GNSO PDP3.0 small team call Monday 13 May 2019 13:00 UTC

Attendees: Rafik Dammak, Elsa Saade, Arsene Tungali, Pam Little, Marie Pattullo, Flip Petillion
Apologies: Philippe Fouquart, Darcy Southwell
Staff: Marika Konings, Steve Chan, Berry Cobb, Julie Hedlund, Ariel Liang, Nathalie Peregrine

Zoom Chat:

14:53:00   From Elsa S : could anyone hear me?
14:53:56   From Elsa S : ill come back
14:54:43   From Nathalie Peregrine : You can also dial out to yourself
14:57:08   From Rafik Dammak : Hi all
14:57:25   From Flip Petillion : Hi
14:57:27   From Maxim Alzoba : Hello All
14:57:36   From Pam Little : Hi
14:57:39   From Marie : Afternoon all!
15:00:42   From Pam Little : Welcome back, Rafik
15:00:43   From Nathalie Peregrine : Darcy sent her apology for this call
15:04:22   From Nathalie Peregrine : I ve stopped sharing me screen
15:04:28   From Nathalie Peregrine : so you can all see Berry's now.
15:04:37   From Arsene Tungali : Thanks Nathalie,
15:04:41   From Arsene Tungali : hello everyone
15:04:52   From Arsene Tungali : I am here until my connexion fail on me
15:05:05   From Nathalie Peregrine : Thanks Arsene,let's hope it remains this way!
15:05:14   From Steve Chan : Here are all of the questions…
15:05:15   From Marie : Optimism, Arsène.
15:05:52   From Steve Chan : 1)   Not all projects on the projects list will look as complete as the prototype. For example projects not yet started but in the pipeline will have very little content and almost an empty shell. Do we create a "thin version" vs. the "thick" version of the prototype?
15:06:01   From Steve Chan : 2)   What do we want to do about priority, if anything? I've not yet included a priority field in the prototype, but there has been lots of discussion in the community about priority of projects. We know we're running well above 100% capacity. Do priority assignments help to park new or lesser priority projects until bandwidth is freed?
15:06:07   From Steve Chan : 3)   How do we handle projects that become owned by GDD during Implementation (stage 7)? While the GNSO needs to be informed about the implementation of projects, Policy does not own the delivery. Is it worth keeping this same design, or would it be better to link to a set of status reports maintained by GDD outside of the projects list?
15:06:13   From Steve Chan : 4)   Who should own project status designation and/or input into a designation change (Staff, WG Leadership, Liaison, or all)? How does this compliment a PCR (Project Change Request) of a WG when they can't deliver to the agreed date?

15:06:19   From Steve Chan : 5)   Do we somehow integrate Council Action Items better into the project list? https://community.icann.org/display/gnsocouncilmeetings/Action+Items

15:06:46   From Maxim Alzoba : number of e-mail is not very informative (beyond zero/not zero), there are things like +1 e-mails, or 'thank you for sending the update, it's very helpful'

15:08:26   From Maxim Alzoba : emails

15:12:59   From Marika Konings : @Maxim - it is one indication of activity, although not an exact measure as you note.

15:15:06   From Maxim Alzoba : I think when combined e-mails & calls close to zero it is time to check (also apologies number would be helpful, for example when a person has vacations somewhere outside of the borders of phone / internet coverage)

15:16:11   From Maxim Alzoba : I think history of changes for planned end date is an important indicator (list of all changes in terms of +number of days)

15:16:18   From Maxim Alzoba : as a list

15:16:32   From Maxim Alzoba : for example when we see +100, +100+100 is a bad omen

15:16:42   From ESun : is there a way to map down the changing status/conditions? with a timestamp? this way if the WG needs evaluation, the data would be there?

15:18:02   From Maxim Alzoba : just like (time added , when, who requested)

15:22:16   From ESun : more like date of when condition was considered at risk, and why.

15:22:21   From ESun : for exmple

15:24:46   From Pam Little : Liaison in consultation with WG leadership? If they disagree, Liaison prevails?

15:25:25   From Rafik Dammak : I think the rationale part gives that detail about the condition consideration

15:25:59   From ESun : every decision should be supported or confirmed anyway. else, it doesnt make sense.

15:26:33   From Maxim Alzoba : I think in situation when the Liaison to the group does not agree with the group leadership - it is time to talk to the Council about the feelings

15:27:30   From Marie : +1 @Maxim

15:27:34   From Rafik Dammak : We should avoid feelings but discuss facts :)

15:28:45   From Maxim Alzoba : even simple text list of (time added, who asked, the reason, date) might help

15:28:46   From Elsa S : thanks Berry!

15:30:30   From Maxim Alzoba : it does not have links to the info (to avoid clogging the document with too much info), it is a list of hints (when things might went south), so we could search around that date in our e-mails e.t.c. to identify the reasons (not an automated task, requires our thinking)

15:31:41   From Elsa S : but that in between means it's in progress right?

15:31:44   From Elsa S : could still be at risk

15:31:57   From Maxim Alzoba : now it is I need more coffee :)

15:32:56   From Elsa S : also, i'm just wondering if the column of "who holds token" will only be limited to one?

15:33:45   From Rafik Dammak : Yes for risk mitigation section (while I dont see how much options as mitigation we can have)

15:37:54   From Nathalie Peregrine : you have the View Option tool at the top of the shared document to adjust the size on your screens

15:38:26   From Maxim Alzoba : Marika, is it possible to send a view only URL to the document?

15:39:38   From Arsene Tungali : Or share this doc over email for easy navigation? Maybe it is already sent but I missed it, my apologies

15:39:49   From Steve Chan : I believe the latest Excel sheet is on Slack

15:41:02   From Steve Chan : The version being shared should be the latest version that includes a handful of edits from both Pam and me.

15:43:34   From Steve Chan : Also here...

15:46:26   From Arsene Tungali : Thanks Steve

15:47:22   From Maxim Alzoba : could it be 'special features' text field to add something non-standard bits of info there ?

15:54:03   From Pam Little : Let me put it another way: which ones of these are contemplated or allowed under the current GNSO Operating Procedures for policy development purpose?

15:55:25   From Marika Konings : The GNSO Operating Procedures refer to PDP Team, and note that the preference is for WG model as that is documented, but as long as the charter details the requirements, it is up to the Council.

15:56:28   From Marika Konings : Exact language: "the GNSO Council may form a working group, task force, committee of the whole or drafting team (the "PDP Team"), to perform the PDP activities. The preferred model for the PDP Team is the Working Group model due to the availability of specific Working Group rules and procedures that are included in the GNSO Operating Rules and Procedures. The GNSO Council should not select another model for conducting PDPs unless the GNSO Council first identifies the specific rules and procedures to guide the PDP Team's deliberations which should at a minimum include those set forth in the ICANN Bylaws and PDP Manual."

15:57:33   From Elsa S : characteristics to take into consideration when deciding the shape of a WG

15:58:47   From Maxim Alzoba : or the WG flips the coin - or tosses matches :)

16:03:43   From Maxim Alzoba : bye all

16:03:46   From Flip Petillion : Thanks all

16:03:50   From Elsa S : thanks all

16:03:50   From Pam Little : Bye all.

16:03:50   From Arsene Tungali : thanks, bye