



MINUTES OF THE PDWG APPEAL COMMITTEE HELD ON 5 NOVEMBER 2020 AT 14:06 UTC VIA ONLINE CONFERENCING SYSTEM

Present:

Dr Paulos Nyirenda	Member
Mr Jean-Robert Hountomey	Member
Mrs Wafa Dahmani	Member
Mr Adam Nelson	Member

Absent :

Mr Luc Missidimbazi	Member
---------------------	--------

Agenda:

1. Welcome and Quorum
2. Assessment of the abuse appeal
3. Consider the draft Report
4. Timeline

BUSINESS OF THE DAY

1. Welcome and Quorum

The Chair WD opened the meeting at 14:06 UTC and welcomed the members present online.

A roll call was carried out to confirm quorum. The Committee adopted the agenda as proposed.

2. Minutes of the last meeting

Defer to next meeting.

3. Assessment of the abuse appeal

The Committee continued discussion on the assessment of the appeal against the Abuse Contact Update. The Chair provided a summary of the assessment made as at now.

The Committee was not in agreement with regards on the elements that should be taken into consideration in order to lead to the declaration of consensus or no consensus by the Co-Chairs during the PPM.

PN and AN were of the opinions that there was no consensus on the policy and there was strong objection as per the video during the PPM. There were 5 or 6 speakers on the policy; no one supported the policy almost everyone objected to the policy.

JR and WD were of the views that the Committee should consider what happened before the PPM on the mailing lists and whether the objections raised during the PPM were responded by the authors of the policy. There were some agreements before the meeting and the Co - Chairs in making the decision have taken into consideration points raised before the meeting; and it should be taken into consideration as well by the Appeal Committee.

PN clarified that the discussions before should not be taken into consideration and the Appeal Committee should not dig into discussions before the PPM but only the decision of the Co-Chairs has to be taken into consideration and discussions during the meeting as per Section 3.4.2 of the PDP. That Section 3.4.2 of the CPM on the PDP stipulates that the only consideration to determine consensus is discussion made during the PPM but not before and not after.

The PPM is where the consensus is based and not discussions that happen before or after; those before or after discussions are out of scope and not applicable to the Committee to take into consideration.

AN further explained that the draft discussions on the mailing list form part of the drafting of the policy; the role of Appeal is to look only at the discussions that occur during the PPM. During the PPM, there was opposition to the policy and only one member stated that there should be the need for a contact; as such the co-chairs are correct that no one support the PPM.

WD queried if there is the need to look on valid or non - valid objection. PN replied that addressing an objection is proper , however, the issue needs to go to the PPM where consensus is determined at this stage and not on the mailing list. There is second phase in addressing consensus on a policy, which is during the last call period. In the last call period, the mailing list discussions between the PPM and the end of last call are taken into consideration.

JR was of the opinion that the item that was discussed at the PPM, there were discussions that were brought to the policy meeting for consensus decision and the co-chairs considered in taking their decision. It is odd to take only the few people that that were speaking out in the time allocated during the PPM only while the authors responded to those questions and issues raised.

The Chair called for a roll call of position of the members on the appeal as follows:

PN – No consensus. There were more objection than support during the PPM.

WD - Consensus. The issues raised were addressed by the authors and one issue was out of scope.

JR - Disagree with Co-Chairs decision

AN - No consensus

PN reiterated that the some objections were raised and the objection remains. The Committee should only look at the discussion on the floor.

After discussion the Chair summarized that the Committee should only check whether there is consensus or not, and not to discuss on the policy. We should only look at the decisions of the Co Chairs and the direction of the PPM. The PDP says that the decision should be based on the discussion at the meeting and not analysis the policy.

During the PPM, everyone was against the policy.

Consensus is what needs to be achieved, it was not achieved during the PPM and thus fall into non-consensus. The evaluation is whether there is a strong rational that override the co-chair.

There was no consensus; all disagree and only one neutral; if we use the IETF methodology, there is no consensus'

The Appeal Committee is to make the final decision. It seem that the decision of the Co-Chairs stand. The Committee agreed to ask the feedback from LM via the mailing list before ruling on its final decision.

3. Consider the draft Report

A draft report will be shared on the mailing list.

The Committee agreed to further review and discuss the on the mailing list.

4. Timeline

The Committee agree to host an additional meeting on Tuesday 10 November 2020 for further discussion.

5. AoB

None.

6. Closure

Meeting ended at 15: 05 UTC.