**Draft Minutes – RIPE Code of Conduct Task Force Fifteenth Call**  
  
25 June 16:30 (UTC+2)  
  
**Attendees:** Denesh Bhabuta, Athina Fragkouli, Antony Gollan, Brian Nisbet, Leo Vegoda.

**Scribe:** Karla Liddle-White

**Summary:** TheTask Force (TF) discussed the process for moderating mailing lists, noting that communicating expectations would be key. They also looked at which channels would be moderated and how the Code of Conduct (CoC) team would work with the working group (WG) chairs and RIPE Chair Team in future. The TF discussed feedback from RIPE 82 on what form the CoC should take and the process for making changes and the TF agreed that the CoC would be a RIPE Document. The summer meeting schedule was discussed, and it was agreed that meetings would be adjourned and the mailing list used more intensely over this period. The group discussed changes to the draft CoC and made changes to the document, mostly under the “Behaviour” heading. The TF agreed to draw attention to significant changes and outline the rationale in a RIPE Labs article and for Antony to finalise the clean version of the new draft, create an old version and publish both.

**1. Minutes**  
  
It was agreed to approve the minutes.  
  
**2. Agenda**  
  
Leo added action points from the last minutes and expanded the agenda item for the scheduled discussion for quarter 3.

**3. Actions**  
  
**- (Ongoing) TF to think about how the CoC Team and the WG Chairs would work together to manage discussions on mailing lists. Including tools e.g. Mattermost channel.**

Brian said the focus would need to be on communication and mutual respect and that everyone would be volunteers so response times could not be expected to be 24/7.

He thought setting expectations would be very important and asked what a reasonable expectation for the TF and WG Chairs would be. He added that they will need to confirm what moderation setup each WG has and whether a WG moderates a list or the RIPE NCC web team. He questioned whether the CoC team can ask the RIPE NCC to put a list in moderation after a report without interacting with the WG Chair or whether they could do this after no response within 24 hours. He also questioned whether the CoC team can appeal to the RIPE Chair team in case of no response. Lastly, Brian asked how much of a special case a mailing list should be compared to a WG session at a RIPE Meeting and that WG Chairs would need encouragement to see that the mailing lists come under the CoC.

Leo said that the chat function in Meetecho should also be added to the list. He said that a chair of a meeting can’t moderate the chat too as there’s only so much attention one person can have.

Denesh said that MatterMost should also be considered too and that any communication happening out of the view of the WG chair while a session is taking place needs to be considered.

Athina added that the platforms and channels are managed by the RIPE NCC so it has a legal responsibility to step in if there is illegal activity otherwise it is liable.

She said it would be very helpful to have a clear decision-making mechanism when there is a violation of the CoC which is not an illegal activity and this verdict is clear so it is executable by the RIPE NCC.

**- (Ongoing) TF to think about appropriate level of process to allow further improvements to the CoC.**

Leo said that they had received feedback at the RIPE Meeting that the CoC should be treated like a RIPE Document but the implementation should be more dynamic and the CoC team should have responsibility for implementing it. Leo asked the TF if that is something people agree with or if it is something they should think about again.

Brian said that the RIPE Document was the vehicle they had right now, that it was not great but we don’t have a better idea or better way of doing it and we don’t want to go through a process of finding a better idea so we should go with what we have and that can become a problem when it becomes a problem.

Leo added that this is the least energy-intensive action to take because if we want to use any other method we have to create a different process.

Ant said that we need a process that allows for small changes to be made easily and more robust ones to require more process but if this was left alone as a RIPE Document then this is what would happen anyway. Another point was that if the CoC team went to the RIPE Chair and said we want to add one line then presumably there could be a discussion on the list, and the Chair could announce consensus on that one issue. If they’re reviewing it in-depth then a more detailed process would be used but that would happen anyway in the current way things are done.

Leo said that the RIPE Chair would have the discretion to say this is a simple wording change so this process will be used and this is a more substantive change so we’re going to use a more heavyweight process and allow the RIPE Chair to apply discretion based on good sense.

Denesh agreed with Leo that this was a good way forward.   
  
**4. Do we need to change the meeting schedule for Q3?**

Leo asked the TF whether they should consider stepping back from a regular meeting schedule over the summer as people take breaks for family time and perhaps use the mailing list more intensively.

Brian noted that it was a good idea as long as momentum was kept up and the TF engaged actively on the mailing list. He added that if any TF member felt that the process was stalling because of this then a meeting may be required.

Denesh added that the TF could get together every 5 to 6 weeks over the current period to make sure the TF were meeting the goals and organise what’s happening next.

Leo said that meetings do provide a function by giving us a date but making greater use of the mailing list also allows people a little bit more flexibility especially over the summer period. He added that many people will really need a holiday this year in a way that they might not have needed in previous years so he said it would be a good idea to be more sensitive to people’s needs.

**5. Communication plan for updated draft CoC:**

* **Elements**
* **Scheduling**

Leo said that the document was about to be published and that the TF needed to think about the changes that were going to draw people’s attention the most. He added that there was quite a lot of discussion about law and police reports and in the end the TF decided to drop it as this would be covered by law anyway and they don’t need to include any text but they did need to communicate the rationale.

Antony ran through the updated draft document. He had changed the wording under “Call to Action” about reporting a breach of behaviour to make it more concrete and specific. The section on victims having a choice to report a crime had been removed as had a number of bullet points under “Behaviour”. Antony had also changed ‘size’ to ‘physical appearance’.

Leo reminded the TF that the whole section was new and hadn’t been in in the original draft shared with the community and that “Call to Action” section had been added in response to a request from Vesna.

Brian said that he was concerned that this would put a burden on people who may or may not feel comfortable reporting a breach whether that’s for physical reasons or power imbalance. He noted that this was important to be aware of.

Leo said that it could say that they have a right to ask instead of making it a burden.

Athina added whether they had the right to ask a person to stop and that it looked a little bit formal. She added that you could say ‘you can’ or ‘you may’ and that it also looked like a requirement that someone had to try to sort out a breach themselves before they could report it. She also asked the TF about using the terms Trusted Contact or Future CoC Team or whether the term CoC Team could be used instead.

Ant said that when the final documents were published, they would go back and remove Trusted Contacts. Leo said he thought the wording was good and avoided there being too much judgement. Brian asked why the section about victims having a choice over reporting a crime had been removed. Ant said there had been an exchange between Athina and Leo, and it had been discussed that the legal side is separate from the CoC, which is about behaviour.

Leo added that it is governed by law so rather than making assertions over what people should and shouldn’t do, that we would remove the text and that way they didn’t need to create incredibly complex wording.

Athina said that a statement like that is partially correct; they can have control but sometimes it is a legal responsibility to report and the authorities have to because of the type of crime so it’s not in control of the victim. So instead of going through the details and explaining, there’s no point going into this discussion, to remove it and refer to the local authority every time.

Leo asked Athina to attend the webinar as the TF received a lot of feedback on the topic which she would be able to explain in an authoritative way as the TF didn’t have Athina’s qualifications and experience. Athina said that if she wasn’t on leave she would attend.

Brian said that he disagreed that national origin and immigration had been taken out and asked for it be added back in. Denesh and Leo agreed that ‘family structure’ should be kept in too.

Leo added that it needs to be in alphabetical order so it’s clear that one isn’t more important than the other.

Athina asked whether it could be made clearer that these are examples and the TF agreed.

Leo said to change common sense to good sense as there isn’t really a common sense and add ‘allows’ the community to apply good sense.

Ant added that there was a comment from Salam previously where she didn’t understand the “Behaviour” section. He said that he understands it because he’s literate in these kinds of discussions, but he wondered for people coming at this from outside, if some of these might set people off a little bit so he changed one that said ‘refusing to discuss subjects’.

Brian said that this happened with a different CoC and they ended up adding items back in from Geek feminism wiki and it made perfect sense as it provided more information. He said he would advocate for the five bullet points and dropping them back in rather than adding their own at the moment.

Ant noted that a big part of his job was getting a sense of what will get a reaction from people and ‘refusal to explain or debate social justice concepts’ seemed a bit strange, not that he disagreed with it. He also noted that he did not understand what ‘reports that criticise discriminatory or otherwise oppressive behaviours or assumptions’ meant.

Brian said that criticising or calling out an oppressive behaviour in a tone of language someone doesn’t like would not violate the CoC. For example if somebody said ‘dude you’re being a patriarchal f-‘ or ‘why are there only men on stage’? These would not violate the CoC.

**Action: TF to draw attention to significant changes and outline rationale then plan the rest of the communication.**

**Action: Antony to finalise a clean version of the new draft and create an old version and new version of the text.**

**6. Next Steps**  
  
Leo noted that they would look at the next steps of the process in the future.

**7. AOB**

None

**8. Actions**

**Action: TF to draw attention to significant changes and outline rationale then plan the rest of the communication.**

**Action: Antony to finalise a clean version of the new draft and create an old version and new version of the text.**