

**Policy Process Steering Committee (PPSC) Policy Development Process (PDP)  
Work Team (WT)  
TRANSCRIPTION  
Thursday 25 February 2010 at 19:00 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Policy Process Steering Committee Policy Development Process (PDP) Work Team (WT) meeting on Thursday 25 February 2010 at 19:00 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting but **should not be treated as an authoritative record**. The audio is also available at:

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-ppsc-pdp-20100225.mp3>

on

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

(transcripts and recordings are found on the calendar page)

**Participants on the Call:**

Jeff Neuman - Registry Stakeholder Group - Work Team Chair

James Bladel – Registrar Stakeholder Group

Tatiana Khramtsova – Registrar Stakeholder Group

Paul Diaz - Registrar Stakeholder Group

Avri Doria - Non Commercial Stakeholder Group

Alex Gakuru - Non Commercial Stakeholder Group

Wolf Knoben – ISPC

David Maher – Registry Stakeholder Group

**ICANN Staff:**

David Olive

Margie Milam

Glen de Saint Gery

Gisella Gruber-White

Marika Konings

**Absent apologies:**

none

Glen de Saint Gery: Shall I do the roll for you?

Jeff Neuman: Yes please.

Glen de Saint Gery: On the call we have Jeff Neuman, Avri Doria, Paul Diaz, James Bladel, Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen, and for staff we have Marika Konings, Margie Milam, and Glen de Saint Gery, and we are just calling out to Alex Gakuru.

Glen de Saint Gery: (Bless) you.

Margie Milam: Glen we also have...

Glen de Saint Gery: Hi.

Margie Milam: ...we also have David Olive as well.

Glen de Saint Gery: Oh I'm sorry, David. Yes, I - because I didn't see you.

David Olive: I'm good.

Glen de Saint Gery: Thank you. Thank you very much. Yes, we have David Olive too.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, great. Thank you. This is Jeff Neuman and welcome to, I'm trying to figure out my days here, but I believe it's February 25, 2010 for the normal weekly call of the PDP Work Team. And let me apologize first because I'm calling from a hotel room so if there's too much sound or if I lose connection, I completely apologize. I'm on the West Coast and had to call from a hotel room that doesn't have the greatest reception. So please let me know if there's - if you have any trouble hearing me.

So with that said, that's - the first thing is there was a DOODLE that was sent around by Gisella, I believe it was yesterday, for a call for next week. As we were talking last week on our call, it didn't seem like there were going to be enough people actually in Nairobi from the work team to have a regular work team (meeting) there. But it did seem like, you know, we don't want to stop making progress, so to the extent we can actually have a call next week

either Monday or Tuesday prior to people leaving for Nairobi that we could actually have a call. I see Marika has got her hand raised, so Marika...

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. I just wanted confirm that you want to go ahead with canceling the session in Nairobi. Because I think we still have it on the GNSO schedule, so I just want to clarify that.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, I just - I had that conversation with Glen too just before we started this call. I think that's what we're going to end up doing. I think on the last call we decided that since there was nothing extraordinary that we were planning, there's no report that we've released that it's just a regular weekly type call, you know, that we would have in Nairobi. There wasn't really a special purpose for it. So for that reason and the fact that while there will be a bunch of people participating remotely, it just didn't seem like we could necessarily have that face-to-face meeting.

Marika Konings: Okay.

Jeff Neuman: So there is a DOODLE though for Monday or Tuesday of - I believe it's Monday or Tuesday of next week, so if everyone can go in and fill it out, you probably should have gotten that yesterday through email, then that would be great.

What I think I'd like to do today is to finish up with Stage V that we, you know, I think we're getting pretty close and I think we should be able to do it on this call. Marika sent out the last version of Stage V, Policy Effectiveness and Compliance. I believe it was yesterday. Again I'm getting days mixed up, but it's on the wiki for those of you that haven't had a chance to look at it yet.

So where we left off if you all remember was on Number 3, which was the - so now we're not talking about individual - the individual PDP anymore, we're talking about the overall PDP process and the periodic reviews of that

process. I see what was written here and I notice that - I think that's sort of what we discussed.

Man: Okay.

Jeff Neuman: There's a couple of corrections. I think what we had talked about was the initial - we didn't start with the initial question of what are the metrics we would use. We started with a discussion of, you know, in what kind of timeframe we would do these periodic reviews. And I think we decided that there was really no set timeframe that we had in mind because, you know, we wanted to make sure that there were enough PDPs that have taken place before we did this periodic assessment or complete assessment and if the PDPs were - had gone from beginning to end.

We talked about us possibly having a standing committee that would be around and to be consulted if specific issues of specific things look like early on that they weren't working out and that the PPSC, the Steering Committee was the - was initially created and thought by some on the Steering Committee to serve in that role. But we haven't really assessed the (methods) or what (the review would look like).

I'm sorry is there a bad echo? Do people hear an echo? I think it's my...

Man: Yes, a little bit, Jeff, but it just started.

((Crosstalk))

Man: It just started in the last minute.

Man: ...and just stopped it seems.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. So what the notes say in - from the discussion last week was it was suggested that the problem driven review approach could be pursued only if

substantial or sufficient number of issues have been identified by the council. I think that was - I - and someone can correct me if I'm wrong, but I think that came up with - I don't think we meant that to substitute for after some period of time an overall look at the PDP process. I think that was more what if there were some problems that were - that came up early on because this was a new process we're putting into effect.

I don't think we, and correct me if I'm wrong, I think what we - I don't think we talked about having, you know, (it's) requiring an overall review at some period of time.

Do people remember that? Or have a different view? Marika.

Marika Konings: It is Marika. Because I recall that we, you know, we discussed the option of having it after a year or maybe after a number of PDPs. And I think then, you know, we discussed what the Working Group Work Team is considering or is recommending in the - as part of the Working Group work line - or Working Group Guidelines, which basically is that, you know, once a year the council basically just turns around and says, hey, does anyone have any issues or anything that we need to reconsider in relation to the Working Group Guidelines?

If no, okay, then we just continue business as usual. If yes, we'll just look at those and see if we need to create some kind of ad hoc team that looks at those issues or things that need to be updated and take it from there.

So basically, you know, you have some kind of mechanism where you have like a timely review, but that the review doesn't mean that you need to create a working group or need to create, you know, a whole process like what we're doing now to review it, but you basically just set a point in time where you say, hey, does anyone have any issues, should we take this further, or can we just, you know, wait another year or another two years before we check back again.

And that's something that the Working Group Work Team, you know, has incorporated as one of their suggestions for consideration to the PPSC and one of the things I think I raised as well on the last call. But again, I mean, this group might decide to go a completely different route on that.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Avri. Avri, you have your hand raised and you may be on mute.

Avri Doria: Sorry, I was on mute. Yes, and I was part of the Working Group Work Team that sort of said that check yearly. But one of the things that occurs to me to - listening to Marika describe it is who are we asking are there any issues?

In other words, is it enough to just ask that of the council members or is that something that should be sort of a wider asking of has the PDP gone well or does anyone else see any issues that we review. So almost like a public asking of it, a comment period on a yearly basis. And I hadn't quite thought that through until, as I said, I heard Marika explain it and sort of listened with fresh ears.

Jeff Neuman: So I think that's a good point. And I'm not sure, you know, given the affirmation of commitments and other things that, you know, other mandatory reviews that ICANN has to take on, while I certainly understand the turning around periodically to the councilors and saying, you know, are there any issues, should we do review, I still think at - and maybe it's not a time interval that we can pinpoint at this point, but I still think that there should be some overall review at some period of time of the entire process, whether or not councilors say, you know, raise their hand and say yes we think this needs to be reviewed.

But, you know, I do want to hear from other people on this to get some views as to - and also on Avri's suggestion of, you know, right now the way it's worded or the way that Marika described it it was more towards the council

and Avri had pointed out that, you know, maybe it should be really an ask of the community.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Jeff Neuman: Don't everyone raise your hand at once.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Jeff Neuman: Okay, so what - let's - we'll push that over to the side for the moment and then maybe go to the question of, okay, so and Avri had said, you know, who would be - are we all still full of the opinion that, and I think we agreed on the last call so I just want to make sure we're still on the same page, that it would be - that initially the PPSC or a committee like that would be a standing group around for individual issues that had come up during the process, especially as in the first couple of years when it's new and it's different that could be around to be consulted or review specific items.

I just wanted to double-check and make sure we were all good with that standing committee notion. Paul.

Paul Diaz: Yes thanks, Jeff. I think that's a great idea. I would just ask that we make sure that the members of the PPSC, if there are any changes and whatnot, that that group always has some sensible minimum number of folks, more than one. You know, we don't want to have a situation (unintelligible).

I think that happened last time that because of some changes it was a question about, well, who constituted that committee. I guess when we were doing our face-to-face and we were wondering do we have to send it through the group when the group really hadn't been functioning for a while. If we go ahead and go this route, which I think is a perfectly valid approach, we just want to make sure that that group is always staffed to a minimum level.

Jeff Neuman: Yes. I agree with that. And again it's a little bit more challenging when you have a long period of inactivity and how you would, you know, do you just keep every few months, do you keep sending notes out to people saying, hey, are you still interested. You know, and so logistics would have to be worked out of how to do that, but certainly I think we all should agree with that concept. James.

James Bladel: (Hi) Jeff, this is James speaking. And while I think I mostly agree with what you said earlier, I'm just playing it out in my head a little bit and I have a couple of concerns in that a standing committee charged with reviewing and possibly recommending modifications to the PDP process itself could make the PDP more of a dynamic process and a moving target. I'm just - I'm trying to take this all in and I'm think, you know, doing a little thinking on the spot, so I apologize for that.

But, you know, the idea being that, you know, if for example I didn't get the outcome I was looking for from a particular PDP and then it changed six months later, you know, I might want to circle back under the new process or under the new operating rules. So I just wonder how frequently we would see this changing and I - and my fear is that with a standing committee the answer is it would change as frequently as it could.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, I think that's a legitimate concern. So how do we or what are some things that we could do to make sure that that didn't happen? Is there some sort of threshold from a council that would have to vote on it in order for an issue to be reviewed by the standing committee? Or is there something - and when you were thinking about it, James, was it something that you thought the standing committee would on its own just decide to review?

James Bladel: Well I think the latter. And I think my concern was that if you establish a standing committee it is - and give it a mission, it is going to naturally want to execute that mission.



And I just don't know - I think that there's something to be said for some stability and consistency over time even if there are some - there's a period of acclimation or it's a period of getting used to the new rules, we should allow that to occur naturally as opposed to sitting down and changing them again. Or reversing rules maybe that came out of this group because they were, you know, really just because a certain - they were different and not that a certain portion of the community or the attendance thought it was a problem when in fact it was just new.

I don't know. I'm just - I'm doing a little thinking and talking simultaneously here so if this isn't making sense, I apologize.

Jeff Neuman: No, I think it does make sense and I think those are issues that we certainly need to think about. And I'm just in my head trying to think of suggestions that we could do to mitigate that issue.

You know, for example could it be that the (standing) - that the committee only reviews things that are specifically referred to it by the council by some kind of vote. Could it be that the standing committee could only review items that it demonstrates - or if it was by the standing committee itself could there be a requirement that the standing committee actually demonstrate that it's an issue that doesn't affect just one PDP, but was observed in multiple PDPs?

You know, kind of like the standard is for - and I apologize if this is a bad example but it's just the first thing that kind of came to my head, you know, where people say, you know, a consensus policy can't be aimed at one specific registry but it has to be something that affects multiple registries or registrars, that it can't be just aimed at one party. In theory you could say that a review of a particular item in a PDP isn't one that just came about because it affected one individual PDP but affected multiple. Does that make sense?

Marika, you have your hand raised. Is there thoughts on that?

Marika Konings: No specific thoughts on that, but actually James' comment raised another issue that, you know, I just wanted to take note of and maybe not necessarily discuss now, but it's something the group will need to take into account and discuss as well is how to address the transition between the new PDP and the old PDP. Because it's very likely that some PDP working groups will still be working under the new rules while the new PDP process is being adopted.

So something this group will need to think about as well is how will it affect old PDPs or will it just apply to new ones that start and how to go about that. So, just to make a note of that not necessarily related to this specific issue.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Let me switch to - let me try to first close out the issue and then we'll come back to what you've raised, Marika. But let me come to the issue of - and maybe Margie or Avri have a - Avri put down her hand.

First go to the issue of the notion of how would things - in order to address the concerns that James had raised about making sure that it wasn't just a standing - the standing committee didn't just review things that would - we could to try to get a different result in a PDP, how could we address that other than, I mean, maybe, Marika, maybe one of the points that you raised is maybe we could say that the review couldn't affect the individual PDP that was going on at that moment but was - okay, I'm sorry. Margie you have your hand raised.

Margie Milam: Yes, you know, I wanted to address (again) James' issue about whether it, you know, just a problem or issue arose in multiple PDPs. And in looking at it, you know, we still don't really know how these rules are - these new rules will be implemented. And (unintelligible) unique circumstances (unintelligible) justify the change in rules and we may not necessarily see duplicate, you know, experience in another PDP. So I wouldn't want a hard, fast rule that would, you know, (unintelligible) the issue to be, you know, raised in multiple

ones because there might be reasons that, you know, that it came up in a particular one.

Jeff Neuman: So is there anything then you could - if that were the case and there were no hard and fast rules, is there anything that we could do to address James' concern that it wasn't geared toward a specific one to change the outcome or to change the direction in which that group is going in?

Margie Milam: Yes. I don't know. I mean, I guess from - and I can see the concern, but in practice, I mean, it's so much effort to get a group together with PPSC and to actually come up with something new that I would just think that whoever is on this group to evaluate the new processes would be, you know, you - we would expect them to be reasonable and not, you know, try to apply an arbitrary rule to a particular PDP. You know, it's just too much work to go through the process and if there is a change in the rules or the processes it still has to be approved by the GNSO Council so, you know, you still have that check at some point.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Avri and then James.

Avri Doria: Okay, yes, I guess I have two thoughts on it. One is I still accept - expect the reasonable councilor rule to apply and that if they see an effort to change the PDP rules, specifically to try to change the outcome of a specific PDP, and there'd be enough discretion and review for that to come out and they wouldn't allow that to happen. So I don't know that we need much rule in that beside just, you know, counting on the reasonableness of at least most council members.

On the issue of what happens when you have an in-progress PDP and the rules are changed, I think one of those common rules that I've seen in this kind of situation is that you get to operate under either the rules of old or the rules of new and you basically have to make a concrete decision once the rules are changed. And perhaps this is also a council level decision that the

council would have to review each of the in-progress PDPs and say whether they stayed under old rules which, you know, may make perfect sense if they happen to be in the last two months of the PDP or if they operate under new rules because they just started a month ago or, you know, some other set of criteria.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. James, your reaction to that.

James Bladel: Yes, and I certainly didn't mean to imply that it was any kind of a hedge against unreasonable councilors or members of this particular committee, I just wanted to point out that with a standing committee the barrier or the threshold for extra work that Margie was pointing out is lowered significantly if that group is constituted and continuously reviewing the PDP process.

And I just think that there's some benefit to stability over time. You know, a flawed process that is universally understood and, you know, evenly employed I think is better than the continuous pursuit of a perfect process. That's really all I was trying to say.

And it had nothing to do necessarily with concerns about what the, you know, what - unreasonable councilors, it was just much more the concern that this would continuously be a moving target and that the cycle of change would be shorter than the life cycle of your typical PDP. That's it.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, so let me ask the question then so if we have the standing committee, I don't think we answered this question, but I had asked James what he was assuming when he brought up his comments was well did the standing committee just review items of PDP process on its own or did an issue need to really be referred to it by the council and so I don't think we resolved that or had a full discussion on that. And I think, James - I think and you have your hand raised so remind - I think you said that you were assuming in some of your comments that it was on its own that it could just raise these comments. But you have your hand raised so...

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: Yes, I was - no, yes, that is correct. I was assuming that they were on their own. And I guess I was challenging the idea that there should be a standing committee at all. There shouldn't be one that was just constituted on a periodic or an as-needed basis and then disbanded when that review period was over.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. So let me turn a question directly to Avri because I remember you were - Avri, you were one of the supporters last week on the call of having the standing committee. When you were thinking about it did you - were you thinking it was that the standing committee could on its own review things or were you assuming that it would be issues that were referred to it either by - I guess by the council? Or maybe you, like some of us, didn't really give it thought. We just kind of agreed with the notion of a standing committee.

Avri Doria: I tended to think of it as being able to go either way as either noticing an issue that needed to be discussed; and just because an issue needed to be discussed it didn't mean that there was a change, very often it might just require some help in interpretation. So that it could be something that it was self brought up by people that participated in it though for the most part it would be things that were brought to it simply because they wouldn't be part of all groups. But I tended to think that it could go either way.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. And so does anyone have additional thoughts on that? Anybody else that maybe hasn't spoken? Anyone with some thoughts? Okay.

So James, if we wrote into this to have the standing committee - if we wrote that the standing committee could either on its own bring up issues to discuss, obviously any output would have to go to the council and - or any recommended changes I should say, or the standing committee could have issues referred to it by the council, what other - are there any other

protections or things that you would like to see to make sure that, you know, your points about having some consistency aren't tampered with? Or is it something that's enough just to have it as a cautionary measure in the council when or if - if and when they consider any changes?

James Bladel: Yes, I don't - I'm sorry, this is James speaking. I don't really have extreme views on that either way, Jeff. I just wanted to get the conversation started on the - I just wanted us to spend some time discussing the need for a permanent committee. I don't know that I, you know, I think that once, you know, as I said earlier, once you create a group of folks like that and keep them active, they're going to find things to work on, you know. Anyway, I don't really have any strong feelings on it, Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. How about Marika and then Alex.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. I'm just wondering as well if this is one of the issues that needs to be discussed or considered in the broader context of GNSO improvements because there are, you know, many work teams that are working on papers, processes, documents, and I presume that all, you know, all of them at some point in time might need review or updating or changing.

So I'm wondering if this is an issue that, you know, either the OSC and the PPSC need to come together on and discuss what would be the best approach to review all of these processes and documents that are being produced in the context of GNSO improvements and come together on a proposal and submit that to the GNSO Council for consideration on how to move forward on these kind of reviews and addressing issues that might come up over time.

You know, I think this team can come up as well with a recommendation of course, and maybe it makes more sense to do - to discuss in the broader constituency as well what other groups are thinking on this and, you know, synergize the efforts in that way.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, and so how do we do that? How do we all come together to, you know, just - do we just have a joint call to discuss the notions?

Marika Konings: Well I think it's probably for the OSC and PPSC Chairs first to discuss together whether indeed this is an issue that is being discussed in the different camps and maybe see as well with the GNSO Council if this is something - I guess with the Chairs to - the Chair and the Vice Chair to see what they're thinking is. Whether they are expecting a proposal from the different work teams on each of the different outputs on how those need to be reviewed; if they expect from the OSC or the - and the PPSC to come together on a joint proposal; or whether they just think that the GNSO Council will, you know, develop their own method once they have all the work products in.

And then they'll discuss at the GNSO Council level on how to go about, you know, moving - implementing all these different elements and going about reviewing these in due time. So maybe it's a Chairs discussion at first and then bring it back at the appropriate level, depending on the outcome of those discussions.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Alex.

Alex Gakuru: Yes, I just wanted to remind us about some PDP changes that may not be changes per se when they are starting, but maybe PDP review that come about are occasioned by implementation issues. We discussed that on our past call. There will be incidences where maybe when the staff reach an implementation of a PDP they find (unintelligible) issues, so then it may be necessary to change or to review a PDP, which will result to a change. But it was not envisaged as some sort of new requirement coming in but it's an implementation issue that occasion a change. I just wanted to raise that possibility. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, I expect that's a good point. And there are a number of things also to add to that that we discussed that aren't necessarily bylaw changes. Actually there's a lot of stuff that we have discussed putting into more of a rules of engagement for the council on PDPs, you know, or a lot of recommendations that aren't hard coded just to use that phrase. So that's an interesting point and we just need to be open to that.

So let's say that there are or that it is decided that the standing committee were to review an issue, are there any - if you look at 3A, the question that says what metrics would need to be developed in order to assess the effectiveness of the process as a whole? Has anyone given that some thought as to, okay, so they may decide that, yes, something should be reviewed, what are the metrics in which you would do that review? Or is it really different for or dependent on a specific context and a specific issue?

In other words, could we, you know, punt that a little bit and basically say that if there is a review that's taken up one of the things that the standing committee would need to do is define the metrics with respect to that particular issue.

It seems like we have a quiet on that. It's not something - it's a hard abstract concept because you're thinking of things that may at some point come up to review, but not really given - not really having context of specific items.

Margie.

Margie Milam: Well, yes, I mean, there is some hard metrics you might consider, you know, how long it takes to get in the - through the various stages, you know, there could be annual reports about, you know, a participation, how many people have participated from what stakeholder groups, you know, that - those sorts of things that at least inform how, you know, how much participation there was and how much, you know, consensus was reached within a working group.



Jeff Neuman: Okay. James.

James Bladel: Yes, initially I was going to be contrary, but I think Margie had some good ideas there. My initial reaction was just asking the question - or considering that I don't believe that individual PDPs necessarily lend themselves to comparison with one another over time. But I think that Margie's examples are a good starting point.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Are there other examples that you can think of or are you just - we'll start with those?

Margie Milam: Yes, it's Margie. How many people participated in the public comments forum, you know, whether, you know, or participated in surveys during the PDP, I think that kind of information is useful because it shows that the issue was something significant or - I don't know, I mean, I'm just, you know, thinking of past ones and sometimes, you know, it's surprising how little comment we receive on some recommendations and some reports.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. So it's - but is that an issue that's sort of overall PDP process or with respect to an individual PDP?

Margie Milam: It might indicate the process is broken if you're not receiving, you know, a decent amount of participation. I mean, it is a tough question as to whether it's related to the specific issue or just the process overall.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. James.

James Bladel: Yes, I'm going to go ahead and put my hand back down. I'm sorry, Jeff.

Jeff Neuman: Second thoughts.

James Bladel: Second, third, and fourth and then I decided I was confusing myself, so no sense sharing that.

Jeff Neuman: Well actually I appreciate the fact that you did. It means you're like the rest of us humans. Okay, so the question then remains then, Marika, do you have enough to take some notes and to write something up on this particular part? Do you have additional comments or questions as to what you should do with this section?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. Yes, no I think I got some good input and I'll look back as well to the feedback on the survey and share it there. And again, you know, anyone who has any comments or suggestions on the notes for the other sections, you know, please send them and I want to make sure as well that I try to capture the discussions here as best as possible.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. So in looking back at the other items, I'm just looking to see if we made - if we've covered everything for Section V. Was there any other holes that were in there? I'm not sure, but I think we've covered all of it. I'm just kind of scrolling back.

Marika Konings: This is Marika, we didn't cover all the questions under 1, although I think we did talk to some of - talk about some of those and I think some of us (unintelligible) to 1A and 1H, you know, refer as well to - or could apply as well to the other questions.

But for example an issue that Margie has raised as well like 1F, how should public comments or community input on the effectiveness of a policy be factored in? I'm not really sure whether we discussed that in great detail.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, so we go back to 1 just to remind everyone what that was. That was with respect to an assessment of the recommendations of a particular or a specific PDP as opposed to the PDP process as a whole. And so the question is how would public comments be - or should there be a process of receiving public comments on an individual PDP. And if we go back to our recommendation, we said that in a lot - in most of the or a lot of the PDPs that

(are) done recently we do call for a review of that particular policy within a certain period of time.

For example with domain tasting it said that if there were, you know, every so often there would be a report that would be done by ICANN staff and if the council chose as a result of viewing those statistics to conduct a review after 6, 12 months it could do so. The council has chosen not to do the reviews simply because, I think, at least in the domain tasting the policy is viewed by a number of people to be effective and it didn't seem like with the statistics getting back that there needed to be a review.

So try to think of some more recent examples that were - a PDP has gone through and there's a review process built in. Can ICANN staff think of some examples?

Marika Konings: This is Marika. I think that (IRTP) is one where - I don't know, I don't think it was necessarily was in the policy, but I think that when that was adopted they immediately started reviewing it as well to see whether it was actually - no, if it was behaving as was intended or whether there were any areas for improvement, verification and - I mean, that process is still going on and there's still I think three PDPs in the queue to address the issues that came out of that review process.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, I think - yes, you're right. I think that was - that came out of the original transfer process that - the call for the period reviews and, you're right, now there are several PDPs that are reviewing different elements of - or things that we've learned since we created that consensus policy.

So with that said, I mean, did - was it just an assumption of this group and if so should we spell it out that any time there is a review that like all - like everything else that goes through the ICANN process once there - if there's a review, if there is public comment taken on that review or on that PDP in

addition to setting up a working group to looking at the issue. Is that just an assumption or is that something that should be spelled out?

Well perhaps we should - I think it was an assumption. But I think perhaps we should make sure that when we draft this section of the report that we do allow for public comment to be, you know, if it is decided or if the PDP says there should be reviews at different points in time that we should indicate that that review should also include or should include at a minimum public comment periods to address that as well and it shouldn't just be the Steering Committee that considers it in a vacuum.

Does anybody have an issue with making that clarification? Okay. People seem to be awake today.

((Crosstalk))

Man: No, I'm at lunch.

Jeff Neuman: I - on the West Coast of the US it's - I don't know if Margie is too. Margie.

Margie Milam: Oh actually I am. I thought of another metric if you want to go back to the other issue that we just closed out. You know, by talking and - to David here.

And one of those things that might be an interesting metric would be to look at who from the different stakeholder groups and how many people actually participated in the PDPs over time. I think there's been a criticism of the existing policies or process that says a PDP might be launched by a certain stakeholder, for example maybe a councilor's interested in particular issue, and then no one from that group even participated actively on the PDP, it causes all of this work, you know, that might be something that would be interesting to report back on to see whether, you know, that leads to additional process changes in the process itself.

Jeff Neuman: So potentially a review of - so if it is driven by one or two councilors maybe a change to thresholds or some review of the thresholds...

Avri Doria: Is -- hi, I'm not online at the moment. This is Avri. Is that we'd call the finger pointing metric?

Jeff Neuman: We could come up with a name, sure...

Avri Doria: Well no because, I mean, I'm only being slightly facetious, but I'm walking out in the cold. But it seems problematic. I mean, that one seems to start from an accusatory position and I wonder whether we do want to burden the PDP process with methods that are mostly intended to be accusatory. That's my only point.

Jeff Neuman: So, what (unintelligible).

Margie Milam: Yes, i wasn't - I was intending it more to be just a re - simply a report, you know, as a - summarizing numbers. I mean, it wouldn't (like) whoever is reviewing the report can come to their own conclusions. It's not going to, you know, point (unintelligible) anyway. It's just going to say, you know, this, you know, that for example there were, you know, (unintelligible) 20 people participating, you know, in the (unintelligible) group, you know, that - it's (unintelligible). Whether it's (unintelligible), you know. You know, that's a...

Avri Doria: Okay, the way you had explained it was, you know, one constituency causes all this work and then doesn't participate, so that's what gave me the impression. Sorry.

Jeff Neuman: So certain statistics - again and I think certainly taking it away from accusatory but certain statistics may be helpful in the fact of - that, you know, we - as these groups are meeting there may be certain constituencies or stakeholder groups that are consistently not participating and not in a - and there could be a reason behind that. There could be a - and it could have to

do with the policy development process that we've set forward. So having those statistics is useful, but I certainly agree that there should not be a goal in mind in collecting those statistics initially.

I'll go to Alex and then James.

Alex Gakuru: Yes, I just wanted to underscore Avri's point whereas the statistics would be good because (then) they indicate that the level of participation on a PDP, we should then avoid showing that or accusing anyone. There may be reasons like Jeff did say. For example, there could be capacity in the various contexts that is prohibiting some constituencies or stakeholder groups from participating. Or there could be certain interests that are encouraging a certain stakeholder group to participate, (one) should be noted and maybe they are (unintelligible) participation by a certain stakeholder group or absence of another. So the statistics are good, but not to accuse those that didn't participate from that point of view. (Okay), that's the contribution I wanted to make on that.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, I - and Alex - I still have Alex's comment that brings me back to conversations that we had several phases ago in which we said, you know, the council needs to - we discussed quite lengthy whether there should be a limit on the number of PDPs that are done at any given time. And the conclusion we kind of came to was that we couldn't think of an exact number, but we left it to the council to manage that process to make sure there weren't too many going on at once.

And as Alex said, if we find that consistently there are a number of PDPs where an individual stakeholder group or constituency is not able to participate for one reason or another, and it could be because of capacity, that perhaps someone at a later point in time decides that, okay, we see that the council is maybe not doing an effective job in managing the number of PDPs, so maybe we should come up with a different rule on that.

James, you have your hand raised.

James Bladel: Yes, Jeff, this is James speaking. Going back to what Margie said and I didn't take it to be initially her - I did not take her suggestion to be a finger pointing or an accusatory type of process. But now I'm going to go ahead and, you know, be difficult and say well what's wrong with shining a little bit of light on that?

You know, if there is a pattern that is established that a vocal and active individual or minority stakeholder group, one single stakeholder group, is generating a lot of PDPs and then not participating in the PDPs, but yet, you know, kind of maybe jumping in at the eleventh hour to guide the outcomes, I think that, you know, you really - to have some sort of control you've really kind of written the blueprint on how to gain the entire ICANN PDP process.

So I think that there is some merit to what Margie was saying in terms of shining some light on that so that at least at a minimum it's visible and then what people do with that is kind of neither here nor there.

So I don't mean to sound like I don't trust anybody and that's not really what I'm getting at. I'm just saying that, you know, this - we need to make sure that we're not building in the mechanisms for someone to manipulate this should that type of person come along in the future. I haven't met them yet.

Avri Doria: This is Avri, still not online, can I put my hand up?

Jeff Neuman: Yes, certainly yes.

((Crosstalk))

Avri Doria: When we talk about processes to manipulate, one could sort of manipulate those accusatory statistics as easily as they can - I just - I think we're defending ourselves against things that aren't happening and in so doing kind

of like, you know, all security systems do, we're building in more structure, more suspicion, and more weapons with which to hit each other over the heads with. So I just want to sort of put up a warning.

The whole notion that one person starts a PDP in a group where there's a bylaw that sort of says there's a certain way to start a PDP, a threshold is met, which means that a certain number of constituencies, stakeholder groups, what have you, have made a decision that this is worth going forward on, it doesn't really matter who had the first idea. What really matters is that following the bylaw set threshold the council decided that this was something that needed work on.

And so I think that, one, there's a discontinuity between who has the first idea. There may be people whether they're in a constituency or an (NTA) or, you know, the tramp out in the street who basically are able to look at things and say there's work to be done here and convinces other people there's work to be done there, even though they're not the type of person that does the work. And to say that that is a thing that we should have a punitive measure against is worrisome to me. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: So but Avri you're not - but are you okay the notion of collecting the statistic in the first place? Without (punitive), just every so often, as we do in this group, we (publish) the statistics on who is participating, you know, the attendance. And it does help us by the way get us more people to come to the meetings. (But) it - but so do you have anything against the notion of just collecting the statistic (unintelligible)?

Avri Doria: No. I'm not against collecting facts. Where I worry is where we start to turn them into quantitative and qualitative measures that seem to have meaning. And that's where I - my caution flags start to go up. To have a table that's got a certain number and has, you know, various measures of diverse and (unintelligible) measures bothers me, but as an indicators of diversity indicated I think that is a good thing.



But then we'll have to talk about how many different scales of diversity we're looking for, you know. And - but then to start making them into measures and into things that are qualitative and quantitative measures that we make judgment on is where I start to see the drift that worries me. Certainly collecting data is always a good thing, I just worry about how we use it.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. And I think that's certainly fair enough. So in any recommendation that we have to collect the data, we need to make sure that at least our group makes it clear that we're not going into this with any - or nor should anyone go into a preconceived notion of the use of that data or what we're trying to spell out, just really a mere collection of facts to help us review, you know, what's going on out there.

So I just lost my space on Adobe here. Okay, Marika and then James.

Marika Konings: I think James was first.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. James.

James Bladel: (So) I just wanted to respond to Avri and I think that, you know, you're correct that collecting the data is probably a good idea, infusing conclusions into it is where things get a little tricky.

And I just wanted to also ask Jeff or Marika or Margie, we had something earlier which is when we were talking about the outcomes of unbalanced PDPs that were unbalanced in terms of their stakeholder groups that comprised them, and again I'm just pointing out the idea that if I as a registrar were to hypothetically say, okay, all registrars please stay out and don't participate in this particular group so that when whatever comes out of it we can point to it and say it's an invalid policy because it didn't involve our participation.

I just I feel like that, you know, system could be prone to abuse and I think that the idea is that, you know, we collect the data, what we do with it is another matter entirely. But I think, you know, you need to be careful in these processes that you're not also building in the antidote to whatever comes out of these PDPs.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Marika.

Marika Konings: Yes, this is Marika. I mean, talking about the data and I think looking back as well because we did a similar effort actually, you know, I think at the meeting in Seoul we presented some data on participation in the different working groups and efforts. And I don't think it was done in any way to accuse any group or any individual of not participating, but I think it was more a testimony of saying look there is something wrong because we really see that certain groups just can't keep up and, you know, we don't have a good representation all in the different working groups from the different teams.

And I think that has partly inspired as well the prioritization efforts that is currently going on are basically I think the conclusion that was taken from the data. Like there's too much going on that, you know, the different constituencies and stakeholder groups and volunteers just can't keep up, so we need to do something.

So I think in that sense, you know, that kind of data, you know, I don't think you need to, you know, it should be used as James said that you go back and, you know, on purpose, you don't participate because you know people will review it and then you can just claim that, you know, the PDP outcome is not valid because there wasn't adequate participation.

I think that is something that will be done throughout the course of a PDP where a working group chair will ask from time to time saying look, you know, we don't have anyone from that group, you know, you're not participating, are you sure, you know, we just want to make sure that you know this is going on

and, you know, we (will) come to a conclusion at the end of the day, you know, don't claim that you didn't know about it.

So I think that's - those kind of things are addressed through other means, but I think there is value in looking at the end of the day just at the numbers. And again I think there it's then for the GNSO Council to take those numbers and look at those and draw conclusions from those and see how to improve or address the issues that might come up through that.

Jeff Neuman: Right. Alex.

Alex Gakuru: Yes, I was just wondering whether it would be possible to recommend that at certain stages of the PDP itself perhaps the stakeholder group leads may be asked (unintelligible) would wish to have noted maybe because of maybe absent or maybe inadequate participation as there was previously envisaged when the PDP was being initiated.

And at the end of the day when the PDP is coming to a conclusion (with) the statistics on the participation maybe such responses could be noted (on the) report that comes out of the PDP. Perhaps than that way to give information that would otherwise have been missed out and it could also encourage the absent stakeholder groups from participate - participating more into the PDP. I thought maybe that would be a suggestion I could make.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, I think - and I think - so what the practice has been, at least in this group, is that there - if the chair has, you know, when we've noticed some specific anomalies, and I need to do it again because there is one or two groups that have not been recent, you know, it's usually the chair that kind of goes out and publishes the statistics and then to the - sends it to the heads of these groups (to say), hey, so you see these are the statistics as to who's showing up, can you please, you know, let us know if there's an issue or, you know, if there's not if you could help us make sure that someone from your group (unintelligible). That's what we've been doing and it's worked okay.

I hear - Avri let me go to James (unintelligible) on after James. I  
(unintelligible) okay...

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: Yes...

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: Am I on or am I mute?

Jeff Neuman: No, you're good.

James Bladel: Okay. So yes thanks and, you know, I think if I could sum up with my entire concern with what we're discussing here it's really an issue of balance. You know, how do we balance the voices and the positions of the folks who have participated, you know, in every working group versus the folks who maybe showed up for the first and the last meeting versus the folks who didn't participate at all versus the public comments, you know.

I think that how can we make sure that everyone has open and unfettered access and input into the PDP process without, you know, saying for example it's nice for example that you gave up every Tuesday for a year and a half working on this issue and you wrote all of these reports but, you know, but this guy who posted a paper to the, you know, to the comments section is the route we're going to go. You know, it's a diminishment and a disincentive I think to participation. We need to think about that. So that's really my concern here is just this idea of balance.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. And do you have any - so do you - you brought a very interesting question to the table or a notion and is there anything you can think of how to strike that balance? I mean...

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: Oh now you want me - you want me to fix my problems. Oh okay. You know, I think it's the challenge that's fundamental to the nature of ICANN. We want to be open and we want to allow participation from all spheres and corners and interests within the community. You know, and then I think that's notable and laudable, but we have to make sure that we're not also disrespecting the work of those who participate by allowing, you know, someone to jump in with about ten minutes effort.

You know, if they have a new idea that nobody's considered before, I mean, gosh, good get it in the report, get it on the table. But, you know, I think that you certainly don't want to be so open that someone can come in and derail a process that's been many years and many man hours and woman hours or person hours in the, you know, in the making and has, you know, caused a lot of debate. And, you know, it's just - it's something to think about. I think it's fundamental to the idea of an open and participatory organization.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Avri, you have a comment. You may still be on mute, Avri. Avri says did I fall off or hear nothing? I think you may have fallen off, Avri.

Woman: She still looks connected on meeting view.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, well let's see. Sorry, okay, James just responded to Avri. Let's see if she responds to that.

James Bladel: I think it's probably best that she didn't hear what I had to say, so I don't have to embarrass myself like that.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, she says that she hears nothing and will have to dial back in. So what if everyone now hangs up and plays a little joke and...

Okay, actually we are sort of kind of getting, you know, I'm trying to see if there's anything else in Item 1, Marika, that we need to answer. Actually, so we had just been - we went back to Number 3 after Margie had brought in another element. Is there anything else in 1 or 2 that we need to go over that we didn't cover?

I feel like we've done a pretty good job on each of these. I'm not necessarily saying we have complete answers for each of these, but we've certainly discussed them.

Recorded Voice: Please be patient, your correspondent has put you on hold. Please be patient, your correspondent...

Coordinator: Sorry, that was Alex Gakuru's line making that noise (unintelligible).

Jeff Neuman: Ah, okay, thank you. That's a message I've never heard before. So with that said, Marika, do you have enough then - Avri has raised her hand. So Avri, are you back on?

Avri Doria: Yes, I'm back on. And of course somebody may have already said exactly what I was going to say, so I apologize if I repeat it. What I was thinking - this was in terms of the I've worked really hard and now somebody new has come in issue. I think, you know, I think we talked about that in various in this PDP that, you know, there is this notion that you don't reopen subjects unless you got something really new or a new take on the issue, a new version of the problem, something. And so if something comes through on a comment, if we have already - we, if the people on the PDP have already dealt with that issue then there's basically an explanation that can be written that says yes that issue was brought up, the following concerns were made both in the pro and con, and for the various reasons that follow the following, you know, decision was made, et cetera.

If on the other hand someone brings up something startlingly new that the people in the group had not thought of or a take, it really doesn't matter that it's one person and that it's one person at the end of the day because what they've brought up is a serious concern that was missed and therefore one would have to deal with it anew.

So I'm not sure that it shows in any sense a lack of respect for those who do work, but it does show a primacy to the ideas, the notion, the problem, and its solution as opposed to who says what how often and how much.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, I see James, you've raised your hand. Do you want to respond to that?

James Bladel: Yes, just to agree that, you know, and I'm not sure at what point we lost the connection, but we kind of threw that out as a qualifier as well, Avri, that if it's something new that the group missed then we definitely need to get it into report. But just, you know, again maintaining this idea of balance so that the participation is not inadvertently through a structural process weighted one way or another.

You know, one thing that pops into my mind because it's in the headlines all the time (with) the US Senate, you know, any senator can walk on the floor and tie that lobby up indefinitely. The good news, if you want to call it that, is it's limited to 100 people that can possibly do that. So I think when an organization, you know, imagine if the Senate were open to anyone at any time.

So my point being that I think that when a group is - strives to be as open and inclusive as ICANN then it also has an obligation to ensure that there's balance (unintelligible) contribution.

Jeff Neuman: (Yes, I mean), on the one hand you want to make sure that groups are incentivized to participate in the process as opposed to knowing that they could at the last minute if they get enough people to support them or let's say

it's a stakeholder group or a constituency they could just not participate in the process, wait till the very end, and then submit their ideas.

So I think, Avri, I think the point you make is very important. I think what James said too is that, you know, a balance needs to be struck to make sure that there is no disincentive are there are no disincentives to participate in the process and spend all that time just to know that at the end you could be kind of circumvented by a group that either goes around the process in some sort of way...

((Crosstalk))

James Bladel: And, Jeff, you know, I think that's an excellent point. You know, I didn't really mean it to sound as though it was, again, a distrustful or accusatory thing. I just wanted to point out the idea of balance.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Margie.

Margie Milam: Yes, I think you pretty much covered it. I mean, we want to avoid it being some sort of, you know, last minute veto, right, you know. And I think to a certain extent you can, you know, by having a proper chair for a working group that he can have the discretion in determining whether - or he or she to determining, you know, whether this last minute, you know, issue is even - is worth, you know, readdressing some of the issues that the working group had already resolved.

Jeff Neuman: Great.

James Bladel: Jeff, can I jump in on that real quickly?

Jeff Neuman: Yes.



James Bladel: Yes, so this is James speaking and I agree completely. I just wanted to say that even distracting or non-meritorious issues or if they're reopening arguments, even just, you know, just determining whether or not it is sufficiently new takes time and effort on the part of the group. So that is also a consumer of resources that could accumulate to derailing a process. Think of it as, you know, spamming a group with unrelated issues. It's possible.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, Alex.

Alex Gakuru: Yes, I share with you the frustration of doing so much (work over the) years, I've been in so many situations where you volunteer to do so much for so long and then the last minute somebody comes and just says things and projects you back, way back. But you know what this is a problem of democracies. And since ICANN is now going to be exercise a democratic (position) (unintelligible) for all the countries around the world we are going to see lots and lots of that.

And I think the more we probably create more room for people to try to come in and (unintelligible) it is and (unintelligible) at the last minute, it doesn't matter, and then create process where we can say, okay, we have reviewed this with regard to this PDP and for reasons X, Y, or Zed or how many number, maybe we feel can't continue with that. I then would probably give the PDP process a fair chance of global acceptance in the new realities of the OSC.

It's just it's my thinking that in as much as maybe the historical information and we understand how it can be very frustrating to all of us, it may be fairer and it gives the PDPs a better chance if we create a little more room and create more rules of how to tighten the rules of trying to reopen work (unintelligible) the cost is (in hand) because democracy is very expensive. I think it would be very (unintelligible).

And I know you are democratic, James, I'm not in any way suggesting anything. But maybe we create rules of how we can minimize the chances on going back on what's already been done that at least allow whatever new view may come at the eleventh hour or whenever, whoever.

And also be cognizant of the other fact that again there might be a problem of over participation by one group here, very more lack of participation by one, there might be too much participation of another, another problem altogether. So let me stop there for now (unintelligible).

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Thank you, Alex. Margie.

Margie Milam: Yes, James made me think of an issue too related to the timing. You know, as we plan for our - the international meetings, I mean, every (unintelligible) that the deadline for publications and that's really where the - this issue, you know, is highlighted because someone who's raising a new issue at the last minute, you know, could affect the working group's ability to meet the publication deadline for the next int - you know, international meeting, so I just wanted to raise that as a concern.

And I agree with Alex's perspective that, you know, that sometimes the - there might be over participation of one particular that, you know, and that might, you know, also affect the outcome. I think, you know, that that's certainly something that can be a problem.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, and I think, yes, we've discussed that before to make sure that in a number of different stages that the recommendation is that the report that's produced documents not just amount - or not amount of people that support or are against a certain position, but to document the group - a specific group's and to make sure that that's reflected in the report.

You know, because there are working groups, you know, there's the, and I'm going to forget what the abbreviations stands for but the P - PEDNR, P-E-D-

N-R group, the Post Expiration Domain Name Recovery I think. Certainly there are - because it is of high interest to the registrars there are a lot more registrar reps on that group than other groups, but that doesn't mean that the registrars should have more of a say in the outcome of that group, so the Chair has to balance it to whether it's over participation.

And I see, you know, this Vertical Integration Group being highly constituted, you know, a high number of registries participating in that group simply because it's (unintelligible) them.

Avri, you have - your comments.

Avri Doria: Yes, just a quick point. I think we've run into another area where, you know, balance is needed to borrow somebody else's line. I mean, I do worry about, you know, things that say, well, there's a schedule for getting documents out before a face to face meeting and that being a good reason for limiting comment at certain points. I mean, I realize the reality of schedules and the importance of getting things printed in time for people to see them and - but we have to have a way to work around that if there is content that needs to be, you know, included. And so that's another place where we have to sort of strive for some notion of balance.

Jeff Neuman: I think (unintelligible) Margie if you want to respond. I think it was that there's a point that needs to be considered, a balance that needs to be considered probably in the publication of something for comment (unintelligible) those deadlines. I think that Margie was really just pointing it out as an illustrative example of certain things that - that's the balance needs to be struck. I don't think (unintelligible) in as kind of a (unintelligible).

So with that said though, are there any other comments on Stage V? Okay, hearing none I think now with the surveys and with the discussions that we've had on Stage V, I think Marika has what she needs to start drafting a report for Stage V.

I want to remind everyone that Stage IV, the report is out. It came out last week or maybe even two weeks ago now, but that's out and up for comment for the group. Stage V should come out shortly. I won't make any (unintelligible) on behalf of Marika, but so, you know, when she can get that out. And at that point we're going to have the five stages.

What we need to delve into starting next week and beyond are the overall - or overarching issues, things like translations, timing, issues that we've kind of gone through each stage saying, okay, yes that's an issue in all of the stages, so we need to kind of now focus on those. I think there are going to be some tough conversations that are going to take place for those because they're not easy issues at all. So we'll need to go through those.

And Marika, you have a comment.

Marika Konings: Yes, I do. This is Marika. I actually send - sent you, Jeff, a document earlier today that I hope might facilitate that discussion in which I've tried to, you know, put in a row the different overarching issues that we still need to address and also all the bylaws that related to Annex A, you know, in one document. And also incorporating those recommendations for changes that are already a part of the report.

There might be an easier way to - because, you know, the issues such as time for example is closely linked to the bylaws. So it might help the group in going through the bylaws and as you said it will be - that will be a really difficult discussion because there, you know, the group will really need to come together and agree on what changes the group wants to make as part of the review of the PDP process. So I hope, you know, that the document might be a way forward.

Another issue that was also included in the email I sent out earlier this week is something that came up I think on our call last week is on, you know,

decision making and appeal mechanism that was discussed in the Working Group Work Team. Any maybe that's something as well to include as part of the overarching issues whether the PDP Work Team wants to make any recommendations on, you know, what does consensus mean.

Do we want to give any more specific instructions compared to what is now in the working group guidelines on how consensus is measured or how you measure the different, you know, labels that we've given to the different levels of support. You know, the appeal mechanism is that - that the Working Group Work Team proposes do we - does the group agree that the same one should apply to a PDP Work Team or does the group want to have a different proposal for PDP working groups. So I'm actually that that's probably something to add to that list of issues as overarching issues for the PDP Work Team to consider.

Jeff Neuman: Okay, and that was - and were there any other items that the Working Group Work Team have kind of kicked over to us to discuss?

Marika Konings: I mean - this is Marika again. They haven't really kicked that over to us to discuss. They have made a specific recommendation.

But the question is, and I think it's something we have discussed as well within staff and we see it now as well in some other working groups, should further guidance be provided on, you know, what does it mean to have consensus? Or, you know, where do you draw the line between rough consensus and strong support? Should there be any more meat around that? Because now we basically provide a descriptor - or the work - in the Working Group Guidelines when it's provided is a description and is basically Chair's discretion to make that call. And of course an appeals mechanism if people don't agree with it.

But the question is for a PDP should there be, you know, more instructions around like, you know, because it, you know, we're talking here about

recommendations off of our consensus policy, should there be more meat around that? And what it means to have consensus or rough consensus or, you know, strong support, where does the difference lie?

It's not a specific question from the Working Group Work Team but it's just an issue that this group might want to consider if they want to make any different recommendations on that. I mean, the group might say well we're happy with what is in there and that should also apply to PDP working groups.

Another issue that I think the response should be forthcoming shortly because I know - I have at least drafted them and I think they're in (J. Scott)'s hand to send back to the PDP work team is the questions on, you know, how should you measure the level of support from certain groups. Should you take into account if, you know, there are 20 registrars on the group and they all support it and there's only, you know, one other constituency that doesn't support it, how do you balance that?

And they've provided some feedback on that on those kind of questions, like how should the GNSO Council go about recommendations that only have strong support or, you know, alternative views, what discretion should they have. So the Working Group Work Team has discussed those and I think should be providing some feedback shortly on those to this group.

Jeff Neuman: Okay. Thank you for that. I know, Avri, you have your hand raised.

Avri Doria: Yes, I - thanks. I - first of all I want to agree with Margie that these two groups need to have the result come together and be compared. And that was something that I think was always assumed from the beginning.

I just wanted to point out one thing and perhaps it's only in the way the description hit my ears, in fact it probably is, but it isn't that the Chair decides there's consensus and then it can be appealed, it's more - and I think that the work of the group describes it more is that there's a process whereby the

Chair sort of goes through a work with a working group of, hey, do we have consensus on this and going back and forth, making sure all opinions are heard, making sure that they've all been discussed. And then at a certain point having gone through that process, they can try to call consensus, see what kind of feedback they get from the working group, and then if the feedback is always one person saying no but everybody else saying yes as an example then they can go ahead and call it and it be appealed.

But it's not quite so flat that, you know, Chair says, okay, I think we have consensus, let's move on without there being a really very serious process of arriving at that consensus.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks. (Are there) any other comments before I think we can adjourn for the day? Please everyone go fill out the DOODLEs, the DOODLE for next week for Monday or Tuesday, including myself. I have to fill it out too. So if everyone could fill that out and then we can have a call next week and get started on these overarching issues.

I will, Marika, review that document that you sent me today. I have not been able to get onto my email today yet, but once I do I will make sure I send that out to the group as well.

Marika Konings: Okay then, Jeff, let me then just add the two issues we just discussed like the transition and as well is this decision making methodology. So I'll send you an updated version a bit later today, yes.

Jeff Neuman: Great. It sounds fantastic. All right everyone, thank you and we will talk next week.

Man: Bye bye everyone.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Man: Thank you.

Woman: Bye everybody.

Man: Take care.

END