
YESIM NAZLAR: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the APRALO Rules of Procedure Working Group call taking place on Tuesday, the 17th of September, 2019, at 13:00 UTC.

On our call today we have Satish Babu, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Syuzan Marukhyan, Priyatosh Jana, Amrita Choudhury, Ali AlMeshal, Nadira Al-Araj, and Shreedeeep Rayamajhi.

We have received an apology from Maureen Hilyard.

From staff side, we have Silvia Vivanco, Alperen Eken, and myself, Yesim Nazlar. I'll be doing call management for today's call.

Just a kind reminder to please state your names before speaking for the transcription purposes.

Now I would like to leave the floor back to you, Satish. Thank you very much.

SATISH BABU: Thank you very much, Yesim. I'd like to welcome everybody who's shown interest in joining this working group and also have made it to the call today. Now, RoPs are a fairly involved topic. While it may be new to some of us, we also have people like Cheryl on the call who have been through this and have authored most if not all of the existing RoPs for APRALO, so we would be of course guided by Cheryl's inputs.

But we do have a very mixed group right now with us, both in the – yeah, Cheryl's hand. ["A few runs,"] she says. So we have a mixed group,

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

and I would also say that it's an experience of and for the younger people to work with people like Cheryl so that we have an idea of how to manage these things in the future when the times comes, maybe five years or ten years from now.

We have been thinking for the last three to years of some tweaks that were required for our RoP. Basically, the RoP is well-drafted, but the [inaudible] around us has been changing. So there has been this need for minor tweaks. Then we had the individual members being admitted, which became a hot topic during the review last time. When that happened, it was an untested part of our RoPs and there were some more minor issues that came up. Nothing really major, but we thought it's better that they get fixed.

The final trigger for setting up this working group was a series of exchanges we had on our mailing list when we felt our membership, especially the newcomers, perhaps should have been guided better by the leadership team in how they ought to behave themselves.

So we have taken both of these things in account in the terms of reference of this working group. We have specific deliverables, both on the RoP side and the code of conduct or starter kit that we can get to every new individual or ALS that joins us so that they are aware of how we operate, how we work, and what are the etiquettes and niceties of a community like ours.

So this is very briefly our background. So we have the agenda that was sent to you. Are there any suggestions for any additional items or any modifications?

I note that this process is likely to be fairly long, so we have tentatively put six months. But we will discuss whether we need to make that longer or not.

I'd also like to thank Silvia for her specific help from a legal perspective on some of the aspects of our bylaws. She has taken extra pains to join us for these calls.

Now we move onto the terms of reference of this group. Please stop me if anybody has anything to add or comment. We are now at Agenda Item #2 [A]: Objectives and terms of reference. We have the cut-and-paste of the three objectives in the chat. Basically – okay, we have the full draft terms of reference here. We will refine it. We will have to refine it because it may not be comprehensive enough.

The three main aspects of it were to, one, examine the existing provisions of our RoPs and suggest new provisions or modifications to existing provisions relating to the obligations and responsibilities of individual members. So, in general, our community seeks more clarity on the role of individual members and their obligations.

The second relates to the individual member representative who's elected from amongst the regional members. [Realistically], the rules and responsibilities of the elected individual member representative and his or her relationships vis-à-vis the leadership team ... Now, at this point, we're not being clear whether that person is a part of the leadership team or not a part and what are the obligation and eligibilities that person might have.

The third main point is a separate document, like a code of conduct or a standards of behavior, for every newcomer that joins our community.

So these three have been devised from our last interactions over the last three or four months. But when we actually get to the RoPs, we might end up having to address some more items.

Below this, we have some additional points that I've just added very tentatively. Now, these have been things that are coming up frequently in discussions. One of them relates – the first one in B – to the individual member criteria. Now, one of the main criteria is that that person should not be a member of an existing ALS.

Now, there is some confusion regarding this. Some people ask us why this criteria is there at all. Suppose the other member [inaudible] been a member but we want to directly contribute. So our answer usually is that there is nothing stopping them from contributing as a member of an ALS because they're automatically a part of the community. The current unaffiliated individual membership is actually meant for a slightly different purpose.

But this is a thing we have to examine – firstly, whether this is valid, and, secondly, is it enforceable? We depend on an affidavit that is given to us by the individuals when they join. Now, we've been taking it on trust, basically, but should we move beyond trust and go to trust-but-verify? How does this thing work over a period of time? Suppose after three months or six months or after submission the status changes. Then what do we do? On an ongoing basis, [inaudible] status? It's something that we have to discuss.

Then the role of the representative that was just mentioned. The job description would also be useful for this representative.

The third actually is not related to the individual membership alone. It's a general point regarding our election process. We have had situations where some of our contestants in our election in the last case, in the previous case, was a person standing for the individual member representative itself. It was also contesting in another part of ICANN. Some of the community felt that this was irregular. So now this is again a bit of a gray area. There's nothing in the rules that absolutely state so, but we have been steering clear of this sort of a conflict by being discriminative about it, meaning we were careful about not getting into such situations. But this year we did have a problem that one of our—

AUTOMATED VOICE: Please hold.

SATISH BABU: Somebody has a problem?

Okay. So there's a case where this did come up. There was some dynamic in the community. So we wanted to see if this were to be [inaudible], in so many words, or if it's possible at all, because many of us are actually members of multiple parts of ICANN. The problem comes when we start contesting for leadership positions in multiple organs of ICANN.

Then we have several issues relating to membership. Can we scroll down a little bit, please.

Yeah. First is the kind of association that exists currently. So what are the kinds of membership that we have? We have currently ALSes, which are members of ... ALSes are represented by two primary and secondary topics, which are of official status within APRALO. Then we have a status of a member of an existing ALS. Now, that person who is not directly a part of APRALO is nevertheless a member of a member, so that person is automatically part of the community. The third is a formal legal member – unaffiliated individual member. The fourth is a status of people who are subscribed to the APAC list, but they don't belong to any of the categories mentioned. Now, this is also a status because our RoPs do provide for anybody to become – it's an open list. Anybody can apply to be on the APAC discuss list and thereby be a part of every open meeting and meditation and everything else that happens on the list.

So this is the current status. I don't know if I misread anything. So we need to discuss whether this is exactly what we want or if any points are required.

Another point (4B) is that our APAC list has been growing [monotonously], meaning it's been increasing in size all the time. It's never decreasing. This is because we have never done a purge because this list has been open, if I'm correct, from early 2010 or so. From then, people have been coming in but not going out. So it's possible that there are many people who, for multiple reasons, are not any longer interested in these lines of discussions, etc., but they're still in the list because we don't purge.

Now, is it something that we should do, or we just ignore it? Now, either a term of appointment for individual members – because it's also

related to this purge because, after a while, some individual members may become inactive. So do we carry them on with us or do we start asking them for options?

Then we have the issue of deregistration of ALSes. Now, some of our RALOs have been doing this very methodically and systematically, but we have not done this so far. Now, this is not directly connected with the RoPs, maybe, but still something we can discuss.

We also have ALTAS III coming up, and we are not sure if there's any bearing on any of the decisions taken at ATLAS III on membership. Now, since this is a fairly long-term and [Pressley] is coming up next month – okay, early November – we do have time to incorporate any decisions from there into our scope of work.

Finally (#5) the code of conduct: updating expected standards and the kind of [inaudible] for [inaudible] newcomers.

So this is awfully an, what shall say, unorganized bunch of items that have been put here, only as a starting point. We will probably move this out into a separate working document that we will set up as an action item in today's call.

At this point, I would like to stop and ask for any comments – general comments, [specific] comments – in anything that we discussed so far.

Amrita, please go ahead.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY: Thank you, Satish. The issue is quite complex because there are different aspects to it. One is that most of the ALS individual members are part of an existing ALS. So perhaps, rather than, when an applications comes in, just relying on what the application says, when, people send out an e-mail to react to it. Similarly, it could be done for individual members where ALSes are asked whether the person is an ALS member. [inaudible] we also need to understand that, many times, many individuals want to become an individual member because they feel they cannot contribute through their ALS. However, there are also instances where people do not have issues with their ALSes but are in a leadership but are still in the individual membership position.

So it's complicated, and I think we need to see all the different aspects and then look at this in-depth. Thank you.

SATISH BABU: Thanks, Amrita. Cheryl, please?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Satish. All of this is all well and good, particularly some of the particular matters, including the additional points that may need to be raised. In general, they're useful. I think we should probably pull out a couple of them and deal with them perhaps as a slightly different bundle necessarily linked in the unaffiliated members.

But unaffiliated members are exactly that. They're unaffiliated because the rules of procedure were designed to take into account the desirability of allowing a pathway and encouraging a pathway for

people who were not and probably would choose not to be or were in fact in a process of forming an At-Large Structure to be actively engaged, just as they can be as individual once they were in an At-Large Structure. So that's the principle behind why unaffiliated members exist out of the recommendation from the first ALAC and ATLAS At-Large review process.

So there is, as you said, Satish, a bit of fine-tuning that's associated with the rules and the expansion of the rules to do with clarifying matters for unaffiliated members.

On a separate but nevertheless complementary line, which also needs to be done, are things that affect everybody. That includes At-Large Structures. So I think I would encourage us to keep those things slightly separate as we go through.

Amrita, you mentioned that all unaffiliated members – or perhaps, you feel, many unaffiliated member – applications might be members of At-Large Structures. Obviously at the moment this is a statement that is requested for the individual member applicant to state that they are not a member of an At-Large Structure.

We occasionally find the situation where the member applicant is a member of, for example, a chapter of the Internet Society, and they have no idea of the rank and file of the membership of the Internet Society that we're referring to and have absolutely not idea that the Internet Society chapter is even a member of ICANN in terms of being an APRALO structure. Now, that's really just an indictment of how that At-Large Structure isn't even doing the job they said they would do

when they became an At-Large Structure, of course. But that's another story.

So we have to separate those things out. It's certainly through not fault of their own that the unaffiliated member in that case (the applicant) – [this] discovers that their chapter is already an At-Large Structure. All it means is they're already able to be as active as they want to be.

So, for the individual member who is an unaffiliated individual member, this is an alternative pathway to being a member of an At-Large Structure, and sometimes it's a way they can be active while they are forming an At-Large Structure. So let's be clear why these unaffiliated memberships [exist].

The other thing I was just concerned about, Satish, is you talked about ATLAS III. I just want to make sure that the group– in fact, everybody – that ATLAS III is not, in this case, designed to be anything like any of the ATLASes that have gone before it. Some of the activities of the previous ATLASes have had a feature where they have made recommendations or proposals towards policy recommendations or comments on aspects. That's not the intention for ATLAS III, so there is little if any likelihood that there will be any effect on our work from ATLAS.

However, what ATLAS III is supposed to do is produce the next grouping of active thought leaders and of people who are going to be implementing and assisting with the implementation of the recommendations from our last At-Large review. That's probably important inasmuch as those individuals, those ambassadors, probably need to now considered in some way, shape, or form within our

regional rules of procedure. So it's not quite the function of what ATLAS III does but rather how the region or the regional leadership may wish to recognize and work with the next grouping of thought leaders who aren't going to be chairs and vice-chairs and secretaries and whatever but are going to people working at the edge communities on behalf of whatever we need to be implementing and particularly working within policy.

Long preamble there, but it's important that we all understand exactly why we're gathering. Thank you.

SATISH BABU:

Thanks, Cheryl. Quickly, there are three points that I take away from Cheryl's intervention. The first is that we probably have to separate the unaffiliated member points from the general points. For example, in this list of additional points, we could separate it out into, does that impact? So, in general, when we're setting up the working document, we will have an entirely separate section on the individual members and then the rest of it as a separate part because we [have worked] more on the individual member side. That's one.

Secondly, also linking with Amrita's point about willful declaration as someone is not a member currently as opposed to somebody not realizing because their ISOC chapter, for instance, has been so ineffective that they're not aware that they're already a part of ICANN, we need to take care of all these edge cases in some fashion so that there is no more confusion about these things.

The third point regarding ATLAS III – of course, thank you for the clarification there – is that, if there is any bearing that our RoPs require some change on account of whatever decisions happen there, we'll be happy to consider that. Otherwise, of course, we don't have to bother about it.

Shreedeeep, please?

SHREEDEEP RAYAMAJHI:

I think the two most important things when we talk about membership criteria or membership is clarity and commitment. I think the problem starts when people see more opportunity and they move around. So I think the ALSes also, from their point, need to reach out to the members and talk about responsibilities and rules and things like that.

Apart from that, the individual members have to be very clear. Satish mentioned previously that even we are involved in various constituencies, but we have to be very clear in terms of our rules and responsibilities and our commitments.

So I think these two things – commitment and clarity – have to be very clear when you are engaged, especially with newcomers. I think the incident that happened has clearly brought into view the point that ICANN is not just about opportunities. ICANN is about commitment, about work, about contribution. You cannot just jump from one place to another. You can be engaging in different constituencies or different working groups, but the point is you have to be very clear about what you have committed to and what your rules and responsibilities are. Thank you.

SATISH BABU:

Thanks, Shreedeeep. Yeah, I agree with you. So far, it has been up to the individuals' concern to steer clear of these kind of situations. But perhaps the time has come from us to be more specific in terms of rules so that the individuals get the message that they are not supposed to be certain things.

Now, regarding commitment, I'm not fully sure how we can embody that concept into our code of conduct, but I agree that we should communicate that. Maybe it's the role of the leaders to communicate that aspect to the newcomers.

Any other comments?

Not seeing any hands, let's go back to the previous document, the agenda. There is a third issue under 2A, which is harmonizing the RoPs with the ALAC and ICANN bylaws. I forget the exact context of this. There was recently where the ICANN bylaws were actually quoted in something. So we will take that [inaudible] details in the next call maybe. But we are to ensure that what changes we make to the RoPs as part of our work has to be harmonized with the rest of the ALAC and ICANN bylaws.

2B: Timeline. I'm proposing six months, but it is possible it may not be over by February 2020. Maybe a few more months. If anybody feels it is less or more, please raise your hands.

Yes, please, Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. Two things. I think six months is an admirable objective. This is a relatively large albeit mixed group. So there should be plenty of people to share the workload. So let's aim for six months. I think that's more than reasonable. It also means that you have then the opportunity. Please remember that any change to the regional rules of procedure is more than just harmonizing, of course. Obviously one in the development of any proposed changes to the rules of procedure needs to be very aware of where the ICANN bylaws and any ramification of what we are doing and proposing may have. Also, we need to make sure that it is indeed harmonized with the At-Large Advisory Committee's rules of procedure as well.

But we can't change our bylaws before ICANN Legal also have a double-check. But to make the change, we need to make that change via an agreement of the RALO. So you need to look also at having actual adoption of changes to the bylaws associated with some form of a general meeting or general assembly of the region.

So, as you're working your timeline, it would be wise to make sure that all of that works so that you have that all done and you can lead up to a final voting resolution to adopt the changes. That's all I wanted to make sure of, just as we're doing [inaudible].

SATISH BABU: Thanks, Cheryl. Good point. Silvia could you please, maybe later, add on a fourth bullet under – I don't know which one. Maybe timeline or – yeah, timeline maybe – [clearing] from ICANN Legal? The next point is the process of adoption, maybe through a general assembly or a similar

process. So ICANN Legal and the process of adoption we have to add onto this list.

Also, under 2A, the last bullet – harmonizing APRALO provisions with the ALAC and ICANN bylaws – I’m wondering if there’s any need to harmonize with the At-Large review implementation. I’m not sure if there’s anything that the At-Large review implementation might impact then work that we’re doing.

Cheryl, what do you think? Is there any such link? Please go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

There certainly is. There’s considerable links. There will be a goodly amount of work coming out of one of the primary implementations activities under the recommendation known as Recommendation 2. Recommendation 2 from the most recent At-Large review is all about how individuals, regardless of what they’re associated with or not – affiliations or not or an unaffiliated individual member or a rank-and-file member of an At-Large Structure – are able to more effectively and directly engage in the work of ICANN.

So, yeah, there’s going to be a lot of stuff coming out of implanting Recommendation 2 that will directly affect his work and vice-versa.

SATISH BABU:

Right. Thanks, Cheryl. So we will include the At-Large review recommendations as well to the final bullet of A.

Now, moving on—

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Satish? Sorry. Just if I may, just so everyone here is really, really clear, that's not negotiable. Those recommendations will be implemented out of the review. They have the approval of the ICANN Board. We don't get to say we don't want that to happen. We get to make it happen. So that's not up for discussion.

What is appropriate if at least some of the group involved in this process of our own regional rules of procedure review makes sure they are also involved and engaged in the workaround implementing Recommendation 2. So it's not what the effect is on our group but how our group can be involved in that Rec 2 work as well.

SATISH BABU: Right. Thanks, Cheryl, for that. Now, moving onto the scope of the work, there was this question of if the RoP review should only look at the individual member-related areas or if it should focus on individual members but also look at any of the other glaring items that need tweaks.

I think the discussion so far today has indicated that our focus should be on individual member areas, but we should also consider some of the rest of the RoPs if they require significant change. So we are saying both here in the scope of work but to focus clearly on the individual member.

The deliverables of this group (we're looking at 2B now) are the submissions for new RoPs, the code of conduct document, which is a separate document, and a sort of webinar. We should perhaps put a

general assembly to introduce and adopt the RoPs. So that is a formal process, not an informal, optional process: to make a webinar. So we will change that.

Any comments?

Okay. Moving onto Agenda Item #3 (plan of work), what I was thinking – this is just a proposal; we can finalize this after discussions – was that we have a working document wherein we first look at the issues that we feel need to be fixed. Now, we [do] have a list currently. We'll take some time – maybe a week or a couple of weeks – to fill out any more issues that we think should be looked at, just like the list that we saw a little bit earlier. We categorize them into individual member-related and others. That is our basic working document.

Once we have that, we started looking at the current provisions, starting out with the individual member-related provisions. Then we apply or we discuss and finalize and have a consensus on what should be changed and how. We take [inaudible] and work through it.

So I don't know if it's going to work exactly like this, but this is what I had to propose for our concentration. If this is the case, then we're going to start up with a working document, like a wiki, where we will seek help from Silvia to organize this into two sections A) relating to individual members and B) relating to any other part of the RoP. We will in these two sections. All of us are invited to comment and fill up your points and anything that's been misspelled into this wiki. That is our starting point.

Then we will have the RoPs also in [inaudible], collaborative wiki kind of a thing. We take each of these items and apply them on the RoPs.

Now, are there any comments or better suggestions?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Satish, are you planning on regular calls and a schedule of regular calls? Human nature being what it is, you're going to get, if you're very lucky, 20% of your working group actually interacting with the wiki. You're more likely to get somewhere in the 60s, if the gods and goddesses are all smiling upon us – even up to the 80% -- of your joined up members actually involving via meetings.

SATISH BABU: Right. So I was thinking of looking at a combination of the two. But I think the substantive progress is going to be made at the meetings, where we take a point and look at what there is in the current RoP and we discuss and propose a change. So we need to have calls, at least monthly calls.

Any suggestions from anybody on the frequency of calls? I would suggest at least monthly.

Yes, Ali? Please go ahead.

ALI ALMESHAL: Thanks, Satish. I think a monthly call is good. I would suggest as well, as part of our monthly agenda, to give an update on the progress of this

working group as well. So our monthly call has to have one continuous agenda item to give an update on where you stand and what is the progress of this working group as well. Thank you.

SATISH BABU: Thanks, Ali. For the monthly call this week on Thursday, we already have put this as an agenda item. [inaudible]

ALI ALMESHAL: [inaudible]

SATISH BABU: Yeah. So we'll have it at every call. If there are no other comments, then we are looking at monthly calls. Silvia will be fixing these calls. Now, the timing of this call is also because she can actively contribute. I think it's important she's there with us in this journey.

Silvia, the action items coming out of this call that we need to set up a working document – yes, please. Go ahead. I see your hand.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Oh, no. Thank you, Satish. First, thank you very much. I think this is a great plan of work. I think you had addressed most of the issues that came out of the discussions back in July. It will be on the previous in 2014, when the APRALO rules of procedures were drafted. It's quite intensive, so I think it's very good to have a current call.

I was just going to ask you about the next action items. It will be to put these two wikis and separate the items. If you could please repeat that. What would be the two sections that you want to have separated. Then we can go [to] the next steps. Thank you.

SATISH BABU: Right. Thanks, Silvia. Yes, Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sorry. Took me a minute to come off mute. Satish, sorry. You said something about the timing of the calls having to suit Silvia.

SATISH BABU: Yeah, because normally APRALO calls are at a very odd time for Silvia, so she requested that—

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. While I reach for my handkerchief and go “Boo-hoo” and also remind you that we are volunteers and Silvia is paid to do a job, we should of course try and make things to be in a time that is at least inconvenient for everybody. But this is very nice to be kind to staff. You might think I’m being a bit harsh here, but I’m pretty much always kind and nice and considerate to staff. But I’m actually far more concerned that you have time and time rotation, if that’s the way you go for it, that, once per month, is at least inconvenient to everybody involved, not just have it driven by what works for one or of another of the staff. Here I’m including Yesim. I’m very well-aware that we try and avoid

putting too many calls on to our staff outside of what would be considered their normal office hours. That's why we have staff spread over the world, of course: so that there is not too much of an impasse. But it doesn't mean that our staff don't work very often and very regularly at particularly unfriendly times for what would be considered normal working hours. We should try and avoid it, but it shouldn't be the only directive.

Regarding the timing of this call, please remember – this is a note for staff – that we can only chose from the times you put in the Doodle. If you put times in the Doodle that only work for the most western part of the region or the most eastern part of the region, you'll get Maureen and those in the western At-Large Structures and areas of geography because the eastern and western region eventually meet up just a day apart. But you're only going to get grumpy old women like me who would work 24/7 from the middle bits. So just make sure you [provide] options. It doesn't have to be 15:00 UTC. It doesn't have to be 30:00 UTC. You might want to choose between them. But thinking about spreading as much as you possibly can, especially if it is only a monthly call. If it's a weekly call, then that's slightly different. But once a month? Come on. We can all be inconvenienced occasionally.

SATISH BABU:

That's a fair point, Cheryl. What we could do about it is either have a rotation – have two times ... Like today with Maureen. I know it's going to be very hard for her – in fact, I remarked to Yesim when we were sending out the thing – because we go by the time slot that the maximum amount of people click. But that, as you say, is dependent on

what are the slots given to us in the first place. So I see that we need to spread the pain. So I'll work with staff to ensure that we have some kind of a rotation so that others can also participate and that it's unfair to nobody in particular.

Cheryl, I see your hand up. It's an old hand or is it something else?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

It's something else. I just wanted to ask whether or not Silvia was aware if there is also an action in other regions for review of their rules of procedure. The reason I ask is that, whilst we have noted harmonization with the At-Large Advisory Committee rules of procedure and the ICANN bylaws, we have in recent times gone through a reasonable amount of effort to try and make sure that there is significant if not absolute harmonization between rule of procedure between the various RALOs. So, if we're aware of a whole flurry of other changes about to start in the other regions, we might also want to make sure we keep a watching brief on that. But that's something, seeing it's Silvia's job to work with all of the RALOs, that she might know that we don't have [inaudible]. That's all.

SATISH BABU:

Yes, Silvia. Please go ahead.

SILVIA VIVANCO:

Hello. Thank you, Cheryl. Yes, indeed. LACRALO included the issue of unaffiliated membership in the new operating principles. They haven't actually regulated the terms and conditions on how the individuals

would become members, but they are in the process of doing so. At the moment, they have servers. But they are working at the moment on this. So perfect timing.

Also, [Goran] just finished the new bylaws. They are also in draft form. However, they have not addressed the issue of individual membership because, as you know, they have a different model, whereby all the individuals are members of an ALS. So they haven't really adopted the model that the other RALOs have adopted.

So at the moment, we have LACRALO working on these issues. AFRALO also has individual members. They accept individual members, but they have rules. But they are not doing further reviews.

So that's the status at the moment.

SATISH BABU:

Thanks, Silvia. I hope you'll be updating us as we start work on actually modifying the RoPs about anything similar in the other RALOs.

Now, coming back to your question of what we were saying with that, we want to separate out work that we're doing with individual members and the rest of the RoPs. So we would like to have either a single wiki with two sections or two different wiki pages where we can put down first the current list that we have, divide it into two parts – the individual member-related and the rest – and we give some time – maybe a week or two weeks – for the rest of the group to add to this list. Once we have the reasonable number of items that we feel is comprehensive, we have the RoP itself in a collaboratively [inaudible]

format, which I assume is a wiki. Then we [pick] section by section in a call and go through it.

So that is roughly the kind of thing we are planning out. This may, when we actually start doing it, be slightly different. But I suppose that's fine.

So, Silvia, I hope you got the action item.

SILVIA VIVANCO: Yes, Satish. Noted.

SATISH BABU: Thanks. I think we are coming to the end of this call. Are there any other comments? Currently, what we expect from the group members is that, when Silvia sends out the mail regarding the two wikis, we go back to it, take a look, and think of adding anything we feel is left out, any other pain points. Then we will set up a document. That document we will do live editing on during a call. Let's see how it works.

I think there's nothing more from my side. Are there any other comments from anybody else?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Satish, just one final thing. If you could ascertain from the group members – those that are here and those that weren't able to join today's call – if there are any of them that are unable – note unable – to use a particular type of collaborative document. In our area, we do find

in our region that there are some countries in which, for example, access to Google Docs is impossible or difficult.

Now, we can work around it. We just need to know if that's the case. It's always useful to know that when you're starting work rather than when you're trying to finish some particular important piece of drafting and you discover a few people have to be engaged in a different way. We can always find ways to around it, but it'd be good to know at the beginning of the process if there's going to be difficulties for anyone. Thanks.

SATISH BABU:

Good point. Silvia, I think in the first amount that goes out, we have to tell people, "This is what we're planning. This is the tool that we're using," which I presume here in this case is the ICANN community wiki. We have to ask the group members if any of them have any difficulties in using this tool. If there is, then we can think of some other workaround for them. But it's important to ask them that.

I would like to thank everybody for joining this call. I think it's a very productive first step. Lots of work in the future, but it's a good start. Thanks, everybody. We will meet in a month's time. Before that, we will of course have the Doodle for the rotating of the times and so on.

Thanks very much, and it's over to Yesim to close this call.

YESIM NAZLAR:

Thank you very much, Satish, and thank you all for joining today's call. This meeting is now adjourned. Have a lovely rest of the day. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]