ICANN

Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers

2007 NARALO Documents Series

NORTH AMERICAN REGIONAL AT-LARGE ORGANISATION

CODE OF CONDUCT

prepared by the Staff

The Code of Conduct of the North American Regional At-Large Organisation was certified as having been adopted on 12th June 2007 by the Interim Chair of the NARALO.

[End of introduction]

NARALO Code of Conduct

The NARALO discussion lists and its other online collaborative spaces serve two purposes. They are where we discuss ICANN-related policy issues and attend to administrative tasks related to the management of NARALO.

Content that is acceptable in our online collaborative spaces is defined as:

- Discussion on ICANN-related policy issues,
- Discussion of NARALO administrative matters,
- Announcements of conferences, events, or activities related to ICANN matters.

Inappropriate postings include:

- Unsolicited bulk e-mail,
- Discussion of subjects unrelated to ICANN policy, meetings, activities, or technical concerns,
- Unprofessional commentary, regardless of the general subject,
- Postings being used to abuse, harass, stalk, or threaten others,
- Postings that are libellous, knowingly false, ad-hominem, or misrepresents another person,
- Postings that violate an obligation of confidentiality,
- Postings that violate the privacy of others,
- Announcements of conferences, events, or activities that are not related to ICANN matters.

The NARALO Chair is empowered to suspend or restrict a person's posting rights when the content that person has posted is inappropriate and represents a pattern of abuse. The Chair defines and determines what is inappropriate content on a case-by-case basis. Our definitions are not limited to this list. If the Chair suspends posting rights or deletes a comment or link, he will say so and explain why. When determining the duration of the suspension, the Chair is encouraged to take into account the overall nature of the postings by an individual and whether particular postings are an aberration or typical.

Occasionally, a participant may engage in what amounts to a "denial-of-service" attack to disrupt the consensus-driven process. Typically, these attacks are made by repeatedly posting messages that are off-topic, inflammatory, or otherwise

counter-productive, and the Chair may choose to revoke the participant's posting rights. In contrast, good faith disagreement is a healthy part of the consensus-driven process. For example, if the group is unable to reach consensus, this is an acceptable, albeit unfortunate, outcome; however, if that group fails to achieve consensus because it is being continuously disrupted, then the disruption constitutes an abuse of the consensus-driven process. Interactions of this type are fundamentally different from "the lone voice of dissent" in which a participant expresses a view that is discussed but does not achieve consensus. In other words, individual bad faith should not trump community goodwill.

[Acknowledgments to the IETF for RFC 3683 and to Tim O'Reilly.]