

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, Gisella, let's go for it.

GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you, Cheryl. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone. On today's Definitions Structure Drafting Team call on Tuesday the 29th of January at 17:00 UTC we have Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Holly Raiche, Yaovi Atohou, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Carlton Samuels, Eduardo Diaz, Alan Greenberg, Dev Anand Teelucksingh.

From staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco and myself, Gisella Gruber. Apologies noted from Darlene Thompson, Natalia Enciso, Sandra Hoferichter and Tijani Ben Jemaa. I hope I haven't left anyone off the roll call, and if I could please remind everyone to state their names when speaking for transcript purposes. Also a transcript will be made available within the next 48 hours of this call. Thank you, over to you, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much, this is Cheryl for the transcript record and Holly is the primary penholder here today but I've just asked her for permission to muscle in onto the intro and the care and feeding of this call. Heidi has – thank you very much, Heidi – popped together a nice little skeletal agenda and that's really all that this meeting needs. But it would be appropriate I think at this stage for us to all, because what we have here is a gathering which includes the primary penholders or one or more of

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.

the primary penholders from all of the other drafting teams, an agreement on a mechanism and a way forward for today.

So let's have a quick run through the agenda with some annotations from me and see if we can all agree that this is how we will go. We've just done roll call – that one was easy. Welcome, introduction, purpose of the call – all mine at the moment but we'll have a talk about it in a second. Sandbox current, recognizing that the current sandbox text has a lot more than we've probably been wanting to need and it has been described as what's called a decentralized approach – in other words, it's a catchall at the moment for all sorts of things and lots and lots of good comments.

We probably should do a quick run through there and do "In/out, yes/no, or this needs to be worked on more." Hopefully that's something that will not take more than the allocated time and if it does then we're spending far too much time into the small [Trudeau-ier poems] there. I think we need to have a high-level run through of that sandbox material, not a discussion of this word versus that.

We'll pop over to the master template which yes, we've also recognized is not totally up to date; but what it will do is just refresh us onto any ways of going through and catching any definitions that need to be picked up and put into Section I. Any AIs we'll review and then we'll sort of what happens next, and I suspect what happens next will be at least one of the primary penholders from each of the drafting teams working with Holly and myself and staff obviously to ensure that we have missed as few as possible definitions.

Okay, I saw Holly wave her hand during that preamble so Holly, over to you and then we'll have a call for a discussion.

HOLLY RAICHE:

I didn't wave my hand; I was just actually reviewing where we were up to. And at this stage in the middle... Oh yeah, full screen is what I want, okay. Having looked at the bit that Maureen and I were doing was just focusing on terminology. Now neither Maureen nor I have had a chance to go through the final document but a lot of the terminology is now defined, and Cheryl, we've had a look at your comment. Most of the definitions are there. Could I just ask Alan, are you confident that upfront in the introduction all of the terminology that should have been defined is defined? Have you had a chance to go through the front bit?

ALAN GREENBERG:

I have not at all. In the two sections that I am a penholder on I tried to identify but I don't think I did a very rigorous job of what the definitions are that have to be replicated in the front section. So there is a short list at the end of Sections B and C in the current draft, not in the template but in the sandbox, of the definitions that I thought I captured.

I know in a call yesterday there was reference to something that we hadn't defined that we need to – I don't remember what it is but I'll catch it along the way. So I think I've tried to identify them but I haven't gone and looked, I haven't done it rigorously and I haven't gone and looked at what you have in the first section to see if you caught anything. My apologies but I haven't.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, Alan, I think that's an acceptable point to where the agenda takes us to next. Go ahead, Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes, that was exactly the big question because we do have, and I'm just refreshing my memory here – we do have things like the yesterday thing, the GAC and so forth. So those being in front, but if you look at what we say, and there is some options for how either would be defined – I think we'll have to determine how we do that. But it seems to me those are the sorts of things that perhaps belong in a glossary where in fact we really have a discussion of what something is and how to find out about it as opposed to actual terminology where we are just explaining how we're using a term in the document.

I don't know if that makes a lot of sense but I was trying to think one of the... I was originally of the view that everything should be upfront, but if we're going to put some stuff upfront and some stuff behind we do need a frame of reference that says "This is how we do it." So we've got, for example we've got definitions of SSAC which are very short. We've got a longer one for GAC and it seems to me we need to decide are we actually going to define SSAC or are we going to say "This is what it is and this is how we find out about it in more detail." Because we've done that for some and not others.

So Alan, did you have a view of...

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, I do. I would think... And if I remember correctly, what we tentatively decided a long time ago was the ones upfront are the terms

that we're defining in the document. So in other words, when someone is reading a section and they come up with a ALT and they say "What the hell is ALT?" and it was defined somewhere earlier or somewhere later or something, and they can go back or go up to the front and say "This is ALAC Leadership Team." The terms that we glibly use because everyone at ICANN knows what they are are the ones I think we want to put in the glossary.

But I question, do we want and need to have GAC defined? I don't think we use "GAC" anywhere in the document. I may be wrong on that one but I don't think we do.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Well, it was put in the sandbox so I used that one as an example. But whether we actually use "GAC" or not I don't know, but that's the kind of... That's one example of what I question of being in the glossary. Another, and this is perhaps a more critical question: we have terms like "rough consensus" where in fact it is a term that is used that is important. But when we say "defined" we're saying "We are defining it this way in this document," and that's the kind of thing we're thinking about goes in the glossary as opposed to simply acronyms that we use all the time, don't think about them. But anybody picking up the document unfamiliar with the terminology will need to know right upfront what that means.

ALAN GREENBERG: To use the specific example, I do not believe we use in this document “rough consensus.” We do use the capitalized term “Consensus” and that one does need to be defined.

HOLLY RAICHE: Now upfront or behind would be my question there.

ALAN GREENBERG: I would think any capitalized term, if we used contract terminology, any Capitalized term is one which when later used has a very specific meaning which may be different from the typical meaning in the English language and therefore is a defined term. And I think those should go at the front. If we find out there’s a five-page list we may want to rethink that but I don’t think it’s that long a list.

HOLLY RAICHE: Actually that’s very helpful because we in the sandbox have “rough consensus,” because at one point that language was used in the document. We can go through, take out “rough consensus” but we still need “Consensus” because it is a defined term, it is used and we want it to have a particular meaning for the Rules. So that’s the sort of thing I think we have upfront.

So would the critical difference between the stuff we have upfront and we are calling definitions include acronyms that people are not necessarily that familiar with but also terminologies that we want to be used in a particular way versus something like the SSAC which is you know, there’s nothing about it that is contentious and it is a definitive

ICANN term that anybody that's picking up these Rules probably already knows about ICANN and can probably already know about SSAC.

ALAN GREENBERG: Cheryl has her hand up but I have a thought also. Let Cheryl go first.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No, no, go ahead Alan. I'll follow you.

ALAN GREENBERG: As we're talking, and every time we come up with an example of something in the glossary it's not a term that we use in the document as far as I know and I'm pretty conversant with most of the sections of the document. And I'm starting to wonder is there anything that needs to be in the glossary other than have a pointer to the ICANN Glossary which is a standard document?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Here, here, here.

ALAN GREENBERG: There may not be a lot. Maybe there's one or two, I can't think of what they are right now but there may be some that we glibly use that we don't define. I think "Supporting Organization" might show up somewhere or something like that but the number may be small enough that we don't need a separate section. Certainly we don't need to define terms that don't show up in the document at all.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Here, here.

HOLLY RAICHE: Excellent.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, my turn – Cheryl here for the record. Alan, you took the words right out of my mouth, thank you, as you often do. I have been on the bandwagon for quite some time, well I've been on many bandwagons for quite some time but the [very good] bandwagon I'm referring to here is do not reinvent things that we do not have to. And therefore there's an excellent glossary tool which we should link to; and if indeed there is something which is so specific to our text and that it does in fact not end up as a capitalized term, which I also agree with Alan and Holly's discussion earlier in this call, they're the bits that need to be upfront.

Anything that the drafting teams have decided needs to be a capital-letter word then yeah, we put those upfront. If there's a half dozen of these other terms which we might need to say, such as Alan's example of "Support organization" – but I think we'll find that is actually in the ICANN Glossary anyway – then we'll call them out. That might be twenty words if we're lucky and that might be 100 words if we're not. But that can just be at the end of whatever this section is, and we can even put it in extremely small fonts in the tradition of legalese communication exercises. Sorry, that was a jibe at the lawyers on the call.

I just note we've lost Holly so can someone call her back because we really need her here. I might just filibuster until then.

ALAN GREENBERG: I have one or two questions that don't fit anywhere.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Please Alan, back over to you as long as it's not something that Holly has to hear.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, I don't think so. There's a number of issues that we need to discuss somewhere. They probably fit in the overall Rules of Procedure Committee but maybe we want to talk about them here if we have a few minutes in the call. And the things relate to what is the definitive version of this document, and I have an opinion on that; and the formatting of it on the web and stuff like that. It ends up it's going to be not a contentious argument but an important discussion, and I'll give you my answers.

I think formatting matters on these kinds of documents, it matters a lot. And so I think we should format it in Word. Word can export to the web in HTML so the formatting does not get lost along the way. And we talked at one point about having words that we can hover over and things like that and a definition pops up. I think that's a nicety which is probably not going to be easy to do in a universal way and I think we should shelve that for some future experience.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: In the web version do you mean, Alan, can I just ask? Cheryl here.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, in the web version, yeah.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't think we want to do anything which requires a significant activity to take what is the definitive Rules that we're going to work from and make them usable on the web. And I think as ugly as the HTML that Word generates is it is wholly viable and usable. And I'm not sure we want to reinvent anything, and we moreover want to make it really easy when we make a change to the Rules as we may well in three months or in two months or on a semi-regular basis that that can go up onto the web without someone spending four years tuning the HTML.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Absolutely, I couldn't agree with you more personally but we have a blessing – it's Cheryl here, and that is hopefully a blessing as well that it is Cheryl here identifying herself for the transcript record. We have Dev on the call and he happens to wrangle the Technology Taskforce. So guess what, Dev? [laughing] I'm going to punt this one over to you. Please respond and recognize that that's going to be an action item for you and possibly your group at a later date.

ALAN GREENBERG: But remembering we may not have Dev for the next seventeen years.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Understood.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: [laughing] That's a possibility, Alan. This is Dev Anand speaking. Okay, I mean obviously after we work... We should probably do it in Word and make sure it's properly formatted in a printed version first and then indeed I would look at, when we put it on the Wiki... Because one of the things we'll have to do is obviously I think we may have to look at translations of this as well. So once this is now finalized we have to then do the translations in possibly the six UN languages and then we'll move it to the Wiki; and then we'll see whether to do the hyperlink can be done on the Confluence Wiki.

I mean I'm not going to spend time, we're not going to spend time trying to implement that now while this entire thing is still in flux. So I agree with you Alan – do it in Word, make sure a PDF version is fully available that's properly formatted, then we'll see whether the hyperlinking with a hover that too can get translated or whatever we'll certainly look at that. But we don't have to worry about that now. [laughing] That's it.

ALAN GREENBERG: May I make one intercession?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I was just going to say it looks like you've got a right of reply there, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, this needs to go on the web. The web allows formatting to be precise. It cannot go on the Wiki which mangles formatting and makes things almost unusable for something like this. So let's talk web and not talk Wiki please. This document is stable enough that we don't want people editing it on the fly on the Wiki. This is a web document.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: This is Dev, just to say fine, but again I don't think this is an issue we have to worry about now. We can just concern ourselves with finishing the Rules of Procedure obviously.

ALAN GREENBERG: Agreed, I just want to set people's mindset.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Understood, okay. Okay, fair enough.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Alright, good. Well that was a valuable sidepiece but Yaovi, you do have your hand still raised and Olivier is raising very, very valuable points of order so can I ask that you have your interaction with this as briefly as possible now please? Go ahead.

YAOVI ATOHOUN:

Thank you, Yaovi speaking. Just to comment, I think at this point to move, if we can work from all the (inaudible) documents as stated in the action items. So if you can (inaudible) to have the final drafts from the three other drafting teams together and then from that it will be very easy to see what needs to be defined.

My second comment is that we need to have this document in a format that people will not be necessarily obliged to click on links. This is the purpose of this section, the definitions and structure, which I think should be a [factor] of the document and not put outside on the links. Because if you put links in the document and these links for some reason change then we have to change our links, so my alternative is that our document should be a very complete document including if possible the [notations], the definitions – even if you want to make a link to that (inaudible). It would be very important for me that at the end we have all the information contained in the same document. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you. If I may, Holly, I'll just respond to that. Thank you, Yaovi, yes that's also very important and I think no one on this call or any of the drafting teams would disagree with that – the simplicity and keeping it simple, and the recognition of the different levels of technology and access to technology that people will be using is essential. It is of course those particular things, the decision on and the advice more to the point to the ALAC on what the best care and feeding and specific technology is so that it best meets our community's needs, that the ALAC has a Technology Taskforce which is why I suggested putting it across to Dev.

And Alan, you have some very particular requirements – you and Dev need to talk as does Yaovi and Dev, I suspect. But perhaps I could encourage you to leave that for the right place and time.

If I may, it has to be done – don't get us wrong, it is important. But I'm quite sure that with both Yaovi and Alan dressing the issues and Dev leading the field on the responses, we've left that in a quite strong and capable triumvirate's hands. So we'll have one-third of the ALAC actually advising the ALAC on what the ALAC should perhaps be doing, which gives me great heart.

If we can then... I just very much with my hand raised would like to run roughshod over Holly's Drafting Team call for a slightly longer time if I may; and if I may not well, tough. Can I get you to pop yourselves into the sandbox, please, for a moment as she currently has writ, and I just wanted to very briefly get everyone to remind themselves what we originally envisaged here. The section, this definitional section originally was envisaged to open with a very simple "What is the ALAC and what is it relevant to us and to anyone reading the document?" And we also agreed that it should have the appropriate links or references to the Bylaws.

We also said that in this section, this was the original expectation: any of the expectations upon and desired characteristics of a person who's appointed to the ALAC should be, and I would have suggested although it's not written here – that's why I briefly referred to – and obviously any cross referencing to other things; participation requirements, criteria, metrics, etc. That doesn't have to be in the body of this part but it could be an adjunct document that is referenced.

And then we did also say, because at least at that point in time we wanted it upfront, that we would have in this section the mantra that the ALAC should operate and act on a consensus, and that we would define what constitutes a quorum and/or regional representation balanced requirements, etc. in this section. Now, since we have decided that part which was early on we of course have had a lot of work done on things like quorum by one of the drafting teams, and it may be that little more than a link and reference to that drafting team's subsection is required there. But that's something I'd like for this group to discuss a little bit more today if I may.

And finally it was also discussed that the again, high-level mantra that the ALAC will jointly and separately act in the best interests of the At-Large community was proposed to be upfront in there, and there were a few other things. So can I ask at this stage, before we get into capitalized terms which I think is kind of a given and before we get into what I trust is an agreement on us calling the glossary to a link on work that is done elsewhere – and if we differ in any way then we'll pop it in – can I get us just to have a look at those original concepts and see where they start now?

And just before I do that I just want to remind you, many of those original concepts were agreed upon by the work group as a whole. In other words, there were agreements that were wrought out of this work group before we broke into specific drafting teams. Okay, I've got Holly followed by Alan.

HOLLY RAICHE:

Thank you, Cheryl, Holly Raiche for the transcript records. This is where we as a smaller drafting team started to have questions and that's probably where we all threw our hands up and went "Oh my goodness!" There were sort of three places, it started off two, now three places where we thought there was work to be done, and one of the places was there's a thing called ALAC. Now, you can put ALAC in the definition upfront but what we want to say about ALAC is much more comprehensive than simply a definition.

So we started to ask, and this would be stylistically but also it's more substantive as an issue, for something like ALAC where in fact there are critical rules about what ALAC is, what it does, what it means to be a member, what's expected of members. We thought do we actually need to have upfront in the definitions "ALAC means ALAC" and spell it out, and then "See Clauses blah..." or not. And then it's at that point where people started to say "Oh, you can put that stuff in a glossary" and I didn't think so because what ALAC is and does always should be upfront in the first section.

So and maybe Alan's hand is up and he can answer that, but that became another drafting issue as to when something's really substantively important it shouldn't be just a definition. But then the question is, do you have something in the definition that says "ALAC stands for the following, and by the way, see the whole front section or two." And I will leave it there and ask Alan who has his hand up. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay, it's Alan speaking. I'm of multiple minds. [laughter]

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I've often wondered about that.

ALAN GREENBERG: I approached this originally saying "These are the Rules of Procedure. They are not formal Bylaws; they are not our Articles of Incorporation. We should have the rules in it," and I didn't even see a need for saying what the ALAC is because you know, the ALAC has to be defined somewhere – it's not necessarily our job to define ourselves when we're getting our rules. However, there seems to be a general will that we want an introduction and we want to perhaps outline in that introduction some general principles and I can certainly live with that.

I have no problem with it. It's sort of in line with the ICANN Bylaws where we state major pillars on which we want to make our decisions and things like that – that's fine. So I can see that the introduction says to the extent possible ALAC and At-Large should be consensus-, that's lower case "C", driven organizations but I don't think we want to replicate in there stuff which is in detail, talked about in detail later on because the details of capital-C Consensus or the details of what is expected of individuals... We go into a fair amount of detail on that later on and I don't want to pretend our summary is capturing it all. And by putting a little bit of it in we almost give people dispensation from going and reading the details.

So I can easily see having principles there, that there are certain expectations of people who are going to be on the ALAC, but not detailing what they are; that we're consensus-driven, lower-case C or

we want to be, but not defining consensus in the introduction. So as I said, I approached it from the beginning saying “We don’t need any of this” but if we’re going to have it, it should be a really high-level overview and stating principles and not trying to define the details which we’re going to be spending the next ten pages doing. I’m not sure that makes sense but that’s I think my position.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Holly, you raise your own hand, off you go.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you, Alan, because I think that’s where I started off as well, which is really if we have an introduction it ought to be very high level, very principles-based – not having anything that even closely resembles a rule or anything like that, so that there’s a kind of “This is what we are and we’re made up of RALOs and blah, blah, blah.” Very high level, not looking like a definition at all, not using defined terms at all and keeping it short [and even] questioning whether we needed it at all; and only using the Definitions section for terms that we specifically use and need to have defined. And I would be absolutely delighted if we did not need a glossary section because I still have a little bit of difficulty trying to distinguish between definition and glossary. So if we can do away with glossary I’m very happy; and if we can do away with a detailed front section I’m even happier. I just want to know if that’s the right direction, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah, one more comment I forgot to make and then maybe we should let Cheryl speak. Cheryl asked the question of when we originally started this we put A, B, and C in the DS section. Since then we have spent literally hundreds upon hundreds of person hours trying to put all of the old rules and the changes we want to them in some reasonable format. If the end product ends up being different than we envisioned it when we really didn't know where we were going I say so be it. I don't want to get hung up on that as long as the final document ends up being reasonable and usable. You know, lots of prototypes get scrapped because you actually learn something in the process and I'm not uncomfortable with that. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Okay, my turn, Cheryl for the record. Thanks, Alan, and again – and this gets to be a bit repetitious sometimes when we're at this point in these work groups – I agree totally with you. And yeah, Holly, I think that keeping it lean is the essential part. The reason I wanted to ask you to go back quickly to the sandbox and have a look at what we originally envisaged was very much because when we did that, you know, it was at the beginning of the process. And there are probably a couple of things, and I think Alan has probably articulated them and even put them in a numerical order for us of what probably needs to stay there.

So what I'm going to suggest is, as an action item, that we update what is envisaged in our Wiki, and we ask everyone – not just this drafting team but everyone, because these definitions; and remember, it's definitions and structure, DFDT – to interact with that on the Wiki page. But what I would be proposing because of the size of this sandbox, and

it is quite extensive because of the glossary work that has gone into it, is I'll make a little edit. This is an AI on me and on Holly, I'll make a little edit in the existing sandbox provided I've got permission, which I assume I have; and I'll take across from this sandbox the bits that based on today's conversation and in my totally biased view deserved to get hauled over to the master document.

Then what I'd be asking is for everyone, and particularly the primary penholders to look at that master document and start reacting to it. I think that's probably going to be the cleanest way of doing this when everyone else's agreed final text from their drafting team gets imported across to the master document in a format that works for them to best move it across in structure and function, and often assisted by staff. Yeah, I just don't want that dog's breakfast that can happen. I would suggest I have a reasonable skillset developed over the last few years in the wonderful world of Wikis including this Wiki. All I'm going to do is unashamedly copy and paste, and that will mean with all the crappy formatting bits that come across with it, the bits that we can clearly identify out of today's call need, must, and should inarguably probably therefore go into the master document.

Now there'll be space that says "stuff needs to go in here" and that's okay, too. But I think if we then actually work on that we'll be in a cleaner, more manageable place. The alternative to that is to move all of that not directly into the master document but into a new page which we could call the DSDT Final Draft or Draft Text. So I guess you can flip a coin. It looks like Alan wants to – Alan, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, I would strongly advocate that we create, I don't care which we call it – the Final Draft, Sandbox Prime, Sandbox v2 – but I strongly recommend you create a new page and move stuff into it as opposed to trying to clean up the sandbox.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Oh God, no!

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, I wasn't sure because yes, you have editing skills but you cannot edit the comments out and those are taking the significant amount of the room. And last time we tried that it was not pretty.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay Alan, just let me be really clear – Cheryl here. What I was proposing, and I don't particularly care where it lands either directly into the master as she is currently writ or in a new landing page, that all we do is rape and pillage the bits we want out of this existing sandbox from this team.

ALAN GREENBERG: I would suggest a new working page, whatever you want to call it, because that will allow this group to put comments in as we refine it.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, so now here is the AI because Heidi A) dropped, and B) we were still fluffing about. We now have a fresh Wiki page to be created which is called DSDT Proposed Text, okay? And into that page me and then of

course Maureen and Holly and everyone else will be doing their editing, commenting, and titivating, etc. But to get that started, an AI on me but feel free – Alan and everyone else can help but just let me have a go at it first – by the end of this call we should have an idea of what bits out of that original sandbox that we’re looking at at the moment just need to be moved across or moved across as possible placeholders.

And we’ve had a couple decisions that we should flesh out there, such as “linked to ICANN glossary,” that type of thing. So go one... [laughter] For the record there, my giggle was Carlton in the chat who’s decided some of my terminology is a bit colorful. Listen, between 4:00 and 5:00 in the morning I can be a bit colorful, Carlton, and that’s very sad indeed. But there we go.

And I really think, Alan, that yes, a fresh page is a good idea. I was just wanting to take it straight to the master because I was being selfish and not wanting to duplicate work, and wanting to get the master up to speed. But I’m happy to go via an extra part. Eduardo?

EDUARDO DIAZ:

Yes, this is Eduardo for the record, just a point of clarification. I think having a fresh, brand new page is a good idea. What I’m confused on is are what we’re going to put in this sandbox the final document as it is right now? If that’s the case then I would change the title of that page from DSDT to the Master v1, something like that because that’s really what it is. I would just like a clarification of this, if this is the master-master? Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, thanks for that, Eduardo. I must say I'm happy with any name of that new page that identifies it as being the Definitions Section, right? I'm equally happy for it to say "Master" or anything else. We certainly don't want to just transcribe everything across from this. This has to be a serious edit as things shift across but we do have a DSDT commitment to work with the penholders of the other groups to tidy things up. And I think it's fair enough that it should happen in that space.

Okay, alright, as Holly said – just call it "Definitions" and put in the date from today's call, that's fine. "Definitions as at (insert date)" works for me. That's an important AI. So from that we will have a reasonable little place to play. If there's anything vital that is not transcribed across from the existing sandbox, when I put a message out to the list and say "Okay, I've had a first go at it, all of you have a go now" – I think it's important, Holly, if you and Maureen agree that that call goes not just to this Drafting Team but to this Drafting Team and all the primary penholders of all the teams for everyone to have a look at and then get on to any final comments, "Oops, you missed this."

Alan can double check, or better still he can ensure that already-identified capitalized terms that exist in the two sections he's one of the primary penholders for are there somewhere and Yaovi and Yrjö can do exactly the same for theirs. I think that's probably the best way forward. Can I have a yay or a nay from people on that? And if that's the case then that would be a second action item on us all. Yaovi, go ahead please.

YAOVI ATOHOUN: Can you hear me?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes, we can now. Go ahead.

YAOVI ATOHOUN: Thank you. So regarding the new page that will be created, my thinking is that it would be good to have only one person posting to that page, to that new other fresh page. Why? Because if we let the various drafting team persons, the numbering, they have their own numbering. This means that if on that new page each drafting team is putting in you'll need somebody to go over again and to reorganize the document. So my question is, if we need to [risk] that step it means the various drafting [cohorts]...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Oops, I think we may have lost you, Yaovi, so hopefully staff will be getting you back. I was just typing and I will continue to type into the chat, but yeah, let me respond to this – this is Cheryl. This new page, and thank you Heidi for putting that page up already, is not going to be a formatted skeleton. It's going to be formatted because it has to have some form of formatting for us to be able to read it but it's not going to be enumerated and formatted in a style that would in any way, shape, or form affect contributions from the other drafting teams. In fact, I will suggest that I don't put any format – I just put a hard [character return], a blank line between parts and I may put an actual formatted drawn line between primary sections if we even end up with a primary section here.

So we will make sure that yeah, what happens in this new page is not going to be affecting what the look and feel of the master document is going to be, at which point might I suggest that we now have a quick look at that master document? And there is a link in your agenda to the current state of play. We won't spend anywhere near the amount of time as we did on this Drafting Team's sandbox, but during that discussion in the sandbox for the DSDT I think we've established some important next steps and indeed several important action items. So I do not regret that time being spent at all.

But if I can encourage you now to have a look at what is now euphemistically called the At-Large Rules of Procedure Modifications Proposal Template Workspace – I must have been feeling very, very wordy that day. It may in fact end up in front of you; if not please use the link which Heidi has put into the chat.

What we have here is an attempt to make sure we will capture all the important bits and not miss anything out of the modifications proposal that we first started with. What we have of course is as Alan said, many hundreds of man hours of getting the work actually done since this structure was put together and we are in no way, shape, or form wedded to this being the only way, the only formatting, the only flow that we should have for this. But what we may as well use it for at least in the interim is a place to capture all the incredible work that each of the drafting teams has done.

What that means for this Drafting Team, however, is that that will be a place that we can make sure – and there will be an AI out of this, Heidi, actually possibly two – that the drafting team that's interested in

definitions, this one, uses this master as their point of reference to make sure everything has been captured and is double checked. I would certainly encourage them to work directly... Sorry, what I'm really saying is here, Maureen and Holly, please work directly with Alan and Eduardo and Yaovi and Yrjö and themselves to make sure that nothing gets dropped, that's all.

I would suggest then that what we might do is have a first action item on all of the penholders of all of the drafting teams, so this is a request coming from this Drafting Team, that by A.) insert date, and you can discuss that in a minute because you're all on here, representatives of you are all on here – a date by which there's a commitment to have the final documentation as it currently stands moved from each of the sandboxes of each of the drafting teams with the possible exception of this one, the DSDT, into this master document. So that would be the very first AI, and let's discuss that in a minute.

But I want to produce the second AI onto the table at the same time, and that is that we have an absolute drop dead deadline for all of the material including from this new page that Heidi put up for the DSDT – in other words, after I have a first play at it you will have a conversation and an edit on, and then Maureen and Holly finalize and titivate and put to be, hopefully working with the other leads, the penholders; that there is a drop dead date for that material to go into this master. So these are the two AIs I'd like to see happen.

Can I ask you all when do you think you can all undertake to have your drafting team's updates into this master? I am aware that staff has said they will assist Yrjö and Yaovi in moving their final documentation that

they've signed off on theirs across, so staff will do it when staff can obviously – it'll be hopefully a priority that will meet with other dates and times. We have a proposal of a week from Holly and we have Alan with his hand raised. Alan, you have the other two all to your super-control – what's your bid, sir?

ALAN GREENBERG:

I think a week is going to be tight. I will have my draft, my next level of draft out on both of the documents in the next day or so. How quickly we can come to closure on the issues there... I mean if you want to make me king and whatever I say goes I can do it. [laughter] Others may not agree with said position, so a week may well be tight if we're talking about it being drop dead. We could probably do a week and a half if we schedule new calls for the MADT and the DMDT for the beginning of next week. It's easier to get closure on a call than it is with emails is the problem.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Correct.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I wasn't planning on having additional calls. We may want to schedule one more call in each and then we could probably try to clean it up in a deadline closer to a week. It's still going to be a bit over a week because the calls will only be a week from now.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah. Yaovi has proposed ten days, you mentioned a week and a half – it sounds like ten days is the current feasible.

ALAN GREENBERG: If we can get Doodles out and schedule meetings for those two groups at the beginning of next week, yes. Scheduling the Doodles has been problematic so we need to make sure we can do them.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alright, so we now have sort of a three-step related action items. We have to announce to all of the drafting teams who have penholder representatives here on this call – therefore please consider this your announcement though there will be a little rude reminder if no action is seen on those master templates in a week, okay?

So within a week, if you haven't started to do something and it's not obvious, even if it's just logging and going "I'm working on it" and then log back out again then staff will remind you that there is a ten days from today deadline for materials to be moved across from those drafting teams. February 11th sounds where we would like the second date, the DSDT date to be I would suggest but let's see how that works... Yes, thank you Eduardo, I agree. I'm reading the chat at the same time as prattling.

We then have the two weeks line – so that's ten days for the three teams, the EASDT, MADT, and what's your other one, Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: DMDT I believe.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: DMDT, there's so many of them it's like alphabet soup. Alright, we have those in ten days and then we have the DSDT, the final bit from this subgroup in a fortnight. So ten days, fourteen days – that'll be February 11th without looking at a calendar, and if it's not we'll make it whatever it is in ten days' time. I think we can all live with that, that's okay. That's good, for the final master by then.

I would ask that if anyone sees a section with no action on it and they are a penholder in another drafting team, contact the penholder in the what looks to be unmoving section, and say "Dear Mary, do you need a hand? Can I pop something in for you?" just in case that stuff happens. But let's set ourselves those deadlines now. There will be then a super AI on us all and that is to watch the new page and watch the master page, so if you're not subscribed to changes on that page you might be well advised to do so and I'd ask staff to send out a reminder in a week's time regardless to all of the drafting teams with the links to those pages, saying "Just remember in another few days' time, in other words ten days' time, everything's got to be in this master in said space. And in a fortnight's time the DSDT work will also be included in it. Please look to this which is the new page to make any comments."

And if we do that in a week I think we can work. I now have Holly and Alan and any modifications they make to those AIs, just take notes on them. What happened, Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes, you were saying me so I put my hand down so there would be no confusion.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Right, you were ahead of me, go for it.

HOLLY RAICHE: Just to support what you say because really the DSDT is there to have the final look. We really... I don't want to do anything until I have a final document. I can go through it, well Maureen and I can go through it. So could we just, I just want to stress a different and later date for us because our job actually is to go through the whole document if that's okay.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yep, you've got the luxury of four more days, you lucky girls. Okay, Alan, over to you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I'm a bit concerned about the terminology final-final master that Eduardo wrote. [laughter] Remember there is another step after we get these all pulled together, and that was if I remember correctly me, you, Eduardo, Maureen and maybe Holly, I don't remember if Holly volunteered or not-

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: ...to do a cleanup of the whole document. And I would suggest that to some extent, the finalization of the DSDT could be done during that phase. So we can start the phase a little bit quicker because a lot of the cleanup is going to be again, there's inconsistencies between the sections, there's a new definition we didn't catch, there's something that's defined twice in two different ways. I've got the two big sections so I'm trying to do that internally with my brain, but you know, they're complex enough that I'm not sure I've done a really good job of that. So let's not forget that next phase after the sections are pulled together to do the cleanup because a lot's going to rest on us doing that well. And then we can go out to ALAC and At-Large with it.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yep, absolutely. Eduardo?

EDUARDO DIAZ: Yes, thank you. When I [put] final-final is when we can start looking to clean it up and proofread it and stuff like that. So that's step one here.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, I was just setting expectations that from the title people may have thought that we're ready to go out to the public with it and there's a step in between.

EDUARDO DIAZ: Thank you for the clarification.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. Now it's important to note I think – Cheryl here for the record, and well it's important to note Cheryl's here for the record at all times. But it's important to note, and it's Cheryl for the record saying this, that what you've just said between you and Eduardo, Alan, is exactly what Yaovi was asking for – to ensure that there is a flow and a consistency in format, look, feel, usability, etc., etc. And yeah, I think what we can do is now set ourselves yet another AI and that is to begin and run in parallel that whole of document review between the plus 10 and the 14 days that we've set ourselves for the other drafting team work, okay?

I note Yaovi's typing so I'll make sure in case he's not... Excellent, alright. Add Yaovi's name to the list of penholders who will be doing that whole of document review.

ALAN GREENBERG: Good, then we have the big boss and people from every drafting team. Wonderful.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sounds like a wonderful thing and there'll be more crowns for more people deserved at the end of that process than we possibly have gold and jewels to create, but that's alright. We might use paper hats when we see each other in Beijing.

ALAN GREENBERG: Cheryl? Can I ask one other favor from the drafting teams? Although the stuff is going into a Wiki page it would be really, really good if when

we pulled them together to clean them up we were working from a Word document.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah, I don't have a problem with doing a master through on Word. I'll just remind you all that I actually don't use Word – I use Open Office so be kind and don't use .docx format. [laughing]

ALAN GREENBERG: If you'll notice I actually use .docx format but when I save them for the public they become .doc.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That's very kind of you, Alan, but you're always a great attender to detail. Yes, same here, Dev. Dev and I would appreciate the fact that we will be using Word but we'll be using Word that open sourced document work can be done on as well, terrific. So that's all good.

Can I just ask us to go back for... Yes indeed, it's certainly editable – I couldn't agree more, Carlton. Okay Alan, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: Just a word of caution: experience has shown that if you take a Word document and edit it with Open Office and then send it back to Word and do it a few times you end up with things that have horns on them. [laughing]

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Cheryl here – it only has horns on it for the people who insist on using Word. But yes, we will make sure that we have enough talent in this group to make sure this is managed properly. Okay, and that’s a good thing.

So that’s all fine. Can I just go back to the agenda very, very briefly Holly if you’ll allow me and make sure we’ve actually done everything we promised we would do. We have looked at the purpose of our Drafting Team as well as the purpose of this call and I think we’re in a fairly good place as to what we are doing and what we intend to do. We’ve looked at the sandbox and we’ve got a plan for extracting all the really good bit out of the sandbox as per what we agreed needs to be taken out of the sandbox today into a new as-at-date set of text. We’ve had a quick look at the master document and we’ve given some undertakings on timings for that and how we’re going to proceed with a review of the whole which is an added bonus, thank you very much everyone.

Can I ask is there any action item that staff thinks they might not have captured that they need to have clarified from us at the moment?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thanks Cheryl, this is Heidi.

GISELLA GRUBER: Yes, Gisella here, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I’ve got you all, go for it in whatever rank and order you so desire.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Go ahead, Gisella.

GISELLA GRUBER: Cheryl and Alan, just to confirm on the Doodles for the drafting teams, confirming next week we have on the 4th of February the ESADT, MADT, and do we do the DMDT as well?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alan, correct me if I'm wrong – Cheryl here...

ALAN GREENBERG: You definitely do the DMDT and the MADT. Whether you do the other two is up to those groups.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah, I thought it was in fact the DM and the EA....

GISELLA GRUBER: It's DM and MA.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: DM and MA – I'm glad someone's got their head on straight this morning. I obviously need to have a morning coffee. Yeah, but correct me if I'm wrong, Yaovi – I don't think it was the intention of the EASDT to meet again.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Sorry, that was my fault – this is Heidi. It’s the MADT and the...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alan and Eduardo and Alan and Maureen. [laughter]

GISELLA GRUBER: Gisella here, it’s DMDT and MADT for next week. And then the following week we have the DSDT, the week of the 11th of February.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That sounds like the plan works for me. Does that one work for everyone else? Thank you. Excellent, you have more Heidi? Please, go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, just basically if I can review the AIs – we have a lot. So let’s see... So we have...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We’re reading them in the action items and summary space, correct Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Correct, I’m just going to scroll down... So those are the first few that Dev set out. The third one is again related to the TTF, so after the

documents have been translated and put onto the webpage that they'll work on technology to allow definitions to be clarified once you hover over them. A fresh Wiki page – that's actually been completed. Well actually that's been created but then Cheryl, Maureen, and Holly are to add their comments.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes, we've still got to work on it, yes.

HEIDI ULLRICH: So that's not been completed. By the end of the call we should have an idea of what text – that's been completed.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yep.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, draft definitions should be sent to other DTs for review – is staff to do that or when should that happen?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Hmm.... Yeah, it'll probably be a staff job. I think I've said a week out from today, so that's five days' time? So that's just the reminder.

ALAN GREENBERG: The AI on the Doodles as EMDT instead of DMDT by the way.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, the DSDT can use the master template Wiki as their mater source to ensure that all of the key terms are identified. By 8 February, 2013, there's a commitment to have the final DT text into the master template. The drop dead deadline for all DSDT 29th January Wiki page to go into the master template... Or actually is that? What is that drop dead date? It would be Friday the 14th?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's Valentine's Day for some people.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Or sorry, let's see... Sorry, by 11th.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: Folks, it's Alan. I've got to drop off the call now. I'll take a look at whatever comes out of this.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: The next steps are already sorted, Alan, so thanks for your time.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay.

HEIDI ULLRICH: And Gisella's already corrected the Doodles, and the DSDT call remains scheduled for the week of the 11th of February. All members of the DTs are to watch their pages, staff to send out reminders; and Alan, Cheryl, Eduardo, Maureen, Yaovi, Yrjö and Holly are to polish the final whole draft text between the 11th and 14th.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sounds like a plan. Now the only thing would be, Heidi, I think in that last one they are to proceed during that time. I doubt that it will actually be completed on the moment of the February 14 so we just get to start that in parallel. February 14 will be the date when the final text will be coming in from the DSDT, so it will be 14+ for the whole document review. But we won't wait until February 14 to start. So if one day we can proceed and polish that AI to indicate it would be completed by February 14 I think that's perhaps a little bit...

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, this is Heidi, Cheryl. Again as we agreed the drop dead deadline for all DSDT comments will be 11th of February, I thought, or should that be the 14th?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No, the 11th of February... Oh sorry, you're right, you're right. My error. I really do need the coffee, my error, yep, yep, yep. I'm thinking today's the end of the month and I'm adding on 14 days. Okay, you're right.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Gisella, those are ready to post then.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And the only other thing is just to make sure when we post these action items because they have an effect on all of the drafting teams, we need to send it as advice not just to this list but to all of the lists because I think it's a courtesy to give everyone a head's up on those dates. Even though most of the penholders were here it's appropriate to have those things brought together. Alright, is there any other business before I stop running roughshod over this meeting and I give it back to Holly to close?

HOLLY RAICHE: [laughing] I'm ready to close.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [laughing] Holly's just pleased to close and hopefully start her life for today – not her life in general, just her life for today. I don't see anybody or hear anything other than absolute agreement with Holly saying it's time we should end. Holly, did you want to do the honors my dear and I shall now shush and thank you all? [laughing]

HOLLY RAICHE:

Just to say thank you everybody for your time. Please have a look at the action items [in the cloud] and hopefully we're very close to finalization. So I thank everybody for the time they've spent this morning, afternoon or night. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Terrific! I look forward to all of this thrill-filled and exciting work! Take care everybody, bye for now.

[End of Transcript]