

# W3C Process CG November 8 2023

Automatic transcription

plh

We should see what kind of follow up we can do on the request 790 uh which is about uh defunct registry.

Uh Then I looked at our list of issues that we had on our, on our list to pick a shoe that I think we should either check on the status.

Make sure we know where we are uh or uh uh discuss about them to, you know, start making progress on the, on the on this.

If you have an issue that you wish that we would make some progress here, please don't hesitate to speak up and add it to our agenda on that.

Uh Then uh um I want you to look, we have a bunch of requests that needs poor request that are Mark NSU request.

I removed some of those labels when I realized we already had some, but we have some that NSU request.

Uh uh uh and well, uh uh help would be welcome.

And last we have a bunch of uh issues that have been marked a needs to request but differ in the past, we should look to see at the minimum if we keep want, if we want them to stay differ or if we want to move them under process 2024 on uh on that, I am not going to ask a report from the A B on progress on the uh a new exploration and the chartering conversation today.

Uh But if you want to give some update here, uh please don't hesitate to speak up.

Uh Anything else that we should think about or add to our agenda? Um The last thing I should mention, Florer is uh on Slack.

I don't know if you notice this question from \*\*\* regarding uh.

florian 02:02

um I haven't had time to think about it in detail, but I did notice the question and it's a good question.

plh 02:09

I think that Nigel to say, hey, once you reach the conclusion, if you want to raise a process issue or a guidebook issue, please, uh Please do so uh on uh on uh on, on that.

Um uh for anybody who hasn't noticed it, do we have a link so that other people can give it some thoughts for the slack? Uh I think the Slack was a reference to an email.

So there's an email somewhere.

You uh you're right.

There is an email on spec proud.

Let me find the link quickly.

Uh Here, this is the link for spec crowd uh on uh on that and regard.

This is fy, I don't think we need to discuss that today.

I just wanted to allay up this conversation was ongoing on that.

And the last thing I'm going to say is you may have seen two weeks ago, a lot of changes happening in the guidebook uh uh from myself and others, we upgraded the guidebook to actually finally support process 2023.

So now any references to the director in the guidebook is, is not only a bug, but we missed it.

Uh uh uh Last time on, on that, we moved a lot of documentation into the GTA repository.

Some of that documentation was linking to email dated from 1999 like the role of an editor in the c for example.

So anyway, so, so we are moving, we've been moving a lot and more of our documentation into the git repository so that it can be maintained at uh uh uh more easily including the team, some of the team, internal documentation on how we do things to implement our process on, on that.

Um So, so ideally, you know, the guidebook is completely, we contain everything but we need to know when we implement our process.

Um OK.

Uh That was the introduction, sorry for taking that long.

So um um our first agenda and I'm going to write the topic, Josh, so you don't have, you don't have to do it is to request to discuss and, and potentially.

And um the first one is uh and I'm not quite sure about this tax in Irc, so uh, you may have to correct me.

I'm sorry, in advance.

Uh No, apparently I'm using the right one.

the one issue we have to discuss on additional item is, is the PreQue 790 which was enabled him to replace defunct registry custodians when no one else can, which as far as I know is not a problem today because we don't publish many registry under the registry track yet.

We haven't twisted the harm of the working groups to switch from notes to registry track yet.

But eventually we will.

And uh the, the early attempts at the pool request had some editorial challenges which uh Toted has provided a bunch of suggestions to improve on.

And uh well, let's go through them together.

Ok.

All right.

Well, I will let you drive the conversation from you here.

I mean, unless you know what to do.

Uh if you have questions for us, please go ahead.

.

florian 05:44

I mean, there are alternatives and options.

So, uh we should see if we like them.

Um But I suggest uh or maybe I should share a screen.

I'm not sure.

Um I have multiple screens that might not go well, uh look at the files uh changed uh tag of the pool request.

Oh, wait, I, I'm actually gonna try and start sharing.

plh 06:08

the screen these tab.

Uh uh look at this, this, this URL two mistakes specifically.

Would it help if I share a screen so that we look at the same thing or is that not helpful if you tell us the right number, uh that should be able for us to uh of the in your file.

It should be able to help us scrolling with you.

florian 06:37

So if you scroll to line 46 and 50 right after this, there are two suggestions from Ted which number 4650.

plh 06:49

4650.

Thank you.

There are two suggestions from Ted for a rephrasing.

One which has the thumbs down, vote on it and one which has two thumbs up, which gives us a hint of which one we might want to go with.

But, um, uh, giving everybody a minute to read.

Do we feel inclined to agree with the two thumbs up or not? To some extent? This depends on the last comment I've made in there at the bottom of the, the tab all the way to the bottom.

Yeah,.

tallted 07:36

it's.

florian 07:36

a question.

Maybe you, maybe you can explain uh, what we should be thinking through.

tallted 07:41

Yeah.

So as I said there in text, as I understand it, any registry may be defined to have multiple tables and any subset of tables within a registry might have a different custodian than any other subset.

Yes, it is correct.

Each and every table within a registry might have a different custodian than every other one.

Yes, but a custodian might also manage multiple tables.

So it seemed less clunky to me to say that a custodian of an entire registry or any portion thereof as opposed to the custodian of a registry or registry table I'll live with either when, but I, I don't understand the objection to the portion.

Yeah, I'm, I think, I agree.

I think both raisings work.

Uh, if it's for stylistic reasons that people dislike portion thereof.

Sure.

Uh, aesthetics, I mean, beauty and the eye of the beholder and all of that.

But I agree with you that um it does make sense.

Um But I, I think the second one is compatible as well.

So it's a matter of reference, I guess I'm OK.

One.

Does anybody go ahead.

What's the.

florian 09:24

issue number? We are on the pull request.

Uh 90 sorry, 790 and the pool request, sorry, the issue that corresponds to that six.

tallted 09:36

199.

Yeah.

And we're looking at the tab about files and we all, we are all the way down that tab looking at the from tab, I'm guessing from the side that you don't have access to Irc.

That's why you're asking.

I've been trying to paste link to Irc as much as I can.

Oh, you already did that.

OK.

.

florian 10:05

So we're, we're looking at the possible rephrasing of the beginning of a sentence.

The sentence used to be if a custodian of a registry becomes defunct.

Uh And, and so it was if a custodian of a registry becomes defunct.

Uh and uh the proposed phrasing makes to change, it replaces becoming defunct with thesis to exist or to operate as a custodian.

Uh But the part that we were talking about now is to replace a custodian of a registry with the custodian of a registry or a portion thereof.

Or alternatively, the custodian of a registry or registry table and thumbs in github seem to prefer registry or registry table rather than registry or portion thereof.

fantasai 10:57

Why would you say? Or you can, I mean, if we're going to be as specific as to call out the table, then, I mean, the custodian can't change anything about the registry other than the contents of the table.

So.

florian 11:11

the tables.

So if we have a registry with multiple tables and only the custodian of table three ceases to operate as a custodian.

Oh,.

fantasai 11:23

yes.

So you say if the custodian of the registry table ceases to exist or operate that should be fine? Mm.

Um, it's viable except that it doesn't, by, by writing it that way it suggests that each table should be addressed as it becomes an issue as it comes up as it's revealed that its custodian is gone.

Yeah.

Isn't that what we're doing?.

tallted 11:56

Well, yes and no, to, to my mind, once it's discovered that, that any table within the registry no longer has a custodian, it makes more sense to address it once and put a custodian on all of them.

All of these are lacking some.

fantasai 12:17

I don't feel like there's a sort of timing thing.

It's like if a custo, if the custodian of a registry table ceases to exist, then we replace them.

Now, if there's multiple tables in that state, then multiple tables get replaced.

So that's, I guess a third phrasing.

We just go for table directly without talking about the whole registry.

Yeah, because you're not a custodian of a registry, you coach, they don't have a table.

So might as well just say that and keep the phrasing simple because honestly, most of the time it's just gonna be the one person for all of them.

And like we don't need to make the phrasing more complicated if it's not incorrect.

So let's just keep it simple.

All right.

Do we want to take a straw ball? I mean, we are not that many people.

We.

plh 13:10

can take a straw ball or we can feed a coin at this point? I feel.

Um, well,.

florian 13:14

we have three sides now.

So a coin isn't great.

Ok.

All right.

.

fantasai 13:18

Um So is there anything incorrect? Is there anything incorrect about saying, um, it's the custodian of a registry table? I don't think it's incorrect.

It is the shortest phrasing.

So we should take it and it is the simplest words as well.

.

tallted 13:38

It's to, to my mind, it's not just a question of what's written in this document, but also the way that it operates functionally.

And if it's written to address each table at a time, then you discover that the custodian is not responding when you try and make a change to a given table of whatever change.

And then you have to discover it each table.

And so you have to go through this process, each table.

.

florian 14:05

But it's, if not, when.

fantasai 14:08

we're, if they're all the same custodian and they're being unresponsive to one table, I think we're all human and we will assume that they are.

tallted 14:17

responsible, that's already been set aside because the, the, the initial part of this conversation when I was present for it made plain that the registry might have multiple custodians for portions of its tables to cover that.

.

florian 14:41

But if only, I mean, if only some of these custodians are non responsive, we don't need to replace the custodians of those that do respond.

And so if we have four tables, two of them are maintained by people who are responsive and two of them are maintained by people who are not.

When, when we discover that the people who are not, are not, will replace them on both tables.

We don't have to discover separately that that same individual or group is failing to respond to both tables.

They are failing to respond, period.

Yes, this is, this is being worded in a best case scenario where essentially there is one custodian for all tables in the registry.

But the earlier discussion and an awful lot of what's in this process document is not for the optimal situation.

So I'm not going to lay down on the road, but this is either the phrasing should be to cover the unusual situation as well as the usual or we should just not cover the unusual.

Well, I mean, going with going with registry alone isn't great because, yeah, that's confusing given that there can be different custodians for a different table but going with table alone doesn't prevent us from saying, well, these three tables are maintained by three different people who are unresponsive or the same people who are unresponsive.

We need to deal with each table anyways, whether we'll deal with them by batch or, or one by one is up to operating the process, but the definition results in the same thing.

Let.

plh 16:21

me ask something.

Let's see many others.

She has 10 tables.

OK? If the team is s because we are talking about, he is doing an ac review to replace the custodian, which is a pretty heavy process, not for the team, but for the ac it is a pretty, I mean, they're going to grumble at spanning them.

So what are we going to do is we're going to send one W BS uh uh survey with only one single question.

Are you willing to replace the custodians for this table with this individual or you know, or with this set of individuals? We are not going to have separate questions for every single table.

Would that be an appropriate implementation of the process?.

florian 17:06

I think it's fine.

Either way to me, all these three phrasing are functionally equivalent.

It's just a matter of which one is more readable, more expressive, more easy to understand.

I'm fine with wording.

.

fantasai 17:23

Yeah, I, I wanna keep the wording simple.

It is not wrong.

So let's keep it simple and, and, and if people need to like lawyer it up in some weird complicated situation in the future, they can do that and they have it fine and they can interpret it and it's gonna be fine like, but it also leads much easier for everyone who is not thinking about weird cases.

And I think that's important.

Are you willing to accept from the proposal? I'm not entirely clear what the current proposal is to say whether.

florian 18:03

so her proposal is on the like you made two alternatives which changed line actually to.

tallted 18:11

be clear, this went back and forth a number of times.

And the latest proposition for me is down at the bottom of the page that's in junk.

It's a seven line green, replacing three lines of red.

Oh, sorry, I had missed that.

This was a full alternative rather than just adding to earlier things.

So I think Panda I's suggestion keeps the six last lines of your proposal unchanged.

It just changes the first one.

And instead of a registry or registry table, we go straight for a registry table.

It's fine.

And the other change I would make is to remove, to repeated attempts to make contact.

The second time it's said because at this point, we understand what unresponsive means.

It's mentioned earlier as repeated to attempt to make conduct is that also shortens the sentence without losing anything.

Order is better for us.

We didn't complain because the process is too long.

So we're gonna, so the proposal is to take to Ted's uh final suggestion um with two changes, one is to remove registry over from the first line.

And the second change is to remove all the words after unresponsive on the last line works for me and remove the word after all.

Unresponsive.

fantasai 20:03

after, yeah, the words after unresponsive on the last line, we keep it in the in the middle one and I can see from the light slide, I just want to make sure to capture in the minute.

So that plans if I manage to die.

OK, on the last line, OK.

That should be enough for you too.

Act on it.



.  
florian 20:33

Yeah.

And uh and I support this amended proposal.

Uh So you will update your pull request like like next time we can ate it.

I my intent is to if you will give me the corresponding resolution is to lend this full request right after this call, making the necessary edits to it.

Are people comfortable with that? Yeah.

OK.

Resolution merge uh uh is only uh 790 after making the tweaks, I think twigs.

OK.

Thank you all and thank you, Ted for moving this along.

All right.

Uh So that seed for um this topic.

Uh Now we have an issue to discuss on that and the first one is gonna be the uh 574 which is um the uh order of preference of membership agreement, cross a document and normative references.

And if I remember last time PC has recommended that we don't give an order of preference, we use A OC.

Instead, we wanted to get the feedback from the A B potentially on that.

The A B.

There was no pushback.

All right.

So now are we waiting for request? Um I'm, I would like the opinion of this group and of people who know pig because as far as I understand P cig say, no, don't define it.

But during the conversation, some people apparently have said things that Rigo understands as meaning that he should double check their conclusions.

If that's not the case, we should not wait on Rigo.

If that is the case, we might want to ask Rigo how far he's done? He's been with that.

.

fantasai 22:52

I think we close the issues and if Rigo comes back and says something else and Pig agrees with him, then we can change it.

All.

florian 23:02

right.

Um Which means uh effectively close this issue and don't open a pool request, right? And close the existing ones.

Yes.

Uh I think there's two of them.

Right.

Yes.

574 and 572.

Oh, I'm sorry, sorry.

582574.

Full request.

599 and full request.

572 are all closed.

They're closed already.

Well, no, they should be, they should be closed.

Ok.

.

plh 23:42

So here uh no action needed except closing the issues and related request and your objection to doing that going once, going twice, all resolve close issue uh 7574 and related turning.

Uh he asked with no change.

Um I'm fundamentally agreeing, but it's been a long time since this pool request was opened.

And I seem to remember that in poor request, 572 alongside with the main substantial change that we were trying for, we had made some editorial tweaks.

I'm wondering if I should try and salvage some of them.

Maybe that's just an action on me to reread it and if so propose an editorial pool request separately.

Yes, indeed.

I will let you handle the closing.

Yep.

Uh uh I will close the issue.

What I'm going to do is I'm going to close the issue, but I will let you on the pull request.

How about that? That sounds great.

Ok.

Record the action item, you know, action.

Um I jumped the gun there.

fantasai 25:17

on the salvage editorial fixes from 572 action to Florian.

joshco 25:23

Put that back.

I jumped the gun, I guess on.

florian 25:25

the, I'm doing it for myself.

Ok.

B eight.

Ok.

Oh, ok.

Ok.

And I'm putting, I'm putting a comment into that.

He should say, feel free to reopen if there is new information.

So it kills without prejudice.

Ok.

That's it for this one on that.

It took us some time from, uh, uh, uh, to get to it.

All right.

Uh, subtopic, next, sub, next, uh, issue is 794 which may be editorial, uh, flo, uh, but it was a new one that was opened since the last time we met.

That's why I placed it on the agenda.

Uh, it was raised by Jeffrey asking, saying that we still apparently have some, uh, uh, pending, uh, pending conversations about, um, uh, when something strange happened with the logboard which, yeah, I.

plh 26:53

saw that and yes, because, uh, Josh did my mistakes.

The same mistake that I did last time was supposed to put GTA Conan and the new issue before we change the topic in Irc.

Yeah.

So, uh, you.

florian 27:08

deal with that later.

Uh, we.

joshco 27:12

can just change it back, right?.

plh 27:15

Uh, because they play subtopic.

I didn't, I didn't think that true enough to realize that as soon as I'm going to the new subtopic, it will record on the previous topic, it will recall on the previous one.

Ok.

All right.

Uh, so we are on 784.

florian 27:34

So 794 the tag had a charter.

It was terribly outdated, we have agreed to mark the outdated tag Charter as being superseded and so it's no longer relevant.

Nobody should be reading it.

The document itself has a warning.

This is fine but the process still refers to it.

So we should remove that.

And I'm happy to take a resolution to simply remove the process references to the tag.

And if so I'll just to the tag Charter not to the tag altogether.

Sorry.

And if we agree to do that, I'll just do it.

Probably that's enough.

I suspect that if somebody someday finds that there was some useful bit in that document that we should reintroduce somewhere, then file a new issue and we'll deal with that.

Uh, as it is, I think we can just remove the reference.

I'm fine with that.

I will mark this as editorial and I will let you deal with it directly from you.

You don't need to get a further review unless you, you feel like it sounds good to me.

The objection going once, going twice.

Ok.

All right.

Uh So, uh resolved, you tell me when you hit and are on the github thing,.

plh 29:14

we'll deal with uh 794 and solve it on their own.

That should be enough for you to take action.

Ok.

That's it for this one.

I'm sorry, Josh, next one is 797.

Right? Yes.

No, no, no, no, no, no, no, no, no, no, no, no.

I need to go set topic first before you type anything in Irc otherwise we're going to mess up.

joshco 29:47

again.

Ok.

So, all right.

Ok.

So the first one.

plh 29:51

we are on 797 now we can have the gift of the, now we can type the gift of things.

So process, so process wise, the first thing you do is you say subtopic and then put the github link.

Yeah,.

florian 30:08

because if you, if you put a new github without changing the topic, it replaces the one we're supposed to post into.

If you say issue number one, then you discuss and then you say issue number two, it thinks that we labeled the wrong issue and we post into issue number two instead of number one.

But if you change topic in the middle, say, oh, we're done with that, let's post it to number one.

Where do you want the rest? And then you say number two.

OK.

So the, the, the, the, the bots mental per version of subtopic and github are not the same thing.

No github alone tells it where to post, but it doesn't close the previous topic.

It redirects the previous topic.

Got it.

OK? Because sometimes we type it wrong so we need to be able to fix it.

.

plh 30:59

Ok.

All right.

Um We are on 797 closing a group prior to the date specified in the charter should be a teenager, not a dirty decision.

Uh, an issue raised by Kali last week on uh on uh on this.

Did people have time to look at it? Should we talk about.

florian 31:21

it? I think we should talk about it.

I don't know if everybody has had time to look about to look at it.

There's two parts to the issue uh which currently uh clarified.

The first one is about the kind of extraordinary conditions for closing a group prior to its uh end date.

And she's proposing that that be a team decision that can be appealed rather than a W three C decision, which must go through ac review.

Uh She explains that the motives to close the group in these cases are things like insufficient resources, tag outcomes or considered detrimental by the tag in the A and these can be uh supported by documentation and, and, or evidence uh as part of the team decision.

The second part of the issue is she meant notices that the process no longer uh covers the group expired case.

I don't remember what it said in the past.

Uh So we would have to look at it.

Uh It doesn't say that you do anything particular which I interpret as meaning the charger just expires and that's just the end of the route.

Uh If we want to say anything additional about that, we could.

So I, I would like to start with an opinion about the second part.

Uh I don't know how shared this is But in my view, the idea of uh trying to close group as early as possible is actually not a good idea.

Just because you've published A R doesn't mean you should be disbanded immediately.

Uh There is maintenance, work to be done and I think long live group tends to be a better thing now.

Yes.

Charters have finite lives and we don't have to re charter a group necessarily.

Although I think it tends to be a good practice, but just because a group appears to be done, I don't see any urgent need to actually close the group.

Uh If it just sits around just in case to me, that's fine.

And so making sure that we have a way to urgently close groups when they appear to be done doesn't seem useful to me.

plh 33:43

II, I agree with that.

Uh uh I think Carly's question was more about but what if we have any sufficient resources for the group to actually produce a recommendation? So that's, that's, that's two parts.

There's insufficient resources is already listed as a motivation for closing.

Uh So whether we do that by team decision or by ac review is one of the questions she's raising but insufficient resources is listed as a reason for closing.

The group is done isn't listed and I think that's fine.

OK.

So do we need an ac review? I think that's the core of Coral's question.

Do we need to go through the ac.

florian 34:31

I think as, as I said, there are two cores to Coral's question.

You trying.

plh 34:36

to get to the bottom of the first one?.

florian 34:38

Ok.

I will start with the second one first but.

Ok.

Uh uh.

plh 34:43

oh you, oh sorry, you were trying with the second one.

I'm sorry.

That's why.

Yeah.

florian 34:47

So to me, the second one is, no, we don't need to add.

The group is done to the list of reasons because if the group is done, just let it sit there unless it has insufficient resources.

But hold.

plh 35:00

on, hold on.

I think the group is out of charter.

So you cannot just let it sit there.

And right now, the team is not required to do any c review when they decide to do nothing, which is not to put, not to put a new charter.

florian 35:20

No, that's fine.

The question is if you have a group that has a three year charter and after two years they're done, do you need to close the group after two years?.

plh 35:30

This is not case two, case two after the charter expired.

I thought.

fantasai 35:37

Philip is correct.

The second question and this is very clear from her last comment is, does the team need to launch an ac review to close a group whose charter has expired? The answer to that question is.

florian 35:49

no, sorry, I misunderstood and yes, I agree.

There is no need to do anything.

The charter is expired.

You're done.

Ok.

plh 35:57

So suddenly let's take the example of the SVG working group and, and Josh, I'm hoping you can take some notes here because I can't take notes and, and speak at the same time, I'm ready.

Um, um, the NDG working group is about to run out of charter at the end of February.

Ok.

Right now, if I do nothing, I can simply ask the company to send an email in March to say the group is closed.

And uh and uh that's a team decision and the only record that you have to prevent me from doing that is to send an appeal once we issue that decision.

Ok.

So in practice, I'm trying to have a conversation with the AC for that.

Uh but there is no need for me to get an AC review to simply announce that the A VG working group is going to be closed uh uh after February on the, on the, on that.

So if I was going to say today, let's close it now because we don't have enough resources, which is a rationale for not continuing it, I would need an ac review to do that today between now and February, I need an AC U to do exactly that.

If I do nothing, I bypass entirely DH C review and I can simply close the group in March without ac review.



Are we ok with that? Yes, that in my mind, it's not even a team decision.

It's a consequence of a charter expiring then what you're doing is not taking the decision to close the group.

It's just cleaning up after the fact.

So there is, it's a decision.

Ok.

The fire team does not propose a new charter is a decision.

florian 37:42

if you fair enough.

But, uh, but I don't think you need an ac review for that and I don't think the process goes for it.

Let me just,.

joshco 37:52

um, Phil, let me, yes, let me ask if I've captured the gist of what you're saying, you're saying if a charter has simply expired, there's no reason for an ac review or decision.

If the reason you want to and you can just close the group.

If the reason is a lack of resources, then there is a need for a review decision.

No good.

If the charter expired, there is no need for me to, there is no need.

florian 38:21

for an A but if the charter has not expired, but the reason you want to close it is insufficient resources, then yes.

So I've just checked the text of the process and indeed the says propose to close the group prior to the date specified in the charter.

And in those cases, you need the review.

But if it's not prior to the date, the process doesn't go for anything, you can just go ahead and do it.

So now when we say for again, looking, talking about case two, um um closing the group for the team to close the group.

Once the charter expired, it is a team decision fair enough in the sense that you are choosing not to do something.

plh 39:06

else that can be, that it should be what I'm saying.

It should be a team decision.

The process says needs to say it's a team decision because if he doesn't say that, then what? Because does the EEC have to object to that decision? So in the sense, in the sense that it's a decision not to reach, alter or not to extend to the group or not to renew the group rather?.

fantasai 39:33

Well, I mean, so not to renew the group is fine, the group is expired.

If the TEC wanted it to extend, then they could um asked the team to propose a charter.

Now, we currently have not a lot of clarity on proposing new charters and the team's decision to accept or deny such requests and we need to clarify that.

But that's a question for chartering.

It's not a question for closing up groups.

So here, yeah, my suggestion here is to say on, on topic number two, it's currently a little bit fuzzy where whether it just happens or whether it's a team decision.

And hopefully, we will clarify that while we clarify how Chartering itself works.

But in any case, it is clear that it doesn't call for an, a review and I think I agree with you ph that it should be something people can appeal from.

But whether we say it here or whether we say it somehow in any change we make about the chartering process, we'll need to see when we deal with the chartering process.

Like if somebody is like, OK, it's SVG Charter is expiring I and the team has not proposed a new charter and intends to let them close.

Um I want to propose a new charter, then they would draft a charter and ask the team to propose it.

And if the team says no, then we have the same situation that we're in whenever the team proposes a new charter for anything else.

.

florian 41:04

That's true.

I mean, another alternative is somebody formally objects to the fact that the team chose not to extend the charter, um are.

fantasai 41:20

usually like for three months or something.

They're not, I don't think we overthink this.

.

florian 41:27

Yeah, I think I agree.

So now we're back to, well, we probably should write a resolution of some kind, but after we're done with that, we should go back to Cory's first part of the question,.

plh 41:39

the resolution should be, this should be addressed.

Case two at least should be addressed as un Shater.

Yes, yes.

Uh um Now, um uh resolve I need to become that problem.

Case two shutter expired, who does not need an ac review and how to deal with this agreement will be covered as part of chartering.

Well, I'm not sure I want to recall.

There's not an issue with you.

I agree.

It's what the process says right now and it's, it's not, there is no ambiguity of.

florian 42:19

it.

We don't need resolutions to agree with what the process said.

Sorry.

Exactly.

plh 42:23

Meaning if we change our mind during the chartering discussion, that's fine.

florian 42:28

Yeah, fair enough.

Ok.

So what was the gist of that? So case two and we're about to call the resolution, case two which is closure after charter expired is uh is a discussion uh uh relative to sheltering and need to be addressed as part of uh needs to be addressed as part of that discussion.

So it's a, it's a, it's a resolution to agree.

We need to do more but in a larger context on the, on that um uh that's for case two.

Now case one, the case from what I understand from Kali case one is requiring an ac review when the charter has not expired and the team wants to close the group prior to the charter expires expiration because of lack of resources of the pack outcome, meaning the group is not capable of producing something on the royalty free terms or because the group has become, the technology has become so harmful that, you know, we should start this group now on that.

And Carly is saying, why do we need ac review from that? If we simply say we need a team decision, the ac can object to the team decision on that.

So uh at least on P A outcome, I'm going to disagree.

Uh because the patent policy itself requires an ac a review for that.

So we can't change that without also changing the patent policy or the other ones, we could make a different decision.

But for pack outcome, I don't feel like revisiting the patent policy.

Well, I think for the others, I don't think we should do anything different.

These are not especially urgent reasons to close a group.

Um And getting ac input is I think important for all of this.

I mean, maybe I see has something to say on these topics.

Maybe they disagree with the tag in the A V.

Maybe they realize that there's insufficient resources due to the review and work on adding more or maybe they decide to give some other input.

I don't know, like um but I, I think ac review is the appropriate response here.

II I concur actually because taking again the example of SVG me going around and saying I'm going to close down the working group.

It took for like four months.

Finally uh uh last month it got picked up enough of people realized, oh that seems broken.

We should do something else.

Uh uh And meaning we should actually put resources into that group uh on that.

Uh It took four months for me to get to that point for four months to some of those individuals.

I when I was telling them closing down the FBG working group, they had no objection at all until they realized until somehow in their brain it clicked.

Don't ask me how.

Um So in any case, uh uh I think, yes, I an ac review uh uh when we close early is at the minimum, it's a signal for the ac that this is your last chance to speak up on this.

After that we're going to move on and we don't need a 5% threshold of the membership to support the closure of a working group by the way, um If I don't get a single answer to an ac you asking if it's OK to close a working group, I will close the working group because I agree that I agree that there is no 5% threshold.

But an ac review is there to assess the consensus of the consortium and to have consensus.

You not only need a lack of objection, you need to have a meaningful number of people agreeing with you.

Now, how many is a meaningful number? Uh is an interesting question but no opinion at all is not a consensus.

.

plh 47:02

Well, on the other hand, if no, just for the fact that really no one cares about this working group, why would I have to go to go and raise awareness, further awareness for something that not a single care to answer this won't happen? I mean, I agree, luckily the is very low.

I just want.

fantasai 47:26

to hear, I think that's a question for the team to decide on when there is such an ac review and not for us to decide on here and fine with that as.

florian 47:37

well.

Yeah, the definition of consensus is a substantial number of individuals support the decision and nobody is complaining.

So if you've got no answer, you can't have consensus.

Now, how many answers do you need? So you'll worry about the day where you only have one or something.

plh 47:59

But here we're talking about the lack of internet in something.

So,.

florian 48:03

so yeah, but if you go to the work, if you go to the ac and say, nobody cares about this thing, we have a full time person assigned to it.

Can we reassign them something ourselves? And everybody is indifference to the fact that we're wasting money.

Um Maybe people won't be indifferent.

We don't need to talk about this.

Not a question that we need to address in the process.

OK.

Um All right.

So, uh we are not closing 787.

Uh We are answering on case one to say yes, we still feel any c review is needed.

And for case two, this is a chartering discussion.

I don't know if we have a chartering label into our gar before or not yet.

But uh I think that's the result so resolved is one a shelter not excused.

And the chapter uh uh is, uh, is still, uh, is, uh, not outdated, it's not out of charter to negation.

I don't know how to phrase that.

Sorry, my brain uh, uh, is not expired.

Thank you.

Uh, I still need ac U are you done by a result? Ok.

And yes, we have a label about chartering and they just played it.

Ok.

All right.

We're going slowly but surely.

Um, uh, I think this is it for 797.

So our new sub topic is going to be, let's see if we can, we have six minutes.

Let's see if we can achieve anything here on 735 um which is uh timelines for um uh from Jeffrey asking requirement to publish formal exchange will include a timeline.

So the process today says we need to each recall of uh a recall of each form election against a decision regarding a publicly available document must be made publicly available uh uh on that in our implementation of it.

There are two, two things that create uh issues.

One is we interpret it that its a, if it's from an AC B view and the company did not agree to disclose their name to the public.

We publish a final objection anonymously, meaning we still publish a foreign objection, but it's anonymous.

And, and, uh, and the second time is, do we publish it uh uh as soon as uh uh AC B view concluded or do we publish it once the report of the conceal on the formal objection gets published, you know, which could be months later, the two weeks, I think it's a little bit in between because if I remember correctly, the process of making something public involves you asking the person who posted it if they're ok with the particular way you want to make it public and that might involve a conversation.

So I think you should not wait for the full report, but you might need a little bit of time to go back and forth with the objector to decide how you can make it public.

Yeah.

So the close of ac review should, should be a trigger for making it public, but uh you don't have to publish it on that day.

Um We just should try to publish it soon from that day.

All.

plh 52:18

right.

So, uh, do we believe we need to process change? We need to give more requirements in the process.

So, is it something that no, we just need to refine the guidebook? I mean, the, the, the concern raised, uh by Jeffrey is valid that if some objections are public, some are private and there is a significant amount of time that passes where it is not known that there is other objections being private than those who are public.

Get all the complaints about all the world about why they're stopping progress.

Well, actually they're not alone there.

So it is a problem if there is a long delay between the two.

Now, how do we address it? Well, yeah, on D ID, I think we created two issues.

The first was that the f the formal objection uh for a while, Mozilla was the only formal objection in the public record on D ID.

And they got a little bit of the, and they got the blame for that because they were the only one while two other companies uh didn't make comments.

Uh uh And one is not only used to not allow their name to be put in public because it creates a lot of headaches internally of the record.

By the way, it's Apple who doesn't like to have their uh uh uh uh uh I mean, it's, it's, it's company policies, they need a lot more power internally to do that.

And I'm sure you, you know, uh fai by now.

Um And uh and, but ironically, the formal election from Mozilla was referencing Apple by name.

So Mozilla, I mean, again, this is of the recall did break ma confidentiality when they publicly recorded the formal object because they disclosed the fact that Apple was also an objector, which was not public information when they did it.

Uh uh on the, on the, on the, I mean, we, we, we did tell Mozilla.

Oops, uh no one made a fuss about it beyond that.

So, so that was uh that did not create a crisis on the, on that.

And I'm sure that Mozilla's mistake was not on purpose.

Um, so anyway, I, I think I agree with Jeffrey that there is a problem whether it needs to be solved in the process or whether again is sufficient.

I'm less strongly opinionated about.

Um,.

fantasai 54:51

I think we could clarify the process to say something about soon after the close of ac review or something, something like that, um, without putting a specific deadline on.

Yeah, I think it just sets the expectation that like ac review, close of ac review is the trigger for making it public that it may take some time to do so.

But that's fine.

Can you repeat your proposal? I know, I, I think we need to draft up specific wording.

I don't have specific wording but it's something to the lines of uh indicating that it should be made public soon after the close of AC review.

And uh I'm fine with that and still my only brother is, is it still something we want to put in the process or is it something we want to put in the guidebook? I think we put it in the process because it helps set the expectation that the trigger for making it public.

Is the filing of it or, or the is the registration of the formal objection? Um Not the report and all of that kind of stuff.

And then what tune means the guidebook can talk about that.

But I think we do want to set the expectation that the trigger for making it public is the registration of the formal objection and not the resolution of the formal objection.

OK.

All right.

So resolved.

Oh, I mean, we have the editors to track APR All.

plh 56:33

right.

I won't recall the next item.

You guys can deal with that.

But uh uh the issue is not closed and the record will show that uh and green, I think it is two propose of request.

Ok.

And we are over time at this time.

Um uh Let me uh uh switch topics to next meeting so that we is going to do.

It's uh it's uh right thing.

Here we go.

Um Next, I'm just checking that we're not conflicting with Thanksgiving quickly.

I forgot to, uh to check before that next meeting would be on the 22nd Wednesday, which is the day before Thanksgiving in the US.

Are people confirmed uh uh uh available to meet on that day, the Wednesday 22nd.

Yeah.

Ok.

Well, uh next meeting, it will be November 22nd.

And are you are burning some poor bird into some oven uh somewhere around the world? Ok.

All right.

Ok.

Um Thank you, everyone.

Uh And uh I will uh talk to you all in two or three weeks whenever that 22nd is.

.

fantasai 58:03

Sounds good.

Thanks.

.