

STAFF ASSESSMENT: Simple Update of the PDP

Proposal AFPUB-2018-GEN-002-DRAFT-01

Title **Simple Update of the PDP**

Assessed 1st November 2018

1.0 Staff Understanding of the Proposal

a. The proposal introduces the following changes to the current PDP:

i. A proposal is discussed for at least 8 weeks before it can be on the agenda for the PPM and is "available for review at least 2 weeks before the PPM"

ii. The agenda for the PPM must be announced at least 1 week before the PPM.

iii. Consensus is announced not during the public policy meeting, but within 2 weeks after the proposal has been presented at a PPM, and when the proposal has been on the list for at least 8 weeks (inclusive). The final consensus announcement must happen within 1 week towards the end of last call.

b. Consensus is defined in detail in a new proposed clause 3.1.1, and appears to be based on RFC7282.

c. Consensus is determined based on discussions both at the PPM and the mailing list.

2.0 Staff Comments

a. At the very beginning of 3.1.1, there needs to be more emphasis on "rough consensus" as this is the basis of the clause.

b. Clauses 3.1.2 and 3.4.3 should be combined as they both talk about "Last Call".

c. The text "**Within 1 week of the end of the last call, the Working Group Chair(s) shall confirm whether consensus is maintained**" in 3.4.3 should be reworded to clarify whether this is 1 week before the end of last call, or 1 week after the end of last call.

d. In 3.4.1, the statements "**The draft policy shall be available for review for at least two weeks before the next Public Policy Meeting**" (1st paragraph) and "**A draft policy must be discussed on the Public Policy List a minimum of 8 weeks and maximum, the period of time required so it can be presented in the PPM**" appear confusing. In the current PDP (CPM 3.4.1), "available for review for at least 4 weeks" is interpreted to mean "discussed on the public policy list" for 4 weeks. Author needs to clarify on this:

- The change from "The draft policy shall be available for review for at least four weeks before the next Public Policy Meeting" to "... two weeks ..." should be explained under "Summary of the problem being addressed by this proposal". Author should clarify why was the existing 4 weeks is a problem.

- Similarly for the change from 3 weeks to 2 weeks for publishing the minutes (3.4.2) - Section 1 should explain why 3 weeks was a problem.
- The 2 weeks versus 8 weeks (3.4.1 vs 3.4.2) needs to be explained better. We understand that the 2 weeks is a requirement for placing the proposal on the agenda, and the 8 weeks is a requirement for declaring consensus, but it's not really clear.
- Does the term "review" in 3.4.2 mean something different from "discussion" as mentioned elsewhere in the proposal? Such ambiguities should be removed for better clarity.

3.0 Comments from Legal Counsel

None

4.0 Implementation:

The proposal will be implemented within the timelines provided for in the PDP.