
Nathalie Peregrine: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is the joint ROP Working Group and Metrics Sub-Committee call on Monday 27, of August 2012. On the call today we have Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Alan Greenberg, Holly Raiche, Darlene Thompson, Yaovi Atohoun, Cintra Sooknanan, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Carlton Samuels, Dev Anand Teelucksingh and Sandra Hoferichter.

On the Spanish channel we have Sergio Salinas Porto and Eduardo Diaz. We have apologies from Maureen Hilyard, Alejandro Pisanty and Tijani Ben Jemaa. Our interpreters today are Veronica and David. From staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, Matt Ashtiani and myself Nathalie Peregrine. I'd like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes, and (inaudible). Thank you very much and over to you Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you Nathalie and I've noticed a couple of extra people have arrived so [Matt will] continue to track the people who come in. And we will also ensure that participants are properly updated. I believe Eduardo said he was in the English channel and I see he's listed as being in the Spanish channel, which he's perfectly welcome to be in the Spanish channel, but I believe at this stage we only have Sergio in the Spanish channel. But I trust that at least two other people will be joining Veronica and David in the Spanish channel with Sergio very shortly.

Okay, Holly we've just noted that it was your line that was causing the echo. I will ask everyone if at all possible to mute their speakers and indeed mute their phone if they're using the phone, when you're not speaking please. We do have Spanish interpretation difficult enough for the interpreters to manage some of this, particularly when we speak a little too soft, but with an echo it becomes all neigh possible. So Holly you've got your own ability to unmute with "star 7", and as you will be the first of the drafting teams to give us an update and I think

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.

we should call this “show and tell” today, which is something we certainly need to do from time to time.

I will remind you to unmute with the star 7 when I send over to you. What we’re doing today is bringing back together the threads that have been running off in their own direction for a short while in the different drafting teams, and of course, the Metrics Subcommittee. And what we’ll be doing at first is having a very brief couple of minutes update from each of the drafting teams. I think we have – well I haven’t seen Yrjo arrive yet – I believe we should have someone who holds the pen from each of the drafting teams in this meeting today because there are no apologies from all of them. And if not, we will manage somehow by feeling or foul.

What we will do after we have a quick review of where people are and what they’re up to is also look to whether or not we can agree on the very rough template that I put together, which is little more than a set up for what needs to be in each of the sections for the new rules of procedure can be put together. So that as things come to consensus the text can be dropped across into a master document; we’ll have a look at that.

And then what we’ll also do is do a bit of planning between now and Toronto, which is our drop dead date for substantive new rules of procedure to be together, and to go to the ALAC. When we’re looking at the template, I’ve just done a rough through. The template will have – each of the pen holders, in fact everyone will have access to edit it, but I would expect that the pen holders to go in and shift order around and make additions as their group voted on. And I will tell you now, I am pretty sure that I have not got the order correct in some of the sections. I literally just did a brain dump on a few things.

I would also think that the sections are far from complete. But things that I have remembered from the drafting team meetings as already having been brought up as agenda items I did try and catch up. Okay, with that said, what we have on your screen, and I think - can someone test that you all have the ability to scroll yourselves? Is it – scroll yourself or...

Alan Greenberg: We do.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Excellent. That's the main thing. If you – don't ignore the top part particularly if you're a pen holder, but there's a standard notes on style, etc that are in literally the same boxes. If you scroll down now with what is envisaged. And we will ask Holly now if you would star 7. And I'll notice that we've got Sylvia and Natalia in the Spanish channel, so welcome to both of you as well. Over to you Holly for a review on what the Definition and Structures Drafting Team has done. Star 7 to unmute Holly.

Holly Raiche: You can hear me now?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes we can.

Holly Raiche: Excellent. Okay, what I did was I looked at, Cheryl, your outline, but thought that I would – we do two things in our group; one is definitions. We've done a lot of work on definitions but I think we have to call a halt to it because at the last meeting we said what we really need to do is go through the document after there's agreement on some general rules and so forth and see what needs defining and what's not. So I'm not calling the definitions final by any means at all. So in terms of structure, what I've suggested, and it's on the Wiki, it starts with my general principles on drafting, because I think when I look at the rules I think they say much too much in terms of repeating themselves.

So I'm picking up first of all, Maureen and Rinalia and Alan's plea that we'll start with very plain simple English and say as much as is needed but no more, that the process I think to make life easy for all of us is to start with some agreed

principles, draft rules and then the definitions at the end. I think we need simple rules and then I'll go through what I think, this is just proposed and maybe different ways of organizing it. Cheryl has organized it differently in terms of teams, and that works very well too.

But I thought in terms of structure of the rules we start first of all with an introduction, and Rinalia's point was we need some kind of paragraph that is something we can put in to all of our documents and say "this is who we are". But an introduction that starts with a bit of background, a bit of who we are...

Okay, I'm still here.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

I take it this call is continuing and that someone in the wonderful world of staff will sort that out.

Holly Raiche:

Right. I think in reading the rules, a lot of them have bits and pieces about the mission and purpose of ICANN and the obligation of ICANN members to represent their organizations, to represent users at-large. I think we don't need all of that in the rules. We need that up front. And then only state the bits and pieces that are particularly relevant to a section that aren't covered by that. So that's still part of the introduction. I think we need relationship to the RALOs as part of the introduction. And then also in the introduction, "What is ICANN" and then say "ICANN Bylaws take precedence over everything".

I think that all works as part of an introduction. We don't have to say that anywhere else. My next suggestion then is just to have something about the ALAC itself; its composition, the qualification of its members, the selection, election voting.

[background conversation]

Holly Raiche: Oh great. I think in there we have the requirement, the minimum participation; those sorts of metrics that are in 21 might go up with that ALAC thing. And the code of conduct, which seems to be an add-on, but I think that should be part of a general description of ALAC itself and then the role and function. Tehn the Executive Committee, and Alan's done a lot of work, so it's basically just throwing together a lot of what Alan's said and then a lot of it's agreed. A section on the liaisons.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: (Inaudible) will be pleased to hear that.

Holly Raiche: I thought "he's done the work for us, why should we do it". Liaisons again, there's a fair bit of stuff that's been done. So pull that together so that there's a description of what the liaisons are, their qualifications, how they're selected and actually what they do. Another section for subcommittees, and then working groups. I think – I don't know if we put in there that we may actually co-op people to do things, but maybe that's the place for that.

And then a longer section on the procedures, and that's where you put things like ordinary – what's the meeting, the role of the Chair, quorum; those sorts of things. Really Robert's Rules of Order, the shortened version which Alan mentioned, would fit in there. And then the final sections would be the selection of a Board member; I can't think where that sits comfortably in anything else, but we have to put that there.

At the end you put the adoption and amendment of procedures, so that in fact we have a process for if we need to change the procedures we know how to do it. If we need to amend we know how to do it. And then at the end we have – I don't know whether to call it definition or glossary, probably a combination where we've got simple "what does an acronym mean" and a link, and then defined terms.

And things like – the two contentious things, the two things we’ll have to do is work through what consensus means; and there’s been a lot of discussion, so that will be something I think that’s for our drafting team to say “these are the alternatives for consensus, what do people want, we suggest X”. There’s also statement of interest; we need to flesh that out. And Alan had a form of words that I think works but we need to confirm that. So that’s where we’re up to.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay. I saw Alan’s hand up and as well I thought I saw Carlton’s hand up and then it disappeared. So Carlton, just before I go to Alan, and it’s Cheryl here for the transcript record and for the interpretation, do you want to speak also Carlton, or was that a...

Carlton Samuels: No, I’ll pass right now Cheryl, thanks.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay, thank you, over to you Alan.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you. Several things – in most documents of this sort, when one comes up with a capitalized term, a defined term, they’re defined in line and that is then echoed within the definition section. Is that the style that we’re going to be using here?

Holly Raiche: Alan we haven’t decided. I’m open to suggestions. I would think that if we have defined a term in the rules that we just provide a link or say “as defined in paragraph X1Z” or whatever.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah, I find having the definitions in one place, so when the terms is used later and you don't remember the definition, as often is the case, you can simply flip to the definitions and see it, not have to do multiple links. But what I was really asking is do we want to just define them in the definition section or do we want to define them in line also? And my preference is in line also, but I just want confirmation of that.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Alan, if I can just stop you at that point – this is Cheryl for the record – a lot of chat is coming across just on that. So what I might do Alan is ask do we need to tie a lot of this down today? So this will be a somewhat interrupted call because we want to put things to the whole group agreement wherever possible. So let's sort this definition and then (inaudible).

Alan Greenberg: Cheryl it's Alan – just to be clear with the comment, Darlene says she agrees with me, just define them, don't bother in line. That was not what I was saying, I was saying the opposite.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah, what I think we need to do is have a proper conversation just on this, because it is an important part of the structure.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. I do have several other items but we can do this one first if you like.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yeah. Let's do them in turn. And also what that will also do is throw our agenda out a little bit. I'm happy to do that because what Holly has reviewed is across many of the drafting teams' roles. So I think what we probably should do is do the definitions, see what your other points are Alan, and then probably go through the other drafting teams. Because I think coming back to the [BTSD's]

work, we probably should overlap that with the whole document approach as well. Yeah we might revisit some of what Holly said. So now let's get to how we're going to deal with the strict definitions, remembering that we will have the need for an extended...and the echo is really bad.

Alan Greenberg:

Yeah I can't hear you anymore.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Can we stop that line? I see that Heidi is working frantically with the team at Adigo to sort that out. Thank you Nathalie, well done. Okay, I think the echo is gone so it's just Cheryl and only in mono. And more than one of me is probably more than anyone should manage, let alone the drafting team or workgroup. So in single voice now, we will now go to the first point Alan raised which is about definitions etc. Olivier is becoming a difficulty but he'll catch up. He's god at catching up, even when his technology is challenging, and sometimes it seems to be very challenging. He even had a moment where his answering machine was talking to us earlier in the call.

A give in will be that there will be a glossary and an appendix. We will also make good use of only in that glossary defining terms which are specific to our need in the document, and linking to the online looking up of acronyms. There's an ICANN acronym buster which is a searchable database on acronyms and that's constantly kept up to date, up to its most current form. So when ICANN invents a new acronym, which I think happens every hour or so, the acronym is put into that system. So we would be silly to try and maintain a system which is already being maintained elsewhere in the world of ICANN.

So we'll link to that. And we will use in our glossary those terms which are used in our own rules. I think that's a good way of doing it. So the real debate comes down to do we also, as has happened in the chat and we'll open for a speaking line in a second so those putting your hands up, please do so.

Alan Greenberg: My hands up.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: We have the question of do we, as Alan is proposing, also define in line? And then it's also referred to in the glossary. But we only define in line the once, the first time it's used. And we've also got an alternative, which I'll put up for your consideration, that at the beginning as is sometimes a contract practice, a few key definitions can of course go in the preamble, which I'm sure all the lawyers amongst us will be familiar and comfortable with.

So there are a couple of ways of doing it. Let's look at how we do it because it does affect our form and style. Okay, so Alan is suggesting first in line, first instance is in line and we're talking here defined terms which are traditionally capitalized words, and a list of both those words and/or relevant acronyms which are used in our text also appear as an appendix. So who has something to say on all of that?

Alan Greenberg: I do, Alan.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Go ahead Alan. I'm almost tempted to put up a poll, but perhaps you'll be able to shake out the majority view.

Alan Greenberg: Okay. I would object strongly if we have neither in line definitions nor the definitions at the front of the document for the capitalized terms. I believe that someone who is reading this document with a moderate sense of memory should be able to read it without having to flip to the definition section. The definitions, whether they're at the front or the back are useful when you find a capitalized term in the middle of the document and you don't recall exactly what

it meant. So I think a definition section somewhere is essential, but I would really prefer to define them in line.

It's a long enough document that I think that makes some sense, and moreover definitions are also going to be local to the section that they're working with. And therefore someone who's using the rules in a reference mode, that is they're honing in to a particular part, if there is something that is local to that section that it be defined right there I think makes it more readable. And moreover, we can always pull out the definitions if we find it's unwieldy in a later draft. Going back and putting them in is a hellish thing to do, having done that before.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Okay Alan. Well you see a great big green tick up from me, but I now have Eduardo and then Sala. Go ahead Eduardo.

Eduardo Diaz:

Yes, the question – I'm not sure what "in line definition" means. But it definitely, I will recommend to help, like Alan said, an area where all the definitions are. If someone could explain what "in line definition" means it will help me understand the conversation, thank you.

Alan Greenberg:

Cheryl I can or you can.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Go ahead Alan.

Alan Greenberg:

In line is the first time the word is used it is defined, either in brackets or in some, depending on what the style is. So the first time a capitalized term, in our case "Members" might be a capitalized term or "Liaison" or "Vice-Chair" or whatever; the first time it is used in the document it is defined within the text.

And afterwards when it's used you only use the capitalized term presuming that someone remembers or can look it up somewhere.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Okay thank you Alan. Is that clear enough Eduardo or did you want to respond now you understand it?

Eduardo Diaz: I want to ask the definition of the abbreviation might be a long definition of what it means right?

Alan Greenberg: It's typically the definition of an abbreviation or the definition of a capitalized term. "Member" is a good example. It's a word that in English has meaning, but in the context of our rules of procedure we've defined "Member", capitalized M as one of the 15 people on the ALAC. And that's what I mean by the definition. It would also apply if we were coming up with acronyms or something like that; then it would similarly be defining what he acronym means.

Eduardo Diaz: Okay, to finish my intervention then, I like the idea of the first time it appears we define it there and then have a definition area somewhere. Because sometimes we find it and you forget what the definition is. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you Eduardo. Sala is next and just before we go to Sala, I think we need to be also aware – this is Cheryl for the transcript record by the way – aware of another small slit in the tree. And I'm very comfortable with Alan's proposal here and I do hope that we agree to this, which we will try to in a moment, after Sala and then whoever else wants to raise their hand depending on what she says. But we have some things which are what I will call primary or main

definitions, such as what is the ALAC. That's something Holly is suggesting is defined in a preamble.

But it would also be something that the first time it is written would be the "At-Large Advisory Committee" ALAC in brackets. So that's where Alan is talking about an opportunity for an in line definition. We also have just word definitions. For example, the first time that the terminology for "standing subcommittee" or "ad hoc committee" or "working group" or "drafting team" are used in the document, if indeed they are used in the document but they may be, we would write them in full wording and they would be things that would be capitalized and they would belong the first time defined in line and the primary glossary would also have those as well.

But we will come back after Sala speaks to Alan again, but also to decide whether or not we also have some terms which may be extremely important definitions pulled out separately in the first section as well. Over to you Sala. Star 7 to unmute Sala.

Sala Tamanikaiwaimaro: Hello, can you hear me now?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes we can.

Sala Tamanikaiwaimaro: Sala for the record. Good morning. Excellent. We've reviewed the existing definitions and based on the previous call what we had in mind is to receive any new definitions or new terms, which will be an ongoing process, but to inform other pen holders that we will be receiving at least new terms. And because we have a deadline we would like to essentially have a cutoff date in which these definitions have to be coming in. My second comment in relation to a definition in the definition section and in line, my first inclination would be to keep all the

definitions within the definition section, but on the rare occasion to insert them inline, because we would like to keep the document as [efficient] as possible.

Also, recognizing the possibilities of using end notes or footnotes, and because it's a working document we have a lot of time to play with it and to see how it looks and how it feels. My third comment is in relation to Alan's concept that Alan posted in relation to the previous call where he had identified, him along with Maureen, identified a few key concepts. I think the document has been circulated through the mailing list. Essentially things like precedence of rules, observers, absentee voting down to working group guidelines and that sort of thing. So those things we're making a note of and essentially they're additional – we'd like to keep it as simple as possible, and if there are terms that people would like to add then we can feel free to use the Wiki.

We'll put a dedicated spot for new definitions to come in and that sort of thing. But that's just a brief update. Thanks Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Thank you Sala. Cheryl for the record. I'll come back to you in a moment Alan. We do need to remember of course that the written forms for us is something that would be downloaded and printed as a pdf – downloaded as a pdf and printed from our Wiki spaces. So do try and think "web" when we're thinking form here. Over to you Alan.

Alan Greenberg:

Yeah, I didn't really need an additional comment. In relation to what you just last said, we do have to be careful that something which works well on the web, like either a hyperlink or hovering over something and the definition pops up, doesn't work well when that document is then printed. So, we need to think in both modes. I'm not quite sure how you do it; I suspect there's technology which will – I know there's technology where what you see on the web is not necessarily what you get when you print it. The format can be different, and we may need to think about something like that.

In terms of Sala's comment, just one, I guess, rebuttal in that although we want a short concise document, we want a readable document. And that's the reason I was pushing for defined terms. Now I'm not saying that the three paragraph definition of an ALAC member of all the qualities that we want in the person, but the fact that "Member" means one of the 15 people. That kind of definition I think is important to put in line. That was my only comment. My hand was up not to get in this sequence, but to go back to me at the end.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

That's okay. I know you have a standing point in the queue, you're only standing aside.

Alan Greenberg:

Would you prefer I put my hand down now so that you...?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

No, no you can leave it up if you want; that's not a problem. Sala I do see your hand is maintaining up, did you wish to respond or can I go to Cintra now? Okay, Cintra over to you.

Cintra Sooknanan:

Thank you so much Cheryl. With regards to – this is Cintra – on definitions I do believe that the definitions should flow within that specific section defined for that mission, but where a definition is only to be used within a particular section then it should be defined locally. So the definition section should have global definitions for where that term is used throughout the document, but where the term is just used as a particular clause, then it's okay to define it in line. That's my feelings. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Thank you very much Cintra. And what I'm going to do now – this is Cheryl for the transcript record – I'd like to just see that we do all have a gentle

agreement on this point. We had Rudi also mention in the chat that what we're struggling to use as technical terminology is "footnote alike". And what I might do is ask probably Matt, it will be a staff AI, if we can come back and distribute to all the drafting teams but particularly make sure it's obvious as a piece of advice on the template page how we are going to be dealing with the technology, whether we're doing it in two forms or using the footnote alikes. But let's see where we are up to.

What I have heard – oops I see Holly's hand up. I'll just do what I've heard so far and then go to you Holly, if you don't mind, is that we will be doing approach where all primary definitions have a repository within the definition part one section, be it in preamble or a cutout; I'm not so clear that it's where they will primarily list. They are the lead definitions, such as "ALAC means the At-Large Advisory Committee of the ICANN" blah, blah, blah. And that we will also have an appendix, which will pick up not only the defined terms in our document, but will also be a reference for any acronyms we use elsewhere, which will also be defined within those sections that are relevant. They're what I would call secondary acronyms that tend to be secondary definitions.

And that we will be using in line alternating to footnote, depending on what works best for the technology as it works on the web, that we can have a holder and definition come up. Then the analogous would be the footnote alike, in other words, on a printed form it would be a footnote. So if you hover over a footnote numeration number one on the web it will be a pop up. If you have that same page printed you would have a traditional footnote. But staff will get back to us on how that magic will be happening and work with the ALAC and the ICANN Wiki web spaces.

Now before I just call for a quick polling on this, let's just see what Holly needs to say on this, and then we'll ask if there's any dissenters from that. Go ahead Holly.

Holly Raiche:

Yeah I'm picking up on what some people have said in the chat. A lot of people would like it in one place. I think there's value in having every term that's used, that is defined in one place in the definition, but I think Alan has it right. You simply say "ALAC is defined by 15 Members" or whatever, a very short phrase, and then possibly a reference to where the discussion is. And that would satisfy the need for having to go to one place for a definition, but maybe a reference to a lot further discussion if people want to make that leap.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Yes okay, I think that fits with the sentiment I'm hearing Holly, for certain. This is Cheryl for the record again. We're about to go fire a poll back to you Alan about it was not a Freudian slip when I typed into the chat that readability "id" the main drive at all time. It should be readability "is" the main driver at all times. And yes, we'll look at the style shape, etc. Alan you might want to have a small chat with staff, that's if the AI from the staff goes via the pen holders before it goes out to the rest of us that that might be a good thing. So Olivier, myself and the pen holders do a quick email run around on what the style shapes or mechanisms are going to be for our templating.

That's before we publish, which will happen sometime in the next week or ten days. Thank you. Okay, so if anyone disagrees with what seems to be the sentiment of how we are going to approach the wonderful world of definitions, which in my experience is almost as time consuming as getting the colors and the logo organized for an organization usually, so you've done very well for the amount of time we spent on today's call to get at least this far. If you dissent from what is in the transcript record now a way forward, make your thoughts known now.

And if you don't make your thoughts known now then we have a consensus position and this is how we will proceed. I'm seeing no dissent which is something that I rather like. I'm hearing no dissent which is something I rather like. So we are agreed – done, sold! Heidi, I think Holly was fairly clear that Holly was happy to, with the drafting team that she and Sala and Natalia are

running, I think they're happy to have links to the Bylaws, the ICANN Bylaws rather than necessarily reiterate them. So looking at the Action Item there, probably think along those lines. So it would be a linking to what are existing sets of mass documents rather than to repeat them. We don't want the world's longest set of rules either.

Okay, Alan, over to you again. Alan, surely you're not muted.

Alan Greenberg:

No I'm not. Okay. I may be. The second item I think does not need much discussion because I wrote it in my list of speaking items before Holly finished, and she covered, I think she covered it by the end. The comment was in the outline that's on the screen right now there's a whole big part saying "this section should also outline at least", and then it goes on to talk about the minimum qualities and minimum specifications and qualities we expect of various people.

I have no problem with this working group being responsible for putting those in an understandable form, but my understanding was that the specifications for that is coming out of the Duties Working Group. I think Holly confirmed that, but that was just a point I wanted to make. "Yep" came from Holly, then we don't need to talk about it further. Okay, my last item is a very small one, and it's a personal one.

Holly made reference to the fact that we need to put the Code of Conduct in somewhere. I find the current Code of Conduct inappropriate, I guess is the most gentle term. It's talking about things which are all indubitably true, but I don't believe they belong they belong in our rules of procedure. Don't send spam. Don't violate the privacy of others. Don't stalk people. Don't harass people. These are all things which perhaps need to be said somewhere, and maybe we want a "how to be nice to people you're working with" section somewhere in our documentation, but I don't believe it fits in the rules of conduct. I find it demeaning.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Thank you Alan. And if I may – it's Cheryl for the record – pop in my own personal “hey yes please”, even though I was one of the people who put it in the existing rules. It was much more required then. With a new format, and with the format that isn't tied to the ghastliness of the UNGA terminology, we can also, in that same style, system as we have decided for our definitions throughout our document, also make good use of putting in a fixed link to the rules, which go to a dynamic document, such as a Code of Conduct or a behavioral list documentation.

So if behavioral lists changes your rules do not need to. It will also be, the link stays static but the dynamic is easy to handle. So, we certainly need a whole lot of things that are, I would call, ancillary or adjunct documentation. And what we will have to do is make a note, as any of those links are formed, or need for any of those links are formed in the rules, we need to make a note so that staff and all current and future staff are aware that the link in our document doesn't change. So a master page in the Wiki will need to be attached to any of those links, and there has to be whatever system they use – great big skull and crossbones on it somewhere that says “Don't go changing the name of this page”, otherwise our hyperlinks will end up broken.

Alan Greenberg:

Well Cheryl, that last point is well taken, but in the general case you have to assume that five years from now any link will not work. And therefore we want to make sure that we're preserving documents only for history that are usable in the future. So overuse of hyperlinks, I think, end up destroying the concept. If I may share one more thing regarding to the rules, the Code of Conduct; I once read, and this is supposed to be humorous but it's not, that a policy is something that is written to address a one-time occurrence which is not mentioned in the policy.

The Code of Conduct was written to fix some people who clearly did not know how to play properly. And I understand that. And there will be again some

people who don't know how to play properly, but we don't need to change the rules to do that. We need some private counseling. And perhaps the general set of rules, and if I remember correctly, ICANN and the ombudsmen published a similar set of rules to address a similar problem of someone misbehaving. Let's assume we're grownups and address this issue where we're not on a one by one case.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Thanks Alan and in fact, what we can do, and we do elsewhere in our other work, we have formally adopted, ALAC has formally adopted the expectations to operate under those ombudsmen rules. We can just refer to them. But coming to a point on hyperlinks, if you link to a page in our Wiki, recognizing that as you were saying, in five years' time we may not be using Wiki's anyway...

Alan Greenberg:

Or not that Wiki.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

What is on that page as you'll see the way that staff has been doing documents, is a image of a externally linked printable form document. You can scroll through it on the page, but it's a document that is archiveable in place, space and time for want of a better word. So we don't have the businesses of webpages changing and documentation being lost. There is a digital equivalent to a hard copy, which doesn't get lost, so we should be able to avoid the disasters that happened historically.

Terrific. What I'd like to do now, if we're all agreed on that, and I believe we are and we'll be having a whole lot more of those external links come together, and what I might do is ask each of the drafting teams where you feel the need to either have a document created, or to link to an external document, that you put that at the moment in perhaps just the comment section, unless Matt creates a

page for us. Right now just make sure we capture it on the template page so that we don't miss any of them when we're putting the whole thing together.

And yes Natalia exactly, these things like Code of Conduct documentation are required, but they don't need to be text in the rules. They need to be referred to in the rules of procedure, as you say, and then the external document, which people are indeed bound to as you state, would be – it's an expectation that you follow them, but if those documents change then the expectations on members of the ALAC, or later on any other people who do rules in similar lines would be the same as well. So that's important.

Let's move on now to our next team, and Matt if you could bring up the sandbox for Duties and Metrics and Holly is it you or who...

Alan Greenberg:

Neither of us have prepared. It's me and Eduardo. I can start for a couple of minutes. I don't think we have an awful lot to say, and Eduardo can fill in what I miss or vice versa.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

You can do a tag team as you so desire. I'll hand over to you first Alan. And Matt, if you could switch out the screen, please. Thank you Heidi for the link. Those of you who can link, please do so until Matt makes the...Sala's point on work plans – the DTST has gone on and done a work plan. We'll cover that off at the section of the agenda which looks at our work between now and Toronto. I'm not aware that any other drafting team has felt the need or inclination to do a work plan in the same way as the DSDT has, but we'll refer to that and how it may or may not be synchronized when we get to that section. Okay, over to you Alan.

Alan Greenberg:

Alright, thank you. What we've been doing certainly in the last meeting, you may remember that roundabout somewhere in Prague I sent out an analysis of

what rules were in the current procedure about duties, prerequisites and obligations of the various members, sorry not members, ALAC members, Liaisons, officers and so on and so forth. That document had a very large number of questions in it, that is things that I didn't feel it was appropriate for me to either decide on or I simply didn't have a clue as to which way we should go.

And at the last meeting we started going through that document, we made it about half way through. It was, as these meetings go, exceedingly productive. The intent is to continue with that and hopefully finish it at this meeting, at which point we will have a good draft of all of the obligations, expectations and things like that of the various people. The part we haven't done yet, and will be the difficult part, is to try to then figure out which of those we can put metrics on and what those metrics should be exactly.

But I think we're making good headway, better than I actually had hoped, so I'm happy with where we are.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Good excellent. Eduardo, any points?

Eduardo Diaz:

No. Alan covered the whole thing. (Inaudible).

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Okay, terrific. Just before the question I note with some concern that the sandbox that you've put up Matt doesn't even have a link to the document that Alan was referring to. And so it would be good to not only have that link in that space, but also a link across to the outcomes from the meeting, which as Alan quite rightly reported to us has gone through a fair whack of that as well. And Matt, if you ask Alan to send you those documents one more time, I don't know whether he will virtually hit you, but I will.

Alan Greenberg: I will not send them to anyone. That sandbox was created today. I didn't know it was going to be there. And the page that presumably links to it that is the workgroup working page, or the design team working page or whatever we are has all the links on it and all of the stuff on it. So I take no responsibility for a new page being created that has no links on it.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I know. I was not asking you to fix the sandbox. I was asking Matt to fix the sandbox. But the sandboxes are there for all the drafting teams and there seem to be so many interesting and inventive ways of doing things, we thought it was good if we at least had a repository for them. Any questions to Alan and Eduardo?

Alan Greenberg: Well, may I suggest...Yes, may I suggest that since we hadn't had a sandbox until an hour ago or something like that, the page that we've been using is the drafting team page. So if we want to have a thing called a sandbox maybe we need to move everything over including all the comments.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That's exactly what I was asking Matt to do.

Alan Greenberg: And I don't know if that's impossible or not.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That's fine. That magic will happen. But yeah, we'll beat people up with a brown boot later for not bringing the pen holders in on that. And two out of the four drafting teams have been using sandboxes, so it's silly to not have everyone have one. Okay, any questions for Alan and Eduardo's drafting team. Sala

what do you mean; “our repository is the rules and references section”? Go ahead Sala.

Sala Tamanikaiwaimaro: Can you hear me?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes we can.

Alan Greenberg: Now we can't.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: You may have unmuted and muted again. Try again Sala.

Sala Tamanikaiwaimaro: Hello Sala for the record. Thank you Alan for the update. Just a quick mention, you'd be aware that for the DSDT the rules and references section is some sort of repository. The sandbox is where we actually do our work. But the question I have for the Metrics team would be, and I thank you Alan and Maureen who's not present but who sent in her feedback, in terms of the core concepts which you've identified that the DSDT, that the potential areas of overlap. So one of the things I suppose we would be interested in from a DSDT standpoint would be, aside from the concepts, but if you were able to flesh out – I'm not sure whether we were doing meetings or whether you're doing meetings for instance.

For example whether it's [that sort of thing], if those sorts of things are going to affect the definition and the actual structure. And we note in congratulation the elaborate work that's done already in terms of the spreadsheet. The metrics spreadsheet which consolidates comments from the entire metrics team, and that's pretty useful, but for us to complete our task, perhaps aside from identifying concepts, which you've done and posted on the Wiki, but if you

could flesh out at least general headers perhaps. And that would sort of help us tighten and identify which areas that we should actually touch.

And noting also that there are things that we may have to park until you complete, and then we'll get back to polishing. Thanks. That was all. Thanks Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

And thank you. And Alan, Holly did respond in line in the chat as well. Perhaps we could leave a fulsome answer for Sala until we hear from the rest of the drafting teams because otherwise she'll ask the same question of every one of the other drafting teams and others, but also have a look at the template because I think the discussion might happen there. So Alan, a brief response if you like.

Alan Greenberg:

Yeah, very brief. As I was trying to say, but maybe not well enough, the group has worked halfway through the list of responsibilities. I hope the next meeting, which I guess will be next week, we'll finish that list. A week or so later we'll have a draft in bullet form the responsibilities and key prerequisites and things like that of all of the main categories of people. At that point, we still may be adding things to it, because once we have that draft we're going to look at it and say is there anything boldly missing. But as soon as we have that, I think we'll also toss that over to the definitions group so they have an idea where we're going.

That's certainly my plan. In terms of meetings, meeting is being done by another group.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Yep. And we'll come back to this if we can – sorry for the noise in my line. I apologize if that was deafening anyone. What I thought we discussed at least briefly at the beginning of the call is that there will be a number of things that

each individual drafting team will come up with and will have defined. And that that will be the repository will be up in the section that the DSDT is responsible for, but they're not responsible for the creation of those definitions. I think that was the way we were heading. Okay, any other questions for Duties and Metrics; where metrics is actually slightly standalone. IF not, let's go to Meetings, administrivia. Who's got the pen on that?

Alan Greenberg: I think Maureen and I do. This is Alan speaking.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well seeing as Maureen's an apology, it's over to you Alan.

Alan Greenberg: I think we have completed the section, the debate on the equivalent of the repository rules, Robert's Rules or whatever, and decided that tentatively we will be using Robert's Rules, but it will be a reference that we can change to plug in something else if necessary. We have also, I think, generally agreed that given the consensus mode of operation of the ALAC we very rarely resort to any of the rules that are within Robert's or anybody else's set of rules of procedure. And even rarer do we have to delve into the fine print of them.

So, our intent, I believe, is to put the generic way that we operate most of the time, in the rules of procedures, in the meeting rules as it were, but reference to other things when necessary. And I think we have consensus, but I'm not sure we've discussed it fully, of do we try to make sure we have rules for everything or give some discretion to the Chair when necessary. Clearly there are things in any formal set of rules, which we do not follow on a regular basis. Now I was amazed to find out Robert's Rules talk about you must stand before making a motion and things like that, and clearly that's not the mode we operate in.

Teleconferences do not fit with those sets of rules very well. So we will be outlining how we're going to work in a general way. We haven't gone through

the process of doing that yet, but I think it's going to come out pretty quickly from that process. I'm not sure what else we have. One of the things that it's not clear where it's decided is the whole concept of proxies and alternates and things like that. There's been a fair amount of discussion in various places. I can live with it being assigned to Meetings and Administration. I think it also could find a home in Definition and Structure, as a place to decide do we want the concept of proxies; do we want the concept of replacement people.

And I think there are some Bylaw implications that we have to be careful about with that, but I'm not sure where we should have that discussion and that's something that I think this group needs to verify. It's a crucial discussion we need to have.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

It is and in fact – this is Cheryl for the transcript record now – when you look at the master template I've proposed for you it does currently sit as a proposal under your drafting team space. But let's talk about that when we get to have a quick look at that. Any other questions for Alan? I see Sala, go ahead Sala.

Sala Tamanikaiwaimaro:

Hello, Sala here. Good morning again. In relation to the concept like a vote or proxy or that sort of thing, this is the reason why I had raised the meetings, because it's not until the Meetings Draft Team elaborately drafts the different types of meeting, whether it's an ALAC face to face meeting or whether it's an online working meeting and that sort of thing. Different rules will be at play, like setting of the agenda. And so, until that happens we can't really flesh it out. But for now, as Alan very correctly raised, there are terms that we can draw from the current Robert's Rules, which will of course need tweaking, and that sort of thing.

But that's not to stop us from going forward. But I think the real driver in terms of fleshing out some of the core concepts will be coming out of the Meeting and

Administration sandbox. I'm not sure who is definitely handling that. Thanks Cheryl.

Alan Greenberg:

Yeah and just as a follow-on Cheryl; it's Alan speaking. I said under the Duties and Metrics drafting team that I was very pleased with the progress. I'm not nearly as pleased with the progress in Meetings and Administration because we spent what I consider far more time than we should have or was needed on the issue of backup rules of procedure, you know Robert's or whatever. But we're over that now and I think we can start moving through the other topics pretty quickly. That's my hope. And we now have Maureen along with the group and I think that will force progress at this point.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

It makes a big difference there. Thank you Alan. It's Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. And the only reason Maureen of course isn't standing by Alan's side today at this meeting is that there is a huge meeting of administrative importance in the Cook Islands for Pacific leaders at the moment. And as an employee of a governmental instrumentality here, of there I should say, she's kind of busy this week, like 24 by 7 busy this week. We not only note Maureen's apology but probably empathize with her that she's juggling a whole lot of very interesting characters and responsibilities in their tiny little island.

Anyway, you can all Google what's going on in the Cook Islands if you're fascinated with that. Finally we have the part two of the third section, which is Elections, Selections and Appointments, and I am going to continually say appointments, selections and elections because that's the order in which we should be doing things, just to try and revert the focus on electoral processes, which are almost last resort, or ought to be a last resort in a consensus based organization.

I don't think we have Yrjo on the call do we? No, we don't. And Yaovi has only just become a pen holder in this group, but he had to leave the call earlier.

So Alan, you've done such a wonderful job today, you're also in that group only as a worker bee, but do you want to give a quick update on where we are there? I've often said you should just write the rules of course Alan.

Alan Greenberg: I'm not sure I remember to be quite honest. I know we have not got to the point where we're actually starting to come out with a formal output, and I missed the first meeting of that group, so I'm not sure I'm really in a position to tell you where we are. I should remember but I don't. I will have an editorial comment though, Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Please go ahead.

Alan Greenberg: Well, if you're going to change it to selections, elections and appointments and that's a change right...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That's what I'm pushing.

Alan Greenberg: Coming up with an acronym that's therefore a SEA change. SEA, for those who don't do acronyms well.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Alan can I just say I'm all for the SEA change. And that can be taken two ways.

Alan Greenberg: For those who are not English speakers Google it, it does have a very specific meaning.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

And yes, as a member of that group I am trying to turn it on a peg so that we think first of selection – they're all appointments, so that's sort of a master word. We appoint people. We appoint people to the ALAC. We appoint people as a Chair of the ALAC. We will be appointing people to various roles within the ALAC. Some of those things we also make selections. We might select people in various ways, one of the ways we can select people is an electoral process. And in fact we would, to answer one of Holly's questions, the selection, and it is a selection because that's what it says in the Bylaws it is, of the person to occupy seat 15 in the ICANN Board, fits in this section as well.

Okay. So to that end, we have I think gone through all of the quick reports, metrics is also working. We haven't had a look at the template. So if I could indulge you for just five minutes, I would very much like you to at least eyeball the template. And then the pen holders in teams can sift and sort and change and reorder to their hearts content. So if we could pull up the template, the proposed template, please Matt. And that means it will be in front of you in a moment Sala but it's linked to the agenda as a hyperlink to the new workspace that's dedicated to it.

We've skipped over metrics. Metrics is in a group that's gone for some time. I think most of you are up to date where they are and [a baseline to have a measurable baseline] to link with the expectations that will be with the Duties and Metrics team. Okay Matt, are we getting that template up? Okay, basically what this is, is going to be the place where each of the drafting teams can weave together in some form of rough skeleton whatever text they have to come to consensus on in their drafting team. So what we're doing with this template is little more than a proper order of things. It will also help the teams understand who's actually got whichever to be looking at.

That doesn't mean that things, for example, that are definition in the drafting team space don't also belong in how the definitions group is organizing things. They do. But it does mean that the question of who's going to be saying what

might be a little clearer to everybody. It also should be noted – is it coming up or not because I'm not seeing it on my screen.

Speaker: No, I'm not either.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well I'm going to be on leaving and having lunch before this thing loads, which is...

[background conversation]

Alan Greenberg: It's Alan Cheryl. I just found the link in the agenda which was not by the way on our calendar so it was hard to find. This page, the template page seems to be hung off of the DSDT workspace. I'm not quite sure why but it is.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well it shouldn't be and Matt will fix that I can assure you, or hang it off everyone's space so everyone's space will be linked to it.

Alan Greenberg: Well maybe it is, but that's what Constance tells me.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: It's certainly not something for DSDT, it should be stand alone. And in fact, what it is, is where US pen holders, with the assistance of staff, will be putting in a final text. So by the time we get to this next joint meeting, which will happen I think 7 – 10 days before Toronto, that we have all of your agreed at that point text in this repository. We can pretty it up after that. But it also

makes sure that if pen holders want to change the order of something, they change the order of it in the template, and whoever's in their own workspaces, if they want to add something they add it to the template as well as in the workspaces.

So, let's see what Matt's managed to get up. Matt has managed to get up a totally unrelated and irrelevant link. I'm going to give up, scream quietly into the black space of the ether and....

Alan Greenberg:

Well I'm going to put the link in.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

...make changes very quickly, otherwise we're going to draw this to a close anyway. The link is there. I'd like you to – thank you Alan. I'd like you – thank you Alan that's why the link is there. I'd like all of the pen holders and all of the draft team members to have a thoroughly good look at that to propose changes in order and additions. There's a few things there where it says the list continues. We need to do that listing. There might be things which as a group you will totally disagree on the order of, but you know, ALAC mechanisms, committees and workgroups should be the first things in definitions and structure. And if you think so, tell the DTST that and if they agree then they may agree to shift it.

But please do not shift order or add to someone else's clean space. But feel free to propose to those things if you think something is in the wrong order or something is missing. I can guarantee to you that things will be missing, this is just a skeleton that you can now start hanging things off. But if you start looking we've got basically pretty much what I am aware of DTST is doing. In other words, what is the ALAC; what are its remits, roles and bylaws; what are members and various structures, etc. All of these things need fleshing out. That will make a definition of what the ALAC is, and maybe going into some secondary tertiary roles.

They'll define what the ALAC mechanisms are, but not necessarily go into detail. Certainly not how they work. They belong in these sections. And obviously there's the [CX and DX] which is to indicate any other numbers that you think is relevant in your section. If you have a quick scan through in Duties and Metrics, I hope I've kind of got things in a sensible order. But definitely that's where I thought things like proxies would be – sorry not Duties and Metrics – that's where we should be looking at many of the appointments, while the definitions may define what a liaison is it's in member duties and metrics that we probably will be going into details on what is some of the external appointments.

Moving down to C, which is your Meetings and Admin. That's where I'm currently suggesting the matters of quorum and the role of the Chair be defined. And instead of C1 and C2, unfortunately I probably was in need of either caffeine or alcohol, I left it still as C1 – it should just be section C. Staff set it up as section C1 and C2. I decided the third part could actually be the third section and it will be part three, section C1 and D. So write through C1 and D2 as I changed the C in the second section and forgot to change the numeral. So I'll go in and edit that when we finish this call.

So you can kind of play with it and make as many changes – Holly's already gone into it – Yay team! Go girl! And make your comments but feel free if it is your own drafting team to change your section of that template. Okay. I'm going to leave the pen holders to decide how they are going to make the nexus between their own Wiki spaces and comments. What I'm talking about is the template needs to be in sync with whatever goes on in your own place. How that's done I care very little. That it's done I care a great deal. Alan, over to you for what I hope is final words. And if staff could line up our next date for our meeting please.

Alan Greenberg:

Alright thank you. I have a plea that one of the things that invariably is going to come up is what numbering scheme do we use. I would suggest that each

drafting team right now pick something that makes sense for them, and we will do whatever is necessary to unify them at the end. It's far easier to make that decision once we see what we're working with then to try to make arbitrary decisions of whether we use section C, section one, section Roman numeral one or one point one point three, one point five point six or whatever. There's all sorts of forms. Let's not spend a lot of time debating it as we are sometimes wont to do. If it's something that makes sense for each group...

[background conversation]

Alan Greenberg:

And then we'll unify at the end as necessary.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Yes, we've got three parts. They're basically to be called A, B, C. I changed it to A, B, C and D because I felt like it. But if you've got a different numbering system in your own drafting team, then just put that in brackets or supersede it. But we will be running it in three primary parts with the third part in two sections; that we have already decided. How that numbering is going to happen yes, we can deal with later. The other thing is if you just make sure that if you're not keeping things in sync, at least copy to staff to say at the end of each of your meetings we need to update the template with this, this and this. At least that will put us in synch because it will be the template that we are working on in Toronto.

And it will be the template we will be discussing at what will be the final group of the whole meeting, which will be at – Heidi, thank you very much, has to put together on the 17th of September. So between now and the 17th of September each of the drafting teams need to, in whatever way they want, make sure that when we all look at this template is says complete as it can be by then. Alright? Sala, if you want to make a [O] for definitions, Holly you and Natalia just do it. As long as it sits under section A I don't care. Alan, over to you.

Holly Raiche: Okay.

Alan Greenberg: Yeah one more thought. One of the things that Wiki's do not do well is allow people to easily look at changes. The Wiki has an ability to go back and look at what changed, but it's not nearly as clear as a marked up Word document for instance. So again, each group is going to have to think about how do they get closure on what they're doing as changes are made. And as un-Wiki as it is, Word documents may be the way to go, but there may be other methodology. But think about it because if you don't make it easy for people you're not going to get all the people on your team commenting and you're not going to get the full benefit of all the people unless you make it relatively easy for them to participate.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Absolutely Alan. But what I need to make really clear is, until your drafting team has come to consensus, in other words it's ready to agree, it's said "this is what we're going to say", it doesn't go into the template.

Alan Greenberg: Correct. That's my understanding.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: That's the main rule. But you've got between now and the 17th of September, I look forward to seeing all the changes on the template. Can I make a plea to each and every one of you who are making changes to the Wiki pages, and this includes the staff, there is a little tick box at the bottom of a Wiki page when you go into edit. It says, and it will be by default "ticked" to say "notify watchers". Only notify the watchers when a substantive change has happened. I really

don't care to get 66 emails on every single line by line change that each of you make.

Alan Greenberg: Cheryl, it's Alan.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And I watch every single one of your pages. So just leave it ticked if it's substantive.

Alan Greenberg: Cheryl I agree with that request, but there's something people need to remember. When you get the notifications, if you're watching a page, the email shows what changed. But if you follow Cheryl's advice that email which you'll finally get will only show a minor trivial change which was the final typo you fixed. You actually have to go to the Wiki page to see what the content is at that point. So the content of the Wiki, of the watching emails is not as useful at that point, but it's not as annoying either as getting 60 emails. So it's a tradeoff.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Yes, but if you've made a major change, for example, if you've put in a new slab of text then leave the box ticked. If you've made a minor change, as Alan says typos or moving from the top section to the bottom, I mean you sure all be able to work out was is a substantive change or not. If it's a substantive change then leave it ticked and everyone will be notified.

Alan Greenberg: Yep. Cheryl, the problem with that, if you do it in that order, is people will then immediately go look at your rough text, which has all the typos in it and you didn't fix yet, and then won't look at the corrections. The alternative is to leave everything ticked until the last one, but there's a downside to that too. So people will have to decide how to...

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: There certainly is. However, it's an annoyance. It's not a die in the ditch thing. And regarding your question for transparency, Sala, you just go to the "show changes" button on any page and you can go back from the very first revision to the most recent. So we never lose transparency by not having notifications. But we would however have notifications as a request on anything substantive.

Alright, we're going to meet on the 17th. You've got a lot of drafting team meeting between now and then. And please keep the template, your own space, matched with your space on the template.

Alan Greenberg: Cheryl, one question. Is there any reason why we can't have drafting team meetings every two weeks instead of every three?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: If you want to have then every third day that's fine as well. But that's up to the pen holders on the tem to agree on, and the staff to facilitate.

Alan Greenberg: I'm just not sure there's enough three weeks between now and Toronto.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: And neither am I anymore. Some of these drafting teams I think are learning how to swim. Some of them are wading and some of them are drowning. And we all need to finish the race by Toronto.

Alan Greenberg: Thank you Cheryl.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Okay? Thank you one and all. We now know what each of us are doing and we have a place to keep each other informed. Thank you all one and all. Thank you for the work you're doing. And I know some of you are on all of the teams and you're all very well aware that it's a huge amount happening. Bye for now.

[End of Transcript]