we will be back in to amending the report and having the whole group to review it and another week of analysis. So I need to be very short if that's what the group intends because that is not what this meeting was about.

(Marilyn): Yeah. Liz, wait a minute. Let me be clear. The things I've pointed out, except for that one phrase on 9.2, adding in on Avri's name on 9.4, which is just an accidental amendment and fixing working group 1 to be either working group A or B whichever one it is.

Avri Doria: Yup. Those two are editorials.

(Marilyn): Right.

Avri Doria: And it seems they could be probably made in the same (unintelligible) editorial.

Liz Williams: Yup, sure.

Avri Doria: In terms of review – of a – taking out a phrase, I would suggest that that's way too big an edit to do.

(Marilyn): I hear you. And that's why I said if you wanted to accept that.

Avri Doria: And in terms of Dan's agreement, I don't think it's pejorative. I think it's just the way of talking. It means, that with some agreement but not much. And so, I would think that that, you know, it's interpretive but...

(Marilyn): Look. All of the other changes I gave are the kinds of things that, you know, as I said, you...

(Avri Doria): Yeah. I appreciate it. Right.

(Marilyn): But however, I'll just also note, I really appreciate how busy the staff is as someone who've – awfully also have responsibilities. And so we don't need to go into that nor debate it on a publicly recorded call.

Avri Doria: All right. Okay.

(Marilyn): So, I've offered the quick things that I caught. I do think that Liz, if possible to take a look at consistency on page 29 just to see it's do not vote should be shown in the same way. I leave that up to the two of you to determine.

Avri Doria: Okay, thanks. So Liz, is certainly getting the editorials okay with you?

Liz Williams: Yup. That's fine.

Avri Doria: Okay. Thanks. And you and I can talk later about the consistency. I think it's – as long that it's understandable, my view is, as long as it can be understood, I don't see an issue. And I worry about changing anything that makes it look like meaning could change. And...

Liz Williams: Well not only that Avri. If those kinds of changes are made, I have to go all the way back to the general council office again, which I'm willing to do. And it will have to go all the way back through the web bobs to web postings issue if we're going to post those changes.

Avri Doria: And that's at least another week.

((Crosstalk))

(Marilyn): That's definitely not necessary. But can I just ask a question. Is it you tooled in to just spell out what's DNV means?

Liz William: Yeah, of course. That's no problem (Marilyn). Did Not Vote. Yeah.

Avri Doria: Yup. So just adding a footnote there or another...

Liz Williams: Just make sure that it's not actually just pushed on to your other page there, because that legend has been there for a very long time.

Avri Doria: Note AA. Registry Constituency (unintelligible). Well, just check that.

Liz Williams: Yup. Sure.

Avri Doria: And if there's anything editorial to be done, we can clear it. So is that an okay covering of your issues (Marilyn)?

(Marilyn): I thought it was useful to point out things that isn't (unintelligible) in there. But I wouldn't dare to bring that up at this point.

Avri Doria: Okay. If there are misspelled words, I'm sure if you send them to Liz, she will correct misspelled words if it's done in the next couple of hours.

Liz Williams: Yup.

Avri Doria: Okay. So I'd like to go back to the schedule. I think we were almost done. We had talked about one week starting Friday. Basically, starting 24 hours after Liz gets – Liz and our plans gets it finalized updated report out to everyone. So, 24 hours.

Liz Williams: Just (unintelligible) – I'm going to send that to everyone individually. Yes.

Avri Doria: Yeah.

Liz Williams: Like I did before.

Avri Doria: Right.

Liz Williams: So I'm just...

Avri Doria: Send it to everyone individually, but please try to get it into the – this is my request...

Liz Williams: Yup. Sure.

Avri Doria: ...and it's simply part of the transparency and accountability because lots of people follow this group even they aren't in it.

Liz Williams: Yup.

Avri Doria: That it get at least into our email archive.

Liz Williams: Well, we'll work with Kent on that Avri. It is a significant technical issue, but we'll work with Kent on that.

Avri Doria: It shouldn't be that hard. I've done mailing list with Kent and stuff. But just...

Liz Williams: Yeah. They just might – they just have a megabyte limit and there's no way around it.

Avri Doria: Of course, there's way around.

Liz Williams: (Unintelligible).

Avri Doria: Not really. But anyway...

Philip Sheppard: Let's not get into that.

Avri Doria: Right.

Liz Williams: No. Keep going.

Avri Doria: Okay.

Liz Williams: Yup.

Avri Doria: So I think that that brings us to the end. The next thing is to initiate the vote, but we obviously can't initiate the vote at this time. But we'll do so once that we updated things that are not. Does anyone have any other issues for this meeting? As I was saying, this will be the last meeting of this group.

(Marilyn): Yes, I have a (unintelligible) question.

Liz Williams: Yes, I have one issue if you don't mind Avri.

Avri Doria: Okay. And Liz and who else?

(Marilyn): And then can I just ask a question after that?

Avri Doria: Of course.

Liz Williams: (Marilyn), you go forward with your question first because it'll be important and my issue is not.

(Marilyn): I'm just - could you just tell me which page the change on 3.A it's going to be on so I can just quickly look at it.

Liz Williams: Oh! No, (Marilyn). I can save you that whole trouble. When I send it to you, I will just put a little note at the top of the email that says changes on page blah, blah, blah, blah, blah, blah.

(Marilyn): Okay.

Liz Williams: Yeah. So that everyone has the same information.

(Marilyn): Great.

Liz Williams: How about that?

Avri Doria: Okay. Liz?

Liz Williams: I – to – on to the formal record, my thanks to the group for getting through the work which is being very contentious and difficult, and I appreciate very much everybody's hard work. Incredibly, I appreciate it very much and I know that it's been difficult for many people. The – when we get together in Lisbon, drinks on the bar are on me.

Avri Doria: And around on me too, because I appreciate all the...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Philip Sheppard: Did you say, in Lisbon?

Glen Desaintgery: Been in Lisbon.

Liz Williams: Oh yeah, oh yeah. No, I'm a cheap drink – I'm a cheap drunk, I'm cheap. I'm in Puerto Rico, I'm sorry.

Avri Doria: Puerto Rico has got a bottle of rum.

Liz Williams: I don't care what we drink, but it's going to be a lot.

Avri Doria: And it's myself.

Dan Halloran: I'm with you on that.

Liz Williams: Thanks Dan.

Avri Doria: And I want to thank you Liz, I want to thank Glen, I want to thank everybody on the group for sticking to it. And I look forward to the vote.

Liz Williams: Okay.

Philip Sheppard: Very good.

Avri Doria: Thank you.

Liz Williams: See you then. Bye.

Avri Doria: Bye bye.

Philip Sheppard: All right.

END