

---

ALAC Rules of Procedure & the ALAC Metrics Sub-Committee Meeting  
Wednesday, December 12, 2012 – 21:00 to 22:00  
Teleconference

JULIA CHARVOLEN: Welcome to the joint Rules of Procedures & Metrics subcommittee call on Wednesday, the 12<sup>th</sup> of December at 21:00 UTC.

On today's call we have, on the English channel, Yaovi Atahoun, Maureen Hilyard, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Alan Greenberg, Yrjo Lanispuro, Roosevelt King, and Tijani Ben Jemaa. On the Spanish channel we have only one person right now, Natalia Enciso. We have apologies from Cintra Sooknanan, Holly Raiche, Sergio Salinas Porto, Dev Anand Teelucksingh, and Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro. From staff we have Matt Ashtiani, Sylvia Vivanco, myself Julia Charvolen, and Heidi Ullrich. For interpreters we have Sabrina and David today.

May I also remind everyone to state their names for transcription purposes, but also for the interpreters to identify the speakers on the other language channel? Please speak at a reasonable pace to allow for an accurate interpretation. Thank you very much and over to you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you very much Julia. Just for the record, we've seen that Eduardo Diaz has joined us while we were doing the roll call, so he is also noted in attendance.

Well, ladies and gentlemen, hopefully you're all going to be telling me and each other that we are on a downhill slope and that we are very close to not just a penultimate anymore, but an ultimate draft for the consideration of the ALAC to look forward to their new modified, supercharged, and indeed most wonderful and resilient Rules of Procedure; at least that's my desire. How close are we going to get it? I guess you'll find out over the next 35 or 40 minutes.

---

*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.*

---

It is my intention, for absolutely and totally selfish reasons, to keep this call to just the hour, so hopefully that will suit all of you. What it will mean is when we get to Section 3 of our agenda, which is the review of the prepared materials, that I'm going to ask each of the penholders to just take us through the highlights and bring to our attention anything they feel may need particular socializing or work with the ALAC.

I would also suggest that what we should be particularly keen to do is make some very pragmatic choices today about recognizing that one can try and make things perfect, but it is occasionally the enemy of the good. At this point in time our objective should be to ensure that as early as humanly possible in the 2013 calendar year the At-Large Advisory Committee has a new set of Rules of Procedure to operate under.

If indeed that means they need to resolve a small review point to ensure that everything we have done is workable and we haven't left great big holes or gaps somewhere, then so be it. So, that's the purpose of our call.

We've already gone through parts one and two of our agenda, which means it is my intention to jump right in. I'd ask those of you who are not... I apologize for my beasts barking in the background; hopefully they won't continue it too much longer. Those of you who are not in the Adobe Connect room, thanks to staff efficiency we are actually looking at the template worksite; which many of you have spent a good amount of time, and thank you very much for that, putting material into.

If you would to look the link on your agenda, and there is a link to what is called 'Prepared Material', it will take you to the current state of where our Rules of Procedure are. As we go through this we'll do it in turns of the drafting teams. If any of the penholders in the drafting team want to do some more generic reporting, and indeed are meeting [Inaudible 4:59]. Fatimata? Welcome back Fatimata. If whether they see a need for having another [Inaudible 5:12] talk, then they should perhaps let us know. But towards the end of the call on agenda item 4

---

we will be looking at planning on how the drafting teams are actually going to work to complete their tasks.

Well, that's it for me, until I interject; which, of course, is what I'm likely to do, knowing me. But if we start now looking not at definitions and structure necessarily, because we are aware that there is some additional work to be done on that. I'm aware that Holly is not with us. I'd like to come back on definitions and structure after we've gone through the others because what I'd like to do is make sure that the other draft team penholders alert now for staff to take a note of if they see there is anything in their section that needs to be picked up in the definitions and structures part.

Which means, Alan, it's over to you. Is it you and Eduardo? Or, is it you and Maureen for the first section?

ALAN GREENBERG:

The first one is me and Eduardo, the second one is me and Maureen. We've got a bad echo. Okay, it's gone.

I have done nothing that is in a form that could be distributed since the meeting in Toronto. So, for that I give my *mea culpas*. I have done some work, but it's torn apart in pieces right now and not put back together. I hope by the end of the week, or the weekend anyway, it will be put back together and something I can distribute. I'm talking actually on behalf of both of the groups right now. So I have not stressed either of my co-workers, or co-penholders, but I will be doing that real soon.

So there's nothing really to report that's different from what I presume everyone had reviewed for Toronto. The changes that I'm in the process of making are, number one, a widespread review for consistency and using the same terms, and things like that, and preparation for merging them all together; which means we have to note the definitions and only define it the first time, that kind of stuff. So I'm doing a bunch of cleanup for that and to try to use due consistency.

---

There were a small number of points that were left unresolved at the last drafting team meetings. Most of those were highlighted in Toronto, or in preparation for Toronto. There were a number of suggestions in Toronto, or maybe on the Wiki, or a combination of those for changes that have to be made, and one or two changes which never saw the light of day on a Wiki, but were discussed with various team members.

I think the section with Eduardo and the section with Maureen, and both of those people have tended to turn documents around quickly when I got them to them. I think hopefully within a week, maybe a little bit more, we should have something to distribute to the rest of the people on the drafting teams for any comments, and hopefully a final set of comments. We're going to need certainly one drafting team call for each, a reasonable time after that. There might be a need for a second one, but I suspect not; I hope not.

The two items that I will want to highlight, and I'm not sure they come under this agenda item or a following one, but I'll just say them. Number one, we have to figure out just how we're going to pull the whole document together and make sure it's consistent. I have some ideas on that.

The second one is the documents refer to a number of adjunct documents, some of which exist in some other form and could be pulled together quickly for ALAC approval, some of which don't really exist at this point. We need to decide, are we going to try to draft these documents or put a placeholder document, which doesn't have really enough information in it, but nevertheless a document with the right name, is in place. Otherwise we can't really approve rules without the documents that they point to, even if they're only placeholder documents. That's my report.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you, Alan. Obviously, thank you and your other penholders. I do think that two of the issues you raised I'd like to open for discussion.

The first one is you indicated you had plans for how you see the final twilight synthesis of the document going. Perhaps we could deal with that first. Then secondly, there's the issue of the placeholder pieces. I would think you also have a plan on that, but I should suggest that one of the things we probably need to do is capture now on the Wiki in some way the placeholder pages or a list of each of those documents so we don't let one of those slip thought.

Can I ask you to share with us how you would see the general blending together? As you do that, if people could cue or indicate their opinions on your proposal, I think that would be useful now.

ALAN GREENBERG:

My proposal, which I make with some trepidation, given that I am the penholder on two of them and I contributed significantly to the elections one, I think I'm probably the most familiar person, most familiar with all of the documents. I'm certainly willing to do a first pass at trying to pull them together and make sure that they are consistent.

I'm afraid that despite your other responsibilities, you're probably the person who is next both familiar with the documents, and more aware than I am with some of the problems we've had over the last number of years, and in a better position to make sure that we catch them. I don't mind being a person who pulls the documents together. I think you need to play a role in making sure that there are no 'Gotchas' that I'm missing. And then we need I think two or three other people who are willing to look at things with a fine-toothed comb to point out our bad grammar and point out inconsistencies.

I don't think we need many more people than that because then it becomes writing by committee. As I said, I do it with some trepidation because I don't really need another task on my list, but it makes some sense to have the people who have been most familiar with the new content and the old content playing a prime role in it, I think.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Next Tijani. Tijani, over to you.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, thank you. I'm not sure I understood everything Alan said because of the quality of the line. But I would like to say that what is remaining is not only the form and the regiment of the text, etcetera, and the harmony of the whole text. We have a section or a part that we didn't work on at all, which is the selection of the Board member.

It is a point that needs a lot of work since there were a lot of complaints during last Friday. So we need to address this point very carefully and we have to take our time in discussing it, drafting, and working through what is drafted so that we avoid any problems in the future. I am sure that most of the work is done, but there is remaining work that is very important too.

The second point is I think that we need to finish inside the drafting teams the work. I think everything should be ready inside the drafting teams, and then we can try to compile all of that work together to make it a text. We have to discuss it afterwards line by line and try to approve it so that there is no contradiction, etcetera.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks, Tijani. I'll note Alan, but just before that, Tijani, just coming back to your last sentence. Are you suggesting that the drafting teams need to go through it line by line? Or are you agreeing that Alan's proposed small group do that?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I think that for the four teams. In each team the whole team has to discuss the finalized work of the drafting team. Then, when we compile it I think that the whole drafting teams, the four together have to go through the text and discuss it. It could be in a meeting. So the compilation has to be by a small group. That's clear; that's very normal.

---

But its discussion and its approval has to be done inside the wider group.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Okay. Well on that point, Tijani, your particular proposal from the end of your intervention is that we will be having a meeting of the whole, in other words of all four drafting teams, with as many members as can possibly join us before this goes finally to the ALAC. If that's the agreement and belief of the rest of the group here today, I don't think we should not do that. I'm quite supportive of that and it will give us opportunity to have a sense of closure as well. In our next agenda item we will need to tie down very specifically dates for that to occur. Back to you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay, thank you. I think I generally agree with Tijani, but I have some caveats. I would not want to see... if a small group, me, you, Eduardo has volunteered, pull together the document and we've gone over it, I would not want to go over it line by line in the full Rules of Procedure committee as a whole.

You've got to believe that people can do their homework and identify things that confuse them, that they don't understand, or believe are wrong. Otherwise, it's going to be an exceedingly tedious meeting. I really think that we have to rely on people to do their homework. And yes, I think it has to be a well-attended meeting, and I think we have to take pains to make sure we set it at a time where that can happen. But anyway, I've said that.

In terms of the section missing on the Board, I was assuming Yrjo was going to be talking about that when we got to him; and we haven't gotten to him yet. However, my recollection is that the overall rules for Board member selection were approved by the community and by the Board, and I don't think it is within our discretion to change the overall, significant rules.

---

I think there are a few areas which need clarification. There are a few documents in which things that should have been documented in the formal rules that did not make it for various reasons, and that we have to fix. But overall, the process I don't think is one that we want to tinker with too much.

But Tijani said there were a lot of complaints. I guess I know some grumblings. I'm not sure I know a lot of real complaints; there were some. I think we need to be documenting those and trying to see what are the issues we have to fix, if indeed there are things we need to fix because it might require formal Board approval if we do things that are more than minor renovations on it. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you, Alan. Before I go to Eduardo, I want to agree with you 110% on what you just said, apart from the fact that it fits perfectly with what I put into the chat.

The degree of problem that the last process for selection of Seat 15 by the ALAC and At-Large community that we can fix, and there are extreme limitations on things that can be fixed before the necessary review point happens, can only really be done by [Inaudible 20:03]. In other words, by the, "we didn't understand," or, "that wasn't clear enough," being made as easily understood as we possibly can and helping specifically the regional At-Large organization executives and leaders to have a shared and clear understanding of some of what they are doing.

hat really is the role of the 2013 to 2014 BCEC. I would assume that that will be convened by the Chair of the ALAC early in the 2013 calendar year so that by the Beijing meeting they can have for ALAC and wider community review a new, more easily understood, and unambiguous selections web space put up.

It would be my hope that Yrjo and some of his team would be willing to continue to a degree in a drafting role and be part of that refurbishment



---

and new space creation so that it's fitted as best as possible with the election, selection, and appointments processes that they will have put together for the ordinary rules as well.

But to be absolutely clear, Tijani, this work group cannot tinker to any great extent with what is the consensus, not full consensus I admit, but the consensus-built process and Board-approved process. We would have to take any changes of any significance beyond minor implementation ones and clarification ones back to the Board via the Board Governor's Committee. Next is Eduardo, and then Alan again.

EDUARDO DIAZ:

I just wanted to go back to the process of binding the documents, which I agree with 100%. We have said already, "Are you going to add the one small group that will put together the [Inaudible 22:42] to look at it?" After we do that we have a period of time for people to comment on it, so we can answer any questions in the Wiki. So when we get to this final meeting when there is everybody, the meeting doesn't get to be a hard meeting to have. That's my comment. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you, Eduardo. If I could get my round of applause up in time I would have done it. But yes, I think use of the Wiki is absolutely essential on this. Back to you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Back to the Board member selection. If there are other problems other than the ones I'm not aware of, then I think we need to identify those really soon so that Yrjo's group can address them.

The only two that I'm aware of are that last time we had a very specific rule, but it did not make it into the Rules of Procedure for reasons I can't remember, that regional decisions must be formal regional decisions. That is, they must include all of the ALSs if it's a decision, and

---

if it's a decision to direct a vote it must be a formal decision to do that, not ad hoc.

The one thing that the most comments were about, certainly from the various Board members who were involved, was making sure that the electorate cannot be captured by a small number of people. So RALO decisions need to be formal RALO decisions. We did have a rule about that, but I don't know why it didn't make it into the formal rules. But I don't think it did.

The other thing which turned up towards the end is that we have inconsistencies if an ALAC member or a RALO Chair is one of the candidates. I had proposed something on one of the lists of a suggested way to work around that.

But those are the only two substantive ones that I can recall. If there are other ones other than reopening the whole thing to have a general election of ever user of the world selecting the Board member, I guess we should try to get those in the open really quick.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thanks for that Alan. Yes, you've captured some of the primary ones. There are some others that are really implementation issues.

For example, it was identified by the selection committee, which is not a selection committee because we can't call it that for the slight of candidates, that they would need to establish well in advance and have published weighting for criteria. The criteria was established, but it is the waiting for those criteria that needs to be well understood, both within the group and obviously by the aspirants and the community in general.

It is my strong push, and I do have some very strong views on some of the process issues on how it should be done better this next time around, that not only should the criteria and weightings be clear and

---

published, the go or no-go or threshold for exactly how good you've got to be to be even on the slate needs to be clear as well.

A point, I don't care what that point is, but I think the community should know what the point is. My personal preference is somewhere in the high 70s or 80s of the total percentage of weighted marks should be clearly understood. I don't care whether it's the world's most popular individual, but if they don't make that cutoff point by the blind, unidentified weighting and checklist-ing that the BCEC does, then tough. You either make the threshold or you don't.

It was a little risk because we did not have that well established before processes had started. Last time because there was initial risk some people fear that it was the problem. I don't believe that it was the problem people thought it was, but the fact that the community fears that there was a risk in that, that needs to be addressed. Alan, over to you again.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah, we did have a number of documents associated with the BCEC last time. My presumption is that those, plus what you deem to be missing having been involved in the process would be drawn into one of these adjunct documents that would be pointed to by the thing. So I think we do need to formalize some of the stuff and attach it to our rules. We have a little bit more time on that one than we do on some of the others, but I think that's the place it fits so that people are going into this without a worry that things might be changed unilaterally by whoever chairs the next committee, and a number of issues like that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Terrific, okay. Alright, since there's no more on that, I think one of the most important things before we move on to the other drafting teams reports is to capture as a primary action item from today's meeting, we need to create a list of all the adjunct documents that are referred to in these new Rules of Procedure.

Matt, if we can have a place and space to start having each of the drafting teams to be able to edit and say what support documentation needs to be there. What I'd also like to do is if I could ask Heidi to establish someone in her staff team who will have a watching brief on that page.

If indeed there is something that we have already in our archives or that may be considered by the drafting team to be partly useful, or at least contributory in our archives that staff alert the drafting team to the existence of those documents and where they exist by some sort of message on that page. I think that might be the best way forward. Can anyone think of a better mechanism?

ALAN GREENBERG:

I think the adjunct documents that I know about are all pointed to by and identified as adjunct documents, or will be by the time I finish my review in the next day or so in the two sections that I'm working on, plus the one we just identified associated with the Board selection. I'm not sure there are any more. There may be another one that I've forgotten about, but I think those are the primary ones.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

I don't mind if they're in the template, but I think they need to be picked out of the template as well so that we can dot our i's and cross the t's, and more importantly, see what resources are already in existence. I think it would be a foolish thing for the creators of the adjunct documents to have to go back to basics and have this fighting adventure of finding things on the Wiki space. Some of these things will get back to social text days; and that should put a cold shutter through many of your hearts.

ALAN GREENBERG:

But my discs have a lot of things on them.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Ah, yes. And of course that's the other thing. Heidi, we might need to make an action item that we have some right of collection and ownership on hard drive material on certain upstanding ALAC members because they're probably holding some more important information.

ALAN GREENBERG: Once I leave the ALAC they'll be available for a price.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It's scary to think where some of this information is or isn't. Okay. Yeah, I think Matt that's probably a reasonable way forward. Look, it's not going to be a great, complicated place, but I think it just needs to be a page where staff can say, "Ooh, ooh, I found something. Does that help?" And that we can make sure that all of those adjunct documents while they're being worked on, but the access to them is from a single point of entry, rather than having people troll through the Rules of Procedure themselves.

Okay, now I think if we go straight to Yrjo that would be the best thing now. We have kind of done some of your selections, elections, and appointments. But how are we tracking with your drafting team?

YRJO LANSIPURO: Yeah, Section D here on the documents... Can you scroll to it, to the center?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yrjo, you should be able to scroll now.

---

YRJO LANSIPURO: Okay, alright. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Right here at the bottom.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yrjo, sorry, but now everyone needs to scroll.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah, I was going to say, but it would have been better for you take us where we need to be and then [Crosstalk 33:24].

YRJO LANSIPURO: So everybody has to do it.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Actually, I'm going to give you hosting rights, and I think that's going to allow you to manipulate... one moment please.

ALAN GREENBERG: If you go down to the bottom and then up a bit, you'll have it.

YRJO LANSIPURO: No, this is not the one actually.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, that isn't. Yrjo, I don't think you ever incorporated those into the template. I think they're just in your Sandbox, or whatever.

---

YRJO LANSIPURO:

Yeah, yeah. I probably couldn't figure out how to do it. But anyway, what we have here is that there are three sections, or at least a text space there. That is to say that one is the general provisions, two is procedures for election of Chair and selection of ALAC leadership team, and three is procedures for other appointments.

What is still open are sections on the procedures for electing the ALAC representatives to the ICANN Board, which was just discussed a moment ago and which seems to be a daunting task. Then, of course, the last point, which is recall. Actually on that one my question is, is recall something that this drafting team on elections, selections, and appointments should do? Or is it somebody else's province?

But anyway, we have to convene the drafting team. I think we need at least two meetings because this ALAC representative to the ICANN Board, that whole thing is quite complicated and we need a lot of help and support from others who have more knowledge of how it actually went last time, than myself. I don't know if Yaovi would like to add something.

YAOVI ATOHOUN:

Thank you. I'm sorry I have a problem with my line today and I'm trying to be in Adobe. What I can add is that I completely agree with what you said. We can have for this drafting team another call. And certainly as Alan said before it would be [Inaudible 36:26] because he was also working on that team with us.

So if you have another call that can help us to take time and talk about this part of the document that is missing. After that we can have our part incorporated into the complete document. So concretely we need to convene another call for this drafting team, to review some changes if necessary, and mainly to talk about the Board member selection. This is what I can add for now.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Yaovi. Can I ask for response to the very specific point that Yrjo raised regarding the matter of recall belonging to their drafting team?]. We're met by deathly silence. Yrjo, I'm a little worried.

Well, you can have my totally biased view, that's for certain. I would think that, yes, the matter of recall should be dealt with by your drafting team. It is valid to, I guess, argue that it belongs and it certainly would intersect with other sections of the Rules. But traditionally it has sat under sections which are devoted to elections and appointments, but it does trigger selection, election, and appointments consequences if recall is enacted. So I think from that rationale I'd be pushing to have it belonging to you.

You may not feel that's great because that's a little bit more work you need to do. But with the matter of recall, of course, we also have some very significant issues that might not be difficult to address, but they need to be considered in terms of both accountability and transparency.

So this may be one of those times where a new adjunct document, and that would be easy enough to build upon from existing documents that would be an At-Large Advisory Committee accountability and transparency framework, and could indeed cross into things like courtesy and codes of conduct, and things like that; some of which are already established.

Now that's not work that would need to be done before the Rules go for consideration. But under Alan's proposal the placeholder and material lists that would be contributing to it certainly should exist.

YRJO LANSIPURO: Okay, alright. We keep it.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yep, sorry. Not going to get rid of that one if I can help it.



---

With regards to your questions and concerns about the selection of Seat 15, I would very, very much like, and that comes from having gone through all of the good, the bad, and the ugly of the whole process that we went through last time, and having no intention of not being involved to whatever extent I can be in making sure that the processes are better understood, and the implementation is not only well understood, but slightly more robust in this next round.

I would be encouraging certainly one if not both of you two penholders from this drafting team to be very closely involved with the next BCEC. I think it would be essential that someone kept an eye on integration as the work of setting up the new space and getting everything established and socialized, because we have many, many more new community members coming in with all of the new ALSs. There's actually I think a lot of outreach, as well as bring up to speed of the old faithful that needs to be done.

That would need to be ready for consideration by the ALAC certainly at the Beijing or shortly after the Beijing meeting. But between Beijing and Durban those places, spaces, and the mechanisms need to start going live. After the Durban meeting, it may be that some of your talents that you have in your current nominating committee might be freer to contribute to what is the At-Large community selection committee.

You've got a number of people that are already on the second year of their term and options are limited. So it may be that the ALAC and At-Large can benefit by pulling NomCom experienced people into running a very, very similar process to their own slate of candidates for consideration. That's certainly how I would like to see it happen. Alan, over to you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah, I just wanted to clarify... sorry, my machine froze so it took me a while to get my hand up. When we're talking about recall, I believe we were talking about recall; that is an appointment the ALAC makes unmaking it.

YRJO LANSIPURO: Correct.

ALAN GREENBERG: Because the concept of removing an ALAC member is already addressed within the metrics; they're not metrics, but the performance issues that we have. And that's not recall because we the ALAC do not appoint those people. So that's a separate section. For Yrjo, we really are looking at recall.

Some of the provisions are trivial; saying a liaison is no longer a liaison. Well, all it took was a vote of the ALAC to put them in, I presume a vote of the ALAC takes them out. The only one that's really difficult is do we want to have a similar clause for the Board member.

If the ALAC chooses to want to have that capability, that's going to require some care because it's not the ALAC, not alone in any case, but in general it is not the ALAC which selects them, and therefore we have to make sure we don't have a positions where the ALAC can remove someone if they didn't approve of the selection in the first place. So that's an edgy one that I'm not sure how we're going to address.

Anyway, I'm just trying to clarify on what the words mean. Most of the provisions are really simple. I presume removing a Chair or a Vice-chair is something that's just as simple, because again, these are majority of ALAC decisions. The worst we want to do is have a supermajority to remove someone, but I don't think those are going to be difficult ones to write. The Board member one, if we choose to go that direction, is perhaps the more difficult one.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Indeed. Yrjo, I'm wondering if we shouldn't put on a possibility. Experience in my world certainly tells me the one time that most people who are involved in any form of organization that has rules or

---

requirements that they are living by get to read those and establish a thorough understanding in that election, selection, and appointment time.

People can go through many, many years with total ignorance of what the rules actually are. They might get excited about someone being selected that they don't like or someone not being selected who they do.

I'm wondering whether it may be of use regardless of the status, because I would like to think that the status of the Rules of Procedure will be accepted by certainly early in our new calendar year. But do you think either before or after the ALAC deliberates and votes on this, it would be worthwhile having a presentation particularly focusing on the personnel issues, the elections, selections, and appointments issues, and indeed perhaps even explaining to everyone why changes can or cannot be made to things like the selection of Seat 15 on the Board? Or do you just want to let sleeping dogs lie on this?

YRJO LANSIPURO:

I think that this is a good idea to have that sort of presentation. It's true that rules usually stay on the books and nobody really cares until, and then it's sometimes late.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Yes. We've all had traumatic moments of inconvenient times because of those sorts of things happening. Heidi, could I suggest then if no one disagrees with this plan that the Executive Committee of the ALAC of our brief on this proposal and that the Chair of the ALAC and his ExCom are asked to consider when they would desire a specific briefing for the ALAC and the wider community on their new Rules of Procedure?

That's also going to, to some extent, affect our time course plans and our time management. That would be, I think, very handy. Then what we will do is make sure that whatever month they call at a point in time

---

they think that would be a good idea we could get that date fairly firmly in our own plans for the penholders and team members as well. Alan, you have your hand up.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I do. I'm trying to type into the comment thing and my Adobe Flash Player is using up all of my processor, and won't let me type. But somehow it let me put my hand up.

I don't think any other groups have the ability of removing their Board member. I don't remember reading that in any other bylaws or rules. I may be wrong; I haven't read them all. It does strike me, however, if a unanimous decision or the ALAC is to advise the Board to remove the At-Large Board member that is a mechanism. The Board has the ability to remove the appointed member. So, that's just a thought.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Alan, I think you're right there. We have had an experience in at least one of the SOs, because I was working with that SO very closely at the time, where the rank and file membership constituency, as well as the Council were very keen to have one of their two Board seats replaced, refurbished, and refreshed with some urgency.

It was a quite convoluted and highly complicated mechanism that was not done as quickly as many of the individuals who were concerned and groups that were concerned. So I think you're right. I'm not sure that there are many other ways of doing it, from a bylaws point of view.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Well Cheryl, it's not clear that if we ask General Council whether we have the right to have a rule like that they wouldn't say, "Sure, it's your call." I don't think anyone currently has such a rule. I don't know the answer to that, but it's possible we would be told we could put a rule like that in place, should we choose.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay Alan, I'm going to ask Jay Jay, Jay Jay loves me talking to him. Actually, Yrjo, you and I think, it's underneath your drafting team. You, Yaovi, and I will have a chat to Jay Jay; that'll brighten his day.

YRJO LANSIPURO: Yeah. I have to talk to him about other things also.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Exactly right.

YRJO LANSIPURO: Yeah. Alright, so I now more or less understand what our team should do. Thinking of the timetable, it's late in the day in terms of holiday season and all of that. What is more or less the deadline for completing this section?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: You've brought us beautifully to the next agenda item. I would like to hear from yours and Alan's, and I think Holly's team will just have to come in behind, you tell us what is achievable. My response would be, "I'd like it to already have been done." Well, I'm not going to get that wish, so let's be both practical and reasonable.

We are moving, however, into a point in Asia where there are many and sometimes quite long holiday and festival requirements. I would encourage our work, the drafting team work to be done as soon as is practical. But I would like to also ask Heidi just before we go to Alan, do you know what the plans are? The ALAC will be having its January meeting in its normal date, will it?

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Are you asking me or Heidi?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm asking Heidi.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Oh, sorry. I thought you were asking Alan.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: If you know the answer, Alan, feel free to tell me.

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't know.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Let me take a look Cheryl. I know that the December meeting is...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We're shifting the December one.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: December, I suspect, is a lost cause to us all. But I would like to think unless you penholders can scream and cry very loudly that it's impossible and it can't be done, that we should certainly be aiming for the briefing and therefore substantive completion by the ALAC January meeting.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Cheryl, it's the 25<sup>th</sup> of January.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay. How does that sit with you all? Alan, you've got your hand up.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, I think that's a little bit aggressive. I cannot see convening a drafting group meeting before the New Year. We're just not going to get one well attended between now and January 2<sup>nd</sup>. So I would hope that well before the New Year each drafting group has... well, sorry, of the two drafting groups that I am a partial penholder of, we'll have a pretty final document ready for the drafting group identifying the issues that need to be discussed.

I would hope that coming out of a meeting that would be held end of the first week, beginning of the second week in January, we would have closure. It's conceivable that the drafting group may need a second meeting, but I am hoping not. I think we will have finalized sections in time for the ALAC meeting. I do not think that there will have been time to draw all of them together, especially since Yrjo said he thinks he's going to need two.

YRJO LANSIPURO: Sure.

ALAN GREENBERG: Mine might need two, but his almost certainly will need two. So I think that the January meeting is going to be just a bit too aggressive. I'd like to get it out of the way too. And the adjunct documents also may be problematic. It would be nice if we could get adjunct documents...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'd rather go through reality than dreams.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. It would be nice if we could get adjunct documents approved in January. That may be possible, but probably even that's not.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, alright. I'm just going to keep pushing you. You can all push back. I'm just going to keep pushing you. Yrjo, over to you.

YRJO LANSIPURO: I would echo Alan's words that the January meeting is going to be very challenging and that the February meeting, in that sense, would be better because I think that between now and the New Year it's very hard to get people together and get them focusing on this. But if we would have a couple of meetings, the drafting team would have a couple of meetings in January, then sort of finalizing it with everybody. That would be doable.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Terrific. Okay, Tijani and then we'll respond to Heidi's question.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, thank you Cheryl. I would like to ask the drafting teams, the penholders to notify on the mailing list any change they do on the text so that people can react on them very early, which will make us win time. If we don't do so, when we meet next time we'll discuss what was done and then perhaps then we'll spend time discussing the text. So the best is to inform the list about any change so that people will be participating [Inaudible 57:13]. Thank you.



CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Indeed, those are wise words. I think everyone would agree with you on that. Heidi, you proposed that perhaps the drafting team calls should be looking at January 7<sup>th</sup>... but it has crawled back now. January 7<sup>th</sup>, what was your other date, Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: I was proposing two drafting team calls the week of the 7<sup>th</sup> of January, and two drafting team calls the week of the 14<sup>th</sup>.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Is there any objection from the penholders? Or can our expert staff try and make that magic happen? Alan, I hope you're not objecting.

ALAN GREENBERG: I put that hand up about seven minutes ago. I'm trying to type something into my chat window, and it refuses to enter... ah, it just entered it. I'm getting about a 20 lag on every keystroke.

Number one, to answer a question you put long ago whether we'll be able to do this at the February meeting, we very rarely get full attendance at teleconferences. Sadly, we just barely make quorum many of the times. I think this is something that we want a full vote on. We will probably have to do it electronically anyway.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Alan, just to clarify, you're saying that the ALAC votes for ratification should be by BigPulse?

---

ALAN GREENBERG: I didn't say BigPulse, given our recent experience with BigPulse. I said an electronic vote.

HEIDI ULLRICH: You've made Matt blush.

ALAN GREENBERG: All I'm saying is, this is something we want approved by the full ALAC, not by three people who happen to be at quorum because seven people weren't there and six people abstained.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay, yeah. Thank you. I just wanted to make sure you weren't talking about the drafting teams...

ALAN GREENBERG: No, I'm talking about the final approval. I do not see how we could have... I mean, if it's delayed long enough that it doesn't happen until Beijing, we can do it in person, but...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: No, don't do that.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, no, no. Cheryl, I said, "if." But presuming it does not get delayed that long, I suspect an electronic vote is what we're going to have to do to make sure that it gets approved and gets approved by everybody; or at least turned down by everybody, not a small subgroup.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: See here, Alan, that my record also shows that Alan has now managed to make Matt blush and me almost cry.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm sorry, when we recently had BigPulse polls that when Matt assures me they're created exactly the same and they act completely differently, and in violation of the rules that the ALAC has approved, I have a problem with BigPulse.

HERYL LANGDON-ORR: I can imagine you do, but we also have a mechanism that's trying to get that fixed. I'm sure Matt will be working directly with the guys in Australia. And if they're a problem, Matt, just let me know because I actually know where they live.

MATT ASHTIANI: Thanks Cheryl.

ALAN GREENBERG: And I would not trust their kneecaps if Cheryl gets to them.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, so we are back to this question...

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't remember the other point I was going to make. Sorry.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: The question was, can the drafting teams meet two meetings in the week of the 7<sup>th</sup> of January and two meetings in the week of the 14<sup>th</sup> of

---

January. We would very much like the penholders to “Yay” or “Nay” on that.

ALAN GREENBERG: That’s fine with me. I think I would prefer for the two that I am primarily responsible for, if they are in the week of the 7<sup>th</sup>.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: Because then it gives me a chance to come back with... well, no, hold it. Yrjo knows he needs two.

YRJO LANSIPURO: Yes. I think that we need two meetings in January. And when they are, I think that one after the 7<sup>th</sup> and one after the 14<sup>th</sup> will be okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, so that means we need to schedule 5 meetings and hope that my groups don’t need a second meeting each. But if they do, we’ll handle that on an ad hoc basis.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yrjo, we could also do one at the end of the first week, so the 3<sup>rd</sup> of January. Would that be better for you? So we could have one that Thursday or Friday that first week and one the week of the 14<sup>th</sup>?

---

YRJO LANSIPURO: I think the 3<sup>rd</sup> of January is a little bit early. I mean, people celebrate the New Year in different ways. So basically I think that after the 7<sup>th</sup> would be safer.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Heidi, I would encourage, if need be, for having the few people like Alan and I who are on absolutely everything to just suffer longer, and then to spread over longer.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes, and Sandra is coming in the week of the 7<sup>th</sup>. Okay, so Gisela and the team will make that magic happen. Obviously I would suggest that she proposes the specifics of dates and times first directly with the penholders because they're the ones that it has to suit. And I'm going to ask for one thing now as we close off. That is that I am both... very confused about the sounds that are coming through my phone.

YRJO LANSIPURO: What's that noise?

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't know.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Sorry everyone, we're just trying to find the source. Sorry.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you. Terrific. Good. Okay, I'm sure whoever was looking for the electronic surveillance device in their hotel room, we've reviewed the material, but they've found it now and they've turned it off. That's a good thing. That sort of sounded like someone was doing a scan.

What I would like very much to promote now that we've got our dates headed off, is that we do aim to have no later than the end of February as the [Inaudible 64:25] date ALAC will be in some way, shape, or form voting or have voted on this document. I'm pleading to you, please do your utmost to not let this time course slip.

If it does, so be it. The world as we know it will not end. But it is going to be in the best interest of the ALAC and particularly of the new members of the ALAC who have joined since October, and those too who will be joining in the following October if these rules are established and are operational.

It is also important because the regents themselves by the Beijing meeting need to be able to look at these ALAC rules and have opportunity to discuss and understand them, and also to consider whether or not any of these rules have some affect or effect on their own rules and the review processes of those rules. So it really is important that we stick to our plans wherever humanly possible.

I'm concerned, however, with one issue. That is that we've said all along that the definitions and descriptions part, Section A, is going to be 'kind of left to the end.' I don't think we can change that, but I would like very much to ask the penholders of the other drafting teams if you would consider [Inaudible 66:15] one or more of you from your drafting teams. I would like to see at least one penholder and perhaps one other from a drafting team to your sections to assist Holly and that Section A drafting team to get their work done in as prompt a manner as possible.

To that end I think what we might do is going back to Alan's proposal of the small review team to dot the i's, cross the t's and make sure this

---

whole document works. That group will also take ownership of that definitions and structures Section A work. I don't think it's going to get done practically any other way. So to that end I would suggest that Holly is compulsorily put onto that review team. And I would very much like either Yrjo or Yaovi on that as well.

YRJO LANSIPURO: Okay. Could we discuss that with Yaovi? But I would suggest Yaovi for that.

YAOVI ATOHOUN: Sure, I could be on that team.

YRJO LANSIPURO: Okay, we will talk about that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Excellent. I like democracy in action. Putting someone else into the role is a perfectly good mechanism as far as I'm concerned. Alan, it's quite probable that you will get the penultimate word. Over to you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. You said already most of what I was going to say in that I was going to suggest that the other penholders, as they're going over their section, make a little list of things that need to be transferred to Drafting Team 1. That is, they shouldn't have to scour everything to find them. As we're going over them in detail, let's make it part of our responsibility. So I think that is reasonable.

The second thing I was going to say is something, Cheryl, you haven't heard from me in this whole discussion before. I think the target of no

---

later than the end of February you are suggesting is reasonable. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Good heavens. And on that absolutely momentous point in time let the record show Alan Greenberg, for possibly the very, very first time in this whole process is agreeing with a potential deadline that I'm asking you to stick. At that, the bells and the choirs are singing.

I'd like to thank you all for your time today and indeed for the work that you're going to be doing online and in preparation for your January calls. I will update the Executive Committee, but of course Alan and all of the rest of you, if you want me to bring certain things forward to the ALAC, just let me know and I will pass that on to them. I look forward to seeing you all on the list and on the Wiki.

Heidi, I would suggest that any action items, if they get checked directly with me or with the drafting team penholders. That's going to be the best way forward. I then wish you all the very, very best of the season and hope those of you who are taking a break have a safe break and find wonderful space and time to share with your family and friends. Thank you, staff. Thank you, teams. We'll be talking certainly some of us before the end of the calendar year, but most of us early in 2013.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Cheryl, we wish the same to you and your family.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Happy holidays everyone. Thank you. Bye-bye.

YRJO LANSIPURO:

Okay, thank you. Bye-bye.



YAOVI ATOHOUN:

Happy holidays to all.