NATHALIE PEREGRINE:	Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is the DSDT call on the 21st of February, 2013. On the call today we have Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Yaovi Atohoun, Alan Greenberg, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Holly Raiche and Sandra Hoferichter. We have apologies from Cintra Sooknanan, Darlene Thompson, Eduardo Diaz, Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro, and Tijani Ben Jemaa.
	From staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco and myself, Nathalie Peregrine. I'd like to remind all participants to please state your names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and over to you, Alan.
ALAN GREENBERG:	I think over to Holly, actually.
HOLLY RAICHE:	[laughing] Good morning.
ALAN GREENBERG:	Good morning.
HOLLY RAICHE:	I was just looking into this – over to Holly for what?
ALAN GREENBERG:	Who is managing the screen? Is that Heidi?

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.

HEIDI ULLRICH: You have host powers and Cheryl has hosting, right?

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't know how to upload things. There was a PDF…

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, if you can let us know what you would like updated Nathalie would be happy to update that.

ALAN GREENBERG: There was a PDF distributed to the DSDT list about two hours ago that I suspect Holly wants up.

HEIDI UULLRICH: Okay, Nathalie, can you please find that and upload it please?

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Sure.

ALAN GREENBERG: It was distributed at 12:18 my time, 9:18 your time.

HOLLY RAICHE: God knows what time my time.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, I could tell you – 4:18 AM your time.

HEIDI ULLRICH: It's "Current Section A," is that the title?

ALAN GREENBERG: That's correct.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. Nathalie, do you have that? I've just forwarded that to you right now, you should have it at the top of the inbox.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: That's fine, I've got it, thank you.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Perfect.

HOLLY RAICHE: Ah, yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Now this is what is in the document as it stands. Obviously the definitions are not complete, partly because this group hasn't met and partly because I haven't gotten around to the parts that I could have

done on my own. And I do have a comment on the text, but how do you want to do this, Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE: If I can, let me just scroll through here up to where the questions are… Okay, we've got…. Okay. I'm just reading what's here. That looks fine, fine. Yep. Is there a way for me to scroll? Oh, here we go, thank you. Okay. I don't have any problem with what's up, Alan. In terms of definitions, I'm looking… [Can I change the document?]

ALAN GREENBERG: The definitions obviously have to be completed but that's not a difficult task; it just needs the final rest of the words and then we have to put some definitions in. I'm more concerned about the text part.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yep. I actually put something in my comment for consensus which is taken directly from the text. I can do that. I'm looking at what's on the screen and the [empty] text, okay… I'm happy with the [appointees].

ALAN GREENBERG: Holly, the definitions need to be completed but I don't think we need to do that with everyone around. I'm more concerned about the lead-in text.

HOLLY RAICHE: I'm happy with that, Alan

ALAN GREENBERG: Am I the only one who thinks that a document talking about Rules of Procedure for the ALAC should say what the ALAC is at the start of the introduction?

HOLLY RAICHE: I think so, I think so.

ALAN GREENBERG: You think it should be? Sorry, Heidi, are you saying you think there should be a change or you're happy with what's there?

HEIDI ULLRICH: This is Heidi. I'm not saying anything but Holly is saying she's happy to have it there.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm sorry, Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE: Alan, was I not speaking loudly enough again?

ALAN GREENBERG: You're sort of fuzzy from my perspective. I thought you had said you're happy with what's there.

HOLLY RAICHE: I have, I did.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. So we're establishing that I'm the only one who thinks we should describe the ALAC in a document about ALAC policy.

HOLLY RAICHE: No.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Cheryl here.

ALAN GREENBERG: Cheryl and then Yaovi?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, what I see, I see the point, Alan, and yeah, I mean this does define it but in a step-by-step from the edges in point of view. Having a pre-sentence to what is there that says "ICANN's At-Large Advisory Committee, ALAC, is the fifteen-person committee blah, blah, blah" – yes, that would work provided it's not seen as repetitious. What text do you suggest should be there?

ALAN GREENBERG: Well I didn't have any text at this point. I just realized it as I was… If you look a few lines later in the definitions, the definition of ALAC is a perfectly reasonable thing or something similar to put up at the top but right now the introduction talks about ALSes, introduces the concept of

ALAC only as the body that accredits ALSes and then goes on… Go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I understand that. That's why I said the addition of a sentence that says "Fifteen-person committee" or that's talking about the body representing the interests thereof, that sentence is fine as long as it's not seen as repetitious.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, we'll just have to make sure that the later on sentence about how the ALAC is composed doesn't overlap, doesn't repeat the same thing. Okay, I can, either Holly can draft something or I can put something in the next revision which will be out later today. I actually got sleep last night so I'm capable of doing it.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Alan, it's Heidi?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yaovi has his hand raised. I also have entered some text from the Bylaws you might wish to take a look at.

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh yes, Yaovi, I'm sorry. Okay. Yaovi, go ahead.

YAOVI ATOHOUN: Yeah, thank you – Yaovi. Just I wanted to agree with what you are saying that we need an introduction. We are referring to ALAC without saying what is ALAC so I totally agree with what you are saying and you need to insert something maybe briefly about ALAC. And I can see people saying things in the Adobe, so just to support what you are saying.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, thank you. As we're talking I think much later on in the section where we're talking about the ALAC and the Rules associated with ALAC it may actually have the same sentence that Heidi has put in. So maybe it's just a matter of moving stuff out of that section and into the introduction. Olivier, are we correcting typos? People can correct typos anytime. We're way past the stage where I said no typos, so if you'd like to tell us about a typo now we'll listen or you can preferably send it in email but either way… And if you're talking we can't hear you.

Ah, my standard PG instead of PH. The question is why does Word not notice that as a spelling mistake?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Alan, it's Olivier. You might have made it so many times you might have now saved it in your dictionary.

ALAN GREENBERG: [laughing] Quite possible. Let's see…

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: And there is a procedure to take it out of the dictionary but that's something I'll leave to you to work out over a long weekend.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, it is in fact underlined, I just didn't notice it. One of the things I will be doing in my rested state is now actually running the spell checker against the document. Holly, what else do you want to do now to finish this up? This front introduction is much shorter than was proposed at various times during the evolution of this document. Are you happy with it or do you believe there are things that were deleted along the way which should in fact be there?

HOLLY RAICHE: No Alan, I'm actually happy with what it is. I do like the sentence that Heidi has pasted in the chat. I think that's the only thing that you add, but I like the fact that it's basically said "This is what it is" in fairly short form. But it seems to cover… If you put Heidi's sentence from the chat in there I think that works.

ALAN GREENBERG: If the chat stops moving long enough for me to copy it I will.

HEIDI ULLRICH: This is Heidi. Again, that's from the Bylaws. That's the first section of the ALAC section.

ALAN GREENBERG: I know, but it's so much easier if I copy it into a note right now and it's now done. The chat can keep on moving now.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Cheryl here.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry, Heidi then Cheryl. Holly rather, then Cheryl.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay, in looking… Are we talking about the text now or the definitions?

ALAN GREENBERG: We could go on to the definitions which I make no claim is complete or finished, but we can certainly talk about it. That's your call.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay. I have a first version but I think it's okay. In my comments I forwarded to you I filled in the definition of "consensus" as taken directly from the text in the Rules of Procedure. (Inaudible) ROP is simple. The staff in some of the discussions, we have talked about "staff" – I can find that and put that in. So without having had a look earlier but actually (inaudible), it looks to me as if we're pretty right on the definitions. I'm going to read it right now, and Alan I'll put anything in the chat that I see. But from my quick look it looks okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, I mean the definitions are something that we can and will no doubt have to fix, but it's not mandatory to get them perfect before we go out to the ALAC and to the community for input. So I'm less worried about those because we'll have plenty of opportunity to fix those. We're not making policy in the definitions, we're just making it easier to read.

HOLLY RAICHE: Now, I've still got a question, and that's the glossary – is there a glossary in the document?

ALAN GREENBERG: I think we decided at the previous DSDT meeting that we held that we did not need the glossary, that pointing people to the ICANN glossary should be sufficient.

HOLLY RAICHE: Right, I'm happy with that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, I think we decided two things at that meeting – we decided the only things that would be in the definitions are terms that we define and that are used repeatedly so people will need to reference them as opposed to something that we may define because it needs to be formal but is only used in one paragraph; there's no need to put it into the definitions. And we decided that we didn't need a formal glossary section because it would pretty well replicate part of the ICANN glossary. I'm not sure how accurate that is but that is what we decided.

HOLLY RAICHE: Yep, I agree with that decision.

ALAN GREENBERG: Cheryl, I think you are still in the queue.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Alan – Cheryl for the record. Two things: one, let me go back to the sentence now Heidi's talking…   Yes, alright, thanks for the attribution but it uses words that are very specifically out of the recommendations from the ALAC Review and Work Team A, I think it was, bludgeoned that sentence into its current form. So I think it's a perfect entre into the whole section.

                                With regards to the glossary as such, Alan, yes, your recollection and Holly's agreement at the last meeting is correct. But I do think the link or reference to that does need to go in this part of the text. So I just wanted to know if it was going to be put in before or after the title. I know that that might seem silly but if we put it in before the title it kind of gives it too much importance, and I'm not saying the glossary isn't important – I'm just saying it gives it perhaps too great of importance. I would prefer that at the end of the table there is a paragraph that says "Blah, blah, blah," and inserts the link.

                                What I wanted to say, Alan, is when you go out for getting the comments in, I think we need to make it really clear to people that the table is not meant to act as a glossary and that the table simply is a definition of used terms within the Rules of Procedure per se. And if

we're going to do that, Holly, I haven't looked at what you've written about "consensus" but I did want to make sure that we also look at how different, if indeed it is different at all from the words that the GNSO used because that's the other time where many of our people working in work groups, if they're constantly playing in one of the SO work group areas – if they have a different definition of "consensus," if ours differs we should even note the difference or try to make sure ours is more close to what is "common use" in ICANN. That's it from me.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, two comments: in terms of the glossary, if you scroll down far enough you will find it's there, and I think it probably has the words you want or something close to it.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, fine, I shall continue to try and scroll.

ALAN GREENBERG: It happened to roll onto the next page. I also sent it to you in an email.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alan, I've been up and in meetings since 2:30. It's now 6:30 so you know what you can do with your email… [laughter] Oh! There it is, I saw it. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: [laughing] Touché, Cheryl. In terms of… What was the other thing you said? Hold on, I'm trying to remember now… Oh, consensus – our

definition is very different from the one the GNSO uses for work groups because the work group consensus if you remember, because you're one of the ones who coined it is it tries to judge consensus where you cannot use anything resembling numbers or counts because the work group may be heavily dis…

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [Flated].

ALAN GREENBERG: The distribution of people may heavily favor one position or another so they try to define things, and they use very wishy-washy terms like "strong opposition," and that's not always clear if that's a lot of people feel a little bit against it or one person feels a lot against it. And in fact, there have been some very, very strong discussions in people disputing a chair's evaluation of consensus because of that lack of clarity. And probably there's no way to get more clarity given the fuzzy situation.

We're talking about judging consensus in a balanced group, and the number that we've been using in the last couple of weeks is if 80% of the people think something that's deemed to be consensus given that you only need 51% in a formal vote. So we can certainly quibble with the 80% but it's quite different from what the GNSO uses. On the other hand, it's probably quite close to what other organizations within ICANN use when they're using the word "consensus" and talking about how much of the group thinks something.

There are people in ICANN who still think "consensus" means unanimity and we clearly don't.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Indeed it may but it does not need to. Can I ask that Holly, if you wouldn't mind, if it's not too lengthy or complicated can you either tell us, read out to me what that proposed definition of "consensus" is from the comments section? Because I'm not able to be in this room and browsing the internet at the same time. Or can you paste it into the chat?

ALAN GREENBERG: I can pull it up.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Terrific. What I was saying is if it is markedly different and it appears it is from at least the GNSO's common usage of "consensus," then we need to note that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We should have wording that goes along the lines of "The ALAC defines for their use of consensus…" and insert whatever text we agree on.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, recall though the GNSO uses a different definition which isn't defined of consensus for use within the GNSO Council. That in fact has been a violent-

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It's a huge issue.

ALAN GREENBERG: …something that causes a large amount of discussion recently because it is not defined and people object to the word "consensus" when one particular group of people disagree.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: When one single person, yep. Let's also Alan remembering right back at you, that one of the ways around that of course is in the table that the GNSO work groups use there are whole lots of flavors of consensus. Now, we do not need to go into the flavors of consensus, I don't think we need to go into the flavors of consensus.

ALAN GREENBERG: You're right, we have to state what it is. I've just put what Holly had and I think Holly took it pretty well from the formal definition. So I think we need to make it clear, this is the definition ALAC uses for the purposes of its decisions. Interestingly, Olivier today asked me what was the definition that the GNSO used and I pointed him to that one, and I also pointed him to a video blog that someone asked me to do in Mexico City – I'm talking for five minutes on the different uses of the word "consensus" in ICANN. And there are a whole bunch of…   If anyone wants to see my beautiful face I'll send you the link to it but you know, it's a word which we have overused far too many times in different ways, but that's life.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: What else, folks?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Cheryl here, this is predominantly to Holly I guess but I think everyone should weigh in. Do you think there are a vast number of additional terms that are likely to go into this list? I just fear a table becoming bigger than the document. I would like to think there wasn't many more.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm sure there's a few we've left out, I don't think there's a lot. And we shrunk it by several, we collapsed everything into the single word "appointee," which by the way should be singular, not plural.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Alan, Holly has her hand raised.

ALAN GREENBERG: Holly has her hand raised. Olivier had his hand raised earlier, let's go to Olivier first and then Holly.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan, it's Olivier for the transcript. So I'm not quite sure what was decided now on "consensus." Are we going to define this or are we going to point to something else?

ALAN GREENBERG: We have defined it in the document.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: There's real confusion with regards… With regards to consensus there's a real confusion among people and I'm saying not only within At-Large but I guess outside those walls regarding the word "consensus," because some define it as being a unanimous decision.   And a unanimous decision would mean at that point if one person does not agree with something then we don't have consensus.   And that effectively provides the power for a minority to block anything that the majority wants to have.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, Olivier, within the ALAC Consensus, capital-C Consensus is a call of the Chair. And the Rules of Procedure give a rule of thumb, saying the general meaning or interpretation is no less than 80% of the sitting members of the ALAC believe that is the correct answer.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: Now, if that sentence is not right we can change it. It's not cast in concrete until it's approved but even with that number it is a call of the Chair. Now, 80% amounts to three people disagreeing. If the Chair would decide that because those three people are all from one region or because of the vehemence with which they disagree that there could only be two or three people disagreeing and the Chair may decide that's not sufficiently strong consensus. It's a judgment call with that rule of thumb. The Chair would not be well advised to judge that 60% of the group thinks something, therefore it's consensus. It might win a vote but you'd be hard-pressed to call it consensus.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, thank you. Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: Given the different number of range of the definitions of "consensus" within ICANN, of which the one you cited – 100% unanimity – is not the most common one I don't think we're going to fix ICANN's problems here. All we can do is try to make clear what we mean.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: But yeah, Alan, it's just so we make sure that definition which you've just given is in that table here. I don't think it's right for… Either that or to point to the right location in the document where this is actually defined or expanded on.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, it is defined and I haven't copied that sentence into the glossary yet. Holly had but I haven't put it into the one I'm working on. So it's just that it's a work in progress and it hadn't moved up, but I don't see how we can do any more than come up with our own rule of thumb which is less strong than a definition because we need to get some flexibility depending on the circumstances.

If you like we could say we work by "rough consensus" as Sandra is suggesting, but I don't see the need to modify it if that's how we always use that word.   And I haven't checked a dictionary definition of "consensus," whether in anyone's meaning it means unanimous – it may well. In any case, Holly?

HOLLY RAICHE: Yeah. First of all I am happy with the definition of "consensus" as it is in the document, and what I suggested for the definition was simply use exactly the same words that were in the document; putting it up front so everybody's clear on what is meant in this document and that's really one of the changes I made. So if it will happen I'm happy with that. The other reason I put my hand up is in response to Cheryl.   I've read through the document looking for terms that needed defining, and what's up front now and any additional comments that I made, but I think most of what I said is up front – and Alan, I'll just go through some time with the rest of today and make sure the things I've suggested are here.

But the terms that are there are pretty much what we've agreed. We don't need anything else.   So I'm happy with what's there plus the reference to the ICANN glossary. I think we're pretty much there, okay?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Terrific, thanks Holly. Cheryl here, thanks for that, Holly, I'm greatly heartened by hearing that. While I've got the microphone can I respond to Sandra, because Sandra's pointing out if we don't use a term like "rough consensus" then surely we should only be referring to the term "consensus" when there's been a vote. I'd argue that that isn't the case, Sandra, because votes tend to be formal, polls or somewhere less formal sometimes in the ICANN world; but what will often happen and what should happen in my view in an ICANN discussion but certainly must happen in an ALAC discussion is the Chair or whoever's managing the meeting will say "Do we have consensus on that?"

With those words it's a call for consensus. Now, if nine people are in the room and nine people go "Yes, yes, yes, yes, yes," then you know, clearly that's consensus. If nine people are in the room and eight of them go "Yes, yes, yes" and one of them says "Well, I still have a particularly large issue with this," the ALAC would still – because that would meet the 80/20 rule – would still suggest that that is in fact a consensus outcome. And no vote per se was taken but it's more of an application of an 80+ rule.

If we get tighter than that then yes, we do need to go to the ridiculous situation in my view where everything has to be voted on. Now, the term "rough consensus" is used elsewhere in ICANN and certainly has even got some specific definitions, and again, now Alan and I can point us back to the wonderful world of GNSO where there's about seven different flavors of consensus – not just full consensus and rough consensus.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, I mean the problem is I just put a definition that I pulled off of the web, and you know, definition #1 is general agreement or unanimity; #2 is the judgment arrived at by most of those concerned. So of those three different things, one of them is unanimous, the other two are not. I think we've lost at some level the concept when we say that we will try to make decisions by consensus, there's a statement there. The statement there says "We want more agreement than is necessary to pass a vote." Saying we want to do things by consensus is not just saying "We don't want the mechanics of a vote." It's saying "We want larger buy-in than a vote will demand for passing." And by approving something by consensus we are giving a stronger vote of confidence than what a formal vote counts, which can pass by one vote.

But it's not unanimity. It says we're trying to honor the intent of the group to the extent that we can identify that intent. So we can modify the word as many times as we want, we're not likely to meet… Everyone's going to end up interpreting it slightly differently. So my thought is to keep it as simple as possible and live with that.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Hi Alan, this is Heidi – Sandra has her hand up?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yep sorry, I'm not paying attention to the screen. Thank you, Heidi. Sandra?

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Thank you, all, can you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes.

SANDRA HOFERICTHER: Okay, great. I just want to raise the question again why do we have to define consensus because we all agree it's so difficult to define and there are different forms of consensus, rough consensus and so on and so forth. Maybe it's easier if we refer to consensus later on in the document in terms of how to reach consensus where we can offer some guidelines to a Chair on how consensus can be reached and when we can let's say talk about having a rough consensus or having another consensus. I think to define it here in a few words is really hard and I would actually delete it from this terms and acronyms.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, but Sandra, you're missing the intent of this set of definitions. What we have here are terms that are defined later on in the context but are then used at various other places in the document as a capitalized term. So to aide you in finding out if you don't have a perfect memory exactly what is the definition we're using, this is here as an aide. We do later on define "consensus" and talk about… We don't have a methodology of how the Chair attempts to guide the group to move to consensus – that's not the kind of thing everyone's ever suggested we should be putting in the Rules; that's more of a guide on how to run meetings. But you know, we are defining it later on in the document. The definition at the top is not meant to be taken out of context but used as a reference.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: I understand the intent behind it but I'm still unsure if it's really possible to define so-to-say generic words, and "consensus" is more or less a generic word. Like "motion" might be as well, but "motion" is easier to define.   All other terms and acronyms are acronyms actually, and "consensus" and "motion" are the only parts where we tried to define a generic term. And this might be the reason why it's so difficult to do this exercise, and another thing which we can keep in our back is that it might mean different things for different regions also because of the language barrier.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sandra, I'm not sure… Go ahead.

SANDRA HOFERICHTER: If we are trying to define something now where the people on the call can agree on, and which might be absolutely right for a native speaker it might have a slightly different meaning for somebody from Asia. It might be difficult in the future.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, we'll go to Yaovi next but I think the thing I want to point out is we're using the format that contracts use, that is when a word is capitalized it has a very specific meaning. If it's lower-case "c" you're correct – it may have many different meanings to people. If it is a capitalized word then it has the specific meaning that is defined in the document. And maybe we need to say that for people who aren't used

to reading contracts, so that may be an important issue. We have Yaovi unless Heidi wants to go first, or Holly rather, sorry.

HOLLY RAICHE: You mean Holly. [laughing]

ALAN GREENBERG: I keep on doing that. Holly, do you want to come in as the group leader or do you want Yaovi to go first?

HOLLY RAICHE: I want, I just want to reply to Sandra to say if it is a defined term, which it is, then that means that's what we mean all the time. It takes away from any particular situation… If we're saying "consensus" then in fact "What we mean according to the Rules of Procedure, we mean the following…"   Now, the term is defined in the Rules; all we've done is take that phrase, put it up front. And as Alan has said if you make it a capital "C" and it's in the Rules then for ALAC purposes, this is what is meant and it simply avoids arguments later in a meeting situation. It means if Olivier says "We have consensus" then we have a document that says that's what it means. And we don't have to discuss it any further.

It means people can have definitions, in their own languages, whatever. But it means we as ALAC have for ALAC purposes defined it in the following way. That's how we will use the term consistently. And you know, it just ends the debate. It ends the discussions. It means "This is what we mean" and I think it's really, really critical that we have

something that says this for Olivier's purposes, for any working group chair's purposes, for whatever. It means this is what we mean. We aim for it and we can tell if we have it because either it will meet the definition or it won't. It just makes life incredibly simple.

I do not want the term omitted because then it means every time you talk about consensus everybody has their own definition and you'll start having an argument all over again. To have it defined in a particular way and then used that way consistently just aides the discussion – it means this is what we say. So please don't delete it. Please keep the definition. And everyone has to be happy with that definition but once it's in black and white that's what it means in this context, okay? Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Holly, Sandra has already answered you in the chat.

HOLLY RAICHE: Good.

ALAN GREENBERG: But Sandra's position is well-taken.   People may have different definitions and I have a note now that I will add a preamble to the table which will say exactly what the table is and why it's there, and what the impact of capitalized words is. So thank you very much. That was a good intervention and I think we'll have fewer problems because of that assuming people actually read it. [laughing] Yaovi, you had your hand

up a while ago and then got tired. I know, holding your hand up a long time takes a lot of energy.

YAOVI ATOHOUN: No, (inaudible).

ALAN GREENBERG: What else, folks? Sorry, Holly, did you say something?

HOLLY RAICHE: I just said I'm very happy.

ALAN GREENBERG: Oh good! That time I heard it. Alright then, if there's nothing else to discuss I'm going to get back to trying to get this document out so everyone can see it.

HOLLY RAICHE: Excellent.

ALAN GREENBERG: Anything else we need to do?

HOLLY RAICHE: Alan, just a question – do you want me to go back into the document and put stuff there, or do you want to put into the document the comments I made earlier that I put into my comments?

ALAN GREENBERG: The answer is yes. [laughing]

HOLLY RAICHE: Yes?? I gave you two alternatives, you can't say yes. [laughing]

ALAN GREENBERG: I know you asked either/or and the answer is yes. I will be putting in what you gave me already, and as soon as I get the version out I want you to go through the document and make sure I didn't miss anything.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay, thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: And since I presume you're going to go to sleep at some point, or did you just get up already?

HOLLY RAICHE: I just got up.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: She just got up.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, well, I don't know – 4:00 in the morning sometimes I'm still awake. Okay, take a nap and it should be out soon.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes?

HEIDI ULLRICH: This is Heidi. Would you like to schedule another call for this Drafting Team?

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't think this Drafting Team needs it. Others might but I don't think this Drafting Team does. Heidi or Holly… Sorry, can one of you please change your name to something that doesn't start with an "H?"

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I do think they need to be switched, yeah.

ALAN GREENBERG: I seem to be unable to handle that today. Holly, do you believe we need another call?

HOLLY RAICHE: No, I don't. I'm happy with this.

ALAN GREENBERG: Cheryl, do you think that the list of reviewers, which is basically the penholders plus a few others needs to have a call? Are we going to be able to get closure without it? I'm wondering about that now.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alan, that's probably merited even if it's just a very quick sign-off call. My guess for that is we're at a point where we need to make sure people have committed to read the document as a whole, and I think that will be a good lever to make sure they've read the document as a whole. So just for the purposes of a quick scan through of the final or pen-ultimately final draft, I think that's probably worthwhile. But I also would suggest that if all the penholders don't turn up that's just tough, we just move on.

ALAN GREENBERG: So be it, okay. Heidi, can you try to schedule a call for no earlier than the middle of next week I'm thinking and no later than the end of next week?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yeah, let's say Wednesday through Friday because we have the ALAC call on Tuesday.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think so. That should give me enough time and people will have had a chance to look at it, and maybe even get another revision out.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, so Wednesday or Thursday let's say.

ALAN GREENBERG: Or Friday.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Well Friday is Saturday for Holly and Cheryl.

ALAN GREENBERG: True enough.

HEIDI ULLRICH: I don't want to have them working any harder than they need to.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, make me work harder instead, that's reasonable. [laughing]

HEIDI ULLRICH: [laughing] You've been calling me Holly all day so…

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm sorry.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah, I think that's fair.

ALAN GREENBERG: It's totally fair you get back at me. [laughing] Alright? Our business is done. We have nine minutes I'm giving back to your lives.   And the Holly in Los Angeles, I'll talk to you soon. [laughter]

[End of Transcript]