Fast Flux PDP WG Teleconference
TRANSCRIPTION
Wednesday 14 May 2009 14:30 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of the Fast Flux PDP WG teleconference on Wednesday 14 May 2009, at 14:30 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:
http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-ff-20090513.mp3
On page:
http://gnso.icann.org/calendar/#may

Present for the teleconference:
James Bladel - GodaddyRRc - Working Group chair
Paul Diaz

Observers - (no constituency affiliation)
Joe St Sauver

Staff
Marika Konings
Glen de Saint Gery

Absent Apologies
Greg Aaron - Afilias Ry c.
Kal Feher - Registrar
Dave Piscitello
Rod Rasmussen
Jose Nazario
Avri Doria - GNSO Council chair, NCA

Coordinator: I would like to inform all participants that today's conference is being recorded. If you have any objections, you may disconnect at this time.

Thank you, you may begin.

James   Glen, if you call our very short role today?

Glen Desaintgery: Yes, I'll do that (sir) (unintelligible) then. We have on the call Joe St. Sauver, James Bladel and Paul Diaz, and from staff (Marika Konings) and myself Glen Desaintgery.

And we have apologies from (Cal Ferra) who said he submitted comments, and he volunteers if he is required for anything. Greg Aaron, (James Piscatello) and Rod Rasmussen who are in Barcelona at the (APWG) meeting. And don't know if there is anybody else that I've missed?

James : Thank you Glen and with such a small group as we were discussing we have reached a consensus or decision on any of the action items that we have, Paul and I have closed out the comments - the final comments Category number 9, on the list. Although the most recent ones come through a few minutes ago so I don't that anyone has really had a chance to thoroughly review them.

So what I would recommend or propose to the group and the limited group here, we can decide if we want to go forward with today's call or we can at least maybe generate some assignments that we can take off list. So that next Wednesday when we hopefully have a larger group, we can hit the ground running a little bit better and get this group moving forward down the road.

So what I would propose is that we defer discussions on Category 4, 6 and 9 since Ron and Dan and (Cal) are not here and Paul and I would essentially (unintelligible). And move onto the - skip ahead to a discussion of how we would like to approach the completion of a few sections in the report that are a little sparse right now and that clearly needs to be flushed out before we would submit anything to Council.

So would we want to have a brief conversation on that or possible take it off list or defer until next Wednesday, I would put that question to the group.

James Bladel: I would suggest um, posting it to the list just because you know going -
- what I mean by the posting is, the drafting approach section. As we
discussed previously the - we probably need a full call to go through all
the comments. And if that is understood to be next weeks call then
maybe front load the drafting approach and an email for the list saying
that we need to do this, call for volunteers for various sections and
what not or at least start having the debate so that we can kind of keep
the process moving. You know, as we've have always say, share the
concern about the timing here.

You know, with so many people out this week and the Memorial Day
holiday we don't know what peoples work schedules are like around
that. We start seeing the window of opportunity closing here. I think we
can still do it, but everything needs to keep moving.

That said, what we need to do left, as far as the drafting stuff, I think is
very important and we do need the input for so many of our regular
participants because they probably have pretty strong ideas about how
we should craft the language, the final draft language. I just wouldn't
want to get ahead of ourselves in making some decisions about that. I
would really want to keep people involved and on the list may be is the
best way to do that so we don't lose a full week waiting ahead to start
the discussion, next Wednesday rather.

Let's just tee it up and explain you know immediate - as you've done
your agenda - here is what we are going to do: We are going to go
through the things as quickly as possible you know ideally it could even
take less than a full call - that would be wonderful. But if not, than also
get people to start thinking about start discussing what they want (with)

the final drafting so that we can have that ready and rolling in the subsequent call.

Marika Konings: Would it be helpful if I would post to the list like in different emails, that in different section that are still outstanding; so people have in front of them the text that is currently there? I mean this the sections 5.8, 5.9 and chapters 8 and 9. If we have the text in an email and can maybe start commenting on the list on these so we can already make, I mean and make some headway on those specific parts?

James Bladel: The thing I was going to say would be helpful, at least for me would to focus on the comments where there have been things we don't actually have covered in the report. It seems like a lot of the discussions on the comments have been, "yup, we do have this covered already," but to the extent that there are things we didn't cover - that would be the ones that I'd really love to see, you know highlighted so folks kind of direct their attention there.

Marika Konings: I can take (it as well as an) assignment to take those out where any people have recommended to make changes and put them again, in a separate email to the list so that people can start making suggestions of how and where they would like to see that reflected in the report; would that be helpful?

James Bladel: That would be great.

James : Marika and I also support your idea, isolating the sections that need to be competed. And not necessarily taking a stab at language, but just identifying them on the list as they currently read and allowing folks to suggest what the topics they would see included in that, not

necessarily writing them out. And I think Paul has a good suggestion on the table as far as how we can proceed.

I would just remind everyone that we are probably going to have to do at least one re-true hopefully not on the call, I'd love to see that on the list but I know that folks prefer to do those final read-troughs on the calls and with the length of this report I don't know if that's feasible. But I wanted to leave one date in late May early June to do that if necessary or least to cover those areas that were highlighted during the read-throughs and the folks that were on the list.

So we can probably get our hour back this morning if we agree that we will have those actions items and just keep moving with the comments next week. But identify what we want to flush out with Section to 5.8, 5.9 Section 8 and Section 9 as well as those comments that generated new information.

Marika Konings: And then just a point I want to remind everyone to start reviewing the changes that have been made in the draft final report. Because I have some opposed language already changes based on what people have submitted included there - so of course we will have an opportunity to go through some of them already at some point they can maybe be approved or reviewed for a final read through.

Man: Okay, good advise. I have been reluctant to do that just because I know there have been so many comment categories outstanding. And I thought that there might dependencies in those but I think that it is - you know if they are minor changes or if there is something that has already been covered then we can definitely get ahead of ourselves by doing that and keep everything moving.

So does that sound like satisfactory approach for today?

Man: Yeah, that makes sense.

Man: So it's just the three of us, it doesn't sound like there is a nod. Okay then I would propose that we adjourn for today and proceed as we've discussed.

Man: Sounds like a plan.

Man: Thanks for calling in, the die hard. I appreciate your commitment to the process and just keep an eye on the list and thank you Marika and Glen.

Paul Diaz: Just a general question for everyone, you know when we had last weeks call, I don't recall anybody at the time saying hey, I won't be here next week. The (APWG) team maybe it is just because everybody is assuming. I know James said something to the affect that he had a lot of drafting deadlines due. But I thought that was ICANN related, not (APWG). Be that that it may, between now and Sydney are there any other these sorts of major industry type events taking place? It might mess up our scheduling, anybody aware of anything?

James :   Not that I am aware of Paul, but...

Paul Diaz: It might be a question - an explicit question to make when the emails are sent out. You know people are aware that there is something coming up and they won't be available, to please speak up in advance so that you can have a good idea. Could we realistically to reach

qualms in the two weeks that we have left and try and meet our deadline and wrapping this up before Sydney?

James : That is a good (unintelligible) and Glen would it be appropriate for you to send a separate email asking about travel and holiday schedules between now and Sydney for the Wednesday time slot and also I noticed on the GNSO calendar that there was a date I believe it's the 27th where we are not showing up on the GNSO calendar. So maybe we can address that as well.

Glen Desaintgery: Is that the 27th of May?

James : (I'm thinking that)...

Glen Desaintgery: Yes, I will add all the (unintelligible) until the meeting.

James : Okay. And can you also post an inquiry to the list of anything that people know in advance that they will not be able to attend. So we can get an idea, as Paul was saying, so that we can get an idea of what our quorum for (unintelligible) looks like.

Glen Desaintgery: I'll do that with pleasure.

Marika Konings: And James just a quick question. Will you send a note to the list recapping what we discussed or would you like me to include that in one of the first (unintelligible) different sections?

James : I think if you send that out with the identified sections that would fine.

Marika Konings: Okay.

James :   Everyone, thank you for your time and I appreciate your dedication and let's just keep it moving.

Man: Okay James.

Glen Desaintgery: Okay.

Man: See you on the next one.

Marika Konings: Thanks.

Man: See you guys.

Marika Konings: Bye.

                              END