

---

YESIM SAGLAM: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the APRALO rules of procedure review working group call taking place on Tuesday, 7<sup>th</sup> of November 2023 at 5:00 UTC.

On our call today, we have Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Justine Chew, Sabarinath Pillai, Fouad Bajwa, Amrita Choudhury, Bibek Silwal, Satish Babu. We have received apologies from Maureen Hilyard, Shreedeeep Rayamajhi, and Gopal Tadeballi has informed us that he will be joining late. From staff, we have Gisella Gruber and myself, Yesim Saglam, and I will also be doing call management for today's call. And before we get started, just a kind reminder, please do state your name before speaking for the transcription purposes. And with this, I would like to leave the floor back over to you, Cheryl. Thank you very much.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. And you could flip a coin as to whether or not you needed to hand it back to Justine or me, because she and I haven't decided. We'll arm-wrestle about that in the near future. Okay. I notice a few other people are joining as well. Now, today we're reconvening a refreshed, we hope, group of individuals from APRALO and now beyond. Noticing, Namra, you're flipped across to North America, but you're joining us again here. So, perhaps you're staying across both regions, which is fine. But what we have got in a short order is to pick up where we left off at the discussions we were having in the General Assembly, which was held in Istanbul, with regard to finalizing the rules of procedure for their much-needed update.

---

*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.*

---

Now, Justine has done a huge amount of work reconfiguring the Google Doc, which you will all get to see shortly. But I might want to just hand to Justine now and see if there's any particular issues that she wanted to raise as a result of the General Assembly. Certainly from my perspective, I'm just delighted that we've got a group of refreshed and revitalized individuals who are going to come together and do a bit of policy. As we move towards a final drafting here. No? Okay, fine. Justine, if you want to leave the filibustering to me, I'm happy to do so.

All right, then. So, those of you who have expressed a fresh interest, I would like to just mention to you that we have a very long history on the needs analysis, the gap analysis and the requirements leading to the changes that you will be reviewing. That, of course, does not mean that they are the only changes that might be suggested even at this late stage. So, as we move towards final drafting mode, if you see something, especially those of you who have a good deal of experience in all things governance or rules of procedure, and you think that there's an issue we should highlight and see whether or not we have opened ourselves to some sort of risk or some sort of misinterpretation or some sort of oversight by not having a particular thing addressed, do feel free to put those sorts of things in suggestion mode. Yesim, if you've got the documents, I just want to recognize now that this is substantially in terms of text exactly what you saw and were working with during our face to face meeting at Istanbul. However, Justine has done as I say a heroic amount of work reconfiguring this now to be side-by-side text. Do not panic when you see the number of pages. It is now a landscape document so it can have two columns looking at the original 2016 rules of procedure text and the proposed edits and changes on a left-hand

right-hand side system so literally there will be less than half these number of pages in the final documentation. However, Justine believes and I absolutely agree with her, that this will help us be more effective and efficient as we go through the review process.

If you can just scroll down to this next section, you'll see here a number of parts which will be listed in the notes as no change. That doesn't mean you shouldn't read them and review them in your own time. You will be given, if you're part of this working group now, read and comment access. At the moment Justine and I are going to hold the reins of editing very tightly and we would like you to put suggestions in the comment mode. I'm assuming that all of you are familiar with the comment mode but if not, if you see at the top of the screen underneath the blue share button on this if you have an option and you can see obviously Yesim is in editing mode, you should have an option to select comment, and if you highlight a piece of text I would suggest— Yes please, that'd be great, Yesim, if you'd like to demonstrate an insert comment, that would be fantastic. So when we set you up, you'll be given suggest mode which means you can highlight a text, a word, a section—please do the highlighting in the right hand side, then to go across to the little square with the little dialogue box which says add comment with the plus in it and let us know exactly what it is that you believe you need to bring to our attention. You'll also note, and I'll get you to do this as well, Yesim, no, don't stay in there, but if you use the @ symbol, so go back into a comment, please, that'd be great where you were. Right, now, if Yesim wanted to draw my attention or Justine's attention, she just goes @ and starts typing the name, and because CHE comes up with Justine Chew or Cheryl, she can choose which of us she

---

---

wants to get our attention, and that will actually prompt an email message to us. So if you want to draw our attention, either to Justine or I or any of the other members, you'll find that's absolutely useful. Now, because of Yesim's particular Google space, she has a whole lot more people listed there, so try and make sure you keep it within the family. Okay, so that's what we would like you to do, put any of those comments in there.

If you scroll down now a little bit further, note also that if you have a particular dictionary, don't worry about an Americanized spelling versus a British-style spelling of things. We'll do those sorts of minor tweaks as a final toilette to the document, so you don't need to go through saying this should be an S or a Z or what your own Grammarly or other tool suggests it should be.

As we move down, you'll see there isn't a lot to do in this very first section, but once we get to the defined terms, which is where we're heading to now, you will start to continue on, to continue on, thank you, dear, to see some red-line text coming in. I think if you go down a little bit further, there wasn't terribly much excitement, ah, here we are. Now, here you'll see the term, a new defined term of ALS representative is a proposed part of section six. You'll see that next to each of these defined terms, you have the term itself, the description of the term, and where possible, the section that it goes in. If you are unaware of what section it should go in, just make a note that says, "Needs section reference," and we will sort that out. But with that, you'll see the type of red-lining, and where you'll see the red-lining, that we're going to be asking you all to do a read-through, review, and agreement or otherwise. We believe most of these should be pretty much agree,

---

agree, agree, agree, because some of us have gone over these things with a fine-tooth comb, but we are also very aware of a couple of issues that may come up. First of all, both, certainly Justine and I, but in particular, everyone else who's been involved in the major drafting of all of this to date, tend to have either a very extensive or first use of English as their language, and that does mean that we may interpret words that could be more easily misinterpreted by someone who is using English as a second or third language, and may, for whatever reasons, not have quite the same vocabulary access that the drafters to date have. So if anything looks to be questionable in terms of could it be misinterpreted or interpreted in a different way, the best rule of thumb on writing of all of these sorts of things is to try and keep the language as simple as possible. So if we've fallen into a trap of using a word or a term that is not simple or is open to interpretation, or more worryingly, misinterpretation, anything that could possibly be confused and therefore possibly open up a loophole, then please highlight it and make the note. I just want to pause here and see if anybody's got any questions for our general modus operandi, in other words, the way in which we will be approaching this asynchronous work, because most of what you'll be doing will be in your own good time using your own access to the document. Happy to take any questions or comments.

Okay. Apparently we're incredibly clear. Good. All right then. Let's scroll down a little bit further. You'll also see some terms that we've got as defined terms here. For example, you'll see AT-LT. As it is written, they're the terms that we are picking up from the original documentation in the current Rules of Procedure. It may not be that that is the common use convention. So for example, it may very well be

that you will see written in shorthand, just 'ATLT', in other words, Asia-Pacific or APRALO leadership team, instead of the hyphenated version. That's okay. If you feel that causes confusability, however, let us know and we will need to address that in our drafting or in some sort of footnoting or explanatory text regarding that. And it may be that there are a number of terms which are in common use, which have a slight variation on what is written here. But what is written here as defined terms are as they have been inherited. In fact, in some cases, not only from our current Rules of Procedure, but from our original Rules of Procedure. All right, any questions on that? Nope. Okay. Thank you very much for outlining how you will be approaching your personal work here, [inaudible]. We appreciate that.

Now, if we scroll down a little bit-- No, actually, don't scroll down any further. Just draw attention to that last cell on the current page six. You will notice that we have, in fact, traditionally used the shorter version of the formal name. We tend to just call ourselves APRALO and refer to that as Asia-Pacific. In the memorandum, in the founding documents, in the material which caused our Regional At-Large Organization to be formed, we are, in fact, far more formally titled as Asian, Australasian and Pacific Islands Regional At-Large Organization. And if you have a problem with that, well, I'm not sure that there's much we can do about it. But it is one of those times when we use a shorthand convention which everybody understands, but in fact, the legal terminology is a little bit more complicated and certainly more detailed. Continue to do a quick scroll down now, and we'll see if we can find something that takes us outside of our...

Oh, just while we're here, thanks, Yesim, you'll notice if there's a blacked out part on the left, what it means is that there is no current text. So that is a totally new text being inserted into the document or the particular rule. So here you've got two examples. One where under APRALO member, we have a modification of the text, which is being redlined on the right-hand side. And also with meetings, we've got Zoom and similar conference tool as an explanatory now. But in the case of APRALO membership, that is a brand new piece of proposed text. Now, Justine's pointing out that you don't have to put up your hand or take a microphone approach to pose a question or make a comment. Certainly you can use chat during this call. Justine, is there anything else you want to bring forward in terms of general care and seating of the document at this stage?

JUSTINE CHEW:

Thanks, Cheryl. This is Justine. Well, it is a large document to begin with, but don't be afraid. I would appeal to everyone not to do anything for the left column, the column that's entitled text of the current ROP, because that's our benchmark. If you want to make a comment on anything, please do it on the proposed text of ROP, the middle column, the one that's headed proposed text of ROP, and we'll address them as we go along. I presume that everyone would have a different speed in terms of reviewing the document, and this is certainly something that I haven't discussed with Cheryl yet, but I presume that we are going to go section by section over the course of the next, however long this takes us, over each call, future calls and so forth. So I would advise folks to read the document in its current order, from top going down to bottom rather than bottom up, but you will find in some cases that when you

---

---

get to, say, a definition of a term, you may have to go to, say you go to section nine, for example, and then you come across a term that you're not familiar with, then you probably have to go back to section two or paragraph two to see what the defined term is. Okay, so you may need to do some jumping around, but for substantive review of the document or the proposed text, I would suggest strongly that you go from section A chronologically downwards.

Okay, and please also note that you'll see at the moment, there is a menu on the left-hand side of the screen that is perfect for your navigation. Okay, so you can, it helps you to jump around if you need to, so just use the menus. And under the notes, I have started putting in some remarks and I included Cheryl's notes about things that we may need to consider, that those are highlighted in green, light green in the note column. And for example, in the introduction where it says no change, the first two rows, I think I might delete that and just leave it blank. Somebody might decide that they want to comment on something, so I'm not going to be presumptuous to say that these two things have got no change and they should not have changed, right? So I'll go back and delete that in a moment. And essentially this is something that we sort of introduced in Istanbul if you were there at the General Assembly. And if you were not, then again, don't be afraid. We're happy to take you through things. And I guess it's for everyone to actually read the document and try to digest it. And as I said if you have comments, please post them in the document as a comment. If you have a question, please feel free to also post them in the comment or write to Cheryl and I or Cheryl or I, either one, it's fine. And we're happy

---

to address them by way of the calls, like now, as we're talking about it.  
Thanks for that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thanks, Justine. So just so you suggested that only one penholder should make comments or changes during our meeting. And you reinforced exactly what Justine was saying, which is we want everyone to just make things in comment mode or suggest mode. In fact, the changes, any change that is made to the proposed text before it becomes final text will absolutely be controlled by Justine and myself and staff. And if we select anyone else to be involved in that, that will be done so advisedly. But there is going to be very tight control on this document because there are so many interconnected and interdependent parts that a simple slip and moving of something from one section to another or deletion inadvertently of part of a sentence could have some extraordinarily complicated issues and would take some of us far too much of our time and energy to unravel. And the great risk is that because some of us have read this stuff so many ways so many times in the sequence over and over and over again, we may fill in with our memory something that is then in fact omitted in the text. And that could have very serious consequences, great effects later on.

So let's just take a moment to review. What we want you all to do is read, preferably from the top to the bottom, the right-hand column, the proposed text. Read it for understandability, clarity. Does it make sense to you? Is it plain and simple language? Is it possible to misinterpret, reinterpret, misunderstand? Or does something need additional or

---

annotated information associated with it to make it clearer or give greater depth and color to what the intent of the text is? You have on the left-hand side the rules of procedure text as they are currently written. We have several sections to work through. Some sections have less work involved in them than others. Some sections will have significantly large blocks of new or fresh text. And to some extent, that might be easier because we will be able to deal with those almost as standalone because they've literally been drafted, cross-checked, discussed, agreed with, and they're almost just being inserted back in as new text. The things, for example, that Justine went over in the Istanbul meeting with regards to certain aspects of the unaffiliated individual member, that sort of thing, is all new inserted text. So we'll be able to go through those in a section-by-section way. I don't mind, [inaudible], whether or not your computers are set up to US English or UK English, but I will assure you, don't tell us that there's a Z or where an S should be or an S where a Z should be. We're not interested in that. The final toilette, the final editing of the final text will take it into a standardized US English because that's what ICANN is. It is a US corporation. So we'll be using a US English, much to my computer's chagrin, I can assure you, because not only do I not speak US English, I barely speak any form of English because I'm an Australian. My computer, however, is set to Australian. And if I'd have to convince it to do something else, it would be then UK English. So don't worry about what your local settings are. That will be the sort of thing we deal with later on. The same thing goes if you use something like a Grammarly. Thank you very much for noting dotting of I's or crossing of T's. You can make a suggestion that we should run Grammarly or something similar over the whole document. And that's fine because that's exactly what we will do. But all of that

---

comes in to the final document when there is no left and right-hand columns, when it is all being formatted, and when all of the text is now agreed to final draft form. Then we'll make it all pretty. Then we'll run grammar checks, spell checks, and all of those sorts of niceties over. Okay? So all of those things come at the end. Don't be tempted to do them now unless you are so desperately keen to... If you can't function without things having their present participles in the proper place, then I suggest you make a local copy. And don't muck around with ours. Thank you very much, [inaudible]. Obviously the catch-up and contribution role you have, you will be invited to be a contributor to the document once staff set that up, and that'll happen, I believe, shortly after this call.

Now, I wouldn't mind if you just scroll down in sort of a reasonably continuous... We just want to get a little overview now, thanks, Yesim, at the types of things. So keep on going. Just keep on going. You see there's some larger blocks of text. Very large box there, the member in good standing, as we discussed, is a brand-new piece of defined terminology. Metrics has been bolstered up, as you can see. And we aren't even out of the... basically, the glorified glossary of the document. So if you take ourselves down now to the next section, we get to—"User menu" is the other thing. We've got our APRALO roles. Not a great deal has changed in all of those. And if you feel there should be some change, make a note, but we are not proposing other than a few minor tweaks in certain roles of certain classifications, such as individual member representative.

You'll see here some much more brightly colored text, some of which will be affecting the left-hand side. Do not be concerned about whether

---

---

it's blue or chartreuse or green or yellow highlights. That's a carryover from the other document, the Scratchpad document, where rather than side by side, we were using color coding to identify where we thought work needed to be done. That document still exists. Those colors still work in that document. So just see that in this document as a bit more of an artefact. Yeah, I do want you to scroll through the document just so people get to see some of the additional things. Although right now, we could just look at the... We're now finishing towards section A. Let's pop into the top of section B, which is here. Keep going down a little bit further. Keep going. Thank you very much. Keep scrolling.

Here you'll see some of these notes. Thank you. That's great. These notes are reminders from the other Scratchpad document. These are pieces of work which we still, we believe, need to address. So these will become agenda items in future meetings. As we move through the document, when we get to these sections, these are pieces of work which we will need to prepare for and present and discuss in our call. The other editing comments... Or should I say comments, so we can then look at editing, can be done asynchronously in your own time, although we'd like you to get started and keep going, because we will be going through those as we follow through all of the homework that's being done by each and every one of you. This is a reminder, if you want to get immediate, or, well, perhaps not immediate, that's an exaggeration, if you want to get relatively prompt attention from either Justine, myself, or staff, just do in your comment, after the comment, through the comment, even just with the comment, use the @ and name, and that will alert whosoever name you have identified after the @ that there is something in this document that needs their attention,

---

and that will mean that, for example, you can get comments from Justine and myself, or Amrita or Maureen, or someone who's had a longevity of experience with some of these things, and get a chat-style interaction going on in the comments, because you can reply to a comment, you can ask a question between commenters, you can get a whole lot of discourse going on within that comment tool, and that then means when we join together for a meeting, such as this one, that we will be looking through that, going, "Oh, he said this, she said that, do we all agree? Yes, no. Do we make some changes? Yes, no. Fine, let's move on, that's a new agreed text." Okay? And so we're assuming that we will have an acceleration up as we move forward through the drafting of this document. Is there any questions, issues, confusions, or concerns with what we've shared with you so far?

Okay. Well, is it boring you? Got you all into a somnambulant state, or we're being terribly clear. Let's hope it's the last one. Okay. Yes, if you would like to just pop through to the next few pages. You'll see a number of crossover pieces. Actually, I'm sorry, something just dawned on me. Scroll back up to the top of the page, I believe it's 31, 30, maybe it's 29. That must be 29. Yes, that's it. Thank you.

Now, there is a possibility. It hasn't been highlighted here, but those of you who are with us today could consider it. Where we have, for example, in Section 7.1, a reference to the member being in good standing. In good standing is, in fact, a newly identified or newly defined term. It may very well be that we might need to do something in our final documentation that we haven't done in our Rules of Procedure for our region to date. That is some hyperlinking cross-referencing. So it would mean that if we clicked on in good standing in that text under

---

---

Section 7.1, that it would take us back in the document to where that term in good standing is defined. I'm on the fence. It just strikes me as a possible useful tool. What would be very useful from all of you is for your opinions to be sought about whether or not that would be useful for, and remember, you've got to think about this from the new or average reader. Because we want to make it easy and as unconflicting as possible for someone who wishes to utilize these rules of procedure. Why? Because we, in fact, are all bound by them. And so if we make it difficult to understand them, then we're not doing any of our members a service. So think about that. That's just something that struck me in more recent times. Justine, is there anything else we want to bring forward at this point?

JUSTINE CHEW:

Maybe we want to set some targets for next week or when the next calls are going to take place for homework and stuff.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Yep. Well, certainly any of you who want to go tearing through the whole document and get it over and done with, fantastic. But you'll also be going through it with us as we go through in our more steady state flow. I think we should aim to have as much review done on all of Section A and as much of Section B as possible in preparation for our next two-three calls. Now, I'd like to then ask you, how frequently do you want to make these calls? Remembering that most of the work should actually be being done asynchronously on the document. So

---

these calls should be short and sweet. Fingers crossed. Amrita, have you got any particular preference on a weekly or fortnightly cadence?

AMRITA CHOUDHURY: Not really, Cheryl. I think the group needs to work on it and come back. So let the others say, "I am good with a weekly or a fortnightly also," so that we finish the task.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. I am aware that we're all volunteers and things happen. Certainly right now, I would prefer to be curled up in a small ball in a fetal position somewhere and not talking to any of you. But there you are. I'm here instead. That being said, recognizing that similar moods could take over each and every one of us, what would be a useful cadence to start with, I think, is let's get as much of the individual review done. And that's in section A and section B. And meet in, shall we say, 10 days' time. So not a full fortnight, just compress it slightly. At that point in time, we'll know how fast you are all... how far you've progressed. You might have all finished section C. You might have all finished the document totally. We do have a target, an aspirational target, of completing our work certainly by the end of the calendar year. But that will mean that things need to be in a final form by the early to mid-December, which means we don't get many meetings if we stick to that cadence. But I think what we might do is allow a little bit more time for you to ramp up. Meet in 10 days or 10 to 14 days, depending on where Yesim can fit things in amongst other meetings, and see how far along the comments will have gotten. Make sure you have at least, this is a

---

minimum requirement, the minimum amount of attention you need to spend is to have all of section A and all, if not most, of section B fully appraised and commented on. If you have gone further, excellent. If all of you have gone further, even better, because then we should be able to expedite all of this and take it to the next phase of work. With that, I'm pretty happy that that's a good objective. I think it allows us to then ramp up and perhaps have weekly or even a couple of twice in the one week just to finalize things. But it'll allow you all to pace yourselves, but at a good enough pace that this does not drag out. It has to be completed in probably a six-to-seven-week time frame to final or final draft documentation. The points have been made in chat, where as this meeting is recorded, which will expect anyone who has missed a meeting, that thank you, [inaudible], thank you for joining us. We look forward to your contributions. If anybody who has had to send an apology, that they listen to the call and they take the same actions and homework notes as everyone who has attended the call. And that means they do it as short a time after the call as is practical. So you all know what your homework is. You know you need to get started on it now. When Yesim releases the recording and the meeting notes, the chat, etc., from today's call, we will remind people, thank you, Yesim, that they need to review if they were not able to attend as soon as possible, because they have a relatively serious homework assignment/project that they need to get underway. And that we will also then have in that same note the proposed date. I'm assuming we're all happy with this time, but the proposed date for the next call, which will be in that 10 days-ish period. Right. Have I neglected to cover anything in this kick-off orientation to the work ahead of us? Justine, have I missed anything?

JUSTINE CHEW: I can't think of anything else, but maybe if anyone has questions?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, I'm not seeing any questions. So Justine and I, and Yesim and Gisella, all of whom are going to be the pointy end of the pen, we would very much like to thank you all for joining us and starting off on this thrill-packed and exciting adventure of finalizing the next version of the APRALO Rules of Procedure. It is worthy work, but it is work you all need to knuckle down and get onto. The faster and better you do your comments and your job, the quicker we will be at getting a final product of quality out for then legal review and adoption for action. So it's actually in place to start us off in 2024. With that, thank you one and all, and bye for now.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]